

- c. **Public Outreach Subcommittee – Deanna Smith (11:00 – 11:50 AM) (pages 22-29)**
Deanna will present the Public Outreach presentation for review by the Committee. This presentation, used in conjunction with the Communities in Motion informational video, is the Speakers Bureau presentation by BGG participants.

The Steering/Technical Committee is requested to provide comments on the presentation and recommendation for submittal to the Consortium for viewing at its November 8 meeting.

- d. **Update of Open Space Subcommittee – Deanna Smith (11:50 – 11:55 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>
- e. **Update from the Transit Ready/Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee – Kelli Fairless (11:55 AM – 12:00 PM)**
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.

Upcoming 2007 Technical and Steering Meetings are as follows:

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

Blueprint for Good Growth

Committee: Steering Technical

Date: October 10, 2007

Name	Contact Number / Email	Representing
Jill Davidson	336-0420 jdavidson@dohertyeng.com	BGG - Doherty's Assoc.
Sabrina Bowman	387-6156 Sbowman@aachd.ada.id.us	AACHD
PETE FRIEDMAN	884-5533 friedman@city.org	MERIDIAN
ANNA CANNING	884-5533	MERIDIAN
PETE O'NEILL	333-2401	CHAMBER
STEVE MARAZE	287-7920	ADA COUNTY
Michael Baird Spencer	939-0227 mbaird@CityofEagle.org	Eagle
MENDEL BIGHAM	350-5016 M.Bigham@WenatcheeSchools.org	JOINT SCHOOL DIST 2
Kelli Fairless	846-8547 kfairless@valleyregionaltransit.org	Valley Regional Transit
Gloria Parkvold	846-8547 ext. 4218 gparkvold@valleyregionaltransit.org	VRT
Charles Trainer	855-2558 x2320 ctrainr@COMPASSidaho.org	COMPASS
Deanna Smith	333-8066 deutsmith@cableone.net	156
Michael Lauer	mlauer@owglanijworks.com	Planning Works
Karen Doherty	336-0420 kdoherty@dohertyeng.com	B66
Dem Gunderson	dgunderson@adaweb.net	Ada County
Richard Cook	dscookra@adaweb.net	Ada County
Ruby German	922-4550	Agriculture
STEVEN HASSON	340 9884	KUNA
Robert Miller	860-4944 robert.a.miller@hp.com	Industry (HP)
Clay Carley	345-7852 clay.carley@idboise.com	ECON DEV
Phil Choate	334-8901 phil.choate@itd.idaho.gov	ITD
JAY GIBBONS	287-5719 jgibbons@adaweb.net	ADA COUNTY
MIKE WARDLE	287-0512 mwardle@brightencorp.com	FORLETTON

Technical and Steering Committee Meeting **Wednesday, October 10, 2007, 9:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M.**

Meridian Police Department

Meeting Minutes

- I. **Consent Agenda (9:00-10:05 AM)**
 a. **Approval of the September 6, 2007 Meeting Notes**
 Approved

II. **Discussion Items**

a. **Transportation Funding Committees – Julie Pipal**

Julie discussed the funding mechanisms that have been presented to the Governor. She explained that “ideas” have been forwarded to the Governor for his consent and authorization to pursue. ITD is still waiting for the Governor to respond to the suggestions, so Julie noted that she is unable to provide specific information at this time. Currently all proposals are in the Governor’s office, and Julie and her staff have not been authorized to present any proposed legislation. She anticipates that transportation infrastructure funding will be a part of the Governor’s initiative for the next legislative session.

The suggested funding mechanisms do include a component with a dedicated funding source for public transportation.

There is some notion from the trucking industry that passenger vehicles are not paying “their fair share”, and that is being taken into consideration. When Idaho is compared with the surrounding 17 states, Idaho falls in the middle. The data from the comparison is being taken into consideration. Julie and her staff are attempting to come up with some reasonable comparisons to be able to present to legislators, so that they have full information in front of them when making decisions.

Julie encouraged attendees to participate in the meeting on October 15, to hear a full presentation on the information that has been presented to the Governor. Julie explained that ITD, due to funding shortfalls, is concentrating on operations and maintenance with preservation as the next priority. Expansion is the lowest funding priority at this time.

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

Julie and her staff are currently working on a percentage for what is required to fund operations, preservation, restoration & rehabilitation, and expansion. There is considerable concern that the freeway system is 40+ years old.

