Communities in Motion

implementation guidebook
"We envision a Treasure Valley where quality of life is enhanced and communities are connected by an innovative, effective, multi-modal transportation system."
Communities in Motion (CIM) is the regional long-range transportation plan for Southwest Idaho for Ada, Boise, Canyon, Elmore, Gem, and Payette counties. The Communities in Motion planning process looked at how our region might develop by evaluating projected population and employment growth, current and future transportation needs, safety, financial capacity, and preservation of the human and natural environment. Using input from public workshops, local governments, stakeholders, and elected officials, COMPASS developed the growth scenario - “Community Choices” - on which the plan is based. Over 2000 residents, stakeholders, and elected officials participated in developing the plan. Of those who reviewed and commented, 72 percent supported Communities in Motion.

The plan provides local governments a common vision of growth in the region and was adopted by the COMPASS Board on August 21, 2006. The CIM planning process identified a broad vision and community goals.

**Quick Facts**

- 19 homes are added per day.
- 32 more vehicles get on the road per day.
- 7,600 more commuters use the region’s roadways each year.
- 35,000 new subdivision lots are in the approval process.
- 21,000 more people per year live in the region.
- Each transportation dollar buys just 53 cents of what it did in 1996.

Intr oduction

“[H]uman activities contribute to creation of greenhouse gases... and have been linked by the US National Academy of Sciences to drought, reduced snow pack, altered precipitation patterns, more severe forest and rangeland fires, and forest diseases...rising levels of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere could have economic and environmental impacts on the West in coming decades...”


Communities in Motion Goals

Connections Provide options for safe access and expanded mobility in a cost-effective manner in the region.

Environment Minimize transportation impacts to people, cultural resources, and the environment.

Coordination Achieve better inter-jurisdictional coordination of transportation and land use planning.

Information Coordinate data gathering and dispense better information.

The “Community Choices” scenario of Communities in Motion offers a vision for a more cost-effective, multi-modal transportation system. To support this vision, funding for public infrastructure must be directed to areas of growth consistent with those outlined in CIM. If done, new growth patterns will mean that our region will:

• Consume less land
• Save more open space
• Offer more housing choices
• Foster the use of public transportation
• Cut one million daily vehicle miles of travel
• Ease traffic congestion
• Reduce fuel consumption
Why does Communities in Motion matter?

Long-term Vision: Communities in Motion is the regional long-range transportation plan for southwest Idaho. It was a result of collaboration and consensus on a region’s transportation system. That document serves as the defining vision for the region’s transportation systems and services. The plan indicates all of the regional transportation improvements needed over the next 20 or more years. Putting a transportation plan together requires careful consideration of many factors, including population growth, economic trends, financial resources, community goals, preservation of both human and natural environments, and maintaining good quality of life.

Regional Scope: Transportation planning today clearly requires a regional rather than a solely local view. Most people do not spend their entire day in one town. Driving to work, school, shops and recreation may require driving through several towns and rural areas. Communities acting individually cannot solve regional transportation demands. Also, funding resources are limited. It makes sense for communities to collaborate to make sure that transportation systems work smoothly together and that individual projects make the system as a whole stronger.

Communities in Motion addresses:

• How land use affects transportation
• How investments in transportation influence growth
• What the transportation system supposed to achieve
• How transportation projects are selected
• How transportation projects serve regional needs

Collaborative Effort: To prepare Communities in Motion, COMPASS and member agencies engaged the public to ensure meaningful input into transportation decision-making. Goals for public participation include representing community needs, reaching underserved populations, offering educational opportunities, and providing public input to planners and decision-makers in a timely manner. From public workshops COMPASS found:

• 88 percent supported an expanded public transportation system and more opportunities for walking and cycling, even though it would require new revenue sources of $1.1 billion.

• 83 percent supported changes that will result in more high-density housing in existing communities.

