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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scenario 1</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Who benefits?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Tenants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Local employers/nearby businesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Developers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Service workers downtown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Defeat sprawl/infill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More units = below market rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Less units = higher than market rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• New residents who need temporary place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Improve traffic = i.e. Connector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Air quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Who loses?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adjacent property owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Doesn’t fit neighborhood character</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Where is the demand—single individuals or families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Long-standing neighbors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Number of units insufficient for affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o Concerns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• High rent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Impact on character of neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Additional traffic on capped infrastructure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Potential impact: type of neighborhood engagement from developer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| • Scenario 2 |
| o Who wins? |
| • Potential buyers |
| • Schools |
| • Developer |
| • Local tax districts |
| • Construction trades |
| • City—fits with Blueprint |
| • Nearby businesses |
| • Median income population |
| • Banks and lenders |
• Potential increase in businesses
  o 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
  o 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
  o Who wins?
    • Developer
    • Buyers
    • ACHD employees
    • Land owner
    • City—tax revenue generation
    • Schools
    • Nearest grocery store
    • Commercial developers and businesses
  o Who loses?
    • Taxpayer
    • Wildlife
    • 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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
  - Disadvantaged?
    - Could impact value of homes negatively
    - Traffic
    - Schools have no room
    - Could impact parking
  - Who opposes?
    - Current nearby homeowners
      - Older, established
  - 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
    - Bringing affordable housing to market
    - Priority placed on including affordable housing options
    - Potential lack of understanding about affordable housing
  - Traffic
    - Depends on infrastructure around it
    - Would rather promote short trips
    - Supports transit options
    - Focus on mixed-use neighborhoods
      - Shops, grocery
- Scenario 2
  - Who benefits?
    - Schools
    - People who need a home
    - Owners of farm land nearby
  - 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
  - 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 lanes 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

- Expectation
  - People expect similar style development to be clustered (ex: subdivisions and more)

- City role
  - Really stick to plans/codes
  - Space out neighborhoods
  - Guarantee green space/park space
  - Infrastructure needs to be in place prior to high density projects (roads, public transportation)
  - Expanded bus service—should be priority (over libraries and other amenities)
    - Park and rides
    - Regional transit plan

Location matters—bus stop, proximity to commerce, etc.

- Scenario 3
  - 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
  - Positives
    - Higher-end homes increase tax base as well (so don’t lose to other cities)

- City role
  - Incentivize/encourage denser development in closer radius to downtown

- Comment
  - To preserve open space, need more dense development

- Impact
  - View shed reduction
  - Agriculture/farmland decreased
  - More congestion
  - Less air quality
  - Water quality, building where water absorbed, etc.

- Final thoughts
  - Growth ok, but want it in smaller components
  - Mixed-development/mixed-use is important
  - Should be a “phasing-out” of density—more density closer in, less farther out
  - Scenario 2 and 3—skipped low income, need that too!

Table 10

- Scenario 1
  - 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
  o Disadvantages
    ▪ Traffic/congestion
    ▪ Impact on schools (overcrowded)
    ▪ Lower income—different vibe to family neighborhood
      • Safety
    ▪ No disadvantages!
  o 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
  o 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
  o 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)
  o 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
  o 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)
  o 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:
  o Federal law requirements—Fair Laws
  o Affordable housing needed across all neighborhoods
  o Spread equity around/diversity needs
  o Also need high quality homes across neighborhoods (better environmental features)
  o Encouraged rehab projects/bring new life back to areas of need
  o Innovation!
  o Equity diversity needed

Table 11
• Scenario 1
  o 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)
Focus on fundamentals instead of prestige projects (not flashy)
Invest in ongoing continual neighborhood planning
Sustainability of resources/lifestyle (didn’t feel like we got into this enough)

Table 12
- Scenario 1
  - 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
  - Disadvantaged
    - Who
      - Homes that lose views
      - Existing families with kids in school/students
      - Existing residents
        - Increased traffic
        - Noise
    - Oppose
      - Existing residents
  - 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
  - Who benefits?
    - Developer
- Provides housing to support need—families, retirees (downsizing)—size, cost, schools
- People who want houses and space/lawn
  - Disadvantaged
    - Farmers
      - People who eat/want local food
    - Existing neighbors
      - Aesthetic/fit to neighborhood
      - Traffic
    - Doesn’t fill need for housing for median families
  - 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]
        - Want difference
        - 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
      - Want to see development in context to surrounding neighborhood
    - Self-sufficient development
      - Neighborhood level services and employment opportunities
    - Incentivize green building
      - Fire wise/natives
      - Low water use
      - Energy efficiency
      - Green space
    - What types of rec. amenities are included? [keep Boise authentic]
    - Can low-income housing happen without government subsidy
- Scenario 3
  - 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 $$

- 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

- 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
  - 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
  o Does it remove/add walkability?
  o Preserve wildlife?
  o Allowing for this?
    ▪ Filtration/water
• What was the original zoning?
• Missed opportunity?
• Understanding property rights
  o Education (everyone), friction lives in this topic
• Infrastructure and support
  o Will it keep up?
• Outreach to the neighborhood
  o Want confidence in builder
• Developers record for performance/compliance
  o Who handles long term management?
• Sustainability of building
  o How green will the apartments be?

• Scenario 2
  o Benefits
    ▪ Schools with capacity
    ▪ Developer
      • New workers (construction) and jobs
        o Maintain homes, grounds etc.
    ▪ City advocate for development
      • Middle/high end employers
        o Engineers
        o 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)
  o 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
  o Inner-city and valley
  o Commuter vans (what can we do in the meantime?)
    • Incentives

• Scenario 3
  o 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
  o 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
- Aesthetics
  - Greenbelt is an asset = plan for green space!
  - Planning a system around canals and river would attract business and homes—also RR tracks
  - In Denver—livability for the trails
- Fill in gaps in scenario #2 with greenspace
- Have a greenspace plan—bones would be a path system

**Orange Table**
- **Scenario 1**
  - **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%)
  - **Disadvantaged**
    - Traffic on roadways (local vs. arterial)
    - Architecture (height)—existing residents
    - Affordable housing needs
    - Loss of commercial and mixed use opportunity
  - **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**
  - **Benefits**
    - Developer/property owner (farmers)
    - 1st time homebuyers
    - Infrastructure upgrades
    - City/public services—tax base
    - Families/larger households
    - New housing stock
  - **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
  - 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
  - Other
    - Pay a more “true” or bigger impact fee
    - Quality open space/gathering space
    - Cluster development to save open space
- Scenario 3
  - Benefits
    - New residents from out of the area
    - City/tax base
    - Public services (schools)
  - 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
  - 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