Community Conversations on Growth #2
August 28, 2018
Timberline High School

Table 1
- Scenario 1
  - Who benefits?
    - Tenants
    - Local employers/nearby businesses
    - Developers
    - Service workers downtown
    - Students
    - Defeat sprawl/infill
    - Safety
    - More units = below market rate
    - Less units = higher than market rate
    - New residents who need temporary place
    - Improve traffic = i.e. Connector
    - Air quality
  - Who loses?
    - Adjacent property owners
    - Doesn't fit neighborhood character
    - Where is the demand—single individuals or families
    - Schools
    - More traffic
    - Long-standing neighbors
    - Number of units insufficient for affordable housing
  - Concerns
    - Design
    - High rent
    - Impact on character of neighborhood
    - Additional traffic on capped infrastructure
    - Parking
    - Potential impact: type of neighborhood engagement from developer
- Scenario 2
  - Who wins?
    - Potential buyers
    - Schools
    - Developer
    - Local tax distrcts
    - Construction trades
    - City—fits with Blueprint
    - Nearby businesses
    - Median income population
    - Banks and lenders

- Potential increase in businesses
    - Who loses?
        - Commuters
        - Neighbors
        - Wildlife/habitat
        - Environmental costs/impact
        - Low income renters/purchasers
        - People who eat—loss of farmland
        - Farmers
        - Kids—walking/biking to activities is challenging
    - Concerns
        - Bike/pedestrian infrastructure lacking
        - Housing costs
        - View shed/loss of open space
        - Traffic
        - Schools could overcrowd over time
        - Gentrification
        - Lacking infrastructure
            - Unsafe bike/walk routes
- Scenario 3
    - Who wins?
        - Developer
        - Buyers
        - ACHD employees
        - Land owner
        - City—tax revenue generation
        - Schools
        - Nearest grocery store
        - Commercial developers and businesses
    - Who loses?
        - Taxpayer
        - Wild life
        - Environmentalists
        - Local farmers, CSAs, people who eat
        - City loses because of size of development
        - Existing neighbors—out of state developer does[n't] know neighbors or neighborhood character
        - Environment and anyone who depends on it
    - Concerns
        - Transit
        - Environment
        - Demand of people living that far out at that price point—"not Boise lifestyle"
        - Sense of place
        - Connectivity
        - Hope that city encourages development to fit within Blueprint
        - City's role
            - Require mixed-income units—housing type and price points
            - Inform and educate public on public process

- Expectation management for forecasted growth
  - Will new iteration of Blueprint Boise be heavily influenced by developers?
    - Concern that director of planning department is a developer

Table 2
- Scenario 1
  - Who benefits
    - Developer
    - 20% below median income
    - Local businesses—restaurants, stores, etc.
      - Nightlife
    - New residents—looking for housing
    - Employees looking for short commute
    - Those interested in walkable/bikeable lifestyle
    - Wouldn't gain affordable
    - Someone else's commute would be longer
    - Blight
    - Miss opportunity for diversity in economic groups (families)
    - Developer may leave
    - Do you want development in the core, or sprawl
  - Who is disadvantaged?
    - Overcrowded schools
      - New residents will pay property tax
    - Existing residents' lifestyle impacted
      - Views
      - Parking
      - More traffic
    - Teachers—overcrowded classrooms
    - Less ownership opportunities
  - Impacts or process
    - Developer has rights. NIMBYs
    - Keeping development as close to what it was presented to be in the beginning (not downgrading)
- Scenario 2
  - Who benefits?
    - Is it compatible?
    - Smaller footprint—next to large lots
    - 0 compliment
      - Animal wastes stink
    - Developer
    - Improved tax base
    - Upper income and some median income housing, 10 rentals not significant
    - Construction jobs—lawn companies
  - Who is disadvantaged?
    - Everyone living downstream—those who live and those who drive
    - Low income
    - Everyone for decreased air quality

