

Community Conversations on Growth #2
August 25, 2018
Boise City Hall

Table 2

- Scenario 1
 - Who benefits?
 - Developer
 - Doesn't see how neighborhood
 - 4%--"lucky people" who get in
 - Value in mixed socio-economic status
 - Below median incomes
 - Below median income lost if not built:
 - 100 housing units
 - Abandoned building stays
 - High density housing would be lost
 - Something else ([illegible] store) could be put there instead
 - Disadvantaged
 - How tall it is
 - Variety of socio-economic classes can cause issues
 - High density
 - Noise
 - Traffic pressure—changes in traffic pattern (but offset by walkability)
 - School at capacity, higher number of children because younger families would live there
 - 3
 - Never heard of a neighborhood meeting
 - Wonder about how the developer handles the meetings
 - Development and transportation not connected
 - Set asides for parking spaces the extent to which development and transportation are developed not focused on the bigger question of how people will get "to and from"
 - There should be more consideration in the development for alternative transportation requirements (developer has criteria that req. help with transportation issues)
- Scenario 2
 - Who benefits?
 - Gov. because increase in tax revenue
 - 100 units helps families/individuals
 - Homeownership vs. rentals
 - Schools will get more revenue
 - Diversity would be lost if not build, new people, cultures, ideas
 - Disadvantages
 - No low income (only 10)
 - Traffic impacts—they don't just happen at rush hour
 - Life changing for those people who currently live there
 - Loss of farmland—what about making it a community farm/garden

- Environmental impacts;
 - Traffic
 - Storm water won't be absorbed like it would with a farm
 - What about parks? Common areas?
 - If large enough it would spur some commercial development with pros/cons
 - No mix of uses, purely residential
 - People still driving to get to store
 - Should be support around the communities
 - Should plan for biking corridors
- There is a larger opportunity to have a "planned community"
- Opportunities are different than scenario 1 because more open space to work with—can have a planned community
- If we need 1,000 houses it would be great if they could be strategically spaced in available areas across the city
- Scenario 3
 - 1
 - Developer
 - High income
 - Land owner around the development
 - City taxes (but also costs)
 - Wealthy will advocate—so will developers/land owner
 - Realtor developers
 - If not built tax revenue will be lost
 - 2
 - Hunters and outdoors folks will be disadvantaged
 - Takes away the chance for lower income housing
 - Need more low income, mixed income houses
 - Harmful to the environment more trips in cars
 - Impacts to the watershed
 - Pollution
 - Neighborhood culture will change dramatically
 - 3
 - What are impacts to infrastructure water, sewer, electric?
 - Transportation
 - Are there things the City can do to make these scenarios successful?
 - Sidewalks? Bike lanes?
 - How are we making things more "livable"? we need "greenbelt type arteries."
 - Amenities, parks important, swimming pools
 - ACHDs mandate is not compatible with the City's vision
 - ACHD should be dissolved or we will never be able to plan comprehensively
 - Need more cooperation between government agencies

Table 3

- Scenario 1
 - 1
 - Residents will benefit
 - Residents further out won't have increased traffic
 - Less pollution

- Developer
 - 2
 - Current residents—traffic, noise level
 - Increased traffic for all
 - School impacts
 - Potential for development to go into disrepair (blight for neighborhood)
 - Need rules to avoid these neg. consequences
 - 3
 - Good/realistic traffic generation metrics
 - Look at actual change in traffic
 - Clear process of engagement before the hearing process
 - Concern about concerns being addressed
 - Disadvantage to residents compared to developer with professionals working on project on full-time basis
 - Non-developer property owners can't plan on type of development for neighborhood
 - Require more adherence to master plan (e.g. sustainable development)
 - Noise without adequate mitigation
 - Concern about funding for maintenance (falling to disrepair)
- Scenario 2
 - 1
 - Developer/builder
 - 2
 - Existing residents
 - Traffic, concern for cyclists
 - Lack of mass transit/this type of development isn't dense enough to support mass transit
 - Loss of farmland
 - Suggestion to develop south of desert/airport
 - Con
 - Concern about realistic nature of scenarios
 - Real project with 300 apartments in semi-rural area not on transit, should be addressed specifically
 - Bus should be front and center at airport
 - 3
 - (same as before, see pg 2)
 - Alternative suggestions for geography (development elsewhere)
 - Development closer to downtown
 - Sustainability—water
 - Lack of incentives to do the right thing somewhere else (sustainability, economic, social)
 - Need to quantify quality of life
 - Concern about over regulation (e.g. California)
 - Concern about lack of priority on common good
 - Allow citizens to articulate what common good is
- Scenario 3
 - 1

