



**Technical and Steering Committee Meeting**  
**Wednesday, April 25, 2007 9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M.**  
Ada County Highway District Auditorium  
**AGENDA**

- I. **Consent Agenda** (9:00-9:05 A.M.)
  - a. **Approval of the April 5, 2007 Meeting Notes (to be distributed separately)**
  
- II. **Discussion Items**
  - a. **Adequate Public Facilities Status – Michael Lauer (9:05-9:20 A.M.) (pg. 3-4)**

Refer to attached memorandum. Discuss need for May meeting of Steering/Technical committee to review Lauer's scope based on Consortium discussion of scope this afternoon and possible addition of work in Item II.b.
  - b. **Impact Fee Review – Michael Lauer (9:20-9:50 A.M.) (pg. 3-4)**

Refer to attached memorandum. A verbal discussion will be held with an expected confirmation of April 5<sup>th</sup> recommendation to ask the Consortium to include this in Lauer's scope.
  - c. **Update of Open Space Subcommittee – Deanna Smith (9:50-10:05 A.M.)**

A verbal update will be given by Deanna Smith on progress of the Ada County Open Space subcommittee.
  - d. **Update from the Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee – Kelli Fairless (10:05-10:25 A.M.) (pg. 5-8)**

A verbal update will be given by Kelli Fairless on the April 13 meeting of the subcommittee. Meeting minutes are attached.
  - e. **Update from the Access Management and Corridor Preservation Subcommittee - Dean Gunderson (10:25-10:45 A.M.) (pg. 9-12)**

A verbal update will be given by Dean Gunderson on the April 13 meeting of the subcommittee. Meeting minutes are attached. An updated on ACHD's TLIP process may be given if time permits.

**Blueprint for Good Growth - c/o Doherty & Associates – 575 E. Parkcenter Blvd, Suite 200 - Boise, ID 83706**  
**Business (208) 336-0420 - Fax (208) 336-2407 – Email [kdoherly@dohertyeng.com](mailto:kdoherly@dohertyeng.com)**  
**[www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com](http://www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com)**

**III. Action Items****a. Recommendation of Steering Committee membership for Phase II  
(10:45 -11:00A.M.)**

There are several vacancies on the Steering committee for representatives from several interest groups including Affordable Housing, Agriculture, Chambers of Commerce, Environmental, Large Employers, and Urban Redevelopment. Doherty & Associates is confirming interest from several individuals to serve on the committee. Individuals who have agreed to participate will be identified at the meeting. The committee will be asked to recommend these individuals for participation to the Consortium at their April 25 meeting.

***Upcoming 2007 Technical and Steering Meetings are as follows:******May meeting to be determined based on outcome of II a and b.******June 7, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM, ACHD Auditorium******July 12, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM, ACHD Auditorium******August 8, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM, ACHD Auditorium***

# Memo

To: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium  
 BGG Steering Committee  
 BGG Technical Committee

From: Michael Lauer, AICP – Principal

Date: April 17, 2007

Re: Adequate Public Facilities Status Report

---

**Status of APF Scope.** In February, I submitted a scope of services to assist member jurisdictions in the development of Adequate Public Facilities (APF) ordinances. Last month, I met with the Consortium to discuss the fact that critical the transportation-related APF provisions. Specifically, each participant was asked to agree to the following points:

- **Each jurisdiction is committed to using its full authority to implement APF.**
- **Each jurisdiction is committed to the implementation of Transportation APF.**
- **To demonstrate the commitment necessary to make transportation APF work, each member agency agrees to:**
  1. **Adopt transportation APF standards that are consistent with BGG policies and the level of service standards established through TLIP.**
  2. **Execute and honor agreements to:**
    - a. **assign responsibility for the determination of transportation system adequacy to the responsible transportation facility management agency; and**
    - b. **assign responsibility for determining the acceptability of necessary mitigation measures to the responsible transportation facility management agency.**

After expressing support for these points, Consortium members were requested to secure endorsements for this coordinate approach from their fellow decision-makers. You should have received draft resolutions prepared by Steve Price that formally adopt the BGG and endorse each entity’s willingness to support BGG implementation through participation in the development of a county-wide transportation APF system. While the scope of services includes other facilities, Eagle has already indicated an interest in developing its own APF requirements for other facilities. Consequently, the draft resolutions focus on transportation facilities.