- - - Wildlife and wild life corridors
    - Conflicting cultures
    - Loss of open space for existing residents
  - What's missing
    - Bodega and a park
    - A community—other uses than a place to sleep
  - Impacts
    - Sprawl
    - Aesthetically pleasing
    - Is the grocery large enough?
    - City's role: go by the rules. Follow the plan. Infrastructure needs to be in place—concurrency
      - Notice more than 300'—increase to ¼ mile
- Scenario 3
  - Who benefits?
    - Developer
    - Wealthy/higher income families
    - Out of state owner
    - New residents
  - Who is disadvantaged?
    - Loss of farmland
    - Aquifer recharge
    - Wildlife
    - People living downstream
    - All property tax payers—have to maintain fire station for a small group of residents
  - Process
    - If development fits in the existing plan—okay
    - City's role
      - Big picture view to balance the plan
      - High density—isolated that will require a disproportionate share of taxes to maintain
      - Fire wise
    - Sprawl is a mistake
    - City needs to define the density in certain areas and stick to it
    - Review process needs to show how it fits with Blueprint Boise (too vague)
    - Who needs large houses?
    - Fire wise

Table 3
- Scenario 1
  - Who will benefit?
    - The developer
    - 160 homeowners
    - Increased tax base for amenities
    - Aesthetics for neighborhood improve
    - Benefit to people who may have been displaced elsewhere

- Diversity in neighborhood
- Others who have homes, cost decrease
  - o Disadvantaged?
    - Could impact value of homes negatively
    - Traffic
    - Schools have no room
    - Could impact parking
  - o Who opposes?
    - Current nearby homeowners
      - Older, established
  - o Concerns about process
    - New development needs to "fit" the neighborhood
    - Incorporating parks and open spaces
    - Fairness of the process
    - Neighbors/potential homeowners need to be informed on what could happen in neighborhood
    - Need for a plan—but plan should be implemented
      - What are plan's priorities
    - Brining affordable housing to market
    - Priority placed on including affordable housing options
    - Potential lack of understanding about affordable housing
  - o Traffic
    - Depends on infrastructure around it
    - Would rather promote short trips
    - Supports transit options
    - Focus on mixed-use neighborhoods
      - Shops, grocery
- Scenario 2
  - o Who benefits?
    - Schools
    - People who need a home
    - Owners of farm land nearby
  - o Who loses?
    - People without neighborhood associations
    - Increase in traffic
    - Increase in pollution—neighbors
    - Kuna and Meridian (jk)
    - Who would oppose?
      - People concerned with loss of open space
  - o Concerns
    - Parking—where find it?
    - Protecting open space—rural feeling
    - People have to drive farther
    - If project doesn't go through?
      - Loss of homes
      - This kind of mixed-use brings diversity (of home type)
    - Question: who is forgotten or ignored

- None of it is "affordable"—below median income
  - Concern: do planners account for water resources near a development?
    - Concern with developments:
      - Fire-wise landscaping
      - Water resources
      - Better infrastructure/roads as more people commute in and out of Boise
    - The process
      - Want direct interaction with developer (not spokesperson etc.), face to face
    - Transit
      - This development doesn't support mass transit
      - No bike lanes
        - Developers should make bike likes a priority
      - Negative impacts on environment
- Scenario 3
  - First thoughts:
    - Sprawl
    - Fire potential
    - Not affordable
    - Concern about water usage
    - Traffic and transportation issues
      - No stores etc.
  - Who benefits?
    - Developer
    - Schools
    - People moving here who can afford these homes
    - Property owner
  - Who loses?
    - Taxpayers
    - Firefighters/increased need due to development
    - People who appreciate open space
    - Wildlife in the area
    - Concerns:
      - Incorporation of parks, places to play
      - Loss of access to foothills/open space
  - Who opposes:
    - Environmental groups
  - Question: how change character of city?
    - Taking on sprawl
    - Creates community disconnect
    - Changes landscape (foothills)
    - Increases traffic and pollution
  - Question: who is most likely to advocate:
    - The developer
    - People from a "certain state"
    - Potentially the county
  - What you want to know about developer?
    - Want local connection

- How plan relates to what's actually done?
- Have they built in Boise before?
- Where else would they build if they don't build this?
- Sustainable? Eco-friendly?
- Overall concerns
  - People are moving here and we need to create smart housing options
  - Transportation access for areas/developments on city fringes
  - Provide housing options for workforce in Boise
  - Not just meeting the minimum—need overstock of housing
    - 1,000 is lowball number, need more like 2,000 houses
  - Need variety (mixed-use, varying prices)
  - Adding in-law quarters, auxiliary units
  - Rules around energy efficiency, sustainability
  - Type of landscaping allowed/concern for fire-wise planning
  - Trash/waste created by increase in residents
  - Concern for light pollution, noise