- Developer
 - Construction industry—plumbers, electricians, etc.
 - New wealthy residents
- 2
 - Taxpayers
 - Need to fund public safety (police/fire)
 - Worse traffic impact
 - Services to less dense development cost more per resident
- 3
 - Need for impact fees calibrated by distance/density
 - Change property tax evaluation to be based on cost of infrastructure, not market value
 - Huge concern about infrastructure (cost of a burden on taxpayers)
 - Loss of open space and wildlife habitat
 - Quality of life (preserve for those who are here)
 - Concern about using taxpayer money to encourage other to move here (out of state)
 - Also, same concerns from scenario 1
 - Concern
 - AirBnB use of accessory dwelling unit
 - Gentrification
 - Legislature lack of local option taxing

Table 4

- 1
 - Who benefits?
 - People (20%) who need affordable housing
 - ? how many bedrooms/person for subsidy
 - Developer—financial
 - Residents (Boiseans)—good housing bang for buck
 - Still only fraction of below median are helped
 - Boise (not in this complex)—push for transport; good space utilization; grows tax base (?)--? About tax assessment/structure
 - Mixed income; lower socio/economic segregation
 - Utilizes a main thoroughfare
 - Potential sellers when neighbors are able to buy (increased home prices)
 - Who is disadvantaged?
 - Bus service isn't robust enough; who lives here, where do they need to go; can they do that at the times they need to?
 - Biking is only option for able-bodied
 - Increased home value=increased taxes (existing neighbors)
 - Strain on services (schools)
 - Increased traffic neighbors
 - Parking-is there enough?
 - Process/governance
 - How is this zoned? What will process/level of review be? Is this in keeping with plans?
 - Public engagements too late and/or just a box to check

- How is neighborhood meeting feedback used? (developer led)
 - How are folks outside of notification radius involved
 - Even this scenario doesn't solve number of affordable
 - 2
 - Who benefits?
 - Developer
 - School—capacity
 - Tax base; impact fees
 - Middle-upper income residents
 - Sidewalks = health
 - If designed well
 - Who is disadvantaged?
 - Existing neighbors—“pushback” can be valid; how do we process together for mutual gain
 - Neighbors can band together to shape design/plan for community benefits
 - Incorporate opposition
 - People needing affordable housing
 - Traffic increased: no transport
 - Large homes not environmentally sustainable
 - How will transit come?
 - Multistory not good for
 - Process
 - Hard to be proactively involved... not up-to speed until it's in your neighborhood
 - Steep learning curve
 - Info is there, but is it presented in an accessible way? (website call out)
 - How do residents get “in” (focus groups)
 - Broader public engagement
 - 3
 - Benefits
 - Developer
 - People who do want this lifestyle; can be done well if carefully designed
 - Increased tax base; but added cost of long term maintenance
 - Building employees (industry)
 - Tradespeople, votech opportunities
 - Disadvantaged
 - NOT affordable housing
 - Not environmentally sustainable
 - Not good bang for buck/space
 - Long term residents (taxes, price them out)
 - Increased traffic; new roads; no alternative (not inclusive) transit; hard to bike
 - Animals, plants, land
 - Process
 - How do we favor #1 and #2?
 - Zoning is only under our control when within city limits
 - Do we protect open space by not re-zoning
 - Toll roads into city?

- How do we work more regionally?
 - COMPASS mentioned (currently road focused)
 - Ex: e-biking to Garden City prohibited by “geo fence” around Boise
 - We should be planning Ontario to Mountain Home
- Refocus existing planning bodies (COMPASS) to be more integrated planning (not just transport; also housing, etc.)
- Local option tax is a state issue; how do impacted communities rally to support?
 - Prioritize this strategically get out of day-to-day
- We’re missing opportunities (land use, infrastructure)
- Could “LIVable” hubs be created all geographic areas (not just downtown focus); ex: big library vs multiple smaller
- More priority on other areas of city
 - Connectivity across city
 - Neighborhoods versus enclaves, small markets
- Would be nice to have specific projects for citizen workgroups (broad representation)
- How do we design for/“enforce” LIVability
 - Through roads (vs. cul de sac)
 - Grocery stores in closer proximity
- “Transit/commuter” impact fee
- ? was this a re-zone?
- How does Blueprint Boise come in?
 - Big education opportunity
 - Is this readily available

