

CITY OF BOISE  
COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS  
SERIES THREE REPORT 2018

Dr. Jen Schneider, Boise State University





This report describes the findings from the third series of Community Conversations hosted by the City of Boise in November/December 2018. The format of this series of Community Conversations differed from previous conversations, in that experts from the City's Housing and Planning and Development departments gave short presentations on specific policy proposals, and then participants had opportunities to ask questions and provide feedback.

The two policy proposals discussed were:



## 1: BOISE LAND TRUST PROPOSAL

1. The majority of participants mostly support the idea of a Land Trust because they view it as one solution that directly addresses the housing affordability problem.
2. However, those who support the idea of a Land Trust feel strongly that Land Trust developments must be mixed-income, to avoid the potential for segregating social classes.
3. Many participants wanted more details before they would endorse the proposal, and some were upset when the City seemed to change or hide information, such as how the proposal would be funded.
4. Those who were opposed to the idea were vehemently opposed, for ideological or other reasons.



## 2: CODING FOR DENSITY PROPOSAL

1. The majority of participants strongly support the idea of lifting the square footage and bedroom restrictions on Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), provided ADUs still respect existing neighborhood aesthetics and conditions. They see ADUs as one useful tool for addressing housing affordability and availability.
2. However, participants were concerned about the proposal to lift the requirement for on-site parking for ADUs—they are worried existing neighborhoods will suffer from competition over on-street parking, particularly given the lack of mass transportation in Boise.
3. Some participants were also very strongly opposed to removing the occupancy requirement altogether. Many fear that speculators will purchase properties and hike housing prices, or that ADUs will turn into vacation properties, which does nothing to address housing affordability and can negatively impact neighborhood cultures.
4. Many would support the idea of changing lot size zoning requirements to embrace density, but for some, this support was largely qualified by concerns about the quality of the developments being built. There were also a number of participants who were strongly opposed to these proposals.
5. A number of participants wanted much more information about the proposals before they would feel comfortable deciding. For these participants, "the devil is in the details."

Findings from the data collected are presented in this report.



# INTRODUCTION

# INTRODUCTION

This report presents results from the **third series of Community Conversations** organized by the Mayor's Office and the Office of Community Engagement in November/December 2018. These Community Conversations were the third in a series of events used to collect feedback and insights from Boise residents on the topic of growth in the City:

- 1. FOCUS GROUPS.** The first events held were two small focus groups, designed to gather information from both long-term and new-to-Boise residents about the issues of most concern to them related to growth. Feedback from these focus groups was used to help design the next series of meetings.
- 2. COMMUNITY WORKSHOPS (SERIES 1).** Three two-hour Community Workshops were held in June 2018 and focused specifically on guiding participants through a modified World Café discussion related to growth. These workshops had two objectives: to provide opportunities for residents to dialogue meaningfully with one another on the topic of growth, and to gather information about resident priorities that could guide the Mayor and City Council in decision-making. Small groups were guided through a series of discussion questions by trained facilitators, and large-group report-outs and sticky-dot voting gave some insight into areas of greatest concern for residents. Four main themes emerged from the analysis of that first set of Workshops as most important to Boiseans: housing affordability, transportation, cultural and environmental preservation, and governance. A report detailing those outcomes can be found here: [cityofboise.org/growth](http://cityofboise.org/growth)

- 3. COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS (SERIES 2).** The second series of large community meetings was held in August 2018. Participants were guided through three hypothetical housing scenarios, which included facts about density, cost, access to public transportation, commute times, and other salient neighborhood characteristics. Results suggested that, overall, participants preferred higher-density developments, provided they were developed close to the core and fostered the development of neighborhoods, proximity to work opportunities, and amenities such as parks, commercial centers, and libraries. They wanted such developments to be of high quality, yet also affordable—though definitions of affordability varied widely.

In addition, themes related to governance emerged again in this series. In particular, residents want the City to be planning proactively for growth, and with increased participation from residents. They also wanted much more detail about the processes the City used for making decisions about growth, and more information about specific policies that could be brought to bear to address the issue of housing affordability. See [cityofboise.org/growth](http://cityofboise.org/growth) for more details.

- 4. COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS (SERIES 3).** The third series of meetings was held in November/December 2018, and was focused on addressing some of the issues that emerged from Community Conversations, Series 2. The objectives of this third series of Community Conversations were as follows:
  - To share the City's definition of what it means by "housing affordability," and the challenges and opportunities for addressing that problem in Boise;
  - To introduce participants to the kinds of policy tools the city has to address the affordable housing problem, as well as the limits of the City's influence; and
  - To engage participants around possible changes to code that would encourage particular types of development and development processes.

## DESCRIPTION OF COMMUNITY CONVERSATIONS, SERIES 3

The two Community Conversations for Series 3 were held in November/December 2018 and were organized by the Mayor's Office and the Office of Community Engagement. The Conversations were moderated by Dr. Jen Schneider, professor in the School of Public Service at Boise State University. As with other Community Conversations, participants were seated at tables with other participants they may not have previously known.

Unlike previous events, however, there were no table moderators, and participants heard short policy presentations from City officials who work in Housing, City Planning, and Development. After the presentations, participants were asked to fill out short surveys in response to the presentations. These were later collected, transcribed, and analyzed.

Participants also had a short amount of time to discuss the presentations with other participants at their table. A longer period of time was then devoted to a large-group conversation, facilitated by the Lead Facilitator, during which participants could ask City officials questions and provide their feedback. Feedback from these large-group conversations was recorded on butcher paper, which was later transcribed and analyzed.

Comment/feedback cards were provided at the end of the event, and were transcribed and analyzed.

Invitations to the Community Conversations were publicized to the community at large through media and social media outlets. Invitations were also sent to various groups that have an interest in the issue of housing, including neighborhood associations and the Chamber of Commerce. Participants from Series 1 and 2 were also invited.

Because of the 30% attrition rate that occurred during Series 1 and 2, Series 3 organizers opted to host two events instead of three, but to accept a greater number of RSVPs to encourage fuller attendance. The first event was held on Thursday, November 29, from 6-8pm in the Boise State Alumni

and Friends Center ballroom. Following feedback from Series 1 and 2 that suggested more diverse groups of people might be able to attend if one of the events was held on a Saturday, the second event was held on Saturday, December 1, at Boise City Hall. Those who showed up for either meeting without having registered were allowed to attend.

It should be noted that, although hosting Saturday events is intended to boost the ability of diverse group to attend, the Saturday event was quite under-attended when compared with other Conversations (an early-morning snowfall may also have been a deterrent in this case). The City may want to consider forms of outreach that will involve more residents, and more types of residents in the future.

The City conducted additional outreach to a variety of community organizations, including Idaho Commission on Hispanic Affairs, the Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Comunidad y Justicia and the Mexican Consulate in an effort to encourage under-represented minorities to attend the Conversations. The city also provided a translator and headsets at the Saturday event. Even so, no participants needing translation services independently registered for either event.

Participation numbers for Series 3 are presented below.

EVENT	DATE	LOCATION	# OF ATTENDEES
CC3, EVENT 1	November 29	Alumni and Friends Center, Boise State	70
CC3, EVENT 2	December 1	Boise City Hall	49

This Series also differed from previous Series in that there was no online session. While the planners prefer to have online options for participation, it was determined that the specific policy proposals made in person by City presenters were too complex to communicate effectively in an online format for this round.

The locations that were chosen were available on the dates needed—a particular challenge during the holiday season; had accessible parking; had venues large enough to seat more than 100 people at round tables; and allowed for catering services (food was provided to participants because the events took place during the breakfast or dinner hour).

The community workshops were scheduled for two hours, from 6-8 pm on November 29, and from 10 am-12 pm on December 1. Roughly speaking, the following outline was followed for each meeting:

- Introductory remarks by the lead facilitator, covering the findings from Series 1 and 2, introducing the Conversation format, and giving tables time to get to know each other (5 minutes).
- Lead facilitator introduced the housing affordability challenge, including information about median incomes, housing costs, and the challenges the City faces in addressing housing affordability (5 minutes).
- Boise Land Trust: Presentation by AnaMarie Guiles, followed by table surveys and small-group conversation, then large-group conversation (35 minutes).
- Accessory Dwelling Units: Presentation by Cody Riddle on possible changes to Accessory Dwelling Unit code, followed by table surveys and small-group conversation, then large-group conversation (35 minutes).
- Zoning for Higher Density: Presentation by Hal Simmons on possible changes to lot density code, followed by table surveys and small-group conversation, then large-group conversation (35 minutes).
- Wrap up: Thank yous and time to fill out comment cards (5 minutes).

