



Steering/Technical Committee Meeting
Thursday, December 9, 2010 - 9:00 A.M. to 11:00 A.M.
COMPASS, Conference Room
800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, Idaho

**** Agenda ****

- I. **Consent Agenda**
9:00 page 2 *A. Approve November 4, 2010, and November 12, 2010, Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
- II. **Information/Discussion Items**
9:05 page 7 *A. Discuss Joint Mitigation Strategies Options – Patricia Nilsson
10:05 B. Discuss Cumulative Development and Planning Level Options for Recommendation to Consortium – Justin Lucas/MaryAnn Waldinger
- III. **Action Items**
10:30 A. Establish 2011 BGG Consortium and Steering Committee Meeting Dates/Times/Locations
- Steering Committee:
January 6, 2011 at COMPASS, 9:00-11:00
February 3, 2011 at COMPASS, 9:00-11:00
May 5, 2011 at COMPASS, 9:00-11:00
August 4, 2011 at COMPASS, 9:00-11:00
November 3, 2011 at COMPASS, 9:00-11:00
- Consortium:
February 10, 2011 at COMPASS, 1:30-3:30 (February instead of March as requested by Chair Dave Bieter)
June 9, 2011 at COMPASS, 1:30-3:30
September 8, 2011 at COMPASS, 1:30-3:30
December 8, 2011 at COMPASS, 1:30-3:30
- 10:55 IV. **Other**
- 11:00 V. **Adjournment**

T:\FY11\700 Services\761 Blueprint for Good Growth\Steering Committee\agenda120910.doc





Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 4, 2010 – 10:00 P.M. to 12:00 P.M.

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

****Minutes****

Attendees: Gary Allen, Givens Pursley
Nancy Brecks, COMPASS
Anna Canning, City of Meridian
Sally Goodell, ACHD
Justin Lucas, ACHD
Patricia Nilsson, City of Boise
Amar Pillai, ACHD
Deanna Smith, Idaho Smart Growth
Matt Stoll, COMPASS
Charles Trainor, COMPASS
MaryAnn Waldinger, COMPASS

Agenda Additions/Changes

Patricia Nilsson moved and Sally Goodell seconded to reverse the order of Action Items A and B on the agenda. Discussion on Item B, Status Report - Cumulative Impacts Analysis on a Development, should come before the discussion on Item A, Consider Menu of Joint Mitigation Strategies on a Hypothetical Corridor. Motion passed unanimously.

Consent Agenda

A. Approval of the June 10, 2010, Steering/Technical Committee Meeting Minutes

Patricia Nilsson moved and Sally Goodell seconded approval of the June 10, 2010, Steering/Technical Committee meeting minutes as presented. Motion passed unanimously.

Action Items

A. Status Report - Cumulative Impacts Analysis on a Development

Justin Lucas and MaryAnn Waldinger presented a status report on the cumulative impacts analysis on a development. COMPASS and ACHD staff tested cumulative impacts tracking and reporting for an example development located in north Kuna near SH69. The main purpose of the test was to identify staff resources, data needs, and technical issues associated with county-wide cumulative impacts tracking and reporting at the development level.

Based on the test case, COMPASS and ACHD staff has significant reservations with the method for cumulative impacts reporting tested during this process. The data challenges, increase in overall time, and technical issues need to be examined and resolved prior to moving forward with county-wide cumulative impacts reporting (as tested) at the development level.

After discussion, the Committee agreed that further discussion needs to take place on the analysis and process before any conclusions can be made. The Steering Committee will meet again on November 12, 2010, at COMPASS from 11:00 am -1:00 pm.

B. Consider Menu of Joint Mitigation Strategies on Hypothetical Corridor

This item was deferred until after further review of the cumulative analysis takes place.

C. Establish December 9, 2010, Consortium Meeting Agenda

After discussion, the Steering Committee members unanimously agreed to request that the December 9, 2010, Consortium meeting be canceled to allow time for the Steering Committee members to finalize their work on the cumulative impacts analysis process.

