January 15, 2013

TO: ACHD Board of Commissioners

FROM: Mindy Wallace
Planning Review Supervisor

SUBJECT: Mace River Ranch Subdivision

Executive Summary:
The applicant is requesting approval of a Rezone, Development Agreement, PUD, Preliminary Plat and Floodplain Development permit application for 255 single-family residential lots on approximately 192 acres. The site is located at 800 West Mace Road, Eagle, Idaho.

The applicant has indicated that they intend to comply with all of ACHD’s conditions of approval (see attached), and this item consent agenda due to the size of the development.

Staff Recommendation:
Staff recommends approval of the staff report, as written.

Attachments:
1. Letter from the applicant
2. Staff Report
December 3, 2012

Mike Williams, Planner II
City of Eagle
660 E. Civic
Eagle, Idaho 83616

RE: MACE RIVER RANCH SUBDIVISION – ACHD TRAFFIC REPORT

Dear Mr. Williams,

First of all, thank you for your assistance with our application.

As you know, ACHD will not be holding a public meeting in the evening until January 23, 2013 because of the holidays. This timing causes a significant delay in our application process.

I am writing this letter to formally express our current understanding of approvals and to express our willingness to comply with the ACHD process and findings.

Gardner Company understands the prior decisions of both ACHD and ITD to close Mace Road. Furthermore, we fully understand that there will be findings and conditions through the ACHD process that we will need to comply with to use the current residential collector and signal on Eagle Road.

Gardner Company intends to comply with all recommendations and conditions.

Sincerely,

J. Thomas Ahlquist
Chief Operating Officer
Gardner Company
A. Findings of Fact

1. Description of Application: This application is for a Rezone, Development Agreement, PUD, Preliminary Plat and Floodplain Development permit to allow for 255 single-family residential lots on approximately 192 acres. The site is located west of Eagle Road on Mace Road, more specifically at 800 West Mace Road, Eagle, Idaho.

2. Description of Adjacent Surrounding Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Zoning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>Idaho Transportation Department</td>
<td>R-4, A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>Single-family Agriculture/Two Rivers Subdivision</td>
<td>A, R-2-P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>Channel Center – Commercial Subdivision</td>
<td>C-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West</td>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Site History: See C1 below.
4. **Impact Fees:** There will be an impact fee that is assessed and due prior to issuance of any building permits. The assessed impact fee will be based on the impact fee ordinance that is in effect at that time.

5. **Capital Improvements Plan (CIP)/Five Year Work Plan (FYWP):**
   There are currently no roadways, bridges or intersections in the general vicinity of the project that are currently in the Five Year Work Program or the District’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

B. **Traffic Findings for Consideration**

1. **Trip Generation:** This development is estimated to generate 2,574 additional vehicle trips per day (0 existing); 253 additional vehicle trips per hour in the PM peak hour (0 existing), based on the submitted traffic impact study.

2. **Traffic Impact Study**
   Horrocks Engineers prepared a traffic impact study for the proposed Mace River Ranch Subdivision. Below is an executive summary of the findings as presented by Horrocks Engineers. The following executive summary is not the opinion of ACHD staff. ACHD has reviewed the submitted traffic impact study for consistency with ACHD policies and practices, and may have additional requirements beyond what is noted in the summary. ACHD Staff comments on the submitted traffic impact study can be found below under staff comments.

   **Executive Summary**
   The site includes 265 single family houses on nearly 200 acres at a density of 1.38 units per acre. The project is located on the west side of SR-55 in Eagle, Idaho just south of the Boise River. The zoning for the proposed development will be 100% residential with private clubhouse amenities internal to the development.

   The study area includes the following intersections at Eagle Road:
   - Eagle Road/Island Woods Drive (unsignalized)
   - Eagle Road/Riverside Drive (signalized)
   - Eagle Road/Mace Road (unsignalized)

   The principal findings include that the existing side streets along Eagle Road operate at unacceptable levels of service a few times throughout the PM peak hour under the existing conditions.

   1. The site will be accessed from an existing signalized intersection (Island Woods Drive/Eagle Road). As part of the project the existing unsignalized intersection of Mace Road/Eagle Road will be removed. This will improve traffic in the area and potentially reduce vehicle crashes in the area.

   2. Off-site improvements include removing the Mace Road/Eagle Road intersection.

   3. Adding dual left turn lanes at the Island Woods and Riverside Drive intersection will greatly improve the overall intersection operations.

   4. Eagle Road will need to be widened to three lanes in each direction by 2025 without any projected traffic. With this widening, there will be some intersection improvements to operations. Delay will remain on some side street movements at Island Woods Drive and Riverside Drive. By doing so, all intersection approaches will operate at LOS D or better with the exception of westbound Riverside Drive and eastbound Island Woods Drive at Eagle Road.

   5. The interaction of the existing roadway system with the proposed development has very minimal impact to the surrounding neighborhood. Mace Road and Island Woods Drive are
classified as a collector roadway. This roadway does not have any residential driveways fronting the roadway and will have the least amount of impact to the neighborhood.

6. It is recommended to monitor the intersection operations at Island Woods Drive and Riverside Drive as the project is built-out since traffic will increase gradually over time. This project is not like a big-box store where once complete, traffic instantly changes.

7. It is highly suggested to remove the Mace Road intersection at Eagle Road for safety reasons. Crash data now shows some crashes due to the intersection but this will only increase as traffic increases in the area.

Staff Comments/Recommendations: ACHD staff has completed a review of the required traffic impact study and has found it to be in compliance with ACHD Policy and standards.