Table 4
- Scenario 1
  - Negatives/concerns
    - Height of building
    - Feels like more profit for developer than residents
    - Increased traffic, not enough parking
    - Limited school capacity, impact fees don't cover
    - Not an opportunity for long-term investment—other cities provide co-op purchase options
    - Aesthetics are crucial—to fit with neighborhood, effort must be made to match style (would gain more support)
  - Positives
    - Being in town instead of adding to sprawl
    - Brings ED—more business, retail, etc.
    - Fringe renter who wants to live closer in heart of city
    - If it was a mix of co-op ownership and rental
  - Opposition
    - Neighbors—doesn't fit
- Scenario 2
  - Positive
    - Feels like a better fit in neighborhood
    - More density could lead to better/more bus options
    - High-density in this neighborhood impacts only 3-4 houses vs. other areas (ex. NE) where 30 houses may be impacted
  - Negatives/concerns
    - Too much, if less units would get more support
    - Will it obstruct views? If not, more receptive
    - Loss of open space is more impactful (higher density makes more sense in higher-density area)
    - Parking—lack of space
    - Higher emissions with more vehicle use

- Already been so much growth, don't want more as resident in neighborhood, put on fringes
  - o Expectation
    - People expect similar style development to be clustered (ex: subdivisions and more)
  - o City role
    - Really stick to plans/codes
    - Space out neighborhoods
    - Guarantee green space/park space
    - Infrastructure needs to be in place prior to high0density projects (roads, public transportation)
    - Expanded bus service—should be priority (over libraries and other amenities)
      - Park and rides
      - Regional transit plan
  - o Location matters—bus stop, proximity to commerce, etc.
- Scenario 3
  - o Negatives/concerns
    - This makes problem worse, more sprawl, more cost
    - More difficult to do infill down the road, when such large lot sized
    - Would need more amenities out in these areas so livable/connected
    - Not affordable
  - o Positives
    - Higher-end homes increase tax base as well (so don't lose to other cities)
  - o City role
    - Incentivize/encourage denser development in closer radius to downtown
  - o Comment
    - To preserve open space, need more dense development
  - o Impact
    - View shed reduction
    - Agriculture/farmland decreased
    - More congestion
    - Less air quality
    - Water quality, building where water absorbed, etc.
- Final thoughts
  - o Growth ok, but want it in smaller components
  - o Mixed-development/mixed-use is important
  - o Should be a "phasing-out" of density—more density closer in, less farther out
  - o Scenario 2 and 3—skipped low income, need that too!

Table 10
- Scenario 1
  - o Benefits
    - Lower income
    - Doesn't hurt neighborhood
    - Developer
    - Good use of land
    - Eliminates sprawl
    - Consolidated city services

- Lowers overall rent market (more inventory)
- Sense of community
- City impact fees benefit area
- Disadvantages
  - Traffic/congestion
  - Impact on schools (overcrowded)
  - Lower income—different vibe to family neighborhood
    - Safety
  - No disadvantages!
- Impacts
  - Overall rents and housing costs decrease
  - Traffic into neighborhoods
    - Family safety issues
  - Safety issues—aggravated drivers
  - Loss of quality of life
  - City needs to education neighborhoods better on projects
- Scenario 2
  - Benefits
    - Innovative solutions (more people encourages the need)
    - Affordable housing
    - Schools have capacity
    - Good use of land
    - Neighborhood amenities (parks)
    - Impact fees benefit area
    - Area transition
    - Provide opportunity for families
    - Improved cleaned stormwater
    - Eventually lead to better transportation services
    - Idaho Solutions
      - Local developer
  - Disadvantages
    - Not enough affordable housing
    - Lack of transportation (multi-modal)
    - Access to amenities (Greenbelt)
    - Loss of open space/farmland
    - Doesn't fit neighborhood
    - Water needs
    - Impacts on environment from houses/yards etc.
    - Need: +- city amenities needed out in this area
    - Climate change impacts (less available resources)
  - Bigger processes
    - Using inside city land (+)
    - Increasing cars on road
    - Widening of roads—better infrastructure (+)
    - Eventually need more schools
    - Eventual lower rental market (+)
    - Not enough low income
    - More resources available for expanding schools (+) and other city amenities