Results from participant comment cards and the online forum are integrated when appropriate into the Findings and Recommendations sections in the following pages.

## Approach to Participation: **SPECIFIC POLICY FEEDBACK**

Participants in earlier Community Conversations Series articulated that they would like an opportunity to provide feedback on actual policies that might help address the housing affordability issue. In addition, results from Series 2 suggested that participants differed widely in how they defined affordability, and in how they would view particular solutions to addressing the need for more housing, and more affordable options, in Boise.

## Community Conversation: **PLANNING TRADE-OFFS**

The planning team needed to balance multiple values, and address multiple challenges, in order to achieve its objectives:

- Participants would need to be presented with policies—which are often detailed and complex—in a short amount of time and in a digestible format. Experts in these policy areas would be needed to help design and deliver the presentations, but in a way that would make sense to non-experts.
- Participant feedback would need to be meaningful. In other words, it would make no sense to present policies that were already decided upon by the City—policies presented needed to be in early development, so that the feedback could be incorporated in decision making moving forward.
- Community Conversations provide opportunities for people to talk to and hear from people who might be different from them, or have different views. Time was a limiting factor, however, as expert presentations needed to be incorporated. So the amount of small-group conversation was limited in favor of giving participants time to ask experts questions and share their views with the large group. This was a difficult trade-off because small-group conversations were quite rich in the two previous Series.

## FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION FROM THE SERIES 3 IN-PERSON MEETINGS

### COMMENT CARDS

Participant feedback on Community Conversations continues to be positive. Asked to rate the event on a scale of 1-10, with 10 being most positive, the average rating was a 7.8, with only five responses scoring the event at less than a 5. As one participant put it, the events make them “PROUD to be a Boise citizen!” Participants seem to appreciate the City continuing to sponsor these events, and are interested in when the next round will be held.

But this does not mean that participants didn’t have strong opinions about what could have been done differently.

The small number of participants who were particularly dissatisfied with the event noted that they were frustrated with the “top-down” organization of the event—with the City presenters talking “at” them rather than the City hearing from the participants. Some believe the City is not sincere in its efforts to reach out to residents.

Others suggested they would have liked more information so they could make more informed decisions, and still others wanted more time and more opportunity for discussion or to ask questions. Several participants noted that it wasn’t clear to them how increasing density would make housing more affordable, a link that event organizers may not have explained clearly enough. Many found the explanation of the Boise Land Trust to be confusing and under-developed.

The feedback ultimately points to three difficult trade-offs. One, present enough useful information for participants to have informed discussion, but don’t overwhelm them with too much information or detail. Two, provide opportunities for discussion and dissent, but keep time short enough that people will attend. Three, present the information concisely and correctly, but also clearly communicate that participant feedback matters. For some participants, the Conversation didn’t always handle these trade-offs well.

- In order to collect quality data, multiple voices and viewpoints would need to be heard and accounted for. Because there was limited time for small-group conversations, table facilitators did not take notes but instead asked participants to fill out surveys. Again, this involves a trade-off, where the qualitative data may not be as rich, but the data was more easily collected and aggregated.

Participants were provided with supplemental materials, including cards that described median incomes, home prices, and additional housing statistics. These cards can be found in Appendix 2.

### DATA COLLECTION AND ANALYSIS

Data collection for Series 3 functioned similarly as for previous Series, though the data itself differed in kind. Three types of data were collected:

- **Table surveys for each of the policy proposals** (Boise Land Trust and Zoning for Density—ADUs and Lot Densities).
- **Large group feedback**, recorded on butcher paper.
- **Comment/feedback cards**, collected at the end of each event.

All data was collected and transcribed. Qualitative data (comments from open-ended questions) was coded and analyzed.

99 comment cards were collected and analyzed. The Lead Facilitator read through all comments to develop a sense of the quality and tone of the feedback. Comments were then uploaded to a computer-aided qualitative data analysis software system (CAQDAS) system called n-Vivo, which can analyze data for repeated patterns and themes. Some commenters left multiple types of comments—each comment was coded separately, so many more comments than 99 were analyzed.

Results and comments from the surveys were treated the same way as comment cards. Butcher paper results featured only a handful of comments for each proposal, so they are discussed descriptively below, in the context of the other results.

The Findings section on the following pages discusses the results of the analysis.



Examples of the types of comments received on comment cards are provided on the following pages, along with how they were coded:

CODE	NUMBER OF COMMENTS
<b>General positive</b>	<b>61</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b>            “This was a great meeting and I appreciate the opportunity to be informed and give feedback. I will watch for other meetings of concern to attend in the future because of this (my first) meeting.”</p>	
<b>Feedback on specific policy proposals or ideas</b> (18 different topics addressed)	<b>53</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b>            “The only feedback I have is that 2 of the 3 issues we talked about helping with housing demand but not so much affordability.”            “As infill happens please make concessions for green space. Community fostering is so important.”            “Why is multi-use housing not something more common in Boise?”</p>	
<b>Wanted more information</b>	<b>28</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b>            “Perhaps more information leading up to the conversation. People at my table had very strong opinions based on a lack of knowledge not on facts.”</p>	
<b>Event organization</b>	<b>17</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b>            “Better job this time with Spanish translation...”            “It [translation] is needed for all handouts.”</p>	

CODE	NUMBER OF COMMENTS
<b>Need more conversation, more listening</b>	<b>16</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b>            “I would have enjoyed a smaller group, therefore longer time to discuss topics.”            “Feels like the city already knows what it wants to do, just wants to cover themselves that they talked to community. Wish they actually wanted our ideas.”</p>	
<b>Wanted more time</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b>            “I wish we had more time, but then this would drag out the meeting forever. I would also like more time to have Q&amp;A with the presenters.”</p>	
<b>Involve more diverse participants</b>	<b>7</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b>            “The big question is, ‘How do you get lower income non-homeowners interested and involved in these conversations?’ I don’t have the answer, but it is pretty apparent that the conversation is lopsided toward the wealthier side of Boise (i.e. no one who will actually benefit from these programs).”</p>	
<b>City too pro-growth</b>	<b>2</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b>            “Why is Boise letting the developers run the show and not taking full advantage of the fact that people want to live here...?”</p>	

## SURVEY RESULTS

Participants listened to presentations about two policy proposals: the creation of a Boise Land Trust, and proposed changes to code that would promote infill (in the form of Accessory Dwelling Units, or ADUs) and density (in the form of changing code to allow for smaller lot sizes). They heard three presentations total on each of these areas, and after each presentation, were asked to fill out a short survey responding to the presentation. They then had an opportunity to talk with others at their table for a short period then to talk to the room at large, or to ask presenters specific questions.

Overall feedback can be found in Appendix 4.



## PROPOSAL 1:



# THE BOISE LAND TRUST



## THE BOISE LAND TRUST

Results from the comment cards, and from comments given orally by participants during the meeting, suggest that many struggled to understand how the Land Trust would work, based on what was presented. Because the Land Trust is in very early stages of conceptual development, concrete information about how it will be designed and function could not be provided, so participants were asked general questions about **who Land Trust properties should serve** (e.g., mixed income or otherwise, homeowners or renters).

For the question that asked, **“SHOULD THE LAND TRUST BE USED PRIMARILY TO ALLOW...”** participants were given the following as options to complete the sentence:

- (a) new homeowners to purchase affordable homes
- (b) renters to rent at affordable rates
- (c) some mix of (a) and (b)
- (d) I don't know

Participants overwhelmingly chose answer (c), “some mix of (a) and (b)”:

RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS
some mix of (a) and (b)	96
renters to rent at affordable rates	16
new homeowners to purchase affordable homes	8
I don't know	6

Next, participants were asked to finish the sentence, **“SHOULD THE LAND TRUST BE USED PRIMARILY...”** with the following possible answers:

- (a) to promote mixed-income housing developments
- (b) to provide affordable housing for lower-income residents only
- (c) I don't know

Responses to this question were somewhat more mixed, with around half of respondents preferring mixed-income housing and around 1/3 preferring the focus be on lower-income residents only:

RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS
to promote housing developments for mixed-incomes	67
to provide affordable housing for lower-income residents only	44
I don't know	14

\*Totals may be slightly different across figures, accounting for people who left some answers blank.

