



Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, February 5, 2009, 10:00 A.M. to Noon

COMPASS, Conference Room

800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100

Meridian, Idaho

AGENDA

I. Consent Agenda

- a. Approval of the January 8, 2009, Meeting Minutes (page 2) ****

II. Action Items

None.

III. Discussion Items

a. Review Progress on Scope of Work Development Elements

- Annual Workshop and Communications Plan (Deanna Smith)
- Policy/Implementation/Technical framework (Sally Goodell, Megan Rush and Patricia Nilsson)
- Update of Level of Service Analysis (Sally Goodell)
- Update on Area of Impact Process and Next Steps (Anna Canning) (page 6) *
- Update on COMPASS' Findings of Approved Unbuilt

b. Discuss Agenda Items for February 12, 2009 Consortium Meeting

c. Discuss Agenda Items for Next Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

d. Other Items

**** Attachments***

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Steering Committee\agenda02 05 09.doc





Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

*Thursday, January 8, 2009, 10:00 A.M. to Noon
COMPASS, Conference Room
800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, Idaho*

MINUTES

I. Consent Agenda

a. Approval of the December 4, 2008, Meeting Minutes

Anna Canning moved and Patricia Nilsson seconded approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

II. Action Items

None.

III. Discussion Items

a. Discuss Subcommittee Recommendations and Next Steps

Matt Stoll recapped the December 29, 2008, Subcommittee meeting and assignments. The Subcommittee identified that the Statement of Values developed by the Consortium in 2006 needed to be reviewed and that an overall work plan needs to be developed and broken down into three components:

- Outreach/Educational/Marketing/Overall Effort, i.e., an Annual Workshop
- Policy and Implementation Procedure Framework
- Technical Framework

The Subcommittee identified areas that are lacking in the process, and discussed asking direction from the Consortium on the next steps after the land use/transportation component.

The Subcommittee discussed the need to identify the barriers that have kept *Communities in Motion* from being adopted by all of the municipalities in Ada and County Counties, and *Blueprint for Good Growth* adopted by all of the municipalities in Ada County.

Matt stated that it was agreed that an example project will be presented to the Steering/Technical Committee and the Consortium on how level of service works based on projected growth patterns.

Annual Workshop

Deanna Smith reviewed an outline for an annual workshop to bring everyone, i.e., newly elected officials, etc., up to-date on the background and history of the plan and provide a status report of the present day progress. Deanna said the time frame for the annual workshops would be late January.

Deanna noted that a Power Point presentation was created previously and recommended that it be updated and presented to the individual jurisdictions. The Committee discussed that the audience should be policy makers, staff, the public and the development community.

Deanna will create a draft timeline based on the status of the goals and objectives of BGG for review by the Steering/Technical Committee. She said the Subcommittee is focused on two major areas to be completed during 2009:

- The transportation and land use elements, and
- Area of Impact review.

Sally Goodell noted that it needs to be emphasized that this is a massive undertaking in the sense of altering the way the local land use agencies and ACHD work, and will not be accomplished overnight.

Statement of Values

Gary Allen recapped his assignment to review the Statement of Values dated September 8, 2006. He asked how to present it to the Consortium and integrate it into other areas. Gary said that the idea of learning to work together as a region needs to be emphasized, which is not a value but puts into contexts that this effort is not a onetime process. There will be an ongoing need to work together as a region on land use issues like what is being done in transportation.

Gary stated that politics is a large part of the process. The participants need to establish a common framework, but there isn't any mandate for participation, which makes it necessary to continually returning to the Statement of Values to emphasize to the reason for BGG.

Anna Canning noted that the challenge is getting the buy-in from the cities that do not provide their own services.

Phil Choate said to begin with reminding people of what the problems are, existing and forecasted.

Pete O'Neill noted that there is a difference between "growth management" and "growth control." Growth control has a negative connotation in the development community and growth management doesn't. So the bullet point that says, "We will distribute growth to all communities so that citizens have choices of where to live and work," appears to be closer to growth control. Pete said there are communities that will not have the choice of living and working in the same area. It would be harder to implement that principle in Canyon County than in Ada County.

Pete said that he has been participating in the Idaho Statesman visioning process that will be published on Sunday, January 11, 2009. He noted that a number of the same values and actions were talked about, but neither Blueprint for Good Growth or ***Communities in Motion*** were part of the discussion and should have been.

Bob Taunton said that when the original BGG power point presentation was being shown, it was overshadowed by the fighting between the municipalities. There did not appear to be buy-in, which is still the case and needs to be overcome. Bob suggested that maybe the values that were identified in the Statesman visioning process will align with the BGG Statement of Values.

Patricia Nilsson noted the more fundamental problem is to get the Consortium members reenergized.

David Turnbull said the Guiding Principles are the right direction, but feels the cities are not signing off on the process because they do not want to lose control under implementation, which is the same issue the development community has. David noted that BGG has had a positive impact already even though not yet officially adopted.

Meg Rush suggested the focus shouldn't be on the cities that haven't adopted the plan, but on cities that have. Highlight the successes, which may encourage the other cities to participate.

Matt recapped the next steps:

- Identify the reasons why some cities have not bought in to BGG and CIM.
- Review of the more detailed components of the BGG process.
- Develop a recommendation to the Consortium on what has been accomplished to-date.
- Review of the Statement of Values by the Consortium.
- Development of an outline of the next steps.
- Development of an educational outreach effort to the general public, development community, local elected officials, and planning staffs on a larger scale than has been done before about where the process is and why the participants are at the table.