Table 5

- Scenario 1
 - Positives
 - Residents of apartment, lower income
 - City—fees, infrastructure
 - Local businesses
 - Public transit helps with density
 - Employers-employees
 - Repurpose property
 - Mixed income, like balance
 - Negatives
 - Parking available
 - Street
 - Impacts on housing increase \$
 - Permanent rental class
 - Rent stability—market
 - Impact on schools
 - Mandate on affordable housing
 - American dream?
 - Financing of condos?
 - Adverse impact on fixed income
 - Low income—sharing property

- Is density what we really get
- Scenario 2
 - Positives
 - Provides housing
 - Developer
 - Density—transit
 - Taxes higher
 - Supply and demand—stable/opposing view to this
 - Negatives
 - Loss of open space to resident already there
 - Increases traffic
 - No funding, impact fees don't cover it
 - Family income—priced out of this development
 - Cost of housing increase due to lack of trades and materials
 - Sacrifice farm land
 - Governance not supporting farm land
 - Is farm being used farm
 - Conflicting interests in land
 - Leads to air quality
 - Infrastructure to support (i.e. bike lanes—connectivity)
 - Stricter property/develop requirements
 - Cherry pick from comp. plan
 - Comp. plan—goal, objective
 - More environmental impact
 - Perspective more is better
- Scenario 3
 - Positives
 - Real estate
 - City [illegible]
 - High end home owner/buyers
 - Tax burden/tax income do these balance?
 - Increased traffic and burden on other neighborhoods quality
 - Contribute to sprawl
 - Nothing to support transit
 - Farm/ranch lose
 - Lack of future plans for impacts growth has
 - Env impacts—landscape water
 - Impacts access to open space
 - Maintain horse property larger lots
 - Other rate payers [illegible] growth
 - Only for high income
 - Contributes to high cost
 - Not affordable
 - More specific land development requirements
 - Collect enough \$ to mitigate offsite issues
 - Smaller parks should be included in smaller development
 - Governance needs to be strict and enforceable (no California)

- Governance—how do you master plan and look at it as a whole not just individually
- 1,000 need a year trajectory, greater density

Tables 6 & 7

*Tables 6 and 7 joined: Jennifer Tomlinson took detailed notes with big sheets capturing high level themes –Jodi

[notes from note pad]

- Scenario 1
 - Central Rim, West Bench, SENA, Southwest, Northwest, small portion of low/mid income, higher amount entire community will benefit since the project is mixed in [illegible]
 - Transportation is key—amenities are within close proximity more favorable because of surrounding neighborhood. How many people will actually not drive? Are we there yet as a community? Need to protect people from traffic.
 - Shoshone Properties will benefit
 - As homeowners, how would it impact homes?
 - Developers want to build cheap but neighbors want long-lasting product.
 - HO feel like they have to move because the apartments would negatively impact property values
 - SENA—increased density=increased property values
 - Build to scale of existing units
 - Design is important with 3rd and 4th floor set back. Rooflines have a big impact on livability—quality of life
 - Need a shift in mentality to create cohesion in communities and mixed incomes
 - Need more parking
 - Like LMI but how many LMI folks are aware of it? We all benefit when LMI folks are integrated.
 - Can address the disadvantaged by talking to [illegible]
 - Overall neighborhood is net zero for folks living 3 or 4 blocks away, but it really affects adjacent neighbors—big picture, things aren't too bad but 8 people next to it are most impacted. Also need to think about local school capacity. Hold developer accountable for school impact.
 - 0 parking for additional vehicles, trash trucks. Potential need for parking district.
- Scenario 2
 - Benefit: developers, people above median income, people who can afford a house, long-run people who can afford to pass the wealth on. Tax base benefits, housing supply would suffer if project wasn't built, businesses would suffer leaves out
 - Being surrounded by farmland is something people like.
 - Size of project is too small for commercial—alternatives are to increase/decrease density.
 - At this point, most farmland has already been developed, so there [illegible]
 - More vehicle trips, but maybe a bus line could be added. Impact on environment—we fail to make choices based on environmental impacts.
 - Changing character
 - Water impacts, sewer impacts, habitat, increased concrete
 - Older people are disadvantaged because they become trapped in homes
 - Cities are made up of these kinds of neighborhoods and need to develop light rail