• 77 percent supported seeking new revenue sources for roadways. Often repeated suggestions and comments were to increase gas tax, that those who use roads should pay for expansion and improvement, and/or increased registration fees.
**Stakeholder Benefits:** This regional, long-term, collaborative approach provides advantages for all stakeholders. Some of these stakeholder advantages include:

**Elected Officials**
- Higher, more stable property values
- Greatly reduced pollution and environmental destruction
- Enhanced ability to maintain economic competitiveness
- Greatly reduced dependence on foreign oil
- Less taxation needed for roadways
- Revitalize neighborhoods
- Reduce crime and increase safety
- Increase social capital and public involvement

**Public**
- Higher quality of life
- Better places to live, work, and play
- Less cookie-cutter and strip development
- Increased opportunities for quality urban lifestyle
- More walkable lifestyles away from traffic
- Reduced household spending on transportation, resulting in more affordable housing
- Healthier lifestyle with more walking, and less stress
- Shorter commutes and more free time
- Increased transit ridership
- Reduced traffic congestion and driving
- Reduced car accidents and injuries
- Preservation of open space

**Developers**
- Increased foot traffic and customers for area businesses
- Reduced incentive to sprawl, increased incentive for compact development
- Less expensive than funding road building and sprawl
- Increased land values, rents and real estate performance
- Larger market as it increases affordable housing opportunities
- Available transit reduces parking requirements and costs
- Increase access to labor pools

---

**THE COMPASS BOARD APPROVED COMMUNITIES IN MOTION ON AUGUST 21, 2006. BOARD MEMBERS ON THAT DATE WERE:**

- A.J. Balukoff, School District of Boise City
- Matt Beebe, Canyon County
- Dave Bieter, City of Boise
- Keith Bird, City of Meridian
- Vernon Bisterfeldt, City of Boise
- Dave Bivens, Ada County Highway District
- Alan Brock, Golden Gate/Notus-Parma Highway District
- Elaine Clegg, City of Boise
- Tom Dale, City of Nampa,
- Tammy de Weerd, City of Meridian,
- Russell Duke, Central District Health
- Marie Ellmaker, City of Notus
- Matt Ellsworth, Governor’s Office
- John Evans, City of Garden City
- Kelli Fairless, Valley Regional Transit
- David Ferdinand, Canyon County

---

John Franden, Ada County Highway District
Phil Kushlan, City of Caldwell
Mike McGown, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality
Carol McKee, Ada County Highway District
Frank McKeever, City of Middleton
Nancy Merrill, City of Eagle
Bryce Millar, Nampa Highway District #1
Nathan Mitchell, City of Star
Garret Nancolas, City of Caldwell,
Dean Obray, City of Kuna
Judy Peavey-Derr, Ada County
Patrick Rice, Greater Boise Auditorium District
Charles Rountree, Idaho Transportation Department
Darin Taylor, Canyon Highway District #4
Martin Thorne, City of Nampa
Fred Tilman, Ada County
Robert Vasquez, Canyon County
Mike Vuittonet, Joint School District #2
Margaret Watson, City of Parma
Rick Yzaguirre, Ada County
Strategies for Implementing Communities in Motion

**Blueprint for Good Growth**
The project involves a public process and the drafting of a county-wide land use guide plan to manage growth in Ada County. This study will be coordinated with, and complementary to Communities in Motion.

**Communities in Motion Implementation Guidebook**
The Guidebook provides specific strategies for land use and transportation necessary to move this vision into action. The guidebook provides a tool to stimulate discussion with developers, public agencies and the community at large on how Communities in Motion can be implemented.

**Downtown Boise Mobility Study**
The purpose of this study is to develop a comprehensive approach to mobility within downtown Boise and for people traveling from, to, and through the downtown area.

**Pedestrian and Bicycle Transition Plan**
This project will survey sidewalk and bike facilities within Ada County and meet the obligation to ensure mobility options for all community residents, including the general need to provide non-motorized facilities, to have safe routes to school, and to meet the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). A plan will address ADA compliance needs in Ada County and identifies top priorities for funding.

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study**
The Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study consists of three related planning projects: Downtown Boise Circulator, Downtown Boise Multi-Modal Center, and Priority Corridor (I-84/184) Alternatives Analysis.
A number of studies have been completed or are ongoing to serve the purposes of implementing *Communities in Motion*. Although each study is independent and focuses on a unique aspect of regional transportation and land use planning they were developed to integrate and complement each other. The following is projects that will help the vision of *Communities in Motion* become a reality.

**Urban Land Institute Report**
A panel of Urban Land Institute (ULI) members from across the nation visited Ada County to examine area-wide growth issues, including the impact that planned communities could have on the area. The resulting report details key recommendations for future growth planning in the region.

**US 20/26 Corridor Preservation Study**
The US 20/26 Corridor Preservation Study will identify future transportation improvements and determine the need for future right-of-way between Boise and Caldwell. It includes areas within the cities of Boise, Eagle, Meridian, and Caldwell, as well as unincorporated Ada and Canyon Counties.

