



Plan Coordination Team Meeting #3
October 12, 2004, 1:30 p.m. to 4:30 p.m.
Community Planning Association
800 Industry Way, Suite 100
Meridian, ID 83642

AGENDA

- I. INTRODUCTIONS** **1:30 p.m.**
- II. SUMMARY OF RECENT ACTIVITIES** **1:35 p.m.**
 - a. Agency & Stakeholder Meetings
 - b. Scenario Workshop Coordination Meetings
 - c. Steering Committee Meeting
 - d. Invitation to Scenario Workshops *
- III. REGIONAL VISION *** **1:45 p.m.**
 - a. Confirmation of Vision Concepts
 - b. Vision Statement Refinements
 - c. Policy Implications
- IV. EVALUATION APPROACH FRAMEWORK *** **2:30 p.m.**
 - a. Presentation of the Framework
 - b. Discussion of Components
 - c. Performance Measures
 - d. Next Steps (TaskForce)
- V. REGIONAL SYSTEM & DEFINITIONS *** **3:15 p.m.**
 - a. Mapping the System
 - b. Review & Discussion of Draft Definitions



- | | |
|---|------------------|
| VI. BOOKEND SCENARIO REVIEW & CONFIRMATION * | 3:45 p.m. |
| a. Final Review & Comment | |
| VII. SCHEDULE REVIEW | 4:15 p.m. |
| VIII. CURRENT ACTIVITIES & ISSUES | 4:20 p.m. |
| a. What's happening in the region? | |

* Attachments

pc: 661.03-04

T:\600transup\661rtp\CIM\04-ProjectCoordinatingTeam\Agendas\PCTAgenda3.doc



Plan Coordination Team (PCT)

September 14, 2004

Meeting Notes

- Attendees:** John Ausherman, Fregonese Calthrope Associates
Mary Berent, City of Middleton
Vern Brewer, Holladay Engineering Co.
Rosemary Curtin, RBCI
Radcliff Dacanay, Fregonese Calthrope Associates
Craig Eckles, City of Star
Kelli Fairless, ValleyRide
Stephen Hunt, ValleyRide
Brant Jewett, Canyon County Development Services
Bryon Keely, Local Highway Technical Assistance Council
Michael Kodama, MK Planning
Don Kostelec, Ada County Highway District
Michael Lauer, Planning Works
Katey Levihn, Ada County Highway District
Kathleen Marie Lacey, Boise City Planning
Terry Moore, EchoNorthwest (*via telephone conference*)
Patricia Nilsson, COMPASS
Steven Price, Ada County Highway District
Craig Quintana, Ada County Highway District
Marty Santoyo, Boise City Planning
Steve Siddoway, Meridian Planning and Zoning
Terri Schorzman, COMPASS
Hal Simmons, City of Boise
Toni Tisdale, COMPASS
Charles Trainor, COMPASS
Donna West, Canyon County Development Services
Phill Worth, Kittleson & Associates

Charles Trainor started the meeting at 1:40 p.m.

Introductions were made of all attendees.

SCENARIO PLANNING OVERVIEW

Phill Worth stated the concept of the bookend scenarios is two uniquely different plausible future outcomes for the Treasure Valley region. Plausible meaning that you believe that it is possible but it is not necessarily the best representation of what the region could be or should be. It begins to give a sense of the ends of the spectrum. We can then work within those over the course of time and as others engage in the process, both at the elected official level as well as regionally.

The meeting was turned over to Radcliffe Dacanay and David Ausherman of Fregonese Calthrope Associates.

Joint Overview of Workshop Process

David Ausherman presented a PowerPoint show of the scenario planning process. To download the presentation, use Microsoft Internet Explorer and click on the FCA ftp URL: <ftp://ftp.frego.com>.

Workshop Input/Output

Radcliffe Dacanay presented maps covering both Ada and Canyon Counties, which workshop participants will be working with in order to get a close look at where development types will be placed. At this scale, development types will cover 100 acres. COMPASS staff will provide data on vacant and redevelopable land. Radcliffe gave a detailed description of development and transportation types.

Radcliffe reviewed the Scenario Game process. Chip sets, one-inch squares, will be distributed at each table to place on the maps of Ada and Canyon Counties. Each chip set represents a different type of development pattern but all equal the same amount of forecasted households and employment. The group will then decide on which development pattern will be used. Radcliffe reviewed the chip types.

Phill Worth commented that four chip sets will be prepared; each chip set honors the regional control totals of population and employment. The first decision that each group of 8 to 10 people will make is which chip set to choose to apply to the map. A printed description of this process will be emailed to the PCT. This is a learning process and not the development of the preferred scenario. The public will be allowed to see a future that has not been constrained by a comprehensive plan or other regulations imposed on them.

Michael Lauer stated that the outcome of these workshops is to define a variety of possibilities that will be analyzed. The tendency of every group will be to define their preferred one, but once this process is completed, a range of possibilities will be defined and will quantify what the implications of those are. We are not trying to replace the plans, we are trying to look at the different alternatives and how they knit together. Each scenario will be translated into a

distribution of population and employment as well as a distribution of different characters of development.