- Need a paradigm shift—call on government to increase decision making based on better transportation options
- Roads don't generate revenue so why do we keep talking about the amount of revenue bus/light rail generate?
- We the people need to force government to shift the paradigm
- Light rail should come to depot
- Can go project by project, but need to look at rules
- City needs to take a more proactive role in making sure each developer is building a good project
- ACHD—as a taxpayer doesn't agree that ACHD should spend all money on roads, taxes should go to mass transit
- Scenario 3
 - Who benefits?
 - Out of state developers, non-Boise residents who can afford it. Subsidizing housing, by existing taxpayers
 - No scenarios hit median income, we are missing a large portion of the population. We aren't talking about actual needs of residents
 - What are we going to do as residents to get the housing we need.
 - City should
 - Are residents who are so hands-off in government creating this problem?
 - Density may not be the answer because of higher living costs (buying car, travel time)
 - Developers need to pay into an affordable housing fund
 - Need smart, intelligent development—if we make laws better regulating development, in the long run the backlash will be less
 - How many people are actually aware of development proposals because the current notification process is lacking.
 - As size of property increases, # of people notified is less, need to scale it. Posting signs isn't effective. Look at robo-calls too.
 - This is the kind of project that impacts the entire community and should increase notification
 - Some development has to happen and people have to live somewhere.
 - If everyone says not in their area, where will it go?
 - If these 3 options are all that is happening, how is this sustainable?
- No one is building affordable housing
- Devil is in the details
- The point is without details and process.
- Community members need to figure out a better process and a better way to get affordable housing
- Affordable housing needs to be dispersed [illegible] community.
- City should look into residential over commercial to get more density. Garden City is doing a great job of including density and a better notification process.

[notes from flip chart]

- Scenario 1
 - Who will benefit?
 - Entire community
 - Mixed income
 - Developer

- Embraces all income/culture
 - Who is disadvantageded?
 - Current neighbors
 - Begin conversations with current neighbors early
 - House right next door to new development (most impacted)
 - What impacts/processes most concern
 - Safe transportation
 - Developer building “on the cheap”
 - Variances approval outside current neighborhood
 - Parking
 - Developer accountability
 - Utilities impact (trash)/noise
- Scenario 2
 - Benefit
 - Developer
 - Buyers
 - Tax base
 - For those who want to live outside city hub
 - Property owner (who sold to developer)
 - Disadvantaged
 - Kids (lack of facilities)
 - Preservation
 - Cultural impact to area (not all land created the same)
 - Older residents
 - Residents with disabilities
 - Those who don’t want change
 - Concerns
 - This neighborhood members commute (work and etc.)
 - No plan for mixed use to bring business here
 - Pollution from car travel
 - Infrastructure (water...)
 - Impact to habitat
 - Pre-plan of including alternate transportation
 - Citizens to influence policy/code
 - Require “open space”
 - Proactive planning with long term goals
- Scenario 3
 - Benefits
 - Out of state developer
 - Out of state residents moving to Boise
 - Disadvantaged
 - Tax payers having to subsidize services
 - Commuters for
 - Time
 - \$ for car/gas
 - Entire community loses open space
 - Concerns
 - All scenarios missing point of affordable housing

- Reality of current Boise housing does not meet needs
- Residents keeping “hands off of government” leading to decisions we may not support
- Make development better/smarter
- Public notification and ongoing communication
 - Outside current radius, increase for rural areas
- Communicate early and often (current process “works” the way it is intended—the message isn’t received so concerns aren’t heard)
- Set “triggers” for required communication
- Concern “nothing will change” even with our voiced concerns
- Don’t create troubled lower end

Table 8

- Scenario 1
 - Winners?
 - Low income families, integration of demographics/socio-economics
 - Single parents, access/stability for kids
 - “We” are taking care of “us” (community)
 - Young professionals/students
 - Seniors downsizing
 - Pro-housing/developers/urban land planners, business close by
 - Transit: increased riders, services
 - Reduced trips (cars) increased air quality
 - “Enliven” local community
 - Renters/options
 - Disadvantaged?
 - Loss of jobs (commercial property is demo-ed)
 - Not enough low-income options, need more than 20%
 - Neighbors liked status quo—viewshed
 - On-street parking users increase
 - Schools, increased students, need for services
 - Impacts/processes that concern?
 - Discussion about whether this development will really result in less cars and trips
 - Why don’t development impact fees include schools?
 - City build relationship with new residents to understand cultural and community expectations and norms
 - Continuity of community integration and values
- Scenario 2
 - Winners?
 - Developer
 - Families (higher income)
 - Schools and city receive additional property taxes
 - Existing community may receive additional services... sidewalks, bus stop/route, commercial properties and business in future
 - Overall benefit to housing needs in area
 - Pull demand from elsewhere in city
 - Disadvantaged?