**Decision Point:** If each jurisdiction can agree to the points above and will endorse the resolutions, then the Consortium should consider approving the proposed scope of services for development of an adequate public facilities ordinance. *Note: some minor edits to the scope are likely to be suggested by the Steering/Technical Committees prior to the Consortium Workshop. These will be presented to the Consortium at the meeting. (NOTE FROM K.DOHERTY – The scope for APF should be modified by Lauer in May based on Steering/Technical Committee comments, finally reviewed and ratified by the*

*Steering/Technical Committee in mid-May, and approved by the Consortium at their June 7 meeting.)*

**Impact Fee Review:** The most significant outstanding APF scope-related issue that has been raised by the Steering and Technical Committees is the review of impact fee methodology. The draft adequate public facility ordinance will provide for impact fee credits when applicable, but the scope does not otherwise address the current impact fee structure. The issue arose during discussion of the potential for impact fees and APF requirements to discourage desired infill development. While the current formula discounts benefits resulting from the proximity of infill development through reduced vehicle miles traveled factors, the Committees inquired about the potential for other changes in impact fees to promote infill and other specific land use patterns. These changes may include adjustments to the formulas to more accurately reflect projected costs, adjustments to the formulas to favor certain types of development (e.g., a speculative trip generation reduction for mixed use or new urbanist development), or the commitment of local governments to “buy” impact fee discounts.

**Decision Point:** If the consortium is interested in including this review as part of Phase 2 for BGG implementation, I will develop a scope of services and budget to address this matter.



## ***Countywide Land Use and Transportation Guide Plan Meeting Minutes***

**Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee Meeting – COMPASS  
Friday, April 13, 2007 10:30 a.m. to 11:30 a.m.**

**Attendees:** Chris Danley, Diane Kushlan, John Cunningham, Dean Gunderson, Charles Trainor, Lars Hansen and Karen Doherty

The group met to update the initial tasks and deliverables from the March 21 meeting Steering meeting. Pertinent discussion items are included as bullets; the revised tasks and deliverables are included at the end of these meeting minutes.

### **COMMITTEE STATUS SUMMARY**

- Attendees are excited to begin work on Deliverable 1 – Educational Series about Mixed Use Compact Development. Kelli Fairless to update her white paper with specific tasks and deliverables for this educational series. The basic forums would include 3 avenues –
  - Forums to developers and technical groups. Could also get support by having prominent community/business leaders host meetings with their contacts to discuss the issue.
  - Public discussions through innovative techniques such as “Front Porch” meetings
  - Presentations at local jurisdictions for P&Z Commissions and Elected Officials

An update from a subcommittee member will be presented to the Steering/Technical Committee on April 25. Information will also be presented at the Consortium on April 25 to confirm that the subcommittee is providing the correct deliverables. Next subcommittee meeting is May 11, 10:30 am to Noon, at COMPASS.

### **Discussion items:**

#### **Action Items:**

- John provided a working draft from Kelli about the proposed educational forum. He noted that this was a draft; Kelli later volunteered to update and distribute the draft based on today’s discussions.
- ULI is having a board meeting April 26 for their new officers. Diane will discuss our suggestion of involving ULI with one of the educational legs. (Deliverable 1.c.)
- Dean to make contacts with AIA and ALSA (Architects and Landscape Architects groups) to determine if they have interests in hosting one of the educational forums.