- Scenario 3
    - Benefits
        - Master planned community (parks, schools, open space)
        - More organized
        - Enough tax base to pay for needs
        - New schools
        - Open space—new amenities
        - Highly educated work force
            - Young professional families
            - Stimulate local economy
        - Community feel
        - Less urban congestion
        - Coherent growth (Blueprint Boise can help control infrastructure needs)
    - Disadvantages/processes:
        - Impact to wild areas—wildlife movement
        - Access to foothills
        - Water needs
        - Downstream water quality
        - Less agriculture/space
        - Lack of affordability
        - Infrastructure needs/traffic increased
        - Not realistic of current projects
- Overall thoughts:
    - Federal law requirements—Fair Laws
    - Affordable housing needed across all neighborhoods
    - Spread equity around/diversity needs
    - Also need high quality homes across neighborhoods (better environmental features)
    - Encouraged rehab projects/bring new life back to areas of need
    - Innovation!
    - Equity diversity needed

Table 11
- Scenario 1
    - Benefits
        - Lower income availability near downtown
        - Density near downtown
        - Jobs
        - People who work downtown
        - Walkable/bikeable interest—bike access
        - Generally good for traffic, fewer minutes on the road
        - Benefits for ADA needs
        - More units overall is a benefit
        - Vibrant neighborhoods
        - People near transportation
        - Part of plan
        - Lower environment impact
        - Already planned/zoned in this way
        - Paying impact fees

- - - Mix is good for neighborhood character
        - Affordability for young families
        - Prevent sprawl
        - Infrastructure efficiencies
      - Disadvantages
        - Need for inventory
        - School capacity
        - Neighbors concerned about property value (NIMBY)
          - More traffic
        - Is it affordable for "younger" people
      - Other concern/impacts
        - Partnering between P&Z and neighborhood
        - Transition options for size impact
        - Sprawl vs density
        - Will people just go to other cities
        - Easier to develop in Meridian (2x, 3x more permits)
        - Jobs close to core and housing
        - Longer we put this off, the harder it gets
        - Aesthetics of the project (parking)—inadequate
- Scenario 2
  - Benefits
    - Variety of sizes
    - Pays their impact fees
    - Lower cost to developers (land $)
    - In line with the plan
    - More ownership in the neighborhood
      - New residents
      - Want a new house
    - Commuters (used to have 1 hr)
  - Disadvantages
    - Large houses
    - Low parking availability if there is no buss access (1 site)
    - Loss of farmland—can there be a requirement for open space development?
    - Surrounding neighbors concerns
    - Not walkable/small town feel
    - Traffic increases, housing not near transport
    - Development following "path of least resistance"
    - Was there ongoing conversation along the way?
  - Other concerns
    - On street parking?
    - Is there a gov/developer partnership on mass transit?
    - Design
    - Density—farmland preservation is best done on planning level/infrastructure
    - Make it easy for people to get information
    - Need to continue parks focus and enhancement
    - Incentive zoning options
      - For affordable housing
    - Mixed use areas are important

- Simplify planning docs for laymen's terms
- "Change the rules"—transparency about why
- Is plan being followed
- "Care and feeding" of neighborhood plans
  - Change/stability
- "Small town feel" is not incompatible with density
- Scenario 3
  - Benefits
    - Property owner
    - May lead to more "usable" open space (develop park)
    - Meets demand for buyers in this category
  - Disadvantages
    - Need to be willing to buy and manage open space
    - Not dense enough for development in city
    - Distance from public transport
    - Traffic/congestion—air pollution
    - No commercial development
    - Neighborhoods not just houses
    - "Mono-culture"
  - Other concerns
    - Survey residents who were concerned in the future
    - Is zoning followed, lawsuit?
    - No partnership
    - All open space is not created equally—view/area
    - How do we define the area of impact. Urban/rural
    - Can green areas be added
    - Need to look at the impact fees
    - Density in the growth area
    - Promoting mixed income at inception
    - Is there an overall plan for the area? Otherwise we just get what market drives
    - Invest more in planning—don't leave it up to developer
    - Getting different people involved
      - Get the renters to show up
    - City partnering with developers
    - Hard city to do business in as a developer
    - Need thoughtfully developed master plan that is followed
      - Biking and greenbelt preservation
      - Follow it
      - Predictability—residents trust in system/process
    - Inform/educate
      - Neighborhood associations/groups/etc.
    - Pre-application notifications
- Final key points
  - Public transit—busses (not rail)
  - Active lifestyle—focus on safe bike transit
  - Follow the plan
  - Keen engaging community like this (have concerns to address)

