

# *All Aboard!*

## *Exploring High-Capacity Transit for the Treasure Valley*

Public Survey (January 19 – February 27, 2021)

### **Open-Ended Comments**

***Thank you to all commenters.***

*All comments will be used to inform decisions regarding a future potential high-capacity transit system for Ada and Canyon Counties. Comments will also feed into Communities in Motion 2050, the regional long-range transportation plan for Ada and Canyon Counties, help shape the Communities in Motion 2050 Vision for growth and transportation, and be provided to the COMPASS Board of Directors to inform decision-making.*

*Comments are organized by question in the online survey, with email comments at the end.*

*Tradeoffs: Pages 2 – 35*

*Destinations: Pages 36 – 40*

*Preferences: Pages 41 – 77*

*Wrap-up: Pages 78 – 80*

*Comments submitted via email: Pages 81-83*



**Survey Response**

1 = faster; fewer stops  
5 = slower; more stops

**Tradeoffs**

***Convenience: More speed...or more stops?***

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

**1 = Faster trips with fewer stops; I want to get to my destination faster**

**3 = Neutral**

**5 = Slower trips with more stops; I have more options to get on/off near my destinations**

2	I would love to see an "express" that is faster but also a slower option, maybe on weekends, with more stops.
4	It might be good to have both options. For example, a "regular" and an "express" option. Perhaps the regular option could run routinely while the express option could be added during rush hour.
3	I think if this is rail, it should feature express runs at peak times and regular at other times, so both.
4	The option of having many stops would be beneficial for leisure activities and would make me more likely to take the rapid transit when not commuting to and from work.
4	How can it be truly "high speed" when it's sharing roads with vehicles? The highest-speed transit (HST) would be rail from Caldwell to Micron, with stops in Caldwell, Meridian, Eagle, the Mall area, downtown Boise and Micron. A robust VRT network would be needed to deliver riders from HST to work/shopping/residential areas. If this is the final vision, start there and work backward to what can be funded between now and then (i.e. buy land, track rights, etc.) In the meantime, beef up VRT.
2	Hopefully there are additional transit options to access those areas not covered by the more rapid system
4	Convenience for everyone should be paramount, but other cities have done a great job of offering additional streamlined services during commutes.
3	I do like being able to get to my destination quickly, but with fewer stops it is less likely that it would be close to my intended destination. I would prefer a (moderately) longer ride time if it meant that the transportation went closer to the place I wanted to go.
5	Fewer stops will cause an increase in bus service due to people getting to their final destination. Having more stops keeps that extra pressure off our other forms of transportation and gives more options for growth around those multiple stops.
3	A good speed with convenient stops
2	Rapid transit with few stops is a really fantastic option, especially considering the need to get from cities like Nampa, Caldwell, and Meridian. It only works though if we have a bus system to get users the remaining distance. Think Chicago's Metra plus busses vs the L.
2	Having lived in larger metropolitan areas before, they had express bus services as well as services with more stops that took longer to get to the destinations.
1	If I'm using this service, instead of my car, I'm likely commuting with everyone else.
2	I will probably not benefit from this transit system but strongly feel this needed to "happen yesterday". I live at one end of the proposed transit line and my job is at the far opposite end. Fewer stops would be better for me but as long as the arrival and departure times for each stop are consistent and overall time is not too much longer than it takes to drive I would use transit every work day.
2	I hope that the combination of high and low capacity would make both options accessible, such as slower bus routes that could facilitate transportation to and from a rail stop or express bus service
3	Don't want the inconvenience of depending on their schedule and stops to get me where I want to go.
5	Being able to get off near your destination is essential for disabled people.
4	Faster trips fewer stops during rush hour...then more stops after rush hour times
2	Both: Express routes that bypass stops (ie: rush hour) accompanied by regular service hours. (9n the half hour would be optimal in my opinion)
2	People will not use it if it takes twice as long to get to their destination than if they drive themselves. It will be important to provide a secondary transportation to get to a specific location once they get off the "whatever" that gets them into Boise. It is that secondary transportation that is as important as the one to get us to Boise.
2	My husband would be commuting to Eagle road, which is a good central location. I don't think our family would need lots of stops to help him get there.
No response	This Transit System is not viable in Idaho!! You can't fund it. And your questions are just forcing an issue that cannot be

**Survey Response**

1 = faster; fewer stops  
5 = slower; more stops

# Tradeoffs

## Convenience: More speed...or more stops?

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

No response	Your questions are too open ended for me to compare your options. Do I want to stop at every corner...no. Do I want the transit to go from Caldwell to the state capital without any stops...no. Do I want 3 stops...maybe, but where? Give people some defined examples to say plan a is better than b, and c is horrible, but d would work for that individual.
1	EXPRESS EARLY AM AND EVENING RUSH HOURS. MORE STOPS IN OFF HOURS
2	If there are too many stops/the trip takes more than say twice as long as it would take me to drive, I would opt to drive on the majority of trips.
2	It would be nice to have several stops as long as commute times could still be comparable to the time it would take you to drive to your destination today. i.e. I'd be willing to leave earlier if my commute from downtown Boise would get me to my destination at work in downtown Nampa within a 40 minute window.
1	I feel if it is too slow with too many stops, most people would drive their own vehicles and the rail idea would fail
1	I would lean towards faster trips with less stops, but I believe this would really depend on the placement and parking of the stops. I doubt I will be able to walk to a stop, if we do less stops and faster trips, so I will need to park at the transit station.
4	People like convenience - they won't walk or drive to the station if it's less convenient than jumping in their car. If the station is at the end of the road they will go for it.
2	Fast from mountain home but intermittent stops through town
4	More stops allow greater flexibility to stop and shop or visit somewhere. Not everyone is working a rush hour 8-5 job.
4	I think having more stops would be vital to those who lack the ability to access other forms of transportation.
2	Three stops or four stops where businesses and Residences live more of where the residences live
2	It seems best. During rush hour times to have the faster trains with fewer stops. And then on rush hour times providing additional stops
5	More stops mean more access, which I feel is more important for everyone.
4	I would just like a light rail system no matter how it stops/works. For people using it for work it makes more sense to have more stops to get people closer to their places of employment.
2	Express trains during rush hour times and local with more stops during off-peak hours
No response	Faster trips with less stops
4	Even stopping frequently, the short distance of this proposed rail makes it easy to make more stops and still be a fast ride
1	For rush hour there should be fast options less stops. The UK does the direct trains during peak hours. I assume the majority of users will be commuters
1	The entire route should be faster than the same route driven by a car.
3	I won't nor will anyone I know use this. We don't want this here. This has been evident for years.
4	There used to be trains from Caldwell to Boise years ago. The only problem I see is Boise would have to improve its bus system once a person gets to Boise so they could get to their destination in Boise.
4	Handicap accessible
5	I can definitely plan for a longer commute and more on/off points is a huge plus!! You could offer a faster one during the typical commute time, too
5	Idaho native, but moved home from Bay Area. Commuter trains/light rail can offer a quiet way to read morning emails, get composure before your day in the office. Adding more stops makes more accessible to more people. Then people can learn to structure their commute time for productivity.
3	We will still have to drive to parking near the stops.
No response	I don't want light rail
4	The whole idea is convenient transit... I would want more stops so I can get close to my destination
No response	Slower stops with more stops
5	The more stops, the greater chance you are picking up and delivering to the destination that is needed by the passenger. That should result in higher usage of the service.
5	More stops to get on and off make it more likely you can get me where I need to go, which should increase use of the service.

## Survey Response

1 = faster; fewer stops  
5 = slower; more stops

# Tradeoffs

## Convenience: More speed...or more stops?

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

4	The more flexibility in the transit system,the better. Our city does not have the density to support transit everywhere, so we should maximizethe lines we currently have by building apartments along the lines.
5	Faster trips with less stops
2	Stations would be limited but would need tobe in easy access locations next to parking and bike routes.
No response	Not sure which I prefer
5	People who don't have access to a car shouldhave as many options as possible for getting to their destinations.
No response	Light rail very rarely covers its own costs.I do not support a light rail project.
1	Having the flexibility to have regular service, with multiple stops, and express service, with fewer stops, is the best solution. This requiresa well thought out track and signal system for light rail so express service has a route "past"regular service.
4	The idea is to get more people from place toplace...more stops along the way will allow more people to use the service and get where they needto be...this is one of the main downfalls of the current mass transit system...not enough routes andstops...i believe that if enough people had access to the system and it was convenient and easy touse, more people would use it.
4	From my prior experience with mass transit having more stops is better than faster trips. A light rail or whatever will not be successful if itdoesn't take people where they want to go regardless of how fast it gets there. And anything thatavoids surface roads will already be faster for most people.
2	Arizona's light rail offers stops every mile or so, which is convenient. However, they have more development mile by mile. Idaho is still veryspread out making it not as worthwhile.
2	Less stops
4	Somewhere in the middle. Maybe less stops but having bus stops near the train to trolly/transport people closer to their destinations. Also timing the buses to be at that stop shortly after a stop in that location.
2	I'd like a speedy way to make my way downtown if I lived farther out in Nampa or Caldwell. But having multiple stops along the way if done well would allow multiple hub areas to develop and I would love to have access to all of those. Allowthe valley to grow up around those and not just downtown Boise.
4	Allowing more stops will bring in more customers to businesses along routes.
2	Need an express plus local
1	Initially I would present fewer stops and more rapid travel times would better serve communities further out. Over time other more localized routes could be added to serve a smaller area with more frequent stops. A Caldwell to Nampa to MeridianTo Boise train with 1 or 2 stops per city to start. Followed with "loops" within each city to service the community and feed into the more linear train.
1	An alternative to the freeway to get to boise mall/downtown would be nice
1	It would ne more beneficial to have only a few stops from caldwell to downtown boise. Have park and rides to reduce traffic for events and weekends.
4	If this is running from Caldwell to Boise, stops at commuter stations in Napma, Meridian, etc. may still be faster than the interstate
1	It is critical that new transit options haveeither A) equivalent of faster travel times as for individuals who drive themselves during rush hours or B) cost significantly less for the individual than driving themselves during rush hours.
4	Is it possible to have two lines? An expressand a local? Both options would be great!
3	Light rail system is not needed.
3	Could we do both? Regular train with more stops, and express train that runs certain hours
3	Maybe you could do both. Do the faster timeduring commuting hours and more stops during non commuting hours.
3	there should be a "don't waste taxpayer money on this" option.
2	Do you mean like a subway or a bus? A subway.
4	Stops accessible via bus or car
1	More stops will create more congestion. I'velived with a light rail in my city before, and it was always getting in the way and increasing congestion.
5	the intent is distribution of people acrossthe valley who can work anywhere and visit

**Survey Response**

1 = faster; fewer stops  
5 = slower; more stops

**Tradeoffs**

***Convenience: More speed...or more stops?***

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

3	Could there not be both? Have express trains and local lines
3	Have all stops during rush hour and during the day have certain trips that hit all stops and some that are direct.
3	More stops at places like universities, downtowns, airports and less stops between cities
4	What's the point if more people can't use it? I see public transportation as an option for those who don't have a car or are trying to help the environment by not using their car as much. I think the faster option would be great if the bus system took the slower/ more stops route and stopped at the minimal train stops as well as their other destinations.
1	Morning and evening commuter runs with few stops at commuter parking locations. Occasional runs throughout each day that allows for additional stops near shopping and medical areas
3	We don't want a waste of monies, a eye sore to our community or the criminal problems caused by mass transit.
1	I would benefit from multiple stops since I live in town but believe the majority of commuters and the environment would benefit from a higher speed train. If people can get to their destination faster in a train than a car they will drive less. I can use the bus system for more frequent stops in town.
2	I believe that public transit has to be almost as convenient and less expensive, for people to choose public transit over using personal vehicle transportation. For convenience that means it has to be almost as fast, and reasonably close to origination and destination. People are not going to voluntarily use transit that takes 30+ to over an hour longer than driving or is more than 5-10 minutes from their location. Slow, complicated, inconvenient transit is unused transit.
1	There is no point in having public transport if it takes longer than driving by car! Speed of transport needs to be the incentivizing factor to get people to choose public transport over the comfort of their own car.
4	I think we need a hybrid solution: favoring speed for point-to-point travel combined with more stops in the cities. Perhaps that is a companion service with coordinated schedules to move travelers to and from the higher speed option.
5	Fewer stops would have to be backed up by a decent bus system.
4	Major freeway exits such as ten mile, meridian, Cloverdale etc
3	We used to live in Portland and used Max! It was fabulous!
3	I drive a car so it doesn't matter
2	Would our busses continue to be used? If so, fewer stops would make more sense as you could then take the bus for the remainder of your commute. <i>Reply: Yes, buses would be used in conjunction with a high-capacity transit system.</i>
3	None don't want the light rail
5	Stopping at every exit more than a mile from the previous one seems like a good thought.
2	No convenient at all, still have to drive to it. Had one in Washington where we lived and it was used mostly by drug dealers.
5	I believe more stops is far better for our communities as it will generate more use, revenue, and will provide nearly direct drop off locations to the desired destination and their return address. Teens and young adults will be able to use the service without too much worry from their parents/ guardians. Light rail drivers will be able to transfer to their shifts at more locations.
3	How about the option of... we don't want light rail.
3	At some times of the day there should be express options that go faster with fewer stops and at all other times options that stop more.
1	It would be great to have less stops, but more connections from those stops. Maybe stopping 1x in Nampa, 2x in Meridian, 2-3x in Boise, but having a better system to move people from those connection points
1	I think a bus system is more effective for slower trips and more stops. The light rail should be faster, with few stops and focused on quick transit. Once people reach somewhere near their destination, we need the bike/ped/bus infrastructure for the convenient short trips.
3	A quick trip from Boise to Caldwell does me little good, however, fast efficient travel is helpful. Stops near Metropolitan hubs or near other public transportation would be ideal.
5	I am disabled, and would prefer to be able to get off nearer to the locations I need than to get there more quickly.

**Survey Response**

1 = faster; fewer stops  
5 = slower; more stops

**Tradeoffs**

***Convenience: More speed...or more stops?***

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

5	I think there should be good spots to get on and off of and also there is maps that show us where and what times the train stops cause the bus maps were never any good or understandable
2	Faster trips, but the reasonable stops still need to be accommodated.
2	Fewer stops would be fine as long as we have park ride lots
1	Need faster transport during rush hour. Would like option of more stops during off hours. Special buses for big events
4	Since the only people that will use it are the indigent and homeless, might as well cut the high speed expenses off the cost overruns that inevitably will occur.
1	Have depot hubs for focused stops. Such as Portland has people will prepare better that way and allow for faster commutes.
4	Less about convenience and more about making sure everyone has access
No response	Faster trip less stop
4	I'd prefer more options to fewer. More chances for meaningful economic growth along the rail line, and more opportunities to avoid having to drive.
5	Slower, so that maybe I could get off in Meridian, Eagle etc
4	However, it needs to be somewhat fast or it wouldn't be worth the time and effort.
2	It depends on the amount of safe walking areas there are. I wouldn't mind a faster transit ride if there was a good way to walk to my destination, but that's not always an option in our cities here
1	Would mostly use for work. So the faster to work and back home the better.
2	Efficiency to hubs (downtowns, the village, BSU, etc) should be priority. Can use Uber, scooters, city bikes or walk to get to specific locations from stations
4	I'd prefer it fine tuned to have many stops in areas where job centers are, with longer walks in more residential zones.
2	I would prefer the rail system to have fewer stops, as long as the stops are easy to get to, park my car at, or take a bus to & from.
3	I don't want \$1.00 of my taxes to go to such a ridiculous project.
4	Would be great to have both options, but having more stops would allow for more users to get on and off at varying locations and increase the likelihood of use by more users.
No response	Faster trips with fewer stops
5	Because of the way Boise is spread out, I don't think anything other than slow trips with more stops is viable. The only way the other would work was for commuter rail between all the major cities in the Treasure Valley.
3	Where is the option for not building a system? The only support is if there are no taxpayer funds expended, either local, state, or federal.
5	The first and last mile are often the biggest hindrance to using mass transit. More stops is preferable with an express option as well.
5	Public transportation needs to be as accessible for everyone as possible. If there are only a few stops along the way, it makes it less likely to be used by anyone except commuters.
4	Provide faster train service during rush hour but slower service the rest of the time.
2	We will use this to visit my parents in canyon county on occasion.
5	More stops. More options. More people will use it.
2	For me, it's about getting from Caldwell to Boise quickly, conserving resources, and less expensive. However, in order for there to be less stops, transport to those stops via public transport also needs to be available
2	The reason I would use public transit systems is to save money on fueling and upkeep of a vehicle as well as getting to my destination quicker and not being stuck in traffic.
4	More stops in convenient locations makes a huge difference. Otherwise people will still need to drive to stops, and we need to eliminate vehicles on our roads.
5	More stops makes the city more walkable.
4	Connecting Caldwell to Boise is a great idea, even better if people can get on & off in convenient locations, to me that means having options.
4	If we are dreaming bit, why not both options? Direct to City Center or Stops along the way
3	I don't think it is convenient at all and has proven to be too expensive in other states.

**Survey Response**

1 = faster; fewer stops  
5 = slower; more stops

**Tradeoffs**

***Convenience: More speed...or more stops?***

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

4	The trip needs to be fast enough that it's not a waste of time to take transit, but this isn't an incredibly densely populated region so more stops for different areas would be needed to get adequate ridership
3	Not neutral but would want a balance between these two.
5	I have built my life around my own transportation, because the little bit of public transit that we do have is focused to a very small area and if you live in Meridian Nampa or Caldwell you should just give up as it is. I would use a transit that was accessible to all parts of the valley
1	Fast trips will go a long way to reasonably replace my vehicle with public transit. I can get from Meridian to Downtown Boise in 30 minutes; public transit needs to be able to compete with that. I already have to park in a garage a few blocks away from the office building so I have an extra walk anyway.
1	If there is adequate parking located near the stops, I am more than willing to sacrifice more stops for speed. In order to compete with the ease of personal vehicles, we need to present a model that is a justifiable alternative. No one would trade a 30 minute car ride for a 45 or 60 minute public transit option. Most people wouldn't even trade a 30 minute for a 30 minute. Make it quick and easy. and make it have Wifi.
3	I prefer neither because this is a horrible idea. I moved here from Portland, OR which has a light rail and it is a magnet for crime, assaults and vandalism.
4	Stops at the CWI campuses would be amazing!
3	Both would be good. There are used for different reasons. When I want to go to Boise (or Nampa, Caldwell) for work, school or appointment I need a faster bus/train. When going shopping (say) multiple stops are fine some time even better.
2	prioritized mass destinations during peak hours, more embark/disembark options during off-peak hours
1	We loved in Portland and love the transit downtown but if needing to travel through downtown to get to work on the other side of the the number of stops made the commute too slow. A bypass route would have been great.
4	I don't think that more stops necessarily equals slower trip. If the stops are in an optimal location and timed just right, you could still have a decent trip time. Sure, faster trip/less stops might be ideal, but it would cut out a lot of potential for the community to use the transit because people might have to travel a longer distance to the nearest stop and at that point it defeats the purpose of the transit.
2	Need a mixture of both: high speed transit between hubs (cities from Ontario to Mt. home) and more local options with more stops going from that.
2	There are 2 goals I think we want to achieve: 1) Enable large events downtown & at BSU. 2) Enable commuter access from outlying areas. Both goals can be achieved logistically and financially if we build a smaller number of carefully located terminals a 15-20 minute walk from high-traffic destinations.
3	The best option would be both an express with minimal stops and a second with multiple stops to get the most people to the most retail stops
4	I would prefer more stops
2	This is a poorly worded question. Obviously I'd rather it be faster, but if there are fewer stops I might not get to my destination faster (or at all).
4	My main point of buy in with the light rail is its ability to reach a greater portion of the commuting community. I don't believe a light rail should realistically stop everywhere, but it would be a miss to have only a few stops and expect a large portion of people to use it.
2	Would be nice to have express trips during commute hours, and trips with more stops for people who don't mind spending more time on the light rail.
No response	It is a waste of money!!
3	Advantages to both more stops and faster travel - so it's a wash or a win win
3	Would not utilize it nor recommend it
2	If it is not faster than taking a car people will not use it.
4	Neither We don't want it here. IDAHO DOES NOT NEED TO BE TURNED INTO A BIG CITY AREA STAY THE HELL OUT!
3	Both

**Survey Response**

1 = faster; fewer stops  
5 = slower; more stops

**Tradeoffs**

***Convenience: More speed...or more stops?***

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

No response	WE DO NOT WANT A METRO IN BOISE.
4	I would imagine there would be different services based on time of day. For example, at 7:00 am (Monday - Friday), there would be an option to go from Caldwell to Boise with several stops and one at 7:05 with minimal stops (for those that are wanting to head to downtown Boise quickly).
4	With a reasonable amount of stops, people could use other methods like bikes to finish their trips. There could be bike share or scooter stations located near the stops to help with this.
2	I would not use a bus
2	I would prefer a system with express options throughout the day as well as local options like most high capacity transit systems. One that has more express lines during peak hours and more local lines during off peak
2	I would like to see express lines and local lines
2	I would use this for my employment. More stops would mean less consistent in timing and delays
3	Who is your intended user? For myself, a fast reliable service to the airport is valuable. For students, seniors, and disabled, broad bus coverage of the valley is better.
4	If there are more stops, more people can use the transportation. There are more options for destinations, so more people can take advantage.
4	Less people would use it if they can't access a stop. If they have to drive to a stop they would just keep driving.
2	My trips to Boise are few & far between, partly due to the traffic; I would prefer faster trips to an area that is centralized which would allow me to catch a bus or another way to get to my destination;
4	I think if people have to drive more than a couple miles to the stop they won't do it.
2	I chose fewer stops however I would hope once in town (Caldwell/Boise) the number of stops would increase considering the distance people will have to walk from stop to destination.
3	Why not both, as most commuter transit services elsewhere have, with some rapid express and some "local" hitting all stations on the route?
3	It wouldn't be convenient no matter what and it's a waste of taxpayer dollars.
3	If this were a rail system from Boise to Caldwell, I'd want faster with fewer stops. To go from home to downtown Boise, I'm happy with more stops, making it more convenient for more people to get on and off.
No response	The option you leave out is not doing a rail system because of the cost and the failure of the systems around the country.
3	The first question should be "Are you in favor of mass transit at all?" to which my answer is absolutely not. For a fraction of the cost of mass transit, which very few people use and is a complete financial failure everywhere except the densest urban areas (only a few of those), you could much better serve the vast majority of people by improving roadways and increasing their capacity. That is what future planning for the valley should be.
3	This is a poor choice for transportation options - expensive, inconvenient, and a general nuisance for those that must live anywhere near it.
1	It will be slower, more stops. Is not faster. your survey is misleading.
No response	Mass transit is not the answer. It only adds to traffic problems in and around destinations and hubs. The fewer stops it makes, the better.
3	You need both the express service and the multi-stop service to address both needs. There need to be several trains to provide both types of service.
3	This is an absolute farce that will cost more and fall short of its goal while providing an opportunity for unbridled and never-ending government spending and cronyism.
No response	No.
No response	We're not California, we don't need this, and we don't have the funds. Increase wages, lower property taxes, and help the homeless before it gets worse.
3	there should be both
5	Why not both? If the infrastructure is already in place to have multiple stops in each city, there could also be a "express line" that has minimal stops for faster trips.
4	I think there could be both. Mix in a few trips that have fewer stops, but are faster for major destinations such as the airport, the Capitol, St. Al's, and St. Likes. The remaining trips could have more stops to different locations.