**30th Street Area Plan**
The purpose of this study was to find an alignment for the corridor between State/Rose and Main/30th Streets in Boise. The analysis included surveying, property identification and some environmental issues.

**Transportation and Land Use Integration Study**
This study is the first stage of implementation of the Blueprint for Good Growth in Ada County. This study will establish a regional functional classification policy, a long-range corridor preservation plan, a countywide collector analysis, and associated roadway typologies. The project will include an ACHD revision to current roadway design policies and an effort by the land use agencies to adopt urban design standards that support context-sensitive transportation solutions.
TREASURE VALLEY USE AND TRANSIT PLANS/STUDIES

COMMUNITIES IN MOTION IMPLEMENTATION GUIDEBOOK

BLUEPRINT for Good GROWTH

REGIONAL LONG-TERM TRANSPORTATION PLAN 2016

ROADWAYS TO BIKeways PLAN Ada COUNTY HIGHWAY DISTRICT

DOWNTOWN BOISE MOBILITY STUDY

ACHD Committed to Service
PURPOSE of the Guidebook

Few regions in the country have experienced growth as rapid as the Treasure Valley in recent decades. This growth has resulted in more communities, residents, businesses, and opportunities. Growth, however, is not without its challenges. The potential downside of rapid growth includes the loss of agricultural land, worsening traffic congestion, and the degradation of natural resources.

The Treasure Valley can grow in a way that improves the quality of life and competitive advantage for the region. By the adoption of the Communities in Motion in August 2006 the region has agreed on a common vision. However, stated in Communities in Motion, “a plan is not a solution.” Leadership in the region must act to put the regional plan into action, securing the legacy of growing to improve. This will be achieved through the cumulative effect of many small actions rather than a single grand action.

The Communities in Motion Implementation Guidebook provides more specific strategies for land use and transportation necessary to move this vision into action. The Guidebook illustrates strategies of how to direct mixed uses such as jobs, shopping, services, and housing. The concepts in this implementation Guidebook are not meant to be applied region wide, but to be used at specific nodes and along appropriate corridors. Of course this does not preclude growth outside these areas. However, substantial development outside these areas will likely comprise the cost-effectiveness of the transit system, increase vehicle miles traveled and degrade air quality and may ultimately limit our ability to effectively compete for federal transit funds. Not through any severe or drastic measures but through this simple change in our approach to land development we can:

The application of these concepts will be based on Communities in Motion, Valley Regional Transit Treasure Valley in Transit Plan and in cooperation with local jurisdictions that choose to modify their land use plans to support transit. Every land development application, subarea plan and every comprehensive plan amendments should be considered in a regional context.

The Communities in Motion Implementation Guidebook shows a variety of land use principles, examples of compact developments, and descriptions of transit types. As these the area grows in population, development patterns, and transit operations this Guidebook will need to be a “living document” which will be edited and updated.
ORGANIZATION of the Guidebook

SECTION 1

CHAPTER 1: So far, the Guidebook has given a review of Communities in Motion. This has included a background of the purposes and goals of CIM and strategies for implementation. Various projects which support CIM have been enumerated.

CHAPTER 2: Chapter 2 highlighted the need for a Guidebook to provide more specific strategies for land use and transportation necessary to move this vision into action. The guidebook provides a tool to stimulate discussion with developers, public agencies and the community at large on how Communities in Motion can be implemented.

CHAPTER 3: Principles of design are critical to successful developments. This chapter will review design concepts which make the difference between congestion and vibrancy. Important concepts in this chapter are:

ACCESS THROUGH MOBILITY AND PROXIMITY: Approaches to improving access including increasing mobility and proximity.

DENSITY: High density creates additional choices by providing the ridership needed to make transit and multi-modal transportation a viable and competitive transportation option.

DESIGN: Guidelines elements of design to feature the transit and land use interface include mixing land uses, considering the pedestrian environment, and building siting.

LAYOUT: The network of roadways and pathways connecting land uses is a critical aspect of creating a usable transit service. Layout of system connections is highlighted on these pages.

INFILL: The natural reuse of a site or neighborhood can convert a disconnected area into a vibrant community with multi-modal opportunities. The graphics on these pages show a before and after depiction of the use of infill.
**IDEAL TRANSIT ORIENTED DEVELOPMENT CONCEPT:** A photograph and graphic explanation highlight the theoretical and practical components of an ideal TOD.

**CONTINUUM GUIDE:** The continuum guide is a pictorial depiction of intensity of land uses and their complementary transit service.