Discussions:

- Steve Hasson suggested turning Kuna-Mora Road into a Toll Road.
- Clay Carley recommended providing “grades” on other states infrastructure status when providing infrastructure policy comparisons to the Legislature.
- Julie indicated there is a misconception that ITD is trying to “take” some impact fees from local jurisdictions. This is not the case. ITD merely wishes to be aware of proposed development, planned growth, and ways to fund necessary infrastructure improvements.
- Copies of the draft impact fee and cooperative transportation planning legislation, will be provided to participants via email.

b. Adequate Public Facilities Update – Michael Lauer

Michael is continuing to collect documents for the background data.

He indicated that the Focus Groups brought up some interesting issues that are being addressed, and possibly implemented. The Legal Staff group felt that Adequate Public Facilities (APF) was being enforced on an Ad Hoc Basis for transportation improvements currently, and felt it this was working fine. The Development Community did not share this sentiment.

Michael is concerned that ITD is not looking at expansion to their system. Without expansion, APF cannot be implemented. This is something that will need to be addressed with ITD. He was encouraged that ITD is reviewing their impact fee options.

The schedule for ACHD’s Transportation and Land Use Integration (TLIP) project is slipping. TLIP is critical to the BGG APF work because TLIP defines appropriate Levels of Service. APF could have the unintended consequence of encouraging sprawl if Level of Service is not defined. Michael will be “on hold” relative to the APF work until the Levels of Service are finalized through TLIP.

Discussions:

- ACHD is attempting to define bearable level of service by area, and this is part of the hold up for TLIP.
- Need to define areas, and levels of congestion, and the tolerance of congestion for those areas. APFs should not be used to contradict the land use decisions.
- The modeling and tracking systems currently used are not adequate for the efforts necessary to implement APF. Michael is working with ACHD and COMPASS on monitoring and tracking system vital for APF. Need to track the commitments and expired developments. Cumulative measurement is a critical component of APF monitoring.

Discussions shifted to Michael’s memo in the agenda packet. He noted that he has received general agreement on items 1 to 6 on Pages 10 and 11.

Group focused on item 7, Page 11. Discussion occurred as follows:

- Smaller developments will need to be tracked, addressed, and monitored

as they occur. Deanna asked who would be doing the monitoring. She is concerned that the appropriate monitoring systems are not in place to track what is going on with projects 5+ years into the future.

- What if counties and cities cannot agree? And who approves the development, counties and/or cities? There needs to be some conflict resolution process established if there can not be an equitable agreement to mitigation. Michael feels as though one agency should not have the ability to unilaterally approve or deny any mitigation plan.
- What about reserving capacity for future development, and how do you factor in development outside of Boise, to filter traffic in and out of this area?
 - Michael noted that Blueprint is only an advisory document. Land use authority is maintained with local governments. It is up to the local government to step up and tell a developer that they are not in compliance, and to provide mitigation.
 - Michael reiterated that the APFO is a surge protector against rapid overgrowth, and lack of planning.
- Tricia cautioned about downstream effects and the process necessary to update BGG or Communities in Motion plans. Michael suggested letter of intent procedure to address the modifications.
- Attendees agreed that ACHD must be able to provide conceptual site plan reviews.
- Operational mitigation is not part of APFO, and the attorneys need to be a part of the planning on this portion, but Michael is hesitant to approach it without their input. He will flag this item for further review.

Page 12 / Item 1 -

- Attendees agreed with Michael's recommendations. Some participants cautioned against transit mitigation.

Page 13 / Item 2

- Attendees agreed with Michael's recommendations. Discussion did involve effect of many, small developments. The private sector representatives didn't feel that smaller developments would be encouraged by this treatment, but they did suggest a "deep" toolkit for mitigation options. Charles Trainor noted that effects of small developments would be difficult to track.

Page 13 / Item 3

- Michael feels that there needs to be a way to credit for trip capture. But this won't be possible for the first few years because trip capture may not happen immediately. Michael thought it was worthy trying to incentivize projects that promote trip capture.
- Attendees agreed with Anna's suggestion of addressing this in varied Level of Service standards and not through mitigation exemption.

Next Steps:

- Michael will continue to work on the APF Ordinance and hopes to have a

rough draft for review in early November. Members asked for case studies of how the APFO is to work in an ideal setting.

