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Abstract

This study is assesses the feasibility for multiple economic development scenarios on Peckham Road, located in Canyon County, Idaho. It includes a cost/benefit analysis of infrastructure and traffic circulation of a developed Peckham Road, as well as examines the relationship between job training centers and economic development, including the feasibility of constructing a job training center within the Peckham Corridor. It also assesses local and regional industry growth trends, current and future land uses of the corridor, general and specific rural economic development strategies, business development incentives, and community input. As part of this process, a local business and industry survey was conducted, in order to identify to expansion/relocation, workforce training and infrastructural needs of existing industries. A Peckham Road property owner survey was also conducted in order to gauge the intentions of property owners either working or living within the corridor, in terms of their willingness to diversify job creation opportunities and/or preserve agriculture. Local and regional economic data were also used, in the interest of assessing the viability of the corridor to produce jobs and stimulate economic growth with the construction of an industry-driven vocational-technical job training facility.

Executive Summary

The Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf have both experienced severe economic distress in recent decades due to the lack of local, diversified economies and subsequent out-migration of its educated population due to the lack of jobs in the area. Insufficient water and wastewater facilities in both cities have limited their ability to attract and retain investment. The lack of high-skilled jobs available in the region means that many of the area’s trained citizens move outside of the area or commute to work in the urban centers of the Treasure Valley. Peckham Road, is a four mile corridor connecting the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf, targeted for economic development by the communities on either end because of its central location parallel to existing infrastructure. Peckham Road also has a number of other infrastructural assets that are fundamental to development, which include a rail spur, high-pressure gas line, telephone, electricity, fiber-optics and cable. The corridor does not, however, have access to central water and wastewater infrastructure, except within the city limits of Wilder. The community of Greenleaf on the east terminus has recently upgraded the water delivery system and is in the process of designing a wastewater treatment plant to accommodate future development.

The Canyon County Owyhee School Service Agency (COSSA) is a public high school consortium providing industry-certified vocational-technical training to the school districts of Parma, Marsing, Notus, Wilder and Homedale. The professional-technical education COSSA
The Peckham Road Economic Development Feasibility Study provides to both high school and at-risk students focuses on the following areas of expertise designed by an industry-driver board of directors: health professions, medical records, industrial welding, diesel technology, automotive technology, building trades, and business technology. At the onset of the Peckham Road study, COSSA was in discussions with the Wilder School District about a land donation to build a centralized job-training facility on the west end of Peckham Road, which was expected to promote the creation of jobs within the corridor to encourage co-location of industries associated with its seven areas of expertise.

Two key components of this study, The Peckham Road Infrastructure Study and The Western Canyon County Circulation Plan, were conducted by T-O Engineering, and COMPASS, respectively. (Note: COMPASS is the metropolitan transportation planning agency for Ada and Canyon counties.) Prior to this, Sage Community Resources created five different “development scenario” maps that reflected either the current or proposed zoning of Wilder and Greenleaf within the Peckham Corridor. Different densities and industry mixes were used to offer both a visual representation of possible future development patterns, as well as to provide a template for cost-benefit comparisons for the infrastructure and transportation circulation studies.

Other study components included an analysis of the relationship between job training centers and economic development, an assessment of local and regional industry growth trends, the current and future land uses of the corridor, general and specific rural economic development strategies, business development incentives, and community/property owner input. As part of this process, a local business and industry survey was conducted, in order to identify to expansion/relocation, workforce training, and infrastructural needs of existing industries. A Peckham Road property owner survey was also conducted, in order to gauge the intentions of property owners either working or living within the corridor, in terms of their willingness to diversify job creation opportunities and/or preserve agriculture, which is currently the dominant industry along Peckham Road. Local and regional economic data were also used, in the interest of assessing the viability of the corridor to produce jobs and stimulate economic growth, while anchored by a vocation-technical job training facility. The following summarizes the primary findings of the study:

**Work-force Training Findings:** COSSA’s ability to serve as an anchor for economic development within the Peckham Corridor is underway. COSSA students average a 96% job placement rate upon graduation, while each of the industries within their areas of expertise is expected to supply steady employment in the coming decades. Financing for new school construction within the Peckham Corridor came together from multiple sources, including a $2.5 million grant from EDA stimulus funds, a local industry donation of nearly $500,000 worth of steel, as well as $2 million in either a bond or levy passed by the five member school districts. Ground was broken in November of 2009, with the new, 56,000 square foot facility expected to open in the fall of 2010. The new COSSA Regional Technology Center will double the square footage of the facilities where it currently operates, which will enable them to expand existing programs (specifically their engineering department, which will add both a renewable energy and waste water treatment curriculum), and double the number of trained, industry-ready graduates in the region from 50 to 100 annually, not including the 300 adult students per year that will be trained in COSSA’s evening programs.
Demographic Findings: In the last decade, Canyon County’s population has risen by nearly 53%, over double Idaho’s growth rate of nearly 22% during the same period, making it the second most populated county in the State next to Ada. Both County and city demographic data indicate that per capita incomes are lower, while minority populations and poverty levels are higher than both State and National Averages.

Infrastructural Analysis Findings: Along Peckham Road, there is ample room to fully utilize the rail, the high pressured gas line, telephone, fiber-optic and cable utilities, with nominal costs to the developer. Electricity would require some upgrades, but there are cost/share/reimbursable options available to the customer. The most limiting infrastructural constraint continues to be water/wastewater services either within Greenleaf and along the corridor; however, Greenleaf is moving forward with both plant design and financing options, Peckham Road runs down grade from Wilder to Greenleaf, making it feasible for Wilder to connect to the future plant in Greenleaf, which would make open to developers water/waste water distribution lines along Peckham Road.

Traffic Circulation Findings: If Peckham Road were built out to the densities the scenario maps suggest, substantial road improvements would be needed along all of the roadways in the Peckham Corridor as well as all of the highways and many of the collectors within the regional transportation network, costing hundreds of millions of dollars. However, road improvements just to the Peckham Corridor, not including regional networks, are substantially less expensive but still high, costing around $48,000,000. In addition to the cost of roadway expansion, the purchase of rights of way from private property would be required especially along Peckham Road, since all of the scenarios call for three lanes on Peckham.

Canyon County Economy Findings: Between December of 2007 and June of 2009 the Boise/Nampa MSA, where Wilder and Greenleaf are located, lost approximately 4261 jobs. The unemployment rate almost tripled in Canyon County between 2007 and 2009, rising from a low of 3.5% in December of 2007 to 12% as of November, 2009. Canyon County has a strong agricultural and manufacturing base in terms of County sales, despite the recent high-tech layoffs and closure of MPC in Nampa. Transportation and Logistics, and Education and Healthcare are also strong industries in the County, in terms of overall employment.

Business Assessment Findings: There are a number of attractive attributes available in the Treasure Valley, including a historically robust economy, skilled labor pool and high quality of life that encourage businesses to expand, stay, or relocate here. Treasure Valley businesses surveyed have benefited from the strong regional economy in the last two decades, and, at least prior to the economic downturn, expect continued economic growth in the region. Of the Peckham Road regional businesses surveyed, over half cited plans for expansion of both their facilities and their workforce training, while Peckham Road employers interviewed, most of whom were light industrial or ag-related, cited that both good employees and low overhead were two critical factors that enable their success.

Industry Projection Findings: COSSA trains its students in industries that are slated to both grow and decline in the Treasure Valley in the next six years, according to the Idaho Department of Labor. Of the industries that are projected to decline, the building trades/
construction sector is the one that shows the least promise in terms of prospective economic growth. In terms of employment, and out of all of COSSA’s areas of expertise, the Health Care sector shows the most promise in terms of total future jobs available. Nationally, however, all of the industries within COSSA’s areas of expertise are either expected to maintain steady employment rates or experience worker shortages in the coming decades, signifying that COSSA students should not have trouble finding employment.

Idaho Business Incentive Findings: Nationwide, Idaho ranked fourth in terms of the best state for business in 2008, fifth in terms of the lowest cost of doing business in 2007, and tenth in terms of best labor pool in 2007. Additionally, the State of Idaho offers a number of business incentives that make it attractive for business to expand or relocate here. However, due to the limited opportunities that exist for municipal and county governments Idaho to raise revenue, self-tax, and/or incentivize business development, every legal option available to these entities should be fully explored.

Rural Economic Development Strategy Findings: Of the broad range of rural development components that have led to successful strategies across the country, the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf are either already engaging in, or are in the process of engaging in, all of the principles necessary for successful implementation, including investments into skilled workforce, effective linkages to metropolitan regions, and grass roots planning processes, to name a few.

Peckham Property Owner and Community Input Findings: While not opposed to job creation, protecting farmland, existing views, and a rural way of life appear to be important to Peckham Road Property owners and community members. Both the Mayors of Wilder and Greenleaf are in agreement, and recognize that growing from the cities outward might be the best way of achieving this. And while zoning is not often recognized as a regulatory tool in Canyon County, zoning can help express the will of the communities and preclude the pursuit of incompatible development ideas. Targeting development areas either within or close to city limits can help to channel future development into these targeted areas by the power of suggestion, even if the zoning lacks any legal influence.

Peckham Road Current Development Findings: Based on the developments that have occurred within the Peckham Corridor during the course of this study, it appears the corridor is feasible for economic development. COSSA’s Regional Technology Center broke ground within the corridor in November of 2009, and, based on their current and prospective areas of expertise, is expected to both retain and attract jobs to the area. In redesigning the subdivision to accommodate six acres of commercial zoning, The Greenleaf Airranch estimates at least four prospective employers creating at least 15 jobs have plans to expand their operations in Greenleaf if the infrastructure was in place, and are planning on pursuing an infrastructure grant from the Idaho Department of Commerce in order to obtain these ends. Another large, one hundred acre parcel has been shortlisted by a wood products manufacturer claiming to supply at least one hundred jobs in corridor. Last, the City of Greenleaf has purchased the property and obtained nearly all of the necessary funding for the development of a centralized waste water treatment plant that will be able to serve both the existing and future needs of the corridor.
Background

Idaho’s Treasure Valley has experienced unprecedented growth in recent years, with some communities tripling in population over the last decade. A strong regional economy, driven primarily by the high tech and agricultural industries, in addition to the relatively low cost of land, low cost of doing business, and high quality of life, has fueled much of this growth.

This growth, while optimal for urban residents, has impacted the rural communities in southwest Idaho. As land has become utilized and more expensive in Ada County (where Boise is located), development has encroached on the rural areas of western Canyon County. Development patterns have been somewhat haphazard, which has resulted in the consumption of thousands of acres of high-value agricultural soils. The continued expansion of residential developments built far from job centers has increased congestion on the regional transportation network, worsened the Valley’s air quality, and increased commute times to and from work.

Wilder and Greenleaf, at either terminus of Peckham Road, have both experienced severe economic distress due to the growth of the urban areas in southwest Idaho, the out-migration of their educated population (due to the lack of jobs in the area), as well as limited resources to attract investment. The lack of high-skilled jobs available in the region
means that many of the area’s trained citizens move outside of the area or commute to work in the urban centers of the Treasure Valley. Major retailers such as Walmart and Cosco have also contributed to this phenomenon, luring rural residents with the promise of cheaper goods, so that even though there is a supermarket in the City of Wilder, residents will opt to drive to Caldwell or Nampa rather than support their local grocer, who cannot compete with corporate pricing structures. This is also true of other retail establishments, as evidenced by the surplus of deteriorating commercial buildings in downtown Wilder.

Because of this, the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf, as well as the Canyon Owyhee School Service Agency (COSSA) and the Wilder School District, jointly came together in 2007 in order to address these issues, and to examine whether Peckham Road would be a viable as job corridor for the region, as well as a sound home for a consolidated COSSA regional job training facility, whose campuses are currently scattered across five, rural cities. In addition to wanting to create an economic development plan that reduces the amount of suburban sprawl and create jobs in the places where people live, these cities also wanted to address the possibility of sharing the cost of both water and sewer through a regional approach to infrastructure.

What began as a discussion between these two communities, COSSA, and the Wilder School District, expanded to include all of the cities that form the COSSA school district, including Homedale, Notus, Parma and Marsing (and also Wilder), as well as Canyon County Commissioners, who, at the time, were considering adopting the zoning proposed by cities within their areas of impact. When Canyon County learned of the collaborative approach occurring in this region, they expressed their interest in expanding the economic development region (and subsequent water and sewer needs) to include not just the Peckham Road Corridor, but the entire triangle as defined by the junctures of Highways 19, 95, and 20/26. Since, the County has been discussing with both State and Federal officials the possibility of creating an enterprise zone in this triangular region, with Peckham Road serving as the primary economic development corridor. And while the feasibility study is funded only to address the Peckham Road Corridor, it
has been generally agreed upon by the mayors and commissioners that the results of the study will serve as a microcosm to address economic development and infrastructural needs of the larger region.

Last, despite the current economic downturn, which has slowed growth considerably, the Boise Metropolitan Area is expected to experience robust growth over the coming decades, doubling its current population 615,528 by 2030 (according to the most recent growth projections of the Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS), the Treasure Valley’s transportation planning agency). This growth will occur primarily in Ada and Canyon Counties, affecting primarily the Cities of Boise, Nampa, Caldwell and Meridian. However, based on current development patterns, the projected growth is also expected to encroach on all of the cities in Western Canyon and Owyhee Counties, including Parma, Homedale, Notus, Marsing, Greenleaf, and Wilder. A regional job training center, combined with a regional water and sewer plant, targeted areas for smart growth, and the incentives available to developers through the creation of an enterprise zone, are the keys to retaining skilled labor in this area and solving the economic distress that Western Canyon and Owyhee Counties are currently experiencing.

Introduction

This economic development feasibility study was administered by Sage Community Resources and included the collaboration of area Mayors, Planning and Zoning Commissions, City Councils, County Commissioners, industry leaders, The COSSA School District, area property owners, developers, and community members. It also included interviews and/or discussions with all pertinent government agencies, including the Idaho Departments of Labor, Commerce, Agriculture, Education, and Transportation. This study complements existing economic development efforts in the region, including the Growth Management Partnership of Greenleaf, Melba, Middleton, Parma and Wilder, The Wilder Economic Development Council, the Caldwell/Canyon Economic Development Council (CCEDC), and the Western Alliance for Economic Development Initiative, which a partnership between the cities of Grand View, Greenleaf, Homedale, Marsing, Melba, Parma, and Wilder.

Methodology

Two key components of this study, The Peckham Road Infrastructure Study and The Western Canyon County Circulation Plan, were conducted by T-O Engineering, and COMPASS, respectively. The Peckham Road Infrastructure Study analyzes Peckham Road infrastructural assets and constraints, approximate costs for upgrades and expansions of service, as well as preliminary cost and size estimates for water/wastewater distribution lines to service Greenleaf, Wilder, and Peckham Road. The Western Canyon Communities Circulation Plan analyzes both the local and regional transportation circulation impacts a developed Peckham Road Corridor would create. The Plan also offers recommended road width expansions as well as preliminary cost estimates.
**Location**

The Peckham Road Economic Development corridor feasibility study focuses primarily on Peckham Road from the City of Wilder to the City of Greenleaf, though it also considers the larger triangle as defined by the junctures of State Highways 19, 95, and 20/26. Peckham Road runs parallel to the Wilder Branch of the Union Pacific Railroad and State Hwy 19. It also is in close proximity to the only north/south freight highway in Idaho, United States Highway 95, which runs through Wilder. Peckham Road is seen as the ideal location for an economic development corridor because of its central location in both the COSSA service region and western Canyon County, in addition to running parallel to other critical infrastructural assets, including a rail spur, telephone, electricity, cable, fiber optics, and a high pressure gas line. Moreover, while most of Peckham Road is under agricultural (and some residential) use, three food processors operate along the road east of Wilder, which already form the base of some business activity.

**COSSA**

The Canyon County Owyhee School Service Agency (COSSA) is a public high school consortium providing industry-certified vocation-technical training to the school districts of Parma, Marsing, Notus, Wilder and Homedale. The professional-technical education COSSA provides to both high school and at-risk students focuses on the following areas of expertise: health professions, medical records, industrial welding, diesel technology, automotive technology, building trades, and business technology. At the onset of this study, COSSA was negotiating with the Wilder School District to acquire a land donation that would enable them to build a centralized job-training facility on the west end of the Peckham Corridor, which was expected to promote the creation of jobs to match its seven areas of expertise.

**Infrastructure**

A primary infrastructural constraint of the corridor involves the waste water treatment capacities of both Greenleaf and Wilder. Wilder's lagoon treatment plant has capacity for just 2-5 years of future use, while Greenleaf does not currently have a centralized waste water treatment plant that can serve its current residents and comply with DEQ standards. Additionally, there are no water or wastewater lines along Peckham Road; all residents and business are currently served by wells and septic tanks.

Prior to the infrastructure and traffic circulation analyses, three preliminary tasks became evident from the onset of this study.

1. To create five different “development scenario” maps that reflected either the current or proposed zoning of Wilder and Greenleaf within the Peckham Corridor. Different densities and industry mixes were used to offer both a visual representation of possible future development patterns, as well as provide a template for cost-benefit comparisons for the infrastructure and transportation circulation studies.
2. To create an industry stakeholder group to garner industry support for the construction of the COSSA Regional Technology Center in Wilder
3. To issue a business and industry survey to regional employers at COSSA’s business and industry summit held in Homedale in September of 2008, in order to gauge the level of industry expansion/relocation potential in the region.

The following is a list of additional components of the study.

1. The relationship between professional-technical training centers and economic development
   - Centralizing COSSA in the Peckham Corridor
2. Local and regional economic and business growth assessment
   - Demographic and economic attributes of Wilder and Greenleaf, Canyon County, and the Treasure Valley
3. Community and Property owner analysis
   - Peckham Road property owner survey
4. Land Use Analysis
   - Current Zoning
   - Future/Proposed Zoning
5. Rural Economic Development Strategies
   - Smart Growth Principles
   - Cluster development and co-location potential

Marketing Plan

**Peckham Road**

Peckham Road is a four mile agricultural corridor that runs along a rail spur between the Cities of Greenleaf and Wilder. Greenleaf and Wilder are bounded by Highway 19 to the south, Highway 95 to the West (which is the only north/south highway that runs the length of Idaho, connecting to Canada to the North, and Mexico to the South), Notus Road to the East, and agricultural land abutting Highway 20/26 to the North. I84, the only East/West Freeway in the State, is approximately ten miles to the East, at Caldwell.
As mentioned, in addition to its nexus within a major interstate transportation network, which provides easy access for freight and the freedom of multiple access points, Peckham Road has a number of other infrastructural assets that are fundamental to development: a high-pressured gas line, telephone, electricity, fiber-optics and cable. Peckham Road, however, does not have access to central water and wastewater infrastructure, except for within the city limits of Wilder. And while Greenleaf has recently upgraded their water to a centralized system, they are still in the process of generating the revenue necessary to build a wastewater treatment plant.

**Greenleaf and Wilder**

Both Wilder and Greenleaf have their roots as farming communities involved in crops such as onions, corn, mint, alfalfa, and hops, as well as food processing. However, while Wilder’s history goes back to the beginning of last century, Greenleaf did not become incorporated as a municipality until 1973. Environmental regulation and engineering specifications for water and wastewater systems have become increasingly more rigid and costly, and the prospect of establishing a centralized wastewater treatment plant has eluded Greenleaf for over three decades, which has been a primary impediment to attracting economic development. Neither community has a very strong nor diversified economic base—while Wilder is home to SSI Foods Inc, a meat processing plant which employees 400 individuals—other types of skilled laborers have to travel outside the rural region for work or accept under-employment.

