Table 1

Building values/concepts

- Cluster around activity centers i.e. Hyde Park/Bown Crossing and existing towns (Star).
- Increase density around existing developed areas, i.e. smaller lots, mixed use. Keep/add green.
- Cluster around transportation (bike, highway, bus, train, complete street).
- Affordable housing near transportations and services.
- Industry and living near appropriate transportation.
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Table 1 (continued)

Bike Rack:

- Do we want one million people here?
- How many current trips east-west would take southern arterial route? Six percent?
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Table 1 (continued)

Scenario Descriptors:

1. Clustered living mixed use along transit.
2. More density and mix in existing developed area to reduce long trips.
3. Protecting farmland and open space (i.e. prevent sprawl).
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Table 2

- Start with TTT
- High capacity east-west transit route.
- Connectivity with bike lanes.
- Funding for transit – what is the revenue based on?
- Reduce commute times.
- Include river crossing section to connect Highway 44 and Chiden.
- Trails are important/strength.
  - Gradual development can happen.
- Transportation and recreation focus.
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Table 2 (continued)

- Focus “DU” around transportation corridors.
- Increase density/multi-family units along transit routes.
- Mixed housing and jobs along routes.
- Build density in city centers.
- Ten mile area – community centers.
- Developers will take the path of least resistance.
- Need more, smaller homes/smaller lots.
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Table 2 (continued)

- Areas not designated for development, default to farmland.
- Get rid of single family low rural (big homes/big lots).

Table 2 (continued)

Scenario Descriptors:
1. Increase housing and jobs along transportation corridors.
2. Build density in city centers.
3. Get rid of single family low rural (no big homes/big lots).

Table 3

Likes/dislikes:
- Would like opportunity to look at percent increases or decreases to various indicators.
- Housing density (.2%) in Treasure Valley community centers.
- Build transit nodes along transit corridors.
- Control access on arterial roads.
- Account for access and connectivity to parks/open space and trails.

Table 3 (continued)

- Strategically placing nodes of development around transportation, housing, business, and services.
- Technology was a challenge.
- Land use choices are too specific driving people to look at neighborhoods rather than globally.
- We missed Eagle and Middleton town centers.

Table 3 (continued)

- Sewage treatment and other infrastructure needs to be put into place.

Table 3 (continued)

Scenario Descriptors:
1. Robust transport opportunities by maximizing existing infrastructure.
2. Maintain and expand quality of life in the Treasure Valley (preserving open space, farmland, trails, housing choices, education, and employment opportunities).

Table 4

- Connect: Highway 16 north-south from freeway to State Street.
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- More frequent bus service but only in high density areas.
- Robust trails option.
- BRT along Meridian – Kuna Road.
- Extend passenger/light rail south to Mountain Home.
- Tried to increase density – went backward on a few things.

Table 4 (continued)

- Concerned about number of people still commuting by car to work.
- Concerned with Bottleneck on Highway 55 due to development.
- Decrease access on Eagle Road.

Table 4 (continued)

- Creating sense of place by building within cities.
- Need more diversity of housing options – balance hard.
- Didn’t address current traffic issues well enough in the north-south corridor.
- More parks needed in Garden City, Meridian, South Boise.
- More schools in population centers.

Table 4 (continued)

Scenario Descriptors:
1. Using land use to support future transit network.
2. Add growth in areas where cities can support with existing infrastructure.
3. Preservation of open space/farmland.

Table 5

Parking lot:
- Expand light rail east toward Micron and airport.
- Transit corridor – need north-south to Kuna, southern east-west route Boise to Kuna.

Table 5 (continued)

Like most:
- More growth toward anti-sprawl.
- Rails/transit.
- BOT corridors.
- Build around transit.
- Transit and growth.

Like least:
- Lack of information.
- Getting the numbers.
- Need more information on Canyon County.
Table 5 (continued)

Scenario Descriptors:

1. Importance of transit and using existing infrastructure.
2. Promote job growth towards Southeast section.
3. Using existing infrastructure and eliminate sprawl.

Table 6

Like most:

- Clustering around community centers.
- More density – less sprawl (housing).
- Worked around transit centers and transportation – contain within transit corridors.
- Did not add southern bypass.
- Consensus on complete streets.
- Removed Eagle Foothills development.
- Protecting open space.
- Improved walkability.
- Reduce car trips with focus on shopping/business near housing.
- Accommodate growth within existing developed areas.
- Affordable housing along transit.