The submitted study recommends widening Eagle Road to three lanes in each direction to improve the operation of Eagle Road and adding dual left turn lanes at the intersection of Island Woods Drive and Eagle Road. The widening of Eagle Road is a significant system improvement and is not in ITD plans at this time.

Overall the intersection of Island Woods Drive and Eagle Road is anticipated to operate at an acceptable level of service at the build-out of the project. The eastbound left and thru movements are the exception with a V/C ratio of 1.43. To mitigate the impacts to the eastbound left and thru movements the study recommends the construction of dual left turn lanes on Island Woods Drive at the intersection. Dual left turn lanes could be constructed on Island Woods if the existing landscape island was dedicated as right-of-way and modifications were made to the existing signal.

The applicant will not be required to construct the dual left turn lanes on Island Woods Drive, because overall the intersection operates at an acceptable level of service; however the intersection improvements could be done by ACHD in the future.

3. Condition of Area Roadways

Traffic Count is based on Vehicles per hour (VPH)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Frontage</th>
<th>Functional Classification</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Traffic Count</th>
<th>PM Peak Hour Level of Service</th>
<th>Existing Plus Project</th>
<th>Future Level of Service</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Eagle Road/ SH-44</strong></td>
<td>620-feet</td>
<td>Principal Arterial</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>“F”</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>“F”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island Woods</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Residential Collector</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>Better than “D”</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>Better than “D”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Acceptable level of service for a five-lane principal arterial is “E” (1,770 VPH).
* Acceptable level of service for a three-lane collector is “D” (530 VPH).

** ACHD does not set level of service thresholds for State Highways.

4. Average Daily Traffic Count (VDT)

Average daily traffic counts are based on ACHD’s most current traffic counts.

- The average daily traffic count for Eagle Road 38,340 at the Boise River (annual average for 2011) on 12/31/11.
- The average daily traffic count for Island Wood Drive west of Eagle Road was 2,430 on 7/18/2012.
C. **Findings for Consideration**

1. **Site History**
   Island Woods Drive was approved and required to be constructed as a collector roadway with no front-on housing as part of ACHD’s February 17, 1998 action on Two Rivers (Quarter Circle Ranch subdivision). At that time Island Woods Drive was anticipated to replace Mace Road as the primary access in and out of the subdivision and to serve the areas north and west of Two Rivers, as they develop. The primary function of all collector roadways, including Island Woods Drive is to intercept traffic from the local street system and carry that traffic to the nearest arterial.

   In 1999 the developer of Two Rivers Subdivision requested an access and signal permit from ITD to allow Island Woods Drive to intersect Eagle Road/SH-55, as a signalized intersection. ITD approved the permit with the condition that Mace Road be closed at the time of construction. Mace Road was not closed, and has continued to be a concern for ITD, ACHD, and the City of Eagle. As part of this application the applicant is proposing to close Mace Road at Eagle Road, and to vacate/exchange the existing right-of-way for Mace Road between Eagle Road and Island Woods Drive. ACHD and ITD staffs are supportive of this proposal, as it improves the safety and function of Eagle Road/SH-55.

2. **Eagle Road/SH-55**
   Eagle Road/SH-55 is under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). The applicant, The City of Eagle, and ITD should work together to determine if additional right-of-way or improvements are necessary on Eagle Road/SH-55.

   **Applicant’s Proposal:** The applicant is proposing to close Mace Road at Eagle Road and to construct a separate private driveway and parking lot to provide sportsman access to the river and to a future City of Eagle park.

   **Staff Comments/Recommendations:** Comply with requirements of ITD and City of Eagle for the Eagle Road/SH-55 frontage. Submit to the District a letter from ITD regarding said requirements prior to District approval of the final plat or issuance of a building permit (or other required permits), whichever occurs first.

   ITD has indicated that if the City of Eagle moves forward with plans to develop a park and greenbelt access in this location that an access permit would be provided.

3. **Mace Road**
   a. **Existing Conditions:** Mace Road is improved with 22 to 25-feet of pavement and no shoulders within 50-feet of prescriptive right-of-way, from Eagle Road west approximately 1,600 feet to its intersection with Island Woods Drive. From Island Wood Drive west approximately 160-feet, Mace Road is improved with 30-feet of pavement and vertical curb and gutter on both sides of the roadway with detached concrete sidewalks on the south side of the road across from the site, within 50-feet of right-of-way. For the remaining frontage of the site, approximately 2,440-feet, Mace Road is improved with 20-feet of pavement and no curb, gutter or sidewalk. There is a detached concrete sidewalk on the south side of Mace Road across from the site within 50-feet of right-of-way. Mace Road does not extend the full length of the development.

   b. **Policy:**
      **Collector Street Policy:** District policy 7206.2.1 states that the developer is responsible for improving all collector frontages adjacent to the site or internal to the development as required below, regardless of whether access is taken to all of the adjacent streets.
**Master Street Map and Typologies Policy:** District policy 7206.5 states that if the collector street is designated with a typology on the Master Street Map, that typology shall be considered for the required street improvements. If there is no typology listed in the Master Street Map, then standard street sections shall serve as the default.

**Street Section and Right-of-Way Policy:** District policy 7206.5.2 states that the standard right-of-way width for collector streets shall typically be 50 to 70-feet, depending on the location and width of the sidewalk and the location and use of the roadway. The right-of-way width may be reduced, with District approval, if the sidewalk is located within an easement; in which case the District will require a minimum right-of-way width that extends 2-feet behind the back-of-curb on each side.

The standard street section shall be 46-feet (back-of-curb to back-of-curb). This width typically accommodates a single travel lane in each direction, a continuous center left-turn lane, and bike lanes.