Map 1: Wilder and Greenleaf Future Landuse
In addition to SSI, the only other major employers for both cities are their schools—the Wilder School District for Wilder, and Greenleaf Friends Academy in Greenleaf.

At the time that this feasibility study was proposed, the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf were updating their comprehensive plans, which included expanding their areas of city impact to abut centrally in Peckham Road. It also included updating their current municipal zoning, as well as creating future landuse maps to reflect desired landuses within the county-owned areas of impact (See Wilder and Greenleaf Future Landuse Map, above). And while most of Peckham Road land lies within Canyon County’s jurisdiction, the County was also in the process of updating their comprehensive plan at the time, and was considering adopting the landuses that municipalities propose within their areas of impact as zoning.

**Canyon County**

The County’s interest in municipal zoning is significant because of the unprecedented growth rates the region has experienced in the last decade, much of the development occurs on County-owned land, which has converted many thousands of acres of previously agricultural land and open space to residential uses. And while this phenomenon has occurred throughout the Treasure Valley, Canyon County has been especially susceptible to development pressure because of its proximity to the more urban Ada County, and the residential spillover that has occurred as Ada County’s residential and economic bases continue to grow. While Canyon County does have landuse zoning, what’s known as “conditional use permitting” (a process that is designed to allow for uses within a zone that are currently not allowed by attaching certain “conditions” to it) has been used to approve subdivision development on agricultural land. See Canyon County Zoning Map, to the left.

The Canyon County Zoning Map shows the last adopted
Canyon County Zoning. Except for urban areas, shown in gray, and some parcels within municipal areas of impact, most of Canyon County zoning is in agriculture. The map at the top left shows the development patterns that have occurred in recent years. The areas in gray are municipal city limits, while the areas in burgundy are the subdivision footprints that have been built on County land. The map on the bottom left shows subdivision development on parcels with prime soils, with burgundy indicating the building footprints and orange indicating prime soils.

While the rate of approval of Conditional Use Permitting has declined substantially in the past year, it is unclear whether this is the result of a decline in overall permit applications due to the economic recession and subsequent halt of most construction in the county, or whether this is reflective of a change in the County’s approach to the process itself.
When we lose high quality farmland to other uses, we lose our ability to be efficient food producers.1

Approximately 5000 acres of agricultural soils are contained within the Peckham Corridor—almost all of which are considered prime by the USGS. Both Wilder and Greenleaf (as well as the county) have repeatedly said that protecting their agricultural base is important to them, and agriculture should be a staple of their economic development strategy.

While encouraging development in a way that protects Canyon County soils might be important to the residents who live there, it should be noted that most of Idaho consists of mountainous regions and desert. Only ten out of Idaho’s forty-four counties have prime soils that occur in concentrations that enable intensive, diversified agricultural production at all. When this is coupled with the fact that Canyon County prime soils are located adjacent to the Boise/Nampa metropolitan area---an area that is not only expected to double in population by 2030, but is hundreds of miles away from other food producing centers---the erasure of prime soils becomes more than simply a bias towards agricultural preservation, it becomes a food security issue, especially in light of the recent instability of gasoline (and hence transportation) costs, and a future with no immediate solution in sight. Furthermore, unlike the Willamette Valley in Oregon, or most of the Midwest, the prime soils that are contained within the Treasure Valley were deposited as a result of flooding that occurred during the last ice age, and are unable to be created again with the vegetation that has dominated the region since.

That said, despite the high agricultural value of Peckham soils, concentrating development along the corridor rather than continuing the trend of sporadic development throughout the county, arguably becomes the more favorable option despite the potential loss of prime soil. The question then becomes: How can these communities promote economic development while preserving their agricultural base, as well as the natural resources that enable that base? What would development look like in this scenario? What blend of industries are compatible and/or symbiotic with agriculture? These are some of the questions that this feasibility study attempts to answer.

---

1Idaho Natural Resource Conservation Service, 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top Ten Idaho Counties with Prime Soils</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bingham</td>
<td>306,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bonneville</td>
<td>142,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Canyon</strong></td>
<td><strong>173,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribou</td>
<td>137,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cassia</td>
<td>265,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>237,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>130,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerome</td>
<td>147,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minidoka</td>
<td>174,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twin Falls</td>
<td>263,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canyon Owyhee School Service Agency (COSSA)

Professional-Technical Training

The Canyon Owyhee School Service Agency (COSSA) is the state’s oldest public school consortium, and operates as its own district that serves the Cities of Parma, Notus, Wilder, Marsing, and Homedale. COSSA’s mission is two-fold:

- To function as an alternative middle and high school for at-risk students (Centerpoint High)
- To provide industry-certified training to high school students in the following area of expertise: Engineering, Welding, Auto/Diesel Technology, Medical Records, Health Professions, and Building Trades.

Students enrolled in COSSA’s professional-technical program receive a minimum of three hours of training per day for two years in one area of expertise. Additionally, students can opt to take up to 30 credit hours transferable to the following institutions of higher education: Boise State University, Idaho State University, College of Western Idaho, College of Southern Idaho, and Lewis and Clark State College. For students who are not college bound, an industry-backed certificate is issued upon graduation that renders them immediately employable. The following is also true of COSSA:

- Graduates of COSSA’s professional-technical programs have a 96% job placement rate.
- The average starting salary for a COSSA technology school graduate last year was $27,419.38—over twice the annual salary at Idaho’s minimum wage.
- All of COSSA’s professional-technical programs are designed to meet local (and national) industry demand.
- Local industry-representatives regularly shape and revise curricula through annual advisory committee meetings.
- College credits transferred from COSSA to area institutions of higher education saved district parents and students $132,400 in tuition last year.

Facilities

Currently, COSSA operates out of five campuses in five different cities, and their facilities are not only in disrepair but are at capacity, regularly turning away students who want to participate in their programs. Additionally, the distribution of
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campuses across five cities in two counties has put extensive bussing requirements on their respective school districts, which has led to an inefficient expenditure of valuable school resources. Discussions to centralize their training programs into a singular location resulted from discussions between the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf, but also from the Wilder School District, who offered to donate fifteen acres of their land within the Peckham Corridor for COSSA's centralized facility.

**COSSA Demographics**

Even though COSSA is located within the Treasure Valley, which, as mentioned above, has experienced several decades of steady economic growth, the cities that COSSA serves (Parma, Notus, Wilder, Homedale and Marsing) are all on the rural edge of the rural/urban divide, and have not been able to reap the Treasure Valley wealth like their urban municipal counterparts further East. And while industry-certified, vocational technical training is often valued as an alternative to conventional education in many areas across the nation, it is especially valued in a region where:

- Only 57% of the population currently graduates from high school (compared to 80.4% nationally).
- Approximately 38% of the population is Latino—many of whom are first generation.
- Only 7% of the population go on to obtain a college degree (compared to 24.4% nationally).
- One in five individuals live below poverty level—over twice the national average.
- Average annual income for individuals within the district falls within 51.3% of the national average.
- Approximately 68% of students in the district are eligible for free or reduced lunches.

In terms of COSSA’s contribution to the workforce, COSSA students (according to U.S. census data\(^2\)) represent only 8% of the total population of the COSSA school district (or the combined populations of Notus, Wilder, Parma, Homedale and Marsing), yet account for 19% of the labor force. However, due to the lack of jobs in the immediate area, their average commute time to and from work is approximately 46 minutes.

Were the Peckham Road Corridor developed to meet the job needs of the COSSA population alone, the average, round trip commute time would be reduced from 46 to 15, vehicle miles

\(^2\) American Factfinder, 2000
traveled would be reduced from 39 to 11, and this would result in an annual savings of nearly $3.8 million dollars in fuel costs alone, based on the 2008 average cost of gasoline.

Even without a centralized training facility, the story of COSSA is one that directly links an underserved population to critical job training skills. This substantially increases the ability of its graduates to generate wages well above what a conventional high school graduate would be eligible for in the absence of an industry-backed certificate.

**COSSA Industry Stakeholder Meetings**

Beginning in October of 2008, COSSA began holding monthly stakeholder meetings involving local industry representatives, COSSA school district administrators, area mayors, and Sage Community Resources. Representatives from Simplot, Top Air, and R & M Steel were regularly present, as well as representatives from other local businesses involved in the construction, farming, energy, and engineering industries.

Over the course of the year, the stakeholder's group discussed funding sources, including public and private grant opportunities, local industry donations, and school district levies. Opportunities to establish internships between private industry and COSSA were also discussed. A paid internship was established between COSSA’s welding program and Simplot in May of 2009—reviving a relationship that had been strong during the eighties and nineties but that had waned, until recently, under different leadership.

Financing came together from multiple sources. Over the course of the stakeholder discussions, R&M Steel agreed to donate $400,000 worth of steel towards the COSSA Regional Technology center, which amounts to the entire exterior as well as the structural members of the new facility. The superintendents of each of COSSA’s member school districts agreed to go to their voters—even in these uncertain economic times—to pass either a bond or a levy. Sage Community Resources was instrumental in helping COSSA obtain a grant from EDA stimulus funds, which was the only EDA stimulus monies awarded in this EDA service region. In addition to cash, the Wilder School District donated fifteen acres of land, and the City of Wilder is in the process of drilling a well for the new facility. An additional grant was made available through USDA for infrastructure.

With this combination of funding sources, and also because of the momentum from industry leaders, municipal government, and the communities that COSSA serves, ground was broken at the end of November of 2009. The new 56,000 square foot facility is expected to open in the fall of 2010. It should be noted that COSSA’s new facility will approximately double the square footage of the facilities where it currently operates, and is expected to enable COSSA to expand their existing programs in order to double their student body, as well as double the number of trained, industry-ready high school graduates in the region. The construction of the new centralized facility in Wilder which will reduce commute times for students and bussing requirements for the school districts, but will also provides the needed skilled workforce training to a population that is not naturally college bound, while making it easier for students to pursue a degree who are
college bound--both of which are essential to help to break the cycle of poverty that has blighted this area for more than a generation.

In terms of job creation, the construction of COSSA’s new regional technology center in Wilder will immediately employ 100 people over the next year, as well as hire a minimum of 3-4 additional staff for their facility. They are also expected to certify approximately 100 students per year in one of their areas of expertise—96% of whom will find employment immediately upon graduation.

Findings

COSSA’s ability to serve as an anchor for economic development within the Peckham Corridor is underway. COSSA students average a 96% job placement rate upon graduation, while each of the industries within their areas of expertise-- except building trades-- is expected to supply steady employment in the coming decades. Financing for new school construction within the Peckham Corridor came together from multiple sources, including a $2.5 million grant from EDA stimulus funds, a local industry donation of nearly $500,000 worth of steel, as well as $2 million in either a bond or levy passed by the five member school districts. Ground was broken in November of 2009, with the new, 56,000 square foot facility expected to open in the fall of 2010. The new COSSA Regional Technology Center will double the square footage of the facilities where it currently operates, which will enable them to expand existing programs (specifically their engineering department, which will add both a renewable energy and waste water treatment curriculum), and double the number of trained, industry-ready graduates in the region from 50 to 100 annually, not including the 300 adult students per year that will be trained in COSSA’s evening programs.

Population and Demographics

Canyon County is Idaho’s second most populated county. In the last decade, its population has risen by nearly 53%, over double Idaho’s growth rate of nearly 22% during the same period. Relatively low prices of land and housing (compared to the more urban Ada County) a more rural atmosphere, and a historically robust Treasure Valley economy has driven much of this growth.

Canyon County Population:
The population of Canyon County was 179,381 in 2007. However, with the onset of the economic decline in the fall of 2008, this growth rate has stagnated substantially, and there are fewer contributing members to the County’s labor force now than there was a year ago.
**Wilder and Greenleaf Populations**

Based on the 2007 census, the population of Wilder was 1462, with a total of 581 individuals in the labor force. The population of Greenleaf was 862, with a total of 419 in the labor force. While the populations of Wilder and Greenleaf have experienced either flat or nominal growth rates during in the last several decades, they are both expected to grow at a 2-3% growth rate through 2025. However, the steady westward march of suburban development that reaches within ten miles of both of these communities, coupled with the explosive, unexpected growth rates of neighboring cities and the general popularity of the Treasure Valley in national relocation trends, demands that both historical and projected growth rates be used with caution.

**Canyon County Demographics**

In 2007, (the last year that U.S. Census data was available):

- On in five individuals are Latino, or 21% of the population, compared to Idaho’s 10% and the nation’s 15%.
- In terms of educational attainment, 81.5% of the population 25 years or older have a high school degree, while 24% have a bachelor’s degree or higher, compared to Idaho’s 81% and 17%, and the nation’s 85%, and 27% respectively.
- In terms of per capita income, Canyon County averages are well below both state and national averages. According to the assessments, per capita income in Canyon County in 2008 was $22,278, compared to $31,804 for the state and $38,615 for the nation. (Idaho Department of Labor (IDL), 2008).
- 15% of Canyon County residents lived below poverty level in 2008, compared with Idaho’s 12% and the nation’s 13%. (IDL, 2008)

According to the IDL, the County’s than average per capital income and higher poverty levels are due, in part, to Canyon County’s heavy dependence on agricultural jobs coupled with higher-than-average family sizes—even though average agricultural wages in Canyon County were above the average per capita income during the same time period.

**Wilder and Greenleaf Demographics**

In 2000, (the last year that U.S. Census data was available)

- The high school graduation rate was 57% for Wilder and 77% for Greenleaf.
- Persons of Latino descent accounted for with 76.4% of Wilder’s population and 23.3% of Greenleaf’s population.
- 13.3% of Greenleaf’s population was below poverty level, while 31.6% of Wilder’s population was below poverty level.
- The per capita income for Wilder was $7601, or 35.2% of the national income.
- Based on current school records, 94% of students in the Wilder School District #133 were eligible for free or reduced price meals for the 2007-2008 school years.
Findings

In the last decade, Canyon County’s population has risen by nearly 53%, over double Idaho’s growth rate of nearly 22% during the same period, making it the second most populated county in the State next to Ada. Both County and city demographic data indicate that per capita incomes are lower, while minority populations and poverty levels are higher than both State and National Averages.

Infrastructure and Transportation

Five development scenario maps were created at the onset of this study. Wilder and Greenleaf were in the process of updating their future landuses within their area of city impacts, which were being proposed to meet in the center of Peckham Road. The development patterns shown on the maps are based off of real development footprints that have occurred in the Treasure Valley in the last two decades, in either commercial or industrial zones. At the same time, there was much discussion between the cities regarding the need to address both agricultural landscapes and economies, as well as the creation of a possible ag/industrial zone. Existing Canyon County food processing footprints were also used. The following maps show the five scenarios that were created, with the red indicating the building footprints in a commercial scenario, the purple indicating the building footprints in an industrial scenario, and gray indicating the footprints of impervious surface, and green indicating agricultural land or open space.

Map 6: Full Commercial/Industrial Buildout Scenario
Map 7: Commercial/Food Processing Buildout Scenario

Map 8: Commercial/Industrial/Food Processing Buildout Scenario
Map 9: Smart Growth Buildout Scenario

Map 10: Do-nothing/Sprawl Buildout Scenario
The scenario maps were distributed to both T-O Engineering and COMPASS, so that they could analyze the traffic impacts, job creation, and cost/benefit of each scenario of the proposed development scenarios. It should be noted that one of the scenarios is titled the “sprawl” and is intended to reflect the potential development pattern in the absence of planning, based on historical precedents. In addition to the cost/benefit analysis, the purpose in creating the scenario maps was two-fold:

1. To display realistic examples (through building/parking lot footprints) of the acreage and impervious surface requirements per zone.
2. To display the “full buildout potential” as allowed for by established zoning laws.

The rationale for the latter, is that while historical growth rates for both cities have been nominal (between 2-3%), there have been a number of small, Treasure Valley communities with similar geography, demography and historical growth rates whose populations have exploded in relatively short periods of time. For example, the City of Kuna’s population (located in Western Ada County), nearly tripled in population in the last decade. Prevailing development patterns are often sprawling, defined by either strip malls or large, box-store developments. Without proper transportation access management, local highways and thoroughfares have experienced an unprecedented level of congestion, while traffic and its associated air quality have become issues previously inexperienced by Southwestern Idahoans. While the Treasure Valley has always had inversion potential because of its low-lying location between mountain ranges, the valley is currently at risk of becoming a ‘non-attainment’ zone as defined by the EPA because of the quantity of vehicular smog that has risen to levels that are considered unhealthy to breathe.

As mentioned, the historical growth rates for Wilder and Greenleaf have been nominal. And while construction has virtually halted in Canyon County since the onset of the current economic recession, there exists the very real possibility that when the economy recovers, growth rates could be comparable to what they were previously. Population growth and its associated development in the Treasure Valley is expected to continue its steady westward march.

It should be noted that these scenario maps, while they are intended to represent a visual interpretation of municipal zoning combined with current, Treasure Valley development patterns, posed some difficulty for the firms who conducted the infrastructure and transportation circulation studies. For example, T-O’s infrastructural analysis study used a historical growth rate of 3% to analyze the future infrastructural needs of the corridor, while COMPASS used the scenario maps, future landuse, and future Idaho Department of Transportation plans to establish transportation circulation impacts. This led to inconsistencies in the forty year planning horizon that T-O used for their study. For example, using a 3% residential growth rate, full commercial buildout, as depicted in the scenarios that were provided, would take longer than forty years. For a full copy of these studies, please refer to Appendix E for the T-O infrastructure study, and Appendix F for the Compass Transportation Circulation Study.
Infrastructural Analysis:

The City of Wilder’s wastewater is currently serviced by lagoon treatment plants. Greenleaf is serviced by a 29-user collection and drain field disposal system, as well as individual septic systems. In 2006, the cities of Greenleaf, Wilder and Notus solicited proposals for a regional wastewater treatment and effluent management system in the interest of bringing Greenleaf’s wastewater treatment up to DEQ standards, increasing the sewer capacity of both Wilder and Greenleaf, and potentially accessing more federal dollars through a regional approach. The scope of the study included an evaluation of a regional wastewater treatment and effluent management meeting Class A standards for recycling and reuse. Additionally, an examination of existing infrastructure was conducted along Peckham Road, as well as future infrastructural needs and job creation potential along Peckham Road. Opportunities for the shared trenching of utility lines, including but not limited to gas, telephone, and fiber-optics was also examined. The following outlines the components that were examined:

Job Creation

The chart below shows the number of households and jobs that would be created per scenario. According to their methodology, all of the scenarios except for sprawl would coincide with 12,500 households that would be achieved in 60 years. The Sprawl Scenario would create 7,800 household in 45 years. However, job creation occurs on a different horizon. The smart growth scenario would create 15,400 in approximately 80 years, the commercial/food processing scenario would create 21,200 jobs in 95 years, the Commercial/Industrial/Food Processing Scenario would create 24,500 jobs in 95 years, while the Commercial/Industrial or “full build out” scenario would create 26,800 jobs in 100 years. The Sprawl Scenario, on the other hand, would create only 1500 jobs in five years.
Table 1: Build-out Term Based on Residential Growth and Job Creation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario Name</th>
<th>Residential Growth</th>
<th>Job Creation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Number of</td>
<td>Term to Buildout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>(in years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smart Growth</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial/ Food Processing</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sprawl</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Railroad

Shortly after the T-O study was completed, the lease to the rail spur along Peckham Road was acquired by WATCO Companies, Inc. from Idaho Northern and Pacific Railroad. This is an out-of-state company whose intentions for the spur are unknown. However, visits to their website indicate that they are a financially motivated rail lessee who has plans to expand rail use on all of their lines, which are leased across many states.