**Survey Response**

1 = faster; fewer stops  
5 = slower; more stops

**Tradeoffs**

***Convenience: More speed...or more stops?***

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

5	You can do like ny and have the one that makes lots of stops and then during rush hour you also have an Express service to
3	Use the same model that other successful local transits work such as Japan and Taiwan. Have an express train that skips the smaller stops and goes direct to the main stops. Have a more local train option that stops at every stop. Start this with a few important stops on a high speed train. Scale it by adding smaller stops and the local option... Watch how businesses blossom around the stations and use that to ensure the station locations are strategic and ready for infrastructure development.
4	You can run both 'local' and 'express' service and accomplish both.
3	NO RAIL SYSTEM!
5	Some Express service between 7-9am & 5-7pm on whatever type of transportation offered would be a great asset.
4	More options are appealing, at first glance, but on the other hand, it may be best to start with fewer stops and add more in as needed. That way we don't end up with extra underused and ultimately closed stations taking up valuable space.
4	Speed is important, but last mile challenges could make rail undoable, unless micro-travel options are also available.
3	I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration.
4	I believe there is a balance here. Looking at larger cities, even ones with a similar layout, provides a good frame. Allow for bikes to be stored on the rail. We can thus bike a distance after exiting the rail. Perhaps a medium amount of stops, or rather, a fast railcar for long distance between, and smaller local rails with more stops? Plan for the future, not just now, right? Build it right! So we don't have to destroy, rebuild, and waste soon...
5	Need to serve as many locations as possible.
1	Convenience for me is a faster trip with fewer stops. Slower trips, more stops defeats the purpose.
2	start with speed and design for future stops to be added as needed
4	Having lived in Atlanta for 16 yrs, the convenience of more stops to get closer to your destination outweighed the time spent on the metro
No response	Mass transit never pays for itself. Unnecessary
2	Can both be accomplished through an express ride during times when fast trips with fewer stops is in more demand (rush hour, e.g.) and more stops available for rides at other times throughout the day?
4	As a retired woman, I can see times when I would prefer that more stops would give me more options to shop in various stores and return home via a system. If I commuted to work everyday, I would prefer being more direct and spending less time on public transit.
1	I believe more people will use the system if it provides more speed.
3	Neither. Use money for widening roads and adding sidewalk and safe bike lanes.
4	If I worked in Boise or had an appointment in Boise, I would want the faster/ fewer option. Going to Boise for pleasure, I would want the slower trip/more stops. Is a mix of the two feasible?
2	Current State Street bus stop frequency is reasonable balance of trade offs.
4	The service should not be only for long distance commuters. Many along the corridor need the mass transit as their daily transportation just to perform their tasks. More stops closer to more destinations. Rush hours can add express service to speed up those trips for commuters.
5	Suggest to build more stops but then you could have an option of a bullet train to run the track once every hour
3	We need 2 or 3 high speed limited stops during rush hours and many slower with more stops in between
2	I would favor speed if there were connecting transit options (something like the Boise State shuttles?) at the stops to get me closer to my destination.
5	It is important to have many stops options so one can use the transit system for running errands or visiting family, rather than just commuting. Maybe reserve some commuting hours each day where the system would not do multiple stops (AM and PM) and have more stops during the day?
3	I am assuming that faster trips means a limited number of departures and less departure time choice. I would like to see a combination of both convenience options.
3	Both with the boring company
4	I think more stops are needed because of how close amenities are in each city; each city has a lot to offer that would be attractive.
1	Faster with fewer stops.

<b>Survey response</b> 1 = focus on rush hour 5 = spread through the day	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Timing: Focus service during rush hour...or spread it out throughout the day?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
<p>1 = I'd prefer extra service during rush hour, even if that means less service at other times.</p> <p>3 = Neutral</p> <p>5 = I'd prefer service spread evenly throughout the day. Not everyone travels during rush hour.</p>	
2	Similar to the previous comment, perhaps an express option could be added during rush hour to increase capacity, but the slower option with more stops could be available all day.
2	How can it be truly "high speed" when it's sharing roads with vehicles? The highest-speed transit (HST) would be rail from Caldwell to Micron, with stops in Caldwell, Meridian, Eagle, the Mall area, downtown Boise and Micron. A robust VRT network would be needed to deliver riders from HST to work/shopping/residential areas. If this is the final vision, start there and work backward to what can be funded between now and then (i.e. buy land, track rights, etc.) In the meantime, beef up VRT.
2	I see the majority of users needing specific times and fewer spread out throughout the day. However, there is a balance needed with off hour peak travel.
2	While I would likely use high capacity transit at off peak times, I realize that in order to ease traffic congestion it makes sense to prioritize rush hour.
5	It definitely needs to run before and after entertainment shows to get us back home.
2	Extra service during rush hour seems best, especially if the buses fill up quickly. My only concern is more buses potentially adding to traffic and the buses being slower to get places. (This isn't so bad for the return trips, but is a big worry when trying to get to work on time)
4	The projected date will most likely see people starting their job at more varying times. Larger cities have "rush hour" often for multiple hours.
2	A focus on rush hour would alleviate major traffic concerns throughout the city. Then, outside of rush hour, truly focusing on specific times that are still busy should be a priority as opposed to a simple hourly schedule. Find things that cause a big draw, college class schedule possibly, and focus off-peak transit times to help with those needs.
1	This would be used more for commuting. Home, to work, to home. Everything else I will probably need my car for.
1	Get the working people to and from work effectively and efficiently. This, of course, means more services during rush hour times. My job schedule falls outside these times as do many food service and part time jobs. I would hope employers and transit officials could discuss this issue and adjust schedules to best fit the majority of commuters.
4	The portion of our community that most relies upon mass transit does not necessarily work an average 9-5 job. Additionally, I believe public transit should be considered for social events, such as when groups of friends head into downtown for parties, drinking, etc., all of which happens outside of work transit times or rush hour. To keep commerce alive, you need people making money and spending it; relegating transit times to only rush hour only provides for the former.
2	HOV lanes would help relieve some of the traffic issues during rush hour so the Transit service wouldn't have to be as crucial during those times. There's no reason to NOT have an HOV lane/Express lane. Some big cities have an Express lane that changes directions for morning or evening Rush Hour.
3	None of these will suffice, I have an irregular schedule and would prefer to travel on my own.
No response	Extra service during rush hour....then spread out at other times
5	Having used commuter trains in the past, I much prefer a regular, even schedule instead of having to remember a variable timetable. Even if that means the trains are a little packed at rush hour.
No response	The Idaho State Constitution doesn't allow a transit system to be financed through property tax which is how other municipalities fund their rail systems
1	I'd prefer to have access all day, however, the need for traffic reduction during rush hour takes precedence.
4	You need to have 4 trips an hour to everywhere you go. So no longer than 15 minute wait for the next transportation. You're competing against jumping into my car....it's got to be quick.
1	The quicker one can get from Caldwell to downtown Boise, ie 30 mins or less, the more we can manage suburban housing developments in outskirts of Canyon county and up toward Middleton

<b>Survey response</b> 1 = focus on rush hour 5 = spread through the day	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Timing: Focus service during rush hour...or spread it out throughout the day?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
2	Since most people would be using this option during peak times (getting to and from work 7/9am to 3/6pm) it would make sense to afford extra travel at those times during the week. As long as we'd still have transport during the weekends, including extended hours. So not ending at 7 or 8 PM but stretching out to 12AM or later.
1	Given the consolidation of businesses (and traffic to those businesses) in downtown boise, I think focusing on the busiest times of the day makes more sense to improve traffic in the area and utilize the transit in the most meaningful way possible.
4	If the service is through out the day then I have more versatility for other stops and planned meetings using the light rail.
5	Again, improved access for everyone is best.
4	Enough accommodation during rush hour but I would most likely be using it during off work hours
No response	Prefer extra during rush hour
2	Congestion at rush hour might dissuade people from using the rail. Increased service at peak times will encourage more participation from the community.
1	Direct with fewer stops makes the most sense at rush hour. It would be nice to have a couple of buses with more stops at the off peak times
2	I feel the majority of commute times right now are heaviest during mornings and afternoons. If valley population continues to grow exponentially i could see the need to have service be evenly spread out throughout a whole day. As for now though the rush hours are clearly morning and afternoon/ evening time frames
4	Time between pickups needs to be no more than an hour, even outside rush hour. During rush hour, absolutely no more than 30 minutes between pickups.
3	I won't nor will anyone I know use this.
5	More trips could be added for rush hour but not if it sacrifices service throughout the day
No response	I don't want light rail
No response	I'd prefer extra services during rush hours
5	The best transit will have downtown boise arrivals beginning at 6am and departures ending at 10pm. All federal, state, county, and city employees and officials should ride the bus. Including teachers, mayors, attorneys general, judges, and janitors. Public employees should ride the bus - it's Best for Boise.
No response	Spread evenly throughout the day
2	Frequent regular service can be evenly spread throughout the day. Extra service and express service can supplement regular service during rush hours.
4	So in order for people to get used to a system and organize their trips around the service, a static schedule would be preferred. Granted rush hour is when the service would be used the most, having a consistent strong schedule would increase ridership throughout the day and alleviate pressure during rush hour.
2	Even though many people travel throughout the day having extra service during rush hour would reduce the congestion on the roads that begins well before and lasts well after "rush hour" thus making way for the fewer people who travels earlier or later.
4	I think more service during rush hour would be something to consider if the trains actually get overcrowded during that time.
2	Focus service
5	It would be nice if public transit ran 24 hours a day for those who have varying schedules.
5	The buses right now don't run on Sunday, and late at night. For myself I would love to use transit for getting around when going to events not necessarily for working. So having access to the service late at night would be perfected.
5	If services are only going during rush hour, huge groups of people will be left out. Retired folks that can't/don't want to drive will have fewer options to get to their destinations. Parents wanting to take to their kids to parks/museums. Students whose classes may be off campus or needing to quickly go from class to work. There are hundreds of different needs in our valley. Please do your best to not exclude those that don't travel during rush hour.
5	I would rather have more options for times to ride rather than have less crowded cars during rush hour.
2	Existing travel infrastructure is under utilized outside of rush hours

<b>Survey response</b> 1 = focus on rush hour 5 = spread through the day	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Timing: Focus service during rush hour...or spread it out throughout the day?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
3	Rail system not needed. Have busses been running full capacity?
1	The less this system runs, the better.
5	of course more service during rush hour
1	If people are going to use it, it has to be available when most people need it. More trips during rush hour and some trips during the day.
1	I rode the light rail in PHX for 10 years. This is how it works there. Frequency was sometimes increased on weekends or evenings if a big event was planned
2	Help our ever increasing rush hour traffic by giving another option rather than the crowded main roads between Caldwell and Boise. This would also cater more to the everyday person and maybe take away some of the stigma of who public transportation is for. Bus system again should be readily available to fill in the gaps of the train schedule
5	work from home and staggered work schedules will decrease congestion during rush hour. If there is always a train for whenever you need to go somewhere people will be able to rid themselves of their car and consider the train their main option for of transport. Having to check a train schedule is another barrier that makes it harder to use the train. If the schedule is set for say the :05 on every hour it takes the guesswork and energy out of using the train system to plan your day. Make it easy
5	This would sure help get the traffic congestion off the freeway and hopefully cut down on accidents on the freeway to have the availability all day with a decent time table
4	With flex scheduling, school schedules, and leisure activities it is important to have consistent transit throughout the day. If there is extremely heavy use during rush hours then ideally there would be some increase in frequency or capacity for those times, while still having reasonably convenient access throughout the day to support all transit activities.
5	I live in Meridian and work in downtown Boise 9-2. I would love to use this option
3	I drive a car so it doesn't matter
3	None don't want the light rail
2	I don't travel much during rush hour, but I would be able to plan my schedule around fewer options through the day.
No response	We already have buses which are more flexible and can be adapted to changes. None of them are anywhere near capacity.
2	Unfortunately rush hour is very real and the light rail will be a lifeline for residents getting to work who don't have other means of transportation. This means that the rail would need to be ready for that rush when the time comes. But while rush hour is important, not everyone works a 9am-5pm and many workers clock out around 9pm-11pm. The rail must also have options that are just as accessible as rush hour to accommodate these workers and families.
3	We don't want light rail.
2	Just like with buses, more service during times when more people travel. Also more service for special events, i.e. at Bronco Stadium
2	I think it is important that service is focused on the times most people will be utilizing this service. I also think it is important to consider equity though. Lower income people tend to work nontraditional hours in the service industry. They should have options as well- unlike the current bus system that stops running very early.
2	I think that having a "regular" schedule throughout the day would be great but then having an extra run or extra "bus" running during the rush hours timeframes would benefit commuters.
4	While it would be useful for commuting, I would hope to be able to use the light rail to access areas for commerce as well.
5	A couple of extra trains at rush hour might be nice, but many people don't work 9-5, and it would be frustrating to not be able to use them as reliably to get places during the day.
5	This is not an accurate question. Several dedicated rails could help with the Nampa/ Caldwell commute, but it would help green house emissions if it were convenient to get around Boise, Meridian, & Eagle. I had a very difficult time finding relevant bus routes & stops to help me back in 2003-05 & there are less stops now. I don't use it because the bus is even less useful now. We definitely need both plus this one.
5	I think that if there are clear instructions of when what time and where to pick up and drop off there shouldn't be a lot of issues
3	I want service until 1:00 am. a LOT OF PEOPLE work shifts and flights come in until after midnight.

<b>Survey response</b> 1 = focus on rush hour 5 = spread through the day	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Timing: Focus service during rush hour...or spread it out throughout the day?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
5	We are retired and love to have a public transit to downtown Boise throughout all hours of the day and evening. Thank you
1	We need this project badly.
1	Most service at rush hour as that is when traffic the worst.
4	Start off with very limited runs with your empty trains, work up from there. That will help the enormous cost overruns from becoming too onerous, hopefully.
5	24/7 or it doesn't make sense...the limited bus schedule is partly the reason that infrastructure is insufficient
No response	Extra service on rush hour
4	This need not be binary, but if I have to choose an emphasis I'll lean towards broader accessibility.
2	please consider multiple rush hours with this approach. Not everyone is in the same rush hour. additionally, focusing on the work commuter will address the biggest need and provide the biggest benefit as other cities have learned
2	Most riders would be during rush hour timesso extra service would make the transportation more reliable and less crowded.
4	Use for business travel is great but use atnights for entertainment would be desired too and could cut down on DUIs
5	Boise desperately needs both, but not having a bus at 9 pm has been inconvenient far more times than not having one at 5:15.
1	Rush hour is where a high-capacity transit system is most needed. Travelers at odd hours can more easily use a normal car.
2	Your more likely to have heavier use times during rush hour so that would be better to offer concentrated use during that time.
No response	Extra service through rush hour
5	Current mass transit schedules are horrendous, and honestly a total joke. Service needs to be available AT BARE MINIMUM until 10:30PM, and ideally until 2:30AM so people are less likely to drink and drive.
3	Dont build it!
5	Again, if we're trying to make it accessible and helpful, it needs to be accessible throuought the day.
2	Let's get some cars off the road during rushhour! It will make things better for everyone (and the environment).
2	I think this would be great for commuters
1	Rush hours suck. Being in crowded train cars is not fun. Especially when your trying to transport groceries or luggage.
5	There are more retirees in the community and school age kids that get out at a different time than 8 to 5. Meeting these needs will provide a service and reduce cars on the road.
2	Having more options during rush hour would keep traffic off the roads making travel more efficient.
2	Maybe just more spaced out during off time would be good.
4	Working hours are becoming more sporadic for a lot of people, and often people who would benefit from mass transit don't work the traditional 8 - 5 schedule.
5	It's really important to run often enough that you aren't waiting too long to ride. Increase frequency in those peak times if space is running out.
2	If this is really about getting people out of their cars, then maybe you should prioritize the Rush Hours.
3	I think traffic is fine in the valley and transit system is not necessary.
3	This is a complicated tradeoff, while I think that service should be provided throughout the day so that people who work unusual hours are still able to use it, I also think that some priority should be given to people who commute during rush hour considering that there are significantly more people who commute at that time. I'm not sure which is best, hopefully a solution somewhere in the middle.
5	If you don't work 9-5 then you're just screwed here in the valley
1	Rush hours exists because a majority of people need the roads at those hours. Choosing to spread the service evenly is not a decision based on realistic scenarios.
2	Evn during rush hour not everyone is getting off at 5. Make frequent trips during peak hours and less frequent trips in the middle of the day. However, there is a lunch time rush that also needs to be considered. And a late Friday night, Saturday night rush that goes until 2-3am.

<b>Survey response</b> 1 = focus on rush hour 5 = spread through the day	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Timing: Focus service during rush hour...or spread it out throughout the day?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
3	None of this matters if people will be in fear to ride the train. In Portland, the homeless and criminals have taken over the trains. People getting assaulted, stabbed or shot while trying to ride the train. Then the trains are dirty and the drug deals that occur on the trains are rampant.
5	Focused (speed) spread throughout the day but fewer say every 90 minutes-2 hours midday and night time.
4	prioritized peak hour, with constant service between
3	I neutral. I think the schedule needs to be what people want and the only way to know is by testing schedules. Also, there could be times when there is a high need for transit for special events.
2	Sure, not everyone travels during rush hour, but the majority of the community does. Maybe consider having extra services on the weekdays and more evenly spread on the weekends/holidays?
2	Both are needed. More capacity during rush hour, but the system needs to support ridership earlier and later in the day.
1	To support large events downtown and at BSU, or to support commutes to high-density areas (like Micron or the mall area), we'll want to move a lot of people very quickly. That said, the real sell for commuters will not be that the trip is shorter. It will be that they won't have to use the time focusing on driving, and can do other things instead (like catch up on email).
5	I am thinking of a light rail system like in Salt Lake City.
1	I-84 has nearly become a swear word in my vocabulary during the work week. On the weekends and off hours I rarely experience congestion - even at the common choke points such as the connector. Boise was recently listed as one of the top 50 worst commuter cities ( <a href="https://www.cbsnews.com/pictures/worst-traffic-cities-america/26/">https://www.cbsnews.com/pictures/worst-traffic-cities-america/26/</a> ). I believe the initial implementation of a service should not be an indicator of the final deployment, but at the initial start, hit the biggest target: commuters.
2	If the intent is to get more people off the freeway during historically busy commute hours, then extra service during those rush hours would be beneficial.
No response	It is a waste of money
3	This allotment will change as populations change. What works in December year one may be very different from what works in July year 2.
2	I think this should be a good balance. Extra service during rush hour, but still runs consistently at other times in order to encourage additional usage.
2	More likely to use transit for commute than going out for fun.
No response	Nothing at all Stay the hell out and leave Idaho the amazing Mountains and Country state it is!
4	I work outside rush hour time, but sometimes work overtime and will end up leaving to go home at rush hour
No response	We do NOT want a metro in Boise.
2	If riders know the service schedule, we can adjust accordingly.
2	More service during rush hour would help distribute the crowd. Rather than everyone trying to be on the one bus that hour (and not having room for everyone) people could go a half hour or 15 minutes later and be guaranteed a seat.
2	Most systems have peak hours and off peak hours I feel this makes sense.
2	I would like to see peak hours and off peak hours
5	Nashville, my home town, tried the select hours for light rail. People could consistently use it because it restricted their work schedule. No time to do a happy hour downtown or stay for a concert. More fun times means more opportunity
2	More people are traveling during rush hour than at other times, so more options need to be available to the most people.
4	Many types of driving times. People could also use it to go to Boise for lunch and a drink and might not want to drive
5	I would prefer the service to be spread out more evenly throughout the day.
2	Time trains based on need.
2	Although I do think Rush hour would need increased Transit I think this is a waste of time and money. There are plenty of modes of transportation available to people without vehicles. Busy families need their cars, as a mother I am not going to work without a vehicle in case I need to get to my children quickly whether they be at school or hospitalized for an accident or any other possible scenario.

