



Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 6, 2008, 10:00 A.M. to Noon

COMPASS, Conference Room

800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100

Meridian, Idaho

AGENDA

- I. Consent Agenda***
 - a. Approval of the October 2, 2008, Meeting Notes (pages 2-4) **
- II. Action Items***

None.
- III. Discussion Items***
 - a. Discuss Policy Issues and Recommended Directions – Patricia Nilsson (pages 5-7)**
 - b. Recommended Technical Work to Advance Adequate Public Facilities – Sally Goodell (pages 8-9)**
 - c. Variable Level of Service related to Adequate Public Facilities – Sally Goodell*

* Attachments

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Steering Committee\agenda11 06 08.doc





Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, October 2, 2008, 10:00 A.M. to Noon

COMPASS, Conference Room

800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100

Meridian, Idaho

MEETING MINUTES

I. Consent Agenda (10:05 AM – 10:10 AM)

- a. Approval of the September 18, 2008, Meeting Notes (pages 2-6) ***

The Consent Agenda was approved without discussion.

II. Action Items

There were no action items.

III. Discussion Items

- a. Transportation and Land Use Integration (TLIP) update – ACHD (10:10 – 10:30 AM)**
ACHD will provide a status on ACHD's TLIP project.

Sally Goodell provided a TLIP update. She stated the review of products with local governments is wrapped up and ACHD staff will follow up as needed.

- The Livable Streets Design Guide and Topology maps should be ready in draft form by the end of October 2008.
- The Framework document is still being worked on. The draft should be ready by the end of October 2008.
- The Collector maps have been reviewed by the local governments and cleanup should be done on the draft by the end of October 2008.
- The Variable Level of Service map is still being worked on with the local governments.
- The Major Streets map work is ongoing. Staff is looking at options and talking with the local governments.
- The Arterial map is a new map being created by ACHD of all the existing arterials, what are they today, ACHD's current plan for them based on the CIP or what ACHD is acquiring for ROW, and local governments comments about their vision for the areas.
- The draft Cost Sharing Policy has been rolled out to the local governments and will be discussed at Alliance meeting on October 16, 2008. Staff will continue working with the ACHD Commission to bring it to conclusion.
- The draft Complete Streets Policy has been sent out to the local governments and other entities for comments. It is a conceptual underpinning of the TLIP Livable Streets concept.
- The timeline strategy for adoption is still being developed. There are two options being considered, to adopt TLIP in segments or after it is complete.

Sally said expectations need to be adjusted regarding the technical work that needs to be done on the variable LOS for the APFO, it is a bigger challenge to sort out than expected and she is still working on a timeline for when that will be completed.

- b. Evaluation of Cumulative Demand – COMPASS (10:30 – 11:30 AM) (pages 7-10) ****
In the September meeting packet, members were provided an approach to assessing cumulative demand, one of the key components in both the TLIP and APFO processes. ACHD handed out other materials on evaluating demand. These are shown in Attachment 2. Staff will be seeking guidance and assistance from the Technical/Steering Committee regarding land use information and other aspects.

Charles Trainor reviewed a flowchart developed by ACHD showing the methodology for determining committed demand and estimating programmed capacity. Charles stated there is an issue regarding development data and the types of information being collected now or will need to be collected and how the data might affect the assessment of cumulative development. There are two broad approaches to determining committed demand: traffic impact studies and traffic counts or the travel demand model, which would be complementary and would blend the two together.

Charles reviewed levels of development that need to be looked at based on the different data sources, which come with their own set of issues, i.e., building permits, existing traffic counts, and assessor files. The levels are:

- Existing: Residential and Non-Residential.
- Approved Un-Built: Residential and Non-Residential

The Committee members discussed where preliminary plats need to be in the process. Currently, they are considered under the “In Process” category. After discussion, the Committee agreed preliminary plats need to be considered as part of the “Approved Un-Built” category. As part of the process the cities in Ada and Canyon County need to provide preliminary plat updates to COMPASS, i.e., what is approved, what has died, or changed substantially on a quarterly or at least every six month basis.