**REGIONAL TRANSIT/LAND USE CONCEPT MAP:** A map identifying potential locations appropriate for higher intensity development and transit services.

Section 2 and 3 of the Guidebook will be an illustration of Community Choices developments and transportation options. These examples illustrate the spectrum of high quality choices at higher densities, and show the type of transit systems supported by the different developments.

**SECTION 2**

This section of the Guidebook provides a catalog of different development types which follow guidelines for compact, “community choices” growth. The examples in the Guidebook include a variety of geographic locations, development densities and sizes, and time periods of development. Each development is visually depicted by a variety of photographs showing architecture, siting, and an aerial photograph showing neighborhood context.

**SECTION 3**

The transit section features various transit technologies with visual descriptions and pertinent information. Each transit type is defined by its potential users, projected costs, functionality, and physical attributes. Local, regional and international examples are shown for reference.

**SECTION 4**

Making the ideals of Communities in Motion a reality requires small steps by a variety of stakeholders. This section identifies real steps that public officials, planners and developers, and the public can do to implement the plan. The Guidebook concludes with a glossary of terms, an appendix of useful data, and additional information.
Density is generally defined as the amount of development that exists on a given parcel of land, be it a subdivision, a neighborhood, or a city’s incorporated area. It is typically measured in dwelling units per acre - the larger the number of units per acre, the higher the density; the fewer units permitted, the lower the density.

**Gross density:** Total residential units per total land area (this includes roads, parks, commercial and industrial areas that are not for residential use). Gross density is typically expressed in units per square mile, such as total units within a city divided by the city’s area in acres.

**Net density:** Total residential units per total residential land area (excluding all area occupied by roads and other uses). Net density is typically expressed in units/acre; zoning codes generally express net density allowances in terms of minimum or maximum allowable units per acre.

**Example**

**Gross Density**

- Total Acreage: 13.98
- Housing Units: 35
- Gross Residential Density: 2.50 units/acre

**Net Density**

- Residential Use Acreage: 6.83
- Housing Units: 35
- Net Residential Density: 5.12 units/acre

Provide Mixed Land Uses

A mix of land uses increases access to retail, recreation, and other amenities by virtue of improved proximity. It also promotes walking and reduces the requirement for large and costly parking facilities.

- Target retail and service businesses to cater to local and nearby residents (convenience stores, dry cleaning, restaurants, shopping, etc).
- Co-locate or site residential and commercial uses in close proximity to each other.
- Place higher-density residential uses closest to non-residential uses.

Organize Density, Land Use & Buildings to Benefit from Transit

Locating commercial and residential uses close to transit nodes increases the availability and convenience of public transportation for residents, customers, and employees, and expands the potential customer base for business.

Orient buildings toward potential transit corridors, with parking on the back side rather than the street side.

Design buildings with visually interesting frontages at the ground level. Windows, entrances, and retail facilities, rather than blank facades, should dominate the streetscape.

Site locations for potential transit facilities, such as turnouts and plazas, to encourage convenient transit routing and rider access.

Where appropriate, cluster buildings at intersections to consolidate transit stops and street crossings.
Minimize Walking Distances & Create Pedestrian/Bicycle Friendly Environments

Facilities must accommodate non-motorized modes of travel by providing a comfortable, convenient and safe atmosphere.1

- Limit block lengths to 500 feet, or provide adequate pedestrian pass throughs.
- Sidewalks along roadways should be continuous and a minimum of 5 to 6 feet wide.
- Sidewalks in areas of moderate-to-heavy foot traffic should be wide enough to allow free flow in periods of peak usage.
- Site pathways and sidewalks as directly as conditions permit.

- Reduce barriers to pedestrian traffic as much as conditions permit.
- Use traffic calming features such as flares, refuge islands, and raised crossings to both signal the presence of and enhance the safety of pedestrian crossings.
- Where appropriate, use trees, low walls, street furniture and other elements to create buffers along heavily trafficked roadways.
- Locate connected street networks with short blocks, rather than streets which do not have breaks for pathways.
- Place buildings as close as possible to existing nearby amenities, such as parks or other public facilities.

Appropriate Densities

Densities are essential to improving the viability and effectiveness of transit as well as reducing dependence on the automobile. Residents in denser neighborhoods will often find social, recreational, retail and employment opportunities closer and more accessible.

