

Communities in Motion, Public Comments

The table below contains quantitative results and all comments received via comment forms during the May 10 – June 18, 2010, *Communities in Motion* public comment period. Following the table are additional public comments received via email and letter. Comments received from member agencies are listed separately.

In the table, when the same comment was received in response to one question, the number of times it was stated is noted in parentheses (e.g., “State Street/Highway 44 [3 comments],” indicates three people wrote simply “State Street/Highway 44” in response to that question). However, when similar comments were received, but they were not identical (e.g., same sentiment but different reasons explaining a viewpoint or similar but slightly different comments), these were listed separately to ensure the commenter’s point was not lost (e.g., “State Street west of Gary,” “State Street and Hill Road,” “State Street connector system” are each listed separately).

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
<p>What prompted you to comment on this plan? That is, is there a specific concern, or a particular road or issue that interests you?</p>	140	NA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improved/expanded public transportation (14 comments) 2. State Street/Highway 44 (3 comments) 3. More transportation options/current lack of multi-modal options (6 comments) 4. General interest (7 comments) 5. The Meridian Road bridge replacement/bottleneck over I-84 (2 comments) 6. Lack of funding mechanisms to pay for the transportation system needs. (4 comments) 7. Chinden Road/US 20/26 (3 comments) 8. Ada County Planning and Zoning Commission (2 comments) 9. State Street west of Gary 10. State Street and Hill Road 11. State Street connector system. 12. I live near Glenwood and State Streets. These roads are heavily traveled and have many auto accidents. 13. Growth of State Street and extensions of Highway 55. 14. I-84 and State Street. 15. I am interested to know what projects can be funded. State Street is a particular concern. 16. Yes, I am interested in State Street/Hwy. 44. I am hoping that light rail or a better public transit system can be developed along Hwy. 44 and would run from downtown Boise all the way to Middleton. 17. The Chinden corridor, especially from Eagle to Can-Ada road is a concern. I would like to see this preserved as a corridor for traffic (without a lot of lights and turnouts) and also for it to accommodate bicycles. 18. Congestion and coordination between Eagle Road and SH 44, can it be improved? 19. Boise Metro Chamber has Transportation as a priority 20. I use public transit since I am blind and can't drive anymore 21. Yes - what is planned to be built / \$ spent on in next 20 years 22. Overall regional economic well being

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			23. Improved transportation system
			24. We need good roads
			25. My concerns for my clients for my clients for my job
			26. Lack of transportation in Caldwell and surrounding areas
			27. I work w/ refugees who are extremely public transit dependent. I commute by bike, I love to use public transit in other cities, environment, etc.
			28. Kuna Mora
			29. Kuna Mora Corridor. Want it to stay on hold forever. I live on Bowmont and Robinson.
			30. I want to make a difference to our future so I wanted you to know my opinions.
			31. Hwy 16
			32. Part of an agency meeting
			33. Asked to.
			34. Desire to become involved.
			35. Yes light rail to bike paths.
			36. Want safe, walkable/bikeable routes to school for my kids.
			37. To support streetcar idea and commuter rail.
			38. Franklin Road west from Linder.
			39. Linder Rd. north from Franklin.
			40. Lack of improvements to state highways.
			41. Participation on Meridian Transportation Task Force.
			42. Warm Springs Ave. East
			43. Community awareness
			44. 3 Cities River Crossing
			45. Interested citizen
			46. Neighborhood underdevelopment (high density) pressure; has no infrastructure
			47. I am Eagle City Council member - Eagle Roads are inadequate for existing volume.
			48. Eagle Road - safe non motorized way to access downtown Boise.
			49. We all are part of a big community and should be involved.
			50. There are lots of the issues that concern me.
			51. Meeting facilitator questions.
			52. Committee member
			53. Need transportation projects to promote compact development.
			54. Interested in plan.
			55. Combined CIM meeting with MIM activity
			56. To forecast the future roadways and public transportation.
			57. Treasure Valley needs high speed rail - Ontario to Mtn. Home
			58. Lack of transportation to sky ranch business area in Caldwell, Idaho
			59. Garrity exit ramp and traffic from Caldwell to Boise stinks.
			60. Frustration from the lack of direction in tackling issues. There seems to be a lot of talk but no action.
			61. Getting tired about having it talked about. LET'S DO SOMETHING!!
			62. My boss.
			63. So I would be on record with my opinions.

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			64. Interested in roadway, transportation planning in the treasure valley.
			65. Overall interest in community and transportation planning.
			66. Went to meeting in a bag
			67. Anger at taxpayers / environment paying for development costs. Developers ignoring / half job on environmental degradation (Eagle)
			68. Interest in the neighborhood development near the neighborhood.
			69. Interest in seeing that our community doesn't become traffic congested.
			70. Upcoming work - future sustainability of the municipalities.
			71. Transportation access for all, conditions of road.
			72. Comment page required with meeting in a bag presentation.
			73. The bus hours, needs to follow Eugene, OR model. This would be especially important for the refugee population.
			74. I would hope someone's putting some thought into good options.
			75. I have major concerns over the quality of forethought on development growth and transportation planning overall in the valley.
			76. Live near Lake Hazel Road.
			77. Preserving our quality of life in SW Idaho.
			78. As a resident of Ada County and Boise City, and as an individual who utilizes the roadways it is important to be involved in shaping the future of transportation in the area.
			79. I am most concerned about sprawl and lack of planning for the future.
			80. I live in Meridian and look forward to better commuting options in the future.
			81. The transportation system affects me each day.
			82. Meridian and Overland Road and Overland Overpass
			83. East and west bound traffic need to be accommodated better by widening roads or increasing transit.
			84. A long term involvement with treasure valley transportation issues.
			85. In the business.
			86. Interested in overall transportation system and approach COMPASS is taking towards future planning.
			87. Interested in growth projections.
			88. Any transportation improvements are a concern (meaning I want more)
			89. I am very concerned about the matter, both as a resident and as a student /professional of transportation engineering.
			90. Concern about sprawl and car-centric transportation.
			91. I feel our road infrastructure is severely lagging in development. We need more forward thinking plans i.e. controlled access roads.
			92. Growth management and reducing the impact of roads on the community quality of life.
			93. I believe our priorities should be on transit, complete streets and corridors that facilitate curbing urban sprawl.
			94. It seems this plan shows a belief that we can build our way out of congestion, ie more roads with more lanes.
			95. I also don't understand why Bowmont Road is being funded when Kuna-Mora is not. I don't believe a by-pass is practical or needed. It's a case of if you build it they will come.