**Residential Collector Policy:** 7206.5.2 states that the standard street section for a collector in a residential area shall be 36-feet (back-of-curb to back-of-curb). The District will consider a 33-foot or 29-foot street section with written fire department approval and taking into consideration the needs of the adjacent land use, the projected volumes, the need for bicycle lanes, and on-street parking.

**Sidewalk Policy:** District policy 7206.5.6 requires a concrete sidewalks at least 5-feet wide to be constructed on both sides of all collector streets. A parkway strip at least 6-feet wide between the back-of-curb and street edge of the sidewalk is required to provide increased safety and protection of pedestrians. Consult the District’s planter width policy if trees are to be placed within the parkway strip. Sidewalks constructed next to the back-of-curb shall be a minimum of 7-feet wide.

Detached sidewalks are encouraged and should be parallel to the adjacent roadway. Meandering sidewalks are discouraged.

A permanent right-of-way easement shall be provided if public sidewalks are placed outside of the dedicated right-of-way. The easement shall encompass the entire area between the right-of-way line and 2-feet behind the back edge of the sidewalk. Sidewalks shall either be located wholly within the public right-of-way or wholly within an easement.

**Half Street Policy:** District Policy 7207.2.2 required improvements shall consist of pavement widening to one-half the required width, including curb, gutter and concrete sidewalk (minimum 5-feet), plus 12-feet of additional pavement widening beyond the centerline established for the street to provide an adequate roadway surface, with the pavement crowned at the ultimate centerline. A 3-foot wide gravel shoulder and a borrow ditch sized to accommodate the roadway storm runoff shall be constructed on the unimproved side.

**ACHD Master Street Map:** ACHD Policy Section 3111.1 requires the Master Street Map (MSM) guide the right-of-way acquisition, collector street requirements, and specific roadway features required through development. This segment of Mace Road is designated in the MSM as a Residential Collector with 2-lanes, on-street bike lanes, a 36-foot street section within 58-feet of right-of-way.

c. **Applicant Proposal:** The applicant is proposing to vacate/exchange and close the portion of Mace Road from Eagle Road to the Island Wood Drive intersection, approximately 1,600-feet. From Island Wood Drive west the applicant is proposing to dedicate 34-feet of right-of-way and improve Mace Road with pavement widening, 3-foot shoulders, and 5-foot detached sidewalks in an easement outside of right-of-way in. The applicant has proposed to stop the improvements on Mace Road approximately 1,580 feet east of the west property line.
d. **Staff Comments/Recommendations:** Staff is supportive of the applicant’s proposal to vacate/exchange and close the portion of Mace Road from Eagle Road to Island Woods Drive. The vacation/exchange is a separate process and will require a separate application. The vacation/exchange should be completed prior to signature of the first final plat.

The applicant’s proposal to dedicated 34-feet of right-of-way meet’s District policy and should be approved, as proposed.

The applicant’s proposed roadway improvements do not meet MSM or Residential Collector Polices, which require the construction of curb, and gutter on Residential Collector Roadways. The applicant should be required to construct Mace Road as one half of a 36-foot residential (plus 12-feet of pavement) collector roadway with vertical curb, gutter, and 5-foot detached (or 7.5-foot attached) concrete sidewalks abutting the sites entire frontage from Island Woods Drive to the west property line.

The applicant should be required to provide a permanent right-of-way easement for all sidewalks located outside of the right-of-way. Sidewalks shall either be located wholly within the public right-of-way or wholly within an easement.

4. **Internal Streets**
   a. **Existing Conditions:** There are no existing public roadways within this site.
   
   b. **Policy:**
      
      **Local Roadway Policy:** District Policy 7207.2.1 states that the developer is responsible for improving all local street frontages adjacent to the site regardless of whether or not access is taken to all of the adjacent streets.

      **Street Section and Right-of-Way Policy:** District Policy 7207.5 states that right-of-way widths for all local streets shall generally not be less than 50-feet wide and that the standard street section shall be 36-feet (back-of-curb to back-of-curb). The District will consider the utilization of a street width less than 36-feet with written fire department approval.

      **Standard Urban Local Street—36-foot to 33-foot Street Section and Right-of-way Policy:** District Policy 7207.5.2 states that the standard street section shall be 36-feet (back-of-curb to back-of-curb) for developments with any buildable lot that is less than 1 acre in size. This street section shall include curb, gutter, and minimum 5-foot concrete sidewalks on both sides and shall typically be within 50-feet of right-of-way.

      The District will also consider the utilization of a street width less than 36-feet with written fire department approval. Most often this width is a 33-foot street section (back-of-curb to back-of-curb) for developments with any buildable lot that is less than 1 acre in size.

      **Continuation of Streets Policy:** District Policy 7207.2.4 states that an existing street, or a street in an approved preliminary plat, which ends at a boundary of a proposed development shall be extended in that development. The extension shall include provisions for continuation of storm drainage facilities. Benefits of connectivity include but are not limited to the following:

      - Reduces vehicle miles traveled.
      - Increases pedestrian and bicycle connectivity.
      - Increases access for emergency services.
      - Reduces need for additional access points to the arterial street system
      - Promotes the efficient delivery of services including trash, mail and deliveries.
      - Promotes appropriate intra-neighborhood traffic circulation to schools, parks, neighborhood commercial centers, transit stops, etc.
      - Promotes orderly development.
**Sidewalk Policy:** District Policy 7207.5.7 states that five-foot wide concrete sidewalk is required on both sides of all local street, except those in rural developments with net densities of one dwelling unit per 1.0 acre or less, or in hillside conditions where there is no direct lot frontage, in which case a sidewalk shall be constructed along one side of the street. Some local jurisdictions may require wider sidewalks.