Respondents also had an opportunity to provide open-ended qualitative feedback. This was coded using the process with nVivo described above. The following three themes emerged as prominent responses to the proposal. Here again, many respondents noted they would need more information to make a good decision, often noting the “devil would be in the details.”

CODE	NUMBER OF COMMENTS
<b>Generally supportive because it's a solution that directly addresses the housing affordability problem.</b>	<b>78</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>“I’m sure we need a variety of solutions. This seems like one reasonable option.”</p> <p>“Definitely!! From my layperson perspective, it appears that land prices are a significant reason for the outrageously unacceptable rental and home purchase prices. Thank you for pursuing this in such a serious and active manner.”</p> <p>“Yes. Inclusion, kindness are part of our culture and this appears to fit that culture while maintaining a pride of residency. Buying increases ‘buy-in’ to community.”</p>	
<b>Not in support (or at least very uncertain), because of concerns about how it will be funded, or lack of information.</b>	<b>41</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>“Too many unanswered questions. Is their equity restricted, who pays property taxes on land. Where is the city getting the money. Not a good idea.”</p> <p>“Land trust = subsidized housing The money comes from taxes. I do not approve of our taxes going toward subsidized housing. My questions were not answered when I asked in public. Will our taxes be used to fund the Boise Land Trust? Boise City is coming to the table with \$5 million in land. This is already using our taxes to subsidize housing.”</p> <p>“Under ownership model, if housing value increases faster than income increase, how does another qualifying family afford the home?”</p>	

CODE	NUMBER OF COMMENTS
<b>The devil is in the details... (how this is done really matters).</b>	<b>32</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>“It’s only right if the use (single or family) is approved by the neighbors and the design fits the neighborhood. It must not add to over-use of local roads.”</p> <p>“It seems like it [this is the right solution for Boise] from what I’ve heard at tonight’s meeting, but we must take measure[s] to keep it from becoming a ghetto.”</p> <p>“Please, mix[ed] use for these communities. A coffee shop, a small grocery store, other community needs in walk[ing] distance.”</p>	

Those who supported the idea of a Boise Land Trust were excited about its potential for creating affordable home ownership and rental opportunities for those at lower incomes. There seemed to be strong agreement that any such developments would need to be mixed-income, however. As one participant put it, “Yes, it is a viable tool to address giving low income households a chance at owning a home in equitable neighborhoods. Mixed income is key to stop creating further socio-economic divides.” Others who supported the proposal did so more modestly, and were concerned the Trust wouldn’t go far enough to meet the scale of the need Boiseans will face in the coming years.

It should also be noted that those who were generally positive about the proposal may simply support most proposals that will attempt to solve this problem, as opposed to specifically supporting this proposal. More work should be done to understand how residents would feel about a Land Trust once more details have been worked out. Several commenters also suggested that the project should be piloted first.

Those who were against the idea of a Boise Land Trust opposed it for a number of reasons: 1) they ideologically opposed the idea of tax monies subsidizing affordable housing, 2) they felt there was not enough information provided to make a good decision, and that it even seemed possible the City was being purposely ambiguous or misleading in not providing details about the proposal, and 3) they had serious concerns about the ownership structure. They wanted to make sure there were deed restrictions, that speculation was carefully controlled, and that the City was not over-stepping the bounds of good government.

A few comments also conveyed that the proposal was not doing enough to keep current residents in their homes, which is what some participants see as the real problem in connection with wage stagnation and increasing property taxes. The tone of these comments, reflected on the surveys and in the comment cards, suggested a great deal of cynicism about the Community Conversations, and the City, in general.

There was also a cluster of comments that had to do with the quality of Land Trust housing developments—these are themes that were prominent in previous Community Conversations. No one topic in this area received a critical mass of comments, but rather, comments reflected that housing development be thought of in holistic terms. For example, these comments were concerned with making sure developments were well done and respected the character of existing neighborhoods; that green spaces were protected and public transportation developed; and that developments were mixed-use, providing easy access to services and amenities.

## LARGE GROUP DISCUSSION

During the large group discussions, comments made by participants holding microphones were recorded on large pieces of butcher paper. Because of time, there were only a handful of comments made related to each proposal, so they are commented on broadly here as anecdotal evidence that might shed additional light on the findings above.

Generally speaking, public comments related to the Land Trust proposal reflected a strong desire for more information, some frustration with the lack of detail provided, and concerns about the potential for speculative practices that might benefit particular developers or homeowners at the city's expense.

There were also several questions, which might be called skeptical in tone, about how the Land Trust would be funded, and additional confusion was created when the presenter provided different numbers about public funding than were posted on the slides. Such changes may promote significant mistrust on the part of various publics, particularly those who are inclined to be skeptical of the City's role in promoting particular policies. If public funding is being used to create the Trust, the City should be open and transparent about that moving forward.

# PROPOSAL 2:



# ZONING FOR DENSITY



## ZONING FOR DENSITY (ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS AND REDUCED LOT SIZES)

Two sets of changes to planning and development code were put forward as part of Proposal 2: Zoning for Density. One set of proposals had to do with zoning requirements for **Accessory Dwelling Units**, or ADUs. The second set of proposals had to do with **reducing lot sizes** for residential housing. Participants seemed better able to grapple with the proposals presented here, perhaps because they were more concrete than the Land Trust.

However, comment cards suggest that participants did not always understand how increasing density would address affordable housing. Ostensibly, increasing housing stock through density might also decrease housing costs across the city. But the lead facilitator and presenters may not have done enough to make this connection clear for participants, and as a result, some left feeling as if Proposal 2 was unrelated to housing affordability. Moving forward, more work may need to be done to connect density and infill proposals with increasing affordability.

## ADUs

The ADU presentation proposed four possible changes to housing code related to ADUs. A survey was given after the presentation for each of the four proposed changes. Survey results are reported here.

**QUESTION #1** asked, “Proposed changes to code may allow an increase in square footage for Accessory Dwelling Units from 600 square feet, say to 700, 800, or 850 square feet. Is this proposal right for Boise?” Participants had been told that these changes would not be applied to historic districts, nor could ADU square footage be allowed to exceed 10% of the total square footage of the lot.

Participants overwhelmingly chose the answer “yes,” with around 1/4 of respondents choosing maybe, implying that they needed more information, or that their answer would depend on the details.

RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS
Yes	91
Maybe	28
No	4
I don't know	3

\*Totals may be slightly different across figures, accounting for people who left some answers blank.

**QUESTION #2** asked, “Proposed changes to code may allow Accessory Dwelling Units to have more than one bedroom. Is this proposal right for Boise?” Results on this question were similar to #1:

RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS
Yes	94
Maybe	21
No	7
I don't know	6

**QUESTION #3** asked, “Proposed changes to code may eliminate on-site parking requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units. Is this proposal right for Boise?” Answers to this question were decidedly more mixed. Around half of the respondents marked yes, but there were more respondents who marked “maybe” and many more who marked “no.” Discussion on the parking issue was more robust than on the other questions, as well, suggesting that how parking is handled will be important for the City to carefully consider if this change to code is pursued.

RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS
Yes	60
Maybe	33
No	30
I don't know	3

**QUESTION #4** asked, “Proposed changes to code may eliminate the requirement that homeowners have to live on-site. Is this proposal right for Boise?” Unlike the other three questions, the majority of responders marked “no,” and around a quarter of responders marked “maybe,” suggesting uncertainty about the ramifications of this change, or wanting to know more about how it would be implemented. During large-group conversation, debate about the freedoms and perils associated with absentee ownership was robust.

RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS
No	45
Yes	39
Maybe	31
I don't know	0

Respondents also had an opportunity to provide open-ended qualitative feedback in response to the question, “Looking at these proposals as a whole, are the proposed changes to Accessory Dwelling Unit standards right for Boise?”. This was coded using the same nVivo process as described above.

A compelling set of viewpoint groupings emerged from the qualitative data, with participants generally excited about the idea of ADUs as one way to increase housing stock in Boise, but less excited about the proposed changes to parking and occupancy.

CODE	NUMBER OF COMMENTS
<b>General support for changes to ADU code allowing for square footage increase and additional bedrooms.</b>	<b>82</b>
<b>EXAMPLES:</b> “Yes, we need to make it easier to increase housing options in a variety of ways.” “I think this will open up possibilities for smaller families to have affordable housing in settled community settings.” “Yes. Are some land incentives for home owners to add accessory dwelling [units] being considered?”	
<b>Do not want the owner occupancy requirement eliminated: concerned about speculation and Airbnbs, which would not address affordability issue.</b>	<b>45</b>
<b>EXAMPLES:</b> “I worry about ADUs falling into the Airbnb market and defeating the purpose of this whole effort, which is to ameliorate the lack of affordable rental housing.” “I worry about neighborhoods turning into primarily investment properties instead of a combined opportunity for a homeowner and a rent. I think as a combined housing affordability push that with the homeowner restriction it increases total available units while promoting local home ownership.” “No Airbnbs.”	
<b>Concerned about eliminating parking requirement, especially when Boise lacks public transportation.</b>	<b>42</b>
<b>EXAMPLES:</b> “Not sure about parking requirements. Today the public transportation options are very limited and most people need a car to go to work. Parking planning needs to be addressed in higher density housing planning.”	

CODE	NUMBER OF COMMENTS
<p>CONTINUED</p> <p>"If the street is a cul-de-sac, the parking on the street becomes a major (underlined) obstacles for mail delivery, trash receptacle service pickup, and generally ability for visitors to park."</p> <p>"Regarding parking, I'd be in favor of not being required to have an extra space *if* the ADU is near public transportation and/or walking/biking distance of grocery/work/etc. opportunities."</p>	
<b>Unsure; need more information.</b>	<b>24</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>"It is not clear to me how this would lead to more affordable housing absent some financial incentive from the government and/or other rules to keep in check."</p> <p>"I really need more information to evaluate this proposal well. Perhaps provide a case study of how similar changes impacted another city."</p>	
<b>Existing neighborhoods must be protected.</b>	<b>10</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>"Depends on the aesthetics of the neighborhood."</p> <p>"It depends on location."</p>	
<b>Not in support of these proposed changes in general.</b>	<b>3</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>"Absolutely not - way too little information prior to giving feedback or providing thoughtful input."</p> <p>"This would change the character of neighborhoods."</p> <p>"No. Updating ADU requirements increases density in already dense neighborhoods. These changes place burden of increasing infill on individual homeowners. "Minimal impact" does not consider livability factors such as privacy, noise pollution."</p>	

In general, there seemed to be broad support for the idea of making ADUs easier to be build, and larger, so they could potentially accommodate small families more affordably. But many made sure to note that these changes would still need to respect existing neighborhood aesthetics and norms.

In the qualitative comments there was a great deal of concern about lifting the occupancy requirement, and in particular with the rise of Airbnbs and other vacation rentals. Participants were especially worried that outside investors would get wealthy off of such properties, that housing costs would skyrocket, and that absentee landlords might not take good care of properties. Much more work would need to be done on this issue before participants would support this change.

Similarly, there was significant concern about lifting the parking requirement absent a versatile and functioning mass transit system. Participants were worried that parking would become too congested and could sacrifice the quality of life for those who live in neighborhoods.

There were also a number of comments that veered toward "maybe" or "it depends," and many requests for more information about how oversight would function. Few respondents dismissed all of the ADU proposals outright.

## LARGE GROUP DISCUSSION

Large group discussion about the ADU proposals was largely focused on the parking and ownership occupancy proposals—there was much less conversation about the square footage and bedroom proposals.

There was what might be considered fairly energetic dialogue about parking and occupancy requirements. Some felt strongly that off-street parking should be required, and others seemed more open to the idea of lifting the requirement. There were discussions about how zoning could be qualified—in other words, if a particular neighborhood does not have on-street parking options (because of street design or other restrictions), perhaps ADUs should be required to have on-site parking accommodations. There were also some comments about how this issue is very much connected to the lack of mass transportation in the City, and that housing and transportation must be considered together.



Across the two conversations, a mix of viewpoints about occupancy requirements were voiced. Several participants noted they were concerned about out-of-state owners renting out multiple units on a single property for a very high price, with neighbors and others not being able to contact them in case of problems. There was significant concern raised about the rise of Airbnbs and other vacation rental possibilities, which also create problems for neighbors and do not address the affordability problem. At the same time, we heard from some property owners who themselves have ADUs, and who have experienced the occupancy requirement as unnecessarily restrictive and unrealistic. They argued that the requirements have injured them personally and financially, and that they operate as a disincentive for the development of ADUs.

## CHANGES TO LOT SIZES

The lot size presentation proposed two possible changes to code related to lot sizes—one having to do with reducing the lot size requirement for single-family detached homes, and the other having to do with attached, townhome-style dwellings. Participants saw a short presentation that explained the history of lot size changes in Boise code, and that discussed the importance of building a “missing middle”—more types of housing that were more dense than large-lot single-family homes, but less dense than high-rise apartment buildings. A survey was given after the presentation for each change. Survey results are reported here.

**QUESTION #1** asked, “Proposed changes to code may allow for single-family homes in subdivisions to be built on smaller lot sizes. Is this proposal right for Boise?”

RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS
Yes	72
Maybe	28
No	12
I don't know	1

\*Totals may be slightly different across figures, accounting for people who left some answers blank.

**QUESTION #2** asked, “Proposed changes to code may allow attached housing units (like townhomes) to be built on smaller lot sizes. Is this proposal right for Boise?” Results on this question were very similar to the results for #1:

RESPONSE	RESPONDENTS
Yes	73
Maybe	26
No	12
I don't know	1

Respondents also had an opportunity to provide open-ended qualitative feedback in response to the question, “Looking at these proposals as a whole, are the proposed changes to housing lot size standards right for Boise?”. This was coded using the same nVivo process as described above.

It should be noted that while the survey responses were generally in support of decreased lot sizes, the comments suggest a much more complicated picture, with participants who supported the zoning changes often qualifying their support (e.g., “Maybe, if green spaces are mandated...”). Furthermore, those who oppose these changes were vehement in their opposition. This suggests that proposed changes are likely to provoke strong responses on both sides of the issue.

CODE	NUMBER OF COMMENTS
<b>General support</b> for changes to lot sizes.	<b>65</b>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>“Yes. More density = less foothills development. Density breeds vibrancy, provides opportunities for walkable neighborhoods – restaurants, bars, etc. within walking distance of large populations.”</p> <p>“Yes, creates more options for housing types and more homes for people to live in.”</p> <p>“Yes, allows for affordability/flexibility in neighborhoods to change and meet the need for different populations. Like the design elements without prominent garages. I am 27 years old and my generation doesn't necessarily want large lots and want[s] more flexibility.”</p>	

