



## **Consortium Member Agency Meeting**

**Thursday, December 13, 2007 2:00 P.M. to 4:00 P.M.**

Ada County Courthouse

### **AGENDA**

- I. **Consent Agenda (2:00 PM – 2:10 PM)**
  - a. **Approval of the September 6, 2007 Meeting Notes (pg. 3 - 5)**
  - b. **Approval of Planning Works October 2007 and December 2006 Invoice, Status Memo attached (pg. 6 – 8)**
  
- II. **Discussion Items**
  - a. **Update from the Public Outreach Subcommittee – Deanna Smith & Pam Sheldon (2:10 – 2:50 PM)**  
Deanna will present the Public Outreach presentation for review by the Consortium. This presentation, used in conjunction with the Communities in Motion informational video, is the Speakers Bureau presentation by BGG participants. The Consortium is asked to provide comments on the presentation
  - b. **Update of Open Space Subcommittee – Karen Doherty (2:50 – 2:55 PM)**  
A verbal update will be given by Karen Doherty on progress of the Ada County Open Space Task Force.
  - c. **Adequate Public Facilities Update - Michael Lauer (2:55 PM – 3:15 PM) (pg. 9 - 10)**  
Michael Lauer will provide a status report on Adequate Public Facility Ordinance (APFO)
  
- III. **Action Item**
  - a. **Request for Adoption of the Area of City Impact Modification Process Subcommittee - Anna Canning (3:15 – 3:50 PM) (pg. 11 - 14)**  
The revised Area of City Impact modification process is attached and has been recommended unanimously for approval by the Steering Committee. Adoption by the Consortium is requested.
  
- VI. **Discussion Items**
  - a. **Update from the Transit Ready/Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee – Kelli Fairless (3:50 – 3:55 PM)**  
An update will be given by Kelli Fairless on the subcommittee's progress.
  
- III. **Informational Items (3:55 - 4:00 P.M.)**
  - a. **Project Coordinator's Report (pg. 15 - 16)**
  - b. **Funding Status Update (pg. 17 - 18)**

*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 [kdoherty@dohertyeng.com](mailto:kdoherty@dohertyeng.com)  
[www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com](http://www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com)*

**Upcoming Consortium Meetings**

January 10, 2008 – Meridian Police Department (Tentative)

February 7, 2008 – ACHD Auditorium

March 13, 2008 – Meridian Police Department (Tentative)

April 3, 2008 – ACHD Auditorium



## **Consortium Member Agency Meeting**

**Thursday, September 6, 2007 1:30 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.**

Ada County Highway District Auditorium

### **Minutes**

#### **I. Consent Agenda (1:30 PM – 1:35 PM)**

##### **a. Approval of the August 2, 2007 Meeting Notes (pg. 3-6)**

*Question as to accuracy of minutes regarding member appointment and the Boise Metro Chamber of Commerce, and their membership as a full member, or a member of the Steering Committee; it was requested that a correction to the minutes be made to show this clarification.  
/Approved with amendment regarding intent of minutes/*

##### **b. Approval of Planning Works July Invoice (pg. 7-9)**

*Planning Works invoice /Approved/*

#### **II. Action Items (1:35 PM – 1:45 PM)**

##### **a. Consortium Membership**

*Boise Metro Chamber of Commerce: Discussion as to whether to request a representative to be a full Consortium member or a Steering Committee member. Some members felt as though there should not be additional membership at this time and some felt an addition as a Steering Committee representative was appropriate. Members discussed the positive aspects of including the business community since this interest has been active in BGG and has asked numerous times for “a voice at the table.” Several motions were entertained and the final affirmative motion was as follows:*

*\* Motion to allow Peter O’Neill representing the Boise Metro Chamber to become a member of the Consortium. \$50,000.00 contribution from the Boise Metro Chamber will be received.*

*Boise City – Aye*

*Eagle-Nay*

*Meridian-Aye*

*Garden City-Aye*

*ACHD-Nay*

*ITD-Aye*

*Ada County- Nay*

##### **b. Supplemental Contract for Continuing Project Coordination Services (pg. 10-11)**

*Motion made to execute a supplemental agreement with Doherty & Associates to provide project coordination services for BGG for a lump sum not to exceed \$24,000.00, ending January 31, 2008 (expected end of the APF phase)*

