Communities in Motion

*Communities in Motion* (CIM) is the regional long-range transportation plan for southwest Idaho providing regional transportation solutions for the next twenty-plus years for Ada, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, and Payette Counties. The COMPASS Board adopted the plan in August 2006. One of the provisions of CIM was the development and implementation of a Monitoring Report to “summarizes progress toward achieving alternative transportation and desired land use objectives” (CIM Task 4.4.3).

The 2009 *Communities in Motion Performance Monitoring Report* (CIMPMR) is the fourth annual report that evaluates factors to depict progress on meeting goals of the plan. The importance of the data grows as information is tracked across time. As data accumulate, the results will portray how the region is moving forward with CIM.

*Communities in Motion* highlights five key “issues” to be addressed:

- Balance Between Jobs and Housing.
- Choices in Housing.
- Choices in Transportation.
- Connectivity.
- Preservation of open space and farmland.

Information and policies indicating progress towards these objectives are on each Agency Summary page and corresponding regional maps are found in the appendix.

Highlights of this CIMPMR include:

**Balance Between Jobs and Housing**

The overall pattern of growth continues to show a westward drift of the regional population center, which is now near the intersection of Linder Road and Pine Avenue. The employment center has also shifted slightly west, near the intersection of Cloverdale Road and Franklin Road, approximately 2.5 miles east of the population center. The rate of westward migration of housing locations and employment sites has slowed, somewhat due to the weakening of the overall housing market. A decreasing spread between the population center and the employment center could demonstrate a reduction in vehicle miles traveled for commuting.

Another indication of sprawl is the density of population, households, and employment. The tables on the agency summary pages indicate the change in densities for the region and individual cities.

A variety of local government policies were initiated in 2008 to curb the momentum of sprawl. A number of cities adopted plans and ordinances which encouraged more mixed use developments. The Blueprint for Good Growth promoted policies which would provide more sustainable growth patterns, balancing infrastructure demands of jobs and housing. Moreover, some prominent mixed use and compact developments received entitlements, though the actual impact on roadway network may be years down the road.
Choices in Housing

The past year demonstrated some critical weaknesses in the housing market nationally and locally. The housing crisis resulted in significantly less new residential construction in 2008 (a 423% drop from the peak in 2005). In 2008, the percent of multi-family units as a share of all permits issued decreased from 29% to 15% compared to the previous year.

Affordability is another factor of housing choice. Another result of the housing crunch was the falling home values across the region. While existing homeowners saw a decrease in equity in their homes, new buyers found new affordability in the region which had not been seen for years. Housing affordability should be considered in context of transportation costs. While housing that is far from employment is typically more affordable, the resulting transportation costs consume a substantial amount of the housing savings. A map depicting housing plus transportation costs was still being developed at the publication of this draft. This map will show which areas have affordable costs of housing and transportation.

A new measurement for the 2009 Performance Monitoring Report is a Housing Diversity Index which demonstrates the variety of new housing stock in each city and county. A higher score (up to 100) indicates a balance of multi-family dwellings, manufactured homes, and a variety of single-family home prices.

Several cities have adopted policies and/or approved subdivisions to promote choices in housing. A focus on improving housing opportunities in mixed-use and downtown areas will improve the amount of housing choices available and increase multi-modal options for traveling.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Choices in Transportation

The availability of multiple modes of transportation, including automobile, transit, pedestrian, and bicycle were evaluated in several ways. Two new measurements are considered in this year’s report, Arterial Level of Service and Transit Level of Service. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHA), the amount of vehicle miles traveled (VMT) dropped approximately 5.3% nationally. This was the largest decline "since monthly data estimates began in 1971." This could be attributed to reduced driving due to job losses, home-price slides, high gas costs, and more environmentally conscious drivers. Locally, the arterial Level of Service only received a lower score in one city impact area.

Drivers shifting to other modes was evident in transit use figures. The number of Commuteride Park and Ride spaces and the number of vanpools increased. Two new measurements for the 2009 report, Transit LOS and Transit Service Area showed the locations and intensities of transit provided to an area. Over the next several years, this data will be able to be reviewed to compare the progress of the region and individual cities in providing more transit services.

Policy changes also improve the choices in transportation for the region. Valley Regional Transit implemented a fixed-stop transit system, which enabled more efficient services, reduced system delay and a safer environment for transit drivers and users. Ada County Highway District made efforts with the Transportation and Land Use Integration Plan to identify how roadways should function and look like in the future. This effort seeks to provide a more complete street and better serve the needs of vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians and people with disabilities. The COMPASS Board adopted the Access Management Toolkit which provides information and guidance on how to improve roadway efficiency while mitigating additional costs.

Connectivity

The ability for residents to access jobs, shopping, public parks and schools, transit and other services increases quality of life. Both proximity and access of households to these destinations and services are components of connectivity.

The measure of household connectivity showed a reduction in connectivity to parks, schools, and grocery stores. Regionally, slightly more than one-fourth of households are within a walkable distance to grocery stores (27%) More than one-third are walkable to a public park (34%) and public schools (37%). In 2007, only 9% of households were within a walkable distance to all three of those locations; this improved to 11% in 2008.

Another critical component in enabling choices in transportation is the proximity of employment and housing to existing transit services. In 2008, 39.3% of households and 64.7% of jobs were within a ¼ mile distance to existing transit. In 2007, 14.6% of households and 76.6% of jobs were within a ¼ mile distance to existing transit. Most of this increase is due to a new transit routes along State Street/Highway 44 that has provided service to Middleton, Star, and Eagle. However, in other locations, employment has followed rooftops, not along transit routes.

Public policies that will improve connectivity in the future are also highlighted in this report. As previously mentioned, ACHD is embarking in a Transportation and Land Use Integration Plan to improve streetscapes and the opportunities for walking and biking. Also, the City of Meridian adopted a Master Pathways Plan which prioritized pathway segments for purchase and construction.
The percentage of households and the number of jobs near transit routes were able to be compared to CIM baseyear figures. More households (39.3% from 14.6%) but fewer jobsites (64.7% from 76.6%) were located within a 1/4 mile walk distance of transit.

**Open Space and Farmland**

Open space is a subjective term. The types of land considered as open space include cemeteries, golf courses, public parks, and publicly owned land outside the areas of impact. Using these categories, there was an increase of open space in both Ada and Canyon counties. The major difference was in the amount of publicly owned land outside the areas of impact.

