

Frequently Asked Questions (FAQs) for TLIP

Below are frequently asked questions that provide background for the Master Street Plan workshops.

What are the Terminology & Approaches Used in TLIP?

Below is some common terminology being used in the TLIP study.

Typology: This is the essence of the Draft Livable Street Design Guide that assigns street “types” to the adjacent existing or planned land use “types” and characteristics. Street “typologies” are a designation of streets according to their features and uses, providing a sense of the purpose they serve in the urban environment. Streets and land use are to complement one another.

For example, a roadway that traverses through a residential area with housing fronting the street will differ from a roadway traversing through a residential area where a landscaped buffer or berm is separating the houses from the road.

- **Constrained Roadways:** A roadway segment or corridor identified as “constrained” is one where circumstances exist that likely preclude future widening of the corridor beyond a defined right-of-way width, either existing or defined through both physical features and/or previous actions or policies. Historically in Ada County roadways have been identified as “constrained” for a variety of reasons. The 1991 and 2006 Capital Improvements Plans (CIP) identified roadways that would remain in their current configuration despite forecasts showing a need for additional capacity. Some examples of these were: Harrison Boulevard, Jefferson Street, 36th Street (Hill to State).

The TLIP process will further identify such constraints for use in future CIPs. In some circumstances the City and ACHD may agree that Level of Service “F” conditions for some segments or corridors is acceptable and these will not be considered for further capacity improvements. These constraints are proposed to be established through joint consideration by ACHD, the cities, the county and coordination with BGG (as TLIP is the implementation of BGG).

When ACHD and the local governments agree to constrain a road, they need to also agree where the travel demand will be served and/or that significant delay on a particular road during peak hours is acceptable.

Constraints are arrived at through a variety of factors, including:

- **By Policy:** The CIP is an example policy where ACHD has identified certain constrained roadways that will not likely be expanded beyond their current configuration. Other examples of roadways constrained by policy are Warm Springs Ave. (Boise Comprehensive Plan policies related to roadway volume restrictions) and various downtown Boise streets (CIP, Downtown Plans, etc.).
- **By Plan:** Various planning efforts have resulted in constrained roadway segments or corridors being defined. These can result from specific corridor studies (State Street from Glenwood to 23rd) or sub-area studies (North Meridian roadways such as McMillan, Locust Grove and Meridian) or joint planning studies between land use and transportation agencies (Main Street in Downtown Meridian).
- **By Geography:** Features such as topography, rivers and canals have played a role in corridors being constrained. Cartwright Road is an example of a topographical constraint.
- **By Development Action:** Various subdivision applications, particularly those outside city impact areas, have necessitated action by ACHD or others to determine a future corridor width at the time of development either based on professional judgment or policies existing at the time. Examples of these include Hubbard Road in Kuna (constrained to 3 lanes through development process) and Amity Road from Eagle Road to Maple Grove (constrained to 3 lanes through development process and based on functional classification policies of the time).

- **Street Design Standards:** It is the purpose of the TLIP study process to identify alternative street design standards for livable streets. These are contained within the draft LSDG, as context sensitive street typologies. ACHD and the cities and county have the alternative to retain ACHD’s current street standards.
- **Variable Level of Service:** the variable LOS concept will move ACHD away from the historically applied LOS “D” for Minor Arterials and LOS “E” for Principal Arterials that set the basis for the Capital Improvements Plan in some locations. The ideas surrounding Typology and Constrained Roadways set the basis for establishing Variable Level of Service standards that have been a centerpiece of the Blueprint for Good Growth and associated Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances (APFOs), as some sub-areas or corridors may be acceptable at LOS “F”, while rural areas may maintain a LOS “C” or better; these LOSs will be based on single-, and multi-peak-hour volumes. The various peak-hour LOS standards may be established:
 - **By urban footprint/design characteristics:** Through BGG and *Communities in Motion*, areas such as downtowns have been identified as those that have special considerations and constraints due to their status as central business districts. Additionally, past TLIP workshops have identified “Special Character” areas such as Boise State University, and most of the downtown areas. These areas are likely to allow a LOS “F” when updating the Capital Improvements Plan and establishing APFOs.
 - **By identified constraints:** Roadway segments or corridors identified as “constrained” (see above) will likely allow LOS “F” thresholds to be applied when updating the CIP and establishing APFOs. It is likely that some corridors may be identified as “constrained” under this process, but may necessitate reconsideration in the event that proposed or planned land use changes significantly alter previous assumptions which would likely trigger funding mechanisms such as APFOs or extraordinary impact fee districts.
 - **By land use designation:** Primarily areas outside of city impact areas would be designated for a different LOS threshold in order to not overly encourage urban-scale developments in these areas. For example, a LOS “C” standard for minor arterials could apply outside the areas of impact, while LOS “D” could apply for minor arterials within the impact areas unless other factors were identified (see above).

How will the TLIP Efforts Relate to Existing or Developing ACHD Plans & Policies?