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>96. My interest is to provide information to help leaders realize a car-centric, "roads and bridges" only approach is doomed to fail - as it has in any major city. If we can get people to walk, pedal or use ValleyRide, we can improve our air and traffic congestion.</p> <p>97. To see that Canyon County is represented.</p> <p>98. Making the roads safer for bicycling.</p> <p>99. Need for bicycle and pedestrian friendly roadways.</p> <p>100. The better streets, roads, and highways are made, the less the incentive there will be for people to want, fund, and use mass transit.</p> <p>101. Specific concerns for the funding of alternative transportation such as public transit, bikeways, and trails.</p> <p>102. A good transportation plan is critical to the long term viability of our area.</p> <p>103. Attended a Meeting in the Bag yesterday and wanted to fill out online rather than on paper.</p> <p>104. I am very concerned about our tendency in the valley to further our 'car centric' culture through simply more, and bigger roadways. We will need visionary leadership that looks beyond our 'lazy' American ways to ensure that the valley is both livable AND encourages investment and business growth for the future.</p> <p>105. Need to better connect our local communities and save fuel in the process.</p> <p>106. I am being impacted by plan.</p> <p>107. A "Meeting in a Bag" hosted by the Collister Neighborhood Association and presented by Deanna Smith.</p> <p>108. Radio announcement soliciting input from public/users.</p> <p>109. Heard the ads on the radio.... and I care about the transportation in our valley.</p> <p>110. My concern is that the 2006 and 2010 update plans fail to take into consideration the major global liquid fuels shortfall we will soon be facing. Please link to graph on page 8 of the US Department of Energy document I am providing the link to: http://www.eia.doe.gov/conference/2009/session3/Sweetnam.pdf The US Dept of Energy presented this information in 2009. The US military Joint Forces Command concurs with this projection. As you can see, by 2012 demand will exceed supply with the disparity increasing rapidly as supply continually decreases. My strong belief is that communities that proactively establish feasible mass transport systems will be able to adapt to this impending change much more successfully than those mistakenly assuming continuation of the status quo.</p> <p>111. I believe the use of fossil fuels (tax revenue) will decrease significantly by electric cars, and hybrid vehicles.</p> <p>112. After I read the draft plan.</p> <p>113. No, I was eager to help a friend, and thought it might be good to learn more about how the system works.</p> <p>114. The roads (around our Paramount Subdivision) interested us the most. This includes Hwy 20/26, Linder Road, Meridian Road, Locust Grove. The rest of the plan is too overwhelming for one or two meetings.</p> <p>115. Expanding transit with more bus routes to all of Treasure Valley.</p> <p>116. Improvement and adding walking / biking paths and lanes.</p> <p>117. Widening of roads.</p> <p>118. Meeting in a bag.</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>119. I live in Nampa and roads are not developing as fast as the population. No thought plan involved and safe roads are not important. We would like to see alternative travel by bike safety.</p> <p>120. My boss wanted our participation.</p> <p>121. Concern about Treasure Valley traffic now and in the future.</p> <p>122. I think State St. would do very well with a trolley to downtown Boise.</p> <p>123. Paving dry creek road.</p> <p>124. Pollution from cars.</p> <p>125. There needs to be more routes.</p>
<p>How did you learn about this opportunity to comment?</p>	<p>220</p>	<p>Invitation to Meeting in a Bag: 41.4%</p> <p>Email: 25.5%</p> <p>Radio Advertisement: 4.5%</p> <p>COMPASS Web Site: 3.2%</p> <p>Word of Mouth: 1.8%</p> <p>Display/Booth: 1.8%</p> <p>Newspaper Advertisement: 1.4%</p> <p>News Story: 0.9%</p> <p>Other: 19.5%</p>	<p>Radio (where):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. River Interactive 2. 107.1 KHTS (4 comments) 3. 94.9 FM (3 comments) <p>Newspaper (where):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Idaho Statesman (4 comments) <p>Display/Booth (where):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. Ada County Extension Office (2 comments) <p>News Story (where):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Don't remember <p>Other (where):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. Nampa Bicycle and Pedestrian Citizens Advisory Group (4 comments) 8. Office/Work (4 comments) 9. ACHD-CICAC (3 comments) 10. Neighborhood Association (3 comments) 11. Scouts (3 comments) 12. City of Meridian (2 comments) 13. P & Z (2 comments) 14. City Council Meeting 15. Meridian Transportation Task Force 16. Meeting 17. Wife 18. Amy Luft 19. ACHD Committee Mtg 20. NACA 21. Hosted meeting in a bag. 22. Church newsletter seniors meeting. 23. Ada County P & Z 24. DAC [Demographic Advisory Committee] 25. ACHD 26. COMPASS PPC [Public Participation Committee] 27. HP Mtg 28. Our neighborhood traffic planning committee (Paramount Subdivision) brought it up. 29. Presentation at Glenwood Rim Neighborhood Association meeting.

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 30. Contacted by COMPASS staff member 31. I received an invitation for a Meeting in the Bag from Idaho Smart Growth 32. Downtown Boise Neighborhood board meeting 33. I have been to meetings 34. Region 3 housing meeting - Caldwell 35. Mailing 36. Open House, Title One
<p>Where did you receive this comment form?</p> <p>(Not asked on the online form.)</p>	185	<p>Meeting in a Bag: 78.9%</p> <p>Open House: 4.9%</p> <p>COMPASS Office: 0.5%</p> <p>Public Library: 0%</p> <p>Idaho Green Expo: 0%</p> <p>COMPASS Web Site: 0%</p> <p>Cinco de Mayo: 0%</p> <p>May in Motion: 0.5%</p> <p>Other: 15.1%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Scouts (6 comments) 2. Church (3 comments) 3. City of Meridian (2 comments) 4. NACA Meeting (2 comments) 5. P & Z (2 comments) 6. HP (2 comments) 7. Nampa Bicycle and Pedestrian Citizens Advisory Group (2 comments) 8. Meridian transportation task force 9. Meeting 10. Extension Office 11. Ada County P & Z 12. Ada County 13. AP 14. Boss 15. Region 3 housing meeting - Caldwell
<p>Transportation Systems – Roadways: The draft plan supports improvements to regional roads. The cost of the improvements listed in the plan would be \$6.6 billion, with a total cost to improve <u>and</u> maintain the road system of \$10.1 billion by 2035. At least \$3.9 billion in new revenues would be needed to pay for the improvements and maintenance.</p> <p>Do you support improvements to regional roads?</p>	194	<p>Yes: 88.7%</p> <p>No: 7.7%</p> <p>No Opinion: 3.6%</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Want local option sales tax (3 comments) 2. People who have more "discretionary funds" should pay more to support the common good. 3. If 100% of increase went directly to new facility construction. 4. This depends on how it is; I'd support increases in fuel, sales taxes more than a lump sum increase, such as vehicle registration. 5. Only certain ones in urban areas. 6. I believe any tax for road improvement should be added to fuel tax. This would also encourage people to use alternate transportation. 7. The current economy, with accompanying high unemployment rates, is not conducive to higher taxes. 8. I'd rather see us maintain existing and focus on transit. 9. Raise gas tax to pay for roads and de-incentivize driving. 10. Stop solving traffic problems with bigger roads. 11. It is not acceptable for ITD to say they are just a maintenance organization and they don't have any money. 12. Education Funding is my first priority - before roads. 13. They have to be targeted. 14. I would prefer taxes for specific projects. How much per year depends on project. 15. To specific projects, not a blanket tax. 16. But based on a compact plan.
<p>Do you support seeking new revenue sources for roadways?</p>	192	<p>Yes: 78.1%</p> <p>No: 15.6%</p> <p>No Opinion: 6.3%</p>	
<p>Would you be willing to pay more in taxes to support improvements to regional roads?</p>	188	<p>Yes: 68.6%</p> <p>No: 22.9%</p> <p>No Opinion: 8.5%</p>	