Growth in the rural areas of the region showed mixed results. Areas of Impact in several cities in Canyon County (Greenleaf, Homedale, Notus, Parma, and Wilder) were greatly enlarged from 11,754 acres to 121,246 acres. However, none of these cities showed growth outside of their original areas of impact.

In 2008, there were almost 1,500 acres more of agricultural land than the previous year. This is a result of the downturn in building permits and more landowners filing land as an agricultural tax code. Less entitlement of agricultural land is helping to preserve farmland.

Some public policy changes this last year may also preserve open space and farmland. Ada County adopted an ordinance which discourages growth outside of the Area of Impact by eliminating "nonfarm subdivisions" and requires all development, in or out of the Area of Impact to be served by urban public facilities. Ada County is also reviewing the planned community entitlement process to improve the efficiency, safety, and sustainability of development in the county. The City of Meridian added a “Future Planning and Referral Area” to preserve the rural character of South Meridian and allows for the continuance of agricultural operations.
## Communities in Motion Adoption

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency</th>
<th>Adopted CIM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ada County Highway District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise School District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon County</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Highway District No. 4</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golden Gate Highway District</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Transportation Department</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa Highway District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus Parma Highway District</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: COMPASS member agencies such as Boise State University (BSU), Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), and Capital City Development Corporation (CCDC) are not included in the 2009 Performance Monitoring Report.
**Communities in Motion**

**Five Key Elements**

**Balance Between Jobs and Housing**
There are three Balance Between Jobs and Housing metrics that can be compared from the adoption of Communities in Motion until 2008. These are jobs/housing balance, population density, and employment density. The overall balance between jobs and housing decreased since 2006, as 3 cities had a closer balance to the regional average, 5 cities had a worse balance and 6 remained unchanged. The population densities within the region also declined as only 5 out of 14 cities increased their overall city population densities. Employment densities generally showed improvement as 6 cities increased their employment density, 2 decreased, and 6 remained the same. As two of the three measurables did not show progress, a down arrow shows that this indicator is declining since 2006.

**Choices in Housing**
There is only one dataset that can be tracked from 2006 to 2008, percent of multi-family dwelling units as share of overall new residential construction. This dropped from 15.6% in 2006 to 14.7% in 2008. The arrow on the right demonstrates that this decline.

**Choices in Transportation**
Several new methods for measuring choices in transportation were introduced in the 2009 Performance Monitoring Report. Two that can be compared to the CIM baseline year of 2006 are Arterial Level of Service (LOS) and roadways with sidewalks. The Arterial LOS remained the same (at “A”) and more than 100 new sidewalk miles were added to the region improving the amount of multi-modal transportation choices offered. The arrow on the right shows improvement in this area.

**Connectivity**
There were three ways of comparing current connectivity to CIM baselines data: neighborhood walkability, housing near transit, and employment near transit. Neighborhood walkability improved from 9% to 11%, indicating more households are able to walk to parks, schools, and grocery stores. Also, more households are within a walkable distance to transit (39.3% from 14.6%). However, fewer jobs are near transit routes (64.7% from 76.6%). Two out of three metrics show improvement this year.

**Preservation of Open Space and Farmland**
The four ways used in this report to measure preservation of open space and farmland were the change in area of impact, acres of annexed land outside areas of impact, agricultural acreage, and change in acres of open space. Both the change in area of impact boundaries and the area outside of the impact areas showed a considerable rise from 2006. This last year showed an improvement on agricultural land being consumed. Finally, while more open space was being designated, it was less than the amount preserved in 2006. As three of four measurable showed decline, the arrow on the right shows no progress.

Overall, two of five categories showed improvement towards the goals of CIM.
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BACKGROUND
COMMUNITIES IN MOTION: REGIONAL LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2030

*Communities in Motion* (CIM) is the regional long-range transportation plan for southwest Idaho and provides regional transportation solutions for the next twenty-plus years for Ada, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, and Payette Counties. The COMPASS Board adopted the plan on August 21, 2006. CIM evaluated projected population and employment growth, current and future transportation needs, safety, financial capacity, and preservation of the human and natural environment. More than 2,000 residents, stakeholders, and elected officials participated in developing the plan. Seventy-two percent of those who reviewed and commented on the plan in spring 2006 supported it. The planning document is available in print, on a CD-ROM, and on-line at [http://www.communitiesinmotion.org/plandocuments.html](http://www.communitiesinmotion.org/plandocuments.html).

VISIONS AND GOALS OF CIM

The vision and goals for the plan were developed with input from the general public, COMPASS Board of Directors and planning staff from member agencies.

**Vision**

We envision a Treasure Valley where quality of life is enhanced and communities are connected by an innovative, effective, multimodal transportation system.

**Goals**

- **Connections** – Provide options for safe access and mobility in a cost-effective manner in the region.
- **Coordination** – Achieve better inter-jurisdictional coordination of transportation and land use planning.
- **Environment** – Minimize transportation impacts to people, cultural resources, and the environment.
- **Information** – Coordinate data gathering and dispense better information.

*Communities in Motion* Monitoring Issues

One of the provisions of CIM was the development and implementation of a monitoring report, specifically:

**Task 4.4.3** – COMPASS will prepare an annual monitoring report that also summarizes progress toward achieving alternative transportation and desired land use objectives. The report will provide information relevant to determining the need to amend or update the plan.”

To assess progress on implementing CIM, COMPASS will issue a CIMPMR every year, which will address the intended results of the “Community Choices” scenario, (i.e., successful implementation, and will track those areas which are not in compliance with the plan). The first report was issued in September 2006, just one month after the COMPASS Board adopted CIM. The “Community Choices” key elements support the CIM goals of connections, coordination, environment, and information.
The CIMPMR is organized to highlight five monitoring categories:

- Balance between Jobs and Housing
- Choices in Housing
- Choices in Transportation
- Connectivity
- Preservation of Open Space and Farmland

For the purposes of this report, the “balance between housing and jobs” and “housing choices” has been split into two categories; they appeared as one category in CIM.
TRANSPORTATION AGENCY SUMMARIES
Community Planning Association

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
Sponsored the Transportation Conference on Funding, Land Use & Politics.
Sponsored the 2008 educational series with speaker’s on the topics of sustainable streets, innovative transportation strategies, property rights, bicycles, transit-oriented developments, and economic development.

Choices in Housing
Completed the 2008 Development Monitoring Report with data on growth and development.
Completed Community Preference Report and other outreach to CIM stakeholders to develop the Communities in Motion Implementation Guidebook.