T:\FY11\700 Services\761 Blueprint for Good Growth\Steering Committee\Minutes\minutes11 04 10.doc



Steering/Technical Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 12, 2010 – 10:00 P.M. to 12:00 P.M.

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

****Minutes****

Attendees: Gary Allen, Givens Pursley
Nichole Baird Spencer, City of Eagle
Nancy Brecks, COMPASS
Anna Canning, City of Meridian
Sally Goodell, ACHD
Miguel Legarret, Realtors
Justin Lucas, ACHD
Sherry McKibben, University of Idaho
Patricia Nilsson, City of Boise
Amar Pillai, ACHD
Deanna Smith, Idaho Smart Growth
Matt Stoll, COMPASS
MaryAnn Waldinger, COMPASS

Information/Discussion Items

A. Discuss Cumulative Impacts Analysis on a Development

(a) Assumptions

Sally Goodell recapped the following agreed upon assumptions:

- The current focus is not on adequate public facilities ordinances (APFO). It is on cumulative development reporting.
- Variable Level of Service (VLOS) is currently off the table for discussion as conceptualized for APFO and for development reviews. VLOS is being used for planning purposes and investment decision making.
- The current agreed upon definition of "committed un-built" is if approved in a final plat or preliminary plat.

Sally said that MaryAnn and Justin will discuss reporting options at the planning and development level. There are two parts to most of them. The first part is the evaluation of demographics. The second part is travel demand and how that is represented.

(b) Planning Level Options

MaryAnn Waldinger presented the following planning level analysis options:

Option A: Planning Level Lite
Deliverable: Level of Service Roadway Map
Additional Staff Time: 38 days, annually.

Roadway Level of Service Map, segments only, no intersections. Used for planning level purposes, updated annually. Will required that current year demographics and committed demographics be developed.

Six days for ACHD to update roadway LOS for all ACHD facilities and develop roadway LOS map.

Thirty-two days for COMPASS to develop current year population, household and job demographics at the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level. Develop "committed" population, household and job demographics at the TAZ level.

Option B: Planning Level Full
Deliverable: Level of Service Roadway and Intersection Map
Additional Staff Time: 305 days, one time to collect intersection count data (ACHD). 119 days, annually

Roadway and intersection level of service map. Used for planning level purposes, updated annually. Tasks for COMPASS are the same as currently done. Substantially more ACHD resources needed for intersection level of service count data, which is very labor intensive.

Eighty-seven days annually for ACHD to update roadway and intersection LOS for all ACHD facilities and develop roadway and intersection LOS map.

Thirty-two days annually for COMPASS to develop current year population, household and job demographics at the traffic analysis zone (TAZ) level. Develop "committed" population, household and job demographics at the TAZ level.

Option C: Planning Level Super Lite
Deliverable: Technical Report
Additional Staff Time: Minimal staff time needed. Would vary annually based on activity

Technical report summarizing the potential impact of land use changes, from a comprehensive plan text/map amendment, short and long-term.

Less than 1 day of staff time for ACHD to review or provide current traffic counts and verify roadway project assumptions.

One to two days for COMPASS to convert land use changes into population, household and jobs at the TAZ level. Develop comparison table of demographics including current year, horizon year (2035), horizon year plus "amendments," and build out. Summarize potential impacts of horizon year demographics (2035) plus the amendment on the funded long range transportation system.

C. Development Level Options

Justin Lucas presented the following options for cumulative impacts reporting at the development level. The options have different levels of intensity based on increased workdays required for the cumulative impacts analysis:

Option 1: New TIS Policy
Additional Staff Time: ACHD: None. COMPASS: 1–5 days.

Use ACHD's new TIS Policy standards for sub-area cumulative impacts reporting.

Option 2: New TIS plus Demographics
Additional Staff Time: ACHD: None. COMPASS: 1-5 days

Use ACHD's new TIS Policy standards for sub-area cumulative impacts reporting plus county-wide demographics reporting based on the approved CIM (25 year plus build out).