Charles said currently COMPASS receives the preliminary plat information from Ada County, which acts as a central depository for the county. Meg Rush said she will research Ada County’s process and report back to the Committee at the November meeting. Charles noted that there is not a central depository for Canyon County. COMPASS collects the preliminary plat information from the individual cities in Canyon twice a year. Charles noted that information isn’t currently being collected from Gem or Elmore counties, but sees a need to start getting at least approved preliminary plat information from them as well.

The Committee discussed developing a mechanism to monitor preliminary plat information from counties outside of Ada and Canyon. It was agreed to focus on Ada County at this point and establish relationships with the other areas to get a heads up of what is coming so it can be taken in account.

The Committee discussed Gary Allen’s comments at the September Steering Committee meeting that an adequate public facilities determination should occur at zoning because it is too late at subdivision and preliminary plat.

Patricia Nilsson said the question is what data is needed to make a decision vs. when is an APFO going to be applied. Ultimately ACHD has to own the process, they make the determination of whether there is the capacity or not. They have to be able to defend the methodology that is going to be useful in measuring the demand on the system.

David Turnbull said it all goes back to the comp plan. If you apply the fivefold method you are going to end up with a lot of little enclaves that are undevelopable because the last guy in just can't make it work and it destroys comp planning.

Pete Friedman asked what other tools are available under Idaho law besides impact fees and development agreements.

Sally said in the reporting process the question is whether entitlement should be accounted for when determining adequate capacity or should it be what has been approved in terms of specific developments to date.

Charles said this process is not the end process. It is intended to inform people what it means when they are picking levels of service, what are the implications. When talking about comp plans and zoning there are a lot of unknowns about what is allowed by the comp plans, such as mixed use. Comp plans are going to be the challenge. The planned communities have some of the characteristics as the preliminary plats: some are in process but are they committed or have a potential for dropping off.

Sally confirmed that the Committee agreed that if the request for a rezone is consistent in terms of trip generation with the underlying assumption from the comp plan it should be allowed. If it exceeds that, then you have to look at it in relation to capacity. This is different than it has been in the past. An example of complexity is that ACHD had a CIP and a Five Year Work Plan that blew up because the cost of projects increased 70 percent in six or seven years. The further out you go in trying to do the analysis and make the determinations the greater the level of uncertainty is.

Charles said that next step is to look at Comp Plans and test them against the network. One of the challenges is that at times the growth is happening in areas where there is no network. There is nothing there to run the system on such as Southern Ada County.

c. *Blueprint for Good Growth Organizational Issues - COMPASS (11:30 – 11:40 AM)*

Charles reported the Consortium elected to maintain a separate identity for Blueprint for Good Growth and its committee structure. The discussion at the Consortium recognized the overlap between BGG and other organizations but wanted to keep the BGG as is to focus on the AFPO process.

Charles stated the October 9, 2008, Consortium meeting was canceled. The next Consortium meeting will be November 20, 2008, at COMPASS from 1:30-3:30 pm.

d. *Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance – Charles Trainor (11:40 – 11:45 AM) (page 11) **

Charles reported this item was disseminated in the September 18, 2008, packet. The APFO is in a holding pattern pending a variety of technical products. Two of these are discussed above. Other issues were discussed (see minutes of the September 18, 2008, meeting). Some of these issues are summarized in Attachment 3.

After discussion, Charles asked for volunteers to compile a list of the Steering Committee's core concerns regarding policy issues and the need to adjust expectations of the timeline. This will be reviewed by the Steering Committee at its November 6, 2008, meeting and presented to the Consortium at its November 20, 2008, meeting. The volunteers are: Tricia Nilsson, David Turnbull, Meg Rush, Nichol Baird Spencer, Sally Goodell, and Pete O'Neill. Gary Allen was not at the meeting but was added to the list.