- Equestrians, folks who want a more rural feel
 - Commuters increased traffic
 - Increased class size
 - Median and low-income families can't afford
 - Seniors on fixed income
 - Wildlife displaced
 - Impacts/processes concerns?
 - Piece-meal development
 - Walkability, corridors for people and wildlife
 - Proactive planning in existing community to define vision and create vibrant spaces, Harris Ranch v. west Boise
 - Zoning changes before development
 - Proposals lead to direct and guide community
 - Centers (create vibrant places)
 - City needs to work to empower and inform conversations in community for visioning and proactive planning
 - Local developer or outside state?
- Scenario 3
 - Winners?
 - New residents from out of state
 - High income earners and families
 - Contractors/developers
 - Students in schools better PTA and support
 - Current residents, enhanced property value and services, amenities
 - Realtors
 - Disadvantaged?
 - "Wave" of development profile
 - Dense urban → suburban → rural doesn't serve changing demographics and growth
 - Low-income families get pushed out farther
 - City is required to extend services (EMTs, roads, sewer, etc.)
 - Requires extended maintenance needs
 - Existing residents are marginalized
 - No mix of socio-demographics
 - Doesn't develop vibrant and integrated engaged communities
 - Commuters
 - Wildlife and "trespassing" recreationists
 - Loss of access to open space
 - Impacts and process concerns?
 - Need to actively plan for the area
 - Not offering a mix of homes and options for diverse housing opportunities
 - Where are smaller sq. ft. homes?
 - Not a "complete" neighborhood
 - Forces commuting—air quality, noise
 - Need a welcome package to communicate "Boise nice", foster cultural features (festivals, etc.) to draw folks out of houses to develop and maintain cultural cohesiveness

- Lack of cooperation between municipalities to plan for comprehensive communities
- Elitism isn't Boise (but it is...).

Table 10

- Scenario 1
 - Benefit
 - Depends on how the 20/10% is dispersed
 - Property owner = collecting rent
 - Tenants = housing
 - City = Added lots more people into space
 - Increased property taxes from dev.
 - Helping below to median
 - HUD program = place to house tenants
 - Negatives
 - Parking is a big issue
 - Bike lanes = safe routes of trans.
 - Public transit
 - Disadvantaged
 - More info requested
 - Zoned?
 - Location?
 - Neighbors—parking, guest parking, increased traffic, congestion
 - Homeowners—concerned with decreased value—nest egg really important
 - Schools
 - Service providers—hospital, fire, etc.
 - Pet friendly
 - How are new schools funded? Development fees?
 - Top concerns
 - Design—does it fit the neighborhood
 - No ugly
 - Traffic
 - Transportation to surrounding neighborhoods
 - No amenities
 - Laundry, daycare, rec center, workout, kids and adults, no green space, people hanging in the street
 - Transient aspect with apartments, not as much pride of ownership
 - Bikeability
 - Bike-friendly, safe
 - Appeal to bike/walk community
 - Mom and pop shops—integrating
 - Open space!
- Scenario 2
 - Who benefits?
 - Future residents
 - More housing

- Renting—moving to owning
 - Not as dense—more housing availability
 - Quiet environment
 - Schools aren't at capacity
 - Increased property taxes
 - Developer owned and benefit, good for farmer = \$
 - Subsidies
 - Renters/owners who received
 - Who doesn't win
 - Amenities—parking
 - If not in place pushes problems into neighboring areas
 - Lack of subsidies/affordability
 - Lack of income diversity
 - Existing homeowners
 - Seeing neighborhood change
 - Originally bought for that “semi-rural” feel
 - Loss of farmland
 - Traffic
 - Environment—losing open space
 - Traffic
 - Loss
 - Loss of farms—farm-to-table
 - Local food production
 - Biggest impact/concern
 - Affordability
 - Compatibility with neighborhood—look/fit in, neighborhood opposition
 - Traffic
 - Lack of “community feel”
 - No one pays attention, each person has his/her own kingdom
 - Harris Ranch
 - Strain on existing services—emergency services
 - Lack of unique Boise feel, “Spirit of Boise”
- Scenario 3
 - Who wins
 - Developer—builders and architects
 - Out of state
 - Home buyers
 - Brings in people with income = jobs, businesses
 - Tax revenue
 - The City of Boise
 - Retirees/moving from out of state
 - Wealthy
 - Loses
 - Environmentalists
 - Lack of density
 - Taxpayers—doesn't cover everything
 - Schools