Residential densities should be a minimum of 7 units per acre within ¼ to ½ mile of corridors and/or potential nodes, 10 or more units per acre is preferable. Residential densities should be 12 units per acre or more within ¼ mile of planned high capacity transit service.

Commercial densities should be at least 25 employees per acre or floor-area-ratios of 0.5 or greater.

Where appropriate, residential units should be placed above ground-level commercial activities to achieve density goals.

Site low-density land uses away from potential transit corridors.

Planning and zoning authorities should adopt minimum rather than maximum density standards near potential transit corridors to ensure the viability of those nodes and corridors for public transportation.

Planning and zoning authorities should lower parking provision requirements near potential transit corridors.

1 For more information visit www.completestreets.org
Some people think of high density development as harsh street grids and bland design that strip the surrounding physical environment of uniqueness and individuality. The following illustrations are street patterns of neighborhoods that share a common density, demonstrating that density truly can have different visual forms. The aerial photographs give a more complete picture of the street pattern within its context.
These complimentary images highlight that good design and utility are possible when a road network considers present or future high density developments. Together with building arrangement, use of open space and quality of architecture, street layout is an important factor that impacts the overall aesthetic of a development and its integration into the surrounding context.

-Adapted from *Visualizing Density*, by Julie Campoli and Alex S. MacLean (2007)
Communities in Motion includes policies supporting the protection of open space and farm land.

In order to protect these types of land it will likely be necessary to employ a “push/pull strategy”. The redirection of land development and growth to existing areas, the central message of this document, can be seen as a strategy “pulling” development into existing, developed areas. In order to be successful however, there will need to be some efforts to “push” development away from open space, with some measure of perpetuity.

It should be noted that in order to be competitive for certain types of federal transportation funding the region will need to demonstrate that there is a strategy for land conservation and management. From Federal Transit Administration’s “Guidelines and Standards for Assessing Transit-Supportive Land Use”:

Actions that reflect an area’s goals to manage growth may include: specific growth management policies, delineated growth management boundaries, incentives or mandates for land conservation and management, actual land conservation purchases or designations, transfer of development rights programs, actual transfers of development easements, and multi-jurisdictional coordination of policies.

For a more substantial discussion on this matter please see the “A Cost Effective Transit System and New Starts Funding” on page 104.
Similar to other issues the region; success will only be possible through a coordinated effort. There are several organizations/events in the Treasure Valley that address open space stewardship issues:

**THE LAND TRUST OF THE TREASURE VALLEY (LTTV)**
The LTTV deals with both open space and farmland preservation. The Trust is a nonprofit organization that works to conserve natural, scenic, recreation and farm lands through collaboration with landowners, citizens and agencies in the Treasure Valley. For more information contact:

Tim Breuer  
Executive Director  
Land Trust of the Treasure Valley  
tbreuer@lttv.org  
208. 345.1452  
208.385.7927

**ADA COUNTY OPEN SPACE TASK FORCE**
The mission of the Task Force is to provide viable and appropriate recommendations for funding options and prioritizing the preservation of open space, creating a system of inter-connected public open spaces and identifying potential inter-governmental agency land swaps. For more information on activities in Ada County contact:

Jay A. Gibbons  
Deputy Planning & Zoning Administrator  
Ada County Development Services  
jgibbons@adaweb.net  
(208) 287-5719

**IDAHO LAND USE SUMMIT**
The Summit was held in Nampa in September 2006 and was a forum where preservation efforts, among other issues, were discussed. A number of promising strategies came out of the Summit that support preservation activities. More information can be found at the link below:

http://www.ictws.org/summit.html
A Transit Oriented Development is a compact, mixed-use development or area designed to maximize access to public transportation by providing higher density residential and/or commercial buildings.

The ideal Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) creates a unique and attractive sense of place to a community. A vibrant transit node can create a neighborhood that has a safe and friendly atmosphere, a strong pedestrian orientation, and higher market values. The resulting environment is a lively mix of uses and provides the opportunity to live, work and play in the same general area. We need to consider that the ‘ideal’ may be different for different locations, both in a regional and local scale. What would be best along State Street in Ada County may not be appropriate for Nampa-Caldwell Boulevard in Canyon County. Transit-Oriented Development is flexible enough to accommodate the market, culture and existing built environment in different settings. Still, there are some key elements that create productive transit nodes. The photo above and the illustration on the right provide general guidelines as to elements that could comprise the “ideal TOD.”
Section of an ideal personal outdoor space

