



**Communities in Motion Steering Committee &  
Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium**  
Joint Meeting - January 20, 2005

**7:30 A.M. – 8:30 A.M. – Blueprint for Good Growth Consortium Only**  
**8:30 A.M. – 10:00 A.M. – Joint Steering Committee/Consortium Meeting**  
**Community Planning Association**  
**800 Industry Way, Suite 100 - Meridian, ID 83642**  
**AGENDA**

- I. INTRODUCTIONS** **8:30 A.M.**  
**a. Receive December 16, 2004 Meeting Summary \***
- II. PRELIMINARY SCENARIO ANALYSIS RESULTS** **8:35 A.M.**  
*Out of the November workshop maps, the consultants have created three distinct scenarios. These, along with three other scenarios, have been tested against a number of transportation improvements. The consultants will present the evaluations and how these early findings can be used to guide decision-making.*
- III. EVALUATION APPROACH MATRIX \*** **9:25 A.M.**  
*The evaluation of scenarios will be based on information that will allow comparisons on key factors between the alternatives. The consultants will discuss how these will be used to help determine the preferred scenario.*
- IV. UPCOMING SCENARIO PLANNING WORKSHOPS \*** **9:45 A.M.**  
*The scenario analyses presented at this meeting will be the subject of the second round of public workshops on February 2 and 3, 2005. The consultants will present the process we will use to engage participants in using the evaluations to refine land use and transportation.*

\* Attachments

**Should you need to call in to this meeting:**

Dial the Toll Free Access number: 1 (800) 416-4956

At the prompt, enter the Participant Code: 79066946#

You will hear music until COMPASS activates the conference call just before 8:30 A.M.

Please note that this meeting will involve visual presentations of materials. If you let us know in advance, we will try to get you copies of the visual presentation. Please call Debbie Winchar at 855-2558 x 269 to RSVP or request the presentation materials. Thank you.

T:\FY05\600Projects\661 CIM\05-SteeringCommittee\Agendas\agenda012005.dot





**CIM STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING  
COMPASS CONFERENCE ROOM  
December 16, 2004**

**\*\*MEETING SUMMARY\*\***

**ATTENDEES:**

David Bieter, Mayor, City of Boise  
 Dave Bivens, Commissioner, Ada County Highway District  
 Elaine Clegg, Councilwoman, City of Boise  
 Tammy de Weerd, Mayor, City of Meridian  
 Craig Eckles, for Nathan Mitchell, Mayor, City of Star  
 Rudy Endrikat, Commissioner, Payette County  
 Kelli Fairless, Executive Director, ValleyRide  
 Bob Flowers, Mayor, City of Parma,  
 John Franden, Commissioner, Ada County Highway District  
 Dale Hanson, Commissioner, Boise County  
 Mike Holladay, Payette County  
 Nancy Merrill, Mayor, City of Eagle  
 Garret Nancolas, Mayor, City of Caldwell  
 Bill Nary, Councilman, City of Meridian  
 Dean Obray, Mayor, City of Kuna  
 Judy Peavey-Derr, Commissioner, Ada County (via conference call)  
 Sharon Pratt, Commissioner, Gem County  
 Paul Raymond for Tom Dale, Mayor, City of Nampa  
 Charlie Rountree, Idaho Transportation Department  
 Lynne Sedlacek, Councilwoman, City of Eagle  
 Fred Tilman, Commissioner, Ada County  
 Rick Yzaguirre, Commissioner, Ada County

**OTHERS:**

David Ausherman, Fregonese Calthorpe Associates  
 Nancy Brecks, Community Planning Association  
 Diana Cavigliano, Ada County Highway District  
 Rosemary Curtin, RBCI  
 Karen Doherty, Doherty & Associates  
 John Fregonese, Fregonese Calthorpe Associates (via conference call)



Dr. Robert Freilich, Freilich, Leitner & Carlisle  
Sonia Hennem, Kittelson & Associates  
Kathleen Lacey, City of Boise  
Michael Lauer, Planning Works, LLC  
Nicole Prehoda, Community Planning Association  
Terri Schorzman, Community Planning Association  
Matt Stoll, Executive Director, Community Planning Association,  
Toni Tisdale, Community Planning Association  
Charles Trainor, Community Planning Association  
Phill Worth, Kittelson & Associates  
Michael Zuzel, City of Boise

Judy Peavey-Derr called the meeting to order at 9:35 a.m.