*/Motion seconded. Motion Passed/*

**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 [kdoherty@dohertyeng.com](mailto:kdoherty@dohertyeng.com)  
[www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com](http://www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com)**

### III. Discussion Items

#### a. **Adequate Public Facilities Update - Michael Lauer (1:45 PM – 2:25 PM) (pg. 12)**

*Status report was given by Michael. He is finalizing data collection on AP but needs more level of service information. He gave a homework assignment to the Steering Committee to review drafts background and level of service data at their September meeting.*

*The APF will be drafted to focus on streets; it will include other provisions for water, wastewater, fire, and schools. Water and wastewater will be unique for each jurisdiction. Ordinances will not be ready for adoption until they are complete there is other information necessary. Michael noted that he needs more information from ACHD's TLIP project for Level of Service on streets.*

*Michael reviewed the desired outcomes from APF ordinances and indicated that, APF should NOT be the main funding strategy for funding transportation infrastructure. It is just a stop-gap measure. He encouraged participants to focus development in desired locations.*

*Examples of best practices from other states were shown.*

*(These items can be found at: <http://www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com/Downloads.asp>)*

#### b. **Update from the Area of City Impact Modification Process Subcommittee - Anna Canning (2:25 – 2:55 PM) (pg. 13 - 19)**

*Anna illustrated the three steps of the Area of City Impact modification process:*

*1-Boundary Establishment*

*2-Sub Area Plan*

*3-Area of City Impact Expansion Submittal and Hearing Process*

*Anna explained that the Steering Committee forwarded the draft process document for review by jurisdictions by September 28. Some members want defined boundaries and MOU's so that city entities are aware of who does what planning for what specific area. The point is that an MOU needs to address this issue, and the cities need to respect each other, and their respective boundaries.*

*The group collectively decided to move forward with planning boundary creation.*

#### c. **Update from the Public Outreach Subcommittee - Bob Taunton (2:55 – 3:05 PM)**

*Bob Taunton provided a "test run" of the public outreach presentation with CSHQA, had 46 people present, and came away with good suggestions from CSHQA to improve the presentation. The outreach group is reaching out to more associations, and businesses to show them what the Blueprint for Good Growth plan entails.*

The meeting was adjourned at 4:00 PM.

# Blueprint for Good Growth

Committee: Consortium

Date: Sept 16, 2007

Name	Contact Number/ <sup>email</sup>	Representing
Jill Davidson	336-0420 jdavidson@dohertyeng.com	BG&E - Doherty & Assoc Admin Assistant
Carol McKee	333-8534	ACHD
Tammyde Weerd	888-4433	Meridian
Nancy Merrill	489-8790	Eagle
Fred TILMAN	287-7000	Ada County
Paul Woods	287-7000	Ada County
Scott Gurnsey	334-8347	ITD
John Evans	472-2927	Garden City
Karen Doherty	336 0420	B66
Katie Hill	384-4422	Boise
ELAINE CLEGG	333-8066	CITY OF BOISE
Patricia Nilsson	384.3842	City of Boise
Mike WARDLE	287.0512	PRILATTEN (ORP)
RUSS DANE	867-8184	ACAR (REALTORS)
BERRY ROBBINS	949-1698	M??
Bob TAUNTON	401.5505	ULI.
Mary Ann SITZ HART	342-0953	Gamma Citizen
Jane Suggs	342-6941	JBS Enterprises, LLC
Stephanie Bounney	331-1800	Eagle



# Memo

To: Karen Doherty, BGG Project Coordinator  
From: Michael Lauer, AICP – Principal  
Date: September 30, 2007  
Re: October Invoice Support Materials

---

Planning Works contract for services for the APFO requires certain information to be submitted with the monthly invoices. This memo addresses those requirements for the October invoice and documents the work done for our outstanding invoice from December 2006.

