



# Community Planning Association

---

## of Southwest Idaho

### Regional Technical Advisory Committee October 27, 2004 Community Planning Association

#### \*\*\*Minutes\*\*\*

- ATTENDEES:**
- Casey Bequeath, Canyon Highway District #4
  - Mary Berent, City of Middleton, **Co-Vice Chair – Canyon**
  - Jim Buffington, Nampa Highway District #1
  - Stewart Constantine, Golden Gate Highway District #3
  - Bruce Eggleston, City of Boise
  - Brant Jewett, Canyon County
  - Don Kostelec, ACHD, **Co-Chair – Ada**
  - Zane Lathim, Idaho Transportation Department-Dist. 3 (for Sue Sullivan)
  - Paul Raymond, City of Nampa, **Co-Chair – Canyon**
  - Steve Siddoway, City of Meridian
  - Michael D. Wilson, Ada County
- ABSENT:**
- John Anderson, Boise Air Terminal
  - Wendel Bigham, Meridian School District Transportation
  - Kevin Bittner, ValleyRide
  - Von Bowman, Notus-Parma Highway District #2
  - Dean Gunderson, Boise State University
  - Melodie Halstead, City of Kuna
  - Leonard Herr, Department of Environmental Quality
  - Gordon Law, City of Caldwell
  - Berrin Nejad, City of Garden City
  - Catherine Sanchez, ACHD Commuteride (*Ex Officio*)
  - Pam Sheldon, Capitol City Development Corporation
  - Nichoel Baird Spencer, City of Eagle, **Co-Vice Chair – Ada**
  - Dennis Stegenga, City of Star
  - Sarah Stobaugh, Boise Independent School District
  - Bill Vaughan, City of Eagle

## **OTHERS**

**ATTENDING:** Bruce Eggleston, Boise City Planning  
Patricia Nilsson, COMPASS  
Carla Olson, Ada County  
Linda Ritter, COMPASS  
Christina Ryan, Holladay Engineering  
Toni Tisdale, COMPASS  
Charles Trainor, COMPASS  
Mike Wardle, SunCor  
Debbie Winchar, COMPASS

## **CALL TO ORDER**

Chair Don Kostelec called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m.

Introductions were made of all attendees.

Don Kostelec congratulated Matt Stoll on his new appointment as COMPASS' Executive Director.

## **CONSENT AGENDA**

### **Approve September 29, 2004 Minutes**

**Mike Wilson moved and Casey Bequeath seconded to approve the September 29, 2004 minutes as written. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.**

## **ACTION ITEMS**

### **Recommend Adoption of Revision 1 to the FY2005 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget**

Matt Stoll stated that Revision 1 to the FY2005 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget comes before RTAC for technical merit review, whether it is going to enhance the program, benefit the agency and the member agencies with any proposed changes or, cause any problems associated therewith. The next step is to go to the Finance Committee, which is comprised of COMPASS Board members and Steve Purvis of Boise City, who provides services in an advisory role at the request of Mayor Bieter. The Finance Committee reviews the financial merits of what has been proposed to determine if it is a viable proposal within the budget constraints.

After going to RTAC and the Finance Committee, RTAC is requested to endorse the proposal for presentation to the COMPASS Board. The COMPASS Board determines whether RTAC, or the Finance Committee, has endorsed revisions to the FY2005 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget and will act accordingly.

Matt reviewed the list of proposed modifications to the FY2005 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget.

After further discussion, **Mike Wilson moved and Mary Berent seconded to recommend Adoption of Revision 1 to the FY2005 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget to the COMPASS Board.**

Don Kostelec suggested amending the motion to add the Committee's endorsement of Matt Stoll's goal to support on-going expenses (i.e., salaries, building lease, etc.) with Consolidated Planning Grant funds and membership dues in FY2006, thus allowing Surface Transportation Program-Urban funds to be used for specific COMPASS Board directed planning and implementation projects with start and end dates.

**Mike Wilson moved and Mary Berent seconded to amend the previous motion and recommend Adoption of Revision 1 to the FY2005 Unified Planning Work Program and Budget to the COMPASS Board and, to endorse Matt Stoll's goal to support on-going expenses (i.e., salaries, building lease, etc.) with Consolidated Planning Grant funds and membership dues in FY2006, thus allowing Surface Transportation Program-Urban funds to be used for specific COMPASS Board directed planning and implementation projects with start and end dates. There being no further discussion, the motion was unanimously approved.**

## **INFORMATION ITEMS**

### **Discussion Regarding *Communities in Motion***

Charles Trainor expressed the critical need for each Committee member, their staff, citizens and community leaders to be involved in the November scenario workshops. Members were urged to distribute and fill out the *Communities in Motion* (CIM) November Workshop Reply Cards. These workshops are going to be the fundament for not only CIM, but also *Blueprint for Good Growth*. The citizens will create the growth scenarios. Various analyses will be done on transportation, as well as *Blueprint for Good Growth's* analyses of impacts on schools and utilities in Ada County. A preferred scenario will be chosen next year. As was expressed to the COMPASS Board and various committees, it is not expected that a large number of general citizens will participate. The emphasis is on staff, stakeholders, elected officials, and planning and zoning commissioners. A guest editorial will be placed in the newspaper, together with half-page ads to inform the general public. The goal attendance is 50 or more per work session.