During seasons of peak rail use (harvest season), there are currently 16 users of the rail spur along Peckham Road. This usage is not nearly the capacity the spur can accommodate, since rail cars only run three days per week, even during times of peak use. However, for heavy loads traveling long distances, INPR estimated that each car could save industry $4000 per car per year over standard trucking costs, so this remains an attractive incentive to businesses that to locate along the spur.

The spur is located on the South side of Peckham Road, and it was noted that additional spurs would be more optimally located on properties south of the spur, in order to avoid the costs and traffic implications associated with crossing Peckham Road. Additional cost considerations are listed below:
Installations Costs:

- Switch on Mainline: $35,000-$50,000
- Signalized Crossing: $500,000
- Cost per foot of installed private rail: $125-$150 per linear foot
- Private crossing of a roadway or entrance: $150-$250 per linear foot

Annual Maintenance Costs for Private Users:

- Maintenance fee for mainline switch to a spur: $1500
- Industry Track Agreement: $1500-$2500
- Property Lease (or right of way for loading or offloading on rail property): $1400-$2500

To date, INPR encourages agricultural and industrial zoning along its rail lines, in an effort to decrease conflicts associated with residential zoning. This has proven to enhance maintenance and safety problems.

**Power**

Typical industry electrical use ranges from 30-60 Megawatts per square mile. However, based on current industry use along the corridor, Idaho Power estimates that future businesses will likely fall on the low end of that range. According to Idaho Power, the electricity currently supplied to the Peckham corridor is sufficient to meet current industry and residential demand. Should growth occur along the corridor in the future, upgrades would need to be made, with cost-sharing/reimbursable options made available by Idaho Power to the developer on a case-by-case basis. However, Idaho Power’s expansion plans have identified Peckham Road for two new substations, as well as three new substations in the proposed enterprise zone. Each new 40 MW substation costs approximately $2.5 million, and requires one acre of land, while upgrades to transmission lines range from $250-$400,000 per mile. If Peckham Road reached the full buildout scenario, as depicted in the maps above, two new substations, in addition to the two substations that Idaho Power has already planned, would be needed along the corridor.

**Natural Gas**

An existing 6" high pressure gas line operating at 300 psi runs along Peckham Road, and is currently underutilized. Natural Gas is provided by Intermountain Gas. Distribution lines run along Van Slyke, Tucker, and Friends. For large users, Intermountain Gas usually waives connection and installation fees; for smaller users, extension costs are $5 per linear foot of distribution line. In the “full buildout” scenario, the existing 6” distribution line would be sufficient to meet industry needs.
Communications (Cable/Fiber Optic/ Phone)
Cable, fiber optic and telephone are available throughout the Peckham Corridor, and are owned by Cable One, Frontier Communications, and Qwest, respectively. Each company has stated that service extensions are driven by development, but that they are also inexpensive and easy to accomplish. Developers must pay for Cable One and Quest extensions; however Frontier Communications will pay for extensions to their commercial customers.

Water and Sewer
A key component of this study was to analyze the feasibility of connecting water and sewer facilities between Wilder and Greenleaf along Peckham Road. This reason for this was threefold: 1) To ensure that Greenleaf has a DEQ compliant wastewater treatment plant. 2) To allow for Wilder to expand into Greenleaf’s plant when the capacity of its own plant expires in the next several years, and 3) To serve future businesses along Peckham Road.

Currently, Wilder is served by two groundwater wells that range in capacity from 250-330 gallons per minute (gpm), and the city is in the process of digging a third well on the southwestern corner of the new COSSA property located just north of Wilder High School. Distribution lines range from between 3-8 inches in diameter. Their sewer is a lagoon treatment system that has recently undergone expansion upgrades; however, these upgrades are only expected to increase their capacity in order to serve the city and its residents until 2011.

The City of Greenleaf is served by four groundwater wells that range in capacity from 30-460 gpm. Distribution lines range from between 4-12 inches in diameter. Greenleaf wastewater treatment system is divided between private and public septic systems. Of the private systems in use, many are located on 25’ wide lots that also contain private wells. The public septic systems are at capacity. As such, the City of Greenleaf has signed to consent order for compliance with DEQ in 2000, and has been struggling to obtain the financing for the costly system upgrades since.

In 2001, Greenleaf voters approved $717,000 in bonding authorization towards sewer projects. In August of 2000, a $6.9 million in bond authorization came from a judicial confirmation in the summer of 2009. Another $600,000 was awarded to Greenleaf through a congressional appropriation made available through the Stimulus funding. Greenleaf has also negotiated an agreement with the Army Corps of Engineers who will provide up to $1,000,000 in loan forgiveness toward this project. Last, the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality offered Greenleaf a 20 year loan to pay for sewer projects at 0% interest. Combined, Greenleaf’s financing options are sufficient to enable them to move forward with completing a wastewater treatment plant.

Additionally, Greenleaf recently purchased a 70 acre parcel just North of Peckham Road to serve as the future site of their wastewater treatment plant, as well as the site for some, if not all, of the land application needs. A survey of the Peckham Corridor conducted by T-O
Engineering determined that Peckham is mostly downgrade from Wilder to Greenleaf, which should make future connections between Wilder and Greenleaf relatively easy with minimal pumping requirements. See graph below for the estimated combined water and wastewater construction costs.

The minimum construction costs for a water system based on a full buildout of businesses with average water needs, and including two wells, a storage tank and booster pumping system, a 16-inch water main along Peckham Road, and 8-inch water distribution system is estimated to be between $7,070 million and $15,150 million over a forty years planning horizon. The cost for a waste water treatment system for the same planning horizon ranges between $8,200 million and $17,565 million, and includes and 18-inch mainline along Peckham Road, 12-inch sewer collector lines, a lift station and force main, as well as a waste water treatment plant upgrade.

**Findings:** Along Peckham Road, there is ample room to fully utilize the rail, the high pressured gas line, telephone, fiber-optic and cable utilities, with nominal costs to the developer. Electricity would require some upgrades, but there are cost/share/reimbursable options available to the customer. The most limiting infrastructural constraint continues to be water/wastewater services either within Greenleaf and along the corridor; however, Greenleaf is moving forward with both plant design and financing options, Peckham Road runs down grade from Wilder to Greenleaf, making it feasible for Wilder to connect to the future plant in Greenleaf, which would give developers access to water/waste water distribution lines along Peckham Road.
Transportation Circulation Study

In February of 2008, COMPASS agreed to conduct the traffic circulation for the Peckham Study in order to analyze the transportation impacts of development within the Peckham Corridor. Parametrix was then subcontracted as the traffic engineering consultant. (Please refer to Appendix F: Western Canyon County Circulation Plan, for a complete copy of the study). Using the scenario maps provided by Sage Community Resources, in addition to relying on data from Idaho Department of Transportation’s long range plans and future population projections, COMPASS ran numerous travel demand model iterations until a reasonable road network could be defined.

The traffic volumes, roadway widths, and their associated costs were much larger than anticipated at the onset of the study. The traffic models used data that incorporated regional, long-range traffic demand projections for all of the surrounding highways and bridges. Also, because the density levels depicted in the scenario maps were extremely intensive in relation to what is there today. Additionally, the study considered managing the access routes onto highways 19 and 95, which is consistent with the Highway 19 Corridor Plan and future ITD goals, though requires that existing roadways expand to widths that would be smaller if more access points were allowed. COMPASS relied upon a 3% residential growth projection, which suggests that the build out densities depicted in the scenarios could take anywhere from between forty-five to one hundred years.

It should be noted that the models showed little variation between the commercial/industrial, commercial/food-processing, or commercial/industrial/food-processing scenarios, so only cost-estimates for commercial/industrial (or “full build-out”), smart growth and sprawl were provided in the study. The following summarizes the roadway costs and recommended road width expansions per scenario.

**Commercial/Industrial (full buildout) Scenario:**
Total approximate roadway costs for this scenario are $376 million—an astonishing number to say the least. Additionally, Allendale and Van Slyke would require five lanes, as would Travis and Tucker. Peckham would require three lanes. It should be remembered, however, that this level of commercial/industrial buildout would take one hundred years to achieve, while its associated residential growth would take sixty years to achieve.

**Smart Growth Scenario:**
In this scenario, total costs for roadway improvements are $352 million --not that much different from the commercial industrial scenario when costs are considered at this scale.
Residential build-out would occur by 2070 and commercial build-out would occur by 2090. Allendale and Travis would still require five lanes, while Tucker, Peckham, and Van Slyke would require three.

**Sprawl Scenario:**

In the Sprawl Scenario, total roadway improvement costs are approximately $288 million over a forty year planning horizon. The fifteen hundred jobs provided in this scenario would be achieved by 2015. Roadway widths within the Peckham Corridor are considerably smaller, (though not much different outside the corridor), though five lanes would still be required on Travis.

Because both the roadway costs and their recommended widths are projected so far in to the future, and also because T-O Engineering was working with a forty year planning horizon, COMPASS was then asked to isolate just the roadway costs that would be needed within the Peckham Corridor, not assuming future, long-term residential growth needs or future ITD needs. The chart below refers to the costs of roadway improvement just for the roads within the Peckham Corridor, assuming full commercial/industrial build-out.

Table 3: Total Estimated Roadway Costs for Peckham Corridor over Forty Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Road Name</th>
<th>Scenario Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allendale</td>
<td>$6.16 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peckham</td>
<td>$14.40 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Top</td>
<td>$3.60 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travis</td>
<td>$6.15 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tucker</td>
<td>$3.60 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Slyke</td>
<td>$1.80 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total For Roads in the Peckham Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>$35.71 million</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total costs just for the Peckham Corridor assuming full commercial/industrial build-out (which their models did not indicate was very different from the smart-growth scenario because of the relative densities associated with each) are $35.71 million, not including a new collector road that would be required running East/West between Peckham and Highway 19, which would cost an additional $13.3 million.

In addition to roadway costs, COMPASS estimated the costs that would be required for railway crossings as well as a bike path running East/West between Wilder and Greenleaf. Both of the cities expressed their desire to examine the possibility of a bike path along Peckham Road, because of the residential/commercial property owners to the north of Peckham, as well as the rail line to the south of Peckham. Both could pose roadway expansion constraints along Peckham Road. Cost estimates were proposed for a path running along Highway 19, though they noted that rights of way costs could be higher along Highway 19, which are incorporated into bike path cost/linear mile.

COMPASS looked at three options for bike lanes. Option one included two, 8-foot attached asphalt pathways costing $360,000 per mile. Option two looked at a single, separated 10
foot pathways costing $300,000 per mile. Option 3 looked at a single, separated pathway and equestrian path, costing $390,000 per mile.

Existing rail crossing improvement costs would be required at Highway 19, Friends Road, Tucker Road, Van Slyke Road, Allendale Road, and Travis Road due to future road widenings and a bridge crossing required at Greenleaf, which accounts for the majority of total rail costs ($6,500,000). Improvements include concrete crossing pads, replacement of existing track rails, ballast rock, cross ties, tie plate system, and geo-textile fabric. The costs also include safety flashers and gates which most crossings do not currently have. That said, the cost of the total estimated railroad improvements for the Peckham rail spur running from Wilder to Greenleaf is approximately $10 million.

**Findings:**

*If Peckham Road were built out to the densities the scenario maps suggest, substantial road improvements would be needed along all of the roadways in the Peckham Corridor as well as all of the highways and many of the collectors within the regional transportation network, costing hundreds of millions of dollars. However, road improvements just to the Peckham Corridor, not including regional networks, are substantially less expensive but still high, costing around $48 million.*

*In addition to the cost of roadway expansion, which includes the estimated cost of purchasing rights of ways, setbacks and rights of way acquisition would also need to be negotiated. The purchase of rights of way from private property would be required especially along Peckham Road, since all of the scenarios call for three lanes on Peckham, and also because of existing residential (and hence, partially developed) land to the north, as well as the development constraint of the rail line to the south. Because of this, expanding Peckham Road to its recommended width needed to accommodate the scenarios could pose some problems due to the residential (and some commercial) property owner negotiations necessary to purchase rights of way. However, it is feasible that setbacks could be negotiated with developers along the other roads bisecting Peckham Road, including Allendale, Travis, Tucker, and Van Slyke, as part of development agreements.*

*Similar constraints exist for constructing a bike lane along Peckham Road. Using the cheapest option analyzed by COMPASS, it would cost approximately $1,200,000 to build a bike lane connecting Greenleaf to Wilder. However, rights of way, in addition to acquiring the rights of way required by the recommended road expansion, would need to be negotiated. This could pose some problems with property owners.*

*The costs to upgrade the rail crossings are substantial but not prohibitive in relation to overall transportation improvement costs.*
Canyon County Economy

Current Economic Climate in Canyon County

Canyon County is Idaho’s second most populated county, yet also boasts the second largest agricultural economy in the state, with the food processing, seed crops, and the cattle, calf, and dairy industries driving much of this revenue. While agriculture is the county’s largest economy in terms of county sales, the second largest economy is manufacturing—40% of which is high-tech.\(^3\) That said, it is impossible to view the economy of Canyon County as fitting on either side of the urban/rural divide because Canyon County is the urban/rural divide. In 2000, the last year that data was available, 26.7% of Canyon Counties population lived in rural areas, while 73.3% of their population lived in urban areas. However, 84.3% of Canyon County acreage was in agriculture as of 2002.\(^4\) More recently, the national economic decline has altered this ratio somewhat. Agriculture, in general, weathers economic declines more than most industries, and has remained relatively stable despite some layoffs at Amalgamated Sugar—a sugar beet processor and major employer in Nampa. However, mass layoffs in the high-tech industry, including Micron and Hewlett Packard in Ada County—but more specifically, the closure of MPC manufacturing in Nampa has weakened Canyon County’s high tech economy.

Despite the economic downturn, nearly every industry sector in Canyon County experienced a growth rate in total jobs during 2007 and 2008, including the manufacturing sector, which grew by 3.8% (IDL, 2008). However, by July, 2009, all sectors in Canyon County had been negatively affected by the economy. The construction, retail, real estate, mortgage and titling industries were among the hardest hit (Idaho Statesman, Department of Labor, 2009)

Additionally,

- Between December of 2007 and June of 2009 the Boise/Nampa MSA, where Wilder and Greenleaf are located, lost approximately 4261 jobs
- Of the 3,400 people in Idaho who lost jobs in June of 2009, approximately 1,100 were Canyon County residents, though without any major Canyon County employer layoff announcements, most of these jobs were thought to have been lost in Ada County (Idaho Department Labor spokesman Bob Fick, Idaho Statesman, 7/3/2009)

\(^3\) S. Peterson, A Rodrigues, 2002, The Value of Agriculture and Agricultural-related Products in Canyon County, 2002
\(^4\) S. Peterson, A Rodrigues, 2002, The Value of Agriculture and Agricultural-related Products in Canyon County, 2002
The Peckham Road Economic Development Feasibility Study

- The unemployment rate almost tripled in Canyon County between 2007 and 2009, rising from a low of 3.5% December of 2007 to 12% as of November, 2009--exceeding both state and national averages (Idaho Department of Labor, 2009)
- During the summer of 2009, Caldwell had the highest jobless rate of the state’s largest cities, at 13.5%
- The labor force in Canyon County increased by 1,455 in June of 2009 while only 399 of them actually found jobs.
- Total Treasure Valley job losses approximate 24,000, as of November, 2009, (IDL, 2009)

Canyon County Workforce

The Canyon County civilian workforce increased by 40.1% over the last decade. The mean travel time to work for Canyon County residents is 24.7 minutes.\(^5\) The relatively low cost of land, the cheapest electricity and water rates in the nation, and the high quality of life experienced in the region were the main contributing factors to this robust growth rate.

Prior to the economic crisis that began in 2007, the Treasure Valley, overall, had experienced a steadily positive economic growth rate for over twenty years. However, economic growth can be measured in a number of different ways. The chart below shows the employment share per non-farm industry in Canyon County in 2008, which indicates that the Trade, Utilities, and Transportation sector is the largest industry in terms of overall employment, employing 21% of the labor force, followed by manufacturing at 16% and government at 15%.

\(^5\) Idaho Department of Labor, 2009
Canyon Employment by Industry and Wages

The chart to the right shows Canyon County occupational wages (compiled by the DOL) beginning at $6.55 per hour, or Idaho’s minimum wage, rising to registered nurses at $18.70 per hour. It should be noted that COSSA certifies four of the ten occupations listed in the chart, including Home Health Aides, Welders, Automotive Service Technicians and Fork Lift Drivers—all of whom have starting wages above Idaho’s minimum wage.

The chart below shows the employment share and wages per industry for Canyon County, between 1998 and 2008.

Table 4: Canyon County Employment Share and Wages Per Industry, 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Employment</td>
<td>Average Wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Covered Wages</td>
<td>42,872</td>
<td>$23,707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>$15,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>$41,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>3,062</td>
<td>$24,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>813</td>
<td>$29,964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Utilities &amp; Transportation</td>
<td>7,921</td>
<td>$22,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>629</td>
<td>$27,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Activities</td>
<td>1,266</td>
<td>$23,619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and Business Services</td>
<td>2,101</td>
<td>$21,549</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational and Health Services</td>
<td>4,540</td>
<td>$25,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure and Hospitality</td>
<td>2,626</td>
<td>$8,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>994</td>
<td>$16,559</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5,872</td>
<td>$24,189</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Department of Labor, 2009

This chart shows similar information to the chart above, and indicates that, in terms of overall employment, the trade, utilities, and transportation sector was well above any other, at 11,481, followed by manufacturing, at 9091, and then government, at 8189. What is curious about this chart, however, is that it shows the agricultural sector employing a relatively low share of Canyon County’s labor force, with only 2827 workers in 2008,
despite being the County’s largest industry in terms of overall sales during the same year. It should be noted, however, that the Idaho Department of Labor quantifies food processing as manufacturing, while food processing is considered part of agricultural sales in other economic analyses.

In terms of wages, mining, while employing by far the smallest share of the County’s labor force, had the highest average wages at $41,263, followed by Information at $35,759, and then Trade, Utilities and Transportation at $35,181. In terms of industry growth between 1998 and 2008, manufacturing had the highest overall growth rate, employing only 813 individuals in 1998 compared to 9091 individuals in 2008.

**Canyon County Agriculture**

In a 2002 study entitled, *The Value of Agriculture and Agricultural-related Products in Canyon County*, University of Idaho Economists analyzed the demographic, social and economic data available through the Department of Commerce. It asked the questions, “What effect might new growth have on existing agriculture,” How important is agriculture to the county’s economy,”and,” Is new growth a substitute for agriculture or a complement?” The study conducted an economic base assessment of Canyon County’s economy, which measured total county sales per industry, and found the following:

- Total agriculturally-related employment accounted for 14,015 jobs (this included food processing, which is categorized under the manufacturing sector in DOL.
- 32.4% of county sales were associated with agriculture and food processing, which also accounted for 23.6% of employment.
- Each acre of cultivated agricultural land was worth, on average, $8,534 in annual sales, and $1372 in wages.

