

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
1	I like the whole concept of moving into 21 <sup>st</sup> century transportation of streetcars, buses (hopefully <u>not</u> polluting) + trains of course. Too many polluting cars, trucks in the valley. Let’s hope people will eventually get with it.	
2		Streetcar route should be between Site H, not Idaho + Main in order to be most effective and practical.
3	This is a much better long-term solution that will enhance the neighborhood (too many parking lots for way too long)! Includes multi use and allows for future expansion such as streetcar and I-84 light rail (revive the inter-urban ok the 1900’s.	None
4	Off street; parking element. Edge of downtown core.	
5	Less environmental impact.	Costs more.
6		
7	The 11 <sup>th</sup> Street site is the best of the two sites presented but not the perfect location.	
8	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Right step toward making alternative transportation available and easily accessible.</li> <li>- Rapid bus systems are a benefit</li> <li>- Easy site to construct</li> </ul>	- More of a mix of uses at center include; retail, civic, resident.
9		

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
10	Responsive to Idaho + California interests. Doesn't have potential negative impact on key local business as 10 <sup>th</sup> St. Plan would.	
11	Hard-rarely get downtown anymore (unfortunately).	Last minutes ACHD corridor influence.
12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Supporting public/mass transpo. -&gt; less CO2 emissions</li> <li>-Raising public awareness</li> <li>-Building “up” instead of “out”</li> <li>-Supporting community feel &amp; increases downtown traffic</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-More expensive</li> <li>-Does the capacity justify cost?</li> </ul>
13	It seems that transferring from one bus to another is easier and smoother at this site.	Cost estimates seem more expensive.
14	Please do the 11 <sup>th</sup> Street deal. The facility would be so much nicer and much more functional. The increased parking in the floors above is a bonus. I believe this facility would increase ridership over the other site. With the facility probably having a life of 100-125 years the increased cost still equates to a bargain.	
15	I prefer this plan for long range. It is key to integrate parking and other uses in the transit center.	None
16	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-More options for public private partnerships</li> <li>-Perhaps multiple uses can be served               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-parking structure + retail</li> <li>-public restrooms</li> <li>-public amenities (benches, phones, info. Center)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
17		

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
Multimodal Center  
Site H  
Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
18	Far superior site: larger site, direct vehicular access to the connector, adjacent properties vacant or office/commercial. A permanent structure offers a commitment to the future as the demands of the valley grow and Boise establishes itself as the urban center.	
19	Compact, more opportunities.	More safety concerns, more cost.
20	This option provides a clear realistic vision of how to shape our future transit center. Growth in downtown Boise – The other option is based on a lack of vision, a lack of planning & a lack of responsibility for our downtown.	While it might not be a dislike \$\$ involved in such a project like this is substantial. If we continue to fear growth & fear responsible growth, including spending money, we will find ourselves with quite a mess.
21	Does not block city streets.	Too optimistic. Expensive with the cost of construction of building.
22	Off street space; use but design more comprehensively: public space on floor above; consideration of light rail connection form Treasure Valley corridor.	Showing parking when not in current plan is highly deceptive change, (there correctly, should be none so centrally located).
23	-Integrated with a parking structure -Closer to existing bus station (shouldn't they be integrated?) -Better long-term tie-in with light rail and Treasure Valley options.	-Higher cost, <u>but</u> this is a long-term decision and therefore supportable (especially with federal fund support).
24	-Easier flow -Better for local businesses	
25	Appears to be lowest impact.	A bit far from center of downtown, but closer to outlying areas.
26	Not on street, parking ramp, bldg. Would add to skyline (according to concept drawings). Access to proposed downtown trolley.	Semi-enclosed terminals would need sufficient exhaust clearing. *Note: How are existing and pedestrian traffic monitored? I can foresee hazards if there is not sufficient safety for pedestrians.

