



Consortium Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 20, 2008, 1:30 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.

COMPASS, Conference Room

800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100

Meridian, Idaho

AGENDA

- I. Consent Agenda***
 - a. Approval of the September 18, 2008, Meeting Notes (pages 2-4) **
- II. Action Items***

None.
- III. Discussion Items***
 - a. Discuss Policy Issues and Recommended Directions – Patricia Nilsson (pages 5-7)**
 - b. Recommended Technical Work to Advance Adequate Public Facilities – Sally Goodell (pages 8-9)**
 - c. Variable Level of Service related to Adequate Public Facilities – Sally Goodell (page 10)**

* Attachments



Consortium Member Agency Meeting

Thursday, September 18, 2008, 1:30 P.M. to 3:30 P.M.

*COMPASS, Conference Room
800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, Idaho*

Minutes

Consent Agenda

a. Approval of the July 10, 2008, Meeting Notes

The July 10, 2008, meeting minutes were approved without discussion.

Action Items

a. Adequate Public Facilities Ordinance

Charles Trainor stated that the BGG Steering/Technical Committee met and recommended that the draft APFO remain as it is and not move forward, that the Consortium grant additional time for the Steering Committee to continue review of the draft APFO as there are significant concerns about the way the draft is written, and to allow time for TLIP to evolve and the technical groups to look at existing ordinance and legislation to determine if there are better implementation tools than the proposed APFO. ACHD will continue to work through technical research to determine the next best steps. Charles noted that the Steering Committee concurred they are in favor of adequate public facilities, but are concerned about the draft ordinance. He said, as indicated in the Building Contractors Association letter, there is support for the idea that the local governments already have the power to do what the APFO envisions.

Elaine Clegg expressed her frustration that the Steering Committee and the Building Contractors Association had not brought their concerns about the draft APFO to the Consortium before this late date in the process.

Dave Bieter said that there are certainly more steps that have to happen and TLIP is the biggest one, and while consideration should be given to any suggestions that make the draft better, the draft does need to be completed. He added that he doesn't believe that the local governments currently have the authority to do what the specifics of the ordinance and TLIP will allow them to do.

Sabrina Bowman stated that ACHD feels that the process should go forward to develop what the APFO should look like in whatever form it takes in the end. She stated that ACHD plans to work with the cities and private developers about what the technical review needs to look like and this will be in a parallel process with TLIP. She believes that there was a distinction in the motion by the Steering Committee that the process would move forward; it was the ordinance itself where the concerns were.

Tammy de Weerd stated she shares Elaine's frustration that the concerns had not been voiced prior to this so they could have been worked through. Some of the concerns are hard to address until TLIP is done, but the direction to the Steering Committee should be for them to work on those issues that are not dependent on TLIP, and the BCA should be part of that process as well as other stakeholders groups that have concerns.

Phil Bandy stated that the City of Eagle wants to see the process progress, but there are concerns about the existing mitigation aspect of the draft. It is perceived that the mitigation aspect may require developers to address deficiencies in the system. Eagle legal counsel says that is not constitutional and cannot be required. He agreed that the Steering Committee should be vetting the issues that are not TLIP dependent and look at the legal ramifications after TLIP is adopted.

Elaine said that the local governments do have the power as individual jurisdictions to make decisions on development applications, but they do not have the power as individual jurisdictions to look at or consider the regional impacts of those developments. The APFO provides the ability to look at the regional impacts. The cities will be giving up some authority by giving ACHD the authority to do an analysis that includes a regional basis rather than just the individual jurisdictional basis, but ACHD then gives the full analysis to the individual jurisdiction to make the final decision.

Sabrina said that comes back to what are the technical issues, what are the options for getting committed demand and program capacity, how to measure cumulative impact and find trip accounting by roadway across jurisdictions. There are options on how to capture cumulative demand and no one has outlined how to do it.

Charles stated the process is a way to provide better information for decisions to be made. He said that the key is how the information is delivered and what the jurisdictions do with it. The information can be provided from a regional perspective to give an idea of what the cumulative effects of a development would be, but if a jurisdiction sees that its growth is creating a problem in a neighboring community can it say no to development because of it? Without an APFO is a jurisdiction limited to evaluating impacts only within its boundaries?

Tammy added that when putting urban density on rural roads it becomes a safety issue, which can be used in making a determination on whether to approve a development, but the technical evaluations done by ACHD doesn't take those public safety issues into consideration. The APFO will give the jurisdictions the tools they need to make the decisions they are compelled to make, but don't feel are within the realm of their authority.