<b>Survey response</b> 1 = focus on rush hour 5 = spread through the day	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Timing: Focus service during rush hour...or spread it out throughout the day?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
No response	The first question should be "Are you in favor of mass transit at all?" to which my answer is absolutely not. For a fraction of the cost of mass transit, which very few people use and is a complete financial failure everywhere except the densest urban areas (only a few of those), you could much better serve the vast majority of people by improving roadways and increasing their capacity. That is what future planning for the valley should be.
2	The government has not been able to efficiently run transportation systems in most cities through the US, let alone in the greater Boise area.
1	The roads need to be more efficient. Public transportation will increase more the traffic congestion.
No response	Concentrate more on commuters than on constant service all day long. People want to get to work while others need to get shopping done without being inconvenienced by transit modes interrupting traffic patterns.
3	There are no tradeoffs here. You have to provide extra service during rush hour and standard service throughout the day to achieve full support and ridership.
3	This is an absolute farce that will cost more and fall short of its goal while providing an opportunity for unbridled and never-ending government spending and cronyism.
No response	We're not California, we don't need this.
No response	We're not California, we don't need this, and we don't have the funds. Increase wages, lower property taxes, and help the homeless before it gets worse.
1	At least every 45-60 minutes
4	I think service throughout the day is more important than rush hour service. Still, as we scale, we could certainly add more routes during rush hour.
5	I used to live in Salt Lake City. I worked at night, and needed to bus home around 10pm. Luckily I lived near a line that ran until 11pm so I could. Not every line needs to run later, but if a few of the more popular lines did it would really help those of us who work odd hours.
1	NO RAIL SYSTEM!
No response	I think this matrix of 4 questions is too simple. An effective system requires compromise for each of the 4 points. You can't satisfy everyone. I think the goal should look at how to get the greatest reduction in trips over the road, looking at the whole day. Frequent trips with smaller conveyance during lower use times. Cheap will cost more later.
4	As someone who works odd hours, I would appreciate spread out service. That's a main issue with bus service for people in my (theatre/event) industry at the moment, the buses oftentimes just don't run when we're needing to get to/from work.
2	Adequate seats to make a meaningful difference in the commute is necessary, but a regular, less-frequent service through the day would suffice for 90%+ of my needs.
3	I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration.
4	Spreading out service seems important. I see how rush hour can get crammed, but persons can always catch the next bus, too. We can accommodate each rail to carry a good amount of people.
1	There are no traffic issues during non-rush hours, so this option makes the most sense.
4	If you really want to have people use mass transit, get them used to using it during the entire day
5	NOTE: I AM AGAINST MASS TRANSIT IN OUR VALLEY. W/ MORE AND MORE PEOPLE WORKING REMOTELY, THERE IS NO NEED FOR PROPERTY TAXES TO GO UP TO FUND IT. NO MASS TRANSIT!!!
No response	Mass transit is a drain on resources. Do not construct
3	use common sense, make adjustments as you see or hear what the commuters needs and want. Nothing should be cast in cement, You want the most people to use this as possible, be flexible.
4	When I used the bus system to get to and from work about 40 years ago, I struggled to get to the bus stop before the last bus left for my ride home. Missing the last bus out meant that my husband made a separate trip downtown to "fetch" me when I was finished working for the day. There no actual driving trips were saved on those days.
1	Highest demand would be during rush hour and if there is more service during that time more would use it and be more apt to also use it at other times.
1	Neither. Use money for widening roads and adding sidewalk and safe bike lanes.
5	Rush hour isn't that terrible. Feel the use would be greater during evenings when people want to go out for entertainment.

<b>Survey response</b> 1 = focus on rush hour 5 = spread through the day	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Timing: Focus service during rush hour...or spread it out throughout the day?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
2	My guess is the most beneficial user is the people going to and from Work. Less traffic, pollution, crowded road ways, etc. I would also think they would be the heavy users if it is cost effective. If most of the work traffic is off the roadways it wouldn't be too bad to drive to Boise if need be.
2	All day scheduling should be frequent enough to be convenient to use, with added service, perhaps express service, during rush hours.
4	Having frequent, regular runs is the best way to get people to actually use transit. No one wants to memorize a time table. It would also benefit lower income workers who often have jobs without regular "office hours", and students, who also have more irregular schedules.
1	Introducing a route that drastically diminishes freeway traffic necessitates speed and ease of access. The way I envision this is a light-rail along the freeway with targeted bus routes from the main hubs to neighborhoods, all heavily focused on rush hour drivers
3	Both with the boring company



**Survey Response**

1 = separate from traffic  
5 = share the road

# Tradeoffs

## Separation: Separate...or together?

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

**1 = High-capacity transit separated from traffic.**

Faster and more reliable, but less convenient access, especially for cyclists and pedestrians.

**3 = Neutral**

**5 = High-capacity transit shares roads with other vehicles.**

Slower and less reliable, but easier to access, especially for cyclists and pedestrians.

5	I would prefer better access for cyclists and pedestrians.
2	As long as high capacity transit works in conjunction with local transit options (like existing bus routes, bike/pedestrian hubs), separated would be better for the longer distances between the cities.
3	My personal recommend... put rail down the median of I84. The psychological factor of slow traffic seeing fast moving rail will be FREE advertising just by being visible to those stuck in traffic. Priceless!
2	How can it be truly "high speed" when it's sharing roads with vehicles? The highest-speed transit (HST) would be rail from Caldwell to Micron, with stops in Caldwell, Meridian, Eagle, the Mall area, downtown Boise and Micron. A robust VRT network would be needed to deliver riders from HST to work/shopping/residential areas. If this is the final vision, start there and work backward to what can be funded between now and then (i.e. buy land, track rights, etc.) In the meantime, beef up VRT.
2	I think it can be made convenient for pedestrians and cyclists. It needs to be, but with the growth of the area, you can't rely on traffic to continue to move smoothly.
1	THIS is the crucial question. Separation is key. Mode is secondary. A separated bus lane takes less dough to implement, but will have the same benefit to users as light rail.
1	I get an uber to get to the "less convenient access"
2	I think the future system will need both high capacity separated from traffic with transit hubs, and a distributed, road based system to get people around.
2	If there was parking for pedestrians and cyclists this would be fine.
1	Part of my concern with more buses (Timing question) is adding to traffic, but if a train service or something similar were used, it wouldn't add as much to street traffic, I think
2	Our metropolitan area is one of the most cyclist friendly in the country. We can continue that reputation with some Idaho-style innovation. Using our hills in the natural landscape of the valley could maximize ease of access points.
3	A combination of both seems most effective. In places where cyclists & pedestrians do not frequent, having specific transit lanes would be beneficial but then when moved into the heart of the downtown corridor, utilizing existing traffic lanes would be ideal.
4	I feel like this would fit our valleys lifestyle better.
1	Light rail, light rail, light rail, eventually from Middleton to Mountain Home and then Ontario (Oregon not Canada) to Twin Falls. When driving to work look to see how many vehicles have one occupant. I'm guilty of this too. We need light rail to reduce energy consumption and reliance on oil. I was too young to take advantage of Amtrak and will be too old to benefit from the proposed transit line. What I learned in my lifetime though, is we are always playing catchup when it comes to commuting.
1	I would hope for a safe route that is fast and efficient, provided there are slower routes that provide access to the central express travel options.
5	People who do not want to drive to work would need easy access by bike or on foot. HOV/Express lanes on the freeway for rush hour traffic accommodating those who do drive.
3	I don't walk or ride a bike to anything so inconvenience of a transit system is still an issue I don't want.
1	There is no need for it to be difficult for cyclists and pedestrians to access. I have lived in several different cities with train/light rail options with easier pedestrian access than buses.
No response	Transit separating from car traffic for safety
5	We do not need separate infrastructure built. That would cost too much and benefit us very little.
2	Hire a really good civil engineer and base your designs off ease-of-use. Best not to impede traffic with mass transit. Minimize road rage instigation.

Survey Response		Tradeoffs	
1 = separate from traffic 5 = share the road		<i>Separation: Separate...or together?</i>	
(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)			
1		There are constantly accidents that impact the trains if they share roads. It always becomes an issue down the line based on the growth I saw inSeattles system while I was there	
2		Public transportation needs to be easily accessible to everyone, however I prefer HIGH CAPACITY public transportation to have a separate line. The whole point is to ease traffic and move commuters along faster.	
1		I'm assuming there would be an option to carry the bike on the train, which would be helpful.	
No response		The old mayor of Boise tried to get a smaller rail system in the capital city and failed every year.. he even had the rails purchased dozens ofyears ago for 300k.. yet still no rail system..	
1		I would expect to see a collaboration between city bus services and the rail being separate from traffic.	
2		It seems unfair to have to sacrifice access,but if we want to work toward a greener future and have people invest and use public transportationit needs to be reliable and at least somewhat more convenient than driving yourself.	
3		Both is necessary	
1		I lived in Portland, OR for 3 years, and theMAX (separate from traffic) was a lifesaver! Traffic has gotten SO bad since Portland has grown over the last 10 years, and it is a saving grace for commuters to have the MAX, which bypasses congested freeways and downtown areas	
3		Whatever would be the best option long term	
1		What a great question! I would much ratherbe able to walk to the transit station, but i would prefer high-capacity, as I have been on crowdedbuses before and it really makes the trip more difficult, especially when slowed down by traffic. Being an office worker, I would prefer to be able to work on the transit, if possible.	
4		In early Boise history a trolley ran from Boise to Caldwell-Ustick is a viable path just as it was those years ago.sharing the road will diminish urban traffic.	
1		We will probably need as much space as we can get for traffic, so this seems more reasonable.	
1		It would be nice if stops had ramps/ stairsso pedestrians and cyclists had a way down to roads and sidewalks. That way the rail system has it own space, while also not alianating pedestrians and cyclists.	
1		Rail systems have only caused traffic to getworse because of the signal phase changes and pedestrian v train accidents.	
1		It needs to be faster and serve a purpose. If it's equivalent to my car I'm going to drive my car	
No response		Shared roads with other vehicles	
2		I think they each serve their purpose. I really would like to see both.	
2		Improve bus system, but having light rail (with park and ride etc) would be efficient and so convenient	
5		Needs to be accessible to bikes and people as everyone needs a way to get to their final destination and this would help reduce reliance on cars	
2		Bigger concern is cost..	
3		Even on-road transit would need to be reliable. A bus failing to show up means people miss work. That's why so few people take the bus into Boise now.	
3		This is a public health disaster and a wasteof money that no one wants	
3		I would never use it	
2		If separate from traffic people will learn new routes ans development can occurs near route and it won't add to traffic congestion	
1		Reliable timing is highly important	
No response		I don't want light rail	
No response		Share with other vehicles	
1		I prefer a ground-level track as much as possible. Eleveted tracks are frequently an eyesore, provide places for graffiti, and are difficult toevacuate in an emergency, or to access for a rescue. If the primary routes will be along freeways and main roads this shouldn't be a problem, perhaps only needing elevated tracks in the downtown Boisearea.	
5		The roads exist. Spend the money on buses.	
No response		High capacity transit separated from traffic	
1		Non-drivers won't plan their day around unreliable services. A separate transit system will have increased convenience even with less access	

Survey Response		Tradeoffs	
1 = separate from traffic 5 = share the road		<i>Separation: Separate...or together?</i>	
(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)			
2		I think more people would use the transit system if was just as fast or faster than driving.	
2		Traffic congestion holding your trip hostage is the worst thing about buses. Being separate from cars would be the biggest allure of a light rail.	
1		I worked in mass transit for 35 years, 22 of them in light rail, both in training and 10 years as the Transportation Superintendent. Grade separated high capacity rail is THE ONLY way to go. Anything else is an accident magnet.	
2		So the thing about the valley is that there is already a rail corridor throughout the community. using the existing rail corridor or tandem it would allow for quicker start up and less disruption of current traffic. Building stations along the route and using existing stations, such as the Boise Depot and Old Nampa and Caldwell stations would generate pedestrian traffic and business opportunities in the vicinity. Lets be real. Use light rail to get people to town then bus them around.	
1		Adding high capacity transit that shares roads will only further our congestion problems and would prevent people from using it. They will see it as too similar to driving their own vehicle but with less autonomy so they're more likely to still drive the personal vehicle.	
3		I think it would be best if it did both like the trax does in Salt Lake City, at least while in downtown.	
2		Separate	
2		Doesn't Utah's transit allow bikes on? I wonder is something like that could be allowed. Having transit that would allow me to take a bike on it would greatly expand the scope of where I could ride it without a car.	
2		With the way we are growing, setting up away from major roads could be best? Perhaps it would attract small local business to put down roots near the rail. It would probably also remove the risk of more congestion on our roads, which are already bad, especially during rush hours.	
1		I won't use the bus. It's faster and more efficient for me to drive my own car...a bus won't get me there any faster.	
1		Using to get from city to city would make this the better option.	
4		Both depending on the area. I'm from San Diego and their light rail system is a great example.	
3		Separate is the best option for long term infrastructure growth but likely bears the greatest cost, and largest lag time between initial development and significant utilization. So a balance must be met in order to satisfy citizens tendency to demand more immediate results with a new transit option.	
1		For sure separated. Otherwise what's the point? Cyclists and pedestrians currently have options they can continue to use	
3		Waste of taxpayer money.	
1		The system absolutely should not share the road with cars. Again, I've lived with this, and it does not work to have these systems on the road.	
1		Cyclists and pedestrians just need to get to their closest station. Although not the best system, there already are buses in the valley. We need a rail system!	
3		traffic lights can be timed to let the light rail go through. Also the train is always first in line on the track, never has to wait through multiple light changes	
3		If the transit is set away from main roads there will 100% need to be bus stops to bring people to it, maybe a new green belt path to allow cyclists a safe passage to it as well?	
4		Expanding the existing bus transit system seems to be more practical given the community spread in the Treasure Valley. Bulk up bus route along highway 44 to Boise, add additional runs from Caldwell, Nampa, and especially Meridian and southeast Boise into the Boise hub area	
5		Cyclists and pedestrians will be the main users anyway. Keeping all the noise and infrastructure together will be better. Also if drivers see a train passing them in rush hour getting there faster they might get on the train instead next time increasing ridership.	

Survey Response		Tradeoffs	
1 = separate from traffic 5 = share the road		<i>Separation: Separate...or together?</i>	
(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)			
2		Public transit has to be reliable to be effective. People will not use transit that is frequently late for important transit to work, appointments. They do not have time to stand at stops waiting for late buses, missed buses or to allow an extra 15-30+ minutes every time they transit for unreliable transit. Employers will not tolerate habitual lateness due to public transit problems. The service must be dependable and consistent, or it is not convenient, and will decrease voluntary ridership	
2		Both speed and frequent stops are important, as is making it easy to access by pedestrians and cyclists. Other cities, states, and countries, have figured out how to combine them into a near seamless system - it's not an either/or; just takes more planning.	
1		Please just look at the beautiful job Salt Lake City has done with their public transport! SLC has done a great job creating a street car that is both reliable, quick, and does not impede traffic. No need to reinvent the wheel.	
1		I think it must be separate from other traffic. If it is not you will have a hard time getting people to buy in.	
1		PLEASE look at what a phenomenal job Salt Lake City does with their tram cars! I would be THRILLED to see something just like that here in Boise!!	
3		I drive a car so it doesn't matter	
3		None don't want the light rail	
No response		Non drivers are the target populace. This pro and con speaks for it's self.	
3		The Salt Lake valley has a mixture of both: sharing roadways in the downtown core, and separate in the outer areas of the county. This works very well for them and should be considered.	
4		I'm familiar with these two types of transportation structures. I worry that a separated from traffic model will lead to commuters having to drive to the train location with a large parking structure making it only accessible to those who already have a car and want to take the train for the pure convenience. Having a transit system that is accessible from the sidewalk is key for people of less means to access.	
3		We don't want light rail in the boise area	
1		No need for arterial roadways with 7 lanes. Use the right-of-way for dedicated transit lanes. People in cars can deal with congestion if they insist on driving and choose to travel at peak hours. We cannot afford have excess lanes at non-peak when that right-of-way can be used for more efficient use by high capacity rapid transit	
2		I think the faster option is best. We have buses that operate within traffic at that slower rate, and they aren't used frequently because it just takes too long.	
3		I imagine a combination. Separate where appropriate, but joining roads where access would be beneficial. Think Portland. It parallels the interstate but is a part of surface streets.	
4		The real in Salt Lake City and Portland are both in with traffic and I loved them when I lived in those areas.	
3		I like the first idea but it not being available to cyclist and pedestrians then you would loose more buisness	
1		If we're talking trains, lets separate it from traffic. #1. I don't want to compete with high-capacity tansit for precious roadway space. #2 I want the High Capacity Transit to haul ass, so it should be separated from road traffic so we don'tget in it's way.	
2		If the access points are well thought out, I don't understand why it would be inconvenient for cyclists and pedestrians to access if we have them separate.	
2		Pedestrian pathways and bridges could make it easier to access separated transit.	
2		I'd like to see a mixture. Some travel separate from traffic, with boarding stations with "park and ride" lots, and some travel shared with traffic, such as in the downtown areas.	
5		Need it to be accessible to people and bikes as that gets more users and allows people to use alternate transport end to end	
2		Doesn't really matter, bike riders are annoying enough as it is, the streets are for cars.	
2		I don't see how it's less convenient for cyclists and pedestrians	
No response		Share with others vehicle	
2		Not convinced this has to be one or the other, but if it must be either/or, I'll lean towards ride reliability so there's less chance of needing to drive. However, this is assuming that appropriate accommodation can be made for people with disabilities.	

Survey Response		Tradeoffs	
1 = separate from traffic 5 = share the road		<i>Separation: Separate...or together?</i>	
(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)			
1		Supplemented by buses that would coordinatetimes during rush hours.	
2		other locations in utah, washington, oregonand colorado have shown this is the most prudent and provides a huge benefit	
2		Can't we make it more accessible? Using ashared transit will increase the congestion that is already becoming a problem	
1		Need faster and frequent trips to boise	
2		Cyclists and pedestrians will still make itwork! And probably safer for them, too.	
1		Separated from traffic to have faster and more reliable transportation is much more important than having slightly easier access for pedestriansand cyclists. Walking or riding to a station does not make for harder access. People will want speed and reliability while keeping roads clear.	
2		Would prefer some sort of rail system 100%.Avoiding traffic would be great but light rail in higher density locations (downtown Boise, etc) isunderstandable and welcomed	
2		I think the transit system should focus on being a viable alternative to the interstate and State Street. convenience for pedestrians should notbe a priority, but rather focus on a park and ride system.	
1		Seems like the whole purpose is to relieve some of the traffic congestion commuting into boise, so makes more sense to separate.	
No response		High capacity transportation separately	
3		We honestly probably need a little of both.More bike/pedestrian ONLY transit paths are needed in Boise.	
3		How are these your two options? These thingsare not mutually exclusive. You can have both.	
1		Roads already crowded. Adding buses will slow down traffic further. Lived in places with systems, they dont work.	
2		Please don't build a system that gets justas stuck in traffic as a bus. This is the Achille's heal of the Seattle light rail system.	
1		Safety is more important than convenience. Not taking up road space allows current traffic to be uninterrupted, hopefully leading to fewer accidents.	
2		A mixture would be good. Share the road downtown Boise then separate out of town	
3		I personally prefer faster travel, and wouldn't mind walking a mile or two to reach transportation. However, anything further than that will make it inaccessible for those that need it most.	
1		I already think there should be some other way for semis to get to their destinations. I don't want to add another system to the roads.	
1		I use the L in Chicago (college student) andas a pedestrian and cyclist I have no problem access it. Bike ramps are helpful	
2		Canyon county is not bicycle friendly. I seethis being used mostly for those commuting.	
1		Please. Separate transportation is soo muchbetter.	
1		Rail seems like a better option. It should still be accessible to bikes and pedestrians.	
4		If it's not convenient, it wont be used.	
1		From my point of view safety is more important than speed, separation from road sharing, and possible pedestrian hazards is most important.	
1		In Portland, OR, the light rail follows thehighways. Very convenient. Not an either/or.	
4		If Portland can make it work I am fairly confident we can.	
2		The Treasure Valley is very car oriented. The introduction of more bus lanes, or even just more buses on the road would make a lot of drivers unhappy. best to keep it separate and have a more reliable and faster mode of transit.	
3		I am NOT neutral on this point, but my selection represents I consider these needing to be balanced in a well-developed network. Neutral is a poor choice of words to use for you midpoint.	
1		No one in this area knows how to merge to save their lives, it would cause so many accidents if it were to share road space with commuters	
1		It is shortsighted to congest the already-congested roads w/ public transit. Sharing the road will lead to more accidents, slower transport times, and more complicated problems from interleaved systems.	