<p><b>Maybe:</b> response would depend on pending details about things like 1) protects existing neighborhoods, 2) preserves greenspace, 3) is mixed-use, 4) is paired with mass transportation, etc.</p>	<p>41</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>“It depends on area within Boise. Parking, carbon footprint etc. still becomes an issue. Play areas etc. for kids?”</p> <p>“I live in a 3 unit attached dwelling multi-family HOA. What makes it livable is green space and streams.”</p> <p>“This needs to be compatible with existing structures and neighborhood. One size does not fit all. So changes can happen but everyone in neighborhood need to be involved.”</p>	
<p><b>Solidly opposed:</b> humans need space, this benefits developers, eliminates public comment.</p>	<p>33</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>“If it ain’t broke, why fix it? Why change zones across the board when currently the city requires a public hearing and can require developers to do things to improve the neighborhood. In some places, it would work, but in other places it would cause problems. Zoning won’t help anyone except developers who want to build ASAP and go on to the next project.”</p> <p>“Too much togetherness. Too close to neighbors. Not enough space. I’m not a fan of smaller lots and squeezing houses together. Habitat for Humanity is a good example. They squeeze too many houses on a really, really small lot.”</p> <p>“No, no, and no. Hal Simmons certainly soft-pedaled this insidious attack on the protections afforded existing residents by zoning standards. Up-zoning by any other name is still up-zoning. I’m sure developers and profiteers love t his one. Very bad idea, and people should be alarmed at what the City is scheming to do.”</p>	
<p><b>Skeptical:</b> need more information.</p>	<p>18</p>
<p><b>EXAMPLES:</b></p> <p>“I just wonder how much land is left that has not been subdivided that would benefit from this change? Need data.”</p> <p>“Will this increased density allowance create more affordable housing? If so then yes. It’s not a very attractive site though.”</p> <p>“It’s not clear to me what happens if the code changes are enacted to existing neighborhoods – for example if a house if torn down and a new one(s) built? Patchwork neighborhood? Tear down 2 houses and replace with town homes? And no public process? Keep opportunity for comment. Do the changes proposed apply to new developments exclusively subdivisions?”</p>	

As the comments illustrate, participants who supported the increase in lot size felt like it was a good tool, among others, for the City to deploy to increase density and potentially provide more affordable housing options. Many cited the need for more housing in the City in the coming decades, and broadly referenced the importance of promoting density in response.

A second group of responders might be characterized as "leaning toward support, but only if...". As was the case with other proposed policies, for this group, the “devil is in the details.” These participants felt that the kind of infill this proposal might promote could be done poorly, and might not take into account how important it is for humans to have access to green space, public transportation, and other amenities. Others might begrudgingly support these policies if it meant building wouldn’t happen in sensitive areas such as the Foothills, but they weren’t totally convinced that these developments would be affordable for those at 80% of median income or below.

A third group was solidly opposed. Some of their responses suggested that humans don’t do well in “cramped” spaces, and that they themselves could not imagine buying in a place as densely developed. Others were extremely concerned that this proposal amounted to the City trying to skirt the public comment requirements now in place, and that this is an invaluable check on City and developer power that residents should fight to preserve. Others felt this was an example of yet another policy that would primarily benefit developers and not Boise residents.

A final group of comments might be classified as “skeptical.” Though these comments were mostly posed as questions, the tone suggests that if they didn’t receive satisfactory answers to their concerns, they would be likely to oppose. This group was definitely not sold on the proposal, though they weren’t as strongly negative as the group above.

In short, although the majority of comments broadly supported the proposals, and survey results suggested broad support, the qualitative analysis of comments suggests a much more complex story. City leaders should not take these responses as uniform support for the proposals, and (perhaps to no one’s surprise) may anticipate facing a lack of public consensus on these issues.

## LARGE GROUP DISCUSSION

Comments on the proposals related to reductions in lot sizes tracked the findings presented above. Several commenters noted that these proposals were needed to address the demand for more affordable housing in the City. Some noted that we have an opportunity to act now in order to avoid more painful choices in the future.

Several commenters, however, noted that the issue fundamentally depended on how density and infill are handled. They were particularly concerned about the impacts on existing neighborhoods and on the quality of life for existing residents. Again, there were also a few comments about the importance of providing mass transit.

Finally, some commented on feeling strongly opposed to these proposals, primarily because they seemed like a way for developers to avoid the public comment part of the planning and zoning process. These participants were understandably opposed to giving up this requirement, which they see as an important check on the City's power, and on the speed and manner with which development is occurring.



## SUMMARY



## SUMMARY

Taken in the aggregate, participant comments seem representative of the types of larger debates happening around growth, housing prices, and planning and development policies in Boise in general. The results of this report suggest that a majority of participants believe **growth and housing affordability issues are ones the City should be proactively addressing**, and the Housing Trust and density proposals are important tools in the City's toolbox.

But those majorities are not unchallenged. Many who may lean toward supporting these proposals do so in a qualified way, pending more information about the details of the Trust and infill/density zoning changes. It is possible that this group could be swayed the other way if the City is perceived as promoting poorly-built projects, or unfairly privileging developers.

It is also important to point out—as many participants themselves did—that the majority of attendees were themselves already homeowners (as illustrated by a show of hands). The results will therefore be skewed in the direction of those who already own property in Boise.

Finally, it should be said that those who are opposed to these proposals are very opposed, either for ideological or personal reasons. These objections and concerns should not be dismissed as mere NIMBY-ism, as many participants have good reasons to be worried about residents having a say in how growth happens. It is also possible that some members of this group will not view anything the City does positively, as they already feel some distrust toward the City, or believe government should have a limited role in addressing issues such as housing affordability. Decision-makers will have to decide how to engage these disaffected populations moving forward.



# APPENDICES

# APPENDIX 1: DISCUSSION THEMES

## LAND TRUST

### DECEMBER 2018

- \$5 mil will come from an increase in taxes?
- How to design to reduce parking + transportation - development to have a vehicle pool
- Dev. always to include green spaces + amenities
- What is the land the city already has? Look like?
- Are caps placed on resale of trust units so it remains affordable?
- Potential for mix of work/live development opportunities?
- What is the current need for below 80%

### NOVEMBER 2018

- What are the restrictions on a person if they decide to move? i.e. full or partial equity?
- What would the transfer look like for the seller and new purchaser?
- How will vulnerable populations be considered? Screen process?
- How do we mesh this concept with public transportation?
- What is the cost to the city? Is there research?
- Need clarity on how a trust operates
- Are there legal limitation on using for air bnbs or similar type of business operation?
- Can you actually acquire \$20 mil in philanthropic \$\$?

# APPENDIX 1: DISCUSSION THEMES

## ADUs – INCREASED DENSITY

### DECEMBER 2018

- Homeowner – concerns about investor criteria economy
- Requirement – could impact housing in Boise by outside investors, require owners to live within 20 mins for example
- How will changes in size impact fees? Will need to be adjusted
- Best practices in other communities?
- Is higher down payment required to buy a house within area?
- Do we need to control pricing on ADUs and Air BNBS? Deed restrictions on ADU properties?
- Both square footage and 10% cap will prevent huge ADUs
- Would prefer to keep original structure and add ADU rather than tear down to build multiple units
- When will Boise have mass transit?
- Until a transit system exists, concerns exist around eliminating parking requirements
- Could consider requirements to consider width of lot when implementing parking requirements
- Homeowner requirement
- Is there a barrier to financing?
- Need to be sensitive to people's lives changing example – owner lives there first year
- Incentives/assistance to build ADUs may need to adjust
- See how accommodations can be made
- Person living here doesn't impact price of parcel – # of units does impact
- Bedrooms restrictions
- On-site parking
- Could change requirements change based on geography?  
Ex downtown vs. west Boise

# APPENDIX 1: DISCUSSION THEMES

## ADUs – INCREASED DENSITY, CONTINUED

NOVEMBER 2018

- Sq. Ft Increase
  - Would we consider going larger than 850 sq ft?
  - If infill is goal, why the size limitation? If its my lot why should I be limited?
  - Do ADUs comply with setbacks?
- More than one bedroom
  - If you tie parking requirement, then it makes sense
  - Does bedroom count and parking requirement really make sense?
- Removing parking requirement
  - Removing parking requirement doesn't mean we can figure it out
  - Would this proposal include rent control? Keep this option affordable?
  - Could there be conditions based on the street?
  - This would be a bad idea. Location of existing ADUs are on streets with limited parking
- Onsite homeowner occupancy
  - This would pave the way for air bnbs on both units (home and ADUs) rather than affordable housing
  - Homeowner occupancy doesn't make sense. "I own two homes with ADUs and can't rent one for affordable housing" (city should avoid admin costs)
  - Property management agencies are shady
  - State code - cannot regulate air bnbs and we don't have requirements for prop management
- General feedback
  - We reduce affordable housing options with more restrictions
  - Life is not static - if we refuse to allow rentals of ADUs when owner doesn't live onsite, we are ignoring reality.
  - Do ADUs pay impact fees?
  - Owner should live onsite to screen person moving in. neighbors would likely be more open to ADUs.