After discussion, ***the direction to the Steering Committee is to provide the Consortium with a list of the issues and identify those that have a relationship with TLIP. Start working on the issues that are not related to TLIP and plan to address those with the appropriate stakeholders. Provide regular updates on the central issues and highlights to the Consortium.***

Sabrina said ACHD sees one of the goals with an APFO process is to be able to give the jurisdictions the background technical data, showing the existing capacity and what is missing. It will be different levels of information than ACHD has been able to give before. She said that ACHD has outlined the technical issues for discussion at the next Consortium meeting and will be ready to talk about how to resolve some of those.

Scott Gurnsey said the Idaho Transportation Department sees the need for the APFO to go through. Currently, there are no statutes to help jurisdictions enforce what they want for the improvements on the highways.

Discussion Items

a. Blueprint for Good Growth Organizational Issues

Charles reviewed questions from the Steering Committee on the details of the transfer of Blueprint to COMPASS regarding keeping BGG as a separate entity; retaining the 501C3 status; streamlining the overlap of meetings, i.e. COMPASS, Alliance, and BGG; how to keep private sector involvement; and regional implications.

Dave said the charge of BGG is different than either COMPASS or the Alliance and the focus isn't Canyon County, so it should keep its separate identity. The main focus must be to successfully implement BGG in Ada

County before thinking about other counties. Tammy and Elaine agreed that BGG should be kept separate and noted that as BGG goes forward and develops technical applications, those should be shared with Canyon County, but not implemented regionally.

Matt Stoll stated that four years ago it was agreed that BGG would be kept as a separate entity focused on Ada County and in June 2008 it was agreed that BGG would remain a separate entity when the administrative functions moved to COMPASS. BGG is an extension of *Communities in Motion* and as the implementation of BGG is successful in Ada County and as the tools are successfully developed staff will have to start looking at the other counties because of non-attainment and the metropolitan statistical area requirements. Matt recommended that the 501c3 designation be retained at this point in time as there are funding streams that have not been fully explored that contribute money through a grant process to a 501c3. He said further legal review will be done on the 501c3 status to ensure that it is an appropriate mechanism. He agreed there is a need to explore efficiencies of meetings and to avoid duplicate presentations.

b. Transportation and Land Use Integration (TLIP) Update

Sabrina stated subject to public comment, ACHD is planning to consider adoption of TLIP at its last meeting in October 2008.

c. Evaluation of Cumulative Demand

Charles stated staff is recommending that the next step be that ACHD and COMPASS staff work together to test the existing year conditions in a sub-area using the COMPASS travel demand model to estimate the “as of April 2008” conditions. COMPASS staff recommends an area bounded by Nampa Blvd., Eagle Rd, I-84 and US 20/26. This area encompasses both counties, two of the fastest growing cities and major programmed transportation investments. Preliminary results could be presented to the BGG Consortium and the Technical/Steering Committee in November 2008. This will allow for an in-depth discussion regarding the process, staff time, advantages, disadvantages and potential options for adjustments.

The Committee directed staff to have RTAC and the Consortium participate in a test case at their next meeting.

d. Discuss Future Meeting Dates

After discussion, it was agreed to hold Consortium meeting on the second Thursday of each month at COMPASS from 1:30-3:30. The November 13, 2008 meeting was rescheduled to November 20, 2008 because it conflicts with the all day COMPASS Transportation Conference.

After discussion, it was agreed that the Steering/Technical Committee meetings will be held on the first Thursday of each month at COMPASS from 10:00 am -12:00 pm.

T:\FY08\700 Services\701 General Membership Services\Blueprint for Good Growth\Consortium\minutes\consort_minutes091808.DOC



Planning & Development Services

Bruce D. Chatterton
Director

Boise City Hall
150 N. Capitol Boulevard

Mailing Address
P. O. Box 500
Boise, Idaho 83701-0500

Phone
208/384-3830

Fax
208/384-3814

TDD/TTY
800/377-3529

Web
www.cityofboise.org/pds

Mayor
David H. Bieter

City Council
President
David Eberle

Council Pro Tem
Maryanne Jordan

Vernon L. Bisterfeldt
Elaine Clegg
Alan W. Shealy
Jim Tibbs

MEMORANDUM

TO: Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium

FROM: Patricia Nilsson, AICP, Boise City Comprehensive Planning Manager

DATE: November 12, 2008

RE: Framework for Analyzing Adequate Transportation Facilities

During the current discussions on developing the adequate public facilities analysis for transportation, it became clear that committee members held different perceptions of when the APF analysis should be required. There is a continuum of land use decisions that begins with policy formation (the comprehensive plan), moves through the entitlement phases of rezoning and subdivision, and culminates with the issuance of a building permit. Clarity on when a detailed APF analysis will be required is necessary to focus the important work of developing the methodology. Too narrow a focus on the APF analysis without understanding the larger relationship between the planned demand represented in local comprehensive plans to planned capacity represented in COMPASS and ACHD plans will undermine the effectiveness of any measurement of adequacy on a specific entitlement application.