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
27		Better to use existing city owned properties.
28	I like that we picked this location and it seemed we were on our way.	
29	Been fully vetted by public.	
30	Prefer this location – build facility & use 11 <sup>th</sup> St. on-street/need.	
31	Location. Design. Really like possibilities for additional retail/food/coffee shops.	
32	I really like that it will be a full facility. It will allow a separation from those shopping and those waiting for transportation.	N/A

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
33	<p>I am against this site. What the builders want is money. Why disrupt what has been here for years with such a drastic change? People in power think first of money, second of history and/or what others who commute need a change in route – or perhaps do not consider this at all. We have the large, empty and now ugly area on Front St. between the east and west highways. What more convenience for commuting could there be? This land at one time was being “saved” for a much larger center for different affairs. This the public turned down. It is land empty and ready for use. This is the best answer and too bad for builders who cannot smash other areas to make more money. We need a popular vote. Noise in itself should be a factor to consider as well as exhaust fumes downtown. Two areas downtown will only add to congestion – everywhere. It will be a mess of noise, clutter, and inconvenience for everyone and such disregard for people will bring future disgrace. What areas we start out with according to your plans will only grow and become worse. Small town thinking and lack of a sense of history, surrounding areas, convenience for all and some who need to transfer to other areas is not now being considered. How many on this committee are actual passengers and would leave their own vehicles at home?</p>	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
34	Finally we are moving forward as a city. I fully support either site. All the downtown businesses should realize that this will do nothing but bring more people & more business = more \$ for the downtown area! Love the light rail concept! Bring it on!	
35	Inside! Especially during winter. Own site where businesses will not be worried of loss of customers. Multimodal system that will have new businesses.	
36	Uses + revitalizes a “dead space” with less impact to current traffic patterns.	
37	Compact and complete.	Cost appears to outweigh the benefits.
38	I like that it would fit into the existing streetscape - i.e., a building next to buildings. I like the possibility of public/private cooperation – the construction of the publicly funded center with a privately financed parking garage on top. I like that it won’t harm historic buildings. I like that it was considered over a significant length of time – not railroaded through at the last minute.	
39	Off-street concept – this design appears to be a true step in the right direction to create a transit center. The design as displayed will add value to the city and move us in the right direction.	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
40	I like the extra parking and office facilities this provides. Keeping the buses off-street minimizes the potential for pedestrian/bicycle and vehicle collision while loading/unloading the bus. No impact to existing lanes on 10 <sup>th</sup> . Keeps passengers out of the elements. Better image – nicer to look at.	Potential for pedestrian collision at each end of the bus shelter.
41	-Design is easier to accomplish than 11 <sup>th</sup> -Opportunity for mixed use-pkg. above.	-Impacts to the historic bldg. -Dead space when buses are not there. -Underutilization of significant downtown property.
42	Less disruptive of existing business & infrastructure & other amenities. Like off street.	
43	I like this location over the 10 <sup>th</sup> St. location. I like the design w/a fixed structure and parking garage above. I think this site will be better to tie in w/trolley.	
44	Lets retain as large an area as possible as it will be needed in the future.	
45	The location, the fact that it connects more modes of transit, it maintains the existing flow & feel of downtown while adding retail space, conceals the actual bus locations to make it more visually appealing, closer connection to the multi-modal future center.	You should bring back the parking garage on top to show that it can add more parking to downtown.

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
46	I like the idea of adding parking above the transit center. Also this seems to have the least impact on the business downtown, and the “street” feeling that currently exists. I also like how it takes the “bus” traffic off the main streets & put into a central location, vehicular and pedestrian.	It seems to be hidden from the main downtown area, it also seems smaller and incapable of handling the busloads that are currently in place, there needs to be more buses anyways.
47	The fact that the design will not have negative impact on existing small & medium sized business owners on 10 <sup>th</sup> . The site provides opportunity for future development that will benefit from a transit center.	
48	A “true” center as opposed to something like we already have.	Expense.
49	Purchasing property rather than renting. Larger area for proposed development of transit center.	
50	Compact	
51	I think this is the best site. It makes great use of relatively undeveloped space with a high quality project. H will centralize transit users in a spot which allows easy access to downtown for pedestrians & cyclists accessing transit.	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
52	This is a long-term solution, looking forward for multiple uses, lower impact, and greater ridership. Takes the buses off the street and gives us a location for tie in with other transportation modes. Friendlier to the disabled – i.e., lighting, ramps, signage, assistance, etc. As a legally blind person, this would certainly be a better, safer situation than what we currently have.	Closer to the center of downtown.
53	This option best accommodates traffic better. You can build on the empty lots and keep use off the street. This is the best use of traffic and it doesn’t affect existing businesses. This is the best solution.	None.
54	It’s contained – not displacing current businesses. New businesses can grow with it. The future development projects can be designed to co-exist with it. They can put a police kiosk in to handle potential crime.	None.
55	The lack of impact on downtown businesses + traffic. The capacity for increased services such as bike lockers, ticketing offices, etc. I prefer this option.	The higher cost and longer schedule.
56	Separation from traffic flow Off street Multi-use facility “Enclosed” for weather	Cost Confusing access off/onto Bannock