The study also noted that the manufacturing sector—40% of which was high-tech-related—accounted for 27.1% of all sales and 20.5 % of employment. In conclusion, the authors pointed out that every acre taken out of production will reduce County sales by $8534—not accounting for wages—if not replaced with a landuse that can produce a higher per acre return. It also advocated weighing the costs and benefits of expanding the manufacturing and other sectors against taking land out of production, and went on to suggest that non-agriculturally related industries focused on land other than irrigated farm land would produce an economic net win. (It should be noted that the same study is in the process of being updated, with preliminary indicating substantially higher per acre agriculturally-related sales in 2009).

### Top Agricultural Commodities in Canyon County in 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commodity</th>
<th>Acreage Planted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alfalfa</td>
<td>47,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn (All varieties)</td>
<td>48,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat (All varieties)</td>
<td>41,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarbeets</td>
<td>6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans (Pinto and Kidney)</td>
<td>1,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cattle &amp; Calves (All)</td>
<td>128,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef Cows</td>
<td>13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milk Cows</td>
<td>36,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Canyon County Crops

In addition to the commodities listed in the census, the following crops are also offer significant contributions to Canyon County’s economy:

**Alfalfa Seed:** Idaho produces approximately 20 million pounds of alfalfa seed each year with much of this seed grown in Canyon County.

**Beans:** Lima, pinto, navy, small whites and kidneys, are a few of the beans grown in Canyon County for both commercial and seed production.

**Mint:** Nearly all of the mint grown in Idaho is grown in Canyon County. Mint is national and international market grown for its oils, seed, and (locally), for human consumption.

**Hops:** Hops fields have begun to reemerge in Canyon County, most notably on Peckham Road. Canyon County’s climate and soil are ideal for hops production, helping to make Idaho 3rd in the country for hops production, which accounts for up to one tenth of the US total. Hops is an excellent export commodity, with 40-60% of Idaho hops sold overseas in a given year.

**Onions:** Canyon County is a major onion and onion seed producer.

**Seed Corn (Sweet):** Canyon County raises about 90% of the U.S. supply of sweet corn seed that is ultimately grown in the Midwest for human consumption. A mild climate and low rates of disease make for optimal conditions for sweet corn seed production. Loss of this industry in Canyon County could have national implications.

**Sugar Beets:** Canyon County is the largest producer of sugar beets in Idaho in terms of overall tonnage. Since sugar beets are highly perishable, plants require locating in close proximity to farms where the beets are grown. Sugar beets yield more per crop than other commodities and can take advantage of railway infrastructure which lead to nearby sugar processing plants. Amalgamated Sugar, in international sugar processor, has its second largest plant in the world located in Nampa.

**Vegetable Seed Crops:** Seed Crops grown in Canyon County are many, and warrant a chapter of their own. The seed crops grown in Canyon County are onion, carrot, radish, lettuce and many others. Seed crops are unique in that they require rigid employment of crop rotation, substantial buffer zones and can take as long as two years from seeding to harvest.

**Tree Fruit:** Canyon County is one of the three SW Idaho Counties that account for 95% of all tree fruit grown in Idaho. Apples, cherries, peaches, apricots, nectarines, pears, grapes, and plums are all grown in Canyon County.

**Wine Grapes:** Wine is one of the fastest agricultural sectors in Idaho. Over half the wine acreage and 80% of the wineries in Idaho are located in Canyon County. In addition to the sale of wine or grapes, winery tours and tasting rooms and its associated tourism can help to augment industry output. Varieties grown include: Chardonnay, Cabernet, Pinot Noir, and Riesling.

**Dairy:** The dairy industry is Idaho’s leading agricultural industry, with a substantial portion of its production occurring in Canyon County. A moderate climate, affordable feed and land, a good transportation network, and a market for milk—both locally and nationally—are a few of the factors contributing to its robust 80% state-wide growth rate in the last seven years. Currently Idaho is sixth in the nation in terms of milk production, and 2nd out of the thirteen western states.

**Produce Farms:** A number of farmers in recent years are transitioning or starting out in vegetable crops grown for sale at local farmers markets, food coops, farms stands, roadside markets and some groceries. The Back to the Land program through the University of Idaho Agricultural extension in Caldwell has trained many hundreds of Canyon County residents and growers in the sustainable food production techniques. Both Caldwell and Nampa have recently opened Farmer’s Markets, which have grown rapidly and have thrived even in the down economy. The national trend towards wanting to obtain both fresh food and a market experience have helped to contribute to this growth.

**Alternative Crops:** under experimentation (either at the Parma Research or among independent Growers) include almonds, asian pear, olives (for olive oil), figs, mulberry, jujube, persimmon, quince, sour cherry, walnuts, hazelnuts, and truffles.
Canyon County High-tech/Manufacturing

Coming from the West, Canyon County is the gateway to the Treasure Valley’s High Tech Corridor, where several multi-national companies have located over the last thirty years. According the Caldwell/Canyon Economic Development Council,

- Thirty percent of Idaho’s gross product, or $11.1 billion is related to science and technology industries.
- The Treasure Valley is ranked 2nd in the Northwest and 24th nationally in the Milken Institute’s Tech Pole Index.
- The Treasure Valley has one of the highest High Tech industry concentrations: 1st in the Northwest and 7th nationally.

![High-tech cluster graphic]

The graphic to the left shows the high-tech cluster with anchor employers and their respective universes. The blue universe indicates Micron Technology, and the Green universe indicates Hewlett Packard.

As mentioned, 40% of the manufacturing in Canyon County is high-tech related. In 2007, the manufacturing sector added just under 1,000 jobs in Canyon County, increasing by 11.6%. This growth occurred primarily in the industrial and high-tech manufacturing sub-clusters. In 2009, the manufacturing sector along with most other sectors in the County, contracted along with the national economic decline.  

Nampa, the largest city in Canyon County and the State of Idaho’s second largest city, has the densest manufacturing cluster in the Treasure Valley. Simplot, Great American Appetizers, SSS Cheese, and Amalgamated Sugar are several of the County’s largest employers in the food processing manufacturing sub-cluster. However, the manufacturing sector is broad, with Selkirk Metals fabricating industrial ventilation components, Woodgrain Millwork manufacturing molding and trim for the construction industry, and

---

6 Idaho Department of Labor, 2009
Plexus manufacturing medical devices and electronics. General manufacturing companies have come to Canyon County because of low energy and business overhead costs, while food processors and agricultural biotechnology companies have come because the climate is conducive to their production. The County’s climate is also conducive to seed production companies, including Allied Seed, Harris Moran, and Seminis, which are all national seed producers. The Food Technology Center in Caldwell, which includes a commercial kitchen, educational and technical services, product research and development, as well as a wine-processing incubator, has helped to produce and package more than 200 Idaho-made products.

**Canyon County Transportation/Distribution Sector**

Canyon County’s central location in the intermountain west, coupled with its proximity to major interstate transportation networks, make it an optimal location for transportation and logistics companies. Below is a map indicating the major logistics and distribution companies currently headquartered in the Treasure Valley.

![Map of major logistics and distribution companies in the Treasure Valley](image)

Source: Caldwell Canyon Economic Development Council

Major, national and international companies are headquartered in the Valley, including Federal Express, Northwest Paramedic Associates, Sysco, Food Service of America and Snoline Express, one of the nation’s largest fresh flower logistics companies. Increasingly, due to the higher cost of land and increased traffic congestion in Ada County,
transportation and logistics companies are finding Canyon County a more optimal place to locate.

**Findings:** Canyon County has a strong agricultural and manufacturing base in terms of County sales, despite the recent high-tech layoffs and closure of MPC in Nampa. Transportation and Logistics, and Education and Healthcare are also strong industries in the County, in terms of overall employment.

**Business Assessment**

High-tech is the number one industry in Idaho, followed by food processing. Much of this activity occurs in the Treasure Valley, specifically in Ada and Canyon Counties. However, many Canyon County residents, who experience a lower cost of living compared to their Ada County neighbors, commute to Ada County for work where there is larger concentration of high paying jobs.

Numerous articles have highlighted the benefits of doing business in Idaho in recent years. Because much of the economic activity in Idaho occurs in the Treasure Valley, the following generalizations about Idaho can be assumed to refer to this area, including Canyon County:

- Idaho ranked #1 in patents per capita.  
- Idaho ranked #4 America's Top States For Business.

**Table 4: Average Electricity Costs Per 1000 kW in W. States**

**Table 5: Annual Per Capita State & Local Taxes in W. States**
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• Idaho ranked #3 America's Best Places for Alternative Energy-Geothermal.9
• Idaho ranked #5 Best Homeownership Rate in the Nation.10
• Idaho ranked #5 Lowest Cost of Doing.11
• Idaho ranked #3 Best Economic Climate.12
• Idaho ranked #6 Best State for Business.13
• Idaho ranked #10 Best Labor Pool.14
• Idaho ranked #3 Fastest Growing State.15
• Idaho ranked #13 Wind Power Development Potential.16
• Idaho ranked Best short term employment growth.17
• Idaho had the lowest crime rate in Western States.18
• Idaho had the most new companies.19

**Treasure Valley Business Assessment**

**Boise Valley Economic Partnership Treasure Valley Business Survey**

An online survey mailed to 4814 Treasure Valley email addresses in November of 2007, resulted in a total of 671 respondents. The survey results indicated a positive response to the treasure valley business climate, as well as the need for a trained workforce. For a complete copy of the survey please see Appendix X. The following are a summary of findings:

• 81% of the respondents identified themselves as senior management, business owner, or partner;
• 68% of respondents reported that their company's local facilities employ more people now than they did five years ago;
• 84% of respondents reported that their company's sales have increased over the past five years;
• 41% of respondents reported that they expect that their company's local facilities will expand in square footage within the next five years;
• 44% of respondents said that the local business environment is more favorable now than it was five years ago

---
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- 81% of respondents said that their companies are likely or certain to stay in the Treasure Valley;
- 22% of respondents identified the skills/preparation of the local workforce as a factor negatively affecting their companies’ retention/expansion plans.

When asked what factors might positively influence their company’s retention and expansion plans,
- 89% cited local economic growth over that last several years;
- 85% cited quality of life available to local residents;
- 83% cited expectations about future economic growth;
- 60% cited occupancy costs for local businesses.

When asked what factors might negatively influence their company’s retention and expansion plans,
- 38% cited the condition of the interstate highway system;
- 37% cited the condition of the local public transportation system;
- 23% cited the skills/preparation of the local workforce;
- 22% cited the state tax policies.

While this survey was conducted in 2007—at the onset of the economic recession—respondents suggest that while there are some constraints to conducting business in the valley, primarily with the local road and public transportation systems, there is a strong sense of a healthy Treasure Valley Economy. Most businesses surveyed experienced steady economic growth, and over 40% had plans for future expansion.

**Canyon County Business Assessment**

Canyon County’s major industries and employers reflect both the geography and landuse patterns of the County itself. The current list of major employers (to the right) show that employment is a blend between food processing, government, and medical service providers. However, until the economic downfall of 2008, MPC manufacturing was a major high tech employer in Canyon County. While their Nampa plant has closed, it should be noted that several high-tech manufacturers have recently shortlisted the plant for relocation, and the loss of high-tech jobs is expected to resurge in the future.

**Canyon County Major Employers**
- Amalgamated Sugar Co.
- Caldwell School District
- Canyon County Major Employers
- City of Nampa
- J.R. Simplot
- Mercy Medical Center
- Nampa School District
- Plexus Corp.
- Woodgrain Millwork Inc.
- Vallivue School District
- Wal-mart
- West Valley Medical Center
No survey data exists specific to Canyon County employers, but the following is known through various media sources:

- Sorrento Lactalis, a Nampa cheese maker employing more than 500 people, has plans to add 50 more full-time jobs with benefits. The company estimates construction will create about 250 jobs during a 14-month project. (Idaho Statesman, June 2009)
- Three big-name retailers were lost in Canyon County in 2009, -- Sportsman’s Warehouse, Joe’s and OfficeMax - but it soon will be gaining some other major businesses, including Sports Authority and Idaho Athletic Club. (Idaho Statesman, 2009)
- Healthcare and education were only sectors to add jobs in June of 2009, compared to the last five June averages. (Department of Labor, 2009)
- Two new vintners have moved into the University of Idaho Business & Technology Incubator in Caldwell, while the incubator’s director, Steve Toomy, has said that the demand for incubator space could fill twice the wine incubation space they currently supply. They are currently in pursuit of funding for expansion.

Despite evidence of some economic growth, Canyon County’s unemployment rate has been one of the State’s highest since 2008. Department of Labor economists estimate that this rate has much to do with layoffs in Ada County, specifically at Micron and Hewlett Packard. And while the closure of MPC as well as other large box stores have undoubtedly effected Canyon County’s employment base, healthcare, education, and ag-related industries have remained strong, with some businesses expanding and hiring new employees.

**Peckham Region Business Assessment**

**COSSA Business and Industry Survey**

The commencement of this study coincided with a business and industry summit hosted by COSSA, in September of 2008. The summit was intended to garner support for building the regional technology center in Wilder. Local industry speakers, North Idaho industry speakers (testifying to their need for a skilled workforce) Sage Community Resources, COMPASS and COSSA all made presentations at the summit.

In order to gauge the expansion/relocation, skilled workforce, and infrastructural needs of local industry, Sage Community Resources compiled a business survey that asked questions regarding skilled workforce needs, the importance of proximity to various transportation modes, co-location preferences and plans for business expansion. (To see a copy of all of the survey questions, please refer to Appendix A). The survey was placed at
each seat in the summit, and participants were asked to complete it when the summit began.

At the end of the summit, fifteen surveys were returned. The following is a summary of survey results:

- 100% of respondents said that access to State Highways and/or Freeways was either “very important” or “important”
- 40% of respondents said that access to either rail or shipping transfer stations was either “very important” or “important”
- 26% of respondents felt that there was an advantage to co-locate near complimentary businesses
- 46% felt that their workforce was adequately trained, while another 46% felt that they were “somewhat trained”
- 53% had plans to expand workforce training
- 53% had plans to expand their facilities in the next five years
- 33% listed access to trained workforce as a primary reason affecting expansion plans, while 46% cited financing as a primary factor.

The survey sample was not large, however several of the region’s major employers were present, including Simplot, a major potato processor and anchor of Canyon County’s food processing cluster, Top Air, an agricultural equipment manufacturer, and R&M steel, whose pre-engineered steel building manufacturing facility east of Greenleaf supplies 80% of the airplane hangers purchased in the U.S. Together, they employ over 500 people.

**Peckham Road and Surrounding Area Employer Interviews**

T-O Engineering conducted a number of informal interviews with Peckham Region Employers. Employers were either located on Peckham Road, or fit the agricultural/light industrial model that the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf are interested in attracting. For a full list of T-O’s employer interviews, see the Appendix E. While the responses varied, T-O concluded that nearly all interview respondents noted that good employees, good product, good service and low overhead were critical to their on-going success. Low overhead, particularly in the ag-related businesses, was a factor that many business owners felt gave them a competitive edge necessary to maintain a profitable enterprise. T-O goes on to note that some of the zoning ordinances for the Cities of Greenleaf and Wilder are incompatible with a low-overhead agenda, particularly the inclusion of curb, gutter, sidewalk, and landscaping required by Wilder City Code. When brought to his attention, Mayor Bechtel of Wilder noted that were the City of Wilder’s landscaping requirements prohibitive to business relocation or expansion within the Peckham Corridor, the City would be amenable of waiving these requirements in the interest of job creation, on a case-by-case basis.
The Western Alliance

The Communities that surround the Peckham Corridor, including Marsing, Melba, Homedale, Greenleaf, Grand View, Parma, and Wilder are all members of the Western Alliance for Economic Development, whose purpose is to strengthen the economic base of rural cities by providing a forum where private businesses, government, and property owners can connect. Through the partnership and with the support of the Idaho Department of Commerce and Sage Community Resources, these communities have hired a joint economic development professional, Michael Pollard. Pollard is focused on assisting the Western Alliance communities create and retain jobs and attract private investment, and has been instrumental in connecting potential employers with the Peckham Corridor. The industry mix that makes up the Western Alliance reflects the diversity of Canyon County itself, ranging from international food processors to healthcare services to high tech. The following are the industries that form the core base of the Western Alliance:

- Agriculture, Forestry, Fishing and Hunting Businesses (60)
- Construction-related Businesses (62)
- Wholesale Trade Businesses (49)
- Accommodation and Food Service Businesses (48)
- Retail Trade Businesses (94)
- Health Care and Social Assistance Businesses (33)
- Transportation and Warehousing Businesses (20)
- Professional, Scientific and Technical Service Businesses (19)
- Educational Service Businesses (20)

Buying locally, supporting business to business networking, and building off of existing industry clusters can bolster regional economies, strengthen community connections, and help to preserve a rural way of life.

Findings:

There are a number of attractive attributes the Treasure Valley offers that encourage businesses to expand, stay, or relocate here. Treasure Valley businesses surveyed have benefited from the strong Treasure Valley Economy in the last two decades, and, at least prior to the economic downturn, expect continued economic growth in the region. Of the factors negatively affecting expansion plans, 23% responded that the availability of skilled labor is a factor, and while relatively low compared the other negative factors, it does indicate that there is a need to expand workforce training opportunities in the Valley. Of Peckham Road regional businesses surveyed, over half cited plans for expansion of both their facilities and their workforce training, while Peckham Road employers interviewed, most of whom were light industrial or ag-related, cited that both good employees and low overhead were of equal importance to their success.
Industry Projections and Forecasts

Industry and Employment Projections for Southwest Idaho.

The charts below list the projected fastest growing and fastest declining occupations and industries for Southwest Idaho, compiled by the Idaho Department of Labor. These projections were then compared to COSSA’s area of expertise, in order to gauge COSSA’s receptivity to local industry trends, as well as the likelihood of industry potential to co-locate along the Peckham Corridor, because if the value of COSSA’s services.

Table 5: Top Ten Fastest Growing Occupations in Southwest Idaho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Employment 2006</th>
<th>Employment 2016</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Actuaries</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>78.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal and Home Care Aides</td>
<td>617</td>
<td>1,062</td>
<td>72.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Health Aides</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td>2,661</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Human Service Assistants</td>
<td>1,099</td>
<td>1,846</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Software Engineers, Camera Operators, Television, Video, and Motion Picture</td>
<td>468</td>
<td>746</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child, Family, and School Social Workers</td>
<td>563</td>
<td>882</td>
<td>56.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadcast Technicians</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Systems and Data Communications Analysts</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>508</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advertising Sales Agents</td>
<td>350</td>
<td>542</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top ten fastest growing occupations in Southwest Idaho between 2006 and 2016, in terms of overall projected employment growth, fall within the communications, sales, high tech and healthcare industries. Four of the top five fastest growing industries, healthcare and engineering, fall within two areas of COSSA’s expertise.
Table 6: Top Ten Fastest Growing Industries in Southwest Idaho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>Percent of Employment</td>
<td>Percent of Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and Support and Waste Management and Remediation Services</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>8.7%</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance excluding federal</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>43.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance and Insurance</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services (except Public Administration)</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Services (all ownership)</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top ten fastest growing industries in Southwest Idaho between 2006 and 2016 are broader than the industries reflective of the largest employment growth, and include the information, mining, administrative support and waste management, healthcare, utilities, finance, high-tech, and education sectors. Of these, COSSA provides vocational training in three of these industries, specifically in the high-tech, healthcare and utility sectors, however, COSSA is currently in discussion about adding a fourth at the request of local industry---waste management and remediation---because of the dearth of Class IV wastewater treatment operators currently available in the State of Idaho.
Table 7: Top Ten Declining Occupations in Southwest Idaho

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>File Clerks</td>
<td>919</td>
<td>590</td>
<td>-35.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic Process Workers</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Operators</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>-15.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tool Grinders, Filers, and Sharpeners</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>-12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lathe and Turning Machine Tool Setters, Operators, and Tenders, Metal and Plastic</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>-10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewing Machine Operators</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cutting, Punching, and Press Machine Setters, Operators, and Tenders, Metal and Plastic</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>-9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tailors, Dressmakers, and Custom Sewers</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>-8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drilling and Boring Machine Tool Setters, Operators, and Tenders, Metal and Plastic</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>-8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and Electronic Equipment Assemblers</td>
<td>435</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>-7.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The top ten declining occupations in Southwest Idaho during 2006-2016 fall within the building trade, high-tech, textile, office management and printing industries. Of these, COSSA prepares students for two of these sectors, specifically the high tech and building trades industries.
The top ten projected slowest growing industries in Southwest Idaho between 2006 and 2016 fall within the manufacturing, wholesale and retail trade, arts and entertainment government, construction and real estate, and food services industries. Of these, COSSA trains students in one of these industries—construction or building trades.

