



DEMOGRAPHIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE

April 13, 2006 – 8:30 a.m. to 10:30 a.m.

Community Planning Association

800 S. Industry Way, Suite 100

Meridian, ID

Notice: This packet contains only the documents listed with an asterisk (*) in the agenda. The entire packet, including all attachments is available at <http://compassidaho.org/committees/dac/agenda041306.pdf>. The online document requires Adobe Acrobat to read it; COMPASS' homepage <http://www.compassidaho.org> contains a free download link if you need a copy. The online document includes bookmarks at the left of the screen that are named to correspond to agenda items that have attachments. Clicking on a bookmark will take you directly to the named document.

****AGENDA****

I. AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES

8:30

II. OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS

8:40

III. CONSENT AGENDA

8:45 *A. Approve January 26, 2006 Minutes

IV. ACTION ITEMS

8:55 None

V. INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS

9:00 *A. Review scope for the Annual Monitoring Report Charles Trainor

9:15 *B. Population Estimate Issues Charles Trainor

9:30 *C. 2005 Development Monitoring Report Nicole Prehoda

9:45 *D. Research Project – Who is Buying Homes and Why Charles Trainor

10:15 E. New Demographer/Economist Position Charles Trainor

VI. OTHER

10:25

VII. ADJOURNMENT

10:30

*Enclosures

Times are approximate. Agenda is subject to change.

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

T:\FY06\800 Maintenance\820 Committee Support\DAC\Agendas\agenda041306.doc

*DEMOGRAPHIC ADVISORY COMMITTEE**January 26, 2006**Community Planning Association****MINUTES***

- ATTENDEES:*
- Mary Berent, City of Middleton
 - Bruce Eggleston, City of Boise
 - Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit
 - Pete Friedman, Ada County Development Services
 - Norm Holm, City of Nampa
 - Gary Inselman, Ada County Highway District
 - Giano Paolo Mammone, City of Caldwell
 - Susan Mason, Boise State University
 - Larry Rincover, Public Participation Committee
 - Diana Sanders, City of Kuna
 - David "Kip" Sikes, Idaho Power
 - Nichoel Baird Spencer, City of Eagle, *Chair*
 - Dennis Stegenga, City of Star
 - Mike Wardle, SunCor Development
- MEMBERS ABSENT:*
- Anna Canning, City of Meridian
 - Bonnie Ford-Le Compte, Canyon County Development Services
 - Jorge Garcia, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
 - James Grunke, Boise Metro Chamber of Commerce
 - Rick Sweaney, Canyon Development/Real Estate
 - Gary Vezzoso, Canyon County Chamber of Commerce
- OTHERS PRESENT:*
- Nicole Prehoda, COMPASS
 - Charles Trainor, COMPASS
 - Debbie Winchar, COMPASS
- CALL TO ORDER:*
- Chair Nichoel Baird Spencer called the meeting to order at 8:40 a.m.
- Introductions were made of all attendees.
- AGENDA ADDITIONS/CHANGES*
- Since a quorum was not present, the Chair moved to Information Item V-A.
- OPEN DISCUSSION/ANNOUNCEMENTS*
- None
- INFORMATION/DISCUSSION ITEMS*
- Development Monitoring Report Update/Refinements under **Communities in Motion***
- Charles Trainor stated that Nicole Prehoda has been the main staff person within the last couple of years to prepare and update the Monitoring Report. The Monitoring Report may go through a transformation this year to tie measurements to goals under *Communities in Motion*. The intent is to issue the first Monitoring Report in August 2006. This would allow the Report to be used in the consideration of project requests for the 2008 Transportation Improvement Program cycle.

800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

Charles Trainor reviewed the potential content of a Monitoring Report.

Kelli Fairless suggested including factors that would indicate that the pedestrian network is getting closer to the transit. Pedestrian access is very important.

Charles Trainor stated the question being posed is how do we tie to implementation? Part of our job is to say that community ordinances and plans should be supporting certain types of outcomes and then go back to the Board, showing them which communities have compatible ordinances and plans as well as what is being improved and implemented.

Kip Sikes asked if there are any leading indicators that should be included. Better tracking of new growth by type is needed. Charles replied that this type of input would be appreciated. This potential content is not intended to be a final list. It is Matt Stoll's desire to have a final bluish implementing the Monitoring Report by August 2006. The DAC is directed to review the content presented and send any further suggestions to Charles within the next few weeks together with the data source and an explanation on how it ties with transportation.