- Karen to discuss option of providing a noon seminar with the local section of the American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE).
- Visual illustrations need to be added to the educational presentation; attendees suggested approaching local graphics consultants (such as Visual Dynamics and Blackfin) to provide visual 3d models for presentations. Each entity could provide funding for their individual presentations. Chris suggested this info be used on a website and also at storefront displays using the “What if” tagline. The U of I Urban Design Center students could also be involved in this campaign.
- Attendees suggested Carter from Portland be invited to sit on the panel for public transit.
- Diane indicated there are investors willing to explore Mixed Use Compact Development but our local jurisdictions need to provide local illustrations of demonstrated public investment.
- Chris suggested educational activities to encourage appropriate transit densities for City land-use decisions along transit designated corridors. Examples should be provided for densities which support the suggested transit means (i.e. Park & Ride lots, bus, light-rail). Mechanisms to do provide this were discussed; this should be included in the P&Z/Elected official leg of the educational forum.
- Kelli indicated she is doing her annual “roadshow” with her member agencies this summer and offered to expand this presentation to include topics discussed today.
- Diane suggested gathering local media as a partner in the “Front Porch” meetings. She indicated this type of public involvement was used in other areas very successfully; groups met on the same night and the media reported on the results the very next day. This summer would be a good time to develop this work product.
- Discussion also occurred about utilizing a pattern book of examples for Mixed Use Compact Development in the Treasure Valley. Placemakers.com was suggested as a location for members to review examples.
- Attendees ended the discussion by acknowledging that land-use decisions by elected officials must support these educational efforts in order for a successful change to occur in Ada County.

**Revised Tasks and Deliverables based on April 13, 2007 discussion:**

***Mixed Use Compact Development***

The Tasks

Information will be developed to support the implementation of mixed use compact development (MUCD) nodes. The MUCD concept has not yet been implemented in the Treasure Valley, the materials should reflect this. The concept is especially critical at this juncture to provide a variety of affordable housing options within the Treasure Valley.

Because of this relative unfamiliarity, the recommended deliverables are intended to first educate decision makers about the concept. Further recognition should be given to the current limited nature of transit in the region. Because of this limited service emphasis should be given to: benefits of MUCD other than increasing efficiency of transit service, ongoing plans/efforts to increase transit service, and that given the time involved in creating a MUCD it is an acceptable if not superior strategy for MUCD development to precede transit service.

This task must be coordinated with the on-going State Street Transit Oriented Development project.

### The Deliverables

1. Informational/Educational Presentation and/or Report
  - a. COMPASS will be initiating outreach now on a regional level. ValleyRide could add educational component to their summer member agency “roadshow”
  - b. Highlights for the educational presentation
    - i. Mixed Use development is resistant to economic fluctuations caused by energy price changes
    - ii. Location dependent mortgages could be an advantage
    - iii. These developments offer “livable affordability”
  - c. Outreach should occur with three groups:
    1. Forums to developers and technical groups. Could also get support by having prominent community/business leaders host meetings with their contacts to discuss the issue.
    2. Public discussions through innovative techniques such as “Front Porch” meetings
    3. Presentations at local jurisdictions for P&Z Commissions and Elected Officials
  - ii. Pursue buy-in from elected officials as a result of the joint forum. Allow developers the opportunity to show local officials that they are ready to go to this level of development in a quality manner. Provide solid examples to illustrate good design.
2. Mixed Use Compact Development Policy Guidelines
  - a. Sliding scale of densities for different transit supportive opportunities should be created. Create a matrix for differing densities that support various means of transit options.
  - b. Need transitional tools for developers so they can provide “development that does no harm” that allow for future transit supportive development.
  - c. Stress proximity of residences to these developments. Walkability and pedestrian friendly must be included in the design criteria relative to proximity to residences.
  - d. Developers need a streamlined entitlement process. The requirements of developers to complete much of the design prior to approval is cost prohibitive. Suggest flexible design guidelines.
3. Specific modifications/additions to Comp Plans using the MUCD Guidelines (Could be included or a subset of the above)
  - a. Include rail corridor analysis – this is a fixed corridor which can be pursued immediately and would attract Canyon County to the BGG process.
  - b. Cross-county roadway corridors should also be included to provide maximum level of coordination.
  - c. BGG Staff time will be required to assist with local level jurisdiction implementation.
4. Functional classification/usage map for transit corridors in coordination with CIM
  - a. Develop a map similar to the roadway functional classification map to illustrate transit usage on different corridors.