- variety in building height and massing
- buildings oriented towards street
- mixed-use building
- public space, ideally with a defined center
- attractive/interesting building design
- recreational opportunities/greenspace
- wide sidewalks
- narrow streets

- public transport
- abundant public transit
- adaptive reuse/redevelopment potential
- pocket parking areas
- ground-level retail (service, coffee, etc.)
- attractive lighting & street furniture
- pedestrian oriented/walkable scale
- public art
- landscaping
- moderate to high density

- buildings, oriented towards street
- attractive/interesting building design
- wide sidewalks
- narrow streets
Infill at Existing Sites

Discovering Possibilities

Different types of sites could be converted to function as a Transit-Oriented Development. Numerous sites in the Treasure Valley could become prime locations for transit oriented developments. While many sites do not provide the needed intense land uses necessary to support transit, the infill of these sites could make them more attractive. The illustration above shows an example of a development pattern that has infill potential (see right).
In the map above, surplus parking has been replaced by buildings to promote additional housing, employment, and shopping opportunities. The infill of the site makes the pedestrian atmosphere improve as buildings are clustered together and reduces the amount of pedestrian-traffic interface. Also, the reduction in parking spaces is mitigated by more transit riders. The dashed circle indicates a walkable radius distance.
The graphics depict how access is accomplished through mobility (above) and proximity (right). While certain features such as sidewalks and bicycle lanes are constructed in a mobility-based system, their capacity as access providers is not realized until a necessary proximity between locations exists to make these viable as transportation options.
ACCESS THROUGH PROXIMITY

Land Use:
Ada County
Canyon County
Boise
Caldwell
Eagle
Garden City
Greenleaf
Kuna
Meridian
Middleton
Melba
Nampa
Notus
Parma
Star
Wilder

Roadways:
Ada County Highway District
Canyon Highway District
Golden Gate Highway District
Nampa Highway District
Notus-Parma Highway District
Idaho Transportation Department

Public Transportation:
Commuterride (ACHD)
Valleyride (Valley Regional Transit)

Sidewalks and Bicycle Lanes:
Ada County Highway District
Canyon Highway District
Golden Gate Highway District
Nampa Highway District
Notus-Parma Highway District
Idaho Transportation Department
Transportation is a means to an end. In the context of regional planning, the end is access. While COMPASS is charged with the development of the “long range transportation plan” ultimately we plan for access. People, for the most part, do not have an inherent need to travel. What they need is access to jobs, schools, goods and services. Access is provided in two ways, through mobility and/or proximity.

In the Treasure Valley, access has historically been provided through automobile-based mobility. This mobility is provided by government agencies with responsibility for road construction and maintenance. As an area grows, reliance on auto-based mobility supplied by a limited number of agencies grows tenuous and diversification of access strategies becomes prudent.

**Communities in Motion proposes to diversify the provision of access through both proximity and mobility. Proximity as a tool to provide access is implemented through several means and has several benefits:**

- **Proximity to Goods & Services:** Residences are located to, or integrated directly with, retail and commercial development allowing people to walk or bike (or at a minimum drive less) to gain access to goods and services.

- **Proximity to Alternate Modes:** Residences, local retail and job centers are clustered around transit stations to create “built-in” ridership for the transit system.

- **Access becomes a shared responsibility.** Rather than relying exclusively on roadway agencies to ensure quality access, the responsibility is shared with agencies with land use jurisdiction as well as the transit provider.

*...in pre-industrial country towns and city neighborhoods, the people who needed each other lived close to each other. This proximity was free, and it provided many benefits that were either free or comparatively cheap. This simple proximity has been destroyed and replaced by communications and transportation industries that are, again, enormously expensive and destructive, as well as extremely vulnerable to disruption.*


The Regional Transit/Land Use Concept Map on the following pages depicts the areas in which improvements in proximity based access improvements could take place.
This graphic is a pictorial depiction of Communities in Motion goals and objectives. In summary, growth and development in the Treasure Valley should be directed to specific areas whenever possible. The concepts in this guidebook are regional and thus are at a very low resolution. Specific detail on where what type of development is appropriate will be developed by local jurisdictions. The corresponding level of transit service will then be determined by Valley Regional Transit and COMPASS. The continuum guide is an estimation tool showing level of transit service and is not a rigid requirement of a specific transit type.
Regional Transit/Land Use Concept Map

This map was developed using the planned concept for transit service in the Treasure Valley. What is depicted is the approximate land area which should have development supportive of the planned transit service. Land development policies will not be developed directly from this map. Each corridor and node could be subject to more focused planning efforts.