III. Action Items

a. **Area of City Impact Modification Process Subcommittee – Anna Canning**

Anna opened the discussion explaining that the Consortium expressed the opinion to trim down the process document, and to complete the planning boundary map. Overlap is an issue that the County would like to resolve. Tricia and Anna were charged to meet with Steve Malone to trim the document. The document is down to 3 ½ pages, and should provide the guidance that the cities and county need. This information will be provided to the Steering Committee for their review at the next meeting.

Deanna questioned as to why the text was reduced. Anna said that the Consortium wanted to get simplify the process. Deanna feels that this is going to be a detriment to the process. Anna is hoping to have the deleted text available to the Idaho Planning Association as reference.

Anna asked that the Steering Committee focus on map content and items necessary for the Consortium to establish the planning boundary and NOT the planning boundaries themselves. The draft planning boundaries were established based on input from City staff and it will be left to the elected officials to negotiate the final boundaries. Three persons from each jurisdiction are requested to attend at the next Consortium meeting including the regular Consortium representative, a second elected official, and a member of the planning staff.

Suggestions for map inclusion and supporting material were as follows:

- City Limits
- Areas of City Impacts
- BGG growth tiers
- Proposed planning boundaries
- Smaller section maps to show details in areas of potential overlap
- Topography
- Water and sewer lines including service provider identification

Tricia noted that Boise's lines as shown are incorrect and will be updated prior to the November 8 meeting.

Michael encouraged Anna and other staff bring as much support information as possible so that they can provide immediate data to Consortium members for planning purposes during the Consortium meeting.

Discussion was held regarding providing BGG principle and guidelines to the Consortium prior to this planning boundary exercise. The group agreed that an educational whitepaper clarifying the intent of planning boundaries and listing the BGG policies related to this exercise should be created for the Consortium to review prior to the meeting. Anna, Steve (Malone), Deanna, and Karen will start the paper and present it for review by the Steering/Technical meeting at their November 1 meeting.

b. Public Outreach Subcommittee – Deanna Smith

The Committee has been moving along with the update of the presentation to educate the community and elected officials about Blueprint.

The committee members questioned the attendees about the moving forward with public outreach if the governing structure is in flux. The general consensus was we should continue branding Blueprint, and provide educational opportunities about the process.

It was suggested that the PowerPoint be shown to the Consortium at their next meeting. A Dry run of PowerPoint will be presented to the Steering/Technical committee prior to presentation to Consortium. This is an excellent opportunity to provide information to the “extra” elected officials who will be at the Consortium meeting for the planning boundary exercise.

c. Update of Open Space Subcommittee – Deanna Smith

Deanna stated that Task Force members are making recommendations on tools that should be implemented into the County process. Lack of fiscal resources are hindering the Task Force’s progress.

She suggested that each of the attendees take a request back to their jurisdictions for additional support of the Task Force through staff time, map preparation, etc. The Task Force is still gathering information about existing data and identification of that data which currently exists should be send to Jay Gibbons at the County.

III. Discussion Items

a. Update from the Transit Ready/Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee – Kelli Fairless

Kelli indicated the subcommittee has morphed into an information tool for COMPASS and Blueprint. Kelli and Gloria are doing a preliminary review of data, and will begin scheduling a review of the data with potential hosts, and then will begin developer workshops.

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

After discussion, the Steering/Technical Committee meeting will remain on November 1, 2007 from 10:00 – 12:00 @ ACHD Auditorium. Michael will not be present. The Consortium meeting will be on November 8.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:00 pm.

MEMORANDUM

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Steering/Technical Committee

FROM: Karen Doherty, P.E. – Project Coordinator

DATE: October 29, 2007

RE: Consortium Planning Boundary Establishment
Educational White Paper

Requested Action:

Attached is the draft educational whitepaper which will be presented to the Consortium prior to their Planning Boundary exercise on November 8. This whitepaper informs Consortium participants about the purpose of the Planning Boundaries as well as related BGG Policies. This document is meant to be a “primer” for the Planning Boundary participants before they begin the exercise. The Steering/Technical Committee is requested to provide review comments for this white paper and recommendation for submittal to the Consortium for its November 8 meeting.