Choices in Transportation
- Continued efforts on the Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study and downtown Boise Multimodal Center.
- Introduced legislation for a local option tax.
- Completed a regional truck freight study.
- Continued corridor planning of State Highway 44 and 20/26.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
Completed the 2008 Performance Monitoring Report which measured growth within urbanized areas and preserving open space and agricultural land.
Used criteria in the Transportation Improvement Program prioritization to encourage projects in anticipated “growth areas.”

Connectivity
- Recommended Practices for Transportation Impact Studies for COMPASS review of TIS.
- Access Management Toolkit which highlights techniques for improving traffic flow.
- High Volume Intersection Study which explores innovative methods for increasing efficiencies at intersections.

Opportunities
Preparing to update Communities in Motion, evaluating transportation, land use, environmental, and financial conditions to prioritize transportation improvements.
Working with member agencies in securing federal funding through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009.
Continuing of mobility management strategies to enhance transportation services especially for the elderly, disabled, people with low incomes.

Adopted CIM?    Yes
Ada County Highway District

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None Provided by the Ada County Highway District.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by the Ada County Highway District.

Choices in Transportation
- Development of the ACHD Complete Streets Policy
- Development of the ACHD Livable Street Design Guide
- Expansion of ACHD Commuter ride Vanpool Services
- Development of the ACHD Bicycle Master Plan
- Community Programs and Pedestrian Improvements
- Safe routes to School

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by the Ada County Highway District.

Connectivity
- Continued to provide cross access between development and stub streets to undeveloped land
- Development of a collector network map through TLIP
- Bicycle Master Plan - Coordination with Cities to connect city/private paths to the bikeway network
- Sub Area Planning – Southwest Boise and South Meridian (includes roadway networks, intersection configura-...

Opportunities
- Access Management Policy Updates
- TIS Policy Updates
- Sub Area Planning
- Transportation Land Use Integration
- ADA accessibility improvements

Adopted CIM? | Yes
Canyon Highway District

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None Provided by Canyon Highway District.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by Canyon Highway District.

Choices in Transportation
None Provided by Canyon Highway District.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by Canyon Highway District.

Connectivity
None Provided by Canyon Highway District.

Opportunities
None Provided by Canyon Highway District.

Have Adopted CIM? No
Idaho Transportation Department

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None Provided by Idaho Transportation Department.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by Idaho Transportation Department.

Choices in Transportation
None Provided by Idaho Transportation Department.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by Idaho Transportation Department.

Connectivity
None Provided by Idaho Transportation Department.

Opportunities
None Provided by Idaho Transportation Department.

Have Adopted CIM?  No
Nampa Highway District

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None Provided by Nampa Highway District.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by Nampa Highway District.

Choices in Transportation
None Provided by Nampa Highway District.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by Nampa Highway District.

Connectivity
None Provided by Nampa Highway District.

Opportunities
None Provided by Nampa Highway District.

Have Adopted CIM?  Yes
Valley Regional Transit

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Does not apply to Valley Regional Transit.

Choices in Housing

Does not apply to Valley Regional Transit.

Choices in Transportation

Implemented a bus stop system with 680 bus stops in Ada and Canyon Counties. The stops make the system safer, easier to use and more timely.
Simplified the fare system to make Canyon and Ada county the same.
Increased capacity on the Route 42—Nampa/Meridian/Boise Limited Stop by running 40 passenger busses during commute times.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Does not apply to Valley Regional Transit.

Connectivity

Made a major commitment to mobility management to improve citizens mobility throughout the community.
Implemented policies to increase accessibility to bus stops for those with disabilities and secured stimulus funding for bus stop enhancements to make them more ADA accessible
Increased bike rack capacity on busses.

Opportunities

- Adding 3 bike racks to all 40 passenger vehicles.
- Participating in the High Capacity Transit Study to determine alignment and mode options.
- Continuing work on downtown multimodal center.
- Implement an accessible taxi cab program.
- Implement a travel training program.
- Implement the ADA improvements at bus stops.
- Participating in State Street Corridor study.
- Exploring service enhancements with city partners
- Implementing bus bench program.

Adopted CIM?

Yes
Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 1.3  2008:  1.2

Population Density:
2006: 0.5  2008: 0.6

Household Density:
2006: 0.2  2008: 0.2

Employment Density:
2006: 0.2  2008: 0.2

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 15.6%  2008: 14.7%

Affordable Housing: 63%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 89

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS
2006: A  2008: A

Transit LOS: NA

Service Area: NA

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 385
Vanpool origins/destinations: 170

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 1,700  2008: 1,831

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 11%

Housing in TODs: 6,789

Housing near Transit:
2006: 14.6%  2008: 39.3%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 76.6%  2008: 64.7%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 2,246  2008: 109,491

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 1,045

Agricultural Acreage:
2007: 260,915  2008: 262,394

Change in acres of Open Space:
2007: 220  2008: 68
Ada County

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 0.8  2008: 0.4

Population Density:
2006: 0.0  2008: 0.1

Household Density:
2006: 0.0  2008: 0.0

Employment Density:
2006: 0.0  2008: 0.0

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 2.9%  2008: 5.2%

Affordable Housing: NA

Diversity of Housing Stock: 63

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A  2008: A

Transit LOS: NA
Service Area: 1%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 0

Vanpool ridership: 0

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: NA  2008: 3

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 0.0%

Housing in TODs:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Housing near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 2,246  2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 9,043

Change in Agricultural Acreage: +5,215

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 303,867  2008: 307,709
Adopted CIM?  Yes

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None provided by Ada County.

Choices in Housing
Ada County formed a Planned Community Team which is reviewing the planned community entitlement process and is looking to recommend changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Ordinance so that it is more efficient and transparent while maintaining focus on the public health, safety, and welfare of the community.

Choices in Transportation
None provided by Ada County.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
Ada County adopted ordinance 699 which discourages growth outside of the Area of Impact by eliminating "nonfarm subdivisions" and requires all development, in or out of the Area of Impact to be served by urban public facilities.

Connectivity
None provided by Ada County.

Opportunities
None provided by Ada County.
Canyon County

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 0.8  2008: 0.1

Population Density: DU/acre
2006: 0.1  2008: 0.1

Household Density: HH/acre
2006: 0.1  2008: 0.1

Employment Density: Jobs/acre
2006: 0.0  2008: 0.0

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 1.8%  2008: 0.0%

Affordable Housing: NA

Diversity of Housing Stock: 86

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A+  2008: A+

Transit LOS: F

Service Area: 0

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 0

Vanpool Vehicles: 0

Roadways with sidewalks: 0

Miles of Bikepaths: 0

Connectivity

Household Connectivity:
2006: NA  2008: 0%

Housing in TODs:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Housing near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: NA  2008: -109,491

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 1,044

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+28,929

Acres of Open Space:
Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None Provided by Canyon County.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by Canyon County.

