



Consortium Committee Meeting

Thursday, March 11, 2010, 1:30 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.
COMPASS Conference Room
800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, Idaho 83642

AGENDA

I. Consent Agenda

Page 2 * a. Approve December 10, 2009 Meeting Minutes

II. Information/Discussion Items

Page 9 * a. Status Report – Transportation Adequate Public Facilities Accounting
Work Group
b. Status Report – “Incentivizing Downtown Development “Delegation
Discussions

III. Action Items

a. Elect Consortium Officers
b. Direction on Next Steps for BGG Steering Committee

IV. Other Items

V. Adjournment

* Attachments

T:\FY10\700 Services\761 Blue Print for Good Growth\Consortium\agenda03112010.doc





Consortium Committee Meeting

**Thursday, December 10, 2009, 1:30 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.
COMPASS, Conference Room
800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, Idaho**

Minutes

I. Consent Agenda

a. Approval of the September 10, 2009 Meeting Notes

Phil Bandy moved and Elaine Clegg seconded approval of the Consent Agenda as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

II. Action Items

a. Approve 2010 Steering/Technical and Consortium Meeting Dates

Steering/Technical Committee:

- February 4, 2010, at COMPASS from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm
- May 6, 2010, at COMPASS from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm
- August 5, 2010, at COMPASS from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm
- November 4, 2010, at COMPASS from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm

Consortium:

- March 11, 2010, at COMPASS from 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
- June 10, 2010, at COMPASS from 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
- September 9, 2010, at COMPASS from 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm
- December 9, 2010, at COMPASS from 1:30 pm - 3:30 pm

Matt Stoll noted that the March 11, 2010, Consortium meeting is the annual meeting and officers will be elected.

After discussion, **Fred Tilman moved and Carol McKee seconded approval of the 2010 Steering/Technical and Consortium meeting dates as presented. Motion passed unanimously.**

b. Comprehensive Plan Consistency/Development Review Report

Sally Goodell stated that the Transportation Adequate Public Facilities work group has developed draft reports on cumulative impacts for changes in comprehensive plans and development review. Staff is requesting approval to test drive the processes for at least 6 months, which will allow time for the communities to see the impacts of each proposed development or comprehensive plan change, how they compare to the 20-year plan and build out picture, and for staff to do any fine tuning.

Maryann Waldinger described the four report elements of the Consistency Report for comprehensive plan amendments:

1. Description
2. Consistency
3. Current Conditions/Background
4. Programs and Plans

Maryann provided an example of an amendment that covers a four square mile area bound by a principal arterial on the north and arterials on the east, west and south. The exercise demonstrates what would happen to the area and the overall transportation system if the area had been tagged for low residential and the jurisdiction wanted to increase it to something other than low residential. The goal of the process is to give the jurisdictions another tool to use in decision making. It is not to dictate if an action should be taken or not.

Maryann said that the tracking and accounting will be the key to the process. Not only how the proposed amendments line up with the forecasts and build out, but how to keep track of what actually is being approved.

Elaine asked who will be required to pay for the analysis.

Maryann replied that COMPASS charges for special model runs for a traffic impact study requested by a developer, but for the test run COMPASS will cover the cost, and after the six month test period staff will review the process and suggest a fee structure.

Elaine said the onus will be on the jurisdictions to make sure the fee structure does incentivize those developments that are within the current plan. Matt Stoll stated there is a fee structure for the analysis and then another for incentivizing.

Elaine requested that staff use a different development example, one where half of the development fits a connectivity index and the other half does not. Or use one that is side by side.

Dave Bieter commended the committees for their work. It is the only way to get to where the Blueprint process and especially Communities in Motion has been leading. Dave recommended a short window for the test run, anticipating discussion of the process again at the March 2010 Consortium meeting.

Maryann said staff can either use a new comprehensive plan amendment or reanalyze an old one so that there is something to show the Consortium in March.

Justin Lucas reviewed an example of an ACHD staff report for a development review, highlighting new elements of the cumulative impact analysis that have been folded in as part of the current practice.

