



Technical and Steering Committee Meeting
Wednesday, October 10, 2007 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M.
Meridian Police Department, 1401 E. Watertower Ave, Meridian

AGENDA

- I. **Consent Agenda (9:00-9:05 AM)**
 - a. **Approval of the September 6, 2007 Meeting Notes (pages 3 - 8)**

- II. **Discussion Items**
 - a. **Transportation Funding Committees – Julie Pipal (9:05 – 9:20 AM)**
 Julie Pipal, Manager of ITD’s Office of Budget, Policy, and Intergovernmental Relations, will discuss current plans for legislation that may relate to policy and tax structure. Handout will be provided at the meeting.

 - b. **Adequate Public Facilities Update - Michael Lauer (9:20 – 11:15 AM) (pages 9 - 13)**
 Michael will provide a status report on Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) data collection and the draft Synthesis Report. He will summarize the APFO policy issues for which there is an agreement, facilitate a discussion of outstanding APFO policy issues, and also review key APFO policy issues from the September meeting. He will present an outline of the APFO.

- III. **Action Items**
 - a. **Area of City Impact Modification Process Subcommittee - Anna Canning (11:15 – 11:25 PM) Attachment to be distributed under separate cover**
 Per the Consortium’s request, this subcommittee has focused its recent activities on a draft planning boundary map for Ada County. A draft map will be distributed prior to the meeting. The map will be reviewed by the Steering Committee with requested action of recommendation for consideration at the November Consortium. The map illustrating the planning boundaries is anticipated to be presented to the Consortium for debate at their November meeting.

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
www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com

b. Public Outreach Subcommittee – Deanna Smith (11:25 – 11:40 PM)

Attachment to be distributed under separate cover

The Steering/Technical Committee will be asked to provide a recommendation to the Consortium for their November meeting about future Public Involvement activities. Agenda attachment for this item will be distributed prior to the meeting under separate cover.

c. Update of Open Space Subcommittee – Deanna Smith (11:40 – 11:50 AM)

Deanna will provide a brief verbal update and then will solicit individual jurisdictions for resources to bring to support the Ada County Open Space Task Force. The action required on this item is commitment from the jurisdiction representatives to relay a request for support of the Task Force to their jurisdictions. The Ada County Open Space Task Force website is located at:

<http://www.adaweb.net/departments/developmentservices/OPENSPACETASKFORCE.asp>

IV. Discussion Items

a. Update from the Transit Ready/Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee – Kelli Fairless (11:50 – 11:55 AM)

A verbal update will be given by Kelli Fairless on the subcommittee's progress and coordination with COMPASS' Communities in Motion Community Choices Implementation Tool.

b. Discussion of November Meeting Dates (11:55 AM – 12:00 PM)

The BGG Consortium meeting has been tentatively moved to November 8 from the originally scheduled November 1 date. This new November 8 date will be finalized next week with the Consortium members. Does the Steering/Technical committee wish to retain the original November 1 Steering/Technical meeting date, or would you like to meet on November 8?

Upcoming 2007 Technical and Steering Meetings are as follows:

November 1 or 8, 2007, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM, ACHD Auditorium - DISCUSSION ITEM

December 6, 2007, 10:00 AM – 12:00 PM, ACHD Auditorium



Technical and Steering Committee Meeting
Thursday, September 6, 2007 10:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M.

Ada County Highway District Auditorium

MEETING MINUTES

I. Consent Agenda

a. Approval of the August 2, 2007 Meeting Notes

Consent agenda approved unanimously.

II. Discussion Items

a. Adequate Public Facilities Update – Michael Lauer provided a status report on APFO data collection and the draft Synthesis Report.

1. Michael noted there are some gaps in the items for the jurisdictions which are included as background data in the Synthesis Report. He'll be contacting the jurisdictions individually to secure that missing information.
2. ACHD's TLIP project is about one month behind schedule. The Level of Service (LOS) information that is to be provided by TLIP is necessary for Michael to move ahead with the APF ordinance. Michael noted that the TLIP schedule slip will slide his APF schedule by one month as well. He will continue to work though the APF as much as possible without the LOS.
3. Michael asked that each jurisdiction review the synthesis report for errors or inaccuracies.
4. The group began a review discussion on Policy Items (starting on page 47 of the agenda):
 - (i) *What areas should be exempted from testing transportation system adequacy?*
 Bill Clark noted that, for new projects that are being built in downtown Boise, there is limited information available to substantiate modified impact fees (i.e. trip generations for downtown mixed use developments). Bill suggested incentives for "BGG" type developments. Michael suggested a menu of mitigation options that could be used to address specific development concerns (i.e. Ingress/egress, multimodal). Diane Kushlan requested more specific information about the mitigation techniques. There was general agreement with Michael's recommendations as listed in the agenda packet with a few reservations regarding mitigation requirements – more specific detail is needed.