- Lack of affordability
 - Multi-unit
 - Loss of spirit of Boise, want to change Boise
 - Lack of assoc. amenities
 - Zoned to allow amenities to develop with it
 - Concerns
 - Nothing—as a neighbor—would bring values up
 - Don't lose safe feel, crime
 - Lack of mixed use
 - Post office, restaurant, housing, biking, hiking
 - “Gated community” feel
 - Totally car-dependent, impacts everyone along the way
 - Environmental pollution
 - Lack of public transit
 - Wildfires—environmental
 - Affordability
 - Community doesn't need to be affordable to all, can't make everyone happy, freedom of developers
- Things to add to scenarios
 - Walkability scores
 - How they are considered in the comp. plan
 - Taxes/impact fees
 - Who pays? Schools
 - Segregation: low-income/ wealthy
 - How does the transportation master plan fit in? ACHD

Table 11

- Scenario 1
 - Who benefits:
 - Developers
 - Owners of rental properties
 - Property taxes (city)
 - Local businesses
 - Economic benefit
 - Renters can get into decent area
 - Community living (urban)
 - Good transition between renting and buying
 - Affordable housing
 - Disadvantaged
 - Over-density
 - Saturation
 - High impact on schools
 - Lack of social equity (not enough low income)
 - Home buyers not able to get into neighborhood
 - Decrease multi-modal of neighborhood (bike/walk)
 - Safety (more people/more risk)
 - What is target audience for low income

- Doesn't fit neighborhood
 - Other impact/concerns
 - More complexes
 - Fear don't know
 - School—overcrowding/funding
 - Taxes/using of taxes
 - Sustainable
 - Neighborhood culture
 - Mixed use housing (restaurants/houses/stores)
 - Need more parks'
- Scenario 2
 - Benefits
 - Upgrades neighborhood
 - Increase property value
 - Cultural mindset
 - Increase revenue local economy
 - Less intrusive—more neighborhood feel
 - Schools will benefit
 - Positive use of space with growth
 - Creating space for people
 - New home owner opportunity
 - Disadvantages
 - Suburbia
 - Community identification
 - Lose Boise identity
 - HOA restrictive cultural
 - Individuality lacking—sterile
 - Increase traffic problems
 - Car-dependent
 - Environment disappears
 - Lack infrastructure
 - Not addressing main housing needs
 - Social equity
 - Historical/cultural preservation
 - Other impacts/concerns
 - Not walkable
 - Some okay but not all like this
 - Missing commercial space—mixed-use neighborhood
 - Encourages car culture
 - City role in developing culture of new areas
 - Worry of encroachment on foothills
 - Losing small town feel
 - Need parks/preservation space
 - Not enough smaller space for purchase
 - City planning 1st—housing development 2nd
 - Collaborate sprawl with neighbor towns
 - More transportation options needed
 - Less market driven development

- Water needs
 - Scenario 3
 - Benefits
 - Move higher income folk out of way
 - Free up space in urban areas
 - Brings \$ to economy
 - Helps with annual housing needs – 10%
 - Help equalize density in core
 - Beautification of area—parks, water features
 - Schools with more students
 - Disadvantages
 - Lacks diversity
 - Losing foothills—open space
 - Infrastructure—roads/stores/etc
 - Air pollution
 - Drive times
 - Congestion
 - Concrete/cement—lack of beautification
 - Drive market too high
 - Not multi-use—boring
 - What happens if economy busts
 - Other impacts/concerns
 - Loss of habitat
 - Water needs
 - City role in preservation
 - Capacity
 - City vs state authority (streets)
 - Consideration for smart growth (mixed-use space)
 - ‘small city feel’ threatened
 - Transportation options
 - Air quality (increase in cars and time)
 - Out of state developers—doesn’t consider culture only \$\$\$
 - Higher impact on resources (hospitals, etc)
 - Farming not possible

Table 12 & 13

- Scenario 1
 - Benefits
 - Helps prevent urban sprawl (people who want to prevent sprawl)
 - “would love to see ‘micro units’”
 - New residential benefit
 - Open space preservation (higher density)
 - Businesses (downtown)
 - Job density—wages
 - Disadvantages
 - People who want the view
 - Traffic concerns