The sidewalk may be placed next to the back-of-curb. Where feasible, a parkway strip at least 8-feet wide between the back-of-curb and the street edge of the sidewalk is recommended to provide increased safety and protection of pedestrians and to allow for the planting of trees in accordance with the District’s Tree Planting Policy. If no trees are to be planted in the parkway strip, the applicant may submit a request to the District, with justification, to reduce the width of the parkway strip.

Detached sidewalks are encouraged and should be parallel to the adjacent roadway. Meandering sidewalks are discouraged.

A permanent right-of-way easement shall be provided if public sidewalks are placed outside of the dedicated right-of-way. The easement shall encompass the entire area between the right-of-way line and 2-feet behind the back edge of the sidewalk. Sidewalks shall either be located wholly within the public right-of-way or wholly within an easement.

**Cul-de-sac Streets Policy:** District policy 7207.5.8 requires cul-de-sacs to be constructed to provide a minimum turning radius of 45-feet; in rural areas or for temporary cul-de-sacs the emergency service providers may require a greater radius. Landscape and parking islands may be constructed in turnarounds if a minimum 29-foot street section is constructed around the island. The pavement width shall be sufficient to allow the turning around of a standard AASHTO SU design vehicle without backing. The developer shall provide written approval from the appropriate fire department for this design element.

The District will consider alternatives to the standard cul-de-sac turnaround on a case-by-case basis. This will be based on turning area, drainage, maintenance considerations and the written approval of the agency providing emergency fire service for the area where the development is located.

**Landscape Medians Policy:** District policy 7207.5.16 states that landscape medians are permissible where adequate pavement width is provided on each side of the median to accommodate the travel lanes and where the following is provided:

- The median is platted as right-of-way owned by ACHD.
- The width of an island near an intersection is 12-feet maximum for a minimum distance of 150-feet. Beyond the 150-feet, the island may increase to a maximum width of 30-feet.
- At an intersection that is signalized or is to be signalized in the future, the median width shall be reduced to accommodate the necessary turn lane storage and tapers.
- The Developer or Homeowners Association shall apply for a license agreement if landscaping is to be placed within these medians.
- The license agreement shall contain the District’s requirements of the developer including, but not limited to, a “hold harmless” clause; requirements for maintenance by the developer; liability insurance requirements; and restrictions.
- Vertical curbs are required around the perimeter of any raised median. Gutters shall slope away from the curb to prevent ponding.

**c. Applicant’s Proposal:** The applicant is proposing to construct a 10-foot wide by 80-foot long landscape median within 60-feet of right-of-way on Mace Ranch Way at its intersection with Mace Road. The applicant has proposed to construct 21-foot travel lanes on each side of the
median with vertical curb, and detached 5-foot wide sidewalks located outside of the right-of-way in an easement.

The applicant is also proposing to construct a 10-foot wide by 50-foot long landscape median within 60-feet of right-of-way on Lands End Way at its intersection with Mace Road. The applicant has proposed to construct 21-foot travel lanes on each side of the median with vertical curb, and detached 5-foot wide sidewalks located outside of the right-of-way in an easement.

The applicant is proposing to construct all of the internal local streets as 36-foot street sections (back-of-curb to back-of-curb), with rolled curb, gutter, 8-foot parkway strip within 50-foot right-of-way and 5-foot detached sidewalk located outside of right-of-way in an easement.

The applicant is proposing to construct 2 cul-de-sac turnarounds and 5 knuckles all with center landscape islands.

d. Staff Comments/Recommendations: The applicant’s proposals meet District Policy, and should be approved, as proposed.

All of the center landscape islands (islands cul-de-sac, and knuckles) should be platted as right-of-way owned by ACHD; the Developer or Homeowners Association should apply for a license agreement if landscaping is to be placed within the medians and/or islands.

The applicant should be required to provide a permanent right-of-way easement for sidewalk located outside of the dedicated right-of-way. Sidewalks shall either be located wholly within the public right-of-way or wholly within an easement.

The cul-de-sac turnaround should be constructed to provide a minimum turning radius of 45-feet with a minimum 29-foot street section around the islands; provide written approval from the appropriate fire department for this design element.

5. Roadway Offsets

a. Existing Conditions: There are no roadways constructed within the site.

b. Policy:

Local Offset Policy: District policy 7206.4.5, requires local roadways to align or offset a minimum of 330-feet from a collector roadway (measured centerline to centerline).

District policy 7207.4.2, requires local roadways to align or provide a minimum offset of 125-feet from any other street (measured centerline to centerline).

c. Applicant’s Proposal: The applicant is proposing to construct 3 roadways to intersect Mace Road. The first, Mace Ranch Way, is proposed to align centerline to centerline with Osprey Island Street, on the south side of Mace Road across from the site. The second, Lakes End Way will be located approximately 875-feet west of Mace Ranch Way (measured centerline to centerline). The third, Bentbrook Lane, will be located approximately 825-feet west of Lakes End Way (measured centerline to centerline)

The applicant is proposing to construct a 30-foot wide emergency only access approach onto Mace Road located approximately 1,300-feet from the Brentbrook Lane approach between lots 128 and 129, of Block 1.

d. Staff Comments/Recommendations: The applicant’s proposal meets District Policy, and should be approved, as proposed.
6. **Private Roads**

**a. Private Road Policy:** District policy 7212.1 states that the lead land use agencies in Ada County establish the requirements for private streets. The District retains authority and will review the proposed intersection of a private and public street for compliance with District intersection policies and standards. The private road should have the following requirements:

- Designed to discourage through traffic between two public streets,
- Graded to drain away from the public street intersection, and
- If a private road is gated, the gate or keypad (if applicable) shall be located a minimum of 50-feet from the near edge of the intersection and a turnaround shall be provided.