Justin said that Maryann was talking specifically about comprehensive plan amendments that have Traffic Impact Study (TIS) associated with the amendment. ACHD receives a lot of applications that have a TIS associated with them, so the development review analysis will be done with an associated cumulative impact analysis. The new categories in the Development Review report are:

- Planned Demographics (From 20 Year Transportation Plan and Reported by TAZ), which is broken into subcategories:
 - Demographic Categories
 - 20 year Total Planned
 - Existing
 - Approved
 - Committed (Existing + Approved)
 - Proposed Development
 - Committed + Proposed
 - Full TAZ Build
- Map of Area of Influence as defined in the TIS
- Cumulative Impacts (Road Segments) (LOS calculations include funded improvements in the first three years of the FYWP). With the following subcategories:
 - Roadway
 - Committed LOS
 - Committed + Proposed Development
 - City/County Target LOS
 - ACHD LOS (Policy 7106.4)
- Cumulative Impacts (Intersections) (LOS calculations include funded improvements in the first three years of the FYWP). With the following subcategories:
 - Roadway
 - Intersection Type
 - Committed LOS
 - Committed + Proposed Development
 - City/County Target LOS
 - ACHD LOS (Policy 7106.4)

Justin stated that working with COMPASS, ACHD will provide the demographic information in a tabular format on every development with a TIS. What the decision makers decide to do with the information is the next topic of information.

Elaine requested adding columns showing how many it is over/under the current plan total and how many it is over/under the full build out analysis.

Justin said that ACHD currently does do the analysis but only within the TIS, and the area of influence defined in the TIS. It is not a countywide approach, which is the main distinction with the new process. The Map of Area of Influence as defined in the TIS shows what the extent of the impacts of a project is, and it may be cross jurisdictional. The Cumulative Impact tables would be reporting for road segments and intersections, the existing, the committed, committed plus proposed development, city/county target level of service, and the ACHD level of service policy. The reporting for the road segments would show the LOS and the volume to capacity ratio, which is a number that allows staff to see if the next level of service has been triggered or if it

is way beyond it. This will take more tracking and reporting on COMPASS' side so we can track committed level of service and plug in committed development, which is something within the area of influence we have done in the past, but we have not been able to do it outside the area of influence before.

Pete O'Neill stated this is obviously very specific to transportation, but it is a precursor to adequate public facilities. Does it make sense to add other facilities such as schools, parks, water, or wastewater?

Matt replied it was agreed that after we get the transportation component figured, we will consider whether to take the next step for other services.

Pete asked how often do we rethink the assumptions in terms of household size and trip generation, which is another huge variable.

Carl Miller replied at this point, the 2000 Census data is the most consistent across the two county area. The next update will be 2011. In the future, it will become a more routine process.

Elaine asked if we are using the same household sizes for the future as we are using today. Carl replied that we have been. Elaine said that based on information that household sizes are shrinking we are probably over projecting.

Carl stated that the Demographic Committee has discussed the issue of shrinking household sizes, but the Committee has not been comfortable with the data to know how much. Charles added that we will not know the answer until the 2011 Census information comes in.

Dave said in response to Pete's point, adequate public facilities were defined as a group of services: water, sewer, road, and schools. Does it make sense to pick one to scope out other than transportation? Matt replied sewer would be the easiest one.

Patricia Nilsson said that United Water and Idaho Power have been at the table with the Technical Committee for these discussions. What we have learned is that Boise has standards in its comprehensive plan for those essential public services. Ada County has adopted some in the last year as well. It has been the prerequisite for the analysis for the communities to determine what their standards are for their essential public services.

John Evans said the schools do their own analysis.

Pete said in regards to the trip generation, assumptions are made on trips per day, etc, is the model sensitive enough if we ever had a public transportation system, can the trip generation assumptions be changed? The goal is to do things smarter than what we are now doing.

Maryann replied that the model we use now is a mode choice model and will reflect options. Within the next 3-4 years we will have new information to update.

Charles added that in the current model we borrow factors from Salt Lake City, because we have never had a big enough investment in transit to develop good transit factors of our own.