* Attachments

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Steering Committee\minutes\steer_minutes_10 02 08.doc



Planning & Development Services

Bruce D. Chatterton
Director

Boise City Hall
150 N. Capitol Boulevard

Mailing Address
P. O. Box 500
Boise, Idaho 83701-0500

Phone
208/384-3830

Fax
208/384-3814

TDD/TTY
800/377-3529

Web
www.cityofboise.org/pds

Mayor
David H. Bieter

City Council
President
David Eberle

Council Pro Tem
Maryanne Jordan

Vernon L. Bisterfeldt
Elaine Clegg
Alan W. Shealy
Jim Tibbs

MEMORANDUM

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Steering/Technical Committee

FROM: Patricia Nilsson, AICP, Boise City Comprehensive Planning Manager

DATE: October 28, 2008

RE: Framework for Analyzing Adequate Transportation Facilities

During the current discussions on developing the adequate public facilities analysis for transportation, it became clear that committee members held different perceptions of when the APF analysis should be required. There is a continuum of land use decisions that begins with policy formation (the comprehensive plan), moves through the entitlement phases of rezoning and subdivision, and culminates with the issuance of a building permit. Clarity on when a detailed APF analysis will be required is necessary to focus the important work of developing the methodology. Too narrow a focus on the APF analysis without understand the larger relationship between the planned demand represented in local comprehensive plans to planned capacity represented in COMPASS and ACHD plans will undermine the effectiveness of any measurement of adequacy on a specific entitlement application.

The attached matrix is a first attempt to distill the land use/transportation coordination needs to their basic constituents. At each progression of land use decision, the APFO working group identified the level of analysis required, the finding for an approval decision, general mitigation options and any issues or concerns that should be considered.

We welcome your feedback of the committee on the usefulness of this initial matrix an organizing tool as ACHD develops specific methodologies to measure adequate transportation capacity. The flowchart distributed at the September meeting and the additional ACHD memo in the November meeting packet really launched us toward developing the analysis. The matrix is intended to help us focus the effort at the appropriate target. This effort should be considered an early draft, as it does not yet represent the benefit of the whole committee's thoughts and perspectives.

PAN:pan
Attachment

I:\PDS\Planning and Zoning\Comprehensive Planning\Blueprint for Good Growth\Adequate Transportation Facilities matrix.doc

DRAFT Adequate Transportation Facilities Decision Framework 10/28/08

Prepared for Blueprint for Good Growth Steering/Technical Committee November 6, 2008 meeting

Prepared by Patricia Nilsson, City of Boise

Land Use Decision	ATF Analysis Needed	Finding for approval	Mitigation options	Comments
Comprehensive Plan Update	Does the planned demand have adequate planned capacity?	There is adequate planned capacity. Transportation element consistent with regional long-range transportation plan and master streets plan.	Reconfigure planned land uses to match capacity or adopt policies to stage entitlements in sync with available capacity.	Need ACHD to provide existing LOS and capacity/demand analysis of existing comprehensive plans.
Comprehensive Plan Amendment that alters map or density policies	Does the planned demand have adequate planned capacity?	There is adequate planned capacity. Transportation element consistent with regional long-range transportation plan and master street plan.	Reduce additional planned land use demand to match planned capacity.	If concurrent with an entitlement application, use detailed APF review of the requested entitlement.
Rezone	Is there adequate funded capacity available for the additional entitlements?	There is adequate funded capacity based on 5YWP.	Staging of entitlements through use of a development agreement.	Need to have a detailed analysis (e.g. trips/acre cap).
Subdivision Plat	Is there adequate existing capacity available for the additional entitlement?	ACHD analysis of adequate transportation facilities for the project.	Conditions of approval could require phasing in coordination of road improvements.	Need detailed (trips/acre?) analysis.
Master Site Plan	Same as plat.	ACHD analysis of adequate transportation facilities for the	Conditions of approval could require phasing in coordination of road	Need to consider whether prior APF analysis needs to be updated if significant time has passed between platting and CU

Land Use Decision	ATF Analysis Needed	Finding for approval	Mitigation options	Comments
		project.	improvements.	or construction.
Conditional Use Permit	Same as plat.	ACHD analysis of adequate transportation facilities for the project.	Conditions of approval could require phasing in coordination of road improvements.	Need to understand differences among jurisdictions on use of CUs to grant additional entitlements.
Building Permit	None.	N/A	N/A	

Who can access available capacity? Who is required to mitigate?