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
Multimodal Center  
Site H  
Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
57	It is on a lot where there currently is nothing. There will be a brand new building dedicated just for the transit dept. You will not be displacing anyone.	
58		
59	Surrounded on 3 ½ sides by parking lots. Not intrusive to adjacent businesses. Potential for changes in parking lot use in adjacent areas to (_____) to transit customer specific use and/or as parks.	Cost is an issue but the building + transit center concept could offset initial costs.
60	I feel this is the best site. Then you can build the center you need. Also, not a lot of business on site to mess with. It’s more open and you have more freedom to do what you need to do.	Don’t let a property owner bully you in a decision.
61	This is the approved site that has been in the works for years. It is a good choice for <u>all</u> of the people of Boise.	
62	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- inside shelter for us riders. Plus, walls, rooms</li> <li>- floor space available for fine art, recirculating displays (library, art museum, etc.)</li> <li>- convenient location to central city workers (a shuttle from St. Luke’s to center would be a no brainer).</li> <li>- Inside features seems will allow for bus arrivals/departures later into evening. Hello, light until 10:00 with daylight savings!</li> <li>- “Enhanced” bicycle station for those of use who bicycle into town for movie, Steelheads, concert this would be ideal.</li> </ul>	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
63	Stick with Site H - takes buses off street - bldg. Looks well designed - does not disrupt businesses on 10 <sup>th</sup> - keeps 10 <sup>th</sup> Street unmolested	
64	Better, not on-street – restrooms – bike parking	
65		
66	This is the only site that makes sense w/the two options presented. Makes use of an open parking lot area w/o obtaining ACHD ROW KEEP OUT of 10 <sup>th</sup> St. Site.	
67	Off the street – dedicated use building. Not impacting auto traffic nearly as much.	
68	Amenities, no impacts to streets.	Cost, time.
69	Enclosed, ease of use.	May not feel as vibrant.
70		
71	Site H. Has a parking garage to begin with = And = this will be important.	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
Multimodal Center  
Site H  
Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
72	Less disruption of traffic, potential of additional parking if a parking garage is built. Aesthetically more acceptable in that a new structure can be nicely designed, parked buses will not be less obstructive visually. Concept seems to fit better with the long-range regional transportation vision.	Limitations on funding options.
73	OFF street and does not significantly affect 10 <sup>th</sup> or 11 <sup>th</sup> Street. Covered pedestrian area for loading + unloading passengers is much better than open/non-sheltered 10 <sup>th</sup> Street design. On site retail and service space is much more practical than taking space in existing buildings on 10 <sup>th</sup> Street. Bicycle parking will be central, and provided space for bicycling services can also be designed appropriately (such as E-bike charging stations or repair facilities). In general site H is a better long-term solution that shows a serious commitment to transit solutions for Boise. It will have value for a long-term.	Cost
74	I think H (which I thought was a done deal) is by far the best location also offers for possible expansion.	Nothing
75	Gets the buses off the street for loading and unloading. I like one central location.	Costs. It is a little bit of a walk for the average person. This will deter use.
76	It is self-contained and passengers can transfer easily.	
77	Either site would make me walk further to destination now 2 mil/day.	
78	I like the idea. It’s one thing to build a transit center, it’s another thing to get people to use that site.	Too far away from the existing transit mall.