- o Focus on fundamentals instead of prestige projects (not flashy)
- o Invest in ongoing continual neighborhood planning
- o Sustainability of resources/lifestyle (didn't feel like we got into this enough)

Table 12
- Scenario 1
  - o Benefits
    - Developer
    - Local businesses
    - Renters
    - People from out of area who can afford
    - Housing (respond to demand)
      - Incl. affordability
      - Accessible (trans.)
    - Infill—maximizing existing developed property
    - People without access to car
  - o Disadvantaged
    - Who
      - Homes that lose views
      - Existing families with kids in school/students
      - Existing residents
        - o Increased traffic
        - o Noise
    - Oppose
      - Existing residents
  - o Concerns/opportunities
    - Traffic: high density—shorter, fewer car trips
      - Option for alternative transit
    - Diversity: increased access to this neighborhood for more people
    - Parking
      - Underparked? Increased street parking
    - Cultural: benefit of nice apartment versus vacant building
    - Access from neighborhood to Greenbelt/foothills
    - How do job types coming to Boise change types of housing? Concern: gentrification.
    - Avoid development in undeveloped land
    - Environment:
      - AQ[?]—number/length of car trips
      - Energy—more efficient type of use/construction
    - City role: how do you keep Boise authentic
      - Green space: what are park, outdoor activities
      - Provide housing options at a range of rent that supports citizens
      - Less uproar from neighbors with blend of housing type—mix good, allows community to avoid getting pushed out later
- Scenario 2
  - o Who benefits?
    - Developer

- Provides housing to support need—families, retirees (downsizing)—size, cost, schools
- People who want houses and space/lawn
  - o Disadvantaged
    - Farmers
      - People who eat/want local food
    - Existing neighbors
      - Aesthetic/fit to neighborhood
      - Traffic
    - Doesn't fill need for housing for median families
  - o Opportunities/concerns
    - Want people to be able to buy a house if they want
    - Character of neighborhood
      - Increased traffic/commute/in-out of neighborhood
      - Change in land use—wildlife impacts
      - Cookie cutter homes [don't want]
        - o Want difference
        - o Increases feeling sprawl
    - Wildlife—w/ open space going
    - Environmental
      - More cars, longer trips
      - Air quality
    - Parking—under parked/one garage
    - Transportation/traffic
      - Increased cars; longer trips
      - No local retail/commercial
      - More than double first one, because number of cars and lack of resources
    - Developer
      - More local retail/commercial to increase walkability
    - City
      - Increase public transportation (<10 minute wait)
      - Want city to prioritize infill and development from center/out
      - Sincere neighborhood meeting to start is very important
        - o Want to see development in context to surrounding neighborhood
      - Self-sufficient development
        - o Neighborhood level services and employment opportunities
      - Incentivize green building
        - o Fire wise/natives
        - o Low water use
        - o Energy efficiency
        - o Green space
      - What types of rec. amenities are included? [keep Boise authentic]
      - Can low0incomve housing happen without government subsidy
- Scenario 3
  - o Who benefits

- People who want to buy "level-up" housing. Opens existing (lower-priced) housing stock to others
- Developer
- Property owner
- Families with children/students—schools, parks
- Uber drivers
- Nearby gas station owner
- People who want large, more rural development
- Nearby property values
- City—property tax $$
  - o Disadvantaged
    - Tax payers—maybe
      - Increased taxes
      - Increased wear/tear on roads
    - People floating river—increased runoff
    - People who recreate/use foothills
    - Firefighters
    - Median Boise ind./family—not even touchable housing
  - o Concerns/opportunities
    - Wildlife
    - Wildland/urban interface—increased fire risk
    - Low water use development
      - Xeriscape
      - Policy considerations
    - Increased development away from river decreases available water (ground-river flow)
    - How do high water use developments on rest of city?
    - Transportation/traffic
      - Terrible
      - Carbon emissions/AQ
      - Highest impact vehicle trips
      - Increased trips and time
    - Developer
      - Want wildlife corridor guarantees
      - Nearest number of property owners
      - Notification distance should be different (0 is never okay)
    - City
      - Review inputs from 10 years ago—what concerns in development process
      - Policy—wildlife corridor
      - Transparency in impact fees and impact to tax payer
    - More inventory of housing—increases housing stability