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
If "yes," how much per year?	137	<p>\$0 - \$100: 48.9%</p> <p>\$101 - \$200: 33.6%</p> <p>\$201 - \$300: 7.3%</p> <p>\$301 or more: 10.2%</p>	<p>17. I'm not against funding roads - I just want the money to go to maintaining roads - when you improve the roads, the ones you have funded in this plan, will actually go against compact growth, your stated goal.</p> <p>18. Based on gasoline/diesel consumption. Only gas tax.</p> <p>19. Need more info.</p> <p>20. The community in general doesn't have the extra money to pay. Taxes generated by the legislature are the only real option and they won't do it.</p> <p>21. Perhaps a sliding scale. Starting smaller and increasing over 5 years to a set amount. Ex: \$100/yr than \$200/yr then \$300/yr to max out at \$500/yr or whatever is needed to reach goal.</p> <p>22. \$0 for amenities for developers who make the profits; \$100 for I-84 corridor / State St.</p> <p>23. I'll comment further in a separate message.</p> <p>24. Fine w/maintaining roads but don't want to keep expanding them.</p> <p>25. Tax the s--- out of gasoline users.</p> <p>26. To start.</p> <p>27. Roadway expansion is only chasing the symptoms of growth, it does not solve our issues. It will never solve them.</p> <p>28. Not well enough informed / studied on all options and specifics to form an opinion.</p> <p>29. This should be a last option.</p> <p>30. What exactly are we talking about? What's the pros and cons the payoff on investment.</p> <p>31. Make the users pay for the added cost of transportation ie: vehicle registration and gas taxes.</p> <p>32. Users of the system should be taxed on their use, this should receive the least amount of funding.</p> <p>33. Make development pay for mitigating their impacts to local roads, not just improvements to their frontage.</p> <p>34. I strongly support roadway improvements - they are vital to our growth and prosperity. I support gas tax increases.</p> <p>35. Gas tax</p> <p>36. For mass transit</p> <p>37. But I must know that my needs will be met.</p> <p>38. Improvements too often mean adding lanes which only increases use - we need to look at ways to reduce cars and trucks.</p> <p>39. Yes providing they fulfill the comments in my first response.</p> <p>40. Only for transit.</p> <p>41. Maybe if they are the right type of improvements.</p> <p>42. Probably not as much as \$100.</p> <p>43. Mixed feelings on this. There are some roads that need to be improved to include bike lanes and maybe a left turn lane. I am more in favor of maintaining the roads with the number of lanes they are rather than building new roads (Kuna-Mora/Bowmont) or widening (Fairview and Ustick) to 5 or 7 lanes, unless there are plans for possible transit (when money permits). I would rather see more money for mass transit than more roads. We should maintain what we have but not necessarily build more roads.</p> <p>44. Yes, as long as more than Otter's outdated mantra of "cars and trucks, roads and bridges" is taken into account.</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>45. The amount I'd support would vary depending on the vision.</p> <p>46. Only if they include the accommodation of bicycles.</p> <p>47. Yes, if the roads are wide enough for bicycles to share the road.</p> <p>48. Yes, but again we need more bicycle friendly roads to reduce the number of cars on the roads.</p> <p>49. Badly needed. Painful but necessary.</p> <p>50. If the improvements included public transit, I would be very open to paying more taxes.</p> <p>51. As long as the improvements address the needs of all modes of transportation -- Complete Streets policy.</p> <p>52. But not without commensurate investment in better alternatives to single person vehicle travel. We must have a local option tax. It is embarrassing to be one of just three states (with Alabama and Alaska) with it. ONLY with a balance between roadways and alternative forms of transportation.</p> <p>53. The CIM Update Presentation (slide 17) shows an estimate for revenue generation of \$390 per household per year to raise \$90 million per year (2009 dollars). This question could use a \$301 - \$400 answer slot; and a \$401 or more slot.</p> <p>54. However, since roads don't pay for themselves (they are supported by tax dollars), my tax dollars should be used in a more efficient manner: with mass transportation improvements. Therefore, I support road improvements if they amount to alternative transportation solutions. I think much more could be done with the dollars we have - without having to constantly increase the funding. Do more with less ~ everyone else is, and transportation should be no exception. Get creative. Not unless more is done to foster a culture of favoring mass transportation: HOV lanes, bike lanes, bus-only lanes, etc.</p> <p>55. We will soon be forced to transition from a primarily individual transportation system to mass transportation systems. Funds should be directed toward that end. I would be willing to pay more in taxes to support mass transit systems.</p> <p>56. Of course if necessary possibly</p> <p>57. Increase fossil fuel tax by increasing fossil fuel tax only.</p> <p>58. But not more tax - more efficient use of current revenue. More efficient use of current revenue - construction - pay per job plan so they are not ripped up for another project after completion.</p> <p>59. I think there might be enough money if efficiency was made a priority. I see a lot of construction stopped halfway, or finished and redone a month later.</p> <p>60. It would depend on which roads were included in the proposed tax increases.</p> <p>61. I do not oppose paying a reasonable amount (\$.50 a day for example) more for better roads, but wonder how that money is spent - carefully or wastefully. How much spent on admin?</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
<p>Transportation Systems – Transit: The draft plan supports an expanded public transportation system and more opportunities for walking and biking. The expanded public transportation system would cost \$4.1 billion and require the region to seek new revenue sources of \$2.7 billion.</p> <p>Do you support an expanded transit system?</p>	201	<p>Yes: 91.0% No: 5.5% No Opinion: 3.5%</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local option tax (4 comments) 2. Do we have enough density/population to support transit? (2comments) 3. People who have more "discretionary funds" should pay more to support the common good 4. This depends on how it is; I'd support increases in fuel, sales taxes more than a lump sum increase, such as vehicle registration. 5. Lots of stops and regular runs are required for "core routes" 6. The current economy, with accompanying high unemployment rates, is not conducive to higher taxes. 7. I think this is essential to quality of life in TV. 8. Protect air quality. 9. Prefer to pay for transit over roadways. Need a dedicated funding source not competing w/ other areas.
<p>Do you support seeking new revenue sources for transit?</p>	196	<p>Yes: 85.2% No: 8.7% No Opinion: 6.1%</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Integrate electric vehicles with transportation systems. 11. I need to see what VRT would do with the money before I give them money. 12. Walking, biking, public transit would also affect health issues - like obesity. 13. However we can't leave our roads in hopes this will happen soon. 14. But the balance of local and regional must be real. 15. I am supportive of improving safe walking and biking opportunities.
<p>Would you be willing to pay more in taxes to support improvements to transit?</p>	192	<p>Yes: 77.6% No: 15.1% No Opinion: 7.3%</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 16. Local. Especially walking and biking. 17. \$.01 sales tax 18. How much is needed, who will pay - determines how much I would be willing to pay. 19. The population is too small to do what is needed. 20. Again same sliding scale idea. Little at first, then increase. Not for "rail" system yet. But start planning for it. 10 years at least for rail. 21. Need to develop the rail corridor at very least - light rail. 22. Light rail system from Caldwell and from Mt. Home. Look at what Houston did. 23. More tax on gasoline. 24. To start. 25. The answer to our transit issues is not more / wider roads it is mass transit options and availability. 26. Needing to do more research and educate myself more to come to an opinion on the topic. 27. Needs to be first option. 28. If well thought out and given choices on all three answers. 29. Depends on the idea and the impact. 30. Again good planning is needed and find a way to make the beneficiaries help front the costs. 31. We need to make this investment and take the lead before it gets more challenging and expensive. 32. Improve / increase service along State St. to Caldwell. 33. Transit will only work with stringent land use and development controls. 34. Except for bus and r/w for future improvements. 35. I support improvements to walking, biking, and the bus systems. 36. I don't think we should look into LRT until the bus system improves. 37. Sales tax.
<p>If "yes," how much per year?</p>	150	<p>\$0 - \$100: 52.0% \$101 - \$200: 29.3% \$201 - \$300: 9.3% \$301 or more: 9.3%</p>	