**b. Applicant Proposal:** The applicant is proposing 4 private roads internal to the development. Brentbrook Lane, Windbreaker Lane, Watercrest Drive, and Hiddenwood Lane. The private roads are proposed to be constructed as 36-foot street sections with rolled curb, 7-foot wide parkway strip on the west/south side and 8-foot wide parkway strip on the east/north side, and 5-foot detached sidewalk on the east/north side of the street.

The applicant has proposed to gate Brentbrook Lane north of its intersection with Mace Road.

**c. Staff Comments/Recommendations:** If the City of Eagle approves the private road, the applicant shall be required to pave the private roadway a minimum of 20 to 24-feet wide and at least 30-feet into the site beyond the edge of pavement of all public streets and install pavement tapers with 15-foot curb radii abutting the existing roadway edge. If private roads are not approved by the City of Eagle, the applicant will be required to revise and resubmit the preliminary plat to provide public standard local streets in these locations.

Street name and stop signs are required for the private road. The signs may be ordered through the District. Verification of the correct, approved name of the road is required.

ACHD does not make any assurances that the private road, which is a part of this application, will be accepted as a public road if such a request is made in the future. Substantial redesign and reconstruction costs may be necessary in order to qualify this road for public ownership and maintenance.

The following requirements must be met if the applicant wishes to dedicate the roadway to ACHD:

- Dedicate a minimum of 50-feet of right-of-way for the road.
- Construct the roadway to the minimum ACHD requirements.
- Construct a stub street to the surrounding parcels.

The applicant should be required locate the gate or keypad proposed on Bentbrook Lane a minimum of 50-feet from the near edge of Mace Road, and to provide turnaround.

7. **Tree Planters**

**Tree Planter Policy:** The District’s Tree Planter Policy prohibits all trees in planters less than 8-feet in width without the installation of root barriers. Class II trees may be allowed in planters with a minimum width of 8-feet, and Class I and Class III trees may be allowed in planters with a minimum width of 10-feet.

8. **Landscaping**

**Landscaping Policy:** A license agreement is required for all landscaping proposed within ACHD right-of-way or easement areas. Trees shall be located no closer than 10-feet from all public storm drain facilities. Landscaping should be designed to eliminate site obstructions in the vision triangle at intersections. District Policy 5104.3.1 requires a 40-foot vision triangle and a 3-foot height restriction on all landscaping located at an uncontrolled intersection and a 50-foot offset
from stop signs. Landscape plans are required with the submittal of civil plans and must meet all District requirements prior to signature of the final plat and/or approval of the civil plans.

9. **Other Access**
Mace road is classified as a collector roadway. Other than the access specifically approved with this application, direct lot access is prohibited to this roadway and should be noted on the final plat.

D. **Site Specific Conditions of Approval**

1. Apply to vacate/exchange the existing right-of-way on Mace Road between Eagle Road and Island Woods Drive, as proposed. This is a separate process and shall be completed prior to signature of the first final plat.

2. Dedicate 34-feet of right-of-way for Mace Road, as proposed. Construct Mace Road as one half of a 36-foot residential collector roadway, plus 12 additional feet of pavement, with vertical curb, gutter, and 5-foot detached (or 7.5-foot attached) concrete sidewalks abutting the site, from Island Woods Drive to the west property line.

3. Provide a permanent right-of-way easement for all sidewalks on Mace Road located outside of the right-of-way. Sidewalks shall be located wholly within the public right-of-way or wholly within an easement.

4. Construct a 10-foot wide by 80-foot long landscape median within 60-feet of right-of-way on Mace Ranch Way at its intersection with Mace Road, as proposed. Construct 21-foot travel lanes on each side of the median with vertical curb, and detached 5-foot wide sidewalks, as proposed.

5. Construct a 10-foot wide by 50-foot long landscape median within 60-feet of right-of-way on Lands End Way at its intersection with Mace Road, as proposed. Construct 21-foot travel lanes on each side of the median with vertical curb, and detached 5-foot wide sidewalks.

6. Construct all of the internal local streets as 36-foot street sections (back-of-curb to back-of-curb), with rolled curb, gutter, 8-foot parkway strip and 5-foot wide detached sidewalks within 50-feet right-of-way.

7. Provide a permanent right-of-way easement for all sidewalks on the internal local roads located outside of the right-of-way. Sidewalks shall be located wholly within the public right-of-way or wholly within an easement.

8. Construct 2 cul-de-sac turnarounds and 5 knuckles all with center landscape islands, as proposed.

9. Plat the landscape medians on Mace Ranch Way and Lands End Way, and the islands within the 2 cul-de-sacs and the 5 knuckles as right-of-way owned by ACHD; and the Developer or Homeowners Association shall apply for a license agreement if landscaping is to be placed within the medians and/or islands.

10. Construct the cul-de-sacs and knuckles to provide a minimum turning radius of 45-feet with a minimum 29-foot street section around the islands; and provide written approval from the appropriate fire department for this design element.

11. Construct Mace Ranch Way to align centerline to centerline with Osprey Island Street, on the south side of Mace Road across from the site, as proposed.

12. Construct Lakes End Way to intersect Mace Road 875-feet west of Mace Ranch Way, as proposed.
13. Construct Bentbrook Lane to intersect Mace Road 825-feet west of Lakes End Way, as proposed. (measured centerline to centerline)

14. Construct one 30-foot wide emergency access only driveway onto Mace Road located 1,300-feet west of Brentbrook Lane between lots 128 and 129, Block 1, as proposed. Pave the driveway its entire width at least 30-feet into the site beyond the edge of pavement.