The attached matrix is a first attempt to distill the land use/transportation coordination needs to their basic constituents. At each progression of land use decision, the APFO working group identified the level of analysis required, the finding for an approval decision, general mitigation options and any issues or concerns that should be considered.

We welcome your feedback to the committee on the usefulness of this initial matrix as an organizing tool as ACHD develops specific methodologies to measure adequate transportation capacity. The flowchart distributed at the September meeting and the additional ACHD memo in the November meeting packet really launched us toward developing the analysis. The matrix is intended to help us focus the effort at the appropriate target. This effort should be considered an early draft, as it does not yet represent the benefit of the whole committee's thoughts and perspectives.

PAN:pan

Attachment

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Consortium\Item III-a112008.doc

Note: First Requirement of implementing an adequate transportation facilities analysis is to synchronize land use plans with transportation plans.

	Land Use Decision	ATF Analysis Needed	Finding for approval	Mitigation options	Comments
Policy Decision	Comprehensive Plan Update	Does the planned demand have adequate planned capacity?	There is adequate planned capacity. Transportation element consistent with regional long-range transportation plan and master streets plan.	Reconfigure planned land uses to match capacity or adopt policies to stage entitlements in sync with available capacity.	Need ACHD to provide existing LOS and capacity/demand analysis of existing comprehensive plans.
	Comprehensive Plan Amendment that alters map or density policies	Does the planned demand have adequate planned capacity?	There is adequate planned capacity. Transportation element consistent with regional long-range transportation plan and master street plan.	Reduce additional planned land use demand to match planned capacity.	If concurrent with an entitlement application, use detailed APF review of the requested entitlement.

	Land Use Decision	ATF Analysis Needed	Finding for approval	Mitigation options	Comments
Entitlement Decision	Rezone	Is there adequate funded capacity available for the additional entitlements?	There is adequate funded capacity based on 5YWP.	Staging of entitlements through use of a development agreement.	May not be needed for annexations when a holding zone is applied prior to receiving a detailed development proposal. Otherwise, may need to have a detailed analysis (e.g. trips/acre cap).
	Subdivision Plat	Is there adequate existing capacity available for the additional entitlement?	ACHD analysis of adequate transportation facilities for the project.	Conditions of approval could require phasing in coordination of road improvements.	Need detailed analysis.
	Master Site Plan	Same as plat.	ACHD analysis of adequate transportation facilities for the project.	Conditions of approval could require phasing in coordination of road improvements.	Need to consider whether prior APF analysis needs to be updated if significant time has passed between platting and CU or construction.
	Conditional Use Permit	Same as plat.	ACHD analysis of adequate transportation facilities for the project.	Conditions of approval could require phasing in coordination of road improvements.	Need to understand differences among jurisdictions on use of CUs to grant additional entitlements.
	Building Permit	None.	N/A	N/A	

- Planned Capacity = The capacity of the transportation system represented in the regional long-range plan and the ACHD 2-year Capital Improvements Plan
- Planned Demand = The buildout (unless specifically phased) of households and jobs represented by local land use plans.
- Funded Capacity = Additional capacity is funded in the ACHD Five-Year Work Plan.
- Existing Capacity = Capacity currently exists in the roadway system.

Who can access available capacity? Who is required to mitigate?

As the BGG Steering/Technical Committee evaluated how to calculate available capacity for adequate public facilities accounting they identified some questions related to the approach embodied in the current APFO draft. The Committee identified two alternative approaches to defining 1) planned development that would have priority access to planned roadway capacity and 2) unplanned development that would be required to mitigate.

First In: Capacity is allocated to developments in the order they come in until all available capacity is used. Additional development is responsible for mitigation. This is the method implicit in the current draft APFO.

The Steering/Technical Committee believes that the First In approach does not lead to the BGG desired results.

- Capacity may be used up by any development.
- Once capacity is used all later development must mitigate for 100% of its trips.

This could potentially be addressed by including a reserve for planned growth in the available capacity calculation. However to do so would require a level of integration between comprehensive and transportation plans that has not been addressed to date. The APFO draft is modeled on Florida adequate public facility methods. Comprehensive and transportation plan integration is required by Florida law.

Trip Density: Capacity is allocated based on planned trips/acre. Development within the planned area is allocated a certain number of trips/acre based on the planned land use. Development consistent with that plan is allocated available capacity without mitigation requirements. Development with more trips/acre must mitigate for trips that exceed the planned trips/acre. Development outside the planned area must mitigate for all new trips.