Survey Response		Tradeoffs	
1 = separate from traffic 5 = share the road		<i>Separation: Separate...or together?</i>	
(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)			
3		Depends on the area. Caldwell and Nampa to Boise, needs a high speed option that is separate from normal traffic. Garden City to the village at meridian? Probably less so.	
2		Train access would naturally be limited. Bus access should share the road, but maybe have lanes allocated like HOV lanes.	
4		I think hi speed transit needs to travel into the city. In the urban areas, frequent stops and travel right i the city is required. But it's ok if transit between urban areas is not near city streets so it can speed up	
3		Should be a mix of both. Unless you have a system in place to bring people to the faster service	
1		obviously cost and building infrastructure is greater, but the finished product is superior in many ways	
2		I am a bit confused on why a separate solution would be inconvenient to pedestrians, especially cyclists. I would think that I could bike some place away from congestion and would actually prefer that as a cyclist. For me the same goes for waking maybe I don't get this trade off n	
2		On one hand, less convenience for pedestrians and cyclists isn't ideal, because that's likely the population that would use the transit. On the other hand, the reliability is what we really need. Especially during rush hour.	
2		Light rail systems around the region provide for access of pedestrians and cyclists. These can be used as models.	
1		Some benefits of mass transit include lowering traffic congestion, and reducing air pollution. You lose those advantages (or significantly reduce them) with buses. In my experience, trains are more likely to run on-schedule than buses, because traffic jams can be unpredictable. I also suspect that trains are less of a threat to cyclists and pedestrians precisely because they don't share the roads.	
3		I think the solution may entail both. Not separated in the more dense urban areas where circulation is a priority, and more separated for commuting.	
1		A bus rapid transit system that removes an entire lane of traffic to accommodate an occasional bus is a non-starter for me and I would not support it, nor use it.	
1		The integration of a rail system needs to consider the needs of the majority, not the minority of the population. This survey is being filled out in January, and I can assure you that I've never seen a person biking into the office this time of year. The experience I personally had with light rail was the one implemented in Denver Colorado. While there might be a small commute to a light rail stop, the benefits of convenience, speed, and reliability definitely outweighed the drawbacks.	
2		Together = slower, less reliable, and would assume it's slow existing traffic down as well = bad!	
1		Keep it separate. People are already tired of construction zones/expanding on existing commute roads, and building on or near current commute roads will cause more frustration. People that want to use the light rail will plan ahead to get to their nearest boarding station.	
No response		It is a total waste of money	
1		I think there's improvements that can be made to the current bus system to make it even more accessible to people. A high-capacity transit is what we're missing and seems the most beneficial.	
No response		Stay out!	
4		WE DO NOT WANT A METRO IN BOISE, IN THE VALLEY, OR IN THE STATE.	
4		In the future, though I realize we are a ways off from this, I would love to see the Treasure Valley have a transit system like the one Salt Lake City and the surrounding area has (combination of bus, light rail/commuter train).	
1		If this system is IN ADDITION TO the existing bus system, pedestrians and cyclists can use that to reach the high capacity transit stations.	
2		This depends, i would like to see main lines separated from traffic but bus lines or smaller lines integrated with traffic.	
2		I would like to see major lines or rail lines separated but smaller lines and busses integrated with traffic	

Survey Response		Tradeoffs	
1 = separate from traffic 5 = share the road		<i>Separation: Separate...or together?</i>	
(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)			
3		If you can reuse the existing train tracks, then rail service makes good sense. Light rail service that doesn't have the right of way at all crossings is a waste of money.	
1		If all travelers including cyclists and pedestrians use the same space, there are more accidents with the pedestrians and cyclists having the most injuries and fatalities.	
1		Would like to see a bike path run along side of a rail system and option to transport bike if weather is inclement	
1		We need less cars on the roads. Use existing rail lines for trains.	
1		This may be largely a cost and right-of-way acquisition issue, as well as an engineering challenge. In Japan, for example, some rail companies (Tokyu, for example), have put most of their lines underground, so the convenient access limitations are not so significant.	
1		If you're going to build this atrocity please keep it away from regular traffic instead of causing more accidents and congestion.	
1		I want it to have their own lanes, using existing roads and don't overbuild. Value-engineering and service are key to me.	
3		The first question should be "Are you in favor of mass transit at all?" to which my answer is absolutely not. For a fraction of the cost of mass transit, which very few people use and is a complete financial failure everywhere except the densest urban areas (only a few of those), you could much better serve the vast majority of people by improving roadways and increasing their capacity. That is what future planning for the valley should be.	
1		Sharing the road with regular traffic just makes all of the traffic worse.	
1		Is inconvenient. Neither is suitable	
5		Building a separate rail will add a greater carbon footprint and additional cost that could/should go towards the already planned repairs and expansion of existing roadways.	
1		I would think this would add to the road congestion.	
No response		Keeping transit services separated from cars is safer. Private cars are less likely to be inconvenient by having to wait for trains.	
2		Transit separated from traffic can still be made available to cyclists and pedestrians if you build convenient access points from neighboring streets, sidewalks, lots, parks, greenways, etc.	
3		This is an absolute farce that will cost more and fall short of its goal while providing an opportunity for unbridled and never-ending government spending and cronyism.	
No response		We're not California, we don't need this.	
No response		We're not California, we don't need this, and we don't have the funds. Increase wages, lower property taxes, and help the homeless before it gets worse.	
5		This needs to be accessible to non- drivers! And the ability to load bikes	
1		Easier for riders than cyclists	
3		Transit needs to be accessible to people without vehicles. But in order for this system to work, people with vehicles must choose this option as well. Therefore, I see a huge need for high-capacity transit to have their own lanes in high traffic areas, and at a minimum, an HOV lane on the highway.	
2		Don't need more traffic on the roads, defeats the once rural farm life Idaho was and ease of traffic to get to places without feeling like we're in Los Angeles, maintain some open feel so having train buses on the roads seems like more congestion than would prefer.	
1		I doubt it will be exclusive either way, but the focus should be to drive overall improvement in speed and reliability of service, which is best served with separation from normal traffic. The stations should be located at popular locations throughout the Treasure Valley. Airport, BSU, Downtown, Boise Town Square Mall, Meridian Village, Downtown Nampa, Downtown Caldwell. Having the ability to load your bike or travel with pets will be important inclusions for ridership.	
2		About twenty years ago I knew a girl who was in the car with her family when they were hit by a Trax train. They all survived, but surgery was needed. The safer option is to keep trains off the road.	
1		NO RAIL SYSTEM!	
3		These two options seem to have equal pros and cons to me. I will say, though, that having a separate track for high capacity transit seems to open up more possibilities as far as build/reach, since disrupting current traffic patterns will be less of an obstacle.	

**Survey Response**

1 = separate from traffic  
5 = share the road

**Tradeoffs**

**Separation: Separate...or together?**

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

2	I've long dreamed of the current rail system being used for the commute. Light rail would lead to almost immediate investment in park & ride and other infrastructure. That said, even large cities like SLC have only very limited service after early evening, which could be a challenge for those wanting to commute from Nampa/ Caldwell or farther west. Same for commuters from Mtn Home.
3	I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration.
3	I think the rails that run on tracks in street, not just big busses, or raised railways, are fantastic. Accessible, but safe, as well.
1	High capacity is the way to go. I'm sure you have looked at other cities. Sacramento's light rail system is a good model.
5	I was used to accessing the transit in Atlanta via, walking, bike and my car. It made it much more attractive to me I had all three options available for using it.
No response	No mass transit anywhere pays for itself. Totally a boondoggle
1	you must have more than ample parking at every major stop. Less parking is a killer to being able to use this type of transit. If you charge for parking it has to be reasonable or forget it
4	I have used both types in other cities. Unless there is a good system of buses out of a train transit system, the person using the train transit system is also stuck without a car at the dispersed end of the commute or that person would be walking a significant distance once arriving at the centralized transit center.
1	Faster and more reliable leads to greater use. Over time access could be improved.
1	Neither. Use money for widening roads and adding sidewalk and safe bike lanes.
3	A mixture of both to compliment one another. In town, share the roads and make routes that can take you to the faster/railway for going long distances. Salt Lake city has a great combination.
1	Especially with rail, at grade running is a recipe for accidents. Light rail in particular needs to be grade separated. More expensive, yes, but far more robust and safe.
3	Both, I vision a direct line that follows the freeway from Boise to Caldwell but stops in main areas such as downtown Boise, downtown Meridian, Nampa, downtown Caldwell
1	The existing train depots in Nampa and Caldwell are in the heart of downtown, which is still pretty accessible. If stops need to be built in less accessible places, provide connecting transit like shuttles to help pedestrians.
1	This seems like somewhat of a false choice given the relative sprawl of the treasure valley and the abundant vacant lots that exist that could be transformed into transit hubs. A light-rail that builds on/near the boise-nampa freeway could operate like the Paris metro or Bay Area rapid transit (BART), where there are frequent stops, but they are incredibly fast because service is so constant/robust
2	However, I support an expanded bus system that could help get people to access points.
4	More accessible



Survey Response	Tradeoffs
1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<b>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</b> <small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small>
<b>1 = Build the least expensive option. We should keep costs as low as possible.</b> <b>3 = Neutral</b> <b>5 = Cost should be considered, but not be the deciding factor. A more expensive alternative might be a better investment in the long term.</b>	
4	You get what you pay for. Can't foresee everything, but buy with intelligence and mindfulness
5	How can it be truly "high speed" when it's sharing roads with vehicles? The highest-speed transit (HST) would be rail from Caldwell to Micron, with stops in Caldwell, Meridian, Eagle, the Mall area, downtown Boise and Micron. A robust VRT network would be needed to deliver riders from HST to work/shopping/residential areas. If this is the final vision, start there and work backward to what can be funded between now and then (i.e. buy land, track rights, etc.) In the meantime, beef up VRT.
5	I think funding needs to get creative. Cost needs to be kept low for riders, but need to find a way to make development and cities pay a fair share, including those that drive.
3	I would not use this service. Just another way to spend taxpayers \$\$\$. You don't even have a bus system in SW Boise, how can you think about high speed transit when you don't have connecting options.
5	Whatever we do, we can't afford to build a system so bad that no one uses it. A base amount of investment will be essential in creating a system that is actually useful for people. We have that problem with VRT right now: Not enough investment to gain significant ridership, but enough investment that conservatives demand why they're not getting more for their money and try to defund.
4	So long as the quality improves with the increased price, I can see the worth is spending a little more. Least expensive means more things breaking, causing more fixes and delays and frustration for everyone involved
5	No to buses! They haven't been successful as it is. Rail for sure!
4	We see time and again school levys for much needed improvements turned down. It is unlikely to be any easier for transit to secure funds for upgrades soon after being build.
5	If I can suggest a high speed line from Boise to Portland with a stop in the Dalles, Hood river or other? And a line to Salt Lake City?
5	We have taken the low cost bandaid approach to so much in Boise Over the years. We are growing and should plan for the future growth now.
1	Don't spend my tax dollars on something that doesn't actually solve a problem. Yes, there is a need for commuter traffic, but not traffic throughout the day.
5	Invest in the future. See previous comments. I'm afraid, in this day and age, there will be many looking to profit heavily from a light rail system in the Treasure Valley. We should not let this happen. Transit should be free but that won't happen so it should still be relatively inexpensive, I'm talking cheap. Light rail should cost a fraction (like 1/8 or 1/4 NOT 3/4 or 7/8) of what it costs to drive somewhere.
5	Ada County is rapidly growing. If we always invest in the lowest option, we will always be behind the growth, and the public trust in rapid mass transportation will be lost (or, at the least, continue on its current trajectory of apathy). Cities with reliable public transportation also help attract new people.
5	I am tired of the lack of long term planning. I wish to see a plan for the future. We still have the space to purchase land and so as the treasure valley continues to grow out that there is space for public transit options.
5	I feel like the Treasure Valley has notoriously gone "cheap" and that is why we are in such a difficult situation right now. No one really planned ahead. It is IMPERATIVE that the different departments work together and have a united Vision for Treasure Valley. Stop wasting tax payer money for half-assed plans and attempting to go "low cost". Charge a larger fee to these out of state developers to make enough revenue to do a good job the FIRST
3	Are you kidding, this will cost MILLIONS of dollars and don't try and tell me the cost to local taxpayers will be covered. I pay FEDERAL taxes enough and that is where most of this money will come from, like the billions given out by CARES. The govt shouldn't be "investing" in anything let alone funding these types of projects. No to transit.
5	This area is rapidly growing and is terribly behind in badly-needed transit options. Don't waste taxpayer money on something that won't be reliable and/or won't last. A more durable option is less expensive in the long run.

<b>Survey Response</b> 1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
No response	Cost should not be a factor build it betteronce only
1	"A more expensive alternative might be a better investment in the long term." This is deceiving statement. As if lightrail will generate money. Nowhere on Earth is lightrail an investment. It always need tax payer subsidies to stay solvent. Ticket revenue never gets close to paying for the operating costs. Adding general purpose lanes to congested roads and then adding buses to them is the best option. Bad idea include light rail, car pool lanes, and toll roads/lanes ie anything blue states do.
5	Progress is progressive. Budgeting for transit operations and expansion should be fixed and adjusted on a yearly basis.
5	If we make the higher-quality investment, we will be happier in the long run. Especially with the amount of growth this area is seeing.
4	This seems obvious, but timing, separation and convenience needs to be "place/route" specific. For longer commutes (from Nampa to Boise) the routes should be separated from local traffic, stop less often, and run less frequently - especially during non rush hours. For local commuting within Boise/Nampa/etc, routes should be more together, stops more frequent and frequency more often throughout the day.
No response	Where does your business get its funding? Your pushing a rail system that no one here wants to pay for. You need a vehicle, taxi service, or live on a bus route to get around in the treasure valley.. a rail system is waste <i>Reply: COMPASS is a government agency. You can learn about our funding and budget online at <a href="http://www.compassidaho.org/people/budget.htm">www.compassidaho.org/people/budget.htm</a>.</i>
5	Portland seems to have a pretty robust public transportation system. With the growth rate of Boise and a 20-year implementation plan, we should look to Portland like we did when downtown Boise was remodeled in the 90's.
4	Cheapest option could turn out being quickly outdated.
5	It is always smart to be fiscally responsible where you can, but with growth in the area as it is...better to invest in the strongest most sustainable model. Even if it means a bigger up front cost.
5	As Boise and the valley continues to grow exponentially, we will need to invest in high quality transit to get ahead of traffic and congestion!!
4	Invest in the growth...I love the Treasure Valley and we need to keep to progressing without sacrificing too much of our amazing lifestyle
5	I strongly believe we should look towards the future and plan for long-term for this. We should look for ways to utilize renewable energy sources, such as laying solar panels above the transit lines and hopefully find ways to offset the cost once it is in use. I believe this is a major investment in our community, and we should plan for this investment to continue indefinitely, once in place.
4	Do it right once and quit replacing over the top of other programs. Spend the money wisely.
5	If we invest in bettering it now it will pay for itself with time
1	We should keep the investment level for this idea very low, as near zero as possible.
4	I'd rather spend more up front on quality.
No response	Cost should be considered but a more expensive one be better for future
1	Since treasure valley not use to great transit it is better to spend less money now and start with fast buses and then as we continue to grow pursue light rail etc. you need to get people use to public transit and comfortable with it before getting fancy
5	Invest more now and plan for any potentials in the future because by the time any system is built it will already be on the verge of being obsolete due to the valley's exponential growth rate. I've lived here since 1973 and have seen this already occur with a number of situations. Within a year of creating the "flying Y" to accommodate population growth the design of it was already causing traffic problems.
4	If Nampa and Caldwell don't want to help pay for it, point to the Front-Runner in Utah. Layton is growing along the rail lines, because the Front-Runner provides reliable transit to Salt Lake and other points South.
3	The lowest cost would be to not do this AND cut bus service which is sparse and unsafe to ride.
5	Definitely plan for the future!! I'm a native and traffic has increased tremendously!! I am praying for this type of transport to relieve traffic on the streets!!
No response	Waste of money

<b>Survey Response</b> 1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
5	Boise is the number one growing city in the country (sadly). Bigger is better and cheaper in the long run.
No response	I don't want light rail
No response	Expensive alternative might be better for future
5	The cheapest option will always cost you the most in the long run, and you will not be happy with the results. But cost is important and should be considered. We do not need fancy, cutting-edge technology with lots of gadgets and gizmos, we just need a reliable workhorse system that will consistently work.
1	The lowest cost option - buses - also offers the greatest flexibility to add/change routes and expand capacity.
No response	More expensive investment for the long term
5	Go big or go home! Automobiles, especially gas powered automobiles are extremely inefficient at the macro level. We need to make public transit the best it can possibly be to help reduce our reliance on automobiles.
5	An amazing light rail would put Boise on the map. I
5	Build a grade separated rail system designed to last. Anything else will just be a stepping stone toward eventually doing it anyway, but at a MUCH greater cost down the road.
4	We have a bus system that is not being used to its capabilities. I attribute this to lack of routes or reliable service. No or minimal weekend service hinders ridership growth. Having a light rail system to bring people to the area would allow for increased bus traffic and increased ridership, thereby increasing the need for both.
5	The growth in the Treasure Valley has been going strong for 20+ years now and there aren't any signs of it slowing down or stopping. Investing now in a viable option for where our population will be in 20-30+ years is a much better investment.
5	Definitely! Traffic is going to be unbearable if we don't get it under control soon. Plus, if we invest our money in trains instead of continually widening and maintaining roads for cars it may not cost that much more.
4	Invest in futuristic
4	The transit system is going to be expensive, but I believe that if someone would look into the economic gains it would bring the valley, it would be worth it.
5	This is a MUST! We have to make this expense. If there will be no real measures out in place for responsible growth, the Treasure Valley has to step up and plan ahead.
4	More cost to go to increased function, not for appearances and needless bells and whistles
1	My actual answer is don't do it. This whole idea is a waste of money.
5	The valley is growing exponentially and we need to invest likewise.
3	effective and impactful transportation improvements at a systemic scale are expensive.
3	Let's not build it and the projected costs could be utilized for more worthwhile projects which will be used by more taxpayers.
1	Do not waste money on light rail.
1	why is there no "private funds only" option?
4	If higher cost is what it takes to create infrastructure that will keep the system from interfering with how well transit in the city runs, then that should be our path.
5	I can't even imagine the growth this area will have in another 20 years. We need some transportation options to handle that. We need to prepare for that.
5	This is antithetical to Idaho thinking, but plan for the future and spend a little to avoid gridlock. Help people to understand that public transit is not a for profit thing and that it's not supposed to generate profit. It is to reduce traffic and pollution. I was skeptical about using the light rail in PHX; I had used the bus and it was slow and not always on time. The light rail was always on time and much easier. I think it could win over people if given the chance, especially w/ park'n ride
3	With home prices increasing and all I'm not sure many native Idahoans can afford to help build a more expensive system. I am worried we will become the new Seattle where people move in for the public transportation and easy access to the outdoors and kick out the people who have been here for generations
5	Cities who do not plan for the long term cannot go back and do a redo in the future where train systems are in question.