SCENARIO PLANNING PROCESS DISCUSSION

Radcliffe continued that all the maps from the workshops would be digitized and averaged out, put through transportation modeling, and will include the land use aspects. Phill added that the workshops run in two phases: the first set in November will be analyzed with the public outcome; then, come back to the public with this information including costs of the infrastructure necessary to support this development scenario. At the second set of workshops the public will start with a great deal of information, which they have gained from having gone through the first set.

There will also be a regional map for participants from partnering counties, or those who think more regionally. Everyone will have an appropriate map to work on during the workshops.

Defining the Bookend Scenarios

David Ausherman reviewed examples of bookend scenarios. David asked the Team for their input on how to draft bookend scenarios for this region that are realistic, which could help to explore the extremes of what the future could bring.

Discussion continued with the review of Base Assumptions:

- Respect regional growth totals
- 25% non-Single Occupancy Vehicle (SOV) Mode Share Goal
- Whatever is done, funds will be available so there will not be a cost constraint when going into this process

When looking at these goals, how does a set of bookends begin to distinguish themselves one from another?

Scenario A

- Five-year trend of land use development
- Land consumption as needed
- Funding, R.O.W. and infrastructure available

Scenario B

- Honor areas of impact boundaries
- A maximum of 5% is occurring in unincorporated areas
- Support the 5% transit goal

Environmentally sensitive areas will continue to receive respect.

Discussion

Mike Lauer voiced several concerns. The goal for 25% for non-SOV as a baseline assumption. Can that goal actually be maintained? If going with Scenario A, we may not be able to achieve this goal. This is an evaluation criteria, not a base assumption. The same thing with funding, what are we going to be able to do with available funds? Available funds, funding for right-of-way and infrastructure available and the 25% are more an evaluation criteria. The 5% transit

goal works because that directly translates into an urban form. If the 25% transit goal is to be reached, we need a certain percentage of the development at densities of seven units per acre or greater.

Kathleen Lacey added that under the Base Assumption the 25% non-SOV goal is “honored”, however, the 25% goal has to be absolutely integrated. There is a need for very precise language. When using the word “honor” it does not provide the amount of strength that we have to have in order to keep this goal. In Scenario B, the phrase “support” the 5% transit goal should be changed to “achieve” the 5% transit goal.

Other suggestions voiced:

- In Scenario B – maximum of 5% in unincorporated areas, in Ada County the planned communities are not included within that 5%. That needs to be very carefully defined to include all of what occurs in the unincorporated areas.
- When talking about a 25% non-SOV as the goal, to achieve the transit goal of 5% (i.e., bikes, walking, carpooling, etc.), you will want to increase that number as well. Every time you increase the population, you have to provide more services.
- Pipeline development is a big concern. There is a concern of whether Planned Unit Developments are included in that 5% goal. There is a perception that those are exempt. Within the land use scenarios discussed, they would be included in the 5% goal.
- We have to be sensitive on how to communicate with the public in such a way that they clearly understand this terminology.
- Will 5% of all vehicle trips be transit? A breakdown is needed (i.e., 10% walking, 5% biking, etc.).
- A reservation was voiced regarding the concept of honoring the areas of impact in Scenario B. Areas of impact are a snapshot in time. Boise has not changed their areas of impact in 20 years. Other cities have more recently expanded their areas of impact and have larger areas of vacant land within them today. Make sure that Scenario B does not penalize those cities that have not recently expanded their areas of impact by precluding them from additional growth close in and around the city.

Phill Worth explained current trend versus existing conditions. There are two concepts: 1) for now, current trend is what has occurred over the past “5” years, new development; and, 2) a snapshot of everything that is developed and geographically specific, what that represents. Is there a strong feeling of which might better represent one of the working scenarios?

Phill commented that today’s discussion has been sufficient to compile the data for what will be used to further develop these two Scenarios. At the next scheduled meeting, we will revisit this discussion to come to a conclusion of the bookend scenarios. Work will be done on these Scenarios prior to the November workshops. The bookend scenarios will be finalized in October.

After further discussion, the challenge to the Team is to think back on what you believe to be the key factors that the region is facing. What is impacting the region today, or will impact the region between now and 2030?

Compile List of Invitees

Phill Worth stated that a good list of stakeholders is needed for the potential mailing list. The Team was asked to mail, or email, their list of names to Terri Schorzman.

Rosemary Curtin commented this is a very complicated and sophisticated discussion for the general public. The focus has been on stakeholders, identified people that have a contribution to make, and not relying on the general public's attendance at these workshops. A list of stakeholders is being compiled. Rosemary may be contacting Team members in order to receive additional names from various organizations. The goal is to bring at least 50 people to each workshop.

Methods of Promotion

Rosemary Curtin stated that because of the holiday season, most of the facilities are booked. We need to confirm dates for these workshops.

After discussion, it was the consensus of the Team to schedule November 16th and 17th: two Canyon County meetings on November 16th (morning and afternoon); and, two Ada County meetings on November 17th (afternoon and evening).

A good faith effort will be made to find a central location meeting place.