- (ii) *What demands from approved, but un-build development should be counted against capacity?* Michael's recommendation is to count the first three years of development. Michael suggested three years based on historical "development" of the lots. Pam Sheldon questioned the tracking function. Discuss was held regarding reporting tools on plat approvals. Plat approvals were tracked well but non-residential and multifamily developments lack this reporting function. Tracking of the un-built facilities will be critical for demands. ACHD and COMPASS were discussed as potential agencies to perform the tracking function. Attendees discussed how to keep track of expirations as well. Discussed if demand tracking was better done at final plat vs. preliminary plat. Private sector representatives suggested that preliminary plat timing provides more assurance to the developer. Bill Clark thought that this timing may encourage a "grab" for capacity reservation and may be impractical. Anna Canning suggested two years for pipeline commitment instead of three years as two years is the timing of expiration of preliminary plats in many of the jurisdictions. Steve provided information about McCall's capacity reservations for their sewer. Attendees had a mixed review of the policy; not many agreements for two years. Michael will move forward with three years as a "testing" arena for modeling. There was recognition that this was a starting point with some major complex issues that the developers brought up which need to be further discussed.
 - (iii) *How much growth should be reserved for external demands?* Recommendation was to rely on COMPASS. No disagreement from the attendees.
 - (iv) *To which developments should APF requirements be applied?* Initial recommendation is to apply to all developments which generate above 50 trips per day. Lauer gave an assignment to jurisdictions to identify which "exemptions" should be granted. Examples were affordable housing, infill, and transit facilities.
 - (v) *How should "capacity" be defined?* Recommendation: Programmed capacity is that available to be complete within three years of the development approval. Bill noted that this may be problematic as well.
5. Michael requested the following action from the attendees: He needs the Steering/Technical Committee to comment on the remaining policies. He noted that "Silence is agreement" on his recommendations. All initial questions should be emailed to Michael by September 21. He will take initial questions and answer them between September 21 and 27. He requested final responses from the Steering/Technical Committee on September 28.

b. Transportation Funding Committees

1. The Consortium has directed the Steering/Technical Committee to utilize their memberships on existing transportation funding committees rather than creating a new BGG subcommittee. Committee members were asked to provide information on their existing committee memberships and utilization of those relationships to further explore new funding opportunities for transportation infrastructure. Kelli Fairless and Phil Choate noted that they sit on many existing committees and will provide regular updates to the BGG Steering/Technical Committee. Existing funding committees were identified as the Regional Coalition for Public Transportation, the Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study, and the Idaho Transportation Coalition.

c. Update from the Area of City Impact Modification Process Subcommittee

1. The subcommittee distributed the updated AOCI Impact Expansion process text and the draft map which reflects the September 4 committee discussions. Anna cautioned the map was draft and there are still changes that need to be made. Deanna Smith indicated the “new” map didn’t match our adopted BGG tiers map – and asked that the maps be overlaid. There are some areas on the new map that conflict; these areas were identified rural on the original Phase I BGG map. Discussion was held that this “new map” was just a 20 year planning boundary not growth tiers – a modification to the map legend and title should be done to reflect the true intent.
2. Anna summarized key modifications that have been made in the process draft. There is a process in the draft to allow for planning boundary modifications. The subarea plans must include the 14 areas necessary for a comprehensive plan update as well special attention to agriculture and fiscal analysis. The subarea plans must include reference to regional plans. Kathleen Lacey suggested addition of the Foothills plan as a recognized document. Attendees also suggested including transit in the regional plan list. Anna clarified that the AOCI expansion submittal and hearing process as listed in the draft are really checklist of necessary submittal items to the County. Dispute resolution was compressed to stay within existing State Code.
3. Anna requested that written comments be sent to her. Deanna and Kathleen queried the modification of regional plan language – “from shall be consistent with” to “shall consider”. They suggested different language than “consider”. The response was that the regional plans may change from adoption. The group suggested to include language which was “substantially consistent with”.
4. The group briefly discussed Canyon County involvement; Growth Tier 3 could be used for this area.
5. In closing, Pam Sheldon thought we were looking at a slippery slope – planning boundaries may be implied that this is an area which may be urbanized in the future. Cautioned against land grab and territory grab. Tier 3 may be useful to inhibit this tendency.