- Current residents can't afford (as opposed to new)
 - Neighbors are "disadvantaged"
 - Will wages increase?
 - Other impact/concerns
 - Need to see the space (case by case)
 - Are the city law/code "strict enough" to support affordability, higher density
 - Need to have government subsidy to generate affordability
 - Need to buy open space
 - City has to have the role of protecting open space
 - print literature for pros and cons, City to educate residents
- Scenario 2
 - Benefits
 - Higher density (prevents sprawl)
 - Landowners/developer right to build
 - Service businesses
 - Focus on micro-communities on the edge
 - Car owners/drivers, median and above
 - Disadvantages
 - Lower income residents
 - People who want to preserve farmland/open spaces
 - People who prevent/fear change
 - Traffic implications
 - Just houses... it's not walkable
 - Need many modes of transportation
 - People focused transport
 - Will downtown be too much focus
 - Lusk Street example
 - Less cultural preservation
 - Take downtown model to communities (amenities like Bown Crossing)
 - Gathering places
 - Other impacts/concerns
 - Need to buy farmland to keep it open
 - Need a bus system
 - City role to work with other agencies
 - Need commercial pockets for walkable neighborhoods
 - Micro-communities
 - "make communities not just houses"
 - Shuttles from micro-communities to downtown
 - Sturdy communities with integrated services
 - Keep historic vibe, but update buildings
 - Cultural implications of working from home
 - More safe
 - Commercial spaces
 - Micro breaks
 - Public spaces
 - Accessible/welcoming
- Scenario 3

- Benefits
 - Owner of property
 - High-income residents
 - Meeting housing demand (for a portion of residents)
 - Remote workers/retirees
 - Families who “play in the streets”
 - Private property rights advocates
 - Idea: bring developers and other stakeholders together for conversations like these. Outside a real case.
- Disadvantages
 - Invasive species potential
 - Wildlife/habitat loss
 - Water sustainability
 - Local food sustainability
 - Open space—quality of life
 - Low-income earners
 - River accessibility/impact?
 - Help neighbors rally to buy it
 - Hit home to “private property rights
 - Show examples of higher density and quality of life—education
 - Avoid “projects”
 - Scale has to fit size of city
- Other concerns
 - How to engage state/gov for subsidies
 - Require developers to include “corner environment
 - Zoning for mix use—city partnership
 - Change city policy/code to include more dev options (rather than just subdivision)
 - Private/public interest
 - Are we building the right size
 - Cultural shift—how to bring it about—education—belonging
 - Marketing the sense of community
 - Concept of a “home” may need to change
 - Higher density in city

Table X

- Scenario 1
 - Benefit
 - Developer
 - People that need lower income housing
 - People that want to live there
 - Lost: opportunity for more people to live in a neighborhood
 - Disadvantaged
 - Adjacent neighbors
 - Views—bldgs vs. foothills
 - Aesthetics—not matching existing neighborhoods
 - On-street parking

- Oppose—neighbors
 - Height
 - Property value
 - Privacy
 - Gain/maintained
 - Existing building repurposed
 - Concerns/impact
 - Schools—absorb more kids
 - Crime rate increase with apartments
 - Walkability/bikeability increase
 - Positive
 - Extremely important to have this no matter what neighborhood
 - Accessibility to essentials without having to drive
 - Are impact fees being used for what they're intended for?
 - Enough sewer, water, roads for transportation
 - Can you incentivize not having a car?
 - Limited parking does this
 - Increased diversity
 - Positive
 - Increased property taxes on that piece of property
 - (54% not taxed, univ., city, church)
 - Environment
 - Development should incorporate open space/parks in development
 - Culture
 - Is existing building worth saving
 - Like the idea of incorporating multi-family housing in neighborhood of single families
 - Integrated community
 - Everyone part of comm./neighborhood
 - Support for mixed income apartments but don't believe possible or developers will do it
- Scenario 2
 - Who benefits?
 - Developer
 - Neighbors—reduced mice
 - Property owner/seller
 - City—infill development; tax base
 - People that want to live there (and can afford)
 - Families—schools adequate
 - Disadvantaged
 - People with limited transportation access
 - Surrounding neighborhood
 - Traffic/congestion
 - Impacts/concerns
 - Does configuration change and have benefits
 - Can't force people into apartments
 - Social amenities