Rosemary stated the goal is to have 3,000 to 4,000 people in the database. A letter of invitation will be sent out with signatures from the Director of the Idaho Transportation Department and Matt Stoll, Executive Director of COMPASS, the week of November 1st through the 5th, with staff participating in follow-up telephone calls. A reminder postcard will be sent out on November 12th.

A media day will be scheduled to talk about this process and the partnership with the Ada Guide Plan. The focus of which will invite the general public to participate in these workshops. The traditional media releases will also be sent out.

Rosemary commented that people will be made aware that this is a two-step process and will be encouraged to attend both workshops. Materials are not going to be sent out in advance, only the letter of invitation.

STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH PLAN REVIEW

Overview of Plan

Rosemary Curtin stated if there are particular questions or concerns from the review of the Stakeholder Outreach Plan, please direct them to Phill Worth.

SCHEDULE REVIEW

Schedule Updates

Phill Worth reviewed the estimated schedule. All the changes to the schedule have been made between mid-August to the early part of November, primarily consisting of the moving of meetings to better fit with the schedule and understanding the Team's needs. Finalization of the Stakeholder/Public Involvement Plan will take place in September.

The process of meeting with elected officials has begun. Three of the four partnering counties have been involved in this process. All meetings were successful. Vern Brewer has been asked to be the technical representative on the PCT for Payette and Gem Counties. After further discussion, Rosemary Curtin stated a good faith effort would be made to invite all counties to participate in this process.

Meetings will begin with the stakeholders and a summary of those interviews will be made available.

Michael Kodama gave a brief review of the Travel Demand Management (TDM). Phill Worth commented that there is a direct link between the TDM and transit, TDM clearly support transit. It can lead the way to more effective transit. We should take advantage of this relationship. Mike added they would look at TDM modes and see how we increase different uses of carpools, vanpools, bikes, etc., and how it can lead to using transit.

STATUS REPORT

Task 3: Document Assembly & Review

Phill Worth stated that next week the PCT would be electronically provided with the first draft of the summary of documents. The consultants have been compiling, reviewing, and now writing the summaries of the review of those documents. One hundred documents were identified as a part of this scope of work. At this point they are well in access of that number both in identifying and reviewing those documents.

The PCT will be asked to review the summary to identify the key issues facing this region and the commonality that exists among the plans.

Task 4:

A first attempt will be made at draft documents: the Regional Vision, the Regional System, and the Evaluation Approach.

Future PCT Meetings

It was the consensus of the PCT to meet on the second Tuesday of each month through the end of the year. The next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, October 12th, 1:30 p.m., at COMPASS. A meeting is also scheduled for November 9th. No meeting is scheduled for December.

CURRENT ACTIVITIES & ISSUES

Sue Sullivan stated that the Idaho Transportation Department's meeting with Boise County focused on the impacts that the partnering counties are having on Ada and Canyon Counties.

Boise County saw the region with a more recreational traffic focus than a commuter focus. It would be good to keep in touch with this issue. Rosemary Curtin suggested capturing this issue through the scenario process by having major destinations on the maps. The major destinations are going to continue to grow as well as recreational opportunities. Charles Trainor suggested acquiring an operation and safety evaluation.

The meeting adjourned at 4:35 p.m.

T:\600transup\661rtp\CIM\04-ProjectCoordinatingTeam\Minutes\notes091404.doc

November X, 2004

DRAFT

Dear {FirstName},

The Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) and the Idaho Transportation Department invite you to participate in a planning workshop for the *Communities in Motion* project. *Communities in Motion* is a six-county, 20+ year plan that will address issues on the regional transportation system, evaluate the needs for future corridors, and address the effects of growth on transportation. *Communities in Motion* involves Ada, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem and Payette Counties.

The scenario planning workshops feature an interactive game that allows participants to use regional maps to plot future residential development, industrial development and main streets using chip sets. The project team will use completed maps to develop several scenarios. Once the scenarios are developed, you will be invited to another workshop in early 2005 to refine them.

As a resident of our region, your input is valuable to this project. Please join us at one of four workshops:

Tuesday, Nov. 16

9 a.m. to noon -- Hispanic Cultural Center
315 Stampede Dr., Nampa

or

6 to 9 p.m. -- Hampton Inn at the Idaho Center
5700 E. Franklin Rd., Nampa

Wednesday, Nov. 17

9 a.m. to noon or 6 to 9 p.m.-- Best Western
Vista Inn at the Airport (Rocky Mountain
Conference Center)
2645 Airport Way, Boise

The workshops will begin promptly. Please arrive 10 minutes early.

To help us plan our attendance, please let us know which workshop you will attend. An RSVP card is enclosed. We encourage you to bring friends, family members, colleagues and employees to these workshops. If you forget to RSVP, please come anyway. Your input is that important to us.

If you cannot attend any of the workshops, please feel free to ask someone else to take your place.

If you have any questions, please call Terri Schorzman, COMPASS Communications Coordinator at 855-2558 ext. 231.

Sincerely,

Matt Stoll
Executive Director, COMPASS
T:\600transup\661rtp\CIM\07-PublicMeetings\WkshpLetterDraft.doc

Dave Ekern
Director, Idaho Transportation Department