# APPENDIX 1: DISCUSSION THEMES

## REDUCE LOT SIZES

DECEMBER 2018

- Incentives to convert existing structures to multi-units
- Stay where we are - not increase density
- Need to do this now to prevent hurt in the future
- Can we prioritize transportation to complement more density?
- Consider noise regs +pet ownership - quality of life aspects
- Very supportive of eliminating garages in front/streets
- Make room for people in a smart way
- What else is being considered in terms of these policies? Restrictions on ownership, public process, etc.
- CR-2 could units be replaced by a business? To promote mixed use

NOVEMBER 2018

- Single Family Smaller Units
  - Concerns about these proposals could be unfounded - proposal are much needed but need to blend into existing neighborhood to reduce a jarring visual impact
  - Concerns that older neighborhoods can be disrupted by new development
  - Big difference in number of units mean more people in town (north end)
  - Allowing changes can change feeling of the neighborhood
  - Has to be a transition from new to existing development - need to give incentives to developers
  - Impacts on existing infrastructure are harder to mitigate
  - These changes won't happen overnight - it is important to accommodate everyone
  - Is there a connection between small units and the number of storage units being built around town?
  - We need to respect the diversity of neighborhoods and consider the neighbors who will be affected.

## HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Below is a breakout of what 80% or below Area Medium Income means for a single person income and for a family of four.



### SINGLE PERSON: \$39,400

- Can afford maximum rental of \$985
- Can afford maximum home purchase of \$98,500\*



### FAMILY OF FOUR: \$56,240

- Can afford maximum rental of \$1,406
- Can afford maximum home purchase of \$140,600\*

\*Based on Median Multiple rating for affordability



## HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

The City of Boise defines Housing Affordability as housing that is within reach for those at 80% of Area Median Income or below.





## HOUSING DEFINITIONS

Below are definitions for the proposed housing tools discussed today, as well as common housing terms.

### PROPOSED HOUSING TOOLS

#### ACCESSORY DWELLING UNITS

A second, smaller dwelling on an existing property already occupied by a single-family home.

#### LAND TRUST

A common way to acquire land and create permanent housing.

### HOUSING TERMS

#### MIXED INCOME HOUSING

A development that typically includes diverse housing types, such as apartments, townhomes and/or single-family homes available to people with a range of income levels, including market-rate and low-income.

#### MULTI-FAMILY HOMES

*(Attached dwellings):* A building with three or more attached housing units. Common examples of multi-family homes include, duplexes, townhomes, condominiums and apartment buildings.

#### SINGLE-FAMILY HOMES

*(Detached dwelling)* - A stand-alone, detached home that does not share any common walls or roof with any other dwelling, and is built on its own parcel of land.

## HOUSING CONTEXT

Below is a snapshot of the anticipated growth in the City of Boise over the next 20 years and the housing needs that will result from this growth.

Next 20 years:



Source: COMPASS Communities in Motion 2040 Plan, 2014; City of Boise 2015 Housing Needs Analysis



## APPENDIX 4: SESSION FEEDBACK

DATE	WORKSHOP RATING	WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER? (Open-Ended Response)	ANY OTHER FEEDBACK? (Open-Ended Response)
12/1/18	10	More time. I know 2 hours is a lot, but I and more of the people at the table are willing to go longer.	Please keep doing these! Also if possible provide reference data at the table. Don't extend the presentation but for example I would like to know how many people are below 80% median and where they live now.
12/1/18	9	More time to learn about the context and background of each issue area. Understanding the current state of affairs and what could happen if no changes occur could provide useful insight.	I am very excited to follow the potential of the land trust proposal. i would like to see more conversation around mixed-use residential/commercial development, hopefully as a primary objective, rather than a "down-the-road" idea.
12/1/18	8	Find ways to include more people of color, people with disabilities, renters, etc. Better job this time with Spanish translation/ interpretation. It is needed for all handouts. Really good improvement. Go out to community groups who serve the country.	Host these sessions in South and West ends of Boise.
12/1/18	8	-Very well presented -very good format for table discussion I look forward to more programs and sessions on other topics like transportation, etc.	
12/1/18	10	Your Spanish translation was not very good.	
			These are big societal problems, and I heard a lot about taxation. Personally, I look forward to the day that Idahoans are asked whether or not they'd be taxed to solve their issues and, I gladly say "yes". Bring on and support local option.
12/1/18	7	More comment time. This is still not addressing the minimum wage employees who cannot afford housing in town.	Great to see the community members participating.
12/1/18	5	Before filling out the feedback card I wanted to hear what people at my table and around the room were concerned about or had questions about. So I could form a more knowledgeable, informed opinion.	Boise has a limited amount of open space. Why not limit your new zone changes to that land only? At least it wouldn't come as a shock to people who bought prequity years about because it was single-family.
12/1/18	6	Be realistic on how to house the increase in the numbers of lower income households.	Where do people live that are on fixed incomes of \$1,000/month or less? Big issue for the lower end wage earners. Better pay. Better public transportation.
12/1/18		These proposals are just bandaids. We need to move forward to discussing more important changes changes. I.e. public transportation, tiny home, villages, etc. There are lots of innovating solutions to low incoming housing. Let's take a look at three solutions and have a real discussion!	
12/1/18	4	Most of the people were addressing their personal agendas. They need to visual Corpus Christi Sanctuary. They need to realize poor will not go away. If we spend \$5300 per homeless individuals per year; how can we channel some of them into building our community, not fixing things after the fact. What about transportation, like an improved bus service, with that we could move more people to lower cost housing locations and they could have access to support.	

## APPENDIX 4: SESSION FEEDBACK

DATE	WORKSHOP RATING	WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER? (Open-Ended Response)	ANY OTHER FEEDBACK? (Open-Ended Response)
12/1/18		More discussion and listening to citizens.	-Shortsighted... need to carefully examine city's ability to equally provide tax supported municipal services at the pace of growth. -There are no laws or regulations that mandate the city has to build xxx units. This is simply an inventory analysis to calculate what profit is left in the vicinity for the developers to capitalize on and what the city can hope/expect to collect in the future tax revenue to keep up the spending spree to "entertain" vs. "protect".
12/1/18	8		Just wondering when there will be a fuller conversation about the policies and other aspects of affordable housing.
12/1/18	8	As someone who feels very ignorant about the housing remedies in Boise and actually what the City is doing or proposing, it was very helpful. The conversations with other Boisians and the people at our table in Boise is really behind the times. The only proposal which sounded more like a different approach was the housing unit. The other proposals were just more of the same and recycled approach which do not address the issues.	I after wonder as a bike around the city. Grocery shopping, entertainment. Why is Boise letting the developers run the show and not taking full advantage of the fact that people want to live here and the opportunity and resource being created to make change for a 21st century town.
12/1/18		The last item	
12/1/18		-Loved the Spanish translation on screens and apparently in audio. This sort of inclusion is pragmatically and symbolically helpful/ important! As an English not first -We spent a lot of time taking notes instead of being able to focus on listening. Would have been helpful to have more available on handouts. -Did you tell if the slides will be available later, or did I miss that?	Thank you for doing this. This is exactly what I have been looking for - what is being done nationally and internationally and out of that what can seriously be considered here? Our species has made serious mistakes in the last century or two - too large lots and more recently in the McMansion too-large homes. How do we fix that? Density changes. This will help us environmentally in myriad ways - less vehicle miles driven, easier to justify public transportation if more residents in an area, will reduce water usage if yards are smaller. Can help socially, too, if smaller - lot small years encourage people to spend more time in common space like parks. Please, please, please, consider publicly owner in-city agricultural land. We have publicly owned soccer land, publicly owned softball land, publicly owned tennis land, publicly owned festival land, publicly owned music performance land. All of those are parks - and we sometimes charge fees - as with sports. Let's do the same for ag. Thank you for the opportunity to hear the presentations and the others in audience.
12/1/18	7	More handouts with policy details	
12/1/18	10	This was an excellent program Well run Enjoyed participating in the process	
12/1/18	7	Table conversations.	The Land Trust focus on the 80% of median income will create a large middle of un-housed population. Need a huge communication marketing campaign for zone changes.
			Integration of services is so important. Being able to live, work, and play in our own neighborhoods is great. The more we can walk/bike and less time in a car the better.
12/1/18	7	Lingo as far as housing was not clarified - more allowance for questions and then comments so we can all be on the same page. Maybe provide reading before hand for people who are new to the conversation.	I wish we could have spent more time talking about the environmental impact and how to be more clean energy minded as we move forward.

