



## *Steering/Technical Committee Meeting*

*Thursday, December 4, 2008, 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 November 6, 2008, Meeting Minutes (pages 2-5) \**
  
- II. *Action Items*

*None.*
  
- III. *Discussion Items*
  - a. *Discuss Consortium Direction and Next Steps*
    - *Adequate public facilities (Goodell/Nilsson)*
    - *Variable level of service (Goodell)*
    - *Mitigation options (Nilsson/Goodell)*
    - *Public outreach*
    - *Scope of work and timeline*
  
  - b. *Next Steering/Technical Committee meeting dates (page 6)\**
  
  - c. *Next Consortium Meeting in January 2009 (page 6)\**

*\* Attachments*

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Steering Committee\agenda12 04 08.doc





## *Steering/Technical Committee Meeting*

*Thursday, November 6, 2008, 10:00 A.M. to Noon*

*COMPASS, Conference Room*

*800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100*

*Meridian, Idaho*

### **MEETING MINUTES**

#### ***I. Consent Agenda***

##### ***a. Approval of the October 2, 2008, Meeting Notes (pages 2-4) \****

The Consent Agenda was approved without discussion.

#### ***II. Action Items***

There were no Action Items.

#### ***III. Discussion Items***

##### ***a. Discuss Policy Issues and Recommended Directions***

Patricia Nilsson recapped that at the October 2008 Steering/Technical Committee meeting a work group was formed to identify what the decision points in terms of adequate public facilities are for the land use agencies and ACHD. This issue was not really resolved in Michael Lauer's work with adequate public facilities: when would we actually measure the adequacy of facilities. Based on that discussion, Patricia reviewed a draft matrix organized in a continuum of land use decisions that hones in on when we need to access the transportation system and capacity that would be available.

After discussion, Matt Stoll recapped that the overall goal is to have the long range transportation plan reflective of the comprehensive plans. That projected growth is based on the comprehensive plans so the transportation agencies can provide the appropriate investments into key corridors and developers will know what corridors are being invested in. And if the comprehensive plans are going to be deviated from, then additional analysis will be required and we will have to figure out how to finance the improvements that will be needed for the infrastructure.

Justin said that one of the key questions for the Consortium is if they are comfortable with the concept of taking an existing comprehensive plan and making modifications to it to make it reflect where growth is going to happen first.

Patricia stated it is a two way-street in some regard since there are already large developed areas, it is not a blank slate.

Charles noted the comprehensive plans need to be more specific in what they would be allowing in terms of growth. We need more specificity about the information from the comprehensive plan agencies, i.e., how much growth, how much development would be permissible under the comprehensive plan, and employment and residential needs to be broken down to a point where they can actually be assessed.

Patricia added that lacking specificity there needs to be some type of capacity reflection.

David Turnbull stated there needs to be a bridge between the policy decision and the entitlement decision. The overall transportation planning has to happen under the policy decision phase and the applications under the entitlement decision phase need to comply with the comprehensive plans and the transportation plan and if they do, they get approved. If they do not, they go to mitigation.

Patricia noted that comprehensive plans are being adopted without a good understanding of the impact of those land use decisions on the infrastructure.

After discussion, Patricia stated she would edit the draft matrix based on today's discussion for distribution to the Consortium on November 20, 2008.

***b. Recommended Technical Work to Advance Adequate Public Facilities***

Justin Lucas reviewed Sally Goodell's draft of recommended technical work to advance adequate public facilities in an attempt to capture the discussion between first in/first out and trip density. Tying it more to a holistic approach of looking at the comprehensive plans and assigning each parcel of land a number of trips it would get through planning. Sally's draft makes a case for the trip density method because it captures the goals of Blueprint for Good Growth better than first in/first out method, as the current APFO is formulated.

David Turnbull commented that there are really two scenarios. There is the city initiated comprehensive plan process or amendment and there is the planner or developer initiated comprehensive plan amendment. David said the goal is that transportation agencies work with the cities in a collaborative process that is a two-way street. Mitigation comes in where a developer wants to increase the density beyond what is planned in the city's comprehensive plan. The city's initiated amendment to a comprehensive plan is not going to be mitigated.

David added that in his opinion mitigation is an added exaction process that the impact fee ordinance was meant to take away. He thinks that the impact fee ordinance should be used as the primary tool. If the cities want some grand transportation system in a certain area, maybe the impact fees in that area needs to go up to pay for it.