- b. This map would provide specific criteria for jurisdictions for land use and design guidelines based on the type of anticipated transit.
    - c. Ties with primary roadway corridor map.
- 5. Recommended ordinance changes to implement TOD Guidelines
  - a. BGG Staff time will be required to assist with local level jurisdiction implementation.





## ***Countywide Land Use and Transportation Guide Plan Meeting Minutes***

**Corridor Preservation and Access Management Subcommittee Meeting –  
COMPASS**

**Friday, April 13, 2007 9:00 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.**

**Attendees: Don Matson, John Cunningham, Karen Doherty, Phil Choate,  
Chris Danley, Kent McCarthy, Dean Gunderson, Charles Trainor**

The group met to update the initial tasks and deliverables from the March 21 meeting Steering meeting. Pertinent discussion items are included as bullets; the revised tasks and deliverables are included at the end of these meeting minutes.

### **CORRIDOR PRESERVATION DISCUSSION**

- Dean advised the group that Ada County will be entering into an *interim* Transportation Adequate Public Facilities ordinance while BGG is working through the process. He agreed that Ada County is committed to the BGG efforts and will continue their participation in Phase II.
- The Transportation and Land Use Integration (TLIP) project by ACHD is producing a map which aggregates data on future needs for corridors based on Communities in Motion and other pertinent studies. This was previously identified as a deliverable for Corridor Preservation by BGG so it will be removed from the BGG scope as it is duplicative of a TLIP effort.
- ACHD is very interested in ordinance creation, especially as identified in Corridor Preservation Deliverable 1.d. This is not a duplicative effort of TLIP.
- Phil Coates distributed ITD's Draft Access Management Policy (May 2006 date) and asked for feedback from the subcommittee directly to him. He indicated that there is on-going work on SH-44 and US-20/26 corridor studies but he didn't feel the BGG tasks previously identified overlapped any of these efforts.
- Extensive discussion occurred regarding validity of the base growth scenario. Concerns regarding modifications to approved land uses were raised relative to their impacts on the growth scenario used to establish future corridor needs. Attendees agreed that the Long-Range Transportation Plan scenario should be followed but questioned if the 20-year planning horizon was long enough into the future, i.e. Should we review at 50-years out to establish corridor width? Attendees agreed to add a new task in the national best practices review as follows:
  - Establish justification of a long-term planning horizon. Review national best practices to determine appropriate time-frame (i.e. 20-year, 30-year, 50-year) for growth scenarios used for corridor planning and preservation.

- Attendees discussed population forecasts based on comprehensive plans and queried if this will be done as part of Michael Lauer's work. Karen to verify with Michael. (Note – This was added as Task 3 – if already occurring, it will be removed)
- Relative to ultimate corridor width, attendees discussed the notion of establishing a maximum corridor width and working "backwards" to find the maximum supportive demand based on that corridor capacity. They also felt this maximum corridor width cost for the entire county would be a beneficial number to have for illustrative purposes. This was added as deliverable 2.a. for Corridor Preservation. Chris noted that maintenance costs for these corridors and ultimate built infrastructure is a large burden for ACHD.

#### **ACCESS MANAGEMENT DISCUSSION**

- The committee noted that they feel the biggest issues facing ITD regarding access management was variances and existing grandfathered accesses. These are listed in item 2.a. of the deliverables for Access Management.
- Karen will to contact Jay Walker (subcommittee member unable to attend today's meeting) to discuss if he has found direct benefits from publications regarding access management to property owners.
- Charles and John will locate "full" Access Management PowerPoint from Parametrix and post for subcommittee's information.

#### **COMMITTEE STATUS SUMMARY**

Attendees felt the list of tasks and deliverables (for both Corridor Preservation and Access Management) were adequate for this juncture for this BGG subcommittee. A discussion occurred regarding TLIP, especially Level of Service (LOS) standards for communities, and TLIP's anticipated deliverable of Access Management Policy and Corridor Preservation Plan. Attendees did not want to duplicate TLIP efforts and felt that the subcommittee should take its recommendations to the Steering/Technical Committees and Consortium on April 25 in conjunction with a presentation on TLIP status by ACHD. (Karen and Chris to ask Don Kostelec). The subcommittee should probably hold on moving forward with tasks until the TLIP drafts on LOS, Access Management Policy, and the Corridor Preservation Plan are released. The subcommittee will confirm this with the other BGG groups on April 25 and then most likely wait for those TLIP deliverables before moving forward with their tasks. Based on direction from the BGG groups on April 25, Karen will evaluate the timing for the next subcommittee meeting. Charles will make the presentations on April 25<sup>th</sup> on behalf of the subcommittee.