## APPENDIX 4: SESSION FEEDBACK

DATE	WORKSHOP RATING	WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER? (Open-Ended Response)	ANY OTHER FEEDBACK? (Open-Ended Response)
12/1/18	9	Great facilitated conversation. Not sure all voices were heard but understand difficulty in recruitment.	Hold in locations in community where more diverse populations live as a means of infusing ideas and different voices.
12/1/18	10	More time. Maybe.	
12/1/18	10	Is better to have a really good life.	
12/1/18	10	Bring up what property rights are so folks understand what can be done and what can't in regards to restriction on owners property rights.	Keep up the good work!
12/1/18	8	I had problems getting to the connect location for today's workshop. I found the EventBrite site to be less than easy to use. :(	
12/1/18	8	More visuals describing proposals.	
12/1/18	8	Some more data and maps with analysis. I.E. Where the human footprint is larger than elsewhere i.e. fewer people per sq.ft. of housing i.e. Where public infrastructure is more expensive to maintain such as low density subdivisions We need to deal with the reality of public obligation to pay to maintain infrastructure and cities that don't all infrastructure face financial crisis.	More data and mapping to illustrate long-term consequences to future residents and taxpayers.
12/1/18	9	Healthier food - lower carb foods such as trail mix - nuts whole grain lower glycemic food Avoid plastic bottle v serving cup - paper better for serving cup	Well done! Excellent outlines v. expert presenters Great Q&A with participant engagement. I felt voice was heard, as was others.
12/1/18	8	More literature to take home giving specifics on policies that may be tied to some of these proposals/considerations	
12/1/18	7	Visuals that are relevant to the entirety of the city, not just small chunks of properties that are already in place	notification by PDS are inadequate. Nowhere else I have ever lived has small scans and extremely limited public notification via mailing lists
12/1/18	8	This workshop was more top down learning I prefer group exploration process of first 2 workshops	
12/1/18	5	Discussion on specific policy proposal wrapped tools	Nice to be listened to but more important to have reflected by leaders and reflected upon.
12/1/18	2	This was the wrong workshop because growth + congestion - not housing in this context	All above
12/1/18	9	I this was the best format of the three. Love the educational component of this format. It allows the city to show how they plan to address these issues.	I am PROUD to be a Boise citizen!
12/1/18		I liked the quick survey after the speaker. Probably good to get positive support for his plans. This is enough! \$20 million is nothing in the housing business. This is the cost of living.	1. The ADU speaker was very difficult to hear. Light voice. Too far from the mike, the density speaker was very clear. 2. Give us name, title and email of our city staff speakers! Invite for them communications. 3. Why not give us the slides in advance? ADU changer are excellent but many may not be enuf to get to 500 once spoken of

## APPENDIX 4: SESSION FEEDBACK

DATE	WORKSHOP RATING	WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER? (Open-Ended Response)	ANY OTHER FEEDBACK? (Open-Ended Response)
12/1/18	2	Two things: It was inappropriate to steer people into filling out feedback cards prior to the large group discussion. This was backward to how it should have been handled. Also, the formal presentations were entirely one-sided and from the City's point-of-view. Equal time should have been granted to respected individuals with contrary viewpoints. This would have contributed to public debate, but then that probably wasn't the City's intention in the first place, was it?	Yes, the admission process to this meeting seemed designed to limit attendance. Perhaps the City wants minimal publicity on what they are planning in these areas, not appreciated.
12/1/18	10		Very informative, enjoyed the speakers and structure.
11/29/18	8	I think it was done as well as it could have been with the people participating.	Infrastructure with growing housing, more per acre needs to be addressed, preferably by builders.
11/29/18	10	Thought everything was great! Thank you for hosting these.	
11/29/18	10	I liked the mix of presentations/information and opportunity to comment on proposals.	
11/29/18	8	Liked the forum better than last times.	
11/29/18	8	I would like to understand better how we are limited as a city, how much power has the state over the city?	Why is multi-use housing not something more common in Boise?
11/29/18	9	Job well done!	No, I enjoyed the session, great job and thanks for putting these one!
11/29/18	8	I completely understand this is early in the process and I appreciate the city wanting input but I found it difficult to provide insightful constructive feedback with such little information. Proposal 1 especially was hard to understand.	I sincerely appreciate the City of Boise's commitment to smart growth and its willingness to listen to residents. Thank you.
11/29/18	9	Prop 1 was a bit confusing. Possibly using more generic terms would help clear up a bit of the confusion.	Thanks for a good night! I will be back for another one.
11/29/18	6	The first topic was heavily emphasized as relating to housing affordability the other two weren't but there could have been an opportunity to mention these as tools to make homeownership more affordable.	I appreciate the opportunity to participate. It would be interesting to offer this in an online format and see if answers were any different for the survey.
11/29/18	8	Perhaps a brief recap of sessions 1&2 for those who didn't attend.	Very interesting and great to hear a variety of viewpoints.
11/29/18	7	Perhaps an email introducing the topics so people could have more time to research. Not sure discussions were productive at such high level overviews.	
11/29/18	9	I thought it was a great workshop.	I really appreciate you taking time to hear us. The only feedback I have is that 2 of the 3 issues we talked about helping with housing demand but not so much affordability.

## APPENDIX 4: SESSION FEEDBACK

DATE	WORKSHOP RATING	WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER? (Open-Ended Response)	ANY OTHER FEEDBACK? (Open-Ended Response)
11/29/18	9	I don't have any suggestions for improvements. I appreciated the photo examples of the various proposals. I'm a planner so I understand the jargon. I'm not sure that everybody has that level of understanding of planning concepts, regulations, etc.	
11/29/18	8	Decent options offered with a lot of different ideas.	Look into reducing Airbnbs.
11/29/18	9	Better explanation of the idea of a land trust. I was lost for a bit.	I would love to hear the city talk more about adjusting parking minimums to increase available space for development. This might need to be done in conversation with parking districts to protect existing parking obligations. But it would be helpful. Also coordination with existing lots and structures would dovetail nicely.
11/29/18	10	I don't know. Loved it!	How many land trusts are funded without a local option tax? Are we trying to cobble this together without the normal resources? I think we need it. But is this how?
11/29/18	8	Issues could be framed more clearly.	The reports that come out of this are fantastic, very impressive.
11/29/18	10	This was a wonderful workshop. Thank you.	Please listen to our concerns, Mayor Bieter and City Council! Thank you!
11/29/18	7	Moderators should have been at each table to record answers. Not everyone got the opportunity to speak up, therefore the results/ opinions are not as varied.	Thank you for taking the time to listen and record feedback. It takes a village.
11/29/18	9	I would like to have [illegible] all 4 proposals. Glad you're looking at all of them.	Good job by all presenters and I think the audience deserves a compliment on their behavior too. No anger. Just reasonable comments!
11/29/18	9	Needed just a little more time to explain land trusts. The other scenarios were great.	These are really good forums for bringing city and residents together. Thank you.
11/29/18	7		The land trust is confusing and needs a lot more research and thorough investigation before presenting to the citizens of Boise. ADU's sound good but detailed review needs to be taken before actions. Please look at all infrastructure before making a change. More homes without same roads only equals more congestion.
11/29/18	9	Well presented and kept the meeting flowing well.	Continue to ask "what if we did this?" AKA keep striving for feedback from neighbors/ residents to help us address needs the right way.
11/29/18	4	The questions on the second density increase questionnaire were too general to reflect the complexity of the actual issue or increasing density in the R-1c and R-2 zones and this seemed loaded in favor of saying "yes" to increasing density in the two zones.	The devil is in the details with any change in the zoning ordinance. I consider the city's interpretation of the zoning rules extremely permissive. Code enforcement is often very ineffective. Review of developments is often lacking in discretion and seems "loaded" in favor of the developers. I have lost a lot of faith in PDS's enforcement of standards.
11/29/18	10		Keep involving us in your ideas. It helps.
11/29/18	7		
11/29/18	9	Each topic was an evening in itself.	Need a legislative strategy to get more tools to deal with these issues.
11/29/18		This has been the best, and most useful, of all of the recent "community conversations", because of the structured nature of this conversation, and the greater specificity. Thank you!	