- Dates and type of work performed, labor classification and length of time such work was performed is included in the timesheet spreadsheet that was attached to the invoice.
- Below is a summary of the tasks performed:

**Current Work:** In October, Planning Works:

- Traveled to Ada County for meetings to explain and answer questions on the function of the proposed APFO on October 9-11 pursuant to Task 5.
  - On October 9, I met with a group of developers and local legal staff.
  - On October 10, I met with business community representatives, the BGG Steering/Technical Committee and the Consortium (tasks 9 and 10)
  - On October 11, I participated in the ULI panel discussion on transportation funding challenges, though I did not bill the BGG for this time.
- Began drafting the APFO and implementing agreements pursuant to Tasks 13.

On the following page is the budget status as of October 31, 2007.

**Old Invoice:** I would like to be reimbursed for invoice #1396 from last December for the amount of \$4,402.88. Pursuant to Karen Doherty's request, I have deferred requesting reimbursement until the Consortium resolved some funding issues and closed discussions with Paul Hastings. Prior to the Consortium directing Robert Freilich to stop work, Planning Works, in good faith, incurred time and expenses that have not been paid. I previously sent all of the work products for which Planning Works was responsible to Karen Doherty. The details relating to this request follow:

- Planning Works had a contract with Freilich, Leitner and Carlisle to assist with developing the Blueprint for Good Growth.
- Subsequently, FLC was dissolved and the Paul Hastings assumed work on the BGG under Robert Freilich's supervision.
- Planning Works was aware of the change, but did not execute any subsequent agreements with Paul Hastings.
- In December of 2006, Planning Works provided assistance related to BGG implementation, including providing options for open space funding, outlining an adequate public facilities program and conducting workshops with the Steering Committee and the Consortium on December 14. These costs are detailed in the 12/31/06 invoice #1396, which documents \$3,510 in professional service costs and \$892.88 in travel expenses for a total of \$4,402.88.
- Planning Works did not bill any additional time after Robert Freilich was directed to stop work.
- After I cleared potential conflicts with Dr. Freilich, I provided services directly to the BGG Consortium as it debated moving forward with the APFO.

### Budget Status Report Oct 31, 2007

	<b>Task Description</b>	<b>Total Budget</b>	<b>Amount Billed</b>	<b>Percent Complete</b>	<b>Percent Billed</b>
1	Orientation and Data Supplements	\$7,260	\$6,897	95%	95%
2	Steering Committee Workshop 1	\$3,260	\$3,260	100%	100%
3	Steering Committee Workshop 2	\$4,640	\$4,640	100%	100%
4	Consortium Workshop 1	\$3,440	\$3,440	100%	100%
5	Focus Groups	\$3,960	\$3,960	100%	100%
6	Level of Service Standards	\$3,900	\$1,950	50%	50%
7	Initial Determinations	\$3,380	\$1,190	50%	35%
8	Capital Improvements Assessment	\$3,380	\$1,031	50%	31%
9	Steering Committee Workshop 3	\$4,120	\$4,120	100%	100%
10	Consortium Workshop 2	\$2,920	\$2,920	100%	100%
11	Public Workshop	\$2,920	\$0		0%
12	Final Synthesis Report	\$7,760	\$352	20%	5%
13	APFO Template	\$4,500	\$450	10%	10%
14	Steering Committee Workshop 4	\$3,600	\$0		0%
15	Consortium Workshop 3	\$2,400	\$0		0%
16	Administrative Procedures and Forms	\$6,300	\$0		0%
	Total Hours				
	Costs	\$67,740	\$34,210		51%



# Memo

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

From: Michael Lauer, AICP

Date: December 5, 2007

Re: APFO Status Report

---

**Status Report.** The Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance (APFO) is on hold until the Transportation/Land Use Integration Program (TLIP) moves forward with the definition of variable level of service (LOS) standards. The ACHD Board will meet with the TLIP team and me on December 14<sup>th</sup> to discuss preliminary recommendations relating to LOS and context sensitive designs. Before I use limited BGG resources to develop specific ordinance and agreement language, I believe it is imperative that the ACHD Board authorize the TLIP team to begin discussions of variable levels of service with each local government.

In November, the ACHD Board began discussion of the APFO and its interrelationships with the TLIP products, specifically street design and level of service standards. While much of the Board's discussions focused on design details, the Board developed an appreciation of the vital importance of adopting variable levels of service prior to implementing APFO requirements (see additional discussion below). The Board wanted to have a better understanding of the following matters before authorizing the TLIP team to move forward:

- The impact of design options on costs for right-of-way and construction;
- Options to make APF standards most effective in coordinating development with available capacity;
- The impacts of establishing variable level of service standards, more specifically:
  - The basis for the initial LOS standard;
  - The impacts of accepting greater congestion on specific streets; and
  - The implications of future policy changes, such as a city requesting a LOS amendment that accepts less congestion.