15. Construct 4 private roads internal to the site, as proposed. ACHD does not make any assurances that the private roads, that are a part of this application, will be accepted as a public road if such a request is made in the future.

16. Locate the gate or keypad proposed on Bentbrook Lane a minimum of 50-feet from the near edge of Mace Road, and to provide turnaround.

17. Comply with requirements of ITD and City of Eagle for the Eagle Road/SH-55 frontage. Submit a letter from ITD regarding said requirements prior to District approval of the final plat or issuance of a building permit (or other required permits), whichever occurs first.

18. Payment of impacts fees are due prior to issuance of a building permit.


E. **Standard Conditions of Approval**

1. Any existing irrigation facilities shall be relocated outside of the ACHD right-of-way.

2. Private sewer or water systems are prohibited from being located within the ACHD right-of-way.

3. In accordance with District policy, 7203.3, the applicant may be required to update any existing non-compliant pedestrian improvements abutting the site to meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements. The applicant’s engineer should provide documentation of ADA compliance to District Development Review staff for review.

4. Replace any existing damaged curb, gutter and sidewalk and any that may be damaged during the construction of the proposed development. Contact Construction Services at 387-6280 (with file number) for details.

5. A license agreement and compliance with the District’s Tree Planter policy is required for all landscaping proposed within ACHD right-of-way or easement areas.

6. All utility relocation costs associated with improving street frontages abutting the site shall be borne by the developer.

7. It is the responsibility of the applicant to verify all existing utilities within the right-of-way. The applicant at no cost to ACHD shall repair existing utilities damaged by the applicant. The applicant shall be required to call DIGLINE (1-811-342-1585) at least two full business days prior to breaking ground within ACHD right-of-way. The applicant shall contact ACHD Traffic Operations 387-6190 in the event any ACHD conduits (spare or filled) are compromised during any phase of construction.

8. Utility street cuts in pavement less than five years old are not allowed unless approved in writing by the District. Contact the District’s Utility Coordinator at 387-6258 (with file numbers) for details.

9. All design and construction shall be in accordance with the ACHD Policy Manual, ISPWC Standards and approved supplements, Construction Services procedures and all applicable ACHD Standards unless specifically waived herein. An engineer registered in the State of Idaho shall prepare and certify all improvement plans.
10. Construction, use and property development shall be in conformance with all applicable requirements of ACHD prior to District approval for occupancy.

11. No change in the terms and conditions of this approval shall be valid unless they are in writing and signed by the applicant or the applicant’s authorized representative and an authorized representative of ACHD. The burden shall be upon the applicant to obtain written confirmation of any change from ACHD.

12. If the site plan or use should change in the future, ACHD Planning Review will review the site plan and may require additional improvements to the transportation system at that time. Any change in the planned use of the property which is the subject of this application, shall require the applicant to comply with ACHD Policy and Standard Conditions of Approval in place at that time unless a waiver/variance of the requirements or other legal relief is granted by the ACHD Commission.

F. Conclusions of Law

1. The proposed site plan is approved, if all of the Site Specific and Standard Conditions of Approval are satisfied.

2. ACHD requirements are intended to assure that the proposed use/development will not place an undue burden on the existing vehicular transportation system within the vicinity impacted by the proposed development.

G. Attachments

1. Vicinity Map
2. Site Plan
3. Comments from ITD
4. Comments from COMPASS
5. Utility Coordinating Council
6. Development Process Checklist
7. Request for Reconsideration Guidelines
November 7, 2012

Michael Williams
City of Eagle
P.O. Box 1520
Eagle, Idaho 83616  VIA EMAIL

Re:  Mace River Ranch Subdivision (RZ-05-12, CU-04-12, PP-04-12, PPUD-02-12)

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) has reviewed the referenced preliminary plat, conditional use, planned unit development, and rezone application for the Mace River Ranch Subdivision on Eagle Island west of SH-55 (Eagle Road). ITD has the following comments:

1) ITD has no objection to the proposed referenced preliminary plat, conditional use, planned unit development, and rezone application. The application generates traffic volumes similar to the assumed trip generation in the comprehensive plan. This project does not require any new access to the State Highway System.

2) This and other applicants should be aware that ITD is currently planning to install raised medians on SH-55. Construction and congestion delays should be expected.

3) The issue of the Mace Road approach is a particular concern for ITD. We have discussed this issue with the City of Eagle staff and met with the developer’s representatives. As a result of these meetings, ITD has the following comments:

   a. The Mace Road intersection does not have an approach permit with ITD.

   b. The original permitting process for the Two Rivers Subdivision required the closure of the Mace Road approach once the Island Wood signal was operational. The Mace Road approach was not closed.

   c. ITD has monitored the existing SH-55 intersection with Mace Road and determined that Mace Road carries a small amount of local traffic but also serves as an emergency access and as an entrance to the Boise River and the greenbelt pathway.

   d. Island Wood Drive was constructed as a collector roadway without front-on housing as part of the approval for the Two Rivers Subdivision. The roadway was designed to accommodate the anticipated traffic from the developments on Eagle Island.

   e. The existing traffic signal at the SH-55 (Eagle Road) intersection with Island Woods Drive was approved on the basis of the anticipated traffic volumes. The
existing traffic volumes on Island Wood Drive are not sufficient to justify the continued operation of the signal.

f. The applicant reports that Mace Road will be terminated west of SH-55 (Eagle Road) at the commencement of the Phase 2 development of the Mace River Ranch project. The applicant also reports that existing Mace Road intersection with SH-55 will remain as an emergency access and as an approach to the city’s planned park, river access and the greenbelt. This information is not included in the materials submitted with the development application.