### **Scenario Process Overview**

Phill Worth, Michael Lauer and John Fregonese recapped the three scenarios (Work Average Scenario, Compact Linear Development Scenario, and Dispersed Satellite Cities Scenario) created from the concepts conceived during the four Scenario Workshops in November. Nearly 500 citizens from the six-county area participated in the workshops and produced over 40 maps representing various ways in which the region could grow.

Dr. Freilich said the scenarios would be evaluated based on environmental factors, fiscal factors, and tested against priorities and the legal ability to implement them.

### **Next Steps**

The next step is to analysis the results of the first round of scenario workshops and establish issues to be examined further. The Committee will meet in January to determine what criteria will be used to reach a preferred scenario. The workshops in February will refine the ideas from the first workshops, and move towards reaching consensus and feasibility of the concepts. In March, the preferred scenario will continue to be refined.

After discussion, **by unanimous consent the Committee directed the consultants to move forward with these scenarios as starting points.**

### **Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 4:00 p.m.

Blueprint for Good Growth (BGG)  
 Communities in Motion (CIM)  
 Scenarios Evaluation Matrix

Category	Measure/ Indicator	Project Considering Factor *	Scenarios					
			Trend	Suburban Shift	Workshop Average	Corridors	Satellite Cities	Bookend 2
<b>Land Use and Development</b>	Land Consumption (calculate acres)	BGG/CIM						
	Land Use Mix (calculate acres by land use)	BGG/CIM						
	Holding Capacity (calculate build-out households average densities)	BGG/CIM						
	Neighborhood Character (map areas expecting significant change)	BGG/CIM						
	Compatibility between Land Uses (map areas of anticipated land use conflicts)	BGG/CIM						
	Redevelopment (map areas of anticipated redevelopment)	BGG/CIM						
	Zoning Changes (map areas where zoning is inconsistent with preferred development pattern)	BGG						

\* Indicates that analysis will not be conducted on initial scenarios, but factors will be evaluated later in the process.

Blueprint for Good Growth (BGG)  
 Communities in Motion (CIM)  
 Scenarios Evaluation Matrix

Category	Measure/ Indicator	Project Considering Factor *	Scenarios					
			Trend	Suburban Shift	Workshop Average	Corridors	Satellite Cities	Bookend 2
	Future Land Use Map Changes (map areas where plans are inconsistent with preferred pattern)	BGG						
	Density (calculate density for region subareas)	BGG/CIM						
	Jobs:Housing Ratio (calculate jobs and households by subarea)	BGG/CIM						
Housing	Total Units (calculate number by subarea)	BGG/CIM						
	Mix of Units (calculate number by type and subarea)	BGG/CIM						
	Affordability (qualitative comparison based on densities and unit mix)	BGG						
	Walkability (calculate households within ¼ mile of commercial center)	BGG/CIM						

\* Indicates that analysis will not be conducted on initial scenarios, but factors will be evaluated later in the process.