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>38. We need more people to use more mass transit rather than getting more cars on the road.</p> <p>39. Most definitely over roadway expansion.</p> <p>40. Buses are inconvenient now. They have to be more convenient and regular to stop being seen as a last resort for folks with no other options.</p> <p>41. Absolutely. To say that there is no need because our current system doesn't get used is ridiculous. It must be funded so that it is convenient and frequent enough to meet people's needs -- then it would really get used. Absolutely. There must be a better way and we must have a dedicated source. Absolutely.</p> <p>42. But not just around downtown. We need to provide links between cities across the valley. We need to move people in-between real locations first.</p> <p>43. ONLY with a balance in funding between traditional roads and alternative forms of transportation.</p> <p>44. I would support transit systems to specific recreational centers: BDO, Lucky Peak State Park (out Warm Spgs-SR71), Bogus Basin Ski Area, Movie Theatre/Malls; especially for evenings and weekends when use would be specially for that destination and not multiple purpose.</p> <p>45. ABSOLUTELY</p> <p>46. This should be prioritized</p> <p>47. I would support light rail and a downtown trolley system.</p> <p>48. For public electric charging locations from new fuel tax from new fuel tax.</p> <p>49. But not more tax - more efficient use of current revenue. More efficient use of current revenue - construction - pay per job plan so they are not ripped up for another project after completion.</p> <p>50. Bikeways are very important to me. Many of the current ones are too narrow to feel safe, or they don't exist at all. I'd bike more if I could.</p> <p>51. Just wish there was another way besides raising taxes.</p> <p>52. Again - yes, but will this money go to accessible public transportation or to someone's pet project. How do we know that it will be available to all with a reasonable schedule? The buses don't run often enough to make them accessible.</p>
<p>Changes between 2006 and 2010 – Funded Projects: By law, only projects that can be paid for (funded) can be included in the planned transportation system. Because of rising costs without increased funding, many projects that were “funded” in 2006 had to be removed from the planned transportation system in 2010 because there is not funding for them, even though they are priorities.</p> <p>Given this constraint, do you agree with the changes that were made?</p>	189	<p>Yes: 49.2%</p> <p>No: 20.6%</p> <p>No Opinion: 30.2%</p>	<p>1. Add State Street/Highway 44 (7 comments)</p> <p>2. US 20/26 should be a funded roadway (5 comments)</p> <p>3. Get a local option tax.</p> <p>4. US 20/26 should be funded over highway 16 and roads south of I-80. Concentrate the funds in existing urban areas or connecting (areas w/ highest density).</p> <p>5. Does nothing for me.</p> <p>6. Cutting corridors for lack of funding is wise.</p> <p>7. Good luck making hard decisions.</p> <p>8. Removing them [projects] from the plan would seem to discourage plan developers. Should priorities remain on the plan until funds are in place?</p> <p>9. Tough times call for tough decisions. Thanks.</p> <p>10. No comment.</p> <p>11. The re-built Meridian Rd. Interchange should be a funded roadway.</p> <p>12. Swan Falls and Bowmont Road should be moved to unfunded.</p> <p>13. Lake Hazel or Amity (not both) should also be amended to free-up dollars for more important projects.</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>14. The 3 cities crossing project should be taken out of the plan. It is just too expensive.</p> <p>15. Disappointing that some needed projects that were funded are now unfunded.</p> <p>16. Alternate routes than Eagle Road.</p> <p>17. Haven't looked at plan closely enough.</p> <p>18. The northwest area of Ada County (Eagle Area) has no funded priorities.</p> <p>19. Construction costs going down.</p> <p>20. I'd like to understand more about the timing of changes.</p> <p>21. The need still exists. Funding still needs to be allocated.</p> <p>22. 16 to I-84 should be a priority.</p> <p>23. Disagree: Bowmont Road</p> <p>24. Fairview Ave. does not need 7 lanes. It will not reduce traffic, or improve the road. It will make it worse. It will feel more like a freeway.</p> <p>25. Not clear how the plan supports compact development. This is a short coming in the plan.</p> <p>26. Some of the funded projects go against your goal for compact growth, such as the Bowmont Road.</p> <p>27. You have highway 16 funded for the bridge, but you didn't fund the interchange at I-84 on McDermott.</p> <p>28. Do not fund Bowmont.</p> <p>29. Do not fund Ustick in lieu of 20/26, do not fund Ustick or Fairview before a transit plan and facilities to support it are complete.</p> <p>30. Do not fund Amity.</p> <p>31. Do fund all of Greenhurst and Lake Hazel.</p> <p>32. Show funds for bike / pedestrian.</p> <p>33. Bowmont Rd. (from illustrative to funded) does not support goals of compact development.</p> <p>34. Not all, but "yes" some.</p> <p>35. It is too political and those with political ties get the choices.</p> <p>36. Not knowledgeable enough to comment on this.</p> <p>37. I'd prefer having another income source.</p> <p>38. It's too complex a question for a yes / no answer</p> <p>39. Not so sure unfunding Three Cities Crossing is wise. Additional river crossings are vital between Glenwood and Eagle Rd.</p> <p>40. Still not well enough informed based on description above and meeting in a bag presentation, I do not feel that is enough info./source to develop an opinion.</p> <p>41. Do not take money away from schools that's all I can think of.</p> <p>42. It is unclear whether the funding decisions are based on lack of traffic demand or political wranglings.</p> <p>43. During these times we can't have government spend funds it doesn't have.</p> <p>44. Remove projects from areas that affect the legislators who are voting against local option.</p> <p>45. However, the elected officials and legislators need to be strongly accused of these increasing transportation deficiencies.</p> <p>46. Decrease the cost of the projects.</p> <p>47. Remove Ustick Road, SH16 and Fairview Ave.</p> <p>48. I agree with HWY 16 crossing (instead of 3 cities)</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>49. We need more people to use more mass transit rather than getting more cars on the road.</p> <p>50. I don't agree with several of the funding changes.</p> <p>51. Why was Bowmont Road changed from unfunded to funded? This will only encourage more development in this part of Canyon County.</p> <p>52. Why fund the river crossing on Hwy 16 but not access to it from I-84?</p> <p>53. I don't see any mention of bike lanes or wide shoulders that would make room for my travel?</p> <p>54. I am not sure what the ramifications of "funded in part" means.</p> <p>55. Seems like we are choosing to cover many little things instead of investing in a significant project that would really begin to drive change in the valley.</p> <p>56. The changes are somewhat outdated already.</p> <p>57. There is nothing noted on electric transportation. The model is based on fossil transportation. A plan should be used from another city which has built in charging locations in plan, from the state of Oregon.</p> <p>58. It's sad that it all can't be funded. But something done is better than nothing. Maybe, down the road.</p> <p>59. I am very pleased to see the improvements from Nampa to Boise on I-84...very much need.</p> <p>60. Very disappointed that funding takes place - priority has been ADA County improvements ONLY.</p> <p>61. I do not know enough about this to have an opinion. I just look at condition of the roads, amount of traffic and decide whether or not I want to continue using this route. I do complain a lot about the traffic, the noise and its smell.</p> <p>62. NO</p>
<p>Recognizing there is not enough money for everything, what different changes, if any, would you recommend?</p>	<p>80</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>1. Transit first</p> <p>2. Fund Kuna Mora</p> <p>3. No.</p> <p>4. Look at more creative bundling of projects to try and get more bang for the buck.</p> <p>5. Local option tax for transit and alternative transportation (4 comments)</p> <p>6. I don't believe the answer is to build more roads. I think people need to learn the advantages of public transportation. The TVTS is the most viable system and needs to be promoted as such.</p> <p>7. Need bike highways from one side of the valley to the other.</p> <p>8. Light rail/rail (2 comments)</p> <p>9. Cargo racks (overhead like in airplanes) to make shopping trips easier.</p> <p>10. Figure out how to owe gas taxes for non-road users.</p> <p>11. Base every project on YMT data. Rank projects by highest use and do them first.</p> <p>12. We need to find money for state highways. Perhaps we use GARVEE bonds for 44 / Chinden like they did for I-84.</p> <p>13. Toll Roads.</p> <p>14. If money becomes available, the first project I would put back on the funded list is US Hwy 20/26 - Exit 29 to Eagle Road.</p> <p>15. 3 Cities River Crossing should be moved up.</p> <p>16. Right turn lane from Eagle Road (going south) onto Chinden should be added to list.</p> <p>17. Prioritize - east west corridors.</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 18. More funding for State St. Eagle to Boise. 19. Take out Bowmont Road 20. Ustick does not need widened. 21. Fund high capacity corridor study vs. some road corridors. 22. We must fund the studies for BRT on State Street and light rail on the existing rail corridor. 23. I want you to find roads that are consistent with the goals of the plan - eliminate Bowmont Road, Amity Road, etc. 24. Do fund the high capacity transit study before expanding roads. 25. Do not fund SH16 bridge without an interchange on I-84. 26. Put money that best supports activity centers and compact development. 27. Put money into high capacity transit study 28. Improve / encourage public transit 29. Just make sure we are prioritizing projects with existing funding. 30. Fund planned priority transportation. 31. Fund Meridian Road Interchange. 32. Fund preservation Corridor for 20/26. 33. Don't extend Bowmont. 34. Trash 3 cities crossing all together. 35. An increase in auto registration fees. Idaho's is quite low when compared to other western states. 36. Cherry over Ustick 37. Fund 20/26 w/ Garvee II 38. I opt for casino gambling in Idaho. Look what the lottery has done for revenue. 39. Widen US 20/26 all the way. Exit 29 to Eagle Road. 40. I like Ustick widening but a limited access east / west Route would move more traffic. So replace Ustick's \$134 million. 41. No changes to the plan. 42. Focus on urban areas, not rural roads - force developers to pay more for new development. 43. Organize, tell stories of those who would benefit from planning. 44. More emphasis on effective transit. 45. More federal funding 46. Incentives to get commuters out of cars. 47. Maintain current / existing - current deterioration will be x2 or x3 with increased costs. 48. A great concentration and effort should be made on improving public transportation i.e. routes and schedules. And less time on building new roads that contribute to community sprawl. 49. Buy land for future light rail 50. Expand bike lanes 51. Tax gasoline (but not farmers) 52. Impact fees on developers. 53. Begin <u>(?)</u> focus / expand on transit. 54. Add lights Hwy 69 @ Hubbard and Lake Hazel and Kuna Road. 55. Spend available monies. 56. A more efficient traffic signalization.