g. ITD will work with the City of Eagle to determine a plan for the closure of Mace Road. The long term goal is to eliminate Mace Road as a public thoroughfare. Two of the current options are to either close Mace Road now and restrict access only to the river, greenbelt and public areas or to allow Mace Road to remain open though the developer’s first development phase of 65+ homes. This second alternative will help with the site’s marketing and signage and also separate the construction traffic from the Two Rivers Subdivision.

h. After the Mace River Ranch project receives City approval and a roadway closure plan is developed, ITD will prepare an approach permit for the Mace Road intersection. The permit will be issued to the City of Eagle only for park and greenbelt access.

i. ITD will construct a raised median in SH-55 (Eagle Road) as part of our existing construction plans. The Mace Road intersection with SH-55 (Eagle Road) will be restricted to right-in/right-out operation when the medians are completed.

j. If the Mace River Ranch project does not receive City approval, ITD will work with the City of Eagle to close the Mace Road intersection with SH-55 (Eagle Road) in conformance with the original agreement for the Two Rivers Subdivision project.

4) ITD understands the neighborhood issues related to the required closure of Mace Road. ITD staff will attend the appropriate Planning and Zoning Commission and City Council meetings as needed to explain ITD’s decisions.

If you have any questions, you may contact Matt Ward at 334-8341 or me at 334-8377.

Sincerely,

Dave Szplett
Access Management Manager
dave.szplett@itd.idaho.gov
November 30, 2012

Michael J. Williams, PCED, CFM
City of Eagle
PO Box 1520
Eagle, ID 83616

Re: Mace River Ranch Subdivision

Dear Mr. Williams:

The Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) received the transmittal of the rezone, conditional use, preliminary development plan, and preliminary plat approvals for Mace River Ranch Subdivision (RZ-05-12/PPUD-02-12/CU-04-12/PP-04-12). The project is generally located at the north side of West Mace Road west of Eagle Road at 800 West Mace Road. The project consists of 265 single family homes on approximately 192 acres.

Site Conditions and Forecasts
The 2015 Federal and 2035 Planning Functional Classification Maps indicate Eagle Road as a Principal Arterial, and Mace Road as a Major Collector. The maps and explanation of each are available on the COMPASS website at http://www.compassidaho.org/prodserv/funcmaps.htm.

Figure 1 shows the 2035 Planning Functional Classification of existing roadways in the vicinity of the site.

Figure 1
Mace Road has not been improved to collector standards. While its collector designation terminates just west of the project area, existing unimproved roads do connect to the west, passing through Eagle Island Park and eventually connecting with Linder Road. This has potential to be a bike corridor.

The site is completely within traffic analysis zone (TAZ) 744, consuming approximately 20% of the TAZ. Please see Figure 2 for the TAZs in the area and Table 1 for the current and forecasted demographics.

Figure 2

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAZ</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Households</th>
<th>Jobs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>1,682</td>
<td>613</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal</td>
<td>1,567</td>
<td>571</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For information purposes, Table 2 summarizes the existing and future demographics for the TAZs adjacent to the project.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TAZ</th>
<th>2010 Census</th>
<th></th>
<th>2040</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Population</td>
<td>Households</td>
<td>Jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>734#</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>738#</td>
<td>932</td>
<td>335</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>740*</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>741*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>743*</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>255</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>744</td>
<td>884</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>749</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>751</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>3,045</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>704</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*North of Boise River or east of Eagle Road

The proposed development is accounted for in the 2040 demographics.

**Access Management**

There are no issues regarding Access Management with the proposal. The development would take all its access from a collector road via a signalized intersection on Eagle Road/State Highway 55.

**Mobility Management**

The proposed development site does not include transit supportive densities (more than 7 dwelling units per acre.) The location is not within a quarter mile of existing transit stops, but is within a quarter mile of the Highway 44 express route. The closest bus stop is located approximately one mile east of the development along Highway 44. The proposed development is within a quarter mile of an existing park and ride lot at Ballantyne Road. Valley Regional Transit has developed a transit plan titled Valleyconnect, which establishes a vision for future transit system needs based on short-term growth projections, regional and local land uses, and roadway plans. This plan will help guide future transit investments. The proposed development is within a planned demand response service area, which is designed for neighborhood services in more rural areas. Additionally, primary service routes are planned for the Eagle Road and Highway 44 corridors according to the Valleyconnect plan. Employer express services are planned along Eagle Road, and express services are planned along the Highway 44 corridor. Primary service routes will have 15 to 30 minute frequencies at peak hours and 30 to 60 minute frequencies during midday service. Employer express routes are planned at 30 minute frequencies during peak hours only. Express services will have the same frequencies as primary services, but will have limited stops.

The proposed development is in the Meridian School District boundary, and is within the Andrus Elementary enrollment area. The proposed development is approximately 2.5 miles from Andrus Elementary.
If you have any questions, please contact Carl Miller at COMPASS, 208-475-2239 or cmiller@compassidaho.org.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Matthew J. Stoll
Executive Director

pc:  Mindy Wallace, Ada County Highway District
     File 701
Purpose: To develop the necessary avenue for proper notification to utilities of local highway and road improvements, to help the utilities in budgeting and to clarify the already existing process.

1) Notification: Within five (5) working days upon notification of required right of way improvements by Highway entities, developers shall provide written notification to the affected utility owners and the Ada County Utility Coordinating Council (UCC). Notification shall include but not be limited to, project limits, scope of roadway improvements/project, anticipated construction dates, and any portions critical to the right of way improvements and coordination of utilities.