## APPENDIX 4: SESSION FEEDBACK

DATE	WORKSHOP RATING	WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER? (Open-Ended Response)	ANY OTHER FEEDBACK? (Open-Ended Response)
11/29/18	10		Great job.
11/29/18	8	The big question is, "How do you get lower income non-homeowners interested and involved in these conversations?" I don't have the answer, but it is pretty apparent that the conversation is lopsided toward the wealthier side of Boise (i.e. no one who will actually benefit from these programs). It's very parental.	Altogether, these are great conversations on important issues.
11/29/18	5	Did not address "preservation of present housing." Didn't address planning for people living in their neighborhoods and working there. Should all jobs be "downtown"?	
11/29/18	9	Too short. I realize that 2 hours in the evening is long for most people, but these topics are complex and it's difficult for this many people to fully participate. Fewer people or longer sessions.	1. \$100 million for a library, \$20 million for affordable housing. Something's not right here. 2. Most comments have sounds of NIMBY—they like a proposal but not in their neighborhood.
11/29/18	10	More background on some topics would have been helpful— [illegible] written backgrounders on the table.	Love that we get to have these discussions! Really terrific opportunity!
11/29/18	5	Example #1 was too complex or poorly explained to have substantive discussion—mush less reach an opinion.	It seems like this process would be much better if we actually had some clear goals and objectives for affordable housing—and they evaluated all options against those goals and objectives. It seemed like the questions for Ex. #1 wanted us to determine the goal—or problem it was solving. Ex. #3 sounded reasonable, but it wasn't clear how it would provide truly affordable housing rather than simply reducing the cost of new construction. Thanks! I understand that it's difficult to discuss and solve complex problems in a short amount of time. Thanks for trying.
11/29/18	7	Discussion before filling out cards.	Good work. Hard to find a balance between feedback and info.
11/29/18	6	It seemed the zoning changes discussed were unrelated to increasing access to affordable housing... or the connection was unclear. So only half the evening was focused on the topic at hand. I did appreciate that there was less time spent on table discussions and more Q&A.	I'd love to see city-provided incentives for private owners to construct/rent ADUs specifically to low income households. I would do this if an incentive of up front capital was available.
11/29/18	8	Perhaps more information leading up to the conversation. People at my table had very strong opinions based on a lack of knowledge not on facts.	Great progress, please make these changes!
11/29/18	2	Feels like the city already knows what it wants to do, just wants to cover themselves that they talked to community. Wish they actually wanted our ideas.	
11/29/18	7	Provide more specifics for session 1—property taxes on land trust, city funding source for this is it one time a annual. If affordable housing is to happen smaller homes are a must and the density needs [illegible]	Transportation—needs to be considered on all development.



## APPENDIX 4: SESSION FEEDBACK

DATE	WORKSHOP RATING	WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER? (Open-Ended Response)	ANY OTHER FEEDBACK? (Open-Ended Response)
11/29/18	6	I liked getting the background to the discussion but there wasn't any opportunity to bring up additional concerns. Our table discussed keeping costs down for current homeowners in particular those on fixed incomes.	I came away with a lot more to think about with the table-wide than room-wide in the 1st meeting than this time.
11/29/18	7	I wish we had more time, but then this would drag out the meeting forever. I would also like more time to have Q&A with the presenters.	Keep it up these have been good.
11/29/18	8	More options to discuss. Clarify misstatements.	
11/29/18	8	Limit time per question.	Have people choose a preference on a proposal. Like I preferred proposal 2 over the others.
11/29/18	8	I enjoyed the proposals, but the land trust idea needed to be fleshed out more for people to give informed feedback. I'd like to know how it was decided to present/get feedback on these proposals.	This was my 1st session and it was very interesting. I liked the visual examples in the 3rd presentation on lot size. That was very helpful.
11/29/18	10	It was great!	Nope! Well done.
11/29/18	1	Less time talking at us and more time listening to us. The whole evening was a presentation of proposals the city is already working through. Public process feels like the afterthought vs the driving force.	This workshop series has felt like more and more of an orchestrated sales pitch. We have not discussed tools to keep current housing affordable; to allow current residents to remain in their homes and neighborhoods.
11/29/18	5	I love this. I just think the scope/"mission"/program should be more, IDK, "on point" "transparent". This was a mirage of "affordability" to discuss (receive feedback) that then you can manipulate to say "the people of Boise are generally for this change." You need to partner with your neighboring counties/cities. Be bold and present data. AnaMarie acted like she just googled topic 1 for the 1st time this morning. The contrast of her talk the the second on ADUs that you admitted did nothing with less than 80% income level was shocking.	Your affordability/rental income numbers changed from last time. Policies on who you rent to and if you have to live in are not huge on access for all and the most vulnerable groups. Mixed-used/work-live-play.
11/29/18	9		Appreciate the City seeking feedback; I just hope decisions consider the input. Great refreshments, good acoustics and leadership. Thanks.
11/29/18	8	People with different proposals didn't all have the opportunity to present them. Instead of just picking people, most of whom give opinions of a proposal, the moderator could ask, "Does anyone have a different idea?"	No. This was a great meeting and I appreciate the opportunity to be informed and give feedback. I will watch for other meetings of concern to attend in the future because of this (my first) meeting.
11/29/18	7		Please flesh out breakout questions better so we don't have to select "maybe" as a default.
11/29/18	9	Continue to provide more "meat" to the skeleton.	-Well run meeting -I went to #2, I like both styles—did like the big group -People were respectful-nice to set up Thank you.
11/29/18	7	Getting around to each table for comment would be welcome to make comments. Good discussion all in all.	As infill happens please make concessions for green space. Community fostering is so important.

## APPENDIX 4: SESSION FEEDBACK

DATE	WORKSHOP RATING	WHAT COULD HAVE BEEN BETTER? (Open-Ended Response)	ANY OTHER FEEDBACK? (Open-Ended Response)
11/29/18	8	I think the first idea could have been much more concrete. The initial preview was all about 90% of median income but only the first presentation even discussed it very vaguely. It's unclear how the rest directly achieve the 90% goal. I'd like more focus on costs-benefit and which ideas will have the most impact on affordable housing.	
11/29/18	8	I would have enjoyed a smaller group, therefore longer time to discuss topics.	No.
	10	More background and details on proposals.	Great session!
	9	It was good. The ideas/concepts were high level so it's hard to make a lot of comments without details.	Looking forward to any future conversations.
	10	Nothing comes to mind. Great job!	Don't be led solely by public sentiment. Do what is in the long-term best interests of the entire city (as a corporate whole).
	9	Break out sessions.	
	8	As before, please provide background info prior to meeting.	Keep it going!
		More time for comments.	
	9	Provide next step process and let us know what to expect from here.	I appreciate the conversation. I appreciate the structure of the meeting and the control of the conversations meaning eliminative intense emotions. I like hearing the different options.





Jen Schneider is Professor and co-Director in the School of Public Service at Boise State University. She is also the Director of the PhD Program in Public Policy and Administration. Dr. Schneider's research addresses challenges in the public communication of scientific and

environmental controversies, with a particular focus on stakeholder engagement, the rhetoric of expertise, and communicating about science and technology in teams. Jen has worked on a number of projects funded by the National Science Foundation, and has been affiliated with the National Academy of Engineering.

Recent projects include the books *Under Pressure: Coal Industry Rhetoric and Neoliberalism* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2016) and *The Joy of Science: Seven Principles for Scientists Seeking Happiness, Harmony, and Success*. Her 2010 book *Engineering and Sustainable Community Development*, co-authored with Juan Lucena and Jon Leydens, has been used in classrooms around the world. Jen teaches courses on the Philosophy of Social Inquiry, U.S. Energy Policy, Science and Environmental Communication, Qualitative Methods, and Science, Technology, and Society (STS).