<b>Survey Response</b> 1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
5	Please invest in a usable, convenient system that will attract riders with good, reliable, comfortable consistent and convenient service. Building the least expensive system to keep cost as low as possible will guarantee an underused system and be a waste of money. If we are not going to invest in a high quality system that will attract voluntary ridership, then don't build one at all. A low budget minimally effective transit system is the biggest waste of money.
5	Idaho has a bad habit of only looking 5-10 years into the future when we should be looking 50-100 years when building infrastructure. The roads in Twin Falls and the lack of planning for growth and the need for light-rail in Boise is proof of the short sightedness.
5	The least expensive option always costs more in the long run! With the direction technology is going, it makes no economical sense to invest in something which might be nearly phased out within the next 20 year. Furthermore, if you can invest in a system that people actually enjoy using, rather than just using it out of necessity, your investment will pay for itself. I, as a customer would happily use a transport system that is eco friendly, fast, and well up kept.....
5	Dont be cheap do it right
5	We truly need a commuter rail between Ontario and Mountain Home with major stops in between. Look at the Sounder in the Seattle metro. It pulls commuters in from the north and south.
5	The cheaper option always costs more in the long run! Why invest in something that will likely be phased out in 20 years due to new technology? I would love to use a public transit system that is quick, eco friendly, and well up-kept and clean!
3	I drive a car so it doesn't matter
3	None don't want the light rail
4	Cost will be worth it as the treasure Valley grows. If it is nicer, a wider variety of income levels are more likely to use it.
No response	What you may consider long term right now might not be the end result 20 years from now.
5	I believe that access points are key. These may/will come at a higher price than the cheapest alternative, which I feel is a necessary expense.
4	Investments should be made towards a clean energy bus system which will lower costs in the long term in health and environmental costs. Speed and comfort are less important at launch and costs could be saved there. Of course, accommodations should be made for disabled and elderly passengers as all federal requirements. A estimate cost of under \$5 per ride using a reusable card would still be attractive for many residents.
3	The least expensive option is to NOT build light rail... do that option.
5	Useless question without more data. The key is what will generate better return on investment in land use on the corridor, transit-oriented development, improved land use with the elimination of parking in the urban centers, reducing pressure to sprawl in all directions that in turn overtaxes our ability to provide public services. Currently, taxpayers massively subsidize sprawl and weak land development patterns by creating an overwhelmingly car dependent transportation system.
5	This is an important investment for a fast growing area. If it's not built to a high standard now, it could be prohibitively expensive to install and fix at a later date.
5	Only a high quality, efficient infrastructure will get the use needed to justify it.
5	Boise's growth is here to stay. We should spend the money needed to do it right.
1	This is a waste of money. I used to work in public sector and no one takes public transportation like this. It is a total waste of money with ongoing maintenance bills that do not justify costs
5	Why can't it be incorporated into the existing railroad tracks and add the extra branches as needed. They go right past the mall and into downtown.
5	I think it's gonna be really expensive. Let's invest in a train that runs in the ditch between the freeway. Let's have it run from Idaho Falls to Ontario, OR
5	Having forethought with such a large investment will inevitably be the determiner of whether the venture will be successful long term or if it will be another run down city transit system. It is important to make the proper investment in the short term to ensure lower costs in the long term.
1	Start with the expanding bus system so that more of public gets in the habit of using public transport before pursuing more expensive options

<b>Survey Response</b> 1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
1	Cost overruns WILL eat up the funds like crazy, better to go broke after spending less money rather than more. Nobody is going to use it, emptytrains going back and forth all day, empty.
5	We should be thinking long term and this issomething worth investment
No response	Less expensive than keep adding
5	Money is a means to an end. Underfunding this project is setting it up to fail, but transit is a cause worth investing in and building up.
5	Environmental benefits or issues?
5	metro buses are not the answer for distancecommutes - they are connect with a true transit line by collecting and depositing passengers at terminals
5	A commuter train would allow senior citizensto get around easier.
5	I'm sure everyone involved in the project isalready aware, but the ROI on public transit is phenomenal. Every dollar spent will pay off.
5	If we invest now, it will save money in the long run.
5	Boise and the surrounding cities consistently top the list of fastest growing cities in the country and that won't stop any time soon. Spending more now and investing for the future is financially more responsible than taking the inexpensiveroute. Spend more now and invest for the future, inexpensive just means more money needing to be spent on broken, outdated, ineffective, or obsolete public transportation.
5	The population is exploding and some sort ofpublic transit/light rail is already behind. Investing now is important cause we don't want to bea city stuck with traffic like Denver or Seattle cause we waited too long. Portland's Max would be a great model to follow, easy to use, mostly off streets except in downtown, cheap day passes, good for business or entertainment use (sporting games, bars, shopping, airport, etc). Plus, rail is generally more efficient and cleaner than bus.
5	Spend as much as you can get away with. We're way behind the curve. Need to get at least where Spokane or SLC are at.
4	Buy once, cry once. We can spread the cost over many years of tax revenues.
1	I don't want 10 cents of my taxes going tosuch a out of touch proposal.
No response	Invest for the future
5	Please don't waste money on commuter rail unless its going to connect Meridian, Nampa, Caldwell, Boise, AND Eagle. Trackless tram and bus arethe only viable options for Boise for anything else. The Circulator was a horrible idea and a tremendous waste of money.
5	Low cost options are never appealing for people. Hence why no one uses the Boise bus system.
No response	Abolish BlueBird school bus budgets and runmetro buses to neighborhoods and schools. Do this for existing Boise populations, then later whiledoing the same to any future towns like Caldwell. It does no good to link towns and cities without last mile service connections directly to neighborhoods. Visit the Netherlands and learn how its done. Better yet hire the Dutch to consult before you make another decision.
3	No taxpayer monies should be used on this.None!
4	The Treasure Valley has kicked the can for far too long on mass transit. Just building more lanes on the connector and I-84 is not the solution. More bus routes won't help, buses get just as stuck in traffic as cars. Light rail is the answer.
5	In light of the new administration, and theincoming Secretary of Transportation, this is the time to invest in America's future.
5	Buy \$20 shoes and you'll buy another pair ayear later. Buy \$100 shoes, and they can last a decade.
5	Our valley keeps growing, so let's build something that lasts!
5	Duh
3	I'd prefer investment, but I'm not surethat's politically feasible
4	Plan for the future growth. Where would we be without the highly debated GARVY bonds.
4	Build it right the first time.
5	We need to get ahead of the curve. Population growth has outpaced our transportation infrastructure.Waiting this long has already increased costs.
5	My motto: Do it right, once.
5	A transit system becomes a core part of thedesign of a city. It needs to be well executed.

<b>Survey Response</b> 1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
5	As someone who used to build "Green" houses, I know how hard of a sell it can be to get the client to accept a higher upfront cost (offset over the life of the product, to be sure, but the sticker shock makes people think in the short term). Get ahead of this problem by HAMMERING on the LONG TERM cost savings of doing it correctly the first time with the correct materials/infrastructure.
1	It's a waste of money.
3	Don't want to anger the tax payers with a super expensive option, but we also shouldn't just pick the least expensive option just because it's cheaper. It should fit somewhere in the middle where it will be able to accommodate increases in ridership but also doesn't cost a fortune to set up. It's also important to not just pick the cheapest option because if the network isn't able to get people to there destinations quickly, then people won't use it and it will have been a waste of money.
5	This should have been done decades ago, conservatives of Idaho need to stop pinching every penny and invest in the infrastructure and the citizens who live here
5	Worst case scenario is we spend a load of cash on an expensive public transit that no one uses. However, choosing the least expensive option maysaddle us with higher maintenance costs, more pollutants, and overall less effectiveness in the long run.
4	I think investing as much as possible in public transportation is the way of the future. Seattle had the option to build light rail in the 90'sbut it was veto-ed until about 2015. This was too late. Either invest heavily in the bus system we have right now, which would prove beneficial on all fronts. Or invest heavily in the light rail/commuter train the people of Ada County are wanting. The system is broken right now, not enough frequencyor convince is decreasing ridership
3	Don't build it EVER. It will be a money pitthat will become a haven for crime and Idaho is too good for this kind of headache.
5	A light rail would be an incredible long-term investment. I would support it, and any other expansions to public transportation, wholeheartedly.
5	You should start with with a BUS system foreveryone. We had one before but was cut so far back that people not on bus routes were unable to use the systems. The system should not just be for the very mobil. It should serve EVERYONE!
5	dont be a cheap bastard. ya we all have to end up paying for a chunk of it. but investments into infrastructure and quality of life are worth it
5	If you are going to do it do it right or itwon't get used and be a waste of money
5	Why not invest in our future now. Yes, the least expensive option might be more ideal at the moment, but it's only going to cost more later downthe road when it no longer fulfills the needs of our rabidly growing community.
5	Unfortunately, the dearth of investment overthe past half century has left us in a position that will require significant cost to build out a functional mass transit system. We need to learn from our past planning/design/funding failures and start now so that things don't cost even more in the future.
4	I lived in Ausin, TX when they were startingto build-out their commuter rail. There are a lot of expensive pitfalls we need to avoid. That said, every commuter rail system I've ever seen required a large up-front expense to build. If builtcorrectly, they generate a lot of revenue. If we have money to invest today, we should invest it for the mass-trans system we will need tomorrow.
3	I think construction should be staggered based on segments offering the greatest benefit, with a realistic plan for extending the line. Fiscally, I don't think the most expensive option nor the cheapest option is best. But consider this: Howin the last century, with a population a fraction of today, could the TV support a trolley system with hundreds of mile of trackage? While today, with a population exponentially greater, we don't seem to be able to fund the funding?
2	Show me a city where a rail project has notcost hundreds of millions of dollars.
4	If I have a home project, I never buy the cheapest materials, but I also never by the most expensive. If I approach my own home this way, my opinions toward public transport are the same. I want it to be a service worth paying for. I can guarantee that right now, it isn't. I found the story of the Houston Transportation transformation quite inspiring, and their minor cost introduction created the needed funds and support to create a great system ( <a href="https://www.ridemetro.org/pages/aboutmetro.aspx">https://www.ridemetro.org/pages/aboutmetro.aspx</a> ).

<b>Survey Response</b> 1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
1	Considering I see empty public buses everywhere, and that there are more work-from-home individuals taking vehicles off the road, the need for this type of system is diminished and cost should be base on a reasonable \$/person-mile or something.I currently see a very high cost for very little use and don't think we need one at this point.
5	Growth in the valley and state have not slowed down, and in fact appears to be increasing. Let's plan ahead so that updates won't be needed in the near future.
1	I don't think that our population would support light rail. Plus, this has been a costly option even for very large cities that have employed it.
5	You have to pay for quality and the bigger picture is what's most important here. Costs are important, yes, however, if this is going to happen,do it correct the first time which will save money in the end.
No response	Nothing Dont want it here
2	WE DO NOT WANT A METRO IN BOISE. Investin making our current system greener (solar), and easier to navigate. The bus tracking never works and the maps are confusing.
No response	Please don't spend our tax dollars this!
5	It's a tough sell in this state - but I think it's potentially really important considering how fast this area is growing.
5	Spending large sums of money is always difficult but a well functioning transit system will transform our communities for the better.
3	The money we don't have we should not spend and the idea that you think my taxes should go towards this is appalling. We weren't even able to use buses during covid why would I put actual money into a system that we already use buses what would you do take buses out of the valley and Eliminate
3	What technology is going to make your investment obsolete? Uber electric mini buses that have separate compartments for each group and drop youoff right at your destination!
4	I will not use public transportation. I lived in Portland, a large metro city with lots of public transportation and feel that experience is relevant to this survey.
1	Our culture is car based, so I do not foresee many people giving up the option of their own transportation at their own convenience which may vary day to day. I will not be using this alternate transportation method since where it stops and when might not meet my schedule. We do not have the millions of people needed to support this investment.
1	Let's get the ROW for a high speed rail line. Develop it and put busses on it to run transit in the interim. Build a road section that will support future rail loads. Then at some point when money available drop rail on the road and installrail infrastructure.
5	Spend money wisely, what is the most you canaccomplish and accommodate?
5	Planning is crucial. Does anyone remember when "interurban" lines were in wide use all over America? Those rights-of-way were abandoned, whenthey could have been upgraded and, in large part, used today if the powers in charge had the foresight for long-range transit requirements. Plan for a hundred years, not five or ten.
3	Since I feel this is going to be just as useless as the bus system, I think the least amount of money spent for this stupid experiment the better.
4	Used to build light rail
4	Service is more important and don't let costs balloon. Keep it inline with european costs
1	The first question should be "Are you in favor of mass transit at all?" to which my answer is absolutely not. For a fraction of the cost of mass transit, which very few people use and is a complete financial failure everywhere except the densest urban areas (only a few of those), you could much better serve the vast majority of people by improving roadways and increasing their capacity. That is what future planning for the valley shouldbe.
1	Government has a difficult time controllingcosts and Boise government has proven time and again that they are unable to appropriately budget and manage costs, especially for transportation.
1	It will be a burden for the taxpayer!!! Is costly
5	If you're going to do this, do it right so it lasts and also consider that if its kinda cheapy looking, it could bring in people that treat it that way...i.e. graffiti, trash, disrespect
2	That would depend on who is paying for it. The option about spending more money but not letting it be a factor description is worded in a way that makes it sound positive. But I'm assuming that would all come out of our tax money which I wouldnot want an increase.

<b>Survey Response</b> 1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
No response	If you're going to force California style transit upon us, spend less. In the real world, people do not use mass transit. Don't waste so much money on systems that people will not use.
5	If you don't invest in a good system that benefits all users, you won't have enough support or ridership.
3	This is an absolute farce that will cost more and fall short of its goal while providing an opportunity for unbridled and never-ending government spending and cronyism.
No response	We're not California, we don't need this. We DON'T have the money for this!
No response	We're not California, we don't need this, and we don't have the funds. Increase wages, lower property taxes, and help the homeless before it gets worse.
3	I lean toward the least expensive option some could benefit from this service sooner. However, avoiding traffic would be a better long term investment and would be more reliable in the long run.
5	Get the best that we can afford now
5	Investing in the future is crucial to have a well working system that people with cars will want to use. But it also needs to be kept affordable. If you have a vehicle, you're only going to use alternative transportation if its comparable in price and convenient (takes an equal amount of time or less and gets you to your destination).
4	Would this up citizen taxes? I moved here due to the low cost of living. <i>Reply: Specific details regarding cost and funding will be developed as different options are evaluated, but in general, yes, funding would likely come from local taxpayers.</i>
5	The Treasure Valley is continuing to grow in popularity as we see social and climate unrest throughout the country. If we do not enable our urban communities with lowcost, efficient travel, we will see more crowding and higher costs in popular areas. Establishing a useful and efficient transit system with better scale, better environmental measures and station infrastructure will help improve the ease of living as well as driving economic improvements as the services around each station grow.
5	Investing with an eye toward future wants/needs is always more prudent. For example, never let someone put a wind farm on your property without them posting a bond to pay for its eventual removal!
1	NO RAIL SYSTEM!
5	The area will continue grow we should have a system that can expand without having to start over.
4	Boise will likely continue to grow, and we will need something built to last.
4	It's all about the long term. We've learned the lessons time and again about making short term investments, and then changing the infrastructure prior to its planned life span.
4	Not sure where you think this is going to be built. We need an interchange at I-84 & Ustick. Not rapid transit in the ROW.
1	I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration. There should be ABSOLUTELY NO expenditures at the expense of the taxpayer for such systems.
5	If we want to be sustainable as a city, and show others interested in joining our city, or staying here, we care about our children. Those who will come to ride the rail even after were gone. We need to be a community, and think of unity, not just me, now. Build it wisely. Properly. Well. With the future in mind. Expense should not be such a big question. It will build jobs, too, and bolster our economy.
5	We need to invest as much as possible in our future. Europe does this.
5	The growth in the Treasure Valley will continue. Build for the future and build the proper infrastructure. Taxes/bonds to support this endeavor should be based on the town's population/usage - 1)Meridian, 2)Boise, 3)Nampa, 4)Caldwell
5	This area is only going to continue to grow!! Plan for the future. Back to my Atlanta example- they didn't expect / plan for the surrounding suburbs to grow as much as they did. When they tried to expand the transit into those areas, they came up against "not in my backyard". Real shame, traffic could be much reduced there had the rail lines been expanded during initial construction.
No response	Do not build at all. Waste of money.



<b>Survey Response</b> 1 = least expensive 5 = invest for future	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Tradeoffs</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;"><i>Investment: Lower cost...or invest for the future?</i></h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
5	The Texas energy crisis shows how trying to deliver resources and services with as little cost and oversight as possible can result in high-cost consequences when unexpected events occur. I think it's best to invest in high quality infrastructure, planning and oversight to minimize risks in the future.
No response	Taxes will undoubtedly pay for this giant expense and if only a few use it, it better be very reasonable and be of sturdy quality. Money has to be spent well and specs written so bids do not come from select few. Calif didn't use regular size bricks and needed odd size manhole covers, etc....taxpayers were over burden and totally screwed with over-runs of budget and graft.
3	I am in a position to be able to afford either option if I was going to use a transit system. I like the experience, the clientele and speed of the train. However, if I was not in the same financial & health position (either being young or old) I would probably lend toward the bus versus light rail for ease of ingress & egress.
5	Long term benefit is very important.
5	Neither. Use money for widening roads and adding sidewalk and safe bike lanes.
5	A dedicated line would reduce traffic issues. Buses, although mass transit, can contribute to traffic problems based out how stops are designed. I've found the DC Metro, San Francisco BART, and Germany's rail system more efficient to get places quicker.
5	You get what you pay for. Slower, better quality growth with a plan for the future makes more sense to me. If you can move people to and from work/play comfortably, quickly and with easy access for them, I think a lot of people would choose to ride. If it is something people like to use they will support the added expense.
5	Build it for the future. Speed wisely up front - don't build cheap only to have an obsolete system in 10 years. The cost to upgrade would be 10 times what it would have been to do it right in the first place.
5	A train! A train system would be SO much better for the treasure valley. We live in a very nice area in a gorgeous state, we want our transportation system to reflect where we live. Also, keep in mind this is a system that many will use during special weekend events, between all of the cities.
4	I didn't like former mayor Bieter's plan to build a light rail in BoDo. It seemed frivolous to spend that much on a small area instead of just improving the local bus system. BUT fast, reliable transit from Boise to Caldwell has been sorely needed for years, and I think it's worth investing to do it right. I used to ride VRT route 43, and even though it was an "express" line it was slow and unreliable and constantly stuck in traffic. Commuter rail would be worth the extra funding it would take.
5	Not only should the legislature allow local-option taxing, but funds should be aggressively raised by taxing the giant companies who utilize our existing infrastructure. In terms of fossil-fuel emissions, no cost should be spared in the process of getting cars off the road and transitioning people away from single-occupancy vehicular use.
5	This area is growing too quickly to think in short term planning. It will end up costing more to use a short term solution and have to go back and do more later.
2	I would like to start with a low cost vehicle option but design the infrastructure to accommodate future higher more advanced options.
5	The boring company meets both lower cost and good long term plan
2	This could allow for partnering services to be developed, such as busing.
4	The only place trains would work is Caldwell-Mountain Home. But in the long run, the expense would be worth it.
4	Focus on cleaner energy or alternatives for the future.

# Tradeoffs: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

I found the order of your questions odd. I could not answer "Tradeoffs" questions for a transit system with an unknown location that goes from somewhere to somewhere. I assume you are planning for along the existing train tracks, but I am not sure. A system along State Street or Chinden would be more convenient for me, but what would the destinations be?

I love that you are considering a transit option from Ada to Canyon counties. I have hoped for this for quite some time. The living costs in Boise has gone up drastically and having an option to live outside of Ada, but travel to for work and entertainment would be great! I think this would benefit both counties greatly!

Sometimes the lower cost options don't get the same adoption as options like rail - this would need to be considered.

Convenience: If it is not faster than driving, most of us would rather drive.

Timing: Rush hour is when it's needed most

Separation: Sharing the road with other vehicles, and possibly cyclists and pedestrians, would be very dangerous.

there should be a balance of time and Stops or maybe an express route at the most traveled times for those who just want to get to their destination quickly.

Separation is a MUST. DO NOT IMPACT existing thoroughfares. Bridges over or under existing roads is a must.

As you know, you need densities to make this financially feasible. We don't have it. Not everyone works in the same place so getting from the transit drop off to work is not there.

Focus inter-town transport. Intra-town transport can be expanded on different routes.

More stops would make it more accessible for people to use mass transit.

Bias. How clever! You don't have an option for not wanting any public transportation.

We shouldn't choose a cheaper option as the valley will continue to grow. I'm glad this effort is trying to get ahead of traffic issues, but no reason to redo this later on.

Absolutely opposed to light rail. Has not worked in Hawaii, Seattle, San Diego, Napa. It's a money sump and has very low ridership. Taxpayers deserve better than these huge boondoggles. It is definitely not the answer for Treasure Valley. Doug Sayers

Do a Gondola! Steady service 24/7, Low maintenance, low cost, slower but above traffic so no interruptions, scenic but also needs to serve areas, Wind and weather proof (see ski resorts)

How many stops are we talking about?

*Reply: The responses to this survey will help determine how to best serve residents' needs, including number and location of stops.*

A lil' tiny bit extra for rush hours, but otherwise, evenly spread throughout the day. Let's run this train from Ontario to Mtn. Home!

grade should be separated but additional infrastructure should be built to provide pedestrian connections to commercial activity centers in addition to further incentivizing transit oriented development as directly adjacent to the corridor as possible, service should connect commercial centers/hubs as efficiently as possible throughout the day to incentivize use of the system as an alternative to driving, and cost should only be a factor in terms of ensuring the project actually gets done.

