



Technical and Steering Committee Meeting

Thursday, January 10, 2008

10:00 A.M. to 12:00 P.M.

Meridian Police Department

AGENDA

I. Consent Agenda (10:00-10:05 AM)

- a. **Approval of the December 12, 2007 Meeting Notes (pages 3 – 6)**

II. Action Items

- a. **Area of City Impact Modification – Tricia Nilsson & Anna Canning (10:05-10:50 AM) (pages 7 – 10)**

The Consortium directed the AOCI subcommittee to modify the document for consideration again at the February Consortium meeting. The subcommittee has worked on the following requested modifications per the December Consortium meeting:

- create a dispute resolution process,
- clarify that Cities will not annex outside of areas of city,
- add evaluation criteria for the sub-area plan, and
- modify section 3.c.i.4 to allow funding options for additional capacity.

The modified process document is attached for review and action by the steering/technical committee. Requested action is recommendation for approval of the modified document by the Consortium at the February Consortium meeting.

III. Discussion Items

- a. **Transportation Funding Committees – Kelli Fairless (10:50 – 11:00 AM)**

Kelli will provide an update on the various transportation funding activities, including transit support. The draft legislation for the Local Option Sales Tax is on the Valley Regional Transit website at: www.valleyregionaltransit.org

- b. **Transportation and Land Use Integration (TLIP) update – Chris Danley (11:00 – 11:15 AM)**

Chris will provide a verbal status on ACHD's TLIP project.

**Blueprint for Good Growth - c/o Doherty & Associates – 575 E. Parkcenter Blvd, Suite 200 - Boise, ID 83706
Business (208) 336-0420 - Fax (208) 336-2407 – Email kdoherty@dohertyeng.com
www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com**

- c. **Update of Open Space Subcommittee – Deanna Smith (11:15 – 11:20 AM)**
Deanna will provide a brief verbal update on the activities. The Ada County Open Space Task Force website is located at:
<http://www.adaweb.net/departments/developmentservices/OPENSPACETASKFORCE.asp>
- d. **Agriculture/Farm Land Preservation – Josie Erskine (11:20 – 11:25 AM)**
The Consortium will review the Agriculture/Farm Land Preservation plan during their February Meeting.
- e. **Update from the Transit Ready/Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee – Gloria Parkvold (11:25 – 11:30 AM)**
A verbal update will be given by Gloria Parkvold on the subcommittee's progress and coordination with COMPASS' Communities in Motion Community Choices Implementation Tool.

Upcoming 2008 Technical and Steering Meetings are as follows:

February 14, 2008 – Meridian Police Department (Tentative)
March 13, 2008 – Meridian Police Department
April 10, 2008 – Meridian Police Department



Technical and Steering Committee Meeting

Wednesday, December 12, 2007

3:00 P.M. to 5:00 P.M.

Meridian Police Department

MEETING MINUTES

I. Consent Agenda (3:00-3:05 PM)

- a. **Approval of the November 1, 2007 Meeting Notes (pages 3 – 6)**
Minutes were approved unanimously.

II. Discussion Items

- a. **Transportation Funding Committees – Kelli Fairless (3:05 – 3:15 PM)**

Kelli, has been working with jurisdictions statewide about the local options sales tax bill. The draft legislation has been presented to various stakeholder groups and feedback received about separating public transportation and roadway infrastructure, lengthening the bond period from 20 to 30 years, and modifying the initial cap of funds. The legislation has been modified to capture these suggestions. Kelli indicates that the bill has many proponents in the Senate and she is following a couple of leads for House sponsorship. Endorsements are welcome.

- b. **Adequate Public Facilities – Michael Lauer (3:15 – 3:30 PM) (pages 7 – 8)**

Michael indicated that he is “on hold” until ACHD formally adopts varying Level of Services for the TLIP project. The concern is that equal Level of Service everywhere will promote sprawl, and Michael will not draft the Adequate Public Facilities ordinance if this is the case.

He is working with ACHD on December 14 to discuss the varying Level of Services issue. If the issue is resolved, Michael is hoping to have draft ordinances by February.

**Blueprint for Good Growth - c/o Doherty & Associates – 575 E. Parkcenter Blvd, Suite 200 - Boise, ID 83706
Business (208) 336-0420 - Fax (208) 336-2407 – Email kdoherty@dohertyeng.com
www.blueprintforgoodgrowth.com**

c. **Transportation and Land Use Integration (TLIP) update – Chris Danley (3:30 – 3:45 PM)**

Chris Danley gave a status report. The team is targeting presentations to Cities after receiving the “green light” at the December 14 workshop. He indicated the schedule delay dealt with technical issues and some differences about project approach.

Michael indicated that TLIP is significantly changing the way that ACHD will be looking at roads, and that philosophy change has caused some resistance. Michael commended ACHD in the way that they have addressed matters and have moved forward with this monumental project. Michael thinks that there may be some resistance from the cities, and possibly the state since some of the roads affected belong to them. A balance will have to be found between the cities and ACHD to make this approach work effectively.

d. **Planning Boundary Exercise – Steve Malone (3:45 – 4:00 PM) (page 9)**

Steve Malone indicated the attached map is a result of meetings with the Cities and County. If cities have an conflict about the boundaries, then they need to address these concerns with the County Commissioners.