Mitigation should be expected of unplanned development. The Steering Committee identified two alternative approaches to defining unplanned development:

1. **First In** - Capacity is allocated to developments as they come in until all available capacity is used (Current draft APFO). Additional development is responsible for mitigation.

2. **Trip Density** – Capacity is allocated based on planned trips/acre. Development within the planned area is allocated a certain number of trips/acre based on the planned land use. Development consistent with that plan is allocated available capacity. Development with more trips/acre must mitigate for trips that exceed the planned trips/acre. Development outside the planned area must mitigate for all new trips.

Examples: This area is planned for mixed use with 33 trips per parcel.

Parcel 1	Parcel 2	Parcel 3
33	33	33

First In Approach

Developer	Trips/Acre	Allowed	Mitigated
1	50	50	
2	33	33	
3	50	16	34

Trip Density Approach

Developer	Trips/Acre	Allowed	Mitigated
1	50	33	17
2	33	33	
3	50	33	17

First In, as currently proposed, does not lead to the BGG desired results.

- Capacity may be used up by background traffic, unplanned development, etc.
- Later infill development must mitigate for 100% of its trips.
- Remaining parcels after adequate capacity is used may be uneconomic to develop. Discourages infill.
- Florida growth management law requires that Cities adopt comprehensive plans that can be served by ‘funded’ infrastructure. This underlying requirement is missing from the APFO proposed to date.

Trip Density requires upfront integrated planning for land use and transportation. When a comprehensive plan map is adopted, the jurisdiction and ACHD would agree on the

BGG Steering/Technical Committee November 6, 2008

Prepared by S Goodell

pg. 2

number of trips/acre generated by the proposed land use and the appropriate transportation network to serve that development. At each further stage in the development process (zoning, preliminary plat, etc) if the development exceeds the planned trips/acre there is a mitigation responsibility. Planned development is incorporated in the CIP.

Steering/Technical Committee is evaluating use of a trip density strategy. This requires two lines of development for the APF accounting.

1. Create a framework for determining trips/acre based on land use. Need to set initial trip density and have a specific procedure for changes at each phase of the entitlement process. This could involve:
 - a. Jurisdiction proposes land uses via the comprehensive plan
 - b. ACHD and jurisdiction agree on trips/acre for each land use
 - c. ACHD models trip generation and distribution and proposes transportation network to support the land use (transit use is factored into the model as an assumed % of trips)
 - d. Jurisdiction and ACHD iterate until agreement is reached. Need to consider what can be built with available funding.
 - e. Land use with trips/acre and planned transportation network are adopted
 - f. Any comp plan amendment would require mitigation if the new trip density exceeds the planned density, in proportion to the incremental increase in trips. This requires a Traffic Impact Study. Need to define what information is needed for ACHD to provide the information the land use entities need to determine transportation impact.
 - i. What infrastructure will be required to accommodate development
 - ii. What portion is planned for construction by ACHD and when
 - iii. What mitigation is needed to address transportation system needs:
 1. Not planned for more than five years, and
 2. That exceed planned trip density.
 - g. Zoning will codify the planned land use and will respect the planned trip density. Any rezone would require mitigation if the new trip density exceeds the planned trip density, in proportion to the incremental increase in trips.
 - h. Each further step in entitlement will either respect the approved trip density or require mitigation for any increase in trip density.
2. Create a system for determining and allocating available capacity and determining mitigation requirements during development review.
 - a. If a development is consistent with the adopted trip density per the TIS, no additional review or mitigation is required.
 - b. If a development exceeds the adopted trip density, ACHD would propose/recommend the mitigation required to achieve the adopted LOS. May want to consider a ratio for certain kinds of particularly desirable development – mixed use that limits trips, infill that is likely to yield measurably fewer trips, etc.

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\APFO\102308 APFO concept.doc

BGG Steering/Technical Committee November 6, 2008
Prepared by S Goodell
pg. 3