### **Discussion about Data Sharing Between Entities**

Ross Dodge stated that Geographic Information Systems (GIS) is a technology that is used by many, whether directly or indirectly. Many of the agencies' databases are tied somewhat to geographic information that can be mapped. The industry is changing dramatically as technology advances. It is becoming more centralized and moving to a geodatabase model, which will allow easier accessibility.

The CIM process has made evident the importance of data exchange. Agencies using different data sets and platforms create difficulties when exchanging information. The migration of this new technology has taken place over the past 5 or 6 years. Those working with GIS information want to facilitate the ease in which data is transferred. Ada County has a GIS group that meets and discusses issues regarding Ada County's GIS information. Recently, meetings have taken place with Brant Jewett and others from Canyon County.

Ross distributed and explained a map of Ada and Canyon Counties' Ortho Photography Coverage Area. Another common data layer that would be valuable for both counties is a

centerline file that could be used by multiple agencies. At this time, no one particular agency has fully invested into this geodatabase. Now is a good time to work together to come to a decision as to whether this is, or is not, needed.

Paul Raymond commented that Nampa has an excellent GIS system and will share data, but does not want to change to a regional issue at this time. The system contains all Canyon Counties addresses, which is continuously updated and kept current.

Ross explained that he was referring to migration to the geodatabase. Presently, GIS is a collection of different data sets that are shared. Nampa, as well as Ada County agencies, is in the process of developing the geodatabase. The geodatabase, however, has not yet been fully developed.

Charles Trainor stated some of the cities may start to have an interest in cross-county GIS information. The central organization Ross mentioned, is not taking over what people do, but rather moving towards coordinating and doing a better job of matching up with one another. The Idaho Transportation Department is beginning to look at moving into expanding and making use of GIS information from local governments.

Bruce Eggleston congratulated Ross for doing a good job and providing a lot of information for the City of Boise. The City of Boise has a state of the art GIS for the Ada County database and receives requests daily. Bruce suggested that COMPASS set up programs for planners to increase their knowledge and use of the GIS process.

*Item IV-D was moved up on the agenda because of its relation to the discussion on GIS data.*

#### **Update on Preliminary Plat Information**

Nicole Prehoda stated that a year ago COMPASS staff began to compile and update preliminary plat information. In Ada County, the Ada County Assessor's office produces a GIS based data set, but in the past it had not been updated regularly. The focus the first half of the year was making sure that all the current plats were on the database and all the old plats were removed. The next thing to focus on is to make sure that the buildable lot information is accurate since that data has not been verified for a long time. COMPASS staff will be working with city and county planning staff to update preliminary plat data every two months.

On the Canyon County side, Canyon County Development Services shared their GIS file that includes preliminary plats in the unincorporated areas of Canyon County. COMPASS staff prioritized first getting preliminary plat information within the two corridor study areas in Canyon County and adding that data to the GIS file. The next step is to meet with city and county planning staff and get information for Nampa and the rest of Caldwell. Much of this information is in paper files and will be difficult to obtain.

Nicole reviewed maps of preliminary plats for Ada and Canyon Counties. All data is in shape files and is available to any member upon request. She stated the preliminary plat coverage is a work-in-progress and that maps and charts shown are not complete at this point. Nicole emphasized that when finished, this data can be a valuable tool to use in planning efforts. She thanked the planning staff both for all the help she has already received and will need in the future to complete and maintain the data.

Charles Trainor stated that COMPASS' interest regarding the preliminary plat information is being driven in part by Ada County Highway District's need to consider that information in area traffic evaluations. An area that has a legal right to develop will have a significant impact on transportation in the near term even though the land may currently look vacant.

Nicole commented that every year COMPASS produces a Development Monitoring Report. Building permit information is obtained from every city and county for each month. A mid-year Development Monitoring report is published the first six months of the year and then a full year's report is published. This is another data set that is used to track recent development.

Charles added that for the past couple of years, the report has not include platted parcels and that adding that information to the report again, along with the preliminary plat data, could provide a more complete picture of current development activity.