**Consortium Planning Boundary Establishment
Educational White Paper
DRAFT FOR REVIEW BY STEERING/TECHNICAL COMMITTEE**

Introduction

The Blueprint for Good Growth establishes a shared vision for the future of Ada County and provides policy direction to achieve that vision. Its Guiding Principles describe shared values that are the foundation of the actions we must take to preserve and enhance the things we cherish about Ada County. The following excerpts from the BGG provide a framework for the directives recommended by the BGG Steering/Technical Committee relating to the establishment of community planning areas that encompass each City's proposed area of impact. The planning areas are not intended to represent areas of planned urban development; they are intended to establish very long term spheres of influence. By reaching beyond anticipated areas of impact, they allow each community to more rationally plan for the needs of future generations.

Consortium members should consider the following excerpt while refining the planning boundary map and during subsequent planning efforts to establish rational areas of impact.

Guiding Principles

We will manage growth with fiscal responsibility, discipline, and creativity.

- Growth must pay for itself.
- We will reduce infrastructure costs by
 - building higher densities in appropriate locations;
 - better managing growth in impact areas;
 - Aligning capital improvement plans with areas targeted for new growth; and
 - Considering new and innovative ways to accomplish these things.
- We will reduce transportation costs and pollution if we can create complete communities where jobs, shopping and housing are near each other.

We will limit sprawl and promote other kinds of more responsible development.

- We will emphasize infill development and increasing the density of residential development.
- We will require master planning of larger, undeveloped areas to ensure an appropriate mix of commercial, residential, and open space uses.
 - We will focus most commercial and residential development within cities and in contiguous portions of defined areas of impact.
 - We will consider master-planned communities outside of developed areas if they demonstrate they will pay for their impact on the area and will not burden other communities by shifting capital, operations and maintenance costs.
- Residential development will include a range of densities, housing types, and price levels.
- We will create a transportation system that will support the land use patterns we want and will be the least harmful to the environment.
- We will work creatively using our group strength to implement the land use patterns we want.

We will offer a quality transportation system for private vehicles with increasing choices for pedestrians, bicycles, and transit.

- We will construct mixed-use patterns along main streets and in downtowns.
- We will connect neighborhoods, parks, schools and open space to shopping areas and other area assets with complete sidewalks, transit stops and bike paths.
- We are firmly committed to identifying, preserving and using key highway and rail corridors.
- We are firmly committed to expanding and strengthening highway and transit connections between communities.
- We will coordinate investments to create efficient transportation corridors.
- We will ensure our transportation systems support our land use decisions and provide alternatives to vehicular travel.
- We will create stable and equitable funding sources for transportation.

We will maintain a vibrant central city in Boise and strong downtowns in all cities.

- We will maintain a vibrant downtown Boise as the region's center for government, commerce and entertainment.
- We will accommodate growth through infill, redevelopment and expansion.
- We will build stronger neighborhoods through mixed-use development.

- We will promote an effective regional transportation system by building developments that support transit.
- We will create a city where car ownership is not required to travel freely.
- We will encourage expansion and reinvestment in all downtowns.

We will protect the natural resources we value.

- The natural resources we value most are our clean air and water, our trees, the Boise Foothills, the Boise River and floodplains, Lake Lowell and agricultural lands.
- We will protect these assets by
 - building higher densities in appropriate locations,
 - better concentrating and coordinating growth in impact areas,
 - providing incentives to property owners,
 - adopting development regulations that encourage protection of natural resource areas, and
 - Participating in the planting of trees and flowers, and
 - Supporting programs that result in tree and flower proliferation.
- We will better protect these assets if we are able to locate jobs, shopping and housing near each other.

Growth Tiers Defined

Areas of Impact

These areas are adjacent to incorporated cities and reflect an area that could reasonably be expected to be annexed and to be served by centralized sewer service within the next twenty years. Some rural residential development that does not receive centralized sewer service may be included within areas of impact in accordance with the applicable municipality's comprehensive plan. The primary purposes of areas of impact are to:

- Protect future city growth areas from inappropriate development that would constrain future growth;
- Facilitate coordinated land use and facility planning so service providers can better anticipate and plan to meet future demands;
- Provide a predictable framework for private development decisions;
- Provide for orderly and sequenced annexations and to reduce pressure for rapid area of impact boundary adjustments to encompass short-term annexation plans; and
- Ensure financial and physical capability to provide needed public facilities and services.