Bruce Eggleston stated the City of Boise would be a strong supporter in tracking data. For the past five years a lot of this same kind of data has been tracked for the City of Boise. The Ada County Assessor's office has been very generous with providing information regarding neighborhood owner-occupancy. Conclusions are being drawn from this type of data. A creditable key piece of data that would be of value is the free and reduced lunch program in the schools which is a key economic indicator of low to moderate income neighborhoods. This information could be tracked on a monthly basis. Another is tracking the value of properties. One of the most important conclusions to draw from this data collection is the cost of municipal services within the community (i.e., how many dollars are going per household or land use type from the budgets of the various municipalities and counties).

Pete Friedman commented that the Post Office in some communities can provide a vacancy rate analysis.

Charles Trainor stated this is a work in progress and a solid version is needed within the next six weeks. The DAC could go to a 2 to 4 meeting cycle a year with the next meeting to be scheduled in April. This would allow time through the summer to work on the content of the Monitoring Report. Nicole Prehoda will contact individual agencies to obtain additional help on identifying data sources. Charles stated that he has to issue a population estimate which goes to the COMPASS Board in March. Census material information will be used and this information can be emailed to the DAC for review and comment in early February. Kip Sikes stated he would follow up on the statistical data.

Quorum now present, the Chair moved to the Action Items.

CONSENT AGENDA

Approve June 9, 2005 Minutes

Mike Wardle moved and Dennis Stegenga seconded to approve the June 9, 2006 minutes as written. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

ACTION ITEMS

Review and Approval of the Proposed Revision to the DAC Bylaws

Charles Trainor stated that the COMPASS Board approved the DAC Bylaws at their January 23 meeting. There is a need to get more standardization when structuring the standing committees. The Regional Technical Advisory Committee membership corresponds to the COMPASS Board membership. In the past, the DAC has had a large number of non-member agencies as voting members.

After discussion, the following suggestions were made to the DAC Bylaws:

- Article III, Composition, 3.b – change Ada County to **Canyon County**
- Article III, Composition, 4 – amend to read, "...appoint one of its members to sit on **DAC**"

Dennis Stegenga moved and Pete Friedman seconded to recommend approval of the DAC Bylaws as corrected. There being no further discussion, the motion carries with one opposition from Mike Wardle.

Interim Years Demographic Forecast

After discussion, Larry Rincover moved and Sue Mason seconded to recommend for approval the Interim Years Demographic Forecast. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.

Information/Discussion Items

Review of Population Center Analysis

Charles Trainor stated that the analysis of the current and 2000 population center for Ada and Canyon Counties was developed (partially) to an inquiry from the Idaho Statesman. The utility of measuring the population center is to travel the effect of cumulative development on travel. The analysis describes the approach used and is more exact than previous efforts that relied on traffic analysis zones. The DAC is requested to review and comment on the analysis. It is possible that the analysis could be incorporated into an annual monitoring report.

Kip Sikes stated that this is a good public information tool.

Future Forecasting Options

Charles Trainor reviewed possible approaches to future forecasts. DAC approval of the Improved Forecasting outline is not being sought at this time. The DAC is requested to review the future forecasting options and forward any thoughts, comments, or suggestions to Charles.

Other

Next meeting is scheduled for Thursday, April 13, 2006, 8:30 a.m., COMPASS.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further discussion, the meeting adjourned at 10:30 a.m.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Demographic Advisory Committee

FROM: Charles Trainor, Director of Planning

DATE: April 6, 2006

RE: *Review Scope for the Annual Monitoring Report*

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review factors for a Monitoring Report.

BACKGROUND:

This item was initially brought to DAC in January. The Monitoring Report is intended to report on key indicators tied to goals and objectives in the regional transportation plan being developed under *Communities in Motion*. It would evolve from the current Development Monitoring Report, also on the agenda for the DAC meeting. In most cases, the measurements would be tracked across a period of time to allow the reader to see if change is occurring. Where quantitative goals or objectives have been established, these would be included.

Communities in Motion is scheduled for adoption in July 2006. The intent is to issue the first Monitoring Report in August 2006. This would allow it to be used in the consideration of project requests for the 2008 Transportation Improvement Program cycle.

STATUS:

DAC members were asked to review and comment on the outline at the January meeting. No comments were received, but the intent is the Monitoring Report will also be in a evolutionary mode. Changes are shown in red.

New items or refinements could be added as necessary as long the items are tied to goals under *Communities in Motion*. The product is intended to help elected officials, staff and others see where progress is being made and where it is lagging; then the intent is to use this information in decisions on transportation investments, future land use forecasts, and establishment of planning activities.