- Greater demand for parks, store, etc.
 - Way of living that has been is changing—could push people out
 - Make sure there are additional parks
 - Impact fee enforcement
 - Make sure infrastructure is in place
 - More vehicles/people without transit and bike infrastructure
 - Developer
 - Will project actually happen after land is bought and project conceived?
 - Assurance that impact fees go to bike and transit
 - Bike infrastructure cost to maintain
 - Add diversity (people, housing)
 - Community
 - Will commercial/retail be included?
 - Environment
 - AQ—more vehicle trips
 - Reduced by commercial and retail if included
 - Increased garbage, environmental impact of more people
 - Land converted to housing
 - Water use (increased with larger lots)
 - Could be higher density
 - Positive and negative
 - Potential underuse of property... possible for greater density
- Scenario 3
 - Who benefits?
 - Developer
 - High income residents
 - City of Boise—need for housing, tax base
 - Who is disadvantaged?
 - Other taxpayers—shifting burden to lower incomes
 - Existing neighbors
 - Impacts/concerns
 - Mill levy—who sets
 - Same tax base as other scenarios?
 - Loss of open space
 - Watershed impact
 - Light pollution
 - Expanded infrastructure
 - Would like lawns to be xeriscape/low water and fire wise
 - Transportation—everyone car-dependent
 - Impact extends because increased cares and miles
 - Property owner:
 - Less incentive to reflect community values
 - Want developer to build energy efficient homes
 - Tie to environmental comm.
 - Loss of open space
 - Recycle water
 - Parks

- Developer should connect to existing trails/foothills
- City: want to see more things required
 - Update code if needed
- Sunset development if they wait too long to construct

Table Y

- Scenario 1
 - Who benefits
 - Developer
 - Investors (hot rental market)
 - Residents who couldn't otherwise afford
 - Local
 - Current neighborhood—diversity
 - Loss—affordable housing
 - Transit system
 - Disadvantaged
 - Close neighbors
 - Schools
 - Pets!
 - Less family-friendly
 - Less neighbor engagement (rental)
 - Difficult for renters – fit in?
 - Property values—upward pressure
 - Disadvantage of gentrification
 - Other neighbors—parking
 - Other concerns/impact
 - Hard to define environmental impact
 - Social disruption, changes in neighborhood
 - Can kids walk to school?
 - Need info on connectivity within units and without
 - What about green space—pets?
 - Need pre-application info on line
 - Need adj. neighborhood association input
 - Broader notification
- Scenario 2
 - Who benefits
 - Developer
 - Tax base increase
 - Families wanting to buy homes
 - Supply and demand
 - Increased stock
 - School district
 - Neighbors (property values increase)
 - Infrastructure, schools
 - Future transit system
 - General benefit of growth—restaurants, activities in the area
 - Disadvantages

- Infrastructure costs
 - Traffic
 - Doesn't add to bike facilities
 - May never transform area
 - No walkability or livability
 - Loss of local farmland
 - Other concerns/impacts
 - Lack of cohesive planning/development
 - Failure to implement vision of Blueprint Boise in zoning ordinance/teeth
 - Can plan for town houses but rental—not purchased: loophole for developers
 - Displacing habitat
 - Environmental—encourages driving
 - Cultural changes
 - Photo-front loaded garages
 - Connectivity? Internal and external (traffic flow)
- Scenario 3
 - Benefits
 - Small number of higher income folks
 - Potential flexibility—
 - Large parcels, could encourage small farms, etc.
 - Can plan more—new area
 - Increased tax base
 - Developer (+ finance, etc.)
 - Land owner
 - Schools?
 - Other areas?
 - Don't want development
 - Disadvantages
 - Loss of farmland
 - Wildland interface, increased fires
 - Habitat
 - Isolation for all
 - Economic
 - Political
 - Physical
 - Geographical
 - Is there enough water?
 - Rural character decrease
 - Downstream communities (drive through)
 - Police/Fire
 - Drive times, response times, adverse impact to costs
 - Health care capacity (in all scenarios)
 - Higher cost for roads (per citizen)
 - Adverse impact to all citizens—less open space, nature
 - Other concerns/impacts
 - No regional planning (no effective regional planning—integration)
 - State v local control

- Limit of city authority to mandate amenities
- Give more than lip service to Blueprint Boise!
- Additional info
 - Details on what is allowed
 - Amenities to community as whole?
- Appointments to advisory groups available to more/broader group of citizens
 - Don't stack!
- True integration of plans
- Higher visibility of existing plans and timely (public education)
- Is this effort sincere, or is it lip service?