I don't under the separation option. How would anyone get on the train if pedestrians couldn't? If you use bridges or tunnels to get under/over roads, separation is better in order to reduce transit/traffic conflict.

*Reply: Transit with traffic can often be accessed directly from the street where it runs, while transit separated from traffic often requires off-street locations for transit stations, making them harder to access by bike or on foot.*

Boise needs Trackless Tram investment, yesterday. Busses are a waste of resources, honestly.

Costs will be not just in the initial construction but likely in the operational cost. Depending on ridership, some form of subsidy will be necessary or people will not ride the system based on cost. There are federal funds available for construction and operation of transit rail.

I do not believe separated versus shared space is necessarily a polarity. One can have a separate light rail that runs parallel to I-84 and in some sense, is both separate as well as a shared space, only sharing the rail corridor. This then lends itself to increased bussing which shares the roads with single occupant vehicles.

I wonder if it would be possible to model this after the Salt Lake and Provo area. They have the front runner train and then Trax or Provo/Orem's UVX specialty bus system. I don't think special lanes would be practical here for those bus routes, but having stops every mile or so on special routes with the most traffic sure makes travel possible to more people! I would use that combination a lot more than just a train! Since the area will continue to grow, more access areas would help a lot!

NO. DO NOT WANT TRANSIT

# Tradeoffs: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

cannot walk long distances - would like light rail from Caldwell to Boise with connecting multi stop transport around Boise
would prefer to see an express at the top of the hour, and milk-run in between - best of both options. More service at rush hours doesn't imply less service at other times.
Investing in the future always sounds like a good idea however its not wise to invest in something has no ROI such as a standalone light rail such Portland's MAX lite rail system. expensive to operate and is lightly used.
our valley is got a lot of sprawl and this service will need to serve a distributed area
Ideally the new transportation mode alleviates the need for automobiles to get to/from destinations and/or stations. Low cost as one never knows about changing technologies and preferences.
Can there be a mix of fast and reliable and easy to access? Why can't there be evenly spread service all day and add some extra capacity at rush hour? This is more proactive and will encourage more use. Rush hour traffic could have extra express lines that make fewer stops but people can make connections to get closer to home.
use the existing railroad tracks to get service going. worry about depots later. cyclists and pedestrians can still get to transit that does not share the roads.
Do not feel the it would outweigh the costs to build and maintain it.
I want both.
The worst possible combo is a fast system that won't take you where you want to go without going 10 miles in the wrong direction and waiting through 2 transfers Not everyone does travel at rush hour and not everyone is going to/from all the way to Caldwell. I live 1/2 mile from Chinden. You already run buses out to Caldwell (A state highway) but EVERY SINGLE ONE goes down I-84. The park and ride is 50% as far as just driving in to Boise.
For convenience, there should be both, one high speed less stops, and one with more frequent stops.
you need both speed and more stops. ex: you have a green train that has limited stops and a red train that has more stops, Different times for different services. Be creative.
IMO, heavy rail rapid transit with fewer stops--while expensive--is worth the push. Then build out extensive bus networks to connect to train stations. If the train system is expected to function for 100+ years, why not build it right now/
First of all, what do our opinions in 2021 matter if this won't be considered for 10 or 20 years? We need something NOW. Ideally there would be express transportation during rush hour and one makes more stops other times. We could expand the routes we have now. <i>Reply: If a decision is made to pursue high-capacity transit, the planning needs to begin now, in order to have it operational in 20 years. It is a lengthy process, and public opinions gathered from this survey help set the stage for the next steps.</i>
Light rail is too expensive. This idea needs to be shot down immediately. It'll cost at least 1 billion dollars and will get very little use. Stop the madness!
Having a light rail from Nampa to Boise would change the game. Emissions down, wrecks down, safety up and community pleaser.
I am not at all interested in any sort of light rail in the area. I've lived in areas with it before and all it did was run WAY over budget and have very little to no impact on the number of cars on the road each day. It also ran empty for the hours outside of commute times. Total waste of taxpayer dollars!
I think the population of the valley is not dense enough to make this a convenient option for travelling in the area. There are too many destinations that would be too far away from the transit line?
Tri-Cities, WA shows an example of a nice, but immovable improvement which gets little use. The new bridge between Kennewick and Pasco turned out to be hardly used because growth occurred instead west of town(s), rather than east.
You ***** have been talking about mass transit since the 1990's. You get the same results when you do your feasibility studies. The population is too spread out to make use of your poorly planned and poorly implemented system. Sure, 50% the people want to go from Caldwell to Boise but, the other 50% want to go from Kuna or Meridian to Eagle. But there is not option for that kind of transportation. Didn't make sense in 1991 and doesn't make sense now. Stop wasting time and money on this

# Destinations: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

I think it's important to note that, with Millennials and Gen Z folks using their vehicles for gig work, places of work will primarily be dictated by one's ability to be mobile via auto. I do think an improved bus and rail system are necessary to change this, and to decrease costs so these groups of folks are not "rent-burdened" due to rising housing/rental costs in Boise.
I do not foresee myself ever using public transit (unless it's extremely good, reliable, clean, and safe) for errands whereas for work (by myself) I am more willing to take reliable public transportation
I have family and friends that live in Nampa and Caldwell. Visiting them requires a vehicle. If we had alternatives, I think we'd get rid of our remaining car.
I would love to access downtown Caldwell, Nampa, and Boise with transit.
For shopping or errands, depends on how much will be purchased—there is generally a carrying capacity on public transit, so if I am going shopping for a LOT of groceries, I would still take a personal vehicle instead because of the cargo space available
This is confusing.
We live in Caldwell, but my wife works in Boise, so a high capacity transit system would be very helpful.
Older people who do not feel comfortable driving with the increase in traffic and congestion would do well with taking public transportation to doctor appointments and to do their errands. Students who cannot afford the cost of their own transportation would also be likely to use it.
Visit family members and entertainment...home northend to Middleton and Caldwell
I would not be able to use transit for work because my job is an itinerant job and I have to have mobility.
I work in downtown Boise, but also travel to other destinations around the valley and out of the area via the airport. I would use a quick and inefficient way of getting to these places nearly every time instead of using my personal vehicle.
Basically build it to get people from Caldwell, Nampa, and Meridian to downtown Boise/the airport and back. Look at what Seattle has done with theirs and try to emulate it, especially with the Tukwila station!!!
I work and live less than a mile from the established rail line -- the amount of time and stress I would save being able to commute on a light rail would be incredible. I've lived other places that had light rail/regional rail or metro that I utilized daily. I do think that people who've never had that experience before would need to adjust and some people do not want to give up their car commute. I would happily say goodbye to the car commute, it's a huge quality of life issue!
Boise airport to downtown
Cannot work your map!
The counties have developed like "pouring motor oil on a swimming pool" there has not been any planning for transit and to force it is wasting valuable limited funds. You need to concentrate on a valley master plan that has teeth in it. As you know there have been a couple efforts but no buy in from the cities nor the counties. Sure they all talk about Transit but they want it free but it isn't free. And from my perspective it is too late!
I live in Mountain Home and work in Boise at the Courthouse. I would use it daily if I could get service.
I'm not able to put a pin in the map. My areas are from Ustick and Meridian Rd to Franklin and Maple Grove area for work
I would use the high-capacity transit if it were reliable, not just available.
This map doesn't work. Work at Orchard and Federal Way in Boise, live off Lake Hazel and Eagle Road in Meridian. Errands to Winco
Home
I don't understand how to use this map. I would travel to Meridian and Parma as well as downtown Boise
I live in Nampa and go to Boise every so often
A light rail option should run all the way to the Ontario/Payette/Fruitland area to provide greater access for people in those communities.
I'm not always going to be this close to work or downtown. With rising housing prices I hate to be pushed out farther from work and farther from downtown. If there was light rail I would not be as apposed to living farther away from downtown, I might actually like it more.
While our family situation may not utilize the public transit immediately, I foresee it being a welcome option in the future. As my kids get older and start getting jobs, or going to college or trade school, they may not have access to or the ability to afford a personal vehicle. In the case of my 5 year old- who has Down syndrome, cerebral palsy, and is deaf- she may never have the ability to drive, but will still want some freedom and independence to go to the store or visit friends without me

# Destinations: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

My family and I have things to do all overthe valley and not having to drive and deal with traffic all the time would be AMAZING!
My personal "bubble" is very small and Iwouldn't likely use the rail, but I still think it is an excellent idea that is needed for our valley to move forward with the population growth we have. In fact, I think it needed to happen 10 yearsago.
Needs stops in Caldwell and Nampa distinctly (not a combined Nampa/Caldwell stop). Must go to the airport, as well as Boise city
Where do I enter my preference for no public transportation? Bias!
The Boise area is one of the best planned,safest, and easiest to navigate areas I've ever lived in. Having lived in 4 states (California, Oregon, Washington, and of course Idaho), and having experience with light rail systems, I speak with confidence when I say they are hardly used, don't pay for themselves, get in the way, and spread crime around their areas. The system is not worth it.
I'd use a lightrail to the airport everytime I travel. Please include overnight parking at major transit centers. Please include parking lots and bus services to transit centers for easier access.
I have thought that we needed some kind ofrapid transportation in the treasure valley for many years. My wife and I are older and would useit. Let's move into the 21st century. Let's not be cheap as the I-84 project at Nampa has shown it cost more when done on the cheap, instead of being done correctly the first time.
My main use of a high speed transit systemwould be for the morning and evening commutes between home and work.
I would use a train to get to work at Boise State, shop at The Village and for nightlife (to venues like the Botanical Garden concerts, ID Center, bars and clubs in Boise, Nampa, Meridian, Caldwell etc.). I would like to see this designed sothat people use this service instead of driving after a night out drinking, so a service that runs pretty much 24/7.
I would not use the transit system but I feel strongly that the neighboring counties shoul d pay the majority of the cost for it as they willbe the largest user. I would oppose any funding that does not make this part of the deal.
I couldnt get the drag and drop to work. My route would be Purple Sage RD at Lancing Ln along Highway 44 into Boise to downtown area and to the BSU campus
Traffic is already bad enough I travel towork before rush hour, both ways. With a light rail system that ran during off hours I would use it.Less vehicles on the road, emission savings, safer option.
Not able to drop markers. I would travel between home at midland/20/26 to Boise
There is no public transit that is not a hassle to use from my house. We bike/walk to most destinations around town as much as possible. The nearest stop to my house is at least .5 miles and typically would require multiple connections. It would take typically 60 to 90 min to go by bus to a location I can drive in 20 minutes, add in the inconvenience of schlepping groceries/recycle on public transit, it just doesn't make sense. We would use frequent, inexpensive public transit to Bogus Basin.
This survey is one of the worst designed evaluation instruments I've seen in a long time. The responses are unclear and it's clunky in mobile - I can't get this map to work for example. This is an embarrassing waste of funds - the treasure valley needs transit options for so many different reasons - economically, environmentally and even socially. Y'all need to do better when communicating with the public and asking for feedback.
Use of light rail would very much depend on how feasible it is to carry things with me (i.e. groceries, packages, etc.), scheduling, and how easily kids could be accommodated (strollers, bikes, diaper bags, etc)
Live and work in Twin. Often travel to Boise for entertainment and occasionally for work. Having a better public transit would make visiting more enjoyable.
I don't know how to drag and drop map markers
I think the transit line should connect downtown Boise to Meridian/Nampa/Caldwell if possible. The route should also be focused on being accessible to low income communities.
Daughter attends BSU and would take the Bus if more times were available. If taking a train and then a bus were convenient and time sensitivethen she would do that.
I'm fortunate to live close to work, I canuse the bus now, my work even pays for a bus pass. But, I ride my bike or drive about 50/50. I would ride a train just to ride a train.
Done
The more transit options are available, and the more convenient they are, the more people will use them, once they know the options are available.

# Destinations: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

We have stopped shopping in Nampa, Meridian and Boise because of the traffic. We have hoped for something like Portland's MAX for a long time. My husband even changed doctors, which we didn't want to do, so we didn't have to risk the traffic to St. Luke's Boise. Yes PLEASE build light rail!!

I generally stay around Boise where I live but if there were a rail option to use during rush hour, I would venture out more towards, Meridian, Nampa, Caldwell areas.

My entire life in this community is designed around the lack of transit, so if there were transit I would be able to take on more jobs that it is necessary to access, I would be able to live somewhere that is not necessarily within walking distance of my workplace, and I could access recreation, entertainment and commercial opportunities in other areas. Where I marked "other" I am not currently able to access these destinations but would even if it still involved some walking or biking.

We would also get to Lake Lowell for walking if transit went there. Just like the old Interurban. Going to the airport by transit might also be great, as long as the departure wasn't at too odd an hour.

A RAIL SYSTEM IS THE BEST...NOT BUSES. RAIL SYSTEM SHOULD RUN DOWN CENTER OF INTERSTATE WITH WALKWAYS CROSSING FREEWAY KEEP OUT OF FLOW OF NORMAL TRAFFIC ON STREETS

Give serious thought for Caldwell to Meridian that can expand to Ontario to Mountain Home. and consider a rail line to the airport and a future rail line to McCall. the population in the area will only continue to increase so let's plan ahead

I work as an outside sales rep and will still have a company car. I'm all over Southern Idaho. Using transit for work is unlikely.

Aside from volunteering, my husband and I both work from home and we live close to downtown, so our travel bubble is pretty small. But I fully support the need for mass and rapid transit growth throughout the Treasure Valley and could imagine using it to get out to the Sunnyslope area to enjoy the wine trail.

I believe I would adapt my travel and locations if light rail were available and could even consider our household not having a vehicle if more efficient means of mass transit were available, saving us time, cost, and energy while improving our quality of life.

My wife and I both work from home, so no commute any longer.

If a transit system existed between Boise, Meridian, Nampa, and Caldwell. I would be more likely to visit those city centers located outside of Boise.

Many trips around the valley would be transitioned from personal vehicle use to rapid transit if it were possible. I would actually go to other places more frequently if there were a functional rapid transit option.

Stops in major hubs in every city from Boise to Caldwell. If we had busing that coordinated with those hubs to go to more fringe locations and bring people in to the high speed transit that would be awesome. I live in Boise and work in Caldwell. I'm a teacher and a lot of my students' families would benefit from high speed transit to and from Nampa, Meridian, Eagle, and Boise. They often work night shifts so transit at all hours would be beneficial.

I don't consider myself a commuter. Work is mere minutes by car, but I hate the traffic, finding parking, and the expense of parking. I would be happy to forfeit the expense I pay for parking (200ish per month) to support this endeavor. I would appreciate the convenience of a circulator that would make easy access to all points in GC, Downtown Boise, BSU, and the Old Pen area.

With this type of service, I would expand my circle of destinations. I would LOVE to visit downtown more often for shopping, entertainment, doctor appointments and events, but with parking and difficulty of driving, I almost never go. That would definitely change! It would truly expand my world! But I still wouldn't use it more than about 2-4 a month, probably.

My answer only includes my work, as that would be my focus for using the light rail.

We need light rail. We've needed it for 25 years. Just do it.

I live and work in downtown Boise so have the luxury of walking most places I need to get to. Part of why I chose a downtown location... the livability. I lived in San Francisco for a couple years and used their public transit systems all the time because it was so convenient. I think connecting the entire Treasure Valley with a light rail, especially for commuters into Boise for work, play, airport, etc. would be extremely beneficial and great for the area.

Anywhere in Boise, to central Caldwell with stop in Nampa. Also would love connect to Mtn home

We are planning on moving out of the city and possible east of Boise. If there was a rail transit system into Caldwell from that area, I would definitely use it to commute to and from work.

I cannot see one use for my family to use this type of transportation,

We drive or ride a bike to most local destinations. Ride a bike if the weather and time allow.

Most of my traveling for work, church, food, etc. is within two miles of my home. I live in Nampa and do not need public transportation. It would be extremely inconvenient for me.

# Destinations: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

be nice to take late night mass transit home after bars close.

Because I don't drive, my range is limited to rides with family or friends. If transit were available, I would be out much more, especially for recreation and a change of scenery, or dining out and entertainment and shopping. I've been to TheVillage in Meridian once since it opened in 2013.

We own a business that helps promote other similar businesses with our visiting clientele. Many of their other options are in the Caldwell/Sunnyslope area, so we would love to be able to suggest a transit option for getting out to visit them, even if the transit only went to Caldwell in town and then a ride share or taxi was needed.

Again, would not use this for any of these reasons. Shopping I have bags to carry, if I'm at work I want to be able to leave quickly in case I am needed from family.

There is no possible way a mass transit system would be useful to me or the vast majority of people in this area. The population density is not now hopefully never will be dense enough to support such a thing.

There is no place that I would use this.

Even though I don't currently live in Canyon County I like to go there and I see a lot of advantages to a system that goes between Caldwell and Boise. I lived in L.A. for 2 years without a car and I loved using public transportation to get to jobs, school and entertainment. If its available here I would drive less.

This is an absolute farce that will cost more and fall short of its goal while providing an opportunity for unbridled and never-ending government spending and cronyism.

I can't adjust my marker.

I use my vehicle as part of my work and carrying supplies, the transit system would not work for me and I don't prefer roads to be more crowded than they already are as it would take me longer to get to destinations while working.

Most of my daily life does not require travel. However, if a transit system was available, we would definitely visit Meridian, Nampa and Caldwell more to see what type of exploring there is (shopping, restaurants, entertainment, trails, etc.)

We need high speed rail please, would use often. Thanks

NO RAIL SYSTEM!

Survey is difficult to access. Illustrations are distracting. Isn't it unnecessarily complicated?

You need to also think about going beyond just Caldwell, Nampa to Boise. There is a lot of growth in Kuna and Middleton and Emmett and laying the ground work for those areas now would be good to plan for instead of waiting 50 years.

Could not finish because screen locked. I will be dead by the time you build but would support it anyway!!!!

I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration.

a no-frills, three-car train or trolley from caldwell to boise would be an awesome start. just some simple station platforms along the way would get the system up and going with multiple stops. it doesn't need to be whiz-bang to start off with. simple, covered, open-air traincars would be sufficient to start off service from the spring through the autumn.

We stay relatively close, in the boise bench and downtown/foothills area. We are active people who love to bike when we can, but winter makes biking to work or errands or fun activities difficult. Transit would be appreciated! I do sometimes work out in eagle/meridian. Transit there would be appreciated, too.

We live in NW Garden City off State st. We don't hope or expect train service via State St, but do expect reliable bus service with bus pullouts and good shelters.

I stay in my own town because I hate driving in the traffic beyond Caldwell. Getting around is a hassle, parking is a hassle. It's just not worth the stress to me. I like to go and shop and play in Nampa, Meridian and Boise if I don't have to drive. I can always Uber around Boise if I can get there.

I current use car and e-bike to access pts. More bike lanes and shoulders are important to network of travel.

This is the most confusing survey I've ever encountered. (and i write these for a living)

Although I spend a lot of time all around the treasure valley- having the train system at least follow the I-84 would be so helpful.

I don't own a car, so I generally stick to Boise, but I would love to have the option to easily get to other parts of the valley. I have family in Nampa and Caldwell, and a rail line would make it much easier to see and spend time with them.

I would be mainly traveling from Ten Mile into Boise and into Nampa to Garrity

## Destinations: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

Most larger cities have a hub with options for busses to go into outlying areas. As big of an area as the Treasure Valley covers, we need a hub or two then access to outlying areas. Older people need a way to get to the grocery store + doctor appointments without having to walk a long way to a bus stop.

Getting from East Boise to West Boise takes way too long on buses.

This will increase safety to our communities

I wor

Having used high capacity transit in other states for entertainment, I feel this could help reduce DUIs and vehicle crashes during events.

2/3 of my entertainment is road cycling so I would not typically take HSHOV. However, if transit could get me to a launch point away from Boise, w bike, I'd do that.

Late spring to early autumn bring biking as the primary transportation. The remainder of the year I use valleyride bus, buying monthly passes. The routes I've used are: 3, 5, 6, 7a and 7b, 28, 29.

I can't get a marker to drag. My route is Nampa to Boise.