The outcomes of TLIP, as well as associated planning efforts such as BGG, CIM and sub-area studies, will have long-term impacts on existing ACHD planning efforts and policies and will necessitate changes in these. TLIP, by its nature, will differ from existing policy. Below is a list of changes that are likely to occur to a variety of existing ACHD plans and policies.

- **Interagency Cost Sharing Plan:** This plan is under development and needs to be closely coordinated with TLIP to develop, reflect and incorporate agreements about cost responsibilities.
- **Capital Improvements Plan:** The 2009 update of the CIP will need to reflect a variety of changes in local and regional transportation policy resulting from TLIP, BGG, *Communities in Motion*, and joint planning efforts between ACHD and land use agencies.
 - **New typologies (TLIP)** will impact the right-of-way width that is needed on some roadways and may differ from previous CIP assumptions (e.g. 96-foot standard for 5-lane arterials will be supplemented by more variable cross-sections based on land uses).

- **Variable LOS standards and related constrained roadways** will result in acceptance of different LOS thresholds within the travel demand model and require a closer look at the impacts of redistribution of traffic.
 - **Adequate Public Facilities Ordinances (BGG)** will impact the LOS considerations (see above).
 - **Corridors identified in *Communities in Motion*** were not fully considered in the 2006 CIP, as the Trend vs. Community Choices issue had not been fully resolved.
 - **Results from sub-area plans such as SW Boise and South Meridian** will need to be incorporated into the CIP, with consideration of related funding mechanisms for improvements not currently included in plans, and cities will need to work with COMPASS to best incorporate planned land uses within the regional demographics.
- **Five-Year Work Plan:** Beginning with the 2010-2014 FYWP, the projects contained within the plan will be impacted by the typologies identified through TLIP.
 - **Cost estimates** will need to be updated to reflect new assumptions for future cross-sections.
 - **Ranking (prioritization) methods** will be updated to reflect changes resulting from TLIP, BGG and other policies that are aimed at the outcomes of ULI whereby ACHD transforms its project selection process to be more inclusive of cities.
- **Functional Classification:** TLIP will create a new functional classification map based on typologies rather than the typical principal arterial/minor arterial/collector paradigm. Associated ACHD (e.g. traffic calming, development requirements) and COMPASS policies will need to be updated to reflect this change. The short-range Federal functional classification map will need to maintain the traditional FHWA nomenclature for consistency purposes with ITD.
- **Development Approval by ACHD:** Various changes may need to occur in how ACHD reviews and approves development applications. Some of the factors that should be considered are:
 - **Requirements:** Selection of new roadway cross-sections will alter what ACHD requires of developers, particularly for local and collector roadways.
 - **Review and Staff reports:** Subdivision applications, plats and design will likely require a higher level of review to determine whether or not proposed development is consistent with the identified typologies. If not, comment should be made to the ACHD Commission and to land use agencies as to the inconsistency with the assumptions generated from TLIP.
- **Corridor studies, Concept Design and Sub-Area Studies:** The results of TLIP will vary in their use on corridor, sub-area studies and concept design. The typologies identified should become the starting point for these efforts, however the typologies may change through these processes if it is determined that there will be significant changes to the land use types; funding strategies will likely need to be developed if this is the case.

How do TLIP Efforts Relate to Existing or Developing Land Use Agency Plans & Policies?

- **Land Use Policies:** Cities/county will need to coordinate policies on setbacks, on-street and off-street parking, landscaping and transit orientation to incorporate TLIP principles, where desired and jointly agreed, especially to achieve land use, building form and access goals related to walkability and promotion of alternative modes of transportation.
- **Comprehensive Plan Revisions:** Revisions to Comprehensive plans, local zoning, ordinances and design standards will need to reflect a vision of land use, density, connectivity and access consistent with street designations. Any revisions to or decisions to deviate from comprehensive plans will need to be

accompanied by a reconsideration of street designations and coordinated between jurisdiction and ACHD, including the need for a funding strategy where revisions exceed what was assumed before.

- **COMPASS Demographics and Modeling:** Compass modeling efforts should reflect community and ACHD plans for access, transit, connectivity/network and land use changes.
- **Design Standards by Cities/County:** All city and county departments (including emergency services) should be consistent with ACHD regarding acceptable lane and street widths, acceptable access and connectivity standards, building form, parking requirements and pedestrian access; this consistency can only occur at the city's/county's direction.
- **Funding Efforts:** As required under the forthcoming Interagency Cost Sharing Policy, local jurisdictions will need to coordinate and refine their procedures and practices for their respective responsibilities to fund additional right-of-way (if needed), special features, and the installation and maintenance of landscaping and street trees.

How will TLIP Efforts Relate to Other Agency Plans & Policies?

- **Metropolitan Planning Agency (COMPASS):** will need to update demographics, coordinate modeling efforts, and revise model network data (e.g. speeds, volume-delay functions, etc.) consistent with accepted revisions to local Comprehensive Plans and ACHD standards and policies.