Option 3: Countywide Tracking and Reporting
Additional Staff Time: ACHD: 24 days annually. 2-10 days per development.
COMPASS: 4 days one time; 34 days annually; 1-5 days per development

County-wide cumulative impacts tracking and reporting plus county-wide demographics reporting based on the approved CIM (25 year plus build out).

(d) Next Steps

Sally said the next step is to determine:

1. What will be presented to the Consortium based on the options presented today?
2. How to move down the path way on how to quantify/manage the alternative mitigation question?
3. Are we on the right track?

Matt said that it is ACHD and COMPASS' recommendation that we pick an option and go forward.

After discussion, Committee members identified their preferred options (subject to further discussion):

Gary Allen: Options A and C/Option 2
Anna Canning: Options A and C/Option 2
Nichole Baird Spencer: Options A and C/Option 2
Sherry McKibben: Options A and C/Option 2
Deanna Smith: Options A and C/Option 2
Patricia Nilsson: Options A and C/Option 3

Next Meeting

The Committee agreed to recommend cancelling the December 9, 2010, Consortium meeting to allow time for the Steering Committee to meet on either December 9 or 10, 2010, to discuss mitigation and to work through the questions on what was presented today.

ITEM II-A

Blueprint for Good Growth
Steering Committee
November 4, 2010
Patricia Nilsson, Comprehensive Planning Manager, Boise City

Process to Determine Mitigation Options

At previous meetings, the Committee desired a discussion on how the application of an APF review would function, particularly if mitigation alternatives were necessary to act on an application. (*Do agencies agree that this is a desired level of review in the current economic climate?*) The process, in general terms, would proceed as follows:

1. Development application received by land use jurisdiction.
2. Application reviewed by ACHD. Determination that roadway capacity is or is not available to maintain ACHD adopted Level of Service.
3. If roadway capacity is not available, ACHD and land use jurisdiction(s) meet to review range of mitigation alternatives:
 - a. Phasing of development
 - b. Reduction of development
 - c. Provision of alternative transportation modes (transit, bike, or ped facilities)
4. ACHD Commission makes decision/recommendation to land use agency.
5. Land use jurisdiction acts on application.

This is not a complicated review, but it requires a commitment to coordination and communication among all parties. (*Is there agreement on this point?*) Several protocols or policies will need to be established before this process can be implemented:

1. Coordination between ACHD and land use jurisdictions may require an MOU to ensure responsibilities are clear on contacts/meetings with applicants, timing and content of technical review (e.g. TIS scoping), and timeliness of review.
2. A catalog of mitigation options for each jurisdiction needs to be completed. There was discussion at the June Steering Committee meeting regarding possible options. For the three options listed above, real time information on available capacity and programmed capacity will be needed. **Phasing of development** can be a mitigation option if additional capacity is funded in the FYWP. **Reduction of development** can be a

mitigation option only if real time capacity data is maintained by ACHD (or COMPASS?). **Capacity provided through alternative modes** will require development of a protocol that calculates capacity needs for systems accessible to the development (to establish rational nexus). This will require use of the existing pedestrian/bike facilities (which needs to be updated by ACHD) and the application of recommendations in the Roadways to Bikeways Plan and the existing transit plans (this requires more committee discussion). This may also require a shift away from just measuring vehicle trips generated from a development to person trips to ensure equitable mitigation options are applied to each development proposal. This topic requires further discussion by the committee.

At the last meeting, access management was discussed as a possible mitigation measure. After some thought, I don't believe this option is needed at this time until specific access management plans are produced that can measure that additional capacity is provided by implementing the plans. Newer corridor plan, such as the Lake Hazel Expressway, may have this information, and but upcoming plans for existing arterials, such as Fairview Avenue, are being planned to provide safety benefits. The plans would need to be modeled to measure additional capacity before mitigation options for APF could be identified.

I look forward to a robust discussion at the meeting!

I:\PDS\P and Z\CompPlan\Blueprint for Good Growth\BBG Nov 4 2010 Nilsson.doc