Discussions then centered around the planning boundary map. Some members thought the process of the map creation was contrary to the cooperative efforts of BGG and concerned about some interior – “city to city” boundary shifts which occurred. No concern over exterior boundaries was expressed. Several motions regarding map modifications failed or died for lack of second.

The general consensus from the Committee members was that they anticipate this map is a starting point for interior planning boundaries and that a cooperative process will occur between the Cities and Ada County to continue work beyond this point. Karen suggested members to participate in the Consortium meeting the following day.

e. **Update of Open Space Subcommittee – Deanna Smith (4:00 – 4:20 PM)**

Deanna Smith provided an update. She stated the group has made a lot of progress in the last two meetings and that the current roadblocks are funding and schedule. They are going to really streamline what they are trying to do in this current phase, and are now going to not have a public process for this phase, nor is the group going to develop an open space plan.

The current work plan includes dividing the County into five sections to graphically illustrate ownership, open space “potential”, and critical areas to be protected. Individual sections will be the focus at upcoming meetings. She also indicated that open space protection methods are been reviewed and are being sorted into categories based on effectiveness and applicability to Idaho based on current laws.

Deanna suggested representation at the upcoming meetings from the various jurisdictions was critical.

- f. **Agriculture/Farm Land Preservation – Josie Erskine (4:20 – 4:45 PM) (page 10)**
A discussion was held about proposed agriculture and farm land preservation implementation strategies. Karen began the discussion by noting that this issue was identified in the Phase I BGG report as one that should be further explored during Phase II.

Josie Erskine presented her views on the issue, including highlight items on the attachment. She indicated that the issue is much different from Open Space and should be handled as a separate issue. Deanna echoed this sentiment especially regarding the Ada County Open Space Task Force; she felt the Committee could not effectively tackle this issue.

Discussion was held regarding the viability of agriculture in Ada County as well as incentives for these businesses. Attendees agreed that we should incorporate a wide variety of agricultural interests in any future activities.

A motion was approved to recommend to the Consortium to form a subcommittee of the Steering/Technical Group to begin implementation of Agriculture and Farm Land Preservation.

- g. **Update from the Transit Ready/Mixed Use Compact Development Subcommittee – Gloria Parkvold (4:45 – 5:00 PM)**
Gloria Parkvold gave a verbal update. VRT and Compass have begun a joint effort of public outreach to educate and accumulate input from developers, local officials, financial folks and the general public regarding the goals and policy guidelines in the Communities In Motion document. The effort began today (12/12/07) with a forum hosted at COMPASS by Sherry McKibben, directed by Kelli Fairless and Gloria Parkvold. Thirty developers came together to give their input on the outreach presentation and to voice their opinions regarding implementing the policy guidelines and goals outlined in CIM. Outreach with developers will continue through March. Concurrent forums with other groups will occur through FY 2008.

Blueprint for Good Growth

Committee: Technical & Steering

Date: 12-12-07

Name	Contact Number	Representing
Jill Davidson	882 330-0420	BGG - Doherty & Assoc.
Josie Erskine	345 8003	Agriculture
STEVE MARLIZ	267-7920	ADA COUNTY DEVSUCS
Chris Danley	387-6202	ACTHO
Nicoel Baird Spencer	939-0227	Eagle
Shann Wardle	863-4160	MDC
PETE FRIEDMAN	884 -5533	MERIDIAN
MIKE WARDLE	378-4000	Brighton
Lynne Sedlacek	939-0132	Eagle Sewer Dist
Jennifer Tomlinson	384-3836	Borke City
Sharon Gallivan	388-3868	Landowners
Richard Cook	246-8300	WRG Design, Inc.
Charles Trainor	855-2558	COMPASS
Bob Taunton	401-5505	ULI
ANNA CANNING	884-5533	MERIDIAN
Charlie Bann	375-0408	Ada Soil: Water Cons. Dist.
Deanna Smith	333-0866	Idaho Smart Growth
John Lee	362-7329	United Water
Pam Sheldon	384-4264	CCDC
Clay Carley	345-7852	ECON DEV
Gloria Parkvold	846-8547	VET.
DAVID TURNBULL	378-4000	COMMERCIAL DEVELOPERS
Phil Chaste	534-8901	ITD
Michael Lauer	816-516-7094	Planning Works

Dean Gunderson

287-7944

Ada County

PETE O'NEILL

333-2401

- CHAMBER -

DECEMBER 28, 2007 Draft**AREA OF CITY IMPACT EXPANSION PROCESS****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 a 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 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 rezoning, 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:

- i. Where two jurisdictions do not agree on a planning boundary, the jurisdictions shall participate in at least one (1) mediation session. The governing body of the disputing party shall select and pay the expense of the mediator for the first meeting among the interested parties. Compensation of the mediator shall be determined among the parties at the outset of any mediation undertaking.
- ii. The decision of the mediator shall be binding upon all parties.

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.

Annexation Outside of Areas of Impact:

Currently, many cities do not have a 20-year area of city impact. Once established, cities may not annex beyond their 20-year area of city impact or into another city's planning area without the agreement of the adjoining city.