Growth Management Goals, Objective and Policies:

General Growth Management Policies

- GM-2:** Ensure that development decisions are coordinated with the availability of essential public facilities so that adequate public facilities will be provided before or concurrent with the generation of demands for those facilities.
- GM-3:** Coordinate land use and capital facility planning by requiring capital improvement programs by service providers to be consistent with adopted comprehensive plans and the Blueprint for Good Growth.
- GM-6:** Coordinate development decisions with local and regional plans for the full range of public facilities, as well as open space and environmental protection.
- GM-7:** Encourage cities and the county, as applicable, to establish long-term annexation agreements pursuant to policy GM-18 to minimize intergovernmental conflicts and provide greater predictability for property owners
- GM-8:** Evaluate development proposals and future land use map amendments, are consistent with Long Range Transportation Plan and the 20-year ACHD Capital Improvements Plan. For new development:
1. Require the submittal of a concept plan for all contiguous land holdings prior to the first preliminary plat approval.
 2. Ensure that the development is reflected in the applicable comprehensive plan, the BGG tier map, and the Long-Range Transportation Plan and the ACHD 20-Year CIP.
 3. Establish the base residential and non-residential intensity at the time of concept plan approval, considering:
 - a. the adequacy of essential public facilities;
 - b. applicable comprehensive plan policies;
 - c. the proximity of the project to existing employment centers;
 - d. consistency of the project with the Long Range Transportation Plan and the ACHD 20-Year CIP; and,
 - e. physical limitations of the site.

Areas of Impact Policies

GM-12: Establish and adjust Area of Impact boundaries based upon:

1. coordinated 20-year capital facility plans that reflect historical or reasonably anticipated funding levels to facilitate the efficient provision of adequate water, wastewater, stormwater and transportation facilities;
2. recent growth trends and projected growth of the applicable city;
3. the availability of adequate land supplies within the city and its area of impact to meet the amount and diversity of growth that may be reasonably anticipated by the city;
4. the existence of short-term (e.g., 5-year) capital improvements programs that are adequately funded to accommodate growth anticipated within at least 20 percent of the area of impact; and
5. inter-governmental agreements with the County and applicable service providers to coordinate land use and infrastructure decisions in accordance with the policies established in this plan.

GM-16: Where essential public facilities are not scheduled to be provided within adopted 5-Year an CIP, the applicable city and Ada County may take one of the following actions after considering the factors listed below:

Actions¹

- Approval of the entire development application subject to execution of a development agreement that provides for adequate public facilities for the entire development and compliance with mutually agreed upon plans, regulations and infrastructure policies; or
- Approval of development of up to 20 percent of the land area² in the development, subject to execution of a development agreement assuring that:
 - The initial portion to be developed will be consistent with the applicable city's comprehensive plan, development regulations and infrastructure policies, and
 - The concept plan for all contiguous land holdings is consistent with the applicable city's comprehensive plan, development regulations and infrastructure policies, and

¹ Through any development approval, the City and County may require the reservation of sufficient right-of-way and easements to serve planned development in the vicinity of the project. Dry sewers may be required if elevations can be determined at the time of development.

² The remaining 80 percent may be developed when the City determines that the full range of facilities and services are adequate to serve the entire site.

- The applicant commits to future annexation and full funding of facilities including funding for future connection of the portion of the site that is initially developed to centralized water and waste water systems; or
- Disapproval of the development application.

Factors

- Consistency of the concept plan for the portion to be developed and the entire property with the applicable city's comprehensive plan;
- System-wide benefits provided by proposed public facilities;
- Local and regional fiscal and economic benefits;
- Capital obligations generated by the development;
- Operations and maintenance obligations generated by the development; and
- Other benefits consistent with the city's adopted comprehensive plan goals (e.g., housing, environmental, recreational, economic, transportation, etc).

GM-17: When an applicant seeks an exception to adopted public improvement standards within an area of impact, the exception shall require approval by both the applicable city and Ada County to avoid future infrastructure deficiencies that impede future growth and service delivery.

GM-18: Adjustments to area of impact boundaries to reflect 20-year growth plans shall include an agreement not to annex beyond the area of impact unless approved by the county or the other affected city if the area lies within the other city's area of impact. Pursuant to Policy GM-7, local governments are encouraged to enter into annexation boundary agreements that establish ultimate boundary lines between individual cities and are based upon the following factors:

- Anticipated growth and the need for additional land to serve the cities' residential and non-residential land use needs;
- Sewer service basins and the capacity to serve development in those basins;
- Other service area boundaries (e.g., school districts, fire districts)
- Geographic features (e.g., ridges, waterways, arterial streets, railroads, greenways) that form appropriate breaks between communities; and
- Public input from affected property owners.