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>57. Fund Chinden from I-84 to Eagle Road (or at least McDermott to Eagle Rd.) as a 5 lane conventional roadway.</p> <p>58. You are doing best you can with resources provided.</p> <p>59. Maintain the road systems and make only the improvements that could be funded.</p> <p>60. Local option for funding is "critical"</p> <p>61. Make new money.</p> <p>62. No changes come to mind.</p> <p>63. Implement the projects in phases - don't overbuild.</p> <p>64. Perhaps another analysis including non-funded projects could be conducted.</p> <p>65. Emphasis on ROW preservation and transit.</p> <p>66. Chinden west of Eagle road (at least to Linder) needs more lanes.</p> <p>67. I do not agree with any funding for roads that are in the Counties such as Bowmont. We need to focus on very limited resources on accomplishing the important corridors for regional travel such as Hwy 16, State ST, Hwy 20/26. These are the roads we need to improve along with transit in order to help infill occur.</p> <p>68. Put money into transit studies, like the rail corridor and State Street. Improve access management on the major roads like State, Chinden, Eagle and Fairview.</p> <p>69. Even if bike lanes (as in 5.5 feet) are not financially feasible in each project, give at least 2-3 feet of pavement to the right of the fog line. A fog line gives motorists/cyclists a dividing line to follow.</p> <p>70. Include projects Greenhurst/Happy Valley Roads</p> <p>71. Give more priority to expanding Chinden's 4 lanes to the county line (at least)</p> <p>72. I think serious attention should be given to the thought of building a new section of the Interstate to bypass Boise, Nampa, and Caldwell so local traffic does not compete with through traffic. It should go from somewhere north of Notus to somewhere around the Boise Stage Stop, skirting the urban areas well to the west and south.</p> <p>73. Delete the Kuna Mora Corridor from the entire plan.</p> <p>74. Seek out alternatives to the automobile before spending \$ on mega projects. Eg: Bus service, High Capacity Lanes, Bus Rapid Transit etc</p> <p>75. Get visionary and begin some long-term change.</p> <p>76. I would like to see a train system similar to Utah connecting Caldwell, Nampa and Boise. Perhaps in the future connecting Mt Home as well.</p> <p>77. Fewer partial projects. Prioritize the projects and complete them.</p> <p>78. Focus on improving roads in and directly between existing population centers.</p> <p>79. More mass transit. Less realignments.</p> <p>80. Do not mark them as funded until they truly are.</p> <p>81. The highest emphasis should be put on public transit systems and bicycle lanes.</p> <p>82. The only reason my teen & young adults own cars is because of the very poor public transport system, therefore I think expanded public transit would go a long way to reduce traffic congestion.</p> <p>83. Invest in making it safe for bike commuters.</p> <p>84. Add more bike paths.</p> <p>85. Still need a fossil fuel tax increase.</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			86. Pay construction projects by the job; plan ahead to avoid tearing up completed projects. 87. I would rather make current roads better than build new ones. I'd focus money on that. 88. Widen Hwy 20/26 but do not make it into an expressway. 89. Cherry Lane and Greenhurst Road improvements funded. 90. Spend less on commercials, marketing - increase fines for DUI's, speeding and other traffic violations. 91. I would go off Dave Ramsey and NOT go into debt.
<p>Growth Scenarios: The <i>Communities in Motion</i> update examines two different scenarios for growth and land use in the Treasure Valley:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Choices, which encourages more compact growth and high-density housing in existing communities; more open space between communities; and building housing, jobs, services, and shopping closer together. • Preservation, which assumes each community will grow to the maximum possible, based upon that community's comprehensive plan. <p>While <i>Communities in Motion</i> examines both, the plan supports the "Community Choices" scenario, based upon extensive public input when the 2006 <i>Communities in Motion</i> plan was developed.</p> <p>Do you support the "Community Choices" growth scenario? (Encourages compact growth and high density housing.)</p>	<p>192</p>	<p>Yes: 72.9% No: 18.2% No Opinion: 8.9%</p>	1. I would like to see a moratorium on residential building that is not presold. Spec homes should be discouraged. 2. To a certain degree - but observing each community's comprehensive plans - being aware that development might be pushed to other communities. 3. Use the comp plan for guidance with developers doing feasibility of each project on an individual basis. 4. Determined locally. 5. Comprehensive plan / local jurisdictions should make land -use decisions. 6. Not all areas are large enough to be "compact" this is not Seattle or Dallas. 7. Encourage - yes / dictate - no 8. What do you mean by high density? More open space. 9. People need to have space and a quiet neighborhood. Compact growth and high density housing creates problems. You need many jobs to bring population in. 10. More growth in undeveloped areas. I do not want to live in higher - density, so I do not expect others to unless they choose to. I think a mix is important. 11. More transit choices to outlying areas. 12. Less compact is going to be more realistic. People in Boise tend to want large properties. 13. Less compact. 14. Changing development patterns by policy is unrealistic. The original CIM plan and this update should have reflected something closer to the trend, because that is what will happen. Let's build a transportation network to match what we know will happen. 15. Less compact 16. I dearly hope we can preserve some open space and avoid sprawl from Boise to Nampa. We don't need 10 more miles of Garden City! 17. I generally agree with the Community Choices scenario. BUT, we still have to tackle transportation issues based on the existing structures/systems/roadways that are already in place. For example, State St./Hwy 44 is a major thoroughfare between Boise and the rural communities of Middleton, Star, and Eagle. I enjoy the rural setting and hope that the farmlands in these areas are not taken over by housing subdivisions, but I also hope that our community leaders can provide adequate public transportation between these communities. I have ridden the Hwy. 44 bus, but it is not an adequate public transport solution. I am a young professional who works downtown and I have a very dynamic schedule. Some evenings after work I meet friends or family for dinner, attend an event, or need to run errands on the way home. Because the Hwy. 44 bus runs once daily on a traditional 8 am – 5 pm work schedule, it is not conducive for most people. My definition of adequate public transportation would be a bus or a light rail that runs Hwy. 44 several times a day, including a bit earlier in the morning and