Choices in Transportation
None Provided by Canyon County.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by Canyon County.

Connectivity
None Provided by Canyon County.

Opportunities
None Provided by Canyon County.
City of Boise

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 1.7  2008: 1.8

Population Density: Persons/acre
2006: 5.1  2008: 4.2

Household Density: HH/acre
2006: 1.7  2008: 1.7

Employment Density: Jobs/acre
2006: 3.0  2008: 3.0

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 26.8%  2008: 40.0%

Affordable Housing: 61%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 76

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 16%

Housing in TODs: 4,761

Housing near Transit:
2006: 68.6%  2008: 60.9%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 87.2%  2008: 75.0%

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A-  2008: A-

Transit LOS: A+

Service Area: 26%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 57

Vanpool origins/destinations: 78

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 780  2008: 798

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+1,177

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 6,152  2008: 6,719
**Balance Between Jobs and Housing**

Adopted the River Street – Myrtle Street Master Plan, the Old Boise – Eastside Master Plan, the Downtown Mobility Study and the Westside Downtown Framework Master Plan.

Approved Harris Ranch and Englefield Green mixed-use subdivisions.

**Choices in Housing**

Approved the Boise Retirement Community, a four-story, continuing care facility.

Approved the Thirtieth St. Condominiums, a residential condominiums.

Approved the Rosemary Row Townhouse, the conversion of an existing four unit condominium to Townhouses.

**Choices in Transportation**

Adopted State Street TOD policies associated with the State Street Corridor Strategic Plan Study.

Require cross-access and a sidewalk on the commercial subdivision at Eagle and Baldcypress.

Denied a retail store on State and Gardener as it did not meet standards of New Urbanism.

**Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land**

Approved a height exception for a new academic building on the BSU campus.

Approved a new Landscape Ordinance into the zoning code.

Approved a baseball practice facility at Timberline High School.

Did not approve any building permits.

**Connectivity**

Required a sidewalk and pedestrian access to the buildings for a commercial rezone on Emerald Street.

Recommended to the Ada County Board of Commissioners:
- Approval of a mixed-use development with requirements for pathways, sidewalks, and street connectivity.
- Denial of a subdivision that would fragment development. Also, encouraged a local circulation system in the area.

**Opportunities**

Working with Valley Regional Transit to improve and expand transit service.
City of Caldwell

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 1.2  2008: 0.9

Population Density: DU/acre
2006: 3.7  2008: 3.1

Household Density: HH/acre
2006: 1.3  2008: 1.1

Employment Density: Jobs/acre
2006: 1.3  2008: 1.0

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 13.3%  2008: 3.0%

Affordable Housing: 86%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 20

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A  2008: A

Transit LOS: D+

Service Area: 11%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 49

Vanpool ridership: 13

Miles of sidewalks:
2006: 104  2008: 142

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 5%

Housing in TODs:
2006: NA  2008: 400

Housing near Transit:
2006: 24.6%  2008: 26.2%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 66.9%  2008: 68.5%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 358  2008: 805

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+2.784

Acres of Open Space:
Balance Between Jobs and Housing
Revised the Subdivision Ordinance which codified new urbanism policies and is consistent with the City’s Comprehensive Plan.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by the City of Caldwell.

Choices in Transportation
Revised the City Center Ordinance to promote a truly urban, public transportation-friendly environment

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by the City of Caldwell.

Connectivity
Created a Public Facilities Plan which identifies future public facilities needs and locations. It promotes neighborhood land uses (schools, parks) to utilize lesser used (collector) streets.

Opportunities
Working with Valley Regional Transit to improve and local community groups to coordinate transportation services, reducing duplication and filling gaps.
City of Eagle

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 0.8  2008: 0.8

Population Density: DU/acre
2006: 2.4  2008: 2.0

Household Density: HH/acre
2006: 0.7  2008: 0.6

Employment Density: Jobs/acre
2006: 0.6  2008: 0.5

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 5.0%  2008: 2.4%

Affordable Housing: 20%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 28

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A  2008: A

Transit LOS: D

Service Area: 1%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 9

Vanpool origins/destinations: 2

Miles of sidewalk: 106

Miles of Bikepaths: 12

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 8%

Housing in TODs: 288

Housing near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 14.1%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 46.2%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 7,055  2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+644

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 1,790  2008: 1,828
Adopted CIM? Yes

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
Amended comprehensive plan to create a Business Park/Tech Center to create & keep employment and capture trips. Stillwater Business Park was approved in Business Park/Tech Center and will be a transportation node.

Created policies for greater housing and employment opportunities in the

Choices in Housing
Currently working to integrate Eagle City Code to address sustainability, design and form, and to better apply the intent of the Comprehensive Plan.

Council direction to incorporate TOD policies/practices and State Street Study policies into City’s Comprehensive Plan.

Choices in Transportation
Worked with ACHD to complete the Northwest Foothills Transportation Study to assess needs and impacts of the future transportation system north of Eagle

Joined State Street Corridor Study which was expanded to SH16.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
Nearing completion of Eagle/BLM Regional Park Plan to provide greater opportunities for open space.

Connectivity
Held Visioning Sessions in the first phase of the Downtown Plan in an effort to create a walkable and distinctive downtown that incorporates greater mix of residential and commercial, and promotes TOD and alternative forms of travel.

Opportunities
None Provided by the City of Eagle.
City of Garden City

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 1.9  2008: 1.7

Population Density:
2006: 3.2  2008: 4.7

Household Density:
2006: 1.5  2008: 1.9

Employment Density:
2006: 2.7  2008: 3.2

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 15.6%  2008: 57.9%

Affordable Housing: 57%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 60

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A-  2008: A-

Transit LOS: D+

Service Area: 36%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 0

Vanpool origins/destinations: 0

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 32  2008: 32

Connectivity

2006: Household Connectivity: 0%

2006: Housing in TODs: 369

Housing near Transit:
2006: 47.2%  2008: 59.3%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 82.5%  2008: 85.2%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+34

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 166  2008: 133
Have Adopted CIM? Yes

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Garden City adopted a development code in 2008 that specifically identified locations for a mix of jobs and housing in the same location. This means that residents in these areas may live, work, and play all on the same property.