d. Update from the Public Outreach Subcommittee

1. Bob Taunton gave an “initial test drive” of the Speakers Bureau presentation at CSHQA. There were 46 persons at the presentation. He began the discussion at CSHQA by showing the Communities In Motion video. The video refreshed the attendees about existing plans. Bob indicated he received some good questions from attendees and the Public Outreach subcommittee is modifying the messaging and the PowerPoint to reflect the questions. The group is modifying the visual presentation messages to include less words and more imaging. The group is also investigating a quarterly newsletter/eletter; workshops on targeted themes; newspaper column similar to Road Wizard; and collaborating with the COMPASS Community Outreach committee. ULI is assisting with public outreach including their Forum on Transportation on Oct 11.

e. Update from the Transit Ready/Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee

1. Kelli Fairless provided a verbal update on the subcommittee’s progress and coordination with COMPASS’ Communities in Motion Community Choices Implementation Tool. She indicated she has recently provided outreach to Canyon County. Her office and COMPASS are making a one year update effort to communities. Incorporation of transit ready developments is one of the goals of this outreach effort.

f. Update of Open Space Subcommittee

1. A verbal update was be given by Deanna Smith on progress of the Ada County Open Space Task Force. Deanna noted that funding for the Open Space Task Force is significantly lower than initially identified. Ada County is doing as much as possible in house and is asking jurisdictions to do the same.

The next Technical and Steering Meetings was announced with modifications to the date and time. It will be held on October 10, 9:00 AM – 12:00 PM, Meridian Police Department. The meeting was adjourned at 12:05 PM.

Blueprint for Good Growth

Committee: Technical / Steering

Date: Sept 6, 2007

Name	Contact Number / email	Representing
Jill Davidson	336-0420 j davidson@dohertyeng.com	Doherty & Associates Admin Assistant
Richard Cook	287-7903 rscokra@adaweb.net	Ada County
Robert Miller	860-4944 robert.g.miller@hp.com	Industry (HP)
Ruby German	922-4550	Agriculture
Deanna Smith	333-8066	Idaho Smart Growth
Pam Snelson	384-4264	CCDC
Dan Gunderson	287-7044	Ada County
Phil Choate	384-8901	ITD
STEVE MARNE	287 7920	ADA COUNTY
Mike WARDLE	287.0512	Brighton Corp
Shawn Wardle	863-4160	MDC
TOPS FRIEDMAN	884-5533	MERIDIAN
ANNA CANNING	884-5533	MERIDIAN
DIANE KUSHLAU	433-9352	GARDEN CITY
Kathleen M. Lacey	384-3835	City of Boise
Bob Taunton	401.5505	ULI
Chris Panley	387 6202	ACHD
Karen McDoherty	336-0420 kdoherly@dohertyeng.com	BGG Doherty & Associates
Kelli Fairless	846-8547	Valley Regional transit
Bill Clark		Reg Dev
STEVEN HASSON	340 9224	KUHA
Steve Rector	STURCO SHFA.ORG 331-4725	SHFA
Joe Kanz	377-3550 / jkanz@heritage.wi.com	BCASWI
JASON ROWLEY	286-0259 jcrowley0794@msn.com	BSU M.P.A. STUDENT



Memo

To: Blueprint for Good Growth Steering/Technical Committee Meeting
 From: Michael Lauer, AICP
 Date: October 4, 2007
 Re: October 10 Steering/Technical Committee APF Policy Issues

At our October 10 workshop, I will:

1. Provide a status report on the data required to complete the Synthesis Report.
2. Summarize the APF policy issues for which we have agreement.
3. Facilitate a discussion of outstanding APF policy issues.
4. Outline next steps for APFO development.

Status Report

Street APFO requirements. We are coordinating with ACHD, COMPASS and ITD to secure recommended LOS standards and to develop the monitoring systems needed to track demands and capacity. It appears that LOS standards developed through the TLIP process will not be available any earlier than the second week of November. While we can continue to work on procedural aspects of the APFO and interlocal agreements, common understanding of the impacts of recommended standards is essential before advancing a draft ordinance for public review.

Other essential facilities. While we've received some data, we would like to secure the data listed below to provide better direction on the steps needed to adopt APFO requirements for essential facilities other than streets.