Blueprint for Good Growth (BGG)  
 Communities in Motion (CIM)  
 Scenarios Evaluation Matrix

Category	Measure/ Indicator	Project Considering Factor *	Scenarios					
			Trend	Suburban Shift	Workshop Average	Corridors	Satellite Cities	Bookend 2
<b>Water</b>	Demands by Unit Type (calculate water demand by type and service area)	BGG						
	Distribution System Needs (compare capital costs for distribution systems)	BGG						
<b>Wastewater</b>	Demands by Unit Type (calculate sewer demands by type and service area)	BGG						
	Collection System Needs (compare capital costs for distribution systems)	BGG						
	Treatment Costs (compare capital costs for treatment plants)	BGG						
<b>Schools</b>	Demands by District (calculate student demand by district)	BGG						
	Needed Capacity by District (calculate new facilities needed by district)	BGG						

\* Indicates that analysis will not be conducted on initial scenarios, but factors will be evaluated later in the process.

Blueprint for Good Growth (BGG)  
 Communities in Motion (CIM)  
 Scenarios Evaluation Matrix

Category	Measure/ Indicator	Project Considering Factor *	Scenarios					
			Trend	Suburban Shift	Workshop Average	Corridors	Satellite Cities	Bookend 2
	Costs by District (calculate new school costs by district)	BGG						
<b>Environment</b>	Open Space Per Capita (calculate open space retained by subarea)	BGG/CIM						
	Open Space Access (calculate jobs and dwellings within ¼ mile of open space)	BGG/CIM						
	Walkability (calculate households and employees within ¼ mile of commercial center)	BGG/CIM						
	Air Quality (Estimates of Pollution Created by the Vehicular Travel Demand Forecasted)	BGG/CIM						
	Stormwater (calculate impervious cover)	BGG/CIM						
	Sensitive Lands Consumed (calculate development area within foothills, floodplains and habitat areas)	BGG/CIM						

\* Indicates that analysis will not be conducted on initial scenarios, but factors will be evaluated later in the process.

Blueprint for Good Growth (BGG)  
 Communities in Motion (CIM)  
 Scenarios Evaluation Matrix

Category	Measure/ Indicator	Project Considering Factor *	Scenarios					
			Trend	Suburban Shift	Workshop Average	Corridors	Satellite Cities	Bookend 2
Transportation	Person and Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita	BGG/CIM						
	Person and Vehicle Trips by Type	BGG/CIM						
	Vehicle Hours Traveled	BGG/CIM						
	Travel Time by Origin-Destination Pairing and on Key Corridors	BGG/CIM						
	Lane-miles of Roadway Exceeding Capacity (Percentage of Travel in Congestion)	BGG/CIM						
	Households and Jobs within ¼ Mile of a Bus Route or within ½ Mile of Rail Transit	BGG/CIM						
	Intersection Density or Connectivity	BGG/CIM						
	Average Travel Speed	BGG/CIM						
	Vehicle Hours of Delay	BGG/CIM						
	Average Vehicle Trip Time	BGG/CIM						
Miles of Roadway	BGG/CIM							

\* Indicates that analysis will not be conducted on initial scenarios, but factors will be evaluated later in the process.

Blueprint for Good Growth (BGG)  
 Communities in Motion (CIM)  
 Scenarios Evaluation Matrix

Category	Measure/ Indicator	Project Considering Factor *	Scenarios					
			Trend	Suburban Shift	Workshop Average	Corridors	Satellite Cities	Bookend 2
	Intrazonal versus Interzonal Trips	BGG/CIM						
	Cost of Implementing New Modes of Transportation	BGG/CIM*						
	Cost of Right-of-Way Acquisition	BGG/CIM*						
	Cost of Transportation System	BGG/CIM*						
	Cost per Mile Added and Number of Miles Added per Type	BGG/CIM*						
	Average Travel Distances	BGG/CIM*						
	Auto/Transit Travel Time Ratio	BGG/CIM*						
	Transit Reliability	BGG/CIM*						
	Transit Coverage	BGG/CIM*						
	Transit Frequency	BGG/CIM*						
	Transit Load Factor	BGG/CIM*						

\* Indicates that analysis will not be conducted on initial scenarios, but factors will be evaluated later in the process.