Table 13
- Scenario 1
  - o Benefits
    - All residents—adding units to balance demand

- More diversity, income-based rents
- Attracts different types of families—those who can't afford single family home
- Developer
- Proximity to services—walkable/bikeable
- Bring restaurants, stores, etc. to downtown
- Those with below-median income
- Utilities—more customers, efficient infrastructure
  - Disadvantages
    - Neighbors—changes to neighborhood
    - Schools
    - "vertical cement"
    - If it brings housing values down
    - Traffic
    - Parking
    - Makes downtown congested
  - Concerns
    - Schools/kids—traffic, lots of people, hard to get around
    - Enough funding for schools for growth—early on
    - Infrastructure—road congestion, police, fire
    - Height—obstruct views, lack of privacy—hold developer accountable
    - Design is crucial
    - Noise pollution—hard on neighbors in old homes
    - Window glare, especially in the hills
      - "Do no harm"
    - Canals—access to water, sharing
    - More due diligence needed before approval
    - Need to fund more oversight
    - Need density for affordability, but want design to be good and concerns listened to
    - Placement is key
    - "Having a voice" in the process—not just hear but listen and accommodate—developers should be open to changes
- Scenario 2
  - Benefits
    - Developer—utilize investment
    - Business with drive through window
    - Existing residents—more density brings in businesses (e.g. Bown Crossing)
    - Employers—workers closer
    - Density could bring more transportation options
    - Clever way to do affordable housing—town houses
    - Hits "yard" and "no yard" people
  - Disadvantaged
    - Loose accessibility to local food (e.g. Peaceful Belly)
    - Loss of farmland
    - Systems issues—development near farmers impact them (runoff of herbicide)
    - But only 10 minutes from downtown—should farmland be there
    - Zoning—get annexed whether you want or not

- City needs to help—people who can't afford to get on city water, but required to
- Forcible annexation
- Benefits to go along with development
- Re-zoning
- Environmental impacts not reviewed well, especially with high-density
- Transit
  - Infrastructure
  - Buses
  - Driving habits
  - Pedestrian safety—roundabouts are bad
- "Cite something" city officials, please, not just "experts say"
- Feel condescended to by city staff
- "Treat people like people"
- Blueprint is old and doesn't actual zoning—it is hypocritical
- Amenities need to reflect community, evolve with community
- Want more neighborhood activity centers required to go along with new development—good for easing congestion, walkability
- Blanket rezoning on developers request
- Zone is law, not Blueprint Boise—don't match
- Bad data leads to bad decisions

Table 14
- Scenario 1
  - Who will benefit?
    - Existing renters
    - Those who can afford it/don't make $$$
    - Developer
    - Property owner
    - City/city services (fees)
    - Surrounding retail, grocery
    - Everyone = transportation accessibility
    - Diverse groups = community
    - People who need transitional housing
      - Young downtown professionals
    - Retirees who are downsizing
  - Disadvantaged
    - Homeowners who rent their home (landlords)
    - People who live there now
      - Longer travel time
      - Crowded schools
      - Views, outside
      - Parking—noise
      - Public services overloaded
      - Not as walkable
      - Property values
    - Impacts