Justin replied that impact fees are fiscally constrained and ACHD must prove that they can match them with general fund money. If the general fund money isn't there, ACHD can't increase impact fees.

Justin stated Sally's goal is to present this draft to the Consortium on November 20, 2008. He asked for consensus that the trip density method, looking at it from a comprehensive plan approach, is desirable as it is a shift in direction from how the current APFO is written. And, by heading in a new direction, the time frame for completion of the process will need to be adjusted.

Patricia noted that Boise City is ready to start some initial vetting of this in terms of forecasts and capacities, and would be happy to be a model and put the trip density method analysis into play.

Justin said one of the key pieces of information that ACHD needs from the cities to make trip density work is that ACHD and the jurisdictions agree on trips per acre for each land use, which ties back to the estimated entitlement at the comprehensive plan level.

Patricia stated there are areas in Boise that need to be considered in trips per geographic area not trips per acre.

Charles said one approach is to take each comprehensive plan at face value and compare it to hypothetical control totals to get some sense of how realistic the level of growth would be. The idea that there is a cap that you can't go over may go away. The flip side is when you see the cumulative result and it blows any potential capacity out of the water, you may have to go back and determine what to do to make it work.

Matt added that air quality as well as capacity on the roadways may be problematic.

Patricia discussed that it is not clear how to protect regional travel versus the other trips on the regional arterials; it can't be treated as all the same capacity. The regional corridors need to serve regional traffic, i.e., the capacity on State Street isn't just for Boise, it is for Star, Eagle and the county.

Justin said there is obvious overlap in the two processes, but some of the key points are how to model the comprehensive plans and how to assign trips to comprehensive plan land use designations.

Phil Choate agreed that in regards to the State system the trip density approach has benefits.

***c. Variable Level of Service related to Adequate Public Facilities***

Justin Lucas said there are three steps needed to adequately provide variable level of service related to adequate public facilities to decision makers that will inform all other decisions. The first step is to show what the existing traffic is on the roadways today. The second step is to show existing plus the platted but vacant development. The third is to show the existing, plus platted but vacant, plus approved un-built.

Patricia said that the COMPASS Regional Geographic Advisory Committee would be a good place to generate this type of data.

After discussion, Justin said a one page summary will be developed for presentation to the Consortium on November 20, 2008.

T:\FY09\700 Services\761 BGG\Steering Committee\agenda11 06 08.doc

**BGG Joint Steering-Technical Committee Meeting  
SIGN-IN SHEET**

Date: November 6, 2008

Name	Representing	Phone #
1. Matt Stoll	COMPASS	
2. Patricia Nilsson	City of Boise	384-3842
3. DAVID TURNBULL	BILGATION CORPORATION	378-4000
4. Phil Choate	ITD	334-8901
5. LeAnn Carlsen	Meridian Joint School Dist.	350-5035
6. Charles Trainor	COMPASS	855-2558
7. JUSTIN LUCAS	ACHD	387-6157
8. Mely Rush	Ada County	287-5715
9. Sherry McWhirter	University of Idaho	364-4540
10. Nancy Beech	COMPASS	
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
21.		
22.		
23.		
24.		

**BGG Steering/Technical Committee Meetings**

COMPASS Conference Room – 10:00 AM - Noon  
(All meetings on 1st Thursday of each month)

- October 2, 2008
- November 6, 2008
- December 4, 2008
- January 8, 2009 (January 1 is New Year's Day)
- February 5, 2009
- March 5, 2009
- April 2, 2009
- May 7, 2009
- June 4, 2009
- July 2, 2009
- August 6, 2009
- September 3, 2009
- October 1, 2009
- November 5, 2009
- December 3, 2009

**BGG Consortium Committee Meetings**

COMPASS Conference Room – 1:30 -3:30  
(All meetings on 2nd Thursday of each month)

- October 2008 - Canceled
- November 20, 2008
- December 11, 2008 - Canceled
- January 8, 2009
- February 12, 2009
- March 12, 2009
- April 9, 2009
- May 14, 2009
- June 11, 2009
- July 9, 2009
- August 13, 2009
- September 10, 2009
- October 8, 2009
- November 12, 2009
- December 10, 2009