

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Evaluation Matrix

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
1.	
2.	Due to opposition of site H and lots of street, and the change in proposed street car route to Idaho & Main, I recommend placing transit center at the Boise Tower site. While smaller than site H, it is between the street car route, and more central to the downtown core, (already parking garage, etc.). Close 8 th street to vehicle traffic, bus only in order to use this site.
3.	Short sited (pun intended)
4.	
5.	I strongly support mass transit and anything that helps make it bigger and better.
6.	
7.	Trolleys and light rail should be considered. They aren't too expensive and as population demographics change, they can not change to meet the demands. A good bus system is still the best mass transit use. United technology has now available. Hydrogen cell powered buses available.
8.	Site H is the best site.
9.	
10.	Why was current level of bus ridership not posted? Why does display about earmark not include date money was appropriated?
11.	See Q4.
12.	Nice visual display and the color coding allows for an easy evaluation and where "sticky" points are.
13.	Gives a good summary of similarities and differences.
14.	
15.	The matrix seems well developed; I don't have any specific comments.
16.	Why isn't there an alternate for 11 th St. that does not include Site H? So an in-street option for 11 th .
17.	
18.	The matrix clearly points to the 11 th Street site as superior. The matrix does not reflect the economic potential to develop vacant property adjacent to the 11 th or the adverse impact the 10 th street site imposes on the economic future of the historic neighborhood.
19.	Other info seemed more helpful—I didn't take the time to decipher. Maybe a different graph/chart type would communicate more simply/directly?
20.	

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Evaluation Matrix

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
21.	
22.	Comparison chart between sites seems heavily biased to 10 th St.—intensifies feeling that this is a charade (the deciding is over).
23.	Well documented.
24.	
25.	Here are items that need to be communicated to the community for buy-in: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Clean buses-no high-particulate polluters 2) Start here with a hub that will allow us to connect spokes out to the outlying areas where the trolley will go 3) We're not talking about creating urban blight/greyhound bus station environment—it will be a place where commuters can receive concierge type service. 5) Health benefits of having a pedestrian/bike friendly city. 6) Very complimentary with tourism—i.e. Tourists will be able to get around more and spend more \$ downtown (??) they might not have seen by their hotels.
26.	
27.	I believe 11 th street is a better location.
28.	
29.	
30.	
31.	
32.	It was a great aid to give everyone as they assess and look at options.
33.	
34.	
35.	
36.	The environmental document process is different for each proposed site. The cultural resource clearance for the 10 th street looks like it is currently underestimated. The impact needs assessment for each and every historic property. The number of properties on the 10 th St. site (which will prolong the time line for the environmental clearance). And taking into consideration a project's effects.
37.	It appears to be very well done and gives a good evaluation on the flow.

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Evaluation Matrix

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
38.	The matrix seems fair.
39.	The evaluation matrix clearly shows that the site H plan has more benefits, except for the challenge of working with the property owner.
40.	Good considerations are noted. It sounds like the owner of the Boise Plaza just doesn't like the H site and that is the major roadblock. I appreciate the opportunity to comment but am concerned my comments won't matter.
41.	
42.	Decent way to convey tradeoffs.
43.	This is to open to one group's wants and desires.
44.	Busy, busy!
45.	Even though site H will be more expensive and take longer to build, it will be worth it in the long run! We need a site that can give more back to the city and that won't take away from the current businesses
46.	
47.	
48.	Very good comparison.
49.	
50.	It all comes down to cost. Your biggest issue.
51.	Matrix, as far as I can see, doesn't consider impact on businesses on the existing business on the block (10 th) to be developed.
52.	
53.	
54.	
55.	The evaluation matrix was very useful in explaining the pros and cons of each option.
56.	
57.	I do appreciate the hard work you have put into this process today.
58.	
59.	
60.	On a whole, I like it a lot.
61.	Not very useful.

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Evaluation Matrix

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
62.	What is the “evaluation matrix?” This paper is an “evaluation,” no? Do you want my comment on this forum? The whole display throughout the room is a “matrix,” no? Do you want my evaluation on this? Is my ignorance of your jargon stopping my input?
63.	Not very thorough. Comparisons are relative to one another, not compared to a baseline. PROBABLY VIOLATES NEPA. Incomplete evaluation of scope, intensity of impacts.
64.	
65.	
66.	
67.	
68.	
69.	Not enough information on how the transit center will make buses more efficient. Is this a good investment? Overall positive matrix.
70.	
71.	
72.	Appears superficial and high level.
73.	Not explained well. I did not fully study it.
74.	While it’s obvious we need a transit center, we also need to think of the future downtown development and enhancement. The 11 th St. location allows for a central location without disrupting a valued 10 th St.
75.	
76.	
77.	
78.	
79.	The only advantage I can see to the 10 th St. site is less cost. All other benefits point to site H, in my opinion.
80.	
81.	
82.	Concern about expending millions of dollars for a ‘nice to have’ rather than really increasing public transit opportunities. The street is a great idea, move bike lanes and secure parking, some efficient transit mode that connects to the airport.
83.	Seems clean, factual.