**Findings:**

*COSSA trains its students in industries that are slated to both grow and decline in the Treasure Valley in the next six years. Of the industries that are projected to decline, the building trades/ construction sector is the one that shows the least promise in terms of prospective economic growth. In terms of employment, and out of all of COSSA’s areas of expertise, the Health Care sector shows the most promise in terms of total future jobs available.*
National Projections for COSSA-specific Industries

While the Idaho Department of Labor’s projected industry projections are specific to the Treasure Valley, national employment trends suggest that the need for vocational-technical training, in general, and specifically for the COSSA’s areas of expertise, will continue to be in high demand in the coming decades. The Bureau of Labor Statistics (2008) estimates that 45% of new job openings in the next ten years will require “middle skill” training, particularly in the areas of health professions, construction, engineering, welding and auto mechanics. Because of the projected demand in contrast to the current supply, the Department of Labor also estimates that there will be skilled worker shortages in each of these areas of expertise except construction. Furthermore, more than half of employers surveyed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce responded that it was either “hard” or “very hard” to find skilled labor, even during a slow economy.

The following are the projections for the industries that fall within COSSA’s areas of expertise, as compiled by the US Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Handbook, 2008-2018.

Health Care Professions

The health care industry has experienced healthy economic growth in the last decade, and is expected to be one of the fastest growing industries in the coming years. Consider the following:

- The Healthcare industry was one of the nation’s largest in 2008, providing 14.3 million jobs for wage and salary workers.
- Ten of the 20 fastest growing occupations are healthcare related.
- Between 2008 and 2018, the Healthcare industry will generate 3.2 million new wage and salary jobs, more than any other industry. This is largely due to the country’s rapidly growing elderly population.
- Most workers in the Healthcare Industry have jobs that require less than 4 years of college education.

The charts below shows the projected growth within the industry by occupation. Out of all health care establishments, 42.6% of were ambulatory healthcare. While the industry as a whole is expected to grow by 22% until 2018, the demand for physicians assistants, administrative assistants, and registered nurses are expected to grow faster than the rest of healthcare related occupations, at 41%, 26%, and 23%, respectively.
Table 9: Projected Employment Change in the Healthcare Industry, 2008 - 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Employment, 2008</th>
<th>Percent Change, 2008-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Occupations</td>
<td>14,336.00</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, and financial occupations</td>
<td>614.6</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional and related occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselors</td>
<td>171.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social workers</td>
<td>206.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dietitians and nutritionists</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physicians and surgeons</td>
<td>512.5</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician assistants</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registered nurses</td>
<td>2,192.40</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical laboratory technologists and technicians</td>
<td>278.8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency medical technicians and paramedics</td>
<td>142.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licensed practical and licensed vocational nurses</td>
<td>619.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and administrative support occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billing and posting clerks and machine operators</td>
<td>194.8</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receptionists and information clerks</td>
<td>386.3</td>
<td>16.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries and administrative assistants</td>
<td>770.7</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Employment Matrix, BLS, 2009

Welding

In 2006, welders, solderers and brazing workers accounted for approximately 462,000 jobs. (Please note: The 2008 Occupational Handbook subdivides welding professions by industry, so 2006-2016 Occupational Handbook projections were used). Most of these jobs are found in the construction, manufacturing and utilities sectors. However, two out of three of these jobs were found in the manufacturing sector, specifically in the manufacturing of fabricated metals, transportation equipment, machinery, and architectural and structural metals. And while the industry is expected to grow more slowly than average—at 5% between 2006-2016, due primarily to the slow growth of the manufacturing industry -- excellent job opportunities will persist due to the shortage of trained welders in the workforce. The welding industry also has the ability to weather economic declines better than
most, since the skillsets required by welders are uniform across industries, so welders can easily shift from one industry to another depending on where they are most in demand. The chart below shows the change in employment between 2006 and 2016 for the industry.

Table 10: Projected Employment Change in the Welding Industry, 2006-2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welding, soldering, and brazing workers</td>
<td>462,000</td>
<td>484,000</td>
<td>22,000 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welders, cutters, solderers, and brazers</td>
<td>409,000</td>
<td>430,000</td>
<td>21,000 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welding, soldering, and brazing machine setters, operators, and tenders</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>54,000</td>
<td>1,000 (3%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Employment Matrix, BLS, 2009

Engineering

Civil, environmental, industrial, and bio-medical engineers are the sectors within engineering that will experience the most employment growth over the coming decade. Employment of engineers is expected to grow about as fast as the average for all occupations over the next decade, but growth will vary by specialty. Environmental engineers should experience the fastest growth, while civil engineers should see the largest employment increase. Overall job opportunities in engineering are expected to be good. Between 2006 and 2016, employment within the engineering sector is expected to grow by 11%. Job prospects will continue to look good for engineering students, with the number of graduates roughly equally the number of new jobs during this same time period. Wages are also substantially higher in the engineering professions than in other industries, with civil engineers earning, on average, $78,560 in 2008, while electrical and electronic engineering technicians earning, on average, $53,990 in the same year.
Table 11: Projected Employment Change in the Engineering Industry, 2008-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Title</th>
<th>Employment 2008</th>
<th>Employment 2018</th>
<th>Change, 2008-18</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineers</td>
<td>1,571,900</td>
<td>1,750,300</td>
<td>178,300</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace engineers</td>
<td>71,600</td>
<td>79,100</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural engineers</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biomedical engineers</td>
<td>16,000</td>
<td>27,600</td>
<td>11,600</td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical engineers</td>
<td>31,700</td>
<td>31,000</td>
<td>-700</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil engineers</td>
<td>278,400</td>
<td>345,900</td>
<td>67,600</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer hardware engineers</td>
<td>74,700</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical and electronics engineers</td>
<td>301,500</td>
<td>304,600</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical engineers</td>
<td>157,800</td>
<td>160,500</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronics engineers, except computer</td>
<td>143,700</td>
<td>144,100</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental engineers</td>
<td>54,300</td>
<td>70,900</td>
<td>16,600</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial engineers</td>
<td>240,400</td>
<td>273,700</td>
<td>33,200</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and safety engineers, Industrial engineers</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>28,300</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marine engineers and naval architects</td>
<td>214,800</td>
<td>245,300</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials engineers</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mechanical engineers</td>
<td>24,400</td>
<td>26,600</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and geological engineers</td>
<td>238,700</td>
<td>253,100</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum engineers</td>
<td>7,100</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear engineers</td>
<td>16,900</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petroleum engineers</td>
<td>21,900</td>
<td>25,900</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other engineers</td>
<td>183,200</td>
<td>195,400</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Employment Matrix, BLS, 2009
Automotive/Diesel Mechanics

Employment of automotive service technicians and mechanics is expected to increase about as fast as the average through the year 2018, though employment opportunities should remain good because of the expected retirement of many workers within the industry. Job opportunities should be very good for certified workers of automotive training programs, who will likely be able to out-compete entry-level workers without training. Between 2008-2018, demand for technicians will also grow as the total number of vehicles in operation increases, reflecting both population growth and the continued trend in the number of multi-car families. As an industry, auto/diesel mechanics can weather economic downturns better than most, and most industry-certified professions should be able to expect steady work. The average wage for automotive service technicians and mechanics in 2008 was $37,540.

Table 12: Projected Employment Change in the Automotive Technology Industry, 2008-2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupational Title</th>
<th>Employment, 2008</th>
<th>Projected Employment, 2018</th>
<th>Change, 2008-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Automotive service technicians and mechanics</td>
<td>763,700</td>
<td>799,600</td>
<td>35,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: National Employment Matrix, BLS, 2009

Building Trades

Despite the sharp decline in the construction industry that began in 2007, the number of wage and jobs in the construction industry is expected to grow by nearly 19% from 2008-2018, compared with the 11% projected for all industries combined. Employment will depend primarily on new construction as well as renovation of older buildings. Green construction and renovation are expected to become higher in demand as concern for the environment grows. Job prospects within the industry are expected to be good, especially for skilled construction trades workers, primarily due to the anticipated departure of skilled workers within the industry in the coming decade. Wages within the industry are high, and average around $36,500 per year.
Table 13: Projected Employment Change in the Construction Industry, 2008-2018


*(Employment in thousands)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Employment, 2008</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Percent Change, 2008-18</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All occupations</td>
<td>7,214.90</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, and financial occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General and operations managers</td>
<td>571.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction managers</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost estimators</td>
<td>176.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management, business, and financial occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office and administrative support occupations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive secretaries and administrative assistants</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretaries, except legal, medical, and executive</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office clerks, general</td>
<td>159.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction and extraction occupations</td>
<td>4,741.70</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-line supervisors/managers of construction trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brickmasons, blockmasons, and stonemasons</td>
<td>442.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement masons, concrete finishers, and terrazzo</td>
<td>176.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction laborers</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction equipment operators</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drywall installers, ceiling tile installers, and tapers</td>
<td>159.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction equipment operators</td>
<td>4,741.70</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drywall installers, ceiling tile installers, and tapers</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenters</td>
<td>176.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cement masons, concrete finishers, and terrazzo</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>17.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction laborers</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction equipment operators</td>
<td>159.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>19.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation, maintenance, and repair occupations</td>
<td>545.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heating, air conditioning, and refrigeration mechanics</td>
<td>178.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Line installers and repairers</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and material moving occupations</td>
<td>251.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

Every industry that falls within COSSA’s areas of expertise is expected to either grow faster than all industries averaged nationwide, or about as fast as historic averages within their industry, providing steady employment in the coming years. In terms of attracting development for the Peckham Road Corridor, all of the businesses within these industries will be in demand of a steady supply of skilled labor in order to keep pace with projected growth rates.

Idaho Business Tax Incentives

Business Investment Tax Credit
Businesses investments of at least $500,000 towards new facilities and the creation at least 10 new jobs averaging $40,000 in wages annually, plus benefits, may qualify for the following incentives:

- an enhanced Investment Tax Credit of 3.75% , up to $750,000 OR 62.5% of tax liability in any one year
- a new jobs tax credit starting at $1,500 and climbing to $3,000 per job
- 2.5% real property improvement tax credit up to $125,000 in any one year along with a 25% rebate on sales tax paid on construction materials for the new facilities
- upon request of the company, respective county commissioners may also authorize a full or partial property tax exemption

Rural Property Tax Exemption
Businesses investing a minimum of $3 million in new manufacturing facilities may receive partial or full property tax exemptions from local county commissioners. To qualify, businesses must invest and build in a rural area as defined by USDA Rural Development (Wilder meets the criteria as defined by USDA).

Large Business Property Tax Cap
Businesses that invest a minimum of $1 billion in capital improvements will receive a property tax exemption on all property in excess of $400 million in value per year.
Large Employer Property Tax Cap
Businesses that employ at least 1,500 people within an Idaho county may receive a property tax exemption on property values in excess of $800 million. To qualify, the business must make a yearly capital investment of at least $25 million within that county.

100% Property Tax Exemption
Business inventory, motor vehicles, vessels and aircraft are 100% exempt from property tax.

Income Tax Incentives
Up to $2,000 for training costs for each new job may be reimbursed to businesses in select rural counties. Each new job must pay at least $12, plus benefits; businesses must qualify for Idaho's Workforce Development Training Fund program.

New Jobs Income Tax Credit
For each additional employee added, businesses may earn a $1,000 tax credit. New employees must work a minimum of 20 hours per week, make at least $15.50 an hour, and be eligible to receive employer provided coverage under an accident or health plan. The credit may be carried forward up to three years.

$500 Tax Credit
Businesses may earn a $500 tax credit for adding new jobs in the production, assembly, fabrication, manufacturing or processing of natural resources. This credit cannot be combined with the $1,000 new jobs credit.

3% Investment Tax Credit
Businesses that make certain investments may be eligible for an income tax credit. This credit can offset up to 50% of a company's state income tax liability for up to 14 years.

Qualified Investment Exemption
A two year exemption from property tax on certain personal property is available if a loss was incurred in the second preceding tax year in which the property is placed in service. The loss must have been computed without regard to any net operating loss carry over or carry back.

Findings:

The State of Idaho offers a number of business incentives that make it attractive for business to expand, stay, or relocate here.
Local Taxing Authority

While Idaho does have a number of business incentives that it offers all businesses, which has helped to spur Eastern Treasure Valley economic development, and which, combined with property values, utility pricing, and access to educational networks and recreation have made Idaho one of the nation’s most favorable locations to conduct business, the Idaho State Legislature has repeatedly chosen not to allocate specific taxing authorities to local jurisdictions. In the absence of attractive, effective incentives to offer to prospective and existing employers, rural communities have been unable to compete with its Eastern Treasure Valley neighbors in terms of attracting development. The Cities of Boise, Nampa, Caldwell, Meridian and Eagle repeatedly trump their rural neighbors in terms of business development or relocation; overtime, distinct industry clusters have developed in these areas so that the phenomenon becomes self-perpetuating.

Local jurisdictions do not have the authority, for example, to waive property taxes in order to incentive development within an allocated area. This is evidenced by the repeated failure of the local option tax, most recently in 2008, as well as the attempt to create State-authorized Renewable Energy Enterprise Zones, which failed in early 2009. However, the momentum behind these local options has not waned and they are expected to emerge again in subsequent legislative sessions.

After failed legislative approval for the creation of enterprise zones, and also because of the money for renewable energy projects that was made available through the AARA, the Idaho Office of Energy Resources (OER) applied for and received money to finance the creation of REEZ’s that are independent of legislative approval. The OER has also stated that they will apply again for stimulus money that will be used for the creation and/or expansion of REEZ’s if they become available again, as well as try for legislative passage of the bill that failed in 2009.

Nevertheless, there is some taxing authority that is available to municipalities for the undertaking of a diverse range of projects. And while this authority does not always directly incentivize new business development, it does have the ability to create more attractive conditions for businesses to expand or relocate.

Business Improvement Districts (BID’s)

Business Improvement Districts are districts where special assessments are levied against businesses within the proposed district to pay for the acquisition or construction of improvements, which are designed to specifically benefit retail trade. They are initiated by petition, which must be endorsed by the business owners within the district that would pay, at a minimum, 50% of the proposed special assessments. Business Improvement Districts can be created for the following projects:

- Promotion of activities (marketing)
- Acquisition and/or operation of transportation services that promote retail trade
• Physical improvements of public space
• Promotional activities that take place in public places
• Acquisition, construction or maintenance of parking facilities

**Local Improvement Districts (LID’s)**

Local Improvement Districts (LID’s) are districts where improvements are financed by the property owners within the district, by levy assessments that are staggered according to the relative benefit of each property owner. These districts can include commercial, industrial, or residential property owners. Because the improvements directly benefit (in terms of the potential rise in property values) only the property owners located within the district, they may be financed with bonds without city-wide voter approval. LID’s are created to finance the following improvements:

- Parking facilities
- Streetscape upgrades, including sidewalks, gutters, storm sewers & ditches
- Street lighting
- Landscaping
- Reservoir, irrigation, or other drainage enclosures
- Parks and recreational facilities
- Removal of nonconforming existing facilities
- Property acquisition
- Irrigation systems

**Urban Renewal Districts**

Urban Renewal Districts (URD’s) are an independent public corporation which is authorized by its respective unit of government to undertake and oversee urban renewal projects. These corporations, or “urban renewal agencies” can be created when a city contains “a deteriorated area or a deteriorating area” as defined by Idaho Code 50-2018, which includes, but is not limited to the following characteristics:

- Deteriorating structures
- Defective of inadequate street layout
- Unsafe or unsanitary conditions
- Tax or special assessment delinquency that exceeds the fair value of the land
- Endangerments to life or property by fire or other natural causes
- Any combination of a factors that substantially impedes the healthy growth of a city

The members of an urban renewal agency include a board of not less than three, nor more than nine commissioners, who are appointed by the mayor and confirmed by the city council. This agency is given the following powers as defined in Idaho Code 50-2007:

- Execute urban renewal and related projects
- Create and execute contracts
• Construct or reconstruct the following:
  1. Streets
  2. Utilities
  3. Parks/Playgrounds
  4. Parking facilities
  5. Public facilities,
  6. Other buildings and/or public improvement

Acquire property through lease, purchase, option, gift, devise, bequest, grant, or eminent domain
Apply for grants, contributions or any other form of financial assistance from any private or public source
Issue bonds to finance projects (the interest, of which, is exempt from federal taxes)

While Urban Renewal Districts can be financed in a number of ways, they are often financed with Tax Increment Financing, which is one of the few taxing authorizations allowable to cities and counties by the Idaho State Legislature.

**Tax Increment Financing**

Tax Increment Financing is an authorization given to urban renewal agencies and/or disadvantaged border communities by the Local Economic Development Act of 1988. Once an urban renewal area or other area that has been targeted for economic development has been defined, an assessor establishes a base value for property in the area based on its current assessed value. Since property values will rise incrementally over time and also with an increase of both public and private investment, the property taxes generated by this “increment” are given to the urban renewal agency or other government entity for investments within the targeted area. In the absence of a local option taxing authority, tax increment financing remains one of the only ways that units of government in Idaho can directly reinvest their tax dollars into projects within their communities that are not funded by standard budgets.

**Findings**

Due to the limited opportunities that exist for municipal and county governments Idaho to raise revenue, self-tax, and/or incentivize business development, every legal option available to these entities should be fully explored.
General Rural Economic Development Strategies

There is a wide array of rural economic development recommendations in the literature, and many conflicting theories. However, there have been some empirical studies that gauge regional competitiveness, as well as multiple themes that emerge in the recommendations offered by contemporary researchers, policy makers and practitioners. The following are the basic, recurring principles that are linked to successful rural development strategies:

- Shared economic (and landuse) vision can elicit wide support and increased coordination
- Strong public and private leadership and coordination
- Focusing economies off of intrinsic strengths rather than emulating rural development efforts elsewhere
- Cluster-based approach to development
- Broad collaboration amongst institutions, government and constituencies in order to effectively address competitiveness
- A regional, private-sector driven economic development organizational structure

The recommendations most cited in the literature for rural economic development are the following:

- Increased strategic linkages to metropolitan regions
- Improve investments in advanced communication infrastructure to enhance connectivity to urban areas, facilitate the dissemination of information, and reduce the barriers between cross-regional, urban-to-rural cluster development
- Target investments in the rural business environment including skilled workforce, transportation infrastructure, and technology infrastructure (particularly communication) around the theme of “connectivity.”
- Encourage cluster based rural economic development policies as central to leveraging rural competitiveness, which includes learning which regionally specific industries are feasible for cluster development or enhancement
- Developing effective institutions for a knowledge-based economy
- Support more diversified and value-added agricultural ventures
- Engage in grass-roots, community-based planning and policy processes.