Sally recapped that there is a fair amount of estimating that goes into the numbers. The hope is while we are doing the test run, the cities' staff will look at the reports and work with COMPASS to try and determine everyone's comfort level with the estimates. The numbers are solid for committed un-built and residential. Commercial is more of an estimate and will be monitored. The test run will help us evaluate how much work this is for COMPASS and ACHD and whether it supports the value of it. Sally noted that we are using the draft LOS map, which needs to be developed further through the adequate public facilities discussion. COMPASS and the cities are working out the uncertainty of the 20-year demographic forecast; the individual community's comfort with the 20-year forecast is a critical underpinning. Going forward, the question is how to align ACHD's CIP with the long range transportation plan, Communities in Motion. The transportation plan is updated every four years; the CIP is every three years. So we could get out of sync with the demographics used in the CIP compared to the adopted demographics in Communities in Motion.

Elaine Clegg moved and Carol McKee seconded for staff to go forward and test drive the process as presented and bring back examples for Consortium review at the March 2010 meeting.

After discussion, **it was unanimously agreed staff will figure out whether to use a new or existing application for testing.**

Motion passed unanimously.

III. Information/Discussion Items

a. Status Report - Build Out Analysis

Maryann Waldinger stated that all the comprehensive plans have been put together. An initial analysis of running the comprehensive land use through the travel demand model has been done, and will be presented to the Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) for guidance on future evaluations.

Elaine asked how it will be used. Will it show the solution for areas over capacity at build out is to widen roads? How will preservation decisions be reconciled with that? Charles replied that is what will be discussed with RTAC.

Matt said the heart of what we are talking about is when looking at all comprehensive plans, is the picture what the cities and counties really want.

b. Review Comprehensive Plan Map

Charles Trainor stated that over the past several months COMPASS has worked on an evaluation of comprehensive plan growth potential based on the adopted plans of local agencies. Carl Miller and MaryAnn Waldinger met with staff of members to determine the appropriate densities and other assumptions in the land use maps and convert them into numbers of future jobs, households and residents.

This effort was initiated to evaluate the transportation needs under the adopted comprehensive plans relative to the existing and planned transportation system. The initial evaluation was presented to the Consortium in September 2009, at which time the future population under the comprehensive plans was estimated at 2.7 million in

the two-county area. Refinement of the assumptions has dropped the future potential population to 2.6 million. As noted in September 2009, at the current rate of growth it could take 75 years to reach the potential population.

Dave Bieter noted that population isn't based on a time frame but rather on a build out number. Charles said that is correct. Matt added it is based on the current growth rate of 2.6%, but it is dependent on household size.

Matt said that part of the dialogue on the preservation scenario is whether we want to grow like we are projecting in the comprehensive plans. And if not, what do we need to change.

c. Provide Notification of Annual Meeting on March 11, 2010

Election of officers will take place at the annual meeting on March 11, 2010.

IV. Other Items

Matt Stoll stated he received a request from Clay Carley of Old Boise LLC and Karen Doherty of HDR to hold a forum at the March 2010 Consortium meeting to propose that the Consortium members consider how they can incentivize downtown development in any of the cities in Ada County, by reducing impact fees or abating taxes for downtown development. This fits within the growth scenarios for both Blueprint and Community Choices. The Steering Committee recommended approval and suggested that representatives from Idaho Smart Growth In-Fill Task Force and the ULI Mayors' Task Forum be invited as well.

After discussion, **it was agreed to hold the March 2010 meeting at ACHD to allow for a large group.**

V. Adjournment

Elaine Clegg moved and Fred Tilman seconded adjournment. Motion passed unanimously.

T:\FY10\700 Services\761 Blue Print for Good Growth\Consortium\Minutes\minutes121009.doc

**BGG Consortium Meeting
SIGN-IN SHEET**

Date: December 10, 2009

Name	Representing	Substituting For	Phone #
1. Carol McKee	ACHD		
2. Fred Tilman	Ada County		
3. PETE O'NEILL	CHAMBER		
4. Scott Gurnsey	ITD		
5. Wade Priel	Boise		
6. Matt Stoll	COMPASS		
7. PAUL BARNY	FEARLE		
8. ELAINE CLEGG	BOISE		
9. John Evans	Garden City		
10. Tammy deWard	Meridian		
11. JUSTIN LUCAS	ACHD		
12. Jilly Goodell	ACHD		
13. Charles Trainor	COMPASS		
14. ANNA CANNING	MERIDIAN		
15. CARL WILKER	COMPASS		
16. Tricia Nilsson	City of Boise		
17. AMAR PILLAI	ACHD		
18. Mary May	M3		
19. Nancy Brecher	COMPASS		
20.			
21.			
22.			