Attachment (1)

pc: File 620 – Development Monitoring
 CT: T:\FY06\600 Projects\620 Growth Trans. System Monitoring\performance monitoring\dac-monitormemo-april2006.doc

Potential Content of a Monitoring Report

The Monitoring Report is intended to report on key indicators tied to goals and objectives in the regional transportation plan being developed under *Communities in Motion*. It would evolve from the current Development Monitoring Report, which is a simple accounting of new construction and subdivision activity compiled by corporate limits of each city, non-city area and by demographic area. The intent of a broader Monitoring Report is to tie measurements to goals under *Communities in Motion*. In most cases, the measurements would be tracked across a period of time to allow the reader to see if change is occurring. Where quantitative goals or objectives have been established, these would be included.

1. Growth related – (Are the general growth forecasts in line with the actual pace of growth?)
 - a. Current and historic population estimates reported by city and county jurisdiction and by area of impact.
 - b. Current and historic employment estimates reported by city and county jurisdiction and by area of impact.
 - c. Comparisons of each with forecast used in *Communities in Motion*
2. Land use related – (Is growth occurring in the same places and at the same densities as depicted under the Community Choices scenario?)
 - a. Acres consumed by residential and non-residential growth
 - b. Acres of farmland consumed by residential and non-residential growth
 - c. Amount and percentage of residential and non-residential growth within areas of impact
 - d. Amount and percentage of residential and non-residential growth within activity centers along fixed-guideway or premium transit corridors
 - e. Amount and percentage of residential growth within ¼ and ½ mile of one or more of the following:
 - i. Supermarkets
 - ii. Employment sites with at least 1,000 jobs
 - iii. Parks
 - iv. Elementary schools
 - f. Amount of residential and non-residential growth and existing residential and non-residential uses within ½ of existing transit routes. Percentage of total residential and non-residential growth and existing.
 - g. Residential densities for new development. (Measure lot densities for single-family subdivisions)
 - h. Percentage of all residential development at transit supportive densities (8+ dwelling units per acre gross)
 - i. Number and location of preliminary plats.
 - j. Residential lot supply (approved, undeveloped subdivided lots)
3. Travel demand related
 - a. Increase in travel time
 - b. Increase in traffic and delay on key corridors (taken from annual Congestion Management Report).
 - c. Percentage of major roadway system exceeding capacity
 - d. Transit ridership, ridership per capita, percentage of trips

- e. Vanpool/carpool ridership, percentage of trips
 - f. Bicycle/pedestrian activity (needs practical method for estimating)
 - g. Peak hour factors on key roadways
4. Travel supply related
- a. Transit service in terms of population
 - i. Per capita expenses/hours of service
 - ii. Total hours of service
 - iii. Number of buses in service
 - iv. Vanpools in service
 - v. Number, location and size of park-and-ride lots
 - b. Roadway
 - i. Centerline miles of 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 lane roads
 - ii. Miles of arterial roadways by number of access points per mile
 - iii. Should there be some monitoring of landscaping or other features?
 - iv. Miles of roadway by pavement sufficiency condition by jurisdiction.
 - v. Number of bridges by bridge rating by jurisdiction.
 - c. Pathways
 - i. Percentage of roadways with no sidewalks, sidewalk one side, sidewalk both sides
 - ii. Miles of off-road pathways (exclude pathways for sole recreation use)
 - iii. Miles of roads with bike lanes
 - iv. Miles of roads designated as bike routes
5. Other
- a. Plans and ordinances
 - i. Track communities' actions on key plan components and ordinances supportive of alternative transportation, access management, or other policies related to transportation goals.
 - ii. Track changes in city jurisdictional boundaries and area of impact.
 - b. Financial
 - i. Amounts and percentage of transportation total expenditures by transportation mode – roadways, transit, walking, biking, carpool/vanpool
 - ii. Amount and percentage of expenditures for maintenance and safety categories.
 - iii. Changes in revenues available for transportation
 - iv. Activities related to seeking new/expanded revenue sources
 - v. Fuel prices (high-low during prior year)
 - vi. Parking pricing by area (where applicable)
 - c. Miscellaneous
 - i. Owner-occupied and renter-occupied by jurisdiction (source would be Assessor file information)
 - ii. New housing pricing compared to median income.



MEMORANDUM

TO: Demographic Advisory Committee

FROM: Charles Trainor, Director of Planning

DATE: April 5, 2006

RE: *Population Estimate Issues*

ACTION REQUESTED:

Review population estimates for April 1, 2006. Discuss issues related to preparing estimates.

BACKGROUND:

COMPASS prepares annual population estimates by starting with the 2000 Census figures for each city and the unincorporated area in each county. Then staff adds the annual residential building permits for each city and for the unincorporated area. These are broken out by single family, multi-family, and mobile home/manufactured categories. These permits are factored by vacancy rates and household sizes from the 2000 Census custom for each jurisdiction and for each housing type.