City Policies

GM-19: Ensure that development decisions are consistent with the adopted comprehensive plans, regulations, the Long Range Transportation Plan, the ACHD 20-year CIO and the Valley Regional Transit Plans.

GM-20: Establish a mix of uses that maintains or improves the balance of jobs, housing and services in each city to improve local fiscal health and reduce long-term transportation demands.

GM-21: Base annexation decisions on the availability of essential public facilities, the schedule for provision of those facilities in applicable capital improvements plans, area of impact boundaries, fiscal benefits, economic benefits, the need for additional development areas, and the local comprehensive plan.

Rural Tier Policies

GM-22: Limit development in the rural tier to an average of three (3%) percent of projected county-wide population growth within any three-year period, exclusive of development approved within a planned community. This limitation should be based on new lot creation and, if applications for new lots reaches the three percent (3%) allocation, subdivision action shall be deferred until the following year in accordance with adopted County standards.

GM-23: Establish an equity-based program to secure permanent open space within the rural tier through the use of techniques such as: conservation subdivisions, transfers of development rights, or purchases of land, conservation easements or development rights.

Open Space Goal and Objective

Open Space and Natural Resource Goal: To develop an interconnected system of open spaces and natural resource areas that:

- Protect water quality;
- Protect development from flood hazards;
- Provide an accessible, system of greenways and trails;
- Protect wildlife habitat by avoiding fragmentation of habitat areas and corridors;
- Minimize development on steep hillsides; and
- Provide appropriate recreational opportunities.

Open Space Objective: Within two years of adoption of the BGG, develop a countywide open space and greenway plan to facilitate the establishment of a coordinated system that helps achieve the open space and natural resource goal. This plan should:

- Involve diverse stakeholders including irrigation, recreation, conservation, agricultural, transportation, flood control, development, neighborhood, and fish and wildlife interests.
- Recognize and integrate open space, trails, and pathway planning completed by each community and the county to date.
- Recommend non-regulatory and regulatory tools such as conservation design subdivisions, tax incentives, transfer of development rights, and wildlife mitigation strategies to achieve open space protection goals.
- Establish context sensitive natural and active recreation open space standards.

AREA OF CITY IMPACT EXPANSION PROCESS

Introduction

Ada County and its six cities have grappled with expansions of areas of city impact over the past four years in the face of tremendous growth pressures. Current provisions in the Local Land Use Planning Act have proved inadequate in defining the purpose and function of an area of city impact boundary, bogging down what had historically been straightforward renegotiations between Ada County Commissioners and city leaders.

The successful implementation of Blueprint for Good Growth requires a straightforward, equitable process for defining areas of impact. During 2007, a subcommittee of city and county planners met to create a process that would fulfill a mutual desire to create a process that:

1. Relies on city provision of adequate public facilities in keeping with the commitment to the Blueprint for Good Growth;
2. Requires subarea planning before a boundary expansion is approved;
3. Includes substantive public involvement in the development of a subarea plan;
4. Relies on objective standards to guide the County approval process.

1. Establishment of a Planning Boundary

- a. Goal: Delineation of planning areas outside currently adopted areas of impact where sub area planning is desired and/or necessary by a city. A sub area plan can be an addendum or amendment to the existing city comprehensive plan or an independent plan.
- b. Purpose: This boundary is created solely for the purposes of developing sub area plans and to establish communication protocols among the city, adjacent cities, and Ada County regarding development activity during the sub area planning process.
- c. Process: Since property rights are not affected by establishing the planning boundary, the boundary will be created through a Memorandum of Understanding between Ada County and the affected city. The Memorandum of Understanding will include the following provisions:
 - i. Establish the planning boundary.
 - ii. Define the roles and responsibilities of the requesting city, the county, and other cities adjacent to or overlapping the planning boundary.
 - iii. Establish referral area for mutual notice of county and city rezoning, land division, or conditional use applications of other city, county, or ACHD planning activities within the planning boundary. The planning area shall serve as a referral area. All county applications shall be transmitted to the appropriate city or cities for comment and review until a formal area of impact agreement takes effect after the completion of the sub area plan and/or the referral area is deemed unnecessary by the requesting city or cities and the county.
 - iv. Periodic review of the sub area planning process and planning boundary.
 - v. Set a term of the Memorandum of Understanding.