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
Multimodal Center  
Site H  
Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
79	The ideal of passenger transfer and bus parking off street is very preferable.	None
80	Off of an existing street/new building/new amenities/public restrooms.	Not sure of the pollution created if buses are “inside” a building.
81		
82	One, clearly identified center for transfers + ticketing (regardless of site H or 10 <sup>th</sup> St.)	1- Parking section may end up encouraging driving rather than public transit. 2- Wonder how this compares to where buses are stored/maintained currently.
83	1- Would be most convenient for riders who need to transfer to another bus. 2- Feels like a proper transportation center – protection from weather, restrooms, etc.	1- Just hope it’s large enough for future growth.
84	Site H. This is my preference. PULL THE TRIGGER.	
85	Be sure to keep sound and air quality in mind for both sites. Blind/visually impaired people rely on their hearing to get in the right place. We don’t want bus fumes to concentrate either in the bus depot on the site H or between the buildings on the 10 <sup>th</sup> Street site.	
86	Approve of this site.	
87	A multi-modal facility. Opportunity to expand onto the 11 <sup>th</sup> Street. Can the transit facility be built on 11 <sup>th</sup> St?	Concern about parking garage appearance. Ventilation and sound of bus bay area.

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
Multimodal Center  
Site H  
Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
88	I like the off-street concept very much. I believe it will help draw downtown West + be a very favorable addition to Boise.	None
89	Design can be incorporated from the beginning	Doesn't connect to future light rail and other future public transportation.
90	Site H doesn't impact business in a negative way. The Site is self-contained. Won't take away from on street parking.	
91	This was apparently the preferred site, until recently, for good reasons. Location and available space make sense.	
92	10 <sup>th</sup> + Site H proposals for mass transit downtown. H is expandable for proposal Site H and 10 <sup>th</sup> St. The impact is less than the trolley system.	The trolley system. H is costly and will take too long to reinstall. However, both will require active security and camera systems for public safety.
93	No problem with either area. Need to evaluate cost/access for both.	
94	Off street. Build to suit.	Too small. One Block? For how many buses? Obviously covered area won't work. Public safety, environmental issues.
95		Further away from Downtown Core. Capital investment more.
96	The off-street – keeps things simple. Traffic.	We have plenty of areas for development of high-rise business that currently are in a holding pattern. How soon would this property be up and running.
97	One core development – more efficient, all buses in one place. The current configuration makes transfers difficult when time is tight. If all buses convene in one place, it will be easier to find + board transfer buses.	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
98		
99	Out of traffic lanes	Cost
100	Big, lots of detail, can serve more people.	Cost, and please see “other comments”.
101	Proximity to Greyhound Station.	
102	Seems like a more rideable bus system is needed before much else is developed.	
103	A transit center is needed for additional users. The concept to include lockers/shower etc. is great and beneficial to riders of the system of all the options. I prefer this one, as it does not affect local business.	*Cost for operations of a center this size. Tax increase would be needed to support the center. Cost cannot be driven by the users. Operational costs need to be planned for. Your answer is through taxes. *Needs for additional parking – Park & Ride idea has been removed. How will you get more users of the system w/o providing parking? Pedestrians + bicyclists will not be enough to support a center of this magnitude.
104	Location seems like the best possible choice in the downtown area. I like adding additional parking in a new structure. Ability to add additional office space and retail space.	None would like to see more than just a concept.
105	I like having a separate building rather than on street center.	
106	It creates a more permanent “center” for the transportation system. Services (bike lockers, retail, etc.) are truly an integrated part of the design – not an afterthought. Best option by far!	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
107	The off-street design adds a focal point to the downtown business climate that seems more upscale, versatile and permanent. Will attract more people into the downtown area businesses because of increased access opportunities. Opportunities for bicycle storage + business support for commuters.	
108	Parking proximity, ability to expand services, contained structure. No need to move buses, everything on site.	Cost
109	Space is available with least impact on small businesses and historical buildings; ease of passenger transfers.	
110	If property owners on 10 <sup>th</sup> Street don’t want it – put it on 11 <sup>th</sup> . If it really attracts so much business, then presumably business on 11 <sup>th</sup> Street will locate there. 10 <sup>th</sup> Street’s loss.	
111	Seems like the logical site.	Unknown costs, traffic flows awkward.
112	<u>None</u>	
113	New structure designed for this use. Newly designed retail can be optimized to coordinate with bus use. Provides parking right at bus transfer location.	More \$ than other site (if \$ is available, this is <u>not</u> a negative).
114	1 centralized location, parking, better long-term concept, out of traffic lane.	None