While ACHD moves forward with the TLIP discussion, I will continue to coordinate with ACHD and COMPASS to address needed changes to procedures and policies addressing the modeling and monitoring of traffic and development activity.

**Need for Variable LOS Standards.** One of the biggest risks of applying adequate public facilities standards for streets is that the standards will promote sprawl development patterns that will exacerbate projected traffic congestion, mobility and environmental problems. There are several strategies to avoid this unintended consequence – the most important of which is to ensure that level of service standards vary from location to location.

Standards should accept greater traffic congestion where other infrastructure is adequate, and where the intensity and mix of land uses supports other modes of travel (e.g., walking, biking, and transit). Less congestion is acceptable in suburban areas, where there are land use patterns and support infrastructure (e.g., schools, stores, parks) that allow for relatively short travel distances for many trips. The least congestion should be accepted in rural areas that are completely dependent on automobiles and where the cost/benefit ratio for additional capacity is the highest.

Under the current system, ACHD tries to maintain the same LOS for all streets, regardless of location. If this standard were used in an APFO, traffic analyses at the project level would favor development in the most remote locations, where there is little existing traffic. Unfortunately, these locations have insufficient jobs, schools, emergency services and stores to support residents. Consequently, the net effect of locating homes in these areas would be to increase travel distances, travel times, energy consumption, auto emissions and congestion in the urban areas where these land uses exist.

For these reasons, it is critical that ACHD and local governments reach agreement on appropriate level of service standards that vary by location and functional road classification before implementing APF requirements. ACHD's agreement to move forward with these discussions is the first step in this process.

## AREA OF CITY IMPACT EXPANSION PROCESS

### Introduction

Idaho State Code requires cities to establish areas of impact to identify where they intend to annex and provide city services. 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.
5. Provide for planning areas that describe very long term spheres of influence where a city intends to evaluate how its area of impact may be extended.

### 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. The planning areas are not intended to represent areas of planned urban development. Part of a planning area may become an area of impact where urban development occurs and part may remain rural. By reaching beyond anticipated areas of impact, they allow each community to more rationally plan for the needs of future generations.
- 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. The 14 mandated elements include: property rights; population; school facilities and transportation; economic development; land use; natural resources; hazardous areas; public services, facilities, and utilities; transportation; recreation; special areas or sites; housing; community design; and implementation.

- 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. At times, the policies of the many regional plans may be inconsistent with regard to a particular issue or area; where there is inconsistency, the sub area plan should address the underlying intent of such policies in light of the needs of their community.

### **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. 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.



**MEMORANDUM:**

**TO:** Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium  
**FROM:** Karen Doherty, P.E. – Project Coordinator  
**DATE:** December 10, 2007  
**RE:** Local Project Coordinator Report

The attached billing summary is for your information only.

**Blueprint for Good Growth, Inc.  
Project Billing Summary  
by Doherty & Associates, Inc.  
for Project Coordination Services**