- Integration with neighborhood culture?
- Transportation
- Air quality—solar, rooftop etc.
- Loss of green space
  - Does it remove/add walkability?
  - Preserve wildlife?
  - Allowing for this?
    - Filtration/water
- What was the original zoning?
- Missed opportunity?
- Understanding property rights
  - Education (everyone), friction lives in this topic
- Infrastructure and support
  - Will it keep up?
- Outreach to the neighborhood
  - Want confidence in builder
- Developers record for performance/compliance
  - Who handles long term management?
- Sustainability of building
  - How green will the apartments be?
- Scenario 2
  - Benefits
    - Schools with capacity
    - Developer
      - New workers (construction) and jobs
        - Maintain homes, grounds etc.
    - City advocate for development
      - Middle/high end employers
        - Engineers
        - Not dishwashers
    - Without this = more sprawl
      - Unplanned
      - Risk of
    - People moving in—median income price resi's
    - People = diversity = $ spending
    - All new residents together
    - Easier to provide services to defined group (efficiency/compact)
  - Disadvantaged
    - Existing community who value rural environment
    - Service industry/lower income
    - Farmers (new)
    - Environment
      - Limited green space, wellbeing limited
      - Continues car culture
      - People without cars
      - Not enough parking for townhomes
    - Disabled

- Aging population
  - Accessibility
- Impact fees unknown
- Needs a park, bus, bike routes
- Loss of green space and not enough garage space
- What about duplexes and the advantages they offer?
- Competitive!
  - More dangerous
- Is this livable???
- Not affordable
- Design is antisocial (garage in back, yard in front)
- Is there an HOA
- Culture!
- Change is happening so fast, culture changes fast. How do you know what neighborhood you're signing up for?
- The design opposes charm and city culture of non-sprawl and transportation/access.
- What about high occupancy lanes
  - Planning space for bus stops
  - Mass transit
    - Inner-city and valley
    - Commuter vans (what can we do in the meantime?)
      - Incentives
- Scenario 3
  - Who benefits?
    - The rich!
      - Developer
      - Landowner
      - High end employers
    - Gas stations
    - Car dealers
    - City=property tax
    - Schools with capacity
    - Some existing neighbors have more community come to them (kids etc.)
    - House cleaners, gardeners, pool maintenance, in general
  - Disadvantaged?
    - The environment
      - Wildlife, water
    - Lower and medium income people
      - Diverse groups—new Americans
    - Folks who work there, have to get there
    - Young people/renters
    - Emergency services (access)
    - People who want acreage
    - People who use surrounding roads
    - Air quality—negatively affects people
      - Environmental justice! (Rich get the good stuff)

- - - Water
      - Using too much!
      - Restrictions on watering/landscaping?
    - Setting an example (culture)
      - Can't afford to be farmers
      - Maintaining long term something of this size!
    - Congestion: access
      - One road in and out
    - Boise Blueprint needs to be made more available, seen, up to date
    - No local option taxes
      - Legislature needs to let Boise use this as a tool (empty bucket)
        - Housing trust fund passed by legislature, but no $ was appropriated
    - Taxes need to be re-assessed for vulnerable populations—restricted income
      - Teachers
      - Ambulance drivers
    - Developer accountability
    - Affordability
      - Employer benefits
      - Accessibility
    - What about community value of farmland. Can't we treat it like parks?
- All 3 scenarios
  - Developers see Boise as easy $
  - Not seeing set-asides for space/sustainability
  - City and ACHD relationship needs to improve

Table 16
- Scenario 1
  - Below median income in a neighborhood—benefit
  - Assuming neighborhood is approx. 350K houses, historic
  - Current residents would be disadvantaged—property rates, traffic, 4 story high
  - Good to replace current empty building
  - Will it be curb to curb? No parking is a problem
  - Minimum parking requirements
  - Will limit # of families = reduce diversity/mix of neighborhood by making units small and the $
  - $150 a square foot = 2 bed, 1,200 square
  - Fills a need for apartments available
  - City should make requirements to increase size of units, decrease price = have mix of residents
  - Doesn't meet need of low income/median income residents = even people with no subsidy
  - Responsibility of landowners to maintain green areas/property
  - Will increase people moving in and out—as renters
  - Landlord can sell property
  - Have larger apartments—want to attract a range of residents
  - Benefits—nearby commercial