Blueprint for Good Growth (BGG)  
 Communities in Motion (CIM)  
 Scenarios Evaluation Matrix

Category	Measure/ Indicator	Project Considering Factor *	Scenarios					
			Trend	Suburban Shift	Workshop Average	Corridors	Satellite Cities	Bookend 2
Agricultural Impacts	Agricultural Land Conversion  (calculate acreage of ag land developed)	BGG						
	Pressure for Land Conversion (map areas of residential encroachment into agricultural areas)	BGG						
Fire/EMS	Need for New Fire Stations (quantify need for new fire stations)	BGG						
	Capital Costs of New Fire Stations	BGG						
	Relative Operations & Maintenance Costs	BGG						
Total Fiscal Impacts	Construction, Operating and Maintenance Costs of New Urban Facilities, Infrastructure, and Services	BGG*						

T:\FY05\600Projects\661 CIM\10c-LandUseScenarios\AnalysisMatrix\_V3.doc

\* Indicates that analysis will not be conducted on initial scenarios, but factors will be evaluated later in the process.

**Proposed Process for Feb 2<sup>nd</sup> & 3<sup>rd</sup> Workshops**

In addition to soliciting feedback on the scenarios emerged from the November 2004 workshops, the upcoming workshops will focus on working with participants to depict their desired form and location of transportation system enhancements to improve connections within the study area.

There will be a total of 5 workshops over the course of two days. Workshop participants will gather at tables and form groups of 10 to 12 persons, anticipating approximately 15 tables at each workshop. Each group will select their preferred land use distribution scenario (based on the results of the Nov 16th & 17th workshops), identify desired refinements, and then depict their preferred transportation system enhancements on their selected land use map.

The workshop will begin with a presentation of "lessons learned" from early analysis of the land use scenarios developed to date. This user-friendly information will include comparisons of the various land use scenarios and how they impact communities, the environment, and the existing transportation system.

Each table will have a set of three 11x17 maps showing the modeled distribution of the workshop average, compact urban form, and satellite cities. Also, a comparison of all 6 scenarios (including the trend and the two bookend scenarios) in chart form will be placed at each table.

To start, the group will need to discuss and choose which land use scenario best represents the desired future. Strengths and weaknesses of the chosen land use scenario will be discussed and recorded, based on the "lessons learned" presented at the beginning of the workshop. Recommended refinements to the chosen scenario will be depicted with colored markers and described with notes on the map. Each group will also be asked to highlight the main activity centers within the region that require good transportation connections (e.g. Boise International Airport).

Having a group-defined land-use base map, participants are ready to work on illustrating the type and location of transportation improvements they wish to see occur in tandem with their preferred land use scenario.

To show their desired transportation improvements, each group will start by selecting a set of colored "strips" that represent various types of road, highway, and transit improvements. (See accompanying "strip-type" sheet.) Each table will have three transportation "Strip Sets" for the group to choose from as a starting point. Each set will contain different mixes of transportation improvements, ranging from a primarily roadway-based improvement set to a more transit and alternative transportation options focused strip set. In each case, the transportation improvements will be constrained to a pre-defined total

budget for improvements. As with the land use sets in the November workshops, to start the exercise, each group must choose a starter strip set. .

Using the various colored strips, each group will need to discuss and place on the base map their preferred transportation enhancements to connect the region. Each group will be allowed to trade strip types from within their set for a financially-equal amount of strips of a different improvement type (i.e., a group could trade a portion of arterial strip for more light rail if desired).

In addition, groups will be allowed to “buy” more transportation improvements if desired by indicating support of additional funding mechanisms. At each table there will be a list of 3-5 additional funding mechanism that the group can choose to support or reject based on their desires and/or their perceived need for additional improvement strips (for example, supporting a gas tax increase will buy and additional \$X of roadway improvement strips). If the group chooses to support one or more of the additional funding mechanisms, they will record this on their map and obtain a corresponding level of additional strips.

After completing placement of the “strip-types” on the map, each group will present their transportation and land use connections created on the base map.