---

Findings:
The Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf are either already engaging in or are in the process of engaging in all of the principles necessary for successful implementation of rural development strategies in terms of having a shared economic and landuse vision, strong public/private leadership and coordination, and building off the strengths of the existing economy. Of the recommendations issued in the literature, Peckham Road has a number of strengths, but also some areas for improvement:

- **Increased strategic linkages to metropolitan regions.** Peckham Road is well connected to a range of highway and freeway networks that effectively connect it to the surrounding metropolitan regions. Areas for improvement include increased public transportation options and better utilization of regional rail systems.

- **Improve investments in advanced communication infrastructure to enhance connectivity to urban areas, facilitate the dissemination of information, and reduce the barriers between cross-regional, urban-to-rural cluster development.** The Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf both have access to cable and high-speed internet as well as cellular connectivity. Canyon County is currently pursuing funds for broadband expansion, with the Peckham Corridor the likely route for enhanced connections because of existing infrastructural assets, as well as its central location in the proposed enterprise zone.

- **Target investments in the rural business environment including skilled workforce, transportation infrastructure, and technology infrastructure (particularly communication) around the theme of “connectivity.”** Four out of the five rural communities in COSSA’s service region passed bond or levy elections during the most depressed economy in over twenty years to support the development of the COSSA Regional Technology Center in Wilder. Investments into transportation infrastructure are beyond the budgets and scope of these communities at this time.

- **Encourage cluster based rural economic development policies as central to leveraging rural competitiveness.** The Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf recognize the strengths of building off of existing industry clusters as the key to economic development and the preservation of their rural way of life.

- **Developing effective institutions for a knowledge-based economy.** COSSA’s Engineering and Health Professions departments prepare both engineering and medical technicians as well as future engineers and doctors for the knowledge-based economy, offering college-level coursework to high-school students.

- **Support more diversified and value-added agricultural ventures.** The Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf want to encourage food processing and other value-added agricultural ventures, as well as other compatible landuses along Peckham Road.

- **Engage in grass-roots, community-based planning and policy processes.** The region’s mayors, volunteer councils and planning and zoning commissions, school districts, property owners, industry leaders and developers all participated in this feasibility study and visioning efforts.
Rural Development Strategies-Specific
The following are specific strategies that have been demonstrated to be capable of promoting rural economic development.

*Education as Rural Development Strategy*

Numerous studies point to the role that education (human capital) plays in rural economic development. Generally, a higher educated population in rural areas—meaning high school graduates with some college—are associated with economic growth in the following ways:

- By enhancing the ability of local businesses to adapt new technologies in response to changing economic conditions.
- By increasing the community’s chances of attracting new employers—especially in the high tech, skilled, and technical sectors.
- By networking and information sharing—two things that are critical to industry cluster development.\(^{21}\)

Empirical data points to an increase in the share of adults with some college in rural counties, and a rise in both per capita income and employment. A 2002 USDA study showed that, nationwide, the average weekly earnings of workers in rural areas was $782 for college graduates, $438 for high school graduates, and $355 for those lacking either.\(^{22}\)

A study of southern, rural counties that had an increase of five percent share of adults attending college, had, on average, a 3.5% rise in per capita income over twenty years. In farming communities, an educated workforce has been connected with a more rapid adoption of new innovations in agriculture, including seed, chemicals and machinery, that have yielded greater net incomes compared with farming communities with a less educated workforce.\(^{23}\) However, educating youth in rural areas is often not enough, because the strength of the relationship between education levels and economic development depends upon the community’s ability to retain its educated population.\(^{24}\) If out-migration of educated adults exceeds in-migration or retention, then an economic net loss occurs, both because of the inability to reap taxpayer investment into their education districts, but also because of the loss of higher per capita incomes associated with a more educated labor force. Because of this, communities must identify other factors affecting their ability to retain workforce as it pertains to increasing their chances of attracting employers. These factors include access to infrastructure, transportation networks, housing, good school districts, and quality of life.

\(^{21}\) Goetz, Stephen and Rupasingha, Anil 2003, Penn State University, *How the Returns to Education in Rural Areas Vary Across the Nation*


\(^{23}\) Goetz, Stephen and Rupasingha, Anil 2003, Penn State University, *How the Returns to Education in Rural Areas Vary Across the Nation*

\(^{24}\) Footnote: Gibbs, 2005, *Education as Rural Development Strategy*
One approach offered in the literature to address the out-migration of educated youth is by making further investments into the region’s educational systems. Studies suggest that creating curricula that is designed to link local students to local employers can offset out-migrating tendencies by:

- helping students acquire problem solving, job and entrepreneurial skills through apprenticeships and school-to-work programs,
- assisting local businesses, (and hence employment opportunities) in their workforce needs
- giving students a sense of place and more identification with their community.

Last, much of the employment growth in recent years has favored high-skilled over low-skilled labor, including in the manufacturing sector, who is consistently choosing to locate in places that host a more educated workforce. Since manufacturing is the second largest industry in Canyon County, considerations regarding national manufacturing relocation needs and trends should be acknowledged.25

Findings:

The Canyon Owyhee School Service Agency, by both providing industry-certified training for in-demand expertise as well as serving as the anchor employer for the Peckham Corridor, has, and will continue to have, a positive impact on economic development and on business retention for both the Peckham Corridor and the region, creating or retaining 200 jobs per year (based on projected school graduates—96% of whom will find employment upon graduation as well as projected number of adult work force training that is currently being arranged with industry employer). COSSA is also poised to catalyze economic development by attracting future employers to the corridor, based on empirical data. Last, the WIA adult work-force training efforts—some of which have gone to support COSSA’s high school for at-risk youth who enroll in COSSA’s vo-tech programs-- have proved to have a significant return on investment through increasing wages, taxes, and reducing public assistance. Given COSSA’s job placement rate and average starting wages compared against minimum wage and considering the demographic of COSSA’s service region where 20% of the population live below poverty level and 68% of its students receive free or reduced lunches, it is safe to say that COSSA’s return on taxpayer investment is likely comparable.

**Cluster Development and Industry Co-location as Rural Development Strategy**

**Industry Clusters**

Industry clusters are widely known to foster economic development. They are also known to contribute to an increase in standard of living resulting from higher wages as well as lower unemployment. Businesses benefit from clustering because it provides them better access to suppliers, distributors, support services, and skilled labor pools. Innovation, the more rapid transfer of ideas, increased knowledge, as well as spontaneous and deliberate collaboration happen because of firms' proximity to one another. The result is increased economic development.  

A 1997 EDA sponsored paper titled, *Cluster Based Economic Development: A Key to Regional Competitiveness*, noted that the following are the components of a successful industry cluster:

- Linking education providers with workforce managers
- Connecting technology providers with product developers
- Shaping physical infrastructure to meet industry needs
- Linking rural areas to metropolitan centers
- Organizing policy makers to maximize cluster productivity

**Co-location**

Co-location can be implemented in two ways. Businesses of the same sector who co-locate

---

create the essential ingredient for cluster development, and the networking that happen as a result. But the benefits of co-location can also occur when industries either don't compete, or develop symbiotic relationships to each other. A study that assessed co-location of different industry clusters and their relationship to economic performance in both rural and non-rural counties across the nation, found that the industries most inclined to benefit from co-locating were business and financial services, information technology, telecommunications, and the printing and publishing clusters.

Economic performance was measured in terms of employment share, unemployment rate, poverty rate, wages, and per capita income. The study also found that for the agribusiness, food processing, and technology clusters, co-location neither decreased nor increased economic performance; also there was no tendency to avoid co-locating. The manufacturing supercluster was also found to increase per capita incomes and decrease poverty rates. Other results of the study indicated that human capital—or percentage of adults with at least some college was a primary factor indicating income growth.²⁷

Another example of co-location tendencies can be found in eco-industrial parks, shown in the graphic above. Eco-industrial parks house businesses of complimentary sectors, where the waste of one sector can supply the raw material for another. For example the waste

²⁷ Purdue University, Center for Urban Development, 2003, Unlocking Rural Competitiveness: The Role of Regional Clusters
wood from lumber mills or construction industries can be used to feed a woody biomass power plant.

**Findings:**

*Industry cluster development can improve the economy by through increased innovation, increase competitive edges through collaboration, raise per capita incomes and employment levels, and help to prevent out-migration, or “brain drain,” by retaining a skilled workforce. Canyon County, including the cities in the Peckham region, have three main industry clusters that warrant both preservation and promotion: Agriculture and Ag-related industry, Manufacturing, and High-tech. Together, they form a diverse economy that not only show no negative co-location tendencies, but increasingly show they have the ability to collaborate, especially in the energy sector.*

**Smart Growth as a Rural Development Strategy**

Smart Growth is a development principle that has been endorsed by the EPA and American Planning Association to reduce the environmental, transportation, infrastructural and adverse pedestrian impacts that unplanned developments can often cause. The national Smart Growth Network has developed the following ten principles that can be used to gauge whether the growth occurring is “smart” or not. These principles include:

1. Mix land uses
2. Compact building design
3. Diverse range of housing opportunities and choices
4. Walkable neighborhoods
5. Distinctive, attractive communities that create a strong sense of place
6. Preservation of open space, farmland, natural beauty, and critical environmental areas
7. Concentrated development within existing communities (instead of farm or open space outside of communities)
8. Variety of transportation choices
9. Development decisions that are fair and cost effective
10. Community and stakeholder collaboration in development decisions

On the EPA’s website, its states, “Many studies show the environmental benefits of smart growth. Development guided by smart growth principles can minimize air and water pollution, encourage brownfield clean-up and reuse, and preserve natural lands”. It goes on to cite its own series of studies evaluating landuse and environmental quality which have confirmed the following:

- The EPA-funded study titled, *An Evaluation of the Environmental Benefits of Infill Versus Greenfield Development* found that new developments sited in existing neighborhoods that make it easy for people to walk, bike or use public
transit, instead of on open space at the suburban fringe that lacks these amenities, can reduce vehicle miles driven by as much as 58 percent.

- In 2000, The Rutgers University Center for Urban Policy and Research completed a study for the state of New Jersey and found that, compared to less compact growth patterns, smart growth could reduce the conversion of open space to development by 43 percent, farmland by 28 percent, and environmentally sensitive lands by 80 percent.
- An EPA-funded study of the City of Seattle neighborhoods in 2005 Seattle study found that people residing in neighborhoods with mixed uses and well connected streets traveled 26% fewer vehicle miles than people residing in less connected neighborhoods with more widely dispersed development patterns.

For a complete list of Smart Growth Principles, their definitions, and suggested implementation strategies, please refer to Appendix C.

**Findings:**

Both the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf, but more specifically Greenleaf, have experienced the frustrations of having to upgrade either their water and wastewater systems in order to meet current EPA (and State DEQ) requirements. Technologies that were approved decades ago are now obsolete, and it becomes the Cities’ burden to upgrade to currently approved technologies. The consent order that has been levied against Greenleaf could, theoretically, disincorporate it if Greenleaf cannot meet the regulatory requirements. This burden is coupled with a population that does not have the discretionary income to afford a large increase in utility rates, which the mandated environmental upgrades invariably imply. This, combined with the state of the current economy, and a county where over one in ten people are unemployed, have made the task of DEQ compliance an enormous, complicated, and time consuming undertaking, which has taxed the already heavy workload of municipal staff. Fortunately, Greenleaf has cobbled enough resources—due primarily to stimulus monies and bonding available---to build a wastewater treatment plant in the near future. The studies have shown that it is feasible for Wilder to connect to Greenleaf’s treatment plant, with pipes running along Peckham Road, which will open the possibility for business to also be able to connect in the future. However, given unknown but expected future environmental regulation, coupled with the stated environmental benefits of implementing smart growth development, it becomes fiscally wise for both of these cities to expand in a way that prevents a further degradation of the environment, and hence, further costly—and often cost prohibitive—environmental compliance.

**Niche Agriculture as a Rural Economic Development Strategy**

The average price per acre for the top three agricultural commodities grown in Canyon County in 2008 was $434 per acre.\(^{28}\) This was based on the average price per unit produced respectively, but does not include a breakdown of the different pricing available

---

\(^{28}\) U.S. Agricultural Census, 2008
for different crop attributes. For example, while Census Data will quantify the total acreage of corn in production, while distinguishing between corn grown for silage or human consumption, it does not distinguish between corn grown for seed, which often garners more per acre than conventionally grown corn.

The average age of the Idaho Farmer is 57, while the average annual net salary is $53,720. (Idaho Ag.Census, 2008). This mirrors the national average. However, nationwide, the number of farm operators 75 years and older has risen by 20% since 2002. (U.S. Census, 2007), the number of farm operators under the age of 25 declined by 30% while during that same period. This suggests a national trend where America’s youth are becoming less and less attracted to the farming professions. That said, many Americans, including Idahoans who live in rural areas, while unwilling to pursue agriculture themselves, want to preserve their pastoral viewsheds and agricultural way of life. Diversifying agricultural bases, and the encouragement of niche agriculture, can help to offset low-per-acre commodity crop profits, while appealing to a broader farming base. Additionally, niche agricultural industries can often survive off of substantially less acreage, due to the higher per acre yield, and do not require the large tracts of contiguous land often required by conventional commodity crops.

Organics

Between 1990 and 2007, the organic food and beverage industry in the U.S. grew from $1 billion to $20 billion. While only representing 2.8% of all U.S. food sales, the organic industry is expected to continue to grow substantially in the coming years. In 2006, organic food and non-food sales rose 21% over 2005. Between 2007 and 2010, organic food sales are expected to increase, on average, around 18% per year. Conventional grocery stores continue to represent the largest distribution channel, accounting for 38% of the organic food and beverage sales in 2006. Large, natural food stores and smaller food coops accounted for 44% of the sales. Farmer’s markets, internet/mail order and club stores accounted for the rest.29 Worldwide, nearly 30.4 million hectares and more than 700,000 farms were under organic agricultural production in 2006. Australia led with the most organic land in production, followed by China and Argentina, with the United States ranking fourth, with 1.6 million hectares in 2005, the last year that data was available. 30

Wine

Wine is one of Idaho’s fastest growing agricultural industries. Nationally, the wine industry is expected to grow 7.7% between 2007 and 2012. Also in 2012, the U.S. is expected to become the market leader in wine consumption, surpassing both Italy and France.31

---

29 Organic Trade Association Manufacturer Survey, 2007


In 2007, through a collaboration of the USDA, viticulturalists, academics and local wineries in the Snake River Valley, running from Twin Falls County to the East and Adams County to the North, obtained American Viticulture Area (AVA) status from the US Department of the Treasuries Alcohol and Tobacco Tax Trade Bureau. In order to achieve this status, Idaho wineries had to prove their successful history in growing grapes and producing wine, as well as the geographic attributes that make Snake River Valley special. Idaho's prime soils and growing climate for wine grapes, coupled with its elevation (it has the highest average wine growing elevation in the country), in addition to its unique geographic history, were all necessary in order to be approved as an AVA, which is the first step in name recognition outside of its borders.

Currently, Idaho is home to 38 wineries, 11 of which are located in Canyon County, and has approximately 1600 acres in wine grape production—over half of which is grown in Canyon County. This is up from only 11 wineries in 2002. Additionally, according the Commission, another 5 wineries are slated to open within the next two years, (3 in Canyon County and 2 in Ada County) while it is widely assumed that further promotion of the industry through the Commission's marketing efforts will both draw vintners to Idaho from out of state, and encourage existing growers to transition their acreage into wine. Moreover, Idaho wineries have received in recent years over 20 national and international awards for their product, which has brought increased recognition to the region.

In 2008, Idaho Wine commissioned Boise State University's Center for Business and Economic Research to evaluate the total economic impact of the Idaho wine industry. The report concluded the following:

- In 2008, the total economic impact of the Idaho wine industry, including tax revenue, indirect wages and tourism dollars, was $73 million dollars (up from $40 million in 2002).
- Of this revenue, $19 million went towards the direct wages of more the 625 employees associated with the wine industry.
- Of this revenue, over $3 million dollars went to Idaho State Tax.
- The Idaho wine industry is currently growing at 3.3% per year, and is projected to increase.

---

For every one direct job created in the wine industry, approximately one (.97%) indirect job is created in associated industries (tourism, bottling, distribution, etc.)

Because of its ideal climate for grape production, the Idaho wine industry has the ability to experience growth rates comparable to Oregon’s and Washington’s in the future.

The Idaho wine industry currently employs 625 people, though employment is projected to rise another 365 jobs by 2015, while total economic would rise to $115 million in annual wages, taxes and general revenue.

Wine industries are intrinsically linked to tourism, and can help to bring tourism dollars to severely economically distressed regions in Canyon, Adams, & Washington, counties, where the majority of Idaho wine is grown.

Unprocessed grapes yield up to nine times the average price per acre than the top three crops grown in Idaho currently, and is the 6th most profitable crop in the United States.

Additionally, wine grape growing and manufacturing appeals to a younger demographic, which can help to offset farm loss (due to low-paying commodity crops) through farm crop transition, which has the ability to preserve agricultural landscapes and hence, a rural way of life that is too often vulnerable to suburban encroachment. While Peckham Road soils are too rich and the geography too flat to support grapes, there is substantial potential to develop processing facilities along the corridor.

**Hybrid Poplar**

Grown for pulp, furniture, and biomass--both woody and ethanol- hybrid poplar (pacific albus) is a promising future industry for a variety of reasons. Despite the recent excitement in recent years surrounding the idea that hybrid poplar can replace conventional forestry, its fast growth renders it unsuitable for structural uses. That said, it remains a suitable substitute for the pulp, furniture and biomass industries, were its growth rate works favorably in these conditions. Additionally, hybrid poplars need rich soils and large amounts of water, which can cause environmental problems which neutralize its benefits in some regions. Peckham Road and the surrounding areas are replete with rich soils and a substantial amount of Class B wastewater from the future Greenleaf plant that is currently slated for discharge into a drainage that leads to the Boise River.

Hybrid poplars can yield as much as 10 tons of dry biomass per acre, per year-5-10 times as much as trees produce in the wild. Hybrid poplars have additional environmental benefits that include stabilizing soil, reducing erosion and runoff, and restoring organic matter the land.