Jurisdiction/Service Provider	Documents Needed
Eagle	Development Impact Fee/CIP Study for water and sewer
Garden City	Water & Sewer CIP is under development and not available
Kuna	Sewer study requested from Keller Engineering
Star	Sewer study under development and not available
Meridian School District	School CIP and demand/capacity projections
United Water	Water Systems Capital Improvements Plans
Owyhee	Water Systems Capital Improvements Plans
Boise	Fire CIP
Eagle	Fire CIP
Kuna	Fire CIP
Melba	Fire CIP

Jurisdiction/Service Provider	Documents Needed
Meridian	Fire CIP
North Ada	Fire CIP
Star	Fire CIP
Whitney	Fire CIP

Responses to policy recommendations. We have received responses to the policy questions from Meridian, ITD and ACHD. While I'd like to assume that silence is assent, I fear that some of the silence is due to outstanding questions or inattention. The following section reflects the comments we've received to date.

APF Policy Recommendations – Areas of General Agreement

1. **What demands from approved, but un-built development should be included in calculations of available capacity?**
 - **Recommendation²:** Include demands projected to be absorbed within the next three years. This means that we will need to monitor and project the absorption rate of existing development as well as tracking demands committed through development agreements for large, multi-phase projects. ***[Note: due to the design life of improvements, testing for projects should also include consideration of traffic capacity at build-out. For larger projects to be developed in multiple phases, long-term capacity commitments should be measured against long-term demand projections and capacities provided by planned improvements.]***
2. **How much capacity should be reserved for external demands?**
 - **Recommendation:** COMPASS' regional traffic model should be used as the basis for projecting the growth in external traffic demands. As with the previous question, we will examine external demands over the next three years against capacity scheduled to be completed in the next three years. ***[Note: this will expose roadways to congestion from projected traffic increases for future years, which will be a more significant issue for ITD improvements that are built for a design life of 20+2 years.]***
3. **How should “capacity” be defined?**
 - **Recommendation:** Define existing capacity (the capacity provided by existing improvements), programmed capacity (the capacity provided by existing improvements and those scheduled to be substantially completed within three years, and available capacity (programmed capacity minus existing and committed demands). ***[Note: due to the length of time required to complete ITD signalization improvements, it may be appropriate to consider demands and capacity over a five-year period, where warranted.]***
4. **When should adequacy be measured?**
 - **Recommendation:** Measure adequacy at preliminary plat for single family development and site plan for all other development. Allow for voluntary early adequacy assessment. Coordinate annexations, rezoning and plan amendment

¹ Available capacity is built capacity plus improvements scheduled to be substantially complete within 3 years minus existing demands (both internal and external) and demands from approved, but un-built development.

² One committee member expressed concerns that the development tracking system would be too complex for local governments to effectively manage.

approvals with the inclusion of required street system improvements in the 20-year CIP or LRTP. **[Note: ACHD does not currently include improvements in the CIP until there is a land use action that creates a potential demand. To avoid this potential stalemate, the interlocal agreements should establish a review/consent process whereby the road authority agrees to add the improvements to the CIP/LRTP prior to completion of the action.]**

5. When should capacity be committed/reserved?

- **Recommendation:** Reserve capacity at the time that adequacy is measured.

6. For how long should capacity be reserved?

- **Recommendation:** Reserve capacity for up to three years or the duration of the development approval or the duration of valid development agreement committing to mitigation. Once a project provides mitigation, its capacity should be reserved in as long as the terms of the applicable development agreement are met by the applicant.

7. What options should be available for mitigation?

- **Recommendation:** Applicants should be able to wait for capacity³ to become available, reduce demands, phase demands or provide capacity in accordance with a development agreement. Capacity may be provided through an approved combination of monetary contributions (which may include fees, district formation or some other financial tool), construction of improvements or contributions of land. When an applicant chooses to wait, development should be allowed to proceed within 5 years of submittal of the appropriate application (e.g., preliminary plat approval or site plan approval) if the property is already zoned for the proposed development and there are no other valid reasons for denying the application. **[Note: Due to the fact that a development application will expire in each jurisdiction prior to the end of the five year period, we will need to establish a formal application for capacity (e.g., declaration of intent to wait). We also will need to address how local governments will address developments for which the applicant wishes to abandon a commitment to provide capacity in favor of waiting for the capacity. Under this circumstance, I recommend that the waiting period begin on the date that the applicant requests the change in status.]**

8. Who should approve mitigation?

- **Recommendation:** Mitigation should be approved by the transportation provider (ACHD, ITD and/or Valley Regional Transit) and, if the improvement is not already included in a currently adopted capital facilities plan, the jurisdiction in which the transportation improvements are provided.

9. When should mitigation take place?

- **Recommendation:** Require mitigation at the time of final plat approval for single family lots or site plan approval for other development to provide sufficient time to provide capacity before demands are generated. Development agreements for multi-phased projects should coordinate the creation of demands (new development) with the provision of needed capacity.