This approach requires upfront integrated planning for land use and transportation. When a comprehensive plan map is adopted, the jurisdiction and ACHD would agree on the number of trips/acre generated by the proposed land use and the appropriate transportation network to serve that development. At each further stage in the development process (zoning, preliminary plat, etc) if the proposed land use/development exceeds the planned trips/acre there is a mitigation responsibility.

The Steering/Technical Committee is evaluating use of a trip density strategy. This requires two lines of development for APF accounting.

1. Create a framework for determining trips/acre based on land use. This entails determining an initial trip density for each land use and a procedure for adjustments and/or mitigation at each phase of the entitlement process.
2. Create a method for calculating and allocating available capacity and determining mitigation requirements during development review.

Examples illustrating First In and Trip Density approaches:

This area is planned for mixed use with 33 trips per parcel.

Parcel 1	Parcel 2	Parcel 3
33	33	33

First In Approach

Developer	Trips/Acre	Allowed	Mitigated
1	50	50	
2	33	33	
3	50	16	34

Trip Density Approach

Developer	Trips/Acre	Allowed	Mitigated
1	50	33	17
2	33	33	
3	50	33	17

**Level of Service Analysis for Adequate Public Facilities Accounting
Status Report
BGG Consortium November 20, 2008
Prepared by S. Goodell**

Several jurisdictions requested an analysis of current Level of Service (LOS) before they finalize their comments on the draft Variable LOS map. ACHD and COMPASS will calculate current LOS as follows.

Peak hour LOS thresholds will be based on the methods used for ACHD's 2006 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP).

ACHD and COMPASS will analyze existing LOS in three steps.

Step 1: Evaluate traffic conditions today (existing traffic without approved, unbuilt development).

- For roadway segments, recent traffic counts will be compared to the LOS thresholds to determine current LOS.
- For intersections, ACHD will update a model prepared for the CIP using recent traffic counts. This will provide an estimated LOS for about 100 intersections that were analyzed for the CIP. ACHD has about 400 signalized intersections.
- ACHD is preparing a contract to complete this analysis. Staff estimates this work will take about three months once a contract is signed. This includes time for ACHD to take additional traffic counts where needed.

Step 2: Evaluate LOS for existing traffic plus platted but unbuilt development.

- COMPASS will determine the traffic volume that would be added by development that has been platted but is partially or undeveloped. This will be added to the existing traffic volumes prepared for Step 1 and compared to the LOS thresholds.
 - Residential development will be estimated from readily available information.
 - Calculating commercial trips is more difficult. Where available, COMPASS will estimate commercial trips using data provided by the Cities and County. Where that is not available COMPASS will use a jobs/housing ratio to estimate the unbuilt development.
- For intersections, ACHD will update the intersection model for 20 intersections to be selected in cooperation with the Cities.

Step 3: Evaluate LOS for existing traffic plus platted but unbuilt development plus approved but unbuilt development (per preliminary plats).

- ACHD and COMPASS will use the method outlined for Step 2 except LOS thresholds will be adjusted for the capacity improvements in the first five years of ACHD's Five Year Work Plan.

Overall, ACHD and COMPASS staff estimates this analysis will take about six months to complete.

Consortium
 BGG ~~Joint Steering Technical~~ Committee Meeting
 SIGN-IN SHEET

Date: September 18, 2008

Name	Representing	Phone #
1. <i>Patricia Brandt</i>	CITY OF EAGLE	514-6248
2. <i>Gene Brute</i>	Boise	384-4422
3. Charles Trainor	COMPASS	855-2558
4. ELAINE CLEGG	CITY OF BOISE	
5. <i>Scott Gurnsey</i>	ITD	334-8300
6. <i>Tommy Wilcox</i>	Meridian	
7. <i>Sabrina Bauman</i>	ACHD - Carol McKee	387-6154
8. ROSS BORDEN	BOISE	433-5622
9. <i>MaryAnn Waldinger</i>	COMPASS	
10. <i>Jeanne Urkage</i>	COMPASS	
11. <i>Matt Stoll</i>	COMPASS	
12. <i>Kelli Fairless</i>	Valley Regional Transit	846-8547
13. <i>Mark Tate</i>	M3 Companies	939-6263
14. <i>Mary May</i>	M3 Companies	939-6263
15. RYAN WTLER	ACHD	387-6202
16. <i>Deanna Smith</i>	Idaho Smart Growth	333-9066
17. <i>Nancy Breck</i>	COMPASS	
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		
23.		
24.		