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
115	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Minimize impact on existing street traffic</li> <li>- Center looks progressive. Like it could be catalyst for downtown reinvigoration</li> <li>- Looks as though, it could provide space for more multimodal units.</li> </ul>	Can't think of anything.
116	Creates a specific, concentrated area for stops & services. Sense that all the information and uses are at your fingertips, cuts down on wandering. Offers parking for those who might drive into the city, but want to use transit to get around, a must until Valley transit gets underway.	With all that parking careful design is paramount to keeping the center from becoming solely a parking garage.
117	Potential multimodal use.	
118	Buses & people don't share the same space (breathing/hearing/sight) well. Site H separates buses from pedestrians. Site H keeps transit users from using lavatories in private businesses. Site H was arrived at through a careful process with input from all affected parties, <u>including</u> the private sector. Site H could be built in phases with auto parking put off until demand exists. Site H is “bricks & mortar” designed to meet future needs (10 yrs+) including transit office space and a police substation.	
119	More centrally located – has less impact on traffic and existing businesses.	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
120	Less disruption for businesses. Leaves on-street for 10 <sup>th</sup> St.	
121	Shows that there is an effort (community wide) to address all levels of transit issues. Clean, secure and off-street loading & unloading of users of both bus and trolley. Make allowance for the bicycling users.	Cost & timelines.
122		Significant walk from core area.
123	- One spot for all functions - All essential functions seem to be included	- Need good ventilation for buses exhaust in covered areas - Multimodal Center has always included parking in first presentations & now there is no public parking.
124	That it’s further away from downtown, meaning less traffic & congestion, especially where I work – The Banner Bank Bldg.	
125	Best option for transit (bus) site. It’s off-street and will allow for safer transfers. More compact/efficient use of space & is more compatible to existing development.	None
126	It’s off the main roads, centralized in one facility less disruptive. Safer than 10 <sup>th</sup> alternative.	Costs, but it gets you more compared to 10 <sup>th</sup> St.
127	Off-street – less impact on businesses.	
128		It seems like more than we need.
129	Large space so potential for vibrant street level development – indoor farmer’s market, coffee shops, flower shops, (_____), etc. Cookshop, yarn shops, etc.	Concerned about tunnel effect of indoor bus transfer space – as a woman traveling alone I would avoid that space unless it developed vibrancy described in Likes section – security issue. Cost is more.

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
Multimodal Center  
Site H  
Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
130	Design, would be nice in winter but don’t need an enclosed facility the other 9 months.	Cost location (farther from center (____) 10th St.)
131	I like this better than 10 <sup>th</sup> Street.	Prefer on-street on 11 <sup>th</sup> Street.
132	That the bus center is off-street That it’s compatible w/surrounding land use That there are some amenities built into the design (restrooms, info. center/kiosk)	
133	Not many – I’d really prefer an open aired transit center with bays with a connected building for transit use only at one end (like Bellingham, WA or even like the ones in Eugene, OR and Reno, NV).	The projected ramp to/from the proposed parking garage is too close to where the buses will exit (in the artist rendering). Not a big fan of transit malls under or tucked beneath a building. They tend to be dark & out of sight (potential crimes).
134	This site is compact	Egressing the structure by buses may cause traffic problems with thru traffic.
135	It’s location doesn’t impact traffic as much as 10 <sup>th</sup> on the existing bus drop off. It has inside facilities for public + employees, better experience with our winter & summer weather. Doesn’t negatively impact existing businesses.	It’s about twice as costly as 10 <sup>th</sup> St. alternative.
136	Empty lot. No business interference. Has been in consideration for long time. Funding is pushing a decision.	
137	I really like the idea that a “building” will house the buses, etc.!	It may be a bit further from center of Boise?