Choices in Housing

The new development code requires new subdivisions to incorporate a variety of lot sizes to encourage a variety of housing types and sizes.

Choices in Transportation

As property redevelops, right of way for pathways and trails is now being required for consideration for pedestrian and bike mobility. Garden City also is involved with the State Street Transit Corridor study, and hopes that this effort will lend itself to be one of the first corridors in the Treasure Valley to specifically accommodate transit.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Garden City has very little undeveloped land. As such preservation of agriculture land is difficult. Nonetheless the new development code allows for urban farming throughout the city; and requires a certain amount of open space preservation in conjunction with redevelopment.

Connectivity

Garden City continues to work with the transportation agencies to develop new street standards. A master street plan has been generated for the Original Town Site that identifies a smaller grid to increase densities and traffic flow.

Opportunities

To further open space preservation Garden City has turned its focus on its parks. The city has enhanced its parks; is in the process of developing a master parks plan and has been working with the City of Boise with parks that will bridge and be enjoyed by both communities.
City of Greenleaf

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 0.2  2008: 0.2

Population Density:
2006: 2.3  2008: 2.2

Household Density:
2006: 0.7  2008: 0.7

Employment Density:
2006: 0.2  2008: 0.2

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 8.6%  2008: 0.0%

Affordable Housing: 63%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 0

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: NA  2008: NA

Transit LOS: F

Service Area: 0%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 0

Vanpool ridership: 0

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 1  2008: 1

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 0%

2006: Housing in TODs: 0

Housing near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 16,806

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage: -749

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 10  2008: 11
Adopted CLM?  No

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None Provided by the City of Greenleaf.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by the City of Greenleaf.

Choices in Transportation
None Provided by the City of Greenleaf.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by the City of Greenleaf.

Connectivity
None Provided by the City of Greenleaf.

Opportunities
None Provided by the City of Greenleaf.
## City of Kuna

### Balance Between Jobs and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs to Housing Ratios:</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Density:</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household Density:</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Density:</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Choices in Housing

- **New Multi-family: % of Units**
  - 2006: 4.0%
  - 2008: 0.0%

- **Affordable Housing:** 79%

- **Diversity of Housing Stock:** 59

### Choices in Transportation

- **Arterial LOS**
  - 2006: A+
  - 2008: A

- **Transit LOS:** F

- **Service Area:** 0%

- **# of Park & Ride Spaces:** 80

- **Vanpool ridership:** 8

- **Roadways with sidewalks:**
  - 2006: 40
  - 2008: 45

- **Miles of Bikepaths:** 5

### Connectivity

- **Household Connectivity:** 0%
- **2006: Housing in TODs:** 0
- **Housing near Transit:**
  - 2006: 0.0%
  - 2008: 0.0%
- **Employment near Transit:**
  - 2006: 0.0%
  - 2008: 0.0%

### Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

- **Change in Area of Impact:**
  - 2006: 0
  - 2008: 0

- **Acres outside Area of Impact:**
  - 2006: 8,300
  - 2008: 0

- **Change in Agricultural Acreage:** +131

- **Acres of Open Space:**
  - 2006: 23
  - 2008: 23
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>None Provided by the City of Kuna.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Between Jobs and Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choices in Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choices in Transportation</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation of Open Space &amp; Agricultural Land</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectivity</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## City of Melba

### Balance Between Jobs and Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Jobs to Housing Ratio</th>
<th>Population Density</th>
<th>Household Density</th>
<th>Employment Density</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Choices in Housing

- **New Multi-family: % of Units**
  - 2006: 4.4%  
  - 2008: 0.0%
- **Affordable Housing:** 75%
- **Diversity of Housing Stock:** 0

### Connectivity

- **Household Connectivity:** 39%
- **2006:** Housing in TODs: 0
- **2006:** Housing near Transit: 0.0%  
  - **2008:** Housing near Transit: 0.0%
- **2006:** Employment near Transit: 0.0%  
  - **2008:** Employment near Transit: 0.0%

### Choices in Transportation

- **Arterial LOS:**
  - 2006: NA  
  - 2008: NA
- **Transit LOS:** F
- **Service Area:** 0%
- **# of Park & Ride Spaces:** 0
- **Vanpool ridership:** 1
- **Roadways with sidewalks:**
  - 2006: 2  
  - 2008: 3

### Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

- **Change in Area of Impact:**
  - 2006: 2,246  
  - 2008: 0
- **Acres outside Area of Impact:**
  - 2006: 0  
  - 2008: 0
- **Change in Agricultural Acreage:** -8
- **Acres of Open Space:**
  - 2006: 31  
  - 2008: 31
Have Adopted CIM?  No

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None Provided by the City of Melba.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by the City of Melba.

Choices in Transportation
None Provided by the City of Melba.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by the City of Melba.

Connectivity
None Provided by the City of Melba.

Opportunities
None Provided by the City of Melba.
City of Meridian

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 1.1  2008: 1.1

Population Density:
2006: 5.0  2008: 4.6

Household Density:
2006: 1.6  2008: 1.5

Employment Density:
2006: 1.7  2008: 1.8

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 8.3%  2008: 26.9%

Affordable Housing: 53%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 77

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A-  2008: A

Transit LOS: D-

Service Area: 1%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 106

Vanpool origins/destinations: 8

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 325  2008: 347

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 4%

2006: Housing in TODs: 178

Housing near Transit:
2006: 13.7%  2008: 7.0%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 59.0%  2008: 33.9%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 2,246  2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+382

Acres of Open Space:
Adopted CIM? Yes

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Added new Comprehensive Plan designation for “Medium-High Density Residential” for mixed, dense housing types, ranging from 8 to 15 dwellings per acre.

City priority emphasis on marketing recruiting industries and employment business to the City of Meridian.

Choices in Housing

Adopted city-wide design guidelines that further guide development of our mixed use designations and further articulate the City’s desire for areas of urban development.

Amended Area of Impact boundary near the Boise River, adding housing choice and preserving area around the river for future parks,

Choices in Transportation

Evaluating options with Union Pacific for using rail corridor for other modes of transportation.

Adopted Master Pathways Plan and prioritized pathway segments for purchase and construction.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Initiating work on NW Specific Area Plan to plan and implement tools for agricultural industries and food production in an urban fabric.

Added a “Future Planning and Referral Area” to preserve the rural character of South Meridian and allow continuance of agricultural

Connectivity

Opened new City Hall that allows citizens a one stop shop in a central downtown, reduces fuel consumption, and sets the foundation for a vibrant and active downtown.