Table 6 (continued)

Like least:

- Know where strip malls are.
- Still have areas with low density.
- Wrapped up with population and jobs, need more focus on livability – parks, etc.
- More fine tuning/time.
- Risk redeveloping too much.
- Wish clustered more along light rail in Meridian.

Table 6 (continued)

Scenario Descriptors:

1. Investment in transit and trails not in roads.
2. Development along transit corridors.
3. Protection and Creation of open space along key natural features.
Table 7

Issues:

- Reduce development in Foothills and increase development in greenfields (this will be national market progression).
- Make State Street mass transit “sexy.”
- Development added to Highway 16 was a guess.
- Respect planning that has been done.

Boise:

- Opportunities.
- Peaceful.
- Outdoor access.
- Ease of getting around.
- Biking.
- Close proximity.

Comments:

- No disagreements.
- Threads reported as “3 scenario descriptors” at end.

Table 7 (continued)

Modified Scenario TTT

Most:

- Parks (protected watersheds/foothills/ag land/open space).
- Jobs and housing near transit lines.
- Creating jobs in Canyon County.
- Creating walkable healthy.
- Preserved greenfields.

Least:

- That we had to increase the population.
- The cost! (our increased taxes).
- That people might not take transit (but SLC and Denver are using it!).
- Outer communities can’t access transit.
- Transit doesn’t go to Micron or airport.

Table 7 (continued)

Scenario Descriptors:

1. Wanted to increase transport, accessibility and choices independent of vehicle use.
2. Mixed use, move housing closer to jobs and both closer to transit.
3. Protecting open space, healthy lifestyle, ag lands, parks, greenbelt, and foothills.
Table 8

Things they liked and felt they addressed:

- Light rail.
- Transportation corridors.
- Limited southerly sprawl and some westerly in Canyon County.
- Tried to/wanted to limit sprawl.
- Increased jobs and housing density along the three high capacity corridors – light rail, State Highway 44, Highway 16.

Things they wanted to address more:

- Address the flood plain – prefer no additional development in flood plain.
- Reduce sprawl more increase densities more in built areas.
- Make sure sprawl to the south doesn’t occur because it is not served by good transportation and would create new demand.
- Need to address city of Eagle’s current land use patterns – curb sprawl, protect open space, provide more jobs and build higher density.

Table 8 (continued)

- Strong protection of Foothills limit development.

Table 8 (continued)

Threads:

- Land use should drive transportation decisions.
- Transit.
- Economic development and transportation.
- Walkable/access to transit/mixed use.
- Road design for police.
- Open space and bike routes.
- SR2S economic development predictable for schools.

Table 8 (continued)

Parking lot:

- Densities for all land uses in Downtown Boise.
- Need attention to bike options.

Table 8 (continued)

Scenario Descriptors:

1. Develop more density housing and jobs along 3 main corridors.
2. Curb land development that increases demand for other transportation projects.
3. Good, safe, accessible, options for walking and biking.
Table 9
Concerns:
- Spread job centers along major corridors – what is the intent for the Highway 16 corridor?
- Create buffers from main corridors to residential.
- Keep railroad functional.
  - Surround with industrial uses.
  - Create more jobs.

Table 9 (continued)
Top 3 priorities:
1. TOD along State Street.
2. Reduce commute time.
3. Find a new approach to transportation funding.

Table 9 (continued)
Likes:
- Giving priority to transit along State Street.
- We didn’t perpetuate sprawl.

Table 9 (continued)
Dislikes:
- Unbalanced S.F. versus M.F. even though we tried.
- Contrary to our group intention.
- Not comfortable with end product.
- Unbalanced commuter traffic from Canyon to Ada County.
- Would have liked to see more roadway project options.

Table 9 (continued)
- Only two major road projects: what about making other east-west connections an identified priority (20/26*) before Highway 16 can become expressway?
- Exceeded transit costs – group feels it is important enough to help support funding options – from State Legislature.

Table 9 (continued)
Scenario Descriptors:
1. Transit oriented development along State Street.
2. Reduce commute time.
3. Find a new approach to transportation funding.