Regional population densities are not important. Rather, high capacity transit requires a sufficient number of people and jobs on a particular corridor.


Notes:
1 Planned service ranges from premium (the most intensive) to secondary (the least). For details, see pages 18-19.
2 Concept based on Communities in Motion, Valley Regional Transit's Treasure Valley in Transit plan & other planning documents.
“I think everyone now generally recognizes that building near transit is a big positive. It’s like waterfront property - it’s physically limited and can’t be duplicated just anywhere.”

- Robert Shaw, Columbus Realty Partners in Mass Transit Magazine
Projected Transit Intensities and Potential Land Use Implications:

- The information provided here is the beginning of what will be an evolution of transit corridor and clustered development planning. The evolution of these concepts will include some of the following steps: adoption of Communities in Motion plan into individual Comprehensive Plans, development of regional and local transit oriented development guidelines, and the eventual development of transit-oriented development ordinances.

- The three major transit service classifications are depicted here. Other services not depicted on this map include, rural, express and special service. Planning and implementation of these services will require detailed study in coordination with the jurisdictions and populations they are intended to serve. Generalization of these service types would be inappropriate on this map.

- This information is conceptual and is subject to change based on available funding, changes in travel patterns, and the extent to which land development patterns support the planned service. The transit service depicted on the map is generalized and depicts the ultimate or most intense service planned. In most cases lower, interim levels of service will be put into operation before the ultimate service is feasible.

- Passenger transit service along the rail corridor is contingent on many factors which will be studied in the coming years: type of service, timing of service implementation, availability of federal and local funding, land development patterns, levels of congestion on roadways, etc. The study of the corridor is intended to identify the most cost-effective alternative. Transit service in the rail corridor should be considered a possibility, not a forgone conclusion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premium Corridor</th>
<th>Primary Routes</th>
<th>Secondary Routes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activity Centers Served</td>
<td>2+ major activity centers</td>
<td>1+ activity center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit Hubs Served</td>
<td>2+ hubs</td>
<td>1+ hub</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Frequency</td>
<td><em>Very frequent</em></td>
<td><em>Very frequent</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Span of Service Hours</td>
<td>Very expansive hours</td>
<td>Most expansive hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spans of Service Days</td>
<td>Most expansive days</td>
<td>Less expansive days</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route Alignment</td>
<td>-Most direct possible to link to most significant activity centers</td>
<td>-Most direct possible to link to activity centers or hubs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Stops</td>
<td>Very limited to assure fast, reliable service</td>
<td>Every 1,000 ft. (on average)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Cluster Area</td>
<td>Every 700 ft. (on average)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corridor</th>
<th>1/4 mile</th>
<th>1/8 mile</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Node</td>
<td>See Next Page</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Transit Node Considerations**

There are two types of nodes, defined and secondary. Defined nodes are established in regional and local planning documents (See Defined Node section below).

Secondary nodes could be established where two major transit lines intersect. Depending on the existing surrounding land use and the type of intersecting transit, the size of the node and intensity of the corresponding development cluster would vary. The proposed secondary node sizes are defined below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Premium</th>
<th>Primary</th>
<th>Secondary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Premium</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following are the range densities being recommended for the different identified corridors and nodes.

- Premium: TBD
- Primary: TBD
- Secondary: 8 –

**Defined Nodes**

**2003 Rail Corridor Evaluation (Valley Regional Transit)**
- Nampa @ 11th Ave.
- Idaho Center
- Meridian
- Eagle Road
- Boise Towne Square Mall
- Boise Train Depot
- East Terminal

**Treasure Valley in Transit (Regional Operations and Capital Improvement Plan) (Valley Regional Transit)**
- Downtown Boise: Between Front & Jefferson, 5th & 12th
- Towne Square Mall: Mall Vicinity
- Meridian: Near Meridian or Main between I-84 and the rail line
- Nampa: Downtown or Civic Center
- Caldwell: Downtown near 10th & Blaine/Cleveland

**State Street Corridor Strategic Plan Study: Final Report (Fig 14: Preferred Scenario) (Ada County Highway District)**
- Highway 55
- N. Bogart Ln.
- Gary Lane/Glenwood St.
- Pierce Park Ln.
- W. Ellens Ferry Dr.
- W. Bloom St/N. Plantation River Dr.
- N. Collister Dr.
- N. Willow Ln.
- Veterans Memorial Parkway/36th St.
- 32nd St.
- Between 28th St. & 29th St.
- 23rd Street