Coordinated closely with ACHD on TLIP – an effort to bring together land use and transportation planning.

Opportunities

Working with Valley Regional Transit to plan future transit service.
City of Middleton

**Balance Between Jobs and Housing**

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
- 2006: 0.5
- 2008: 0.8

Population Density:
- 2006: 2.5
- 2008: 1.8

Household Density:
- 2006: 0.9
- 2008: 0.6

Employment Density:
- 2006: 0.4
- 2008: 0.5

**Choices in Housing**

New Multi-family: % of Units
- 2006: 6.6%
- 2008: 0.0%

Affordable Housing: 61%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 62

**Choices in Transportation**

Arterial LOS:
- 2006: A+
- 2008: A+

Transit LOS: D-

Service Area: 2%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 0

Vanpool origins/destinations: 1

Roadways with sidewalks:
- 2006: 15
- 2008: 25

Miles of Bikepaths: 20.7

**Connectivity**

Household Connectivity: 9%

2006: Housing in TODs: 0

Housing near Transit:
- 2006: 0.0%
- 2008: 35.8%

Employment near Transit:
- 2006: 0.0%
- 2008: 51.1%

**Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land**

Change in Area of Impact:
- 2006: 2,246
- 2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
- 2006: 0
- 2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
- +10,680

Acres of Open Space:
- 2006: 59
- 2008: 383
**Balance Between Jobs and Housing**

The Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map was approved with an increased area of mixed use allowed throughout the downtown area.

**Choices in Housing**

Approved a Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map that increases the density within the existing city limits.

Approved a planned unit development with areas of increased density and a variety of housing types.

**Choices in Transportation**

The Transportation Master Plan map has been incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan.

A public-private partnership is collectively working on extending Cemetery Road to the south which will connect into Sawtooth Drive.

**Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land**

The bike path is being improved at Highway 44 and Middleton Road. The standards are being updated for City parks.

Middleton has been working with the Boise River Trail Coalition to create a continuous land and water trail system on and near Boise River from Lucky Peak Dam to the Snake River.

**Connectivity**

VRT Bus ridership along Highway 44 has increased 45%.

An additional route may be added or a larger bus purchased to accommodate the additional ridership.

**Opportunities**

Middleton is working with ITD, Canyon Highway District 4, and COMPASS on a cooperative agreement for an access plan along State Highway 44.
City of Nampa

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 1.2  2008: 1.1

Population Density: DU/acre
2006: 4.4  2008: 4.2

Household Density: HH/acre
2006: 1.5  2008: 1.5

Employment Density: Jobs/acre
2006: 1.5  2008: 1.7

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 16.0%  2008: 12.0%

Affordable Housing: 76%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 82

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A  2008: A

Transit LOS: C-

Service Area: 10%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 80

Vanpool origins/destinations: 18

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006:286  2008: 297

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 6%

2006:Housing in TODs: 789

Housing near Transit:
2006: 24.2%  2008: 19.9%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 70.4%  2008: 62.6%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 2,246  2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 240

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+406

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 898  2008: 966
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Balance Between Jobs and Housing</td>
<td>None provided by the City of Nampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices in Housing</td>
<td>None provided by the City of Nampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choices in Transportation</td>
<td>None provided by the City of Nampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preservation of Open Space &amp; Agricultural Land</td>
<td>None provided by the City of Nampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectivity</td>
<td>None provided by the City of Nampa.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunities</td>
<td>None provided by the City of Nampa.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Notus

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 0.1  2008: 0.3

Population Density:
2006: 2.5  2008: 2.6

Household Density:
2006: 0.8  2008: 0.9

Employment Density:
2006: 0.1  2008: 0.2

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Affordable Housing: 74%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 0

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: NA  2008: NA

Transit LOS: F

Service Area: 0%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 0

Vanpool origins/destinations: 0

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Connectivity

2006: Household Connectivity: 0%

2006: Housing in TODs: 0

Housing near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 2,246  2008: 7,481

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+291

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 1  2008: 1
Adopted CIM? | No

Balance Between Jobs and Housing
None Provided by the City of Notus.

Choices in Housing
None Provided by the City of Notus.

Choices in Transportation
None Provided by the City of Notus.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land
None Provided by the City of Notus.

Connectivity
None Provided by the City of Notus.

Opportunities
None Provided by the City of Notus.
City of Parma

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 1.1  2008: 0.8

Population Density:
2006: 2.8  2008: 2.9

Household Density:
2006: 1.0  2008: 1.0

Employment Density:
2006: 0.9  2008: 0.8

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 8.0%  2008: 0.0%

Affordable Housing: 70%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 73

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: NA  2008: NA

Transit LOS: F

Service Area: 0%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 0

Vanpool origins/destinations: 1

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 3  2008: 3

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 65%

Housing in TODs: 0

Housing near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 2,246  2008: 7,167

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage:
+275

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 13  2008: 29
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Balance Between Jobs and Housing</strong></td>
<td>None provided by the City of Parma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choices in Housing</strong></td>
<td>None provided by the City of Parma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Choices in Transportation</strong></td>
<td>None provided by the City of Parma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Preservation of Open Space &amp; Agricultural Land</strong></td>
<td>None provided by the City of Parma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Connectivity</strong></td>
<td>None provided by the City of Parma.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Opportunities</strong></td>
<td>None provided by the City of Parma.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Star

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 0.3   2008: 0.3

Population Density: DU/acre
2006: 2.5   2008: 2.1

Household Density: HH/acre
2006: 0.9   2008: 0.7

Employment Density: Jobs/acre
2006: 0.2   2008: 0.2

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 3.9%   2008: 7.7%

Affordable Housing: 56%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 57

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: A+   2008: A+

Transit LOS: D-

Service Area: 2%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 4

Vanpool origins/destinations: 2

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 26   2008: 30

Connectivity

Household Connectivity: 0%

Regional Connectivity:
2006: TBD   2008: TBD

Housing in TODs:
2006: TBD   2008: 0

Housing near Transit:
2006: 0.0%   2008: 35.7%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 0.0%   2008: 66.0%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 2,246   2008: 0

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0   2008: 682

Change in Agricultural Acreage: +744

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 220   2008: 220
**Balance Between Jobs and Housing**
None provided by the City of Star.

**Choices in Housing**
None provided by the City of Star.

**Choices in Transportation**
The City of Star is participating in the Transportation and Land Use Integration Plan, is the implementation tool utilized by ACHD to fulfill the transportation goals of the Blue Print for Good Growth.

Support Valley Regional Transit efforts to expand the Treasure Valley Regional Transit system.

**Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land**
None provided by the City of Star.

**Connectivity**
The City of Star has a supports the notion of the “Complete Street” and seeks to site appropriate land uses which compliment the design of the street.

Policies have been established to implement work other agencies in developing a sidewalk master plan and bicycle plan.

Encourage weather –protecting of building entries for pedestrian traf-
City of Wilder

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

Jobs to Housing Ratios:
2006: 0.5  2008: 0.5

Population Density: DU/acre
2006: 5.9  2008: 3.9

Household Density: HH/acre
2006: 1.6  2008: 1.0

Employment Density: Jobs/acre
2006: 0.6  2008: 0.6

Choices in Housing

New Multi-family: % of Units
2006: 3.9%  2008: 10.0%

Affordable Housing: 89%

Diversity of Housing Stock: 60

Choices in Transportation

Arterial LOS:
2006: NA  2008: NA

Transit LOS: F

Service Area: 0%

# of Park & Ride Spaces: 0

Vanpool origins/destinations: 0

Roadways with sidewalks:
2006: 2  2008: 2

Connectivity

2006: Household Connectivity: 33%

2006: Housing in TODs: 0

Housing near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Employment near Transit:
2006: 0.0%  2008: 0.0%

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

Change in Area of Impact:
2006: 2,246  2008: 74,594

Acres outside Area of Impact:
2006: 0  2008: 0

Change in Agricultural Acreage: -23

Acres of Open Space:
2006: 23  2008: 23
Adopted CLM?  No

Balance Between Jobs and Housing

None provided by the City of Wilder.

Choices in Housing

None provided by the City of Wilder.

Choices in Transportation

None provided by the City of Wilder.

Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land

None provided by the City of Wilder.

Connectivity

None provided by the City of Wilder.

Opportunities

None provided by the City of Wilder.
APPENDIX
Agency Page Data Definitions

Balance Between Jobs and Housing: Measures of employment, population, and housing which indicate levels of concentrated urban growth patterns. A low jobs/housing ratio indicates a housing-rich “bedroom community”, while a high jobs/housing ratio indicates an employment center. In a “balanced” community most residents could work relatively close to home, at least in theory. Even though many residents would still commute out of the area by choice or necessity, research indicates that in areas where jobs and housing are in balance, people on average do in fact commute shorter distances and spend less time in their cars, reducing in transportation-related environmental impacts and an improved quality of life.

Jobs to Housing Ratios: The ratio of employment to housing units within a city or county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Population Density: The ratio of population to acres within a city or county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Household Density: The ratio of housing units to acres within a city or county.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Employment Density: The ratio of employment to acres within a city or county.
**Choices in Housing:** Measures of diversity of housing stock enabling populations to live where they desire. By creating a wider range of housing choices, communities can reduce the amount of auto-dependent development, use infrastructure resources efficiently, and support transit services. Meeting the diverse housing needs of current and future residents, near urban areas where employment and services cluster, will be critical as the population grows to avoid gridlock on transportation corridors. Promoting multi-family housing options as well as smaller single-family homes is a more efficient use of land near cities and helps retain the historical rural feeling outside of the urban areas.

**New Multi-family:** Multi-family units as percentage of total new built. The 2006 data is for housing stock as of 2006, 2008 data is housing permits for the year 2008.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>26.8%</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>5.0%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>4.4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>16.0%</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Housing Affordability:** The percent of single family homes within an area of impact which were affordable. To qualify as affordable, housing plus transportation must be less than 50 percent or less of the regional median income of $52,280. The Housing Affordability Map (page 64) shows areas of single family homes by income level. The Housing Affordability and Commuting Distance Costs Discounted in Transit Areas (page 65), shows areas which become unaffordable once transportation costs are added to housing costs.

**Diversity of Housing Stock:** Diversity of housing stock is a measure based on the Simpson’s Evenness Index, which is a measure used in ecology that takes into account the different types of species present, and the relative proportion of each species, in a given area. An index score of 100 demonstrates a diverse and evenly distributed housing stock and a score of 0 demonstrates a perfectly homogeneous housing stock. Housing was grouped as multi-family, manufactured, and single-family. Single-family units were further split by value as less than $120,000, $120,000-$180,000, and over $180,000.
**Choices in Transportation:** The availability of multiple modes of transportation, including automobile, transit, pedestrian, bicycle, and others. Areas with several options of travel are less dependant on the single-occupant vehicle.

**Arterial LOS:** Arterial Level of Service scores were generated from Congestion Management System data and calculated by the Sanderson Index, which is derived by dividing the congested time by the ideal (free flow) time, and converted to a letter grade. A City’s score is the average of all roadway segments in the within the City’s Area of Impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>A-</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>A+</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Transit LOS:** The transit level of service was loosely based of the highway capacity level of service originally developed in the 1965 *Highway Capacity Manual*. However, the Transit LOS identifies the amount of fixed-route transit provided to a city (and subareas) based on frequency of routes and service hours. The potential values for a particular performance measure are divided into 12 ranges, with each range assigned a letter grade ranging from “A+” (highest quality/service at 15 minute frequency or better) to “F” (lowest quality/no fixed-route service).

**Transit Service Area:** Transit Service Areas refers to the percentage of housing units with access (using a estimated 15 time radius) to a fixed-route transit stop.

**Vanpool Origins/Designations:** Commuteride vanpools by origin and destination (i.e. a trip that originated and terminated in the same city would be counted twice for that city), not a measure of the number of riders.
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**Transit Coverage:** The portion of the transit service area (within 1/4 mile of a bus service where pedestrian connections are available) to the area that has a urban form supporting transit (household density of at least 3 units per gross acre or an employment density of at least 4 jobs per gross acre).

**# of Park & Ride Spaces:** Number of park and ride spaces provided in the Ada County Highway District Commuteride program by City Area of Impact.

**Roadways with sidewalks:** Miles of roadways with a sidewalk. Roadways with sidewalks on both sides are expressed as double.

**Miles of Bikepaths:** Miles of bicycle paths.

**Connectivity:** The ability for household sand neighborhoods to access jobs, shopping, public parks and schools, transit and other service increase the quality of life of its residents. Both proximity and access of households to these other locations are components of connectivity.

**Household connectivity:** Measure of households which are in a 15 minute walkable areas (at 2.5 mph) with sidewalks to public schools, public parks, and grocery stores.