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>until 7:00 pm or so in the evenings. The system should have a dedicated lane or rail so that it can move faster, or at least equal to, the rate of speed that a car moves. It should also make multiple stops along the way, not just the one to two stops per city that the bus runs now. I appreciate your time reviewing my comments. Many thanks!</p> <p>18. We need a combination of high density and preservation. I like my 0.25 acre lot and want that choice.</p> <p>19. I prefer to see sparse population. I don't believe there are enough jobs here to support growth.</p> <p>20. You want revenue, get some manufacturing in here.</p> <p>21. Need to breath, privacy. No congestion. If you mean more services in undeveloped areas, yes!</p> <p>22. Less growth.</p>
<p>If "No," what type of growth do you want to see in the Treasure Valley? (e.g., Less compact? More growth in undeveloped areas?)</p>	<p>21</p>	<p>NA</p>	<p>1. It would be thoughtful to current owners in semi-rural areas to have a mid-range of "compactness" between them and high density developments along the main roads such as state street</p> <p>2. Let the market place determine density - support marketplace choice.</p> <p>3. It's too simplistic of a question - doesn't take into account assumptions that went into it - perhaps we don't agree on those inputs. And how does it get implemented? The MPO controls all cities comp plans via federal funding control?</p> <p>4. Would like to see a balance between the two rather than an absolute of either of the above choices. Should not be either / or.</p> <p>5. To encourage transit in the valley we need higher density - or it will not work.</p> <p>6. I love the low density set forth in Eagle's plans but understand the "core" of the city should be high density. I believe this should be driven by what developers can fund and do.</p> <p>7. I would like to see redevelopment of existing residential commercial areas, with an incentive of some type to encourage developers to go in this direction.</p> <p>8. Rail paths, walk paths, bike paths.</p> <p>9. Want to protect land for agricultural, recreation and open space users.</p> <p>10. But areas where density and compact growth should occur need to be strategically placed - not all parts of the region are appropriate for such intense development.</p> <p>11. Communities need to be directed mostly by their Comprehensive Plans - keeping in mind more compact growth.</p> <p>12. How do land use agencies provide incentives for denser, closer - in development, and / or disincentives for sprawl? What has worked elsewhere?</p> <p>13. But would need strong covenants if people are so compacted to lower negotiation interactions.</p> <p>14. More conservative growth estimates..slow growth.</p> <p>15. This does not fit to the culture and plans of Eagle community.</p> <p>16. Open space within cities - not only surrounding them</p> <p>17. COMPASS should follow the cities comprehensive plans. Cities such as Eagle should have low density population as planned. Sacrificing things (like mass transit) for the lower density.</p> <p>18. As a general concept yes; however, individual communities should be able to decide where these growth scenarios should occur.</p> <p>19. Although CIM needs to be more grounded in market reality.</p> <p>20. Why is there no guardrail on 55 north of Horseshoe Bend in the canyon?</p> <p>21. I'm only upset that parts of the plan do not support compact development. And a lot of the</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			funded projects do just that.
			22. Preservation is an odd term - "trend"?
			23. Bigger lot size, bigger property tax bill
			24. Encourage in-filling
			25. I would like to see some Community Choices, but needs should be based on trend. Plan for the worst growth scenario and encourage the "best" (i.e. Comm Choi)
			26. I just don't see that coming in the next 30 years as you aren't going to have the jobs.
			27. Recognizing that we'll still have variant approaches. Higher impact developments should be required to pay for their higher impacts.
			28. Heed coordination of existing community needs and future growth. COMPASS would take a shot in the dark if Boise, Garden City, Meridian, Eagle - etc. can't coordinate.
			29. We must have infill. "Community Choice" would be the power of communities to exercise a local tax option.
			30. I would like to see infill and less parking lots. We need high density parking and green spaces.
			31. More compact, less development, smarter growth thought out for the people's needs.
			32. Our issues are the result of bad suburban sprawl from the last 30-40 years.
			33. In theory the Community Choice growth scenario is appropriate. However implementation of such plans should not occur as a result of the loss of personal property rights or thru increased governmental regulation.
			34. Sprawl and lack of planning for future growth will eventually make the Treasure Valley unlivable. Smart growth!
			35. Compact growth around transportation corridors. Keep rural areas under county control until city develops up to them.
			36. Minimum densities along designated transit corridors.
			37. Somewhat.
			38. I think "preservation" is unrealistic because it is unsustainable. The __ resources of transportation, water, and quality of life will limit growth before land is built to maximum.
			39. Preservation.
			40. The politicians don't have the guts to hold to a Community Choices.
			41. "Comm. Choices" is the more sustainable option.
			42. Preservation sounds like "status quo" BAD
			43. I think the demographics of the valley (so many families w/children) will make community choices difficult to implement.
			44. Need more buses, bike racks on buses (currently only 2 bikes per bus) light rail, express buses, etc.
			45. Let the market drive the type of communities that are developed. People will self select.
			46. Although I recognize the need for higher density developments. I see a major mindset change that needs to take place. One major motivation for changing mindsets is financial incentives higher gas prices raises voters __, but __ to take transit.
			47. I don't think people will appreciate being compacted together, especially in the Treasure Valley - they love their space. I do think that offering more opportunities for public transportation is a better approach. People are becoming more eco-friendly or would just like a cheaper way to travel. If more of these were available (public transportation) I think more people would take