**Meridian Comprehensive Plan**
- Rail Corridor @ 10 Mile Road

**30th Street Masterplan (Boise City):**
- Intersection of 30th Street/Main Street/Fairview Ave.

---

*The Urban Land Institute (ULI) found that infrastructure costs per housing unit drop dramatically as density increases. The combined cost of utilities, schools, and streets fall from $90,000 for one dwelling sited on four acres to just over $10,000 per unit for developments of 30 units per acre.*

_Office of Technology Assessment - ETI-643; Urban Land Institute, Wieman, 1996._
Development Name

Captions:
Descriptions of the development

Density Graphic:
Measurement of dwelling units per acre within the subdivision boundary.

Connectivity Index:
Ratio of street connectivity; walkability score.

Region Map

Section Number

Pictures of the development

Housing Type Icons

Location of Development

Planned Transit Service Map:
The planned transit system shown is preliminary and does not reflect current routes. Based in part on the Communities in Motion long-range plan. 3 levels of service are shown.

Airphoto:
Aerial view of the development using the most current photo, taken in 2005. The highlighted subdivision is outlined in red.

Land Use Map:
Shaded land uses are from the Community Choices land use scenario for future development and the current land use calculated by COMPASS from assessor data.

Represents minimal transit service

Represents high capacity transit service

* Land Use Map and Planned Transit Service Map are at the same scale

Transit Support Continuum:
Graphically depicts the intensity of transit service that may be appropriate based on residential density by way of the placement of the pedestrian along the continuum. (See Continuum guide on page 15).

Side Bar Color:
Color-coded sections allow for easy reference and create separation between sections.

Community Choices was selected as the preferred land use scenario in Communities in Motion. It emphasized growth inside city “areas of impact,” and higher densities and mixed uses with jobs, shopping and services closer to housing.
**Development Information**

**Year:** Year construction began, not when it was remodeled, added to, or converted (unless otherwise noted).

**Units:** Number of housing units. A structure is a separate building that either has open spaces on all sides or is separated from other structures by dividing walls. In determining the number of units in a structure, all housing units (both occupied and vacant) are counted.

**Connectivity Index:** An index to quantify how well a roadway network connects destinations.

**Land Use:** Refers to the manner in which portions of land or the structures on them are used (i.e., commercial, residential, retail, industrial, etc). The Community Choices scenario promotes a growth patterns that brings homes, jobs, and services closer together, reducing the need to travel and encouraging the use of alternative travel modes, such as walking and biking.

**Planned Transit Service:** Roads with sidewalks are shown in an attempt to display how pedestrian friendly and area is. Bike routes are also shown.

**Walkability:** The measure of the overall walking conditions in an area. Factors which are commonly part of walkability indices include land use mix, street connectivity, medium to high residential density, ground-level retail, access to mass transit, presence and quality sidewalks and pedestrian crossings, aesthetics, nearby local destinations, air quality, street furniture, and traffic flow. Walkability indices have been found to correlate with Body mass index and physical activity and have also been found to have economic benefits for an area. (Adapted from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Walkable)

**Development Types**

**Single Family Detached:** A residential housing type which indicates that the building is physically separated from others and contains one dwelling unit designed for occupancy by not more than one family.

**Multifamily:** A building which features two or more family dwellings within the same structure and on the same lot or parcel.

**Townhouse:** A single family dwelling unit constructed in a row of attached units separated by property lines. Each unit is built on an individual lot. Single-family housing built on narrow lots and without side yards.

**Carriage:** A residential dwelling unit (either attached or detached) which is designed with alley loaded garages. This is done to encourage walkability by separating the automobile traffic and pedestrian traffic.

**Mixed-Use:** A development or building that includes a combination of residential and commercial or office uses. Typically, office or retail uses would be found on the street-level engaging the pedestrian, while residential uses would take advantage of views of the upper floors. A mixed-use development can reduce the dependency on the single-occupant automobile as basic goods and services are located within walking distance or even within the same building.

**Under Construction:** TODs with the “Under Construction” icon have received some level of entitlement and either need completion of construction approvals or are currently under construction.

---

**Guidebook Icons**

- Carriage
- Mixed-Use Development
- Detached Single Family Development
- Multifamily
- Coming Soon/Under Construction
- Streetcar
- Family
- Rideshare Family
- Commuter Rail Family
- Light Rail Family
- Bus Family