d. Guidelines and/or Criteria:

- i. There are not specified criteria regarding the sufficiency of a particular planning boundary, but generally they respect natural or man-made features, landforms, major transportation corridors, infrastructure constraints, and jurisdictional boundaries.
- ii. The planning boundary shall include, at a minimum, area to accommodate twenty years of growth for the city.
- iii. The planning boundary shall not include a portion of an existing planning boundary proposed by another city. Such city (or cities) shall be invited to participate in any subsequent sub area planning process proposed by the city.
- iv. Proposed planning boundaries are shown on Appendix A.

2. Sub Area Plan Scope of Work and Process

- a. Goal: Sub area plans that express the vision of the community after consideration of the needs and vision of affected cities and/or the county.
- b. Purpose: The purpose of this section is to provide criteria related on how to conduct the sub area planning process.
- c. Process:
 - i. Each city, as part of the sub area planning process, shall first develop a scope of work, timeline, and public participation plan for the sub area planning effort.
 - ii. The city shall invite the county, neighboring cities, transportation agencies, and any affected service providers to be stakeholders in the planning process and allow these stakeholders to review the plan timeline, scope of work, and public participation plan.
 - iii. The city shall take comments (requested modifications) and make necessary changes to accommodate such comments. The city and county staffs shall schedule a joint workshop with property owners and affected residents.
- d. Guidelines and/or Criteria:
 - i. Sub area plans may include all or part of the planning area defined in Section 1.
 - ii. The sub area plan shall address the 14 elements, including agricultural land uses, required under Idaho Code by specific discussion or by reference to an existing plan.
 - iii. The sub area plan shall implement to the extent possible adopted regional plans, including but not limited to, Communities in Motion, the Blueprint for Good Growth policies and Tiers Map, the Ada County Parks and Waterways Open Space Plan, Ridge to Rivers Plan, and other local or regional open space, pathways, trails, bikeway, air quality or transportation plans.

3. Area of City Impact Expansion Submittal and Hearing Process


- a. Goal: Predictable and timely review and adoption of area of city impact expansion requests and associated sub area plans by the Board of County Commissioners. The goal is also to shorten the lag time between the two governing units regarding adoption of the sub area plans. Long delays create uncertainty for property owners, invite criticisms of inefficient government bureaucracy, and create a feeling of mistrust in the community members involved in the planning efforts.
- b. Purpose: To establish a process that allows the county to participate early in the sub area plan process so that when the expansion request is formally submitted, the county can quickly evaluate the adequacy of area of city impact expansion requests.
- c. Process:
 - i. Following the joint workshop (see Section 2), the city shall submit a formal request for and area of city impact expansion. Such request shall include:
 1. Map of the proposed future land use map with the proposed area of city impact boundary;
 2. A copy of the city-adopted subarea plan.
 3. Map of areas within the proposed area of city impact that are not proposed for urban services, with a brief written explanation;
 4. Capital Facilities Plan that has a 20-year horizon with a detailed program of the first five years.
 - a. The requesting city shall document how the new facilities proposed in the sub area plan shall be phased (including time increments) to ensure that new facilities shall meet any adopted adequate public facilities ordinance.
 - b. The city shall document that the first five years of the capital facility plans can serve at least 15% of the development in the proposed area of city impact. If less than 15% of the development in the proposed area of city impact will be served in the first five years, the city shall submit a written explanation of why a lower percentage is anticipated.
 - c. If the city does not provide the water, sewer, transportation, storm water, or public safety services, the city shall obtain a letter from such providers indicating sufficient capacity and the ability to fund and provide capital improvements consistent with the five-year capital facilities plan.
 5. Intergovernmental Agreement on the specific implementation guidelines and/or standards that the county would apply to developments proposed within an area of city impact.
 - ii. County Review of Area of City Impact Amendment Negotiation Request.
 1. The provisions of Idaho Code, Section 67-6526 shall apply.
 2. Within 30 days of submittal, county shall notify the requesting city of any missing items listed in 3ci above. The purpose is to determine if the county has a complete application. The city shall respond within 30 days or as may be mutually agreed upon with the County. Subsequent submittals by the requesting city shall be reviewed within 14 days. The county shall notify the requesting city in writing of the date the application is deemed complete.