COMPASS also aggregates 2000 Census block population data by the current jurisdiction boundaries to account for annexations of unincorporated areas since 1999. The population estimates are made for an April 1 date, assuming that permits issued through December 31 of the prior year are completed.

No provision is made for uncompleted permits: the Census uses a 2% incompleteness nationally. Nor does COMPASS update the household size or vacancy information, primarily because there are no reliable data upon which to update these factors.

The Census releases its annual estimates for a July 1 date of the prior year. Generally county-level estimates come out by February with city level issued later.

STATUS:

The most recent estimates are attached. Note the differences in our county-level estimates compared to the Census.

	COMPASS April 1 2006	Census July 1, 2005	Difference
Ada	383,314	344,727	-38,587
Canyon	175,781	164,593	-11,188

The nine-month difference is not enough to explain the difference. Note that over 30,000 residential permits have been issued just in Ada County. But the Census only shows a population increase through July 1, 2005 of 43,000.

COMPASS' estimates, which are used for its member dues calculations, may be on the high side. But I believe the Census' estimates are too low.

Attachments (2)

Pc: File 626.01 and .02 – Population Estimates

CT: T:\FY06\600 Projects\626 Population Estimate Development\dac-memo-apr2006.doc

2006 Population Estimates

<i>City and County Population Estimate for April 1, 2006</i>						
<i>Areas Refer to Corporate Limits of Cities as of 3/1/2006</i>						
					<i>Share of Region</i>	
	<i>2000 Population *</i>	<i>Increase</i>	<i>Population as of April 1, 2006</i>	<i>Percent of County</i>	<i>2000</i>	<i>2005</i>
<i>Ada</i>						
<i>Boise City</i>	194,753	16,720	211,473	55.2%	45.0%	37.8%
<i>Eagle</i>	12,571	7,560	20,131	5.3%	2.9%	3.6%
<i>Garden City</i>	10,624	1,450	12,074	3.1%	2.5%	2.2%
<i>Kuna</i>	6,227	6,420	12,647	3.3%	1.4%	2.3%
<i>Meridian</i>	37,405	29,160	66,565	17.4%	8.7%	11.9%
<i>Star</i>	1,994	2,600	4,594	1.2%	0.5%	0.8%
<i>Unincorporated</i>	37,330	18,500	55,830	14.6%	8.6%	10.0%
<i>Total County</i>	<i>300,904</i>	<i>82,410</i>	<i>383,314</i>		<i>70%</i>	<i>69%</i>
<i>Canyon</i>						
<i>Caldwell</i>	27,118	10,910	38,028	21.6%	6.3%	6.8%
<i>Greenleaf **</i>	862	50	912	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%
<i>Melba</i>	461	100	561	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Middleton</i>	3,015	1,560	4,575	2.6%	0.7%	0.8%
<i>Nampa</i>	53,766	22,670	76,436	43.5%	12.4%	13.7%
<i>Notus</i>	458	100	558	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%
<i>Parma</i>	1,771	150	1,921	1.1%	0.4%	0.3%
<i>Wilder</i>	1,462	120	1,582	0.9%	0.3%	0.3%
<i>Unincorporated</i>	42,528	8,680	51,208	29.1%	9.8%	9.2%
<i>Total County</i>	<i>131,441</i>	<i>44,340</i>	<i>175,781</i>		<i>30%</i>	<i>31%</i>
<i>Both Counties</i>	<i>432,345</i>	<i>126,750</i>	<i>559,095</i>			
* Based on 2006 city limit boundaries.						
** No permit data for Greenleaf was received during 2002-2003.						

<i>Canyon Highway District Unincorporated Population Estimate for April 1, 2006</i>			
	<i>2000 Census</i>	<i>Increase Since 2000</i>	<i>Population as of April 1, 2006</i>
<i>Canyon #4</i>	14,478	3,770	18,248
<i>Golden Gate</i>	4,659	794	5,453
<i>Nampa</i>	18,151	3,364	21,515
<i>Notus Parma</i>	5,240	752	5,992
<i>Unincorporated Total</i>	<i>42,528</i>	<i>8,680</i>	<i>51,208</i>