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
138	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- More ready to go.</li> <li>- If designed correctly it can better set the tone for the design and development of the area.</li> <li>- Need to consider the addition of office spaces not just parking.</li> </ul>	
139	Best location	
140	Facility in itself. Transfer passengers don’t need to cross streets (safety).	More expensive
141	All in one place	Higher cost. Is cost/benefit worth it?
142		
143	- Opportunity to provide new integrated retail space with MMC.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- High cost to obtain land.</li> <li>- Potential for major hold-ups with adjacent landowners.</li> <li>- Creates “dead zone’ in downtown when buses aren’t running.</li> </ul>
144	Aesthetics, additional parking, use of retail, larger building site for retail	Higher cost
145	I think the whole idea is great! It’s good for our environment and to get us off the use of gas. I think it will be good for Idaho’s employment. I think people will use any of your systems.	
146	Great ideas, good start, central location, multifunctional, has all the right characteristics.	Crossed out word Dislikes and wrote Suggestion. Probably a good place to tie more commercial or retail.
147	Nothing!!!	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
148	I like that it takes the vehicles off of the roadway. This option has an area that the public has a place to go to escape the weather.	Will this be a viable option 50 to 75 years from now? Will it be able to adapt to future transportation needs?
149	I like this site because of t location and the idea of a multimodal center with bus, trolley streetcars and shops. We need a center where people come together.	
150	The idea of the streetcar. That seems like it would really benefit downtown, the hospital areas nearby – especially if BSU & MK Plaza were serviced.	Limited runs of bus system. I can’t see such a huge project unless the buses were more frequent, ran later & on weekends ( I realize that’s not the issue here, but does affect it.
151		I don’t believe we should spend approx \$12,000,000.00 for a bus stop because we already have a bus stop (saving \$12 million) that may be used up to 14 hours per day (maybe if we had service that would get me downtown/BSU after 7:00 p.m. and home after 11:00 p.m. the additional time and service routes might be persuasive to a new bus stop.)
152	More room for buses + streetcar to be off the street. Further away from downtown core traffic (auto). Can still use street for auto traffic.	Less businesses in area. Further from downtown core for pedestrians to walk.
153		DT streetcar – Is the 1-block width of the route too limiting? I understand the reason of trying to get the most people using it, but expanding the route (____) blocks width-wise might be a good idea to expand accessibility.

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
154	Does not adversely impact existing businesses Add structure to downtown Design & build on vacant land	
155	Although we don’t have inclement weather often, I like the sheltered terminal.	It seems like the Site H on 10 <sup>th</sup> is also a possibility. One drawback is 11St. touches Grove on the South.
156		I could see possible security problems with a building that would be often open & empty.
157		For 10 <sup>th</sup> : Boise does not have an adequate bus system, and in particular does not serve the needs of those who have no other choice but to use bus transit. Focus needs to be on providing the <u>entire</u> city of adequate transit prior to spending millions on downtown. Let Downtown Boise & CCDC fund this, including long-range maintenance + operation. Not convinced that the greatest NEED is downtown. Time to think regionally.
158	Multi-use could be good extending DT retail. Raise property revenue to the city location is good for access to flow in DT if internal bus routes run for connection to the DT core. Otherwise, location’s result not in the usage expected.	I don’t like the design & the entryway for buses. Congestion in the future looks like a problem. I don’t like the design to the alley from the bank. The building is too close, it looks like a police problem & crime potential. The environment of the bus is rather bland, aesthetics are lacking.
159	It is close to but outside of busy retail & traffic. It is off-street parking for buses.	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
Multimodal Center  
Site H  
Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
160	I think bringing the downtown together w/a private/public project is good.	I think that 8 <sup>th</sup> Street or Capitol would be a better location for workers.
161	Doesn't eliminate as much on street parking. A more centralized location.	Not enough accommodation for bicycle transportation. A bicycle station should be part of it and not considered an enhanced function. Doesn't seem to have enough available room for expansion 20 years from now. I still like C + C2 better. Is condemnation possible?
162	Less impact on street traffic & shop owners on 10 <sup>th</sup> Street. Holds greater potential for expansion. Potential for public/private partnership w/parking garage.	May complicate traffic flow on adjacent streets.
163	Makes a permanent and expandable commitment. Buses will not choke off an existing street.	
164	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- I like that is dedicated to public transportation, which in and of itself makes a political statement of support for public transportation.</li> <li>2- I like that buses would not be idling on public thoroughfares as sitting buses detract from the visual and experiential appeal of a downtown.</li> <li>3- I like that it is close to other future business centers (Linen, 36<sup>th</sup> St.) and encourages more small business development.</li> <li>4- I like that it is close to the future light rail.</li> <li>5- I like that it could provide space for airport service/buses.</li> </ul>	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
Multimodal Center  
Site H  
Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
165	It is much less disruptive to existing businesses. Much easier to design center & build on vacant land.	
166	Site is a much better alternative. I want to see it become a full multimodal facility, incorporating Greyhound/Frontier business, streetcar, light rail, and bike connections.	
167	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Full service facility</li> <li>- Chance to “classy up” downtown Boise</li> <li>- More multimodal &amp; include bikes etc.</li> <li>- Allows other uses</li> </ul>	None
168	Close to downtown, but won’t displace existing business!	None!
169	Approve of site H, like the fact of having a permanent building. Seems more feasible than on-street option.	No dislikes
170		Do not like that it’s the same concept we have now – buses crowding out traffic flow and sidewalks being congested.
171	It seems to me this has been reviewed and considered carefully. The site advantage is that it is off all streets, yet near downtown, easier to police, and control traffic and less disruptive to local businesses.	None
172	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1- Off-street</li> <li>2- Closer to regional bus station</li> </ul>	Offset from trolley route.
173	Extraordinarily convenient location, off-street, will facilitate/foster add’l growth on the W. side of downtown.	Not much.