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>advantage if they were aware of the benefits.</p> <p>48. We need to preserve open space and agricultural land.</p> <p>49. I support the "community choices" growth scenario to a certain extent. I don't like "shotgun houses" and I think people should be able to have enough backyard for some privacy.</p> <p>50. I appreciate growth, compact and high density housing, NO! So, I agree more with preservation. I agree with open space between communities. Building houses, jobs, services and shopping within reasonable distances.</p> <p>51. Less compact, more growth in undeveloped areas.</p> <p>52. No</p> <p>53. More walking and biking spaces.</p> <p>54. Less impact.</p> <p>55. More houses along highway.</p> <p>56. None.</p> <p>57. Less important</p> <p>58. More roads.</p>
<p>Please provide any additional comments about the draft plan.</p>	<p>61</p>	<p>NA</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Boise metro chamber supports planning for central valley highway to continue hwy 16 extension to Kuna and east to I-84. 2. You need to look at the Overland / Maple Grove Area. There is a huge apt complex down on Maple Grove / Lake Hazel that they use Maple Grove Road a lot. That area is growing and needs public transit. 3. I would like to see a light rail option 4. Our economy cannot afford more taxes. 5. Transit not likely to be used widely in an area the size of Boise. Current Boise stages run mostly empty. 6. Transit is an expensive undertaking that adds another tax mandate that grows and grows each year. Taxes go up and so do fares. DC metro system is a good example - subsidized and now facing big fare increases for users. It runs at capacity everyday and still can't pay for itself. 7. There has been enough discussion – let's get to the "do" portion of this project! Turn paper to roadways. 8. Bicycling needs to be a big part of any alternative transportation plan. A bike corridor in every town should be planned into any road improvement / building / development plan. I also think bike trails should be separated from roads whenever possible. 9. When economy turns around: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Bypass to take traffic load off of existing I-84 2. Light rail 3. Bike highway through valley end to end. 10. Look at character of north-south corridors in Boise and use road planning to improve business districts and neighborhoods. Specifically: Orchard, Broadway and Vista. 11. Improve bike commuting on Hill Road - lane all the way to Eagle. 12. Would prefer intensive funding for transit, complete streets, esp. sidewalks in existing communities - esp. around schools. Integrate systems so they really work. 13. As a region we need to establish incentives and disincentives for growing consistent with community choices. Land use and transportation need to better align (