3. After the request is deemed complete, the County shall schedule a joint meeting between the city and county governing boards. The joint meeting shall include the following:
 - i. Discussion of the proposed intergovernmental agreement and any potential issues related to processing the necessary comprehensive plan and/or zoning ordinance text and/or map amendments.
 - ii. Establishment of a hearing schedule for the city and county adoption of the amended area of city impact agreement.
 - iii. Establishment of a schedule for implementing additional provisions as submitted by the city in section 3(c)(i)(11) above.

The meeting may be waived with agreement by both parties.

d. Dispute resolution

Any and all disputes arising during the renegotiation of the area of city impact agreement shall be resolved using the process provided in Idaho Code, Section 67-6526.




Blueprint for Good Growth


Insert Organization Name

Insert Date

Insert Speaker's Name




Creating a Long-term Strategy for Our Community's Growth



**Phase I:
Regional
Agreement**

➔

**Phase II:
Turning Vision
Into Reality**




Prepared by:


Planning Works, LLC 8015 Stone Lane Road Suite 208 Laguna Hills, CA 92653 951-269-7022 www.planningworks.com	Paul Hastings, Janeshky & Mitchell 910 South Flower Street 14th Floor, Suite 1400 Los Angeles, CA 90017 213-633-6300 www.paulhastings.com
---	--

Phase I Report
As Adopted by the Consortium
September 14, 2006

- ✓ Area of City Impact Process
- ✓ Open Space Preservation
- ✓ Transit Ready Development
- ✓ Coordinate Transportation & Land Use
- ✓ Adequate Public Facilities
- ✓ Lasting Political Will



Phase I Accomplishments



Identify Land Use Patterns to Address

- Growth
- Transportation
- Utilities
- Public Schools
- Agricultural Preservation and Open Space



Guiding Principles

The Treasure Valley will be a better place if we plan growth to meet our most important priorities.

We will:

- **Provide choices** in where to live and work.
- **Manage growth** with fiscal responsibility, discipline and creativity.
- **Limit sprawl** and promote more responsible development.
- Create attractive and **livable neighborhoods**.



Guiding Principles, Cont.

We will:

- Create a **quality, regional multimodal transportation system**.
- Maintain a vibrant central city in Boise and **strong downtowns** in all cities.
- **Protect natural resources** of the Treasure Valley.



Phase II – Turning Vision Into Reality

Current activities include:

1. Area of City Impact Process
2. Open Space Preservation
3. Transit Ready Development
4. ACHD's Transportation & Land Use Integration Plan (TLIP)
5. Adequate Public Facilities
6. Lasting Political Will



1. Area of City Impact Process

- Creating planning area boundaries
- Sub-area planning
 - Mini-comprehensive plan
 - Multi-jurisdiction and public involvement
 - Identification / revision of City Impact boundary
- Area of City Impact negotiations



2. Open Space Preservation

- Preservation of natural and recreational open space
- Open space buffers between communities
- County-wide open space corridors
- Preservation of agricultural land
- Ada County Open Space Task Force



3. Transit Ready Development

- Hold forums with developers, business, neighborhoods, general public, and local governments
 - Quality design examples
 - “Do No Harm” to future transit routes
 - Identify and reduce barriers
- Prepare Communities in Motion’s “Implementation Guide”



4. ACHD’s Transportation & Land Use Integration Plan (TLIP)

- Livable street designs
- Long-range corridor preservation
- Revised level of service policies
- Design matches surrounding land-use



5. Adequate Public Facilities

- Infrastructure available to meet needs of new development
- Facilities in place before development is approved
- New growth coordinated with capacity and ability to maintain facilities
- Development guided by capacity



6. Lasting Political Will

What you can do...

- Understand Blueprint for Good Growth
- Host presentations
- Speak up when decisions are made
- Support adoption of Adequate Public Facility Ordinance
- Support additional infrastructure funding
- Engage your elected leaders



Get Involved!


- See Handout
- Sign up on email List
- Participate in public forums and workshops:



Key Ideas

- Regional Cooperation
 - Mutually created principles
 - Identified desired growth areas
 - Jointly developed implementation tools
- Quality of Life
 - Protect investments in home and business
 - Open space protection
 - Air and water quality
 - Transit ready developments
 - Coordinate transportation & land use
- Commitment
 - Measure actions against principles





Blueprint for Good Growth

For more information:
blueprintforgoodgrowth.com