³ There is concern that this could create a secondary market for trading of capacity that is reserved through this method. While capacity should be considered non-transferable, this would not eliminate the potential for land owners to try to manipulate the available capacities.

10. What should the cost basis for mitigation be?

- **Recommendation:** To be equitable and to improve the defensibility of the APFO if challenged, the cost basis should be the project's proportionate share of the costs of improvements. While an applicant may be required to advance more than the proportionate share of the costs if the improvement is not scheduled in the 5-Year CIP or STWP, the APFO should provide a mechanism for recovery of costs that exceed the proportionate share under limited conditions (e.g., timing of subsequent development). [*Note: Additional discussion of these mechanisms will be required.*]

11. How should mitigation relate to impact fees?

- **Recommendation:** Provide full impact fee credit for expenditures on improvements that are included in the basis of impact fees. Credit should not be provided unless proposed mitigation improvements are part of the impact fee calculation.

12. Who should monitor demands and capacity?

- **Recommendation:** Capacity should be monitored by the affected transportation provider, though it likely will be more efficient for a single entity (e.g., ACHD) to maintain a detailed model showing existing capacity, programmed capacity and available capacity. If ACHD maintains a detailed model, this should be calibrated to be consistent with the regional model maintained by COMPASS.

APF Policy Issues Requiring Additional Discussion

1. What, if any areas that should be exempt from testing transportation system adequacy?

- **Discussion:** Uniform level of service requirements tend to promote sprawl and discourage infill development. There are two basic approaches to avoid these consequences: establishing different levels of service and exempting special areas. These approaches are not mutually exclusive. Different level of service standards are used to allow for higher levels of congestion along certain road segments (e.g., downtowns and central business districts). ACHD is in the process of working with each local government through the TLIP process to reach agreement about site specific level of service standards. This will allow development to continue despite affected road constraints, but may require mitigation if congestion is too great. Another approach is to exempt certain areas from APF testing for transportation, regardless of the adopted LOS of affected roads. This approach would eliminate the responsibility to participate in transportation improvements in exempt areas.
- **Consultant Recommendation:** Use different levels of service, but retain testing for all development, though mitigation requirements could be limited in targeted areas (e.g., downtowns and activity centers) to addressing ingress and egress challenges or to provide support for other modes of transportation (e.g., bike/ped/transit). Areas subject to special considerations should be mapped.
- **Concerns and Comments:**
 - ITD would like to negotiate areas exempt from consideration.

- Meridian’s code defines infill areas⁴, but these are based on the presence of surrounding development rather than being specifically identified activity areas.

2. To which developments should APF requirements be applied?

- **Discussion:** APF testing for streets need not be applied to all developments because many small developments have a negligible impact on street system capacity. Most jurisdictions exempt de minimis developments -- those having no significant impact. Some jurisdictions provide exemptions for developments that achieve specific goals (e.g., affordable housing, economic development, and infill). The State of Florida allows de minimis development, provided that existing demand does not exceed 110% of an affected road’s capacity.
- **Recommendation:** Exempt development projected to generate fewer than a threshold number of trips (e.g., < 50 vehicles per day) for all contiguous holdings, but track demands from all development. If specific types of development are desired, allocate the trips to them in advance, prior to the creation of a traffic constraint.
- **Concerns and Comments**
 - ITD requires a minor traffic impact study (TIS) for developments generating between 25 and 99 peak hour trips (approximately 25 single family dwellings) and full TIS for developments generating more than 99 peak hour trips.

3. To what extent should demand be reduced by transit-oriented development, mixed uses and other designs intended to reduce traffic generation?

- **Discussion:** Many trip reduction strategies produce limited benefits over the short term, but contribute to the long-term potential for use of more efficient travel patterns. Assessments based on gains likely to be achieved within three years are likely to significantly reduce or eliminate the travel benefits of these development patterns. Assessments based on the potential benefits could result in short-term or long-term congestion levels that exceed adopted LOS.
- **Recommendation:** Require a critical/credible assessment of traffic benefits based on the proportion of trip reduction likely to be achieved within 10 years of the requested development approval. Apply this proportion of trip capture for to the project for short term capacity analysis. Note that the VRT concurrence should be required for trip reductions attributable to transit use.

Next Steps

Following meetings this week with the Steering/Technical Committee, stakeholder focus groups and ACHD/COMPASS, I will begin drafting the model templates for the APFO and interlocal agreements for review by each jurisdiction prior to our next meeting, which is tentatively scheduled for early December.

⁴ Infill is “Development on vacant parcels, or redevelopment of existing parcels to a higher and better use, that is surrounded by fully developed property within in the City of Meridian”.