**Revised Tasks and Deliverables based on April 13, 2007 discussion:  
*Corridor Preservation***

The Tasks

1. Review existing Idaho statutes and case law regarding right-of-way preservation
2. Compile existing local and state plans and regulations regarding right-of-way preservation
3. Review population projections from each jurisdiction (Note only if Lauer is not doing as part of APF work)
4. Research national "best practices" for model right-of-way preservation ordinance. Develop a summary of these for consideration. Items to include:
  - a. Financial practices regarding funding of acquisition for future corridors
  - b. Establish justification of a long-term planning horizon. Review national best practices to determine appropriate time-frame (i.e. 20-year, 30-year, 50-year) for growth scenarios used for corridor planning and preservation.
  - c. Maintenance activities within unused corridor areas (i.e. Future lanes)
  - d. Temporary uses of future corridors (i.e. Park and Ride lots, bus shelters)
  - e. Utility accommodation
  - f. Receiving entity for buffer land (land that will be used for future road, but not needed now -there could be an intermediate entity that owns the buffer and acquires it on behalf of the jurisdiction; could be used then as local match.)
5. Meet with ad hoc group of persons with appropriate expertise (engineers, public and private attorneys, local government planning staff)
  - a. Discuss existing needs/constraints
  - b. Consider best practices examples
  - c. Determine most appropriate way to accommodate utilities
  - d. Establish areas for improvement to existing ordinances

The Deliverables

1. Develop draft model ordinance, including provisions for:
  - a. Compensation tools (density credits, regulatory controls, options to purchase, interim use agreements, land banking, and purchase of development rights)<sup>1</sup>
  - b. Reservation periods to allow alignment definition and funding
  - c. Determinations of rational nexus between required right-of-way and proposed land uses during development applications
  - d. Minimum setbacks beyond right-of-way related to sensitivity of uses and classification of roadway (increase with higher classification and sensitivity of use)
  - e. Maintenance activities and temporary uses, including funding for maintenance within unused right-of-way.
  - f. Utility accommodation

---

<sup>1</sup> Corridor Preservation Best Practices. Center for Urban Transportation Research. April 3, 2003.  
[http://www.cutr.usf.edu/research/access\\_m/pdf/BestPracticesReport.pdf](http://www.cutr.usf.edu/research/access_m/pdf/BestPracticesReport.pdf)

2. Develop public information tools to help educate elected officials and citizens about need for more effective ordinance. These tools could be used by local governments and might include brochures, press kits and public presentation materials.
  - a. Illustrative data showing cost of ultimate corridor build-out in Ada County as well as maintenance requirements

### ***Access Management***

#### The Tasks

Information will be developed to support the implementation of consistent, comprehensive access management policies. Materials will include a preceding educational component which will summarize the fundamental benefits of access management considering an initial or target audience of non-technical or transportation professional individuals, elected officials and city managers. Materials will also include a paper on issues & history in Idaho related to legal concerns related to access management. Items must be developed on a consistent, regional basis so that there is not a counter effect of enticing development in areas with lower access management.

#### The Deliverables

1. Informational/Educational Presentation or Report
  - a. COMPASS will be initiating outreach now on a regional level.
  - b. Educational materials need to address access management and its fiscal consequences on the business community.
  - c. Canyon County must be brought into this process.
  - d. All jurisdictions must be willing to adopt (similar to transportation adequate public facilities)
2. Legal Issues and Access Management Monograph
  - a. Should address variances and existing/grandfathered accesses
3. Model Access Management Policy
  - a. Must include stop gap measures to assist in the near-term while the full policies are being determined.
4. Specific modifications/additions to Comp Plans to include above Access Management Policies
5. Recommended ordinance changes to implement Access Management