- Poplars can be harvested for pulp in as little as 6 years-3-5 times faster than fir or pine

---

• Hybrid poplars can yield as much as 10 tons of dry biomass per acre, per year, or 5-10 times as much as trees produce in the wild
• One acre of hybrid poplar harvested for pulp/paper mill production can save between 10 and 100 acres of native forest
• Containing little or no sulfur, hybrid poplars won’t contribute to acid-rain like other fossil fuels do.
• Hybrid Poplars produce few nitrogen oxides, the primary ingredient in chemically-induced smog.
• Hybrid poplars don’t contribute to an increase in total atmospheric carbon dioxide. Hence, when replacing oil, coal, or natural gas, they can play a vital role in reducing global greenhouse gas emissions\textsuperscript{34}

**Findings:**

*Canyon County’s agricultural economy is already one of the most diverse agricultural economies in the state, which is part of why it is the State’s second largest agricultural economy. However, opportunities exist to further diversify, particularly in the wine, organic, and possibly hybrid poplar arenas, all of which yield higher per acre returns than conventional commodity crops. For every one job created in the wine industry, another job is created in associated industries like tourism. The organic industry has the ability to operate off of much smaller acreage and has experienced healthy economic growth over the last two decades, with no signs of slowing down. And though they represent only a small share of overall organic sales, farmers markets are intimately connected with the organic industry, which can help foster a sense of place and augment farm income. Hybrid poplar offer both an opportunity to mitigate the waste water from municipal treatment plants, in addition to offering a source of woody biomass for energy production.*

**Enterprise Zones as a Rural Development Strategy**

Created in 1993 under the Clinton Administration, Enterprise Zones are an intergovernmental effort at creating a long term economic development solutions for both urban and rural areas that have experienced long periods of economic distress. Enterprise Zones use a combination of federal tax incentives and grants to stimulate development and job creation. The incentives offered through enterprise zones often drive key locational decisions for prospective employers weighing the costs and benefits of doing business in one state over another, or one region over another. Employment tax credits, Welfare to Work Tax Credits, Welfare to Work, Commercial Revitalization Deductions, Brownfield Grants, Facility Bonds, Academy Bonds, Zero Percent Capital Gains Rate, New Markets Tax Credit, and Low-Income Housing Tax Credit are a sampling

Renewable Energy Enterprise Zones can also offer property tax deferral for new business who either generate renewable energy or manufacture a product pertaining to

renewable energy, which can help poise local, rural industries to compete in a 21st century, global economy.

**Findings:**

*It is unknown whether Enterprise Zones will be reauthorized at the Federal level, or authorized at all at the State level. However, Enterprise zones offer tax incentives in excess of existing Idaho State Tax incentives, which would invariably give an enterprise zone a more competitive edge in terms of attracting business than a non-enterprise zone would.*

**Renewable Energy as a Rural Economic Development Strategy**

A recent study by the USDA advocates using alternative energy as a rural development strategy, particularly for its ability to connect the historically disjointed agricultural and high-tech industries—which happen to be the two of the top three dominant industries in Canyon County. Prior to the availability of Stimulus funding, which has been heavily focused on energy conservation and generation measures as a means to revitalize the economy, discussions between the mayors of Wilder and Greenleaf and Canyon County Commissioners began discussing the creation of an Enterprise Zone in Western Canyon County. Concurrently, COSSA began the process of creating a renewable energy curriculum as part of their engineering department, which will involve an onsite learning laboratory and technical training of the solar, wind, and biomass technologies.

According to two surveys released by the Association of Energy Engineers, a non-profit society of over 9500 professionals, the following indicates the skilled workforce needs associated with renewable energy in the coming years:

- 71% of Energy Professionals (EP's) surveyed indicate that for U.S. energy independence, 10% of electricity should be generated from renewable sources by 2012 and 25% by 2025.

---

**Biomass**

*Biomass can be derived from a variety of sources, from standing forest crops, forest waste, agricultural crops, agricultural waste, construction debris, woods products processing debris, and human refuse. Canyon County has a surplus of many of sources of biomass, and is in close proximity to others. According to the Idaho Energy Atlas, Canyon County is poised to take advantage of f 2,500,001-5,500,000 mmbf of forest biomass residue, out of a range of 11,200. Again, this fell within the medium-high range in their scale. In the Ethanol Impact Assessment for the State of Idaho, completed in 2004, the availability of optimal food crops for ethanol production was measured at 1,820,538 bushels of wheat, corn and barley combined, which had the potential to produce 4,913,356 gallons of ethanol annually. In 2008, according the US agricultural census, the top three crops grown in Canyon County were wheat, corn and alfalfa, all of which create residues that have valuable biomass potential.*

---

**Solar Energy**

*There are approximately 210 sunny days per year in Canyon County. According to the Idaho Energy Atlas, published on the Office of Energy Resources’s website, Canyon County, along with most of Southern Idaho, “is home to a very good solar energy resource...that can...be used effectively in a variety of environments, from urban rooftops to farm applications.” It gauged its solar electric generation potential between 5.1-5.5 kWh/m2/day, out of a scale whose maximum was 7kwh/m2/day. This fell within the medium-high range of total solar potential, which was the second highest solar potential in the State of Idaho, exceeded only by Owyhee County.*
• 97% of EP’s surveyed indicate energy efficient technologies must be a major part of national energy policy in order to achieve energy independence.
• 72% of EP's surveyed indicate a shortage of qualified professionals in the energy efficiency, sustainable and renewable energy fields in the next five years.
• 70% of EP’s surveyed indicate a need for national and state training for "Green Jobs" to address job shortages that are impairing growth in green industries, such as energy efficient buildings and construction, renewable electric power, energy efficient vehicles and bio fuels development.
• 41% of EP’s surveyed plan to retire in the next ten years.
• Solar energy capacity in the United States grew by 17 percent in 2008,(Solar Energy Inus. Assoc.)

Findings:
Renewable energy is a fast growing industry. Current federal subsidies and incentives for renewable energy will likely vault its growth rate beyond the current projections. Canyon County has the potential to exploit its renewable energy resources, particularly in the solar and biomass sectors. Additionally, COSSA will continue to pursue funding for the further development of its renewable energy curriculum, which will be able to supply the region’s need for a skilled workforce in the energy sector, and could possibly attract energy-specific development as a result, independent of a Renewable Energy Enterprise Zone.

Inter-business Networking as a Rural Development Strategy

On average, 80% of economic development comes from existing economic bases. In order to avoid dysfunctional land use patterns, economic growth must occur in a way that encourages local residents to support local business, while more efficiently utilizing the natural resources of a given geography. Most of the businesses in the Peckham region are locally owned enterprises, and, as such, are at a distinct disadvantage as they compete against the economies of scale offered to their corporate competitors. This phenomenon encourages people to commute long distances to meet their basic needs, which not only increases traffic on our roadways (and hence road maintenance expenses) but exacerbates the quality of our airsheds, which can lead to increased Federal scrutiny and regulation. However, there are several tools that businesses can implement that can help to offset the disadvantage small businesses have with respect to corporate competition. These include, though are not limited to, the following:
• Job Share
• Cooperative Purchasing
• Cooperative Distributing
• Cooperative Marketing
• The creation, printing, and distribution of a local business directory
Small businesses and agricultural producers need new models in order to effectively compete with established, big business networks and trends of the 21st century. By encouraging existing businesses to strengthen their existing networks, and by shortening the distance between producer, retailer, and consumers, rural communities can establish the competitive edge they need for future survival.

Findings

While there exists a number of opportunities for existing small and large businesses to network, with the exception of the creation of a local business directory, none have been effectively taken advantage of by local employers in the Peckham Corridor Region. More education, dialogue, and strategies amongst local industries would be necessary for this to occur.

Peckham Property Owner Survey and Public Information Hearing

Peckham Road Property Owner Survey

In September of 2009, a Peckham Road property owner survey was sent to individuals who owned property within the Peckham Corridor, which included property owners with parcels as far South as Highway 19 and North to Penny Lane. A total of 41 surveys were sent; four were returned with wrong addresses, and 18 were returned completed. Questions about property type and land use, plans to sell or develop property, and whether the property owner supported job creation along the Peckham Corridor were asked. For a complete copy of the survey, please see Appendix B.

Of the property owners who returned the survey, 14 identified the property they own as a farm, 13 as a residence, and 6 as a business. (Survey respondents were allowed to check all that apply).

Seven of the property owners fell within the 46-60 year age range, while eleven stated that they were over 60. Only two of the property owners stated that they currently use the rail spur.

In terms of supporting job creation, only three stated that they have “very strong support job diversification” along Peckham Road, six “somewhat supported job diversification” while four were “very strongly opposed to job diversification.” They remaining respondents either had no opinion or were “somewhat opposed to job diversification.”
In terms of supporting agricultural preservation along the corridor, ten respondents “very strongly support agricultural preservation” one “somewhat supports agricultural preservation,” one respondent was “somewhat against agricultural preservation,” while the remainder had no opinion.

When asked if property owners had plans to sell their property in the future, 6 responded no, three responded “in five years,” three responded “in ten years,” while the remainder didn’t know.

When asked to rank the type of job creation they would like to see in the corridor, over half of the respondents cited agricultural jobs as being the most important, followed by food processing. Residential development (or job creation through the construction of residential homes) was ranked least on the level of importance to Peckham Road Property Owners.

Public Information Hearing

On October 12, 2009, a public hearing regarding the Peckham Road Economic Development Feasibility Study was held at Wilder City Hall, along with Wilder’s City Council, the Mayors of Greenleaf and Wilder, a Canyon County Commissioner, Sage Community Resources, city staff, and community members. The purpose of the hearing was to inform the public and council about the study, including the conclusions of the COMPASS traffic circulation study and the T-O Engineering infrastructure analysis study. The five development scenarios were presented, along with approximate numbers of jobs that would be created as well as associated road improvement costs per scenario.

Wilder City Clerk Colleen Cook stated that there was an unusually strong attendance for a public hearing, indicating the interest that the Peckham Road Study has generated. And while most community members did not opine, stating that they were there only to collect information, one community member stated that as a farmer he was concerned about the possible erasure of farmland. Mayor Bechtal responded that both the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf were interested in balancing job creation with farmland preservation, while Sage Community Resources indicated that growing from the Cities outward, or the smart growth scenario, would be the most likely option to achieve those ends.

Findings

While not opposed to job creation, protecting farmland, existing views, and a rural way of life appear to be important to Peckham Road Property owners and community members. Both the Mayors of Wilder and Greenleaf are in agreement, and recognize that growing from the cities outward might be the best way of achieving this. And while zoning is not often recognized as a regulatory tool in Canyon County, zoning can help express the will of the
communities and preclude the pursuit of incompatible development ideas. Targeting development areas either within or close to city limits can help to channel future development into these targeted areas by the power of suggestion, even without legal clout.

Peckham Road Recent Developments

Since the onset of this study, many things have changed both within the Peckham Corridor and the surrounding region. First and foremost, the region, along with the rest of the country, experienced the largest economic decline since the Great Depression, which literally halted, for the first time in over twenty years, Treasure Valley economic growth. This growth, driven to a large degree by the high-tech industry, was also bolstered by a strong construction industry, both have slowed considerably in the last year. However, the lag in economic development has brought with it the time and space needed to assess the wants and needs of Western Canyon County communities, in order to plan for future growth, when the economy begins to grow again. It has also brought a considerable amount of Stimulus dollars—dollars that weren’t previously available—and with these monies have come schools, the promise of wastewater treatment plants, and job creation.

The City of Wilder continues to move forward with many of its city enhancement plans, including upgrades to their wastewater treatment plant, the development of a new municipal well, and a streetscape improvement grant, while passing two bond measures for new school construction. Additionally, a grant for a new, mixed use fire station is currently shortlisted by the Idaho Department of Commerce for development.

The City of Greenleaf has continued to move forward with their wastewater treatment plant plans, which are being designed at the moment by their city engineer. After a decade of trying, Greenleaf is finally close to obtaining all of the money necessary for its construction, and in January of this year, Greenleaf was able to purchase 70 acres just north of Peckham Road for the new facility.

The map below shows the developments by parcel that have occurred within the Peckham Corridor during the last year. These developments include the following:
In September of 2009, COSSA received $2.5 million in EDA stimulus funding for the construction of a new, regional technology center in Wilder. Matched by local school bonds and levies, and a nearly $500,000 local industry donation, ground was broken in November of 2009. The facility is slated to open by Fall of 2010. While continuing to honor its core mission of providing vocational-technical training to high-school students, the new facility will also host employer-driven worker training programs in the evenings, which is expected to bolster the connection between COSSA and local industry. Additional, industry-driven enhancement to program development that has occurred over the past year include:

- COSSA was approached by the Pacific Northwest Food Processing Association (PNFPA) in the interest of implementing their mechatronics program, which teaches students the skills needed for the increasingly high-tech food processing industry. The mechatronics program designed by the PNFPA, dovetails with COSSA’s existing engineering program, as well as local food processor needs. (These discussions are still pending).

- COSSA was approached by a local engineering firm who spoke about the shortage of Class VI waste water treatment operators, both locally and nationally. Because of the requisite eleven hundred hours of training needed for a Class VI license, and the lack of any in-state training, COSSA was seen as an ideal venue to meet the training requirements for waste water treatment licensing. (These discussions are still pending).

- COSSA was approached by Simplot representatives about reviving an internship between the COSSA welding program and the Simplot Potato processing plant in Caldwell. Simplot and COSSA also discussed using the new COSSA facility for most of Simplot workforce training needs, including welding, PLC instruction, and forklift training. An internship was established in May of 2009, and beginning in the fall of 2010, Simplot will begin to train its workforce at the new COSSA facility.

- COSSA is in the process of obtaining funding to pursue a renewable energy curriculum as part of its engineering department, in order to meet the renewable energy demands of the future.
energy sector demands for a skilled workforce, which is currently undersupplied in the Treasure Valley. The curriculum will include a solar array, a wind tower, and a biomass digester, along with their associated grid-ties, software monitoring systems, and battery packs, so that students will become trained in the operations and maintenance of these technologies.

**Greenleaf Airranch**

The Greenleaf Airranch is a mixed-use aviation-centered community located within the Peckham Corridor, just North of Peckham Road at Greenleaf. Prior to this study, the airranch was slated to be primarily a residential development with a central, single engine airstrip. However, recent changes to FAA regulations at the Caldwell airport, which preclude any non-aviation-related industries from conducting business on federal airport property, prompted the Greenleaf Airranch developers to modify their development plans. Since, they are in the process of rezoning the subdivision to be primarily mixed use—with a six acre commercial zone, buffered by mixed use residential/commercial zone, while the remainder will be residential zoning offering a variety of housing styles. In January of 2010, Sage Community Resources met with the developers of the airranch to discuss their plans as well as potential funding opportunities. A primary constraint of developing the commercial portion of the subdivision was the approximately $500,000 in infrastructure that would be needed for a commercial zone. Sage indicated that the Idaho Department of Commerce supplies up to $30,000 per job for infrastructure, and the developers have since begun to pursue that, and are hoping to complete their application by the March, 2010 deadline.

The following are the types of employers that the developers have stated they can obtain commitments from to expand and relocate to the airranch, pending infrastructural development:

- A small craft propeller manufacturer
- A small craft hanger manufacturer
- A small craft accessory manufacturer
- A fuel station, which will sell fuel at cost to residents, while selling fuel at retail to visitors.

Together, the developers are expecting to create at least fifteen new jobs in the Peckham Corridor, and a number of other temporary jobs during construction. They have also mentioned the possibility of partnering the propeller manufacturer with COSSA’s engineering program, in order to supply him with a skilled workforce necessary for future expansion and growth.

**Project Hardwood**

This one hundred acre parcel, just west of Greenleaf City limits, has been shortlisted by a wood products manufacturer who is interested in building a new plant. While the details of the plant are proprietary, the project claims that it could add up to one hundred new jobs.
to the region’s economy. The property owners, who are brokering the deal, have approached the City of Greenleaf about possible annexation if this happens. The property owners have also offered an easement to the City of Greenleaf for the expansion of the rail spur if this property becomes developed.

**Western Canyon County Enterprise Zone**

Canyon County Development Services Department, at the prompting of their commissioners, have created a draft Enterprise Zone map defined as the triangle created by juncture of Highways 19, 95, 20/26 and I84, which resulted from Peckham Road Economic Development Feasibility Discussions. Canyon County which is planning on implementing the triangle into permanent zoning as part of their comprehensive plan. Peckham Road bisects this triangle, and would likely be the central location for targeted development. More recently, Canyon County has been lobbying at both the state and federal level for the creation of new, federally and/or state-recognized enterprise zone, in order to give the less fortunate Treasure Valley communities more of a competitive edge in terms of attracting development.

In the fall of 2009, funding became available for the creation of Renewable Energy Enterprise Zones (REEZ) through the Office of Energy Resources (and the US Department of Energy Stimulus Funding. Canyon County applied for resource assessment feasibility study monies that it was not awarded, due, in part, to the lack of a specific project. However, more money for the creation of a REEZ is expected to be available in the future, and there remains the possibility of creating a renewable energy industry cluster where manufacturing, generation, distribution, and academic instruction symbiotically collocate to support the economic development efforts already occurring in the area.

---

**J.R. Simplot Anaerobic Digester and Food Processing**

*Simplot’s largest potato processing plant is located between Caldwell and Greenleaf on Highway 19. The plant produces approximately 270 million pounds of french fries per year, that are distributed to national and international customers. Over the years, Simplot has engaged in a number of energy reduction strategies; in 2003 U.S. Department of Energy published a case study for best practices citing Simplot’s energy efficiency improvements that led to an annual decrease in electrical use by $300,000, as an exemplary example of the responsible processing of food waste.*

*More recent efforts involve the installation of a $2 million anaerobic digester to treat 2 mgd of primary wastewater, in order to achieve a 90% COD removal and a reduction of the suspended solids to 250mg/l. The methane that is produced from the on-site processing of waste water is then captured, compressed, pumped and distributed to fuel their boilers. Other solid wastes not suspended in waste water are fed to their cattle operation in Grandview.*
As a result of the possibility of creating a renewable energy enterprise zone, Canyon County began discussions with The McKinstry Corporation, a design/build/maintain firm whose specialties include renewable energy generation. McKinstry has been involved in designing and building several woody biomass facilities in the Northwest, and currently have several biomass power plant projects pending that engage the design/build/operate/maintain model, in partnership with a local municipality or county.

Currently, Canyon County is in the process of obtaining funding to build a jail that will be located within the proposed enterprise zone, and has begun discussions with McKinstry about the possibility of incorporating a biomass boiler to heat and cool the facility, and potentially supply energy in excess of the facility's needs. Because of the availability of free labor, as well as an abundance of agricultural waste in this scenario, it remains an attractive option.

The ownership model would involve both McKinstry and the County as co-owners of the plant, and both would receive their proportionate share of profits, which could theoretically supply the County with a revenue stream necessary to further incentivize renewable energy and/or green industries to locate within the zone. Should the County receive approval of either a state, federal, or stimulus designated REEZ, they would be able to offer additional incentives to both existing and future industries located within the zone, who either generate energy or who otherwise engage in green product manufacturing, both of which would legitimize the zone beyond the development of a power plant, and while serving marketing tool to attract new industries.

**Coalition for Agriculture’s Future**

In June of 2009, the Coalition for Agriculture’s Future was formed, with members including the Caldwell/Canyon Economic Development Council and large-agribusiness owners in Canyon County. The group’s purpose was to identify the threats and possibilities for solution to the transitioning farmland in Canyon County. The group stated that other large producers who might have considered relocating to Canyon County in the past are now looking elsewhere, primarily due to the residential development pressure the County has experienced in recent years. In October of 2010, the Coalition published a full-page advertisement in the Western Canyon Chronicle expressing concern over the proposed Western Canyon County enterprise zone. The group stated that over thirty thousand acres of farmland is currently located within the zone, much of which contains prime soils, and that targeting the whole area for economic development would be a detriment to the County’s agricultural economy. The group also stated that, while not opposed to job creation and the diversification of the existing economy, they felt that growth should occur from the Cities outward, rather than sporadically throughout the zone. The advertisement also cited the agricultural value per acre of Canyon County farmland—based on the 2002 assessment, which exceeded $8000 per acre in total economic impact not including wages. If not replaced with a landuse that could yield more than that per acre, the result would be an economic net loss for the county.
Findings

Based on the developments that have occurred within the Peckham Corridor during the course of this study, it appears the corridor is feasible for economic development. COSSA's Regional Technology Center broke ground within the corridor in November of 2009, and, based on their current and prospective areas of expertise, is expected to both retain and attract jobs to the area. In redesigning the subdivision to accommodate six acres of commercial zoning, the Greenleaf Airranch claim that they can obtain commitment letters from at least four prospective employers creating at least 15 jobs, and are planning on pursuing an infrastructure grant from the Idaho Department of Commerce on this premise. Another large, one hundred acre parcel has been shortlisted by a wood products manufacturer claiming to supply at least one hundred jobs in corridor. Last, the City of Greenleaf has purchased the property and obtained nearly all of the necessary funding for the development of a centralized waste water treatment plant that will be able to serve both the existing and future needs of the corridor.

