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
  • Current residents—traffic, noise level
    • Increased traffic for all
    • School impacts
    • Potential for development to go into disrepair (blight for neighborhood)
      o Need rules to avoid these neg. consequences
  • 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
  • Developer/builder
    • 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

  • Scenario 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
- Developer
- Construction industry—plumbers, electricians, etc.
- New wealthy residents
  - Taxpayers
  - Need to fund public safety (police/fire)
  - Worse traffic impact
  - Services to less dense development cost more per resident
  - 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
- 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

● How does Blueprint Boise come in?
  • Big education opportunity
  • Is this readily available

Table 5
● Scenario 1
  o Positives
    ▪ Residents of apartment, lower income
    ▪ City—fees, infrastructure
    ▪ Local businesses
    ▪ Public transit helps with density
    ▪ Employers-employees
    ▪ Repurpose property
    ▪ Mixed income, like balance
  o Negatives
    ▪ Parking available
      • Street
    ▪ Impacts on housing increase $
    ▪ Permanent rental class
  o 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.

Scenario 1

Who will benefit?

Entire community

Mixed income

Developer
- Embraces all income/culture
  - Who is disadvantaged?
    - 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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

  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
• Scenario 3
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o Disadvantages
    ▪ People who want the view
    ▪ Traffic concerns
• Current residents can’t afford (as opposed to new)
• Neighbors are “disadvantaged”
• Will wages increase?
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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?
        o 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
    o Integrated community
    o Everyone part of comm./neighborhood
  • Support for mixed income apartments but don’t believe possible or developers will do it
• Scenario 2
  o 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
  o Disadvantaged
    • People with limited transportation access
    • Surrounding neighborhood
      • Traffic/congestion
  o 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
  o Who benefits?
    ▪ Developer
    ▪ High income residents
    ▪ City of Boise—need for housing, tax base
  o Who is disadvantaged?
    ▪ Other taxpayers—shifting burden to lower incomes
    ▪ Existing neighbors
  o 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/fothills
- 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

  o 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?