- ▪ Walking, biking infrastructure
    - o How much is the city making from property tax? Are we getting less services from existing property taxes?
    - o How is the City controlling zoning?
    - o More people in small houses—more green space
- Scenario 2
    - o How many acres?
    - o Farmland is going to disappear
    - o Better to do infills on the edge
    - o Must have outward growth but needs to be controlled
    - o Identify green space first = farmland is not green space
    - o Restrictions on how close houses can be built together
    - o City to develop a ration of house to lawn
    - o More outlets for traffic to get to big roads
    - o Regulations to say density levels = $ for transit
    - o TOD communication to residents
    - o Want to know actual density
    - o Put density in downtown
    - o Need to ensure planning before development
    - o Lacks support of transit and services
    - o Losers—drivers, nature lovers
    - o Winners—people who want backyards
    - o Clusters of "like homes" – like Harris Ranch
    - o Young people and lower paid residents
    - o Wonder why mixes of incomes is important
    - o Need access to transit = better access to services to make viable for lower income
    - o Homogenous – need to plan
    - o City need ensure denser development and transit
    - o Planning
- Scenario 3
    - o Needs a park
    - o Winners—rich people and developer
    - o Need outlets out of the community
    - o Will be more than 100 cars
    - o Advantage = increased property taxes and taxes in general, more $ in community
    - o Job attraction
    - o People coming from out of state
    - o Not diverse—the least diverse
    - o Means more growth over time = services
    - o Does our population need this development? Is this a population who needs housing?
    - o All new infrastructure
    - o Impact fees should be higher
    - o Property taxes will pay for operation costs?
    - o Build apartments
    - o Less impact should = less fees
    - o Disadvantaged—people with kids
    - o Would prefer mix of homes and prices
    - o We want to maintain diversity in the community

- o Aesthetics
- o Greenbelt is an asset = plan for green space!
- o Planning a system around canals and river would attract business and homes—also RR tracks
- o In Denver—livability for the trails
- o Fill in gaps in scenario #2 with greenspace
- o Have a greenspace plan—bones would be a path system

Orange Table
- Scenario 1
    - o Benefits
        - Below MI (portion of the project)
        - No car/people who walk and bike
        - Developer/property owner
        - City/tax base
        - Surrounding neighborhood/impact fees
        - Empty nesters/young professionals/single parents
        - Income diversity
        - Higher income individuals (60%)
    - o Disadvantaged
        - Traffic on roadways (local vs. arterial)
        - Architecture (height)—existing residents
        - Affordable housing needs
        - Loss of commercial and mixed use opportunity
    - o Concerns
        - Examples/reputation of developer (design/quality)
        - City role: does plan comply with BB and Code
        - Improve notification/public hearing process
        - Additional meetings with surrounding neighborhood
        - Impacts schools, public services
- Scenario 2
    - o Benefits
        - Developer/property owner (farmers)
        - 1st time homebuyers
        - Infrastructure upgrades
        - City/public services—tax base
        - Families/larger households
        - New housing stock
    - o Disadvantages
        - Traffic/commutes
        - Average homebuyers
        - Accessibility to housing depends on mix
        - Loss of open space/farm land
        - Really large footprint is wasteful
        - Lack of commercial things to walk/bike
        - People who want to walk and bike
        - Environmental footprint
        - Lack of a sense of place/character

- - - Rural neighbors would oppose
    - o Concerns
        - City should force mixed-use, better design
        - Energy used/eco footprint
        - Lack of diversity
            - Social
            - Economic
            - Household size
        - Developer reputation/examples
        - Lack of "true" affordability
    - o Other
        - Pay a more "true" or bigger impact fee
        - Quality open space/gathering space
        - Cluster development to save open space
- Scenario 3
    - o Benefits
        - New residents from out of the area
        - City/tax base
        - Public services (schools)
    - o Disadvantages
        - Lower and middle income individuals/households
        - Not walkable or bikeable
        - No neighborhood center/sense of place
        - Surrounding ranches[?] (taxes and ranching[?] standpoint)
        - Loss of open space/Boise character
        - Wildlife/fire concerns
        - Environment: air quality, energy use
        - Where is the infrastructure: water, sewer, roads
        - Lack of quality open space
    - o Concerns
        - Notification process needs to be expanded
        - Publication should include map
        - Impacts to water system and water quality
        - City's role
            - Levy should preserve open space
        - Limiting access to recreation lands/connectivity
        - Farm vs [illegible]—could swing environmental impacts
        - Boise image and sprawling out
        - Not water conscious/impacts to aquifer
        - Role of the city
            - Forcing the environmental issue by more efficient design/landscape
        - Require fire breaks adjacent to open space