Recommendations and Next Steps

Infrastructure

The electricity currently supplied to the Peckham Corridor is sufficient only to meet current demand. At the full buildout scenario, Peckham Road would require 120 megawatts of electricity, which would require roughly three acres of land for three new substations. Smaller, “substations in a box” are also available, supplying 10 megawatts of power and requiring only 10’ x 20’ of space, not including setbacks. Idaho Power already has plans to upgrade transmission lines along Peckham Road, though requiring that acreage be set aside for future substations should be considered as part of development agreements.

Traffic Circulation

All of the development scenarios indicate that Peckham Road would need to be widened to three lanes, and Allendale, Van Slyke and Travis widened to between three and five lanes. A more detailed analysis would be required in order to obtain design criteria for each of these roads, and the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf are encouraged to work with COMPASS, the regional transportation planning agency, the Golden Gate Highway District, Canyon County, and Sage Community Resources, the local Economic Development District, in order to reserve rights of way along all roads within the Peckham Corridor.

Zoning

Both the Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf, in addition to community members surveyed, indicated that preserving the agricultural economy along with its associated viewscapes and way of life is important to them. If the Cities wish to preserve the agricultural landscape and economy along Peckham Road, grow from city centers outward, and preserve their town identity, the zoning that currently exists within their areas of impact would need to be revisited. Both Cities are encouraged to work with Canyon County and
their Economic Development District in order to ensure that the zoning in place adequately reflects their desired future landuse.

**Water/Sewer**

The City of Greenleaf is encouraged to complete their wastewater treatment design and funding options necessary to build the new facility. Due to the size of parcel obtained for the facility, as well as the need to mitigate discharge, Greenleaf is also encouraged to pursue the possibility of installing a hybrid poplar farm at the new facility, which could double as a future revenue source. Due to the finitude of Wilder’s waste water treatment system and likelihood that it will need to connect to Greenleaf’s future treatment plant, both cities are encouraged to pursue funding opportunities for the expansion of service from Wilder to Greenleaf. Late comer fees for new development might be necessary to offset some of the construction costs required for new transmission lines along Peckham Road.

**Enterprise Zone**

Both Cities are encouraged to pursue discussions about the Enterprise Zone using a grounds-up, community centered process. Key discussion participants should include Canyon County, all Cities within or adjacent to the proposed zone, the Working Lands Coalition, the Coalition for Agriculture’s Future, COSSA, and the local Economic Development District. Initial discussions might include identifying the prime/non prime soils within the zone, in order to identify which areas within the zone might be best suited for development. For a full list of agricultural preservation opportunities, please refer to Appendix D.

**COSSA**

COSSA is encouraged to continue its discussions with local industry in order to develop the curricula that has been recommended at industry’s request over the last year. These include mechatronics for the food processing industry, waste water treatment certification for the waste water/remediation industry, and renewable energy for the energy industry. Additionally, with a slated 600 new students and teachers per day coming to the City of Wilder, Wilder is encouraged to network with COSSA, local businesses, and the Wilder Economic Development Council in order to identify the needs and range of service that will be in demand when the COSSA Regional Technology Center is completed.

**City Halls as Information Centers**

Both Cities have the opportunity to serve as education centers to the public, in addition to marketing the corridor. The Peckham Road marketing brochure will be distributed to Greenleaf and Wilder, and both Cities are encouraged to keep copies available—and visible—at City Hall in order to promote the corridor and educate prospective developers about Peckham Road assets. In addition to the marketing brochure, brochures on smart growth principles, Idaho business incentives, and agricultural preservation opportunities are recommended for both prospective business owners and existing community members.
Greenleaf Airranch

The City of Greenleaf is encouraged to apply for an Idaho Department of Commerce Grant on behalf Greenleaf Airranch developers in order to secure infrastructure funding and subsequent job creation for the new development.
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Appendix A: Business Summit Survey
Business Summit Survey

Company Name (optional) _________________________
Number of Employees __________________________
Location (optional) _______________________________
Years in Business _____________________________

1) How would you describe your company?
   ☐ 1 Industrial   ☐ 2 Agricultural   ☐ 3 Technical   ☐ 4 Retail   ☐ 5 Medical   ☐ 6 Other__________ (please identify)

2) On average, how far does your staff commute to work?
   ☐ 1 1 mile or less   ☐ 2 1-5 miles   ☐ 3 5-10 miles   ☐ 4 10-25 miles   ☐ 5 25 miles +

3) Do you feel that your current workforce is adequately trained to meet the needs of your company?
   ☐ 1 Yes   ☐ 2 No   ☐ 3 Somewhat

4) What specific skills are required in order to meet your company’s needs?
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________

5) The following questions deal with methods of transportation. Please rate the following characteristics:

| What modes of transportation are important to you when you distribute goods? |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------|-------|--------|--------|
|                                | Very Important | Important | Neutral | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| State Highway                  |                |          |        |                    |              |
| Freeway                        |                |          |        |                    |              |
| Rail                           |                |          |        |                    |              |
| Shipping Transfer Station      |                |          |        |                    |              |
| Other:                         |                |          |        |                    |              |

<p>| What modes of transportation are important to you when you receive goods? |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------|-------|--------|--------|
|                                | Very Important | Important | Neutral | Somewhat Important | Not Important |
| State Highway                  |                |          |        |                    |              |
| Freeway                        |                |          |        |                    |              |
| Rail                           |                |          |        |                    |              |
| Shipping Transfer Station      |                |          |        |                    |              |
| Other:                         |                |          |        |                    |              |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Which of the following is important for your company to have access to?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>State Highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freeway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Transfer Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) In 5 years, do you see your company:

- [ ] 1. Staying the Same
- [ ] 2. Expanding your facility
- [ ] 3. Expanding your workforce training
- [ ] 4. Other _____________________________

(please identify)

7) If your company needs to expand, does it currently have the space to do so?

- [ ] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No
- [ ] 3. Somewhat
- [ ] 4. Unsure

8) What are the most critical factors currently affecting expansion? (Please select all that apply)

- [ ] 1. Financing
- [ ] 2. Location
- [ ] 3. Trained workforce
- [ ] 4. Distribution
- [ ] 5. Transportation
- [ ] 6. Consumer Demand

- [ ] 7. Other _________________________________

(please identify)

9) Do you feel there is an advantage to co-locate your facility around complimentary businesses?

- [ ] 1. Yes
- [ ] 2. No
- [ ] 3. Somewhat
- [ ] 4. Unsure

10) If yes, proximity to which of the following industries is most important to your company? (Please select all that apply)

- [ ] 1. Industrial
- [ ] 2. Agricultural
- [ ] 3. Technical
- [ ] 4. Retail
- [ ] 5. Medical
- [ ] 6. Other _____________________________

(please identify)
Appendix B: Peckham Corridor Property Owner Survey
Peckham Road Economic Development Feasibility Study
PUBLIC INPUT SURVEY

The Cities of Wilder and Greenleaf are in the process of conducting a feasibility study for economic development along Peckham Road, in order to develop a strategy to encourage job creation while preventing sprawl and retaining land in agriculture. As our region continues to face growth, efforts are underway to address these important issues facing our communities. In order to make good decisions,
We Need Your Opinions!! Please read the following questions carefully and record your opinion as provided. Also note that NO DECISIONS HAVE BEEN MADE regarding Peckham Road, and that any strategies for future land use will involve community supported planning efforts.

☐ Please check this box if you WANT your answers to remain ANONYMOUS. If not, please fill out the information below:

Name:________________________________________________________________________

Address:__________________________________________

Please take a minute and answer the questions below.

1. Do you live in either Greenleaf or Wilder? (Check which one applies)
   ☐ Greenleaf ☐ Wilder ☐ Other (Please list)__________________

2. In which of the following age groups do you belong?
   ☐ Under 18 years
   ☐ 18 to 25 years
   ☐ 26 to 45 years
   ☐ 46 to 60 years
   ☐ 61 years or older

3. As a resident of this area, do you support diversifying job creation along Peckham Road?
   ☐ Very strongly support diversifying job creation
4. As a resident of this area, do you support preserving agriculture along Peckham Road?
   ☐ Very strongly support preservation
   ☐ Somewhat support preservation
   ☐ No Opinion
   ☐ Somewhat oppose to preservation
   ☐ Very strongly opposed to preservation

5. The reason why Peckham Road is being considered as a corridor to create new jobs for the Wilder-Greenleaf region is because it already has development infrastructure in place, including the rail spur, electricity, a high-pressure gas line, as well as some existing businesses that contribute to the region’s economy. How important is it to you to see the development of new jobs within the Peckham Road Corridor? Please rank (put an x in the box), in terms of importance, the following types of job creation you would like to see in the Peckham Road Corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Somewhat Important</th>
<th>Not Important</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Residential (construction)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food Processing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Is there anything not listed in #5 which you feel should be done to encourage (or discourage) new job creation along Peckham Road?

Thank you very much for completing this survey. Your opinions will help to guide the planning efforts of both Wilder and Greenleaf.

Please submit completed survey by Friday, October 16, 2009 to:
City of Wilder: P.O Box 687, Wilder, Idaho 83676, or drop off at the following location:
Wilder City Hall, 219 3rd Street, Wilder, Idaho 83676
Appendix C: Smart Growth Principles Defined
Smart Growth Principles

Mixed Landuses
Mixed land uses not only place different goods, services, and housing in close proximity to each other, but can offset the need to drive in order to get similar needs met. Mixed land uses can also supply to diversity and concentration of commercial and residential zones necessary to support public transportation. When combined with walkable sidewalks that include street lighting and street trees, mixed land use can often draw more people to city streets through the encouragement of walking and biking. Additionally, mixed land uses can often convey economic benefits through the proximity of commercial to residential areas, which have shown to raise property values and hence, local tax receipts. Businesses also notice the benefits of mixed land uses through its association with attracting more people to shopping districts. More people on the street not only contribute to general feelings of safety, but can also double as places for people to meet, a more intensive use of existing public space---both of which can help to revitalize communities.

Compact Building Design
Smart growth provides a means for communities to incorporate more compact building design as an alternative to conventional, land consumptive development. Compact building design suggests that communities be designed in a way which permits more open space to preserved, and that buildings can be constructed which make more efficient use of land and resources. By encouraging buildings to grow vertically rather than horizontally, and by incorporating structured rather than surface parking, for example, communities can reduce the footprint of new construction, and preserve more greenspace. Not only is this approach more efficient by requiring less land for construction. It also provides and protects more open, undeveloped land that would exist otherwise to absorb and filter rain water, reduce flooding and stormwater drainage needs, and lower the amount of pollution washing into our streams, rivers and lakes. Last, recent studies have documented a rise in property values located within compact, mixed use development that is connected to efficient, diverse transportation options and a range of goods and services, compared to adjacent, conventional suburban developments.

Diverse Range of Housing Opportunities and Choices
Planning for housing for people of all income levels is a key component in any smart growth strategy. Housing constitutes a large share of new construction and development, which helps to drive the way that communities grow. By creating a diverse range of housing options that are centered around access to public transportation, job centers, services, and education can help to offset the environmental costs of auto-centric development. It can also reduce household energy consumption, the consumption of natural resources, as well as reduce the pressure on public infrastructure, and hence, taxpayer dollars.
Walkable Neighborhoods
Walkable neighborhoods are neighborhoods where people can live, learn, work, recreate and worship within walkable distances to each other. Walkable neighborhoods also provide the necessary infrastructure to create a safe and pleasurable pedestrian experience, including, but not limited to, ample sidewalk widths, street lighting, street trees, separations between modes of transportation option. Mixed uses and compact building footprints and key components of pedestrian friendly corridors.

Sense of Place
Creating interesting, unique communities that reflect the values of the people who live there is another key component of smart growth. Using both natural and man-made landmarks and boundaries to define neighborhoods, city-edges, and regions can help to achieve this. Design standards that reflect the culture of a community can also achieve a defined “sense of place.” When a town becomes more than a place where people live, but also a unique destination with its own character, residents are more likely to identify with, care for, and help to nurture the kind of growth that will enhance, rather than detract from their communities, which can play an important role in retaining economic vitality over time.

Preserve Open Space, Farmland, Natural Beauty and Critical Environmental Areas
By channeling new growth into existing communities, “open space,” as it pertains to community parks, recreational locations, farm and range land, or places of natural beauty and environmentally sensitive areas can, be default, be protected. Protection of “open space” can often bolster the economy by attracting tourism dollars, decrease local tax dollars through the reduction of infrastructure, and creating higher land values associated with a higher quality of life. Preserving open space can also have a number of environmental benefits, including the protection of surface and groundwater resources through the natural filtering of debris and chemical pollutants that would otherwise require treatment.

Variety of Transportation Choices
Providing people with more transportation choices that seamlessly merge pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and automobile routes, and connect them to housing, goods, and services, and services can help to offset much of the congestion currently experienced on American roadway. According to the Texas Transportation Institute, traffic congestion has worsened in nearly every major metropolitan area in the U.S. and only 36% of peak travel occurs in uncongested conditions. The phenomenon not only contributes to worsening air quality (especially in places like the Treasure Valley who have inverted air flow systems that trap pollutants close to the valley floor), but also to increased commute times, which lesson the amount of people have for family, leisure, and recreation, and hence, quality of life.

Strengthen and Direct Development Towards Existing Communities
Directing development towards existing communities better utilizes the resources and infrastructure that these communities have to offer, and can be more cost effective than
greenfield development, despite the lower cost of land often found on urban fringes. By encouraging infill development, communities can benefit from a larger tax base and a higher quality of life associated with closer proximity to jobs, housing, and services. A complimentary benefit of directing development towards existing communities is the preservation of open space between communities, which supports another important smart growth goal.

**Make Development Decisions Predictable, Fair and Cost Effective**

The private sector plays an important role in the implementation of smart growth principles. It is the private sector, rather than government, that supplies the capital necessary for new developments; additionally, without recognizing the profits that are available through smart growth development than investors, developers, bankers, and builders will not be inclined to utilize these principles. However, governments can play an important role by making infrastructure, zoning, and other regulatory decisions that not only encourage smart growth, but make it a more profitable option than Greenfield development. The more timely, cost-effective, and predictable the government process becomes with regards to smart growth, the more likely developers will be in implementing it.

**Encourage Community and Stakeholder Collaboration**

Making community and development decisions from the ground up rather than from the top down, ensure that development happens in a way that reflects the communities vision and culture. Because smart growth involves a variety of different components, certain communities will find it more important, for example, to improve the diversity of housing options or transportation choices over preserving open space. However, it is the people who live and work in communities who are best equipped to define how, and how by much it needs to grow. By involving citizenry in decision making processes from the beginning of a plan, can often lead to a more comprehensive and efficient resolution of development issues; it can also lay the foundation for a sustainable long term framework for smart growth development.
Appendix D: Agricultural Preservation Opportunities
Agricultural Preservation Opportunities

Agricultural Conservation Easements
An agricultural conservation easement (ACE) is a deed restriction that prevents the subdivision of land or non-agricultural uses from being employed on a farm. The deed restrictions limit or prevent development, and are the equivalent of forfeiting any development rights that are incompatible with agricultural use. While this program is voluntary, and does not supply the landowner with compensation, landowners retain all other private property rights such as the right to use, lease, sell and bequeath land to whomever they wish. Easements are generally established in perpetuity, however term easements are also available, and will pass down to subsequent land owners. This program requires a partnership with a landtrust, similar non-profit or government entity that is able to hold the easement for its established terms.

Landtrusts
Landtrusts, as mentioned, are able to both supply a match for conservation easements as well as ensure that the easement is held in perpetuity. However, landtrusts are also useful in helping the landowner establish his/her own conservation program, as well as interface with state of federal programs, and non-profit conservation programs like the nature conservancy. While there is a landtrust established in the Treasure Valley that can help landowners interface with government programs, there are no landtrusts in the Treasure Valley that are funded to supply a match or purchase easements outright from landowners. In the absence of this funding source, and also in the absence of philanthropic donation of easements on behalf of landowners, this option is not currently viable in Canyon County or the Peckham Road area.

Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program (FRPP)
Farm and Ranch Lands Protection Program is a federal program overseen by the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service that provides matching funds to purchase agricultural easements on farm and ranchland. Eligible parcels must be big enough to sustain agricultural production in perpetuity. The federal government pays for up to 1/2 of the cost of the easement (which is generally valued at one half of the value of the land available for easement) this program requires the landowner to find either a unit of government or land trust to both pay for the other half of the easement, as well as hold the easement itself. Recently, however, the terms of the program have been modified, which allow for the landowner to donate up to 25% of the easement cost, so that the easement holder will only half to match 25% to the federal government's 50%. To date, there have been no agricultural easements employed in Canyon County, primarily because there is not a landtrust established that can fund the match, nor a unit of government who is either willing or able to participate.

Idaho State Bonding Authority
In 1999, the Idaho State legislature passed legislation that enables counties to issue bonds to purchase open space and/or conservation easements for scenic or recreational purchases. This bonding authority has been used successfully in neighboring Ada County, though, to date, has yet to be employed in Canyon County. And while the purchase of
agricultural easements is not included in this legislation, both farm and ranchland may qualify as scenic open space. While there appears to be some momentum behind agricultural preservation in Canyon County, it is unclear whether or not there would be a critical mass necessary to pass a bond specifically for agricultural preservation.

**Transfer of Development Rights**
While the transfer of development rights (TDR) is a relatively new, albeit complicated concept, it is one that has been successfully employed on the East Coast of the United States, though it is still in the experimental stages both in the West and in Idaho in particular. TDR’s are a tool that allows developers to purchase the rights to development from farm or ranchland targeted for conservation, and increase their rights to development, or upzone, on land targeted for development by a city or county. For example, if Farmer A has a one hundred twenty five acre parcel that is zoned for one unit per twenty five acres (or five development permits), while Developer A owns land that is zoned for one unit per five acres, this program allows Developer B to purchase the development rights from Farmer A and thereby double the number of potentially developable units. Cities and counties can manipulate the ratio of development rights however they see fit---For example, the five development permits available the Farmer A can be worth ten to fifteen development permits when purchased by Developer B and used on the parcel targeted for density by the city or county. While only one county in Idaho has employed this concept (Blaine) this remains a fairly attractive option for cities and counties who are eager to employ a free market and non-regulatory solution to agricultural preservation.

**Estate Planning**
While it might seem evident, estate planning is a crucial component for agricultural preservation. Farms that are passed down to families members without proper planning are often subject to sale and subsequent development. Planning for the future preservation of the farm involves passing on farm equipment, land, and operations to family members who are both willing and capable of ensuring the farm’s future success.

In addition to the non-regulatory options mentioned above, there are a number of other programs that reward farmers for various conservation efforts, and while they don’t always involve preventing development, they can incentivize farmers to transfer at least some of the land that they own into a conservation easement, which can be either a term easement or an easement in perpetuity.
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