**Housing in TODs:** # of housing units permitted within subdivision plats that average more than 7 DU/acre.

**Housing near Transit:** housing units within a 1/4 mile walkable area of a transit route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>60.9%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Employment near Transit: Employment within a 1/4 mile walkable area of a transit route.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td>76.6%</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>87.2%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>82.5%</td>
<td>85.2%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>70.4%</td>
<td>62.6%</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Preservation of Open Space & Agricultural Land: Communities in Motion encourages the retention of open space and agricultural lands whenever possible. Local scenic landscapes play a key role in preserving a high quality of life and attracting tourism dollars. This includes prime farm land and “buffer zones” between cities to support the unique boundaries of each city. Transportation decisions play a role in preserving open space. For example, a decision to build a road in a rural location may result in unanticipated development. This “induced” development could happen in places that are not consistent with the land use vision.

Change in Area of Impact: Amount of acres within the City Area of Impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>2,246</td>
<td>109,461</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>7,055</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16,806</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>4,022</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>1,705</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>11,435</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,481</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7,167</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>7,070</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↑</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>1,121</td>
<td>74,594</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Acres outside Area of Impact: Amount of annexed acres outside of the City Area of Impact.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>2006 (Base Year)</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>358</td>
<td>805</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garden City</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenleaf</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuna</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>8,300</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melba</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middleton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>240</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notus</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parma</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>682</td>
<td>↓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>↔</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Change in Agricultural Acreage: Amount of acres used in agriculture, compared from previous years.

Acres of Open Space: Amount of acres used as open space, which is defined in this report as golf courses (including privately owned), cemeteries, and public parks, publicly owned land that is not used for buildings (e.g., city hall sites) or open to possible sale or leasing (Idaho Department of Lands). Not included in these tables are lands under private ownership, specifically those considered agricultural and private parks.

Notes:
NA—Not Available. Data not available to COMPASS at time of publication.
TBD—To Be Determined. Data not issued for this draft report; to be issued for the final report.

Sources:
**GLOSSARY**

**Area of City Impact:** A requirement of state law requiring a land use plan that not only plans for the area within the city’s legal boundaries, but also plans for areas outside of the city’s legal boundaries that are still in the unincorporated area of the county and have not yet been annexed into the city. Officially negotiated areas of city impact are necessary prerequisites for cities to annex adjacent properties.

**Arterial Street:** A class of street serving major traffic not designated as a highway.

**Bikeway:** A facility intended to accommodate bicycle travel for recreational or commuting purposes. Bikeways are not necessarily separated facilities; they may be designed and operated to be shared with other travel modes.

**Blueprint for Good Growth:** The Ada County Consortium is a partnership of governments in charge of local land use and roadway planning: Ada County, Ada County Highway District, Boise, Eagle, Garden City, Meridian, Kuna, Star, and the Idaho Transportation Department. The partners want to better coordinate land use and transportation planning in Ada County to ensure that growth is orderly and beneficial for the community’s continued prosperity and quality of life.

**Jobs/Housing Imbalance:** When people do not live near where they work, the impacts to the transportation system increase proportionally.

**Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP):** Or Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) (the Plan) – a document resulting from regional or statewide collaboration and consensus on a region’s or state’s transportation system, and serving as the defining vision for the region’s or state’s transportation systems and services. In metropolitan areas, the plan indicates all the transportation improvements scheduled for funding over the next 20 years.

**Major Destinations:** Destinations or places that attract many traffic trips such as shopping centers, major employment centers, large educational facilities, regional parks, large entertainment areas, or downtown centers.

**Open Space:** Amount of public green space, including include public parks, cemeteries, and golf courses.

**Preservation:** To save from change or loss and reserve for a special purpose. It is the most restrictive among management principles and should not be confused with conservation.

**Sprawl:** Urban form that connotatively depicts the movement of people from the central city to the suburbs. Concerns associated with sprawl include loss of farmland and open space due to low-density land development, increased public service costs, and environmental degradation as well as other concerns associated with transportation.

**Transit:** Transportation mode that moves larger numbers of people than does a single automobile. Generally renders to passenger service provided to the general public along established routes with fixed or variable schedules at published fares.
**Transit Oriented Density:** The amount of housing density needed to support a transit system. Seven units per gross acre is the minimum density that is considered transit supportive. Transit supportive density can be derived a variety of ways including a wide mix of densities that averages seven units per acre or more. This type of density is only expected within one-quarter mile of transit stops.

**Transportation and Land Use Integration (TLIP):** Part of the Blueprint for Good Growth Implementation, TLIP is a project to better link land-use and transportation planning. This vision, Livable Streets for Tomorrow (or TLIP), says what streets in Ada County should function and look like in the future. Livable Streets for Tomorrow's goal is a roadway network that balances the needs of all users - motorists, pedestrians, cyclists, transit and people with disabilities - with streets that complement the built environment.
2008 Weighted Center of Employment

Major Employment Regions
2008

Employment Density
- 0 - 1 Jobs per Acre
- 1-2 Jobs per Acre
- 2-4 Jobs per Acre
- 4-7 Jobs per Acre
- 7-10 Jobs per Acre
- 10-15 Jobs per Acre
- 15-21 Jobs per Acre
- 21-28 Jobs per Acre
- 28-35+ Jobs per Acre

Page 62
Walking Network Analysis 2009
Areas within a 15 min Walking Time of Grocery Stores, Schools, and Parks

Where types of walkable areas overlap, new colors are generated. These are shown with their definitions below:

- Parks & Grocery
- Parks
- Schools & Grocery
- Grocery

Methodology
The network of walkable roads and pathways was used to measure walking time from destination points of parks, grocery stores, or schools. A "cost factor" of the average time it takes to walk a mile was applied to each line segment. A speed of 2.5 mph was used, producing the time it would take to walk the length of each line segment. The segments were added up to 15 minute lengths from each destination point and made into area polygons.
Housing in Transit-Density Subdivisions

Transit-Density Subdivisions

Bus Routes

[Map of housing in transit-density subdivisions with cities like Nampa, Caldwell, Middleton, Kuna, Meridian, Boise, Star, and Eagle marked on it.]
2008 Employment Near Transit

Employment Density
- 0 - 1 Jobs per Acre
- 1-2 Jobs per Acre
- 2-4 Jobs per Acre
- 4-7 Jobs per Acre
- 7-10 Jobs per Acre
- 10-15 Jobs per Acre
- 15-21 Jobs per Acre
- 21-28 Jobs per Acre
- 28-35+ Jobs per Acre

Bus Routes
Values determined by Assessor land characteristics and deleting Estate type properties with less than 20 acres and improved values greater than $100,000.