Residential Units: 2000-2005

	<i>Total Units Added</i>	<i>Percent of Units</i>	<i>Total Units in 2005</i>	<i>Percent of Units</i>
Boise	7,440	15.8%	1,184	10.7%
Eagle	2,516	5.4%	530	4.8%
Garden City	642	1.4%	70	0.6%
Kuna	2,099	4.5%	563	5.1%
Meridian	10,276	21.9%	3,314	30.0%
Star	958	2.0%	548	5.0%
Unincorporated	6,494	13.8%	1,617	14.6%
Ada Total	30,425	64.8%	7,826	70.9%
Caldwell	4,148	8.8%	999	9.0%
Greenleaf	17	0.0%	3	0.0%
Melba	38	0.1%	3	0.0%
Middleton	563	1.2%	137	1.2%
Nampa	8,607	18.3%	1,384	12.5%
Notus	37	0.1%	8	0.1%
Parma	53	0.1%	11	0.1%
Wilder	33	0.1%	20	0.2%
Unincorporated	3,061	6.5%	648	5.9%
Canyon Total	16,557	35.2%	3,213	29.1%
Both Counties	46,982		11,039	

MEMORANDUM

TO: Demographic Advisory Committee

FROM: Nicole Prehoda, Assistant Planner

DATE: April 5, 2006

RE: 2005 Development Monitoring Report

ACTION REQUESTED: None. Information only.

BACKGROUND:

COMPASS collects building permit information from all the city and county jurisdictions in the Treasure Valley. This information is compiled into an annual "Development Monitoring Report." The report also includes information on preliminary and final plats. Together, this data gives a good sense of the location and amount of building activity in the area.

Building permits are tabulated at several levels of geography, including city limits, area of impact, demographic area and traffic analysis zone. In addition, permits are geocoded and data is in a shapefile format, enabling staff to do more detailed analysis of specific geographical areas when needed.

Tables in the report show both residential and non-residential permits. Residential units are the most commonly used data. The report shows units broken down by single family, multi-family and mobile or manufactured homes. Residential addition or remodel permits are thrown out. Non-residential permits are shown by whether they are new construction permits or additions and changes in use. Non-residential permits are further broken down into commercial, industrial and public/quasi public permits. Tenant improvement permits are only kept when they show a clear change of land use affecting traffic. Total permit value and square footage are also shown where available.

STATUS:

The 2005 Development Monitoring Report is available on the COMPASS website at <http://www.compassidaho.org/reports/dmr/2005dmrfinal.pdf>

The data tables and maps in the report reflect the most commonly asked-for information. Custom data analysis is available per the request of member agencies.



800 S. Industry Way, Ste 100

Meridian, ID 83642

P. 208.855.2558

F. 208.855.2559

www.compassidaho.org

np:T:\FY06\600 Projects\620 Growth Trans. System Monitoring\dac05dmrmemo.doc



MEMORANDUM

TO: Demographic Advisory Committee
FROM: Charles Trainor, Director of Planning
DATE: April 6, 2006
RE: *Research Project – Who is Buying Homes and Why*

ACTION REQUESTED:

This item is for information only.

BACKGROUND:

Historically, COMPASS has relied upon forecasts prepared by John Church, Idaho Economics, to establish a control total by each county. Allocations within a county would attempt to match each city's planned growth, but the reality is that the collective vision of growth always exceeds the control total. In part this is due to local use of trend information. If Community X has experienced a 6.5% annual growth rate over the past five years, its plan would use this rate to establish its 20-year population. This would yield a 250% increase in population. (Communities in Motion is using a 2.2% regional growth rate.)

Growth rates have been remarkable since 2000, with many communities posting record levels of permits and subdivisions. Job growth, which fell dramatically starting in late 2001, has rebounded; but the wage growth has not kept pace. A recent article put this area in the top third for rate of job growth, but in the bottom third for wage growth. Other articles have pointed out the role of speculation in the market, with anecdotal reports of half the loans being process to out-of-state buyers. So the question is "What is driving the growth in the region?" And a follow-up would be "Is this rate sustainable?"

STATUS:

COMPASS is proposing a project to develop more factual information on who is buying homes. The project will research and report on factors that are driving regional residential growth. It will address the percentage of homes sold to speculators, homes owned by non-tenants, location of owners of non-owner occupied units, and reasons for choice of home location. In the case of persons moving into the region, the research will address the reason for moving here. The information obtained will provide insight into long-term growth sustainability, implications on housing affordability, changes in travel demand, and possible demand on other services.

This would be obtained by conducting a random survey of recent (less than 5 years) home buyers. We would need to obtain listings of these, perhaps from the county assessors. Much of the work would be done via a consultant.

The information will help assess the durability of the current pace of development and provide valuable information for preparing the next forecast.

Pc: File 620.01 and .02 Monitoring Report
CT: T:\FY06\600 Projects\620 Growth Trans. System Monitoring\dac-mmo-growthdrivers.doc