Blueprint for Good Growth
Transportation and Land Use Integration Work Group
Cumulative Impacts Reporting and Adequate Public Facilities (Transportation)

Summary

Over the past several months the Transportation Adequate Public Facilities Accounting Work Group (TAPFAWG) has been working out the technical details of cumulative impacts reporting for transportation facilities. This brief report summarizes the outcomes of the TAPFAWG effort and discussions that took place at the February 4, 2010 BGG Steering Technical Committee. There was a general consensus that the following three issues were the most important outcomes of the TAPFAWG effort.

1. Cumulative Impacts Reporting

The primary products from the TAPFAWG group were a methodology for calculating cumulative impacts and two example reports outlining how the information would be presented. The first example report focused on analyzing traffic impacts at the comprehensive plan level (adoption/changes) and ensuring that the city/county understood how modifications to the comprehensive plan impact the roadway network. The report could include deficiencies in the system and deviations from approved demographic allocations. The second example report demonstrated how ACHD could report cumulative impacts for specific developments and how cumulative impacts reporting could be required through Traffic Impact Studies (TIS). The primary change in the TIS reporting is the inclusion of approved un-built developments county wide into the traffic analysis for a specific development.

The methodology and reports have been presented to the BGG Steering Committee and Consortium and were well received. The final step in evaluating these tools is to test them with a real development (previously acted on) to determine if the information is accurate and useful in the development review setting. The time required to produce these reports and maintain the necessary data will also be estimated to help determine if the level of effort required can be justified.

TAPFAWG recommended conducting the test after the certain work products from Communities in Motion are complete to ensure the most up to date information is used, specifically the 2030 demographics and travel demand model. These should be complete by April 2010 and the test development analysis is expected to be complete by June 2010.

The key questions remaining are:

“Are the assumptions in the methodology acceptable for making development decisions?”

“Are the costs to complete the cumulative impacts analysis reasonable in relation to the value of the information?”

“What additional data collection and analysis measures would staff recommend to improve the quality of the report?”

2. Communication Protocols

Another key recommendation from the group is that communication protocols be established to inform affected land use agencies when a jurisdiction's development has impacts on the transportation system beyond their limits. There was a general desire to collaborate and share information early in the development process between affected communities. The Steering Committee recommends that ACHD and the Cities and County continue to work on communication outside the Blueprint process.

The key questions remaining are:

“Who should be responsible for communicating with and convening all the affected agencies?”

“When and how should the information be shared?”

“At what point should the affected jurisdiction be involved and what level of influence do they have in the final decision?”

3. Mitigation

One of the most important consensus items that emerged from the group discussion was that an adequate public facilities ordinance (APFO) adopted by all jurisdictions in Ada County was not a feasible alternative to control mitigation measures at this time. Without an APFO each jurisdiction will have to develop their own methods for dealing with developments that exceed adopted level of service standards. ACHD will report what it takes to meet its adopted level of service standards. ACHD will also report if the impacts are beyond standard mitigation measures. In these situations each land use agency will need to decide how they want to proceed. The options would include: Deny, Approve with alternative mitigation (determined by jurisdiction), or Approve with no extra mitigation. Identifying alternative mitigation measures is the next step in this process and each jurisdiction will have to decide how they want to pursue this.

The key questions remaining are:

“How do you translate excess impacts into alternative mitigation?”

Next Steps

- Review variable level of service standards or other similar measures through the CIP process to ensure that ACHD and its partners concur on areas where it may be acceptable for service to degrade.
- Finalize the regional transportation model and demographics for use in the cumulative impacts report example.
- Complete the test of the cumulative impacts report and present the results to the Consortium.