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
174	It has a building included to create a real “center”.	
175	It appears to be the only well-planned, thoroughly considered project and is only the option that is viable.	Don’t have any dislikes in light of having to choose between Site H & 10 <sup>th</sup> St.
176	The fact that there are few small businesses on 11 <sup>th</sup> .	
177		I think it’s a very bad idea. You will destroy our downtown, and the businesses along the street. I hope you will not do this to our city!
178	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Develops an unoccupied lot</li> <li>- Doesn’t eliminate an excessive # of on st. parking spots.</li> </ul>	Farther from center of downtown
179	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Could be indoor waiting area</li> <li>- Will attract new retail</li> <li>- Will have a parking garage</li> <li>- Will be a nexus for improved transportation</li> </ul>	
180	Indoors & out of the weather & cars flying by.	What would the air quality be like? Will buses all be NG?
181	I like this site set-up better than the 10th St. proposal because 1) it is off street 2) it appears to provide additional parking 3) it appears to be more futuristic in design and function.	It is 1 block further away from the more highly pedestrian traffic.
182	I like the permanent structure to house/encompass the “travelers” & amenities. I like that it would fit well into a small, concise (if you will) area. It feels like it could be a small community unto itself. It also feels safer (esp. for kids).	N/A

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study  
 Multimodal Center  
 Site H  
 Comment Transcriptions**

\*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.

**1. Please tell us what you like and dislike about the multimodal center Site H.**

Comment #	Site H “Likes”	Site H “Dislikes”
183	More potential for additional elements like wider streetscape, café seating, bike racks, etc.	
184	Everything – I really like the idea of a hub or go-to destination.	Lots of building.
185	Better than nothing	Not here yet. I want more bike lanes.
186	If I’m understanding the different layouts, the 11 <sup>th</sup> St. location appeals to me because the street is wider, which should address some of the concerns regarding the 10 <sup>th</sup> St. location, such as, crowding & narrower space for pollution/exhaust/crowding, etc.	
187	Bike parking. Safer for pedestrians. Attractive building. Easier to tie in with I-84 corridor.	
	Received March 6, 2009	
188	I have no comment on the 11 <sup>th</sup> Street location	
189	I like the fact it is right downtown, could promote business growth for current shops, bring in new business ventures as well.	Affect on current & future traffic flow.
190.	It’s not on 10 <sup>th</sup> Street!!! Will not displace any current businesses. If built properly, it will enable businesses that want to be there to become a viable part of the city.	
191.	Nicely designed. Does not impact existing businesses. More retail. All facilities in one place. Noise and emissions contained. This is the approved site, developed over several years.	The in-street concept might work in a different location. In another location, it might be better.