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Evaluation Matrix

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
84.	
85.	
86.	
87.	Presentation fine and helpful. Didn't we do this on front street?
88.	It is Ok, but it may not get at the crux of the matter as well as it should. A matrix can't predict the evolution and soul of a downtown.
89.	There is no consideration of impact on existing businesses.
90.	
91.	It will apparently cost more to build at the 11 th St. site.
92.	Are you taking into account the draw of homeless and drug users to the area the site will draw? Is security/police patrol factored in?
93.	I am also wondering about future development for transit in and out of Mountain Home.
94.	Obviously the current placement is the best in terms of buses. Not so much for drivers/riders due to lack of amenities. Both sites H & 10 th St. are bad. They are too small. Infringe on existing use. Will create back UPS on both streets and intersections.
95.	The most useful display board in the room I was drawn right to it.
96.	I didn't have my glasses and these didn't seem to be any emphasis on that particular information.
97.	Good
98.	Coffee shop—eating shops and all kinds of goodies make more jobs and more money for the city. Listen to the people not the money talking.
99.	
100.	
101.	
102.	
103.	
104.	A little confusing but it does help understand only the differences with the proposed sites not other sites.
105.	
106.	Matrix is helpful. I hope that a decision will be made based on real measurable differences and not just because a developer doesn't like it.
107.	

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Evaluation Matrix

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
108.	
109.	
110.	
111.	
112.	Please consider placing the site farther west, or at least not in the center of downtown. As far as availability of funds, don't be fooled/misled into thinking that the city must decide by a given date. Like most deadlines, the current one is very likely false one. Money will be available after the deadline, just as it is now.
113.	Conclusions of matrix seem logical.
114.	
115.	
116.	
117.	I would see clear benefits but when it is only 1/2 block away seems difficult to distinguish.
118.	10 th St. site has more impacts on adjacent businesses and their customers and would destroy the pleasant pedestrian experience the street offers now. 10 th St. site costs less in total but site H could be built in phases to allow construction to match revenue. Cheap is not better, especially when making a long term capital investment. The matrix does not explain "complications of public/private partnership"—since that is one of only two red flags on site H, it should be explained.
119.	
120.	Greatly needed.
121.	We lack too little "user" data and models to determine if we'd get an increase in users of systems. Will the project have a positive ROI.
122.	
123.	Seems fairly straight forward. Could be larger to see—especially with larger crowds—the matrix says that 10 th meets essential functions but the details do not identify the essential functions.
124.	
125.	Nice colors and layout. Seemed comprehensive and covered all logical (relative) evaluation measures.
126.	Good summary, but hard to make any conclusions without quantitative data. In general, seems to favor H alternative.
127.	

**Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study
 Evaluation Matrix**

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
128.	
129.	It appears 10 th St. site is cheaper, fewer impediments. Please be sure to consider bicycles as one of the modes—on street bicycle lanes that lead directly to the “center.”
130.	
131.	
132.	I was a little confused by the least impact/greatest benefit and greatest impact/least benefit. It makes sense to me if you assume impact is negative. So it might be clearer if you said least negative impact, etc. It was helpful to look at the charts.
133.	
134.	Evaluation matrix discussed the major issues.
135.	I found it helpful.
136.	
137.	
138.	
139.	
140.	There is no clear cut “winner.” Doesn’t highlight price differential. Makes me question the benefits of building a new site—it is going to be dramatically better over the existing situation?
141.	Complicated.
142.	
143.	
144.	
145.	
146.	
147.	
148.	
149.	
150.	

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Evaluation Matrix

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
151.	Not persuasive. Lets put our 20% match into additional bus service (later hours, give back some of the service taken away Oct. 1, 2005). And see what \$2,000,000.00 additional service would buy us in the way of ridership in a tanking economy. To provide the citizens of Boise a new enhanced bus stop by spending tax payer money with a major downtown player smacks of the “same old, same old,” especially if I have to walk 8/10 of a mile to catch return home from a bus, that doesn’t take me to the outlet mall areas
152.	Good way to view all the choices at once and compare positions. Visual way to see effects of impacts.
153.	
154.	
155.	
156.	
157.	
158.	It looks like this at a function level according to your criteria doesn’t work very well. It has the most negative effects according to the DOT system. The cost is more because you are building a building long term I believe it is a better alternative. Can’t really tell how the building will function, I think that is a problem—coffee shop—shelters and benches this isn’t really shown. Both show an increase of complexity to the riding public and I see little fluidity in both alternatives . The outside creates some of this but easy access to travel increases in both plans and what does that accomplish?
159.	
160.	
161.	
162.	Interesting—didn’t make things much clearer for me.
163.	Airport shuttle terminus should be an essential function not an enhanced feature.
164.	I like the access for a mix of bicycles, airport transit, offices and public restrooms. I like the inclusion of public art. I like the energy efficiency of having all transportation services under one roof. And----a green, at that!
165.	Fine.
166.	
167.	It’s OK—hard to differentiate between the 2 options.

Treasure Valley High Capacity Transit Study Evaluation Matrix

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

Comment #	3. Please give us your comments on the evaluation matrix for the multimodal center site.
168.	
169.	Strongly support construction of a multimodal center. Many Bosieans will be happy to see something new to immediate downtown area. When does construction start?
170.	
171.	
172.	Reasonably clear.
173.	It should be patently obvious from the matrix that the disruption to the 10 th St. is patently unacceptable under the 10 th St. site plan. Conversely, the off-street nature of site H minimizes disruptions.
174.	
175.	
176.	
177.	
178.	
179.	It does not explicitly include political factors that will influence if the transit center happens. The most important points is that it happens at one of the two locations. If there are political or limiting financial factors, I prefer the site where the greater likelihood of completion. Decision process was not clearly identified.
180.	A good way to compare options.
181.	
182.	I felt it is comprehensive and gives a good snapshot of the concept at the various sites.
183.	
184.	It was helpful in explaining the pros and cons of all options.
185.	Helped me visualize.
186.	
187.	I don't think the downtown trolley would be used. People like to walk. The first phase should be BSU to downtown.
	Received March 6, 2009