2) Plan Review: The developer shall provide the highway entities and all utility owners with preliminary project plans and schedule a plan review conference. Depending on the scale of utility improvements, a plan review conference may not be necessary, as determined by the utility owners. Conference notification shall also be sent to the UCC. During the review meeting the developer shall notify utilities of the status of right of way/easement acquisition necessary for their project. At the plan review conference each company shall have the right to appeal, adjust and/or negotiate with the developer on its own behalf. Each utility shall provide the developer with a letter of review indicating the costs and time required for relocation of its facilities. Said letter of review is to be provided within thirty calendar days after the date of the plan review conference.

3) Revisions: The developer is responsible to provide utilities with any revisions to preliminary plans. Utilities may request an updated plan review meeting if revisions are made in the preliminary plans which affect the utility relocation requirements. Utilities shall have thirty days after receiving the revisions to review and comment thereon.

4) Final Notification: The developer will provide highway entities, utility owners and the UCC with final notification of its intent to proceed with right of way improvements and include the anticipated date work will commence. This notification shall indicate that the work to be performed shall be pursuant to final approved plans by the highway entity. The developer shall schedule a preconstruction meeting prior to right of way improvements. Utility relocation activity shall be completed within the times established during the preconstruction meeting, unless otherwise agreed upon.

Notification to the Ada County UCC can be sent to: 50 S. Cole Rd. Boise 83707, or Visit iducc.com for e-mail notification information.
Development Process Checklist

**Items Completed to Date:**

- ☑ Submit a development application to a City or to Ada County
- ☑ The City or the County will transmit the development application to ACHD
- ☑ The ACHD Planning Review Section will receive the development application to review
- ☑ The Planning Review Section will do one of the following:
  - ☐ Send a “No Review” letter to the applicant stating that there are no site specific conditions of approval at this time.
  - ☐ Write a Staff Level report analyzing the impacts of the development on the transportation system and evaluating the proposal for its conformance to District Policy.
  - ☑ Write a Commission Level report analyzing the impacts of the development on the transportation system and evaluating the proposal for its conformance to District Policy.

**Items to be completed by Applicant:**

- ☑ For ALL development applications, including those receiving a “No Review” letter:
  - The applicant should submit one set of engineered plans directly to ACHD for review by the Development Review Section for plan review and assessment of impact fees. (Note: if there are no site improvements required by ACHD, then architectural plans may be submitted for purposes of impact fee assessment.)
  - The applicant is required to get a permit from Construction Services (ACHD) for ANY work in the right-of-way, including, but not limited to, driveway approaches, street improvements and utility cuts.
- ☑ Pay Impact Fees prior to issuance of building permit. Impact fees cannot be paid prior to plan review approval.

**DID YOU REMEMBER:**

**Construction (Non-Subdivisions)**

- ☑ Driveway or Property Approach(s)
  - Submit a “Driveway Approach Request” form to ACHD Construction (for approval by Development Services & Traffic Services). There is a one week turnaround for this approval.

- ☑ Working in the ACHD Right-of-Way
  - Four business days prior to starting work have a bonded contractor submit a “Temporary Highway Use Permit Application” to ACHD Construction – Permits along with:
    a) Traffic Control Plan
    b) An Erosion & Sediment Control Narrative & Plat, done by a Certified Plan Designer, if trench is >50’ or you are placing >600 sf of concrete or asphalt.

**Construction (Subdivisions)**

- ☑ Sediment & Erosion Submittal
  - At least one week prior to setting up a Pre-Construction Meeting an Erosion & Sediment Control Narrative & Plan, done by a Certified Plan Designer, must be turned into ACHD Construction to be reviewed and approved by the ACHD Stormwater Section.

- ☑ Idaho Power Company
  - Vic Steelman at Idaho Power must have his IPCO approved set of subdivision utility plans prior to Pre-Con being scheduled.

- ☑ Final Approval from Development Services is required prior to scheduling a Pre-Con.
Request for Reconsideration of Commission Action

1. **Request for Reconsideration of Commission Action**: A Commissioner, a member of ACHD staff or any other person objecting to any final action taken by the Commission may request reconsideration of that action, provided the request is not for a reconsideration of an action previously requested to be reconsidered, an action whose provisions have been partly and materially carried out, or an action that has created a contractual relationship with third parties.

   a. Only a Commission member who voted with the prevailing side can move for reconsideration, but the motion may be seconded by any Commissioner and is voted on by all Commissioners present.

      If a motion to reconsider is made and seconded it is subject to a motion to postpone to a certain time.

   b. The request must be in writing and delivered to the Secretary of the Highway District no later than 3:00 p.m. on the day prior to the Commission’s next scheduled regular meeting following the meeting at which the action to be reconsidered was taken. Upon receipt of the request, the Secretary shall cause the same to be placed on the agenda for that next scheduled regular Commission meeting.

   c. The request for reconsideration must be supported by written documentation setting forth new facts and information not presented at the earlier meeting, or a changed situation that has developed since the taking of the earlier vote, or information establishing an error of fact or law in the earlier action. The request may also be supported by oral testimony at the meeting.

   d. If a motion to reconsider passes, the effect is the original matter is in the exact position it occupied the moment before it was voted on originally. It will normally be returned to ACHD staff for further review. The Commission may set the date of the meeting at which the matter is to be returned. The Commission shall only take action on the original matter at a meeting where the agenda notice so provides.

   e. At the meeting where the original matter is again on the agenda for Commission action, interested persons and ACHD staff may present such written and oral testimony as the President of the Commission determines to be appropriate, and the Commission may take any action the majority of the Commission deems advisable.

   f. If a motion to reconsider passes, the applicant may be charged a reasonable fee, to cover administrative costs, as established by the Commission.