Policy/Implementation Procedure Framework

Patricia reviewed the current framework for comprehensive plan and development reviews and suggested changes to move them more in line with Blueprint.

Patricia stated that as we move forward in trying to identify how to work together in updating or revising those processes, we need to start with what has been adopted as the regional roadway and transit plans. The role of the city is to narrow that down and make it more specific to that particular jurisdiction. Today's deficiencies need to be identified. What is the demand generated by a proposed plan in terms of a future land use map? What are the alternatives within the basic planning process to merge demand with capacity? What is level of service?

Sally said the concept is to create, adopt and develop mechanisms for amendments over time. That is what the unpinning will look like.

Patricia stated the questions are whether the comp plan hangs together in terms of land use/transportation across all modes, and what is the congestion or lack thereof. Does the vision match reality?

Sally noted that the language needs to be clarified regarding the fact that infrastructure is fiscally constrained. How do you connect the geography with the infrastructure? How do you take TLIP and turn it into a Master Street Map that meets the intent of the Futures Map, and characterizes some mutual understanding between the local land use agencies.

Sally said that TLIP will address some pedestrian and bike issues, but the adequate public facilities accounting portion is missing, which starts at the comp plan level.

Deanna said the challenge is to show how TLIP, BGG, and CIM are connected.

Gary noted the steps need to be described clearly at a high level. Sally suggested that there needs to be two levels of explanation, a high level and then a detailed level depending on the audience.

Charles Trainor noted that staff has started a test of the City of Eagles' comp plan to see if it can be broken down in a way to determine what it would mean to the transportation system if it were to transpire as it looks today.

Sally noted that adequate public facilities is not stated in the Policy or Development Review sections of the framework and needs to be addressed. David added that it is not clear under the Development Review section that it is talking about planned and unplanned growth.

Matt recapped the discussion that how the Traffic Impact Study is developed needs to be identified and reviewed further, but not developed as part of this process.

Patricia and Meg will continue to fine tune the framework based on today's discussion.

Technical Framework

Sally reviewed the draft technical framework: Variable Level of Service Map, Characterization of Existing Conditions, Integration of Comprehensive and Transportation Plans, and Development Review for Adequate Public Facilities.

Sally stated the draft Variable Level of Service Map will be reviewed after the existing conditions exercise is completed. There are two parts to characterizing existing conditions: what is on the streets today, and the approved unbuilt. Sally said the review of what is on the streets today is almost complete, and COMPASS is contacting each of the jurisdictions to get input on the approved unbuilt and will bring the information back to the Steering Committee at the February 2009 meeting.

Sally said that based on the Subcommittee's discussed of conducting an analysis of existing level of service on an annual basis, she has asked ACHD and COMPASS staff to capture the tasks and identify the man hours it will take to do the update annually. Sally noted that ACHD is going to take the lead in developing a model of all the synchronized signals, which will make an annual update easier to do.

Sally, Meg and Patricia agreed to meet next week to link the policy/implementation procedures framework with the technical framework to develop the draft work plan.

Deanna said that after Sally, Meg and Patricia have linked the frameworks she will take the policies and link them to the timeline.

Next Steps

It was agreed that an op-ed piece regarding BGG and CIM will be drafted as a follow-up to the Statesman's visioning piece. Matt will work with the COMPASS Board Chair and the BGG Chair.

After discussion of the Pete O'Neill's suggestion that Dry Creek be included as a test case, it was agreed that this is not the appropriate time for that effort.

b. Next Steering/Technical Subcommittee meeting date

A meeting of the Subcommittee will be scheduled within the next two weeks, allowing time for staff to flesh out their assignments.

c. Next Steering/Technical Committee Meeting Date

The next Steering/Technical Committee meeting is February 5, 2009, with the goal of developing a draft work plan to take to the Consortium in February 2009.

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Steering Committee\agenda01 08 09.doc

AREA OF CITY IMPACT EXPANSION PROCESS
(APPROVED BY BGG CONSORTIUM ON FEBRUARY 15, 2008)

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 an area of city impact 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 rezone, 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.

- e. Dispute resolution: Where jurisdictions do not agree on planning boundaries, the jurisdictions shall participate in at least one mediation session. The county shall participate in the mediation. The disputing parties shall select a mediator. Compensation of the mediator shall be equally divided among the disputing parties. The results of the mediator shall be forwarded to all parties. If mediation is not successful, the recommendation from the mediator shall be forwarded to the board of county commissioners. The board of county commissioners shall make a decision on the boundary within 120 days and shall forward the appropriate memorandums of understanding to the jurisdictions.

Formatted: Font: 16 pt, Bold

Formatted: Indent: Left: 0", First line: 0"

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. A map of the proposed area of city impact.
 - 2. A copy of the subarea plan with the adopting resolution and findings indicating that the plan has been adopted consistent with state law, any city evaluation criteria, and the Blueprint for Good Growth Phase 1 Report policies.
 - 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 the adopted adequate public facilities ordinance including acceptable mitigation measures.

- 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.

Formatted: Indent: Hanging: 0.38"

4. Annexation outside of Areas of Impact: Currently, many cities do not have a 20-year area of city impact. Once established (and amended in a timely way), cities will not annex beyond their 20-year area of city impact. Any exceptions to this policy on adjacent boundaries shall be negotiated between affected parties.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Font: Bold