### **Discussion about Functional Classification Guidelines**

Toni Tisdale stated that COMPASS staff would like to update the functional classification system because currently, there is no way to go back in time to see why a project was added and who was involved in making changes; more information is needed. COMPASS staff proposes to develop a region-wide Functional Classification Guidebook. There may be differences between Ada County's concepts versus the concepts of Canyon County, which can be addressed during this guide plan (such as a range of right-of-ways for different types of roads). A database will be created to list every functional classification road in both counties. This database would eventually track changes made, who made the changes and for what reason. Once the database is established, a form would be created for the requesting agency to complete recommending a change, addition or deletion of a road. Toni added that this Functional Classification Guidebook is to be a regional involvement effort.

Don Kostelec commented that the Ada County Highway District Commission had a work session in June 2003. The present system identifying functional classification of roadways is antiquated. You cannot define a roadway as a local/collector/arterial and expect to cover the full range of types of streets of this region. There are also flaws in the policies where things that should overlap do not overlap and, things that do not overlap perhaps should. These issues are being looked at from a policy and regulation standpoint. With COMPASS' future assessment of the entire system of both counties, it is hoped that there will be a more comprehensive process in place using the model, current traffic counts and other data at our disposal, including the land use data. There needs to be a set process in place.

Toni stated *Destination 2030: Limited Plan Update*, as well as *Communities in Motion*, look only at the regionally significant projects in the Plan, not collectors, and therefore collectors will perhaps not be added to the planning maps. However, collectors would have to be on the federal map because they require federal funding. Not listing out all the projects creates more flexibility.

Don added that the goal of Ada County is to work with the cities to get the definitions to where they are consistent, with a common understanding. There may be three distinct types of roadways that under a federal definition for this short-term Federal Functional Classification map can be defined as a collector. The Guidebook will clarify that Ada County has certain standards and analysis shows that the locals are locals, the arterials are arterials, but there are different levels of roadways that fit collectors. Therefore, because a segmented system is a federal requirement, those roads will be classified as collectors. Canyon County may have a different

view. When Toni updates the map, the Guidebook will make the process much easier than has been done in the past.

Charles commented that it may also help the public understand some of the issues in the designation system.

### **Planned Community Review Policy**

Charles Trainor stated that, at the request of the COMPASS Board, RTAC reviewed the draft Planned Community Review Policy at the September 29 meeting. RTAC created a workgroup to handle the review. This workgroup met on October 14. Carla Olson of Ada County Development Services had submitted a memo stating Ada County was considering an ordinance change to reflect a post-application certification by COMPASS versus a pre-application. RTAC concurred with this change, which eliminates the need for an early application of information. The workgroup did not see a need for changes in the draft policy barring elimination of the pre-application information requirements.

Charles reviewed the conclusions coming out of the workgroup's discussion. He noted this policy has restricted a specific type of development within Ada County. Charles stated that future direction will be sought from RTAC to determine when other types of development should be reviewed by COMPASS. He noted that there should be some size threshold to qualify and this should be discussed by RTAC.

Mike Wilson clarified that the zoning ordinance for a planning community requires a determination by COMPASS, which is the only agency from which a certification is required as part of the application process. The applicant is required to obtain comments from other agencies, districts or service providers, detailing what impacts that planned community will have on existing services as well as identifying costs of providing new services within that planned community. Once the application is deemed complete, and formally accepted by Ada County, the application will be transmitted to other agencies for further review.

Mike added that Ada County is looking at amending the ordinance to require determination from COMPASS after the application has been accepted and possibly extending or removing the 120-day review period so there is additional time for Ada County to prepare a recommendation for the planning and zoning commission.

Don Kostelec agreed with the decision resting with the COMPASS Board and going through RTAC, and did not concur with the Ada County staff opinion that it should be at staff level. Given the infrequent occurrence of planned communities and the requirement for a formal certification, he agreed that Board approval is appropriate.

The biggest issue noted was phasing of planned communities and only requiring a certification of each phase instead of the complete project. RTAC members concurred that the COMPASS Board recommendation should address this issue.

Steve Siddoway commented that if the nature of the application is changed, definition is needed at the point it becomes null and void. What is the threshold? The certification is only based on whatever is submitted. If there are future phases that we do not know about while doing the

certification process, it needs to be clear that certifying phase I does not necessarily entitle phase II. It is a new application of its own and has to stand on its own merits.

Steve continued that COMPASS should not be reviewing every small application, but concurred with the tracking cumulative impacts of developments.

Don thought the 120-day period was more than adequate. He said the policy should address the issue of a planned community application coming in during an update process versus between updates.

Don suggested that a draft policy be distributed to the Committee prior to the mailing of RTAC's next meeting packet.

## **OPEN DISCUSSION**

### **Discussion Regarding Meetings for November and December**

It was the consensus of the Committee to schedule next meeting on December 1, 2004, 9:00 a.m., at COMPASS.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 11:05.

T:\FY05\800Maintenance\820 Committee Support\RTAC\Minutes\minutes102704.doc