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>14. Must find a way to get Meridian Interchange rebuilt as well.</p> <p>15. Keep up the work of seeking community feedback and educating the community.</p> <p>16. There seems to be no priorities for moving traffic that comes down Hwy 55 to State Street as far as funding.</p> <p>17. Can funding be consolidated from other projects to fund an existing project without designated funds?</p> <p>18. Extension of bus system west and north.</p> <p>19. Thanks for the great session.</p> <p>20. The current plan is very heavy-handed with regard to dictating what kind of growth should occur.</p> <p>21. 2014 update to have GHG reduction focus.</p> <p>22. Current plan does not focus on transit.</p> <p>23. 20/26 upgrade from Eagle to Linder would help distribute Eagle traffic north of 20/26.</p> <p>24. I think the top priority right now is to fund the study for high capacity on the rail. The economy is ripe - development is on hold for a long time, and traffic isn't bad yet. Take the time, fund the rail study and maintain the current roads. By the time the study is complete, we might have the local option tax passed and we can fund the rail and then use the other funds for needed improvements on roads.</p> <p>25. Corridor summaries should remain in plan and not part of appendix.</p> <p>26. Confusion about highway 16 and full connection (funded to unfunded)</p> <p>27. Accountability must accompany any plan.</p> <p>28. Host was very informative and answered all my questions thoroughly.</p> <p>29. Thank you for including me.</p> <p>30. I am willing to provide tax support as long as there is a directed and focused plan vs. standing still and talking about the future and not getting anything accomplished. We just need to pick a project and prove that project can be completed in a timely manner and benefit all.</p> <p>31. This whole transportation plan needs to be headed by one entity with some teeth to get it done.</p> <p>32. Appreciate all of COMPASS' hard work.</p> <p>33. Taxes need to be raised in good times and banked. People in this economy don't have \$430 lying around to spend on this.</p> <p>34. The people in charge need to plan and not line the pockets of the politicians.</p> <p>35. Action now - 1/2 hour bus service would increase ridership.</p> <p>36. Would like to see more effort on public transit long-term planning.</p> <p>37. Please include a table of contents for the draft or other plans.</p> <p>38. Will comment in greater detail via email.</p> <p>39. Need more solution makers - architects - engineers - involved and fewer politicians and "general public with good intentions."</p> <p>40. We need better connectivity of bicycle routes. I should be able to commute to downtown from Eagle in a safe manner. Bike routes are horribly disjointed.</p> <p>41. I choose to live out of town and work in town and cannot form an opinion on how others need to commute. Personally, I have no problems with my commute or transportation options because I choose to live far from work; as it provides me with a better quality of life living out of town.</p> <p>42. This presentation (meeting in a bag) was very informative and has opened my eyes to issues I</p>

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			do not deal with everyday. I plan to look into this issue and educate myself further in hopes to develop a more specific opinion.
		43.	We need a better organized planning authority "CZAR" for the whole valley. It seems the valley as a whole, has fragmented planning groups for the whole system between Nampa, Meridian, Boise and all. There should be a group that oversees them all for a better vision and approach to the whole thing.
		44.	Some roads that receive funding do not make sense - they are in the middle of nowhere - fund roads that will encourage circulation.
		45.	I would like to see more north-south corridors in Boise (across river) particularly ones that are limited access.
		46.	Why are the funded projects in undeveloped areas (Amity, Cloverdale etc.) this is not compact growth.
		47.	Continue to look for ways to secure a local option tax for support at transit and road improvements.
		48.	There need to be 2 things: 1- Tighter approval of developments by zoning. We need to require developments to comply with Community Choices 2- Funding for mass transit and alternate transportation.
		49.	Good plans, but look for "cluster" areas which need transportation to major employers.
		50.	Start now developing north/south and east/west controlled access roads.
		51.	In addition put in transportation systems (rail).
		52.	Higher density housing may become more attractive if the cost is lower.
		53.	We need to do a better job of tying land-use planning with road building/improvements. It seems like we are destroying much of our farmland and CIM seems to encourage sprawled development. The COMPASS Mobility Summit seemed to indicate that rural towns in Canyon County want more/improved transit.
		54.	I support the COMPASS effort. Twice in the past 10 days, I've commuted through Boise/Meridian on my bike. I caught up with some of the same cars at stoplights from Americana to Cloverdale going west at 6 p.m. On another day I kept up with cars going east at 11 a.m. from Five Mile to downtown Boise. I'm 60 years old . . . and not fast which shows the fallacy of single-occupant, motorized transportation. And if the motorists needed to find parking Perhaps we can educate motorists more on what it costs them in time/money vs. alternative transportation.
		55.	I generally agree with the Community Choices scenario. BUT, we still have to tackle transportation issues based on the existing structures/systems/roadways that are already in place. For example, State St./Hwy 44 is a major thoroughfare between Boise and the rural communities of Middleton, Star, and Eagle. I enjoy the rural setting and hope that the farmlands in these areas are not taken over by housing subdivisions, but I also hope that our community leaders can provide adequate public transportation between these communities. I have ridden the Hwy. 44 bus, but it is not an adequate public transport solution. I am a young professional who works downtown and I have a very dynamic schedule. Some evenings after work I meet friends or family for dinner, attend an event, or need to run errands on the way home. Because the Hwy. 44 bus runs once daily on a traditional 8 am – 5 pm work schedule, it is not conducive for most people. My definition of adequate public transportation would be a bus

Public Comments from Comment Forms

Question	Number of Respondents	Quantitative Results	Comments
			<p>or a light rail that runs Hwy. 44 several times a day, including a bit earlier in the morning and until 7:00 pm or so in the evenings. The system should have a dedicated lane or rail so that it can move faster, or at least equal to, the rate of speed that a car moves. It should also make multiple stops along the way, not just the one to two stops per city that the bus runs now. I appreciate your time reviewing my comments. Many thanks!</p> <p>56. Definitely prefer the compact growth, in-fill, keeping services close to where people live. This moves us towards more livable communities and away from the "sprawl" approach which has not proven to be a good idea -- causes people to use their cars too much.</p> <p>57. I was very inspired about the insights that Jackie Cershaw [Grimshaw] had when she was here a couple of years ago. It's not clear to me that we are choosing to take advantage of what her organization has learned. We can, and must begin to mold the froth choices in our valley through our transportation choices. Otherwise, we will always be chasing the tail.</p> <p>58. The irony is that despite supporting "community choices", many of the road improvement projects that were funded had the effect of carrying people further away from the downtown core. So, in practice, the model seems faulty.</p> <p>59. None at this time.</p> <p>60. I hope projections are accurate. After the Curtis Road (near Fairview) bottleneck fiasco, I don't feel at all secure about planning. This area is prime for nothing but continued growth (it's the new Portland/Seattle) so let's project appropriately! Thanks.</p> <p>61. Pave the canal access roads and make them into bike paths. That would create an interconnected system of paths throughout the entire valley. The space is there, the network is in place.</p> <p>62. It was difficult to grasp all of the intended changes on our major roads close to our subdivision. The summaries of the projects needed improvement, rather misleading with the short explanations. Could not find additional info per project on the website.</p> <p>63. Community Choices plan is a good choice as long as the communities are limited in growth. High density housing without a good plan for development can be unhealthy and cause problems / conflict.</p> <p>64. Thanks for attempting to educate the public. I feel that there should have been more media attention to this. I heard ads on the radio, but "keyed" in because I had some ideas of what this C in Motion was. Most people, I'm sure, are clueless.</p> <p>65. Hopefully when I'm older, I could use these to transport myself around.</p> <p>66. Pave Dry Creek road.</p> <p>67. Need more traffic lights.</p> <p>68. Less compact areas.</p> <p>69. A rail system in Downtown Boise would be beneficial.</p> <p>70. Wider streets should be the priority.</p> <p>71. Better transit system.</p> <p>72. Great plan.</p>