**Invoice Summary as of 11/27/07**

<i>Invoice #</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Amount</i>
1240	12/31/2004	\$ 7,058.82
1249	1/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1254	3/9/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1270	4/1/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1276	5/2/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1297	5/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1312	6/30/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1319	7/31/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1331	8/30/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1340	10/3/2005	\$ 3,529.41
1350	10/31/2005	\$ 4,716.91
1360	11/28/2005	\$ 4,716.91
1372	12/30/2005	\$ 4,716.91
1383	1/30/2006	\$ 4,716.91
1391	2/27/2006	\$ 4,716.91
1399	4/3/2006	\$ 4,716.91
1408	5/1/2006	\$ 1,187.50
1422	5/31/2006	\$ 1,187.53
1438	6/9/2006	\$ 45,000.00
1439	6/30/2006	\$ 5,714.29
1449	7/31/2006	\$ 5,714.29
1463	8/28/2006	\$ 5,714.29
1480	10/2/2006	\$ 5,714.29
1498	10/30/2006	\$ 5,714.29
1507	11/27/2006	\$ 5,714.29
1521	12/29/2006	\$ 5,714.26
1537	1/29/2007	\$ 6,000.00
1549	2/26/2007	\$ 6,000.00
1566	4/2/2007	\$ 6,000.00
1578	4/30/2007	\$ 6,000.00
1609	5/30/2007	\$ 6,000.00
1635	7/5/2007	\$ 6,000.00
1643	7/31/2007	\$ 6,000.00
1668	8/31/2007	\$ 6,000.00
1702	10/9/2007	\$ 4,800.00
1717	10/26/2007	\$ 4,800.00
1737	11/27/2007	\$ 4,800.00
<b>Total Invoiced to date</b>		<b>\$ 216,900.00</b>
Total Initial Budget Through May 31, 2006		\$ 69,500.00
Extra Services Through May 31, 2006		\$ 45,000.00
<b>Total Budget Through May 31, 2006</b>		<b>\$ 114,500.00</b>
Project Coordination June 1 - December 31, 2006		\$ 40,000.00
Project Coordination January 1 - June 30, 2007		\$ 36,000.00
Project Coordination July 1 - August 31, 2007		\$ 12,000.00
Project Coordination September 1, 2007 - January 31, 2008		\$ 24,000.00
<b>Remaining Contract</b>		<b>\$ 9,600.00</b>



**MEMORANDUM:**

**TO:** Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium  
**FROM:** Karen Doherty, P.E. – Project Coordinator  
**DATE:** December 10, 2007  
**RE: Funding Committee Status**

**Action Requested:**

For information only. This information provides you with a background on the funding status.

**Background:**

Non-Profit Status

The IRS has determined that BGG, Inc. is exempt from Federal income tax under section 501(c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. Contributions to BGG, Inc. are deductible under section 170 of the Code Ruling effective December 23, 2004.

Funding Solicitation Status

The funding committee is actively soliciting additional funds from the remaining participating jurisdictions as outlined below.

<b>Jurisdiction</b>	<b>Request</b>	<b>Responsible Funding Member</b>
Kuna	\$ 20,000	Bieter
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$ 20,000</b>	

Mayor Bieter and Mayor Merrill are working to establish meetings with Idaho Power, Blue Cross, Blue Shield, Simplot, and Intermountain Gas. Mayor Bieter and Commissioner Franden will be meeting with United Water (Greg Wyatt).

## Funding Status

Following is a summary of the total contributions to date.

<b>Name</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>Notes</b>
Ada County	\$ 210,000	\$50k for Phase I and \$50k for Phase II; \$60k for Doherty. Addtl \$50k for Phase II in Aug 2006.
ACHD	150,000	\$122k for Phase I; \$28k for Phase II.
City of Boise	150,000	\$50k ea Phase I and II. Addtl \$50k for Phase II in June 2006.
ITD	50,000	
City of Meridian	60,000	\$30k each Phase I and II. Phase II pledged in July 2006.
US Environmental Protection Agency	22,500	
City of Eagle	20,000	\$20k Phase I. \$20k Phase II pledged in June 2006 pending all other contributions received.
City of Kuna	20,000	
City of Star	20,000	
City of Garden City	10,000	
COMPASS Yr End Sweep	9,266	Doherty supplemental.
Boise River Flood Control District #10	7,500	
Hewlett Packard Boise Operations	5,000	Phase II
Tom Ryder	1,500	Additional \$500 contribution received June 2007
North End Neighborhood Assn.	300	
Boise Chamber of Commerce	50,000	
<b>Total Metro Contributions</b>	<b>\$786,066</b>	

<b>Overall Financial Status</b>	
<b>Total Contributions</b>	<b>\$ 786,066</b>
Phase I Payments (completed)	(\$ 405,000)
Phase II Payments (as of Oct 1, 2006 work completion)	(62,060)
Local Project Coordination Contract through January 31, 2008	(230,500)
Phase II Adequate Public Facilities Task Order	(67,740)
Planning Works services December 13, 2006, (pre-APF) Phase II work	(4,404)
<b>Total Remaining Funds for Phase II</b>	<b>\$ 16,362</b>