Survey Response	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Preferences: Where do you want to go?</b>  <i>Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
To go shopping or run errands	Both shopping and doctors offices
To work or school	work has the most predictable schedule. If transit covered more hours perhaps it would expand beyond work, but top priority would be work.
Someplace else	I currently rent in Boise and walk/bike/bus to work. I would like to buy a house, but the houses in my price range would require me to buy a car so I could get to work.
To social events or a night out	I'd likely use for as many destinations as possible, but entertainment purposes always!!
To work or school	In my career I have commuted by rail and light rail in Europe and in a major US city. It worked in Europe because there were connecting bus lines, and the cost to drive was prohibitively expensive for me. In the US my commute was 40 miles one way. I had three stations that were within a five to fifteen minute drive from my home and gave me options for after work activities. My work destination had a light rail connection. I am not sure how rail system gets overlaid on the Treasure Valley.
To social events or a night out	it would be nice not to fight traffic
To work or school	Airport
Someplace else	Sporting events or concerts
To work or school	Work: especially when parking is hard to come by, I would prefer taking public transit so long as it gets me to my destination in a timely manner: arriving on time, with a moderate amount of travel/ride time
I wouldn't use it	Likely wouldn't need high speed transit for my travel needs. I prefer biking.
To go shopping or run errands	I would also use this for going out and getting to locations safely. I would use this for work and other activities as well, like going to friends house
To social events or a night out	My current job is very close to my home, so I don't think I would use public transport - unless my work changed. For errands though, it would be really convenient to not have to take a car, especially in areas such as Eagle road. There would need to be frequent stops there so one could hop off and run errands at different shops.
To social events or a night out	We would use it most to get to Boise and Caldwell and Meridian and Eagle. We probably would not use it within Nampa.
To social events or a night out	Downtown from any location in the valley. If a light rail stopped at the depot, and if there were routine buses that ran from the depot to a downtown corridor, people could leave their cars in Nampa, Caldwell and take the train in, and bus down to work or on a Saturday night.
To work or school	Work & school makes the most sense because it happens the most frequently. Having transit that runs late enough to be a viable option to get to restaurants would be an amazing addition to our city while also increasing driver safety after dark.
To work or school	Work, shopping, and evening out is when I would use it.
To work or school	It would be perfect to go to and from shopping
To social events or a night out	Boise has a lot of recreation and shopping I don't partake in because it costs too much money to drive back and forth.
To work or school	I could use it for commuting, but I need my car for everything else, we're still to spread out in this valley.
To work or school	And the airport
To work or school	I live in Meridian but work in Boise. It is a ten minute drive to a bus stop and the window for routes downtown that don't take an hour and a half are only super early or late. In order to use Transit, I would need more options available for times as well as routes heading north and south to get to the transit lines. I have a free bus pass through my work but I don't use it because of the inconvenience unless I have no other way into work.
To go shopping or run errands	I am disabled and most need an affordable way to do essential tasks.
No response	Visit family in Middleton then entertainment
Someplace else	I fly a lot and I'd rather not park long-term at the airport when I could leave my car at a park-and-ride and take transit to the airport.
To social events or a night out	Most common local commute is to downtown Boise.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: Where do you want to go?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
No response	It can't serve me.. a mass transit system is a germ spreader and can contribute to future flu outbreaks
Someplace else	We used to live in Utah, and we absolutely loved their transit system. We would use it a lot for work, and recreational activities.
To work or school	Ideally, I'd like to be able to take high-capacity transit in conjunction with a bike to get to work and back.
To go shopping or run errands	I work close to where I live, and I'd mostly use this transportation for recreational/social purposes. I do believe work/school to be the most important, however.
Someplace else	Because of time-constraints and the nearness to my place of worship I would not use transit to get there. Also, recreation is hiking for me and I wouldn't want to be on a schedule (pick up/drop off) to go to-and-from my hiking areas.
To work or school	think COMPASS focus should also be State Street and Chinden Blvd.
To social events or a night out	Boise State for football & basketball games
To work or school	Commuting would be the first option, followed by social events and nights out. But I see them as equally important as they are the times I use my vehicle the most and would want to replace driving with public transit as much as possible.
To work or school	The bus lines from my house to work would take 1 1/2 hours. It takes 15 by car. With more buses and better scheduling I'd take the bus a lot to get to work.
To work or school	I love the idea of a rail system in the treasure valley...and I think it would get used. I would say the location is by far the most important. It is relatively successful in SLC and they use the rail to the University of Utah to Down Town.
To work or school	I would use a high-capacity rail for nearly everything possible, as long as the price of usage was reasonable.
To work or school	Both of my jobs currently place me 20-35 minutes to get to, and I am spending a fortune on gas. I would also like to reduce my carbon footprint from using personal transportation.
To social events or a night out	Two, worship and entertainment
No response	I would use it for all destinations if it got me close enough.
To social events or a night out	It would be great to have the service go all the way to downtown Boise. Then we wouldn't have to worry about taking our vehicle and hoping to find parking.
To work or school	commuting to work as a routine that doesn't have to change unless I moved my home location. although I still would like to use public transportation as much as
To go shopping or run errands	From Caldwell to nampa to go shopping, Costco and Doctors appts at St. Luke's
To social events or a night out	It would be great to go to Nampa and Caldwell for dinner and adult beverages and not have to worry about driving or taking an expensive cab.
To work or school	McMillan and Coverdale
Someplace else	Visiting family in other cities
To go shopping or run errands	Not having to try to find a place to park while going shopping would be wonderful. You could get on the transit and make a day of it if there were different stops all along the way. I'd be more likely to go out more often if I didn't have to drive as much because of all the traffic now.
To go shopping or run errands	Downtown Boise and The Village
To work or school	Working downtown I would very quickly trade my expensive parking permit for a rail or BRT pass.
To go shopping or run errands	Downtown Boise, Meridian, and Nampa. Towne Square Mall. The Village
I wouldn't use it	I personally would only use this in the case of an emergency in filling this out because I know the struggle of using the city bus and having a job and believe it would benefit thousands of Idahoans
To social events or a night out	And to shopping and errands
To go shopping or run errands	It depends how well laid out the route is. If I have to catch a lot of connecting buses or trains it would not be worth it.
To go shopping or run errands	The Village or downtown

Survey Response	<b>Preferences: Where do you want to go?</b> <i>Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</i> <small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small>
To social events or a night out	Connecting the wineries in Caldwell to Boise wouldbe something my friends and I would use.
To social events or a night out	All of these to be honest.
To social events or a night out	Events as parking a pain
To social events or a night out	We love going downtown and to not worry about parking or driving, particularly after games or shows would be awesome!
To social events or a night out	Downtown Boise
To work or school	I would also use such transit to large events suchas sporting or entertainment.
To go shopping or run errands	Doctors appointments as someone legally unable todrive due to chronic illness.
To social events or a night out	Hospitals and Dr appointments
To work or school	Using transit for work would be ideal for commute.Also, it would be great to have for a night out or visiting family in Nampa/Caldwell
I wouldn't use it	Where my car takes me.
To work or school	I would love to not use the car for work commutes!! I rode the bus pre-COVID, but can't now as i am vulnerable to a serious case of coronavirus.
To social events or a night out	Downtown, give the ability for couples to enjoy adate night and not worry about drinking and driving.
Someplace else	To the airport
No response	I don't want light rail
I wouldn't use it	I would not use this, I would sorry about crime. Been there / done that. However, I could see benefits for this going from Caldwell to bsu for others.
To work or school	This would be extremely convenient to get to workand save on gas money
I wouldn't use it	Please GOD no don't do this!!!!!! It is the worst thing you could do for a wonderful place
Someplace else	This could be perfect for almost everything we do
To work or school	Boise State/Downtown/The Village
To social events or a night out	To be honest, I would take a train ride for just about every possible activity if it meant that I NEVER have to drive down Eagle road! It is a nightmare and nearly induces panic attacks! Too many cars!
To social events or a night out	Downtown Boise. BSU football games. Ann Morrison park
To work or school	Blue Cross of Idaho HQ Eagle & Pine
To work or school	Work. Having high capacity transit would be greatand could lower the number of vehicles in our household.
To social events or a night out	It would help with not having to fight to find parking and not worrying about drunk drivers
To social events or a night out	Boise State football games, concerts
To work or school	Would take more traffic off the roads during my commute from Emmett to Boise
Someplace else	I dont drive so would be a great help to get around.
To work or school	I'm never going to ride a bus.
To go shopping or run errands	Caldwell or Boise. I'm 72 years old and though I can see at night I hate driving at night. I also hate driving in the snow and ice so having a better way to go see things would be great.
Someplace else	Personal vehicle
To social events or a night out	Shopping, entertainment, recreation
To work or school	I want to go to work and home. The buses don't go to micron.
To work or school	Work is my priority, but i would absolutely use transit for social and recreational purposes.
To work or school	I don't want to have to worry about driving in another snowpocalypse, or worry about losing my job if my car breaks down. I'd like an affordable alternative
To social events or a night out	Downtown Boise where parking is a pain and where drunk driving is a danger.

Survey Response	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Preferences: Where do you want to go?</b>  <i>Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
To go shopping or run errands	I currently have the most flexible schedule for shopping and errands - so would use transit then when I didn't have to worry about needing to leave work early to pick up my son from school by surprise etc...I would like to ride transit to/from work, but am not sure the schedule would meet my needs. I would also love to ride it to recreate at trailheads where parking is a pain, but there aren't any options available.
To work or school	Work, especially if there was a high capacity (and safe) option for my elementary/middle school kids to get to school. I currently have to drive them.
To social events or a night out	Downtown Boise where parking is a pain and drunk driving is a danger.
To social events or a night out	Ann Morrison park area, kid friendly places downtown like the zoo, botanical gardens, Boise State sports arena. Definitely the airport.
To work or school	General downtown area for work and nights out
Someplace else	Occasional visits to Meridian, Nampa, or Caldwell for entertainment or recreation.
To work or school	With home prices rising so much in Boise, transit would give me more area to look for buying a house because transit would make my commute to work simpler, faster and more economical.
To work or school	The majority of my in-town travel was related to work. If a light rail existed and was a viable option to get to work, I'd definitely use it to save money on gas, even if it took longer to get to work
To work or school	Need medical access.
To work or school	To visit family in Nampa also
To work or school	Work and BSU
To social events or a night out	Every train station would create little hubs where businesses and restaurants would be clustered. I would like to see more of those pop up through out the valley and would make getting to other parts of the city more enjoyable. I hardly drive out to restaurants in Nampa or downtown Meridian. A light rail made easy would give me more reason to go to those areas.
Someplace else	Aside from grocery shopping, I would use it for work and many other things like date night out with my husband and taking my kids to see friends in other cities.
To social events or a night out	I have always thought a light rail should run from Ontario, OR to a hub downtown, that would then run to the airport and to east Boise and federal way area
To work or school	Work and school
To social events or a night out	I don't expect to have a lot extra bags/items with me if I were going to/from an event compared to running errands to shopping.
To work or school	I drive. Would love transit
To work or school	Work
To social events or a night out	Downtown and back
To work or school	I could see me using it for everything but shopping because I typically buy a lot
To social events or a night out	From Caldwell to Boise
To social events or a night out	Nampa Regal, Ford Idaho Center, Downtown Meridian, The Village, Expo Idaho, Boise Towne Square, Downtown Boise, Airport
To social events or a night out	I would like to travel off hours and other times for recreation and social events.
To social events or a night out	I'd want more than one! I would take the train to social events but also parks with the kids, school for the kids, errands, museums, library, art classes etc
No response	Work/school
To work or school	I would love to be able to save time and money in gas/maintenance/wear and tear
To social events or a night out	From Caldwell to Boise. Using public transit cuts down on traffic, saves gas and money, and I can drink without having to worry about a cab or a sober ride.
To work or school	Going to work in Nampa but also weekend entertainment often downtown would be just as great
No response	Best use would be from city to city main center. I would like transit that's fast from Meridian to Caldwell
To social events or a night out	If I plan to be drinking, this would be tremendously convenient as far as not needing to secure a ride. Providing that a return journey is available late on weekends. I don't think I'd want to use it for work but that's just the nature of my job which I often telecommute anyways.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: Where do you want to go?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
To go shopping or run errands	Work, to visit friends on the weekends/evenings, to go to peaceful belly farms and the wineries, shopping on the way home from work, etc.
To work or school	If we had reliable transportation we could get a better education and a better job without moving to an area we cant afford because of are limited jobmarket and unreliable transportation.
To work or school	Work
No response	Airport
Someplace else	Visit family, church
I wouldn't use it	I do not want this system in this area.
Someplace else	Downtown Boise, Boise Veterans Hospital, Meridian
Someplace else	to /from bosie airport and McCall. to/from Eagle road shopping /McCall
Someplace else	My family lives in nampa. I would love to use transit to get to them especially as I age. The freeway is too congested
To social events or a night out	This would be great for getting to and from college (CofI)
To work or school	Work in Bose. If you don't make a stop in Kuna, this will not be used. The drive FROM kuna to the interstate is the worst.
To work or school	Work
To social events or a night out	I think we would use this transit for social events - anything with a large crowd (games, concerts, etc.) and sometimes for a night out.
Someplace else	The airport is a really good option for where this should go
To social events or a night out	Extending public transit hours in and out of downtown Boise would greatly diminish intoxicated drivers and protect the safety of Treasure Valley residents.
To work or school	my commute to work takes 1.5 hrs one way which includes 2 buses and a 30-min walk to the bus stop.
To work or school	I would use high capacity transit for all of these options if available.
Someplace else	If scheduling is not set, I would use a bus to getto entertainment
To social events or a night out	Shopping/errands would be helpful when my partner is using our vehicle for work. Entertainment as it would save us from having to Uber.
To go shopping or run errands	If the option was available I would utilize a high capacity transit to go to work and home even if it meant the transit stopped at the airport.
I wouldn't use it	California tried this huge money pit. High-speed train to no where. I will never support it.
To go shopping or run errands	Entertainment and shopping would be my most frequent uses for public transit. I would love to be able to hop on the train to get to the mall or go down town.
Someplace else	Hospital, BSU, biggest employers
To work or school	My husband commutes to Micron each day. It would be great if he had a rapid service option to get to and from.
To social events or a night out	BSU sports, concerts, zoo, parks, events,
To work or school	Who are the biggest employers in the area? HP, hospital, Boise mall, BSU. Use Chinden as a route into town, Incorporate 84. Churches
To social events or a night out	Downtown and other entertainment venues. Especially helpful for party people who shouldn't drive.
To work or school	Downtown in general for work and recreational reasons.
To social events or a night out	Having my husband able to take transit tonwork would be awesome, too
To social events or a night out	Airport
Someplace else	Light rail to decrease traffic on Eagle Rd.
I wouldn't use it	Zero percent useful to anybody
To go shopping or run errands	Boise Town Square mall
No response	I would never use rail transit
To work or school	Work and social events so if I have drinks I do thave to drive
To go shopping or run errands	We go to the gocery store or the area around the mall, mostly. When we're getting something big, we may not ride the bus. The current bus routes take too long. We could walk to many places in the time it would take to get to the bus and make connections.

Survey Response	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Preferences: Where do you want to go?</b>  <i>Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
To social events or a night out	We are (pre-Covid) avid live entertainment fans, whether sports, music, theater, etc., multiple times a month, sometimes multiple in a week. We LOVE live music and go to numerous concerts per year, in many venues throughout the valley. We also like biking on the Greenbelt and visiting the restaurants/bars/parks in the Downtown Boise and Garden City areas. It would be wonderful to be able to take the public transit there and back.
Someplace else	People need to get around. The easier it is, the more our economy grows.
To work or school	While my current residence is close to my work, I like so many others rent an apartment so the distance could change at any moment.
To work or school	I live on the west end of the valley, but my family and most of my friends live in Boise. I don't get to see them nearly as much as I'd like to, because there are so many costs involved. Gas, sure, but also parking. Especially if we want to go downtown. It would also be great as a "designated driver" option, as opposed to being in a stranger's car alone. My second job does not pay for mileage, and is also located in Boise. That's a LOT of gas.
To social events or a night out	I personally think this is the most beneficial destination due to the amount of younger people who frequent the downtown Boise area from around the treasure value for bars, meals and entertainment. It would reduce the amount of vehicles parked downtown and ideally reduce the amount of impaired drivers after late night events.
Someplace else	I'd use it to go downtown or to parks/outdoor rec areas
To social events or a night out	Being able to get home safely from a night out would be really beneficial, and work is close for now. If I move I will need it for work more.
To work or school	All of these destinations are important. I also don't want my tax dollars wasted on sprawl (and all the debt that comes with serving sprawl). It's not about me. It's about what kind of community I want to live in and whether I get a valuable return on investment of tax dollars that make our cities and neighborhoods stronger.
To social events or a night out	Downtown Boise
To work or school	For longer commutes, it's less stressful to not have to drive. It would give me the opportunity to get something else done during the trip.
To social events or a night out	I would love to be able to support Boise area bars and restaurants, but I obviously can't drive home after a night out so a public transit option would be much safer in allowing me to go out for a few drinks without having to worry about an uber. But I would use public transit for literally everything if we had it; I've lived in cities with great systems before and absolutely loved it even if it were slightly slower than having my own car.
I wouldn't use it	I occasionally use public transit when it gets me to my destination in a reasonable time, or my car is being serviced. I have little use for high-capacity transit and am not willing to experience increased taxation to fund it.
To work or school	I want to go to work and not need to drive my personal vehicle. I don't want to sit in traffic and pay for gas and parking every day
To work or school	I would use it primarily for nights and work commutes, however, if it were available the highest usage would be going to work.
To go shopping or run errands	I am really close to my work thankfully but use the current transit during winter months far more.
To work or school	Reduces DUI's, less parking hassle.
Someplace else	This would be uber helpful for me to get to & from my doctor's appointment as it would go directly to the Hospitals in Meridian & Boise. This would cut down on how many nurses need parking downtown also.
To social events or a night out	Such a system would allow us to relax and have a drink or two without needing to worry about having a designated driver. That's assuming the system ran late enough to let us, for example, attend an event or movie then have dinner and drinks.
No response	Waste of money, we have little traffic and everyone has a car.
To social events or a night out	I would mostly use it for social events but would also use it for work, school, shopping.
To social events or a night out	Large sporting events. Bsu games and airport
To social events or a night out	Downtown Boise to enjoy restaurants and breweries.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: Where do you want to go?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
To go shopping or run errands	It would be great for shopping out in eagle orvtoa concert or movie
To work or school	School and Downtown access
I wouldn't use it	Abort this insane make work project, have a conscience, it's not your money.
To work or school	The reaun should go all the way to the airport andMicron atleast.
Someplace else	From downtown Boise to Meridian, Nampa, and Caldwell.
To social events or a night out	Streamlined transit downtown and near shopping centers / grocery stores would be most valuable for me and my household
To social events or a night out	I want to go to work, however work sometimes requires me to drive to locations in Garden city Caldwell Nampa meridian. I would also like the option tonot put so many miles on my cars and would use transportation on the weekends to concerts and social events
Someplace else	Golf courses, C of I football games.
To work or school	I think this would open up options for where people would choose to work. Sometimes the commute/traffic is a deterrent for me because nothing really flows in Boise. Just one example..The only "highway" running north and south is in meridian technically (Eagle road) and is full of stop lights that aren't synchronized to optimize the flow of traffic.
No response	I live in Mountain Home so a quicker commute to the shopping in Boise and surrounding areas would be super convenient, maybe I could get to more placein a day!
I wouldn't use it	I don't think I travel to high demand places thata high speed transit vehicle would go. However, I think it would be great for those who travel Eastto West often.
To work or school	Downtown Boise, Caldwell, Nampa, Meridian, Boise Town Center, Boise Airport
To social events or a night out	We live in meridian and we would use it to travelall across the valley. It would save lives due to decreased Duis, and be more eco friendly by peoplemaking trips in their cars less frequently, our city is growing and should plan for the future!
To social events or a night out	Work is a very close second, but after a year of Covid, a night out sounds wonderful.
To social events or a night out	How do I select more than one option....
To work or school	The mall or downtown Boise
Someplace else	To visit family in Caldwell, Middleton, and Parma.
To work or school	The commute is where most of our driving occurs.
To go shopping or run errands	Not only would our family use this to shop, but itwould open up employment opportunities for our non driving teens.
To work or school	The greenbelt is the beating heart of Boise, it would be great to have a few entry points where you could get on (and avoid riding bike in traffic) and ride your bike to wherever it is you're going
To work or school	I drive from Nampa to Boise every day for work. It's a straight shot yup I84 from the Franklin on ramp to the Cole road exit.
To work or school	I would use it for more than work or school. I would be using it to meet up with my friends in Boise, but I live in Nampa. If I'm trying to go out for the night but I don't want to drive because I know I'm drinking, it would mean I wouldn't have to find a place to stay or spend \$60+ on a ride share or wake someone up to pick me up. It wouldcost less for students and those who work downtown.
To go shopping or run errands	A high speed train from mountain home to bouse would be amazing
To work or school	i want to provide input on all the destinations -not sure how to do that with your survey - so clone my answers to "someplace else" and "errands"and "social"
To work or school	Public transport would open up a lot of opportunities for employment in areas that would otherwise be difficult to reach.
Someplace else	st.Luke's in Boiseand Meridian, The Village, downtown Boise, Bsu, airport,
To go shopping or run errands	I'm retired so I'd go out for shopping, entertainment, doctors, or visit family. However, I feel that mass transit would have the biggest impact for commuters during rush hour and for people going to or from downtown Boise or large entertainmentevents. The airport would be useful as well. For seniors who can't drive, shopping and medical transportation is critical

Survey Response	<b>Preferences: Where do you want to go?</b> <i>Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</i> <small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small>
To work or school	Going to work and back home would be my primary reason for using high-capacity transit. However, I would also use it for entertainment, running errands, and getting to the airport. I would use it on a daily basis.
To social events or a night out	Social events and entertainment (bars, restaurants, sports games) to ensure safe travel if alcohol is included, particularly as the valley keeps growing.
To social events or a night out	The bus is currently okay for work now that I have a day job. I would love to be able to have some kind of reliable night transportation though.
To work or school	Reliable, fast service would be best to get to work with. I don't care much for frequency.
I wouldn't use it	Come on. Most Treasure Valley residents do not want to be limited by any form of mass transit. Without subsidies the BUS system would have failed.
To work or school	Another great option would be transport to and from the airport!
To social events or a night out	Shopping can be a night out, depending on the location. And some shopping can be done on mass transit, some not. I am not hauling lumber or a two week grocery run on mass transit, but a new dress, or a few specialty groceries, you bet!
To go shopping or run errands	The current bus system is unreliable for ALL of these options, because of the very limited range of hours and the unreliability.
To work or school	From home to St Luke's downtown 4 days a week
To social events or a night out	To go out, gives people a more affordable option than uber/taxi
To social events or a night out	Makes travel safe, keeps folks from driving after a night out.
To social events or a night out	I love going downtown for events (pre-covid), but it can be such a pain to find parking, especially in a larger vehicle. It would be great to leave my car at home and take transit!
To go shopping or run errands	It would be nice not to have to drive all over.
To social events or a night out	Events and medical appointments.
Someplace else	My grandmother doesn't drive any more, but she has weekly medical appointments in Nampa and Meridian and the only way she can get there is if someone drives her. If the medical center had light rail access it would make it easier for the elderly (and take the strain off their grandkids!)
Someplace else	Airport would be the number one solution to not have to drive there!
To go shopping or run errands	Typically to the bank, libraries and places I do light shopping.
To go shopping or run errands	shopping at the typically crowded areas without having to fight with people for parking would be nice.
To social events or a night out	In addition to quick and safe transit for entertainment and other social events downtown, I'd love to have an easy option to get out to downtown Nampa and Caldwell so I could enjoy the stops along the wine trail without driving. But I feel like you're missing the obvious need for connections to the airport. My husband flies out of state for work almost weekly and we live close to the airport so might not use this as often, but I see this as critical to any growing city.
To social events or a night out	I would select all of these if provided the option. Mass transit would liberate my household from a car and the pavement that is required all around it. I'd rather read a book on mass transit than stare at the road and face higher likelihoods of accidents and responsibility for unintended fatalities towards me, my spouse, and all I care about in the Treasure Valley.
I wouldn't use it	I would not use high speed transit at any time.
To work or school	A long range rapid transit system in connection with shorter range public transit bussing could help me get to most places I would need to go.
To work or school	Save time and money.
To social events or a night out	I've always found public transportation to social events beneficial. No worries about parking before or after.
To social events or a night out	Downtown Boise access on public transit is so much less stressful than finding parking and designated drivers. Also, it can be used to go to concerts and events outside of downtown.
To social events or a night out	Less concern about parking during events downtown and having a reliable ride home would enable more spending at local restaurants.



Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: Where do you want to go?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
To work or school	I would love to replace my commute with public transportation, and if convenient would use it for personal use to shop or travel to entertainment
To work or school	Efficient rush hour transport to and from my work in Boise would be most important to me
To work or school	Currently there is bus that runs near my home and work but I have varied hours and the options for the bus do not fit my needs
To work or school	This is for work meetings I have throughout the region, not my place of work.
To work or school	Daily transportation to work and/or school would help us save money on travel expenses
I wouldn't use it	I'm not sure this is a necessary service for our community.
To social events or a night out	Right now I need it for work. I have a convenient route to work from my home. But it takes an hour to get there from the bus when it's only a 20 minute drive against traffic.
No response	I would never ride the train as I value my life and don't want to be assaulted or harmed. Mark my words, light rails bring nothing but crime and problems to where they run.
To work or school	Great to get a safe ride home after drinking alcohol. Also faster route vs heavy traffic after an event. Prefer to use transit to get to work - down work while in transit
To work or school	And back home again.
To work or school	Work/school, shopping, and entertainment are all activities I would like rapid transit to take me.
To work or school	Commuting to work (downtown) would be of benefit to me depending on transit schedules and internet availability.
I wouldn't use it	I don't regularly travel far enough for it to be worthwhile.
To work or school	I would use the transit for all 4 options.
To work or school	In order, to work/school, to social events/a night out, someplace else, and finally errands (difficult to transport groceries as easily as with a personal vehicle)
To go shopping or run errands	I'd use high speed to commute to work when I don't bike due to icy roads and to run errands to meridian/nampa
To work or school	Transit from Boise to Caldwell for work. I'd also like to use it for nights out. It would open up our ability to patronize bars and nightclubs in nearby cities without making expensive or dangerous decisions to get home.
To social events or a night out	The bus system does not currently stop near my home in Meridian. A light rail stop near Eagle and 84 would be optimal.
Someplace else	I live within biking/walking distance of home, work, etc. So would use mass transit for travel for recreation
To work or school	Work
No response	It won't stay out of Idaho!
To work or school	All of these options since I don't drive.
No response	Airport for work
To work or school	Downtown Boise. Shopping food and work.
To social events or a night out	Without question. I would use it most when going to work or school, where I know when I need to be there and when I'll be leaving. I would also use it to go to things such as BSU football games, where it can be challenging and time consuming to find parking.
To go shopping or run errands	Between work and home, a Caldwell to downtown Boise connection with multiple stops
To work or school	Right now the two adults in the family walk or bike to work everyday - because we live close to work. I have two kids who won't be able to drive and will soon start to use public transit more than we will. Access to work or school (for instance, CWI campus) could be really important for them.
To social events or a night out	Would be wonderful, especially if visiting bars or nightclubs, to not have to drive.
To work or school	I live in Emmett and odd hours in Boise. While I don't expect transit to my town, transit would help with congestion and the increased traffic I see in the valley every day.
To work or school	I would like to be able to use mass transit to go to work and entertainment venues like bars, restaurants, shops and events.
I wouldn't use it	Parking is the biggest factor, I always use public transportation in San Francisco, when I go to concerts or sporting events, if parking is expensive, hard to find or takes an hour+ just to get out of the parking lot. Public transportation works.
I wouldn't use it	walmart

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: Where do you want to go?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
To work or school	I enjoy going to downtown Boise or to Meridian. I would rather take transit after any alcohol consumption. Cheaper than Uber.
To social events or a night out	Evening service to get out for drinks or a movie, especially in the winter. Generally I ride my bike down town when the weather is nice.
I wouldn't use it	I am within two miles of work, stores, etc., so public transportation is not necessary for me.
To social events or a night out	I'm not really in the demographic since I live in close proximity to work/downtown activities.
To social events or a night out	Avoid night driving, parking. Rapid transit would be great for theatre, dining out, events wherever they might be.
To social events or a night out	Evening or daytime events are challenging to get to with parking and slowed driving. Experience in similar system in Buffalo NY proved beneficial and pleasant to use.
To go shopping or run errands	To go shopping; Where I live the shopping areas are limited;
To work or school	Where I live is pretty easy to access and I don't have to commute on the freeway, but I work at the university with a lot of students who commute in from Nampa and Caldwell, and having more reliable transit with more options for times would make a huge difference to them - especially the ones who don't have a (reliable) car.
To work or school	Daily work commute, but a close second would be accessibility of transportation for dr.'s appointments
No response	You leave out the option to use my personal vehicle to go where ever I want to go when ever I want to go there without having to walk a mile in the snow! lite rail works for a few people at tremendous cost (Seattle - how many years did it take for enough ridership to cover the DAILY cost without paying for capital costs or retirement funds??) and does not solve the congestion on the freeways (Salt Lake City). NO! to a rail system!
To work or school	Everything is online right now but the damn extroverts are trying to drag us back to campus
Someplace else	I would like to be able to use transit to travel conveniently from my home in Boise to the Boise airport. I would also like to use transit to travel from home in Boise to Meridian, Nampa, and Caldwell.
To social events or a night out	Coming from Portland we used the MAX all the time; for work commuting and for evening recreation, even on weekends. Loved that we didn't have to be stuck in traffic. Would like the option for dr appts, errands occasionally, but mostly for fun events where parking is often a challenge downtown
Someplace else	To work and back. Gary Lane (home) in Boise to Garber Street (work) in Caldwell. Also to doctor appointments in Caldwell from Boise.
No response	We're not California, we don't need this, and we don't have the funds. Increase wages, lower property taxes, and help the homeless before it gets worse.
To work or school	Hybird electric car
Someplace else	Farmers market!
Someplace else	I want to be able to take my bike to places out of Boise so I can ride
To social events or a night out	To and from work is great (and most ideal for me personally), but what if I have an emergency and need to go home early, or if I work outside of normal business hours? Maintaining a system that functions for everyone would expand economic opportunity. It would be great if I could use the transit system instead of uber.
Someplace else	I typically prefer driving myself to places, then I can go at my own pace or get there quickly without issues of waiting for others to get off a transit bus or stalling due to bus issues.
Someplace else	I work at Micron, so the availability of a train would be great but not likely. Still ride my bike or commute by car occasionally. The biggest impact would be our ability to get out of Boise quickly and safely for a short day trip to another town in the Treasure Valley.
To social events or a night out	Would be nice to be able to drink and not worry about how I'm getting home.
To work or school	I work downtown it would be way better
To work or school	I would use transit to get to and from work. Traffic is worst during the commuting hours and my job is the only reason I have a car. Transit would save a lot of money.
I wouldn't use it	NO RAIL SYSTEM!
I wouldn't use it	I lived in California when they tried this and wasted ridiculous amounts of money. Regular bus systems would be sufficient. High speed is a waste

Survey Response	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Preferences: Where do you want to go?</b>  <i>Where would you most want high-capacity transit to take you?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
To social events or a night out	I would use it as often as it made sense for all activities
To go shopping or run errands	Utilizing mass transit would definitely depend on the times available. Vancouver BC has an integrated system with a monorail and busses. It works AMAZINGLY well. The Monorail loops the area & busses run on a set & precise schedule.
To go shopping or run errands	I would also use it for social events and nights out if they are kept clean
To work or school	Work. Would need to be easily accessible and not require getting to a downtown transfer onto a west valley bus / train. Downtown and Eagle/Fairview evening transportation.
I wouldn't use it	I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration.
To work or school	I would actually go to downtown Boise if there was public transportation.
To social events or a night out	Grocery stores
I wouldn't use it	Useless to me
To go shopping or run errands	Why cant pick multiple? Work/social/shopping
To work or school	I would love if more (or all!) bus stops had a structure with a roof.
To social events or a night out	Reduces concerns about potential drunk drivers.
To social events or a night out	I'd like to use not use my personal vehicle now and then even a Bicycle especially during the rain and snow time of the year
To social events or a night out	Rapid transit would make it easier to visit friends and family outside Boise. Extended evening and weekend service would be amazing since I work regular hours and can't make it out of the city during the day.
No response	I am retired and wouldn't use this transit.
To go shopping or run errands	I don't go to Nampa/Caldwell very often but my concern is the amount of traffic. The Valley is only growing and with more businesses locating to Boise/Treasure Valley we need to establish an alternative transportation system to alleviate the vehicles on the freeway.
To work or school	I used to ride my bike to work, but have since moved. I would still like to be able to ride the section of the Greenbelt that I used to, but it's too far now. If I could take transit with my bike to Glenwood and Marigold, I could still ride that part.
To social events or a night out	Definitely, for all across the Treasure Valley.
To social events or a night out	I would use it for all of the listed options all the time! Whenever I'm in a bigger city that has a decent transit system I always look forward to getting around much easier.
To work or school	Work and school are where I travel to the most often
No response	I would not the amount of germs that this would carry and the unnecessary increase in taxes. This transport would not benefit me
To work or school	2nd choice would be social/entertainment.
To go shopping or run errands	Eagle road area of Meridian, Near mall in Boise. Downtown Boise
To work or school	Work in Ontario, Oregon & Nampa & Caldwell Idaho

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: How do you get there now?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Which did you use for most of your trips around town before COVID?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
My personal vehicle	<p>Why does this mention specifically before Covid?  <i>Reply: The survey references "before COVID," as some people's methods of transportation have changed during the pandemic. We want to understand what actions under normal circumstances.</i></p>
My personal vehicle	Previous commute included Biking to Bus, Bus to Bus, then Bus to stop to walk to work.
My personal vehicle	There are sometimes that my work schedule works/matches the bus schedule, but most of the time the current bus system route schedules do not get me to work in time, unless I am willing to arrive extra early
My personal vehicle	Sometimes use bike depending on weather
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	We are lucky to live in the north end frontier (until we get priced out by taxes) so we bike everywhere, and do light errands on bikes. Personal cars for everything else (Home depot runs, Costco, etc) and to work, which is also bikable, at 3 miles.
My personal vehicle	This is specific to the day, the trip, and the weather. My family share one car and try to compete as many of our trips by as possible by bike.
My personal vehicle	I'm all over the valley during the day.
My personal vehicle	There are not any routes that go near my home near Ustick and Linder except on Saturdays. The only time it is worth riding the bus is to go to work but the time slots are too narrow.
Something else	There are no reliable and affordable options in this area. I either find someone willing to drive me or, more often, just stay home.
My personal vehicle	I have been trying to use options like Uber, but it's more expensive than I'd like, especially from Caldwell to Boise.
My personal vehicle	Sometimes I bike, but only if I don't plan to shop or stay
My personal vehicle	I mostly use personal vehicle, but do sometimes use the bus system when my wife needs the car.
Bus	Many times I just don't go downtown because of inclement weather or because I don't trust my eyesight at night. I'd love to go many places if mass transit were available... not only for entertainment, lectures etc., but also volunteer opportunities downtown.
No response	The bus system itself is inadequate.. if you believe you can fund a rail system... you need to upgrade and expand the bus system first
My personal vehicle	Always in my car as there isn't much around my neighborhood to walk to.
Something else	Since I live so far out of town and don't have my own vehicle it is very hard for me to find rides to even just get basic daily living activities done and especially find and keep a job.
My personal vehicle	Everything here is a 'drive'. Too much asphalt already increases heat and maintenance.
My personal vehicle	I drive to the office when logistically it doesn't work to bike there. If I have something heavy to carry, or have to go somewhere else after work. I bike as often as possible. I've used the bus, however the bus depot is a good 10 minutes walk from the office - some closer stops would be useful
My personal vehicle	To save on gas and reduce my carbon footprint I would love to use faster public transportation.
No response	I average 20 thousand miles a year on my vehicle to get around in Treasure Valley.
My personal vehicle	I drive for about 30 minutes
My personal vehicle	Or Uber
My personal vehicle	I never use the van pool. I'd like the motor coaches that were available back on the interstate was under construction but I did not like the van idea at all
My personal vehicle	Ride with friends or take my own car.
My personal vehicle	We often carpool with other people in the group

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: How do you get there now?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Which did you use for most of your trips around town before COVID?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
My personal vehicle	My vehicle
My personal vehicle	I truly HATE driving with other reckless and irresponsible drivers!!
My personal vehicle	I'd use high speed transit to get to work if available and did not take excessive time to go from Meridian to downtown.
No response	I don't want light rail
My personal vehicle	Sometimes walk or bike.
My personal vehicle	Also walking and biking
My personal vehicle	Still commuting a couple days a week.
My personal vehicle	I drive my personal truck.
My personal vehicle	Everyone I know, myself included, is 1 person pervehicle. Put in a light rail. People would use it for the novelty just as much as practicality.
Something else	Sometimes ride share, sometimes bike, sometimes work from home
My personal vehicle	I'd like to see traffic reduced for people that have to drive, especially after the garrity exit
My personal vehicle	My car
Something else	Uber but I'd prefer a more public option if I were drunk.
My personal vehicle	It's the any option now. Bus doesn't go enoughplaces to be useful.
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	Most of my commutes and trips for recreating and entertainment are taken by bicycle.
My personal vehicle	In the case that we may lose our vehicle, our family would definitely appreciate other transportation.
My personal vehicle	Car
My personal vehicle	Within a mile
My personal vehicle	No other affordable options
My personal vehicle	I only use my personal vehicle currently.
My personal vehicle	I have lived in Europe and I would love an excuse to get out of my car and take public transportation all of the time, especially the train.
My personal vehicle	It was too inconvenient and slow to take the bus or carpool
My personal vehicle	Nothing trump's having a car, until the traffic gets too bad. I think there would be a lot of benefit to making the roads more bike friendly. I rode my bike from meridian to Caldwell on farm roads and there was really no shoulder room for a safe bikeexperience
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	selecting multiple options would be best for thisquestion. Many of us use several of these options daily.
Something else	My only option is online because I have no reliable transportation. My options are limited online. Having a transit line go from this end of the valley to Boise will improve the lives of everyone in the Treasure Valley and would allow more people toattend college in Idaho.
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	While I could drive or take a bus, I prefer to walk where I can to stay in shape and get outside. It helps with safety for everyone to not have lightrails zipping around.
My personal vehicle	Too much traffic and commute takes too long
Something else	Usually through rideshare apps, which can be costly and not accessible to residents of varying socio-economic backgrounds.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: How do you get there now?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Which did you use for most of your trips around town before COVID?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
My personal vehicle	In the winter we use our car. In the warmer weather we use bikes for 90% of our trips.
My personal vehicle	Do the location of my home and where I work there are no transit options available. If there was one with multiple pick up times then I would be more apt to use it.
My personal vehicle	I always take my car no matter where I'm going in the valley. I would love more options
My personal vehicle	Most often through our personal vehicle, though occasionally my husband takes the kids out with his bike + bike trailer.
My personal vehicle	We ride our bikes when we're going for small things during the day. We drive when picking up things like groceries or going out in the dark.
Carpool / vanpool / rideshare	Personal trips and work, I use my vehicle. Most entertainment, we use rideshare, mainly Lyft.
My personal vehicle	I live rural now. I hear a lot of grumble about how hard it is for people without vehicles to get to and fro. I've lived in big cities before, in smaller cities with better public transit and I used it for everything. It was very effective.
My personal vehicle	Sometimes I ride my bike, in the summertime
My personal vehicle	I drive but more often than not I just opt not to go places, especially in Boise, because I hate paying for parking and I can only have one drink if I drive. I would certainly go out more with a public transit option
My personal vehicle	I occasionally use the bus, as noted previously (although I have walked miles, rather than taking the bus, during the pandemic).
Something else	Carpool with mother to school, bus returning home
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	The bus would be secondary
My personal vehicle	Being a teen in a city with transit gives them independence and a different kind of safety. Yes, this might attract a certain danger like pick pockets. But, there would be less accidents if my high school kids used a bus or truly or rail to get to certain key areas. Or even the organs that are at other highschool classes at other schools.
My personal vehicle	Most of the time personal vehicle sometimes carpooling for sporting events
My personal vehicle	Limits the amount of time and establishments that I can visit.
My personal vehicle	Drive
My personal vehicle	Non subsidized personal vehicle.
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	If the bus goes there, I use the bus. Otherwise, I have to find a ride from friends or family.
My personal vehicle	I realize a bus system exists, but it's never been a viable option, so it's usually the flexibility of a personal vehicle that wins out.
My personal vehicle	Wish I could choose more than one option
My personal vehicle	Car and motorcycle (when weather is good).
My personal vehicle	I always drive my own vehicle. I don't like asking people for rides, ride shares terrify me at times, the bus system is unreliable, and walking is not the most effective or safe depending on where you are.
My personal vehicle	I use my personal vehicle on a daily basis. I would use high-capacity transit on a daily basis if it was available.
My personal vehicle	Right now only reliable option is personally driving in the valley. Sometimes rideshare is a good option but usually everyone drives and streets have gotten busy!
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	Sometimes Uber/Lyft. Bus hours are too short and unreliable for me to consider anything else.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: How do you get there now?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Which did you use for most of your trips around town before COVID?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
My personal vehicle	I drive to Boise from Caldwell once or twice a week doing errands.
My personal vehicle	My car is the only option. Valley ride is NOT a solution.
My personal vehicle	I always drive my child to school and then myself to work. If we had public transit, my child could use it to get to school and i could bike to work.
My personal vehicle	There's just no substitute for a car, especially for quick trips like errands. Don't want to make a day of it with mass transit.
Something else	Uber or Lyft
My personal vehicle	Before I got my motorcycle i bicycled, walked, or rode Valley Transit to work. For farther out errands, i would use our car or call a Lyft.
My personal vehicle	Bus service doesn't operate at the times or locations convenient for me to effectively use it.
Something else	My partner and I share a vehicle. We switch between taking a personal vehicle and a ride share. It is difficult.
My personal vehicle	Bicycle in fair weather
My personal vehicle	Currently a personal vehicle is the only option for something that is too far to bike/walk.
My personal vehicle	I also telecommute from home.
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	I would hope to be able to walk/ bike to and from my stops
My personal vehicle	Share 1 car
No response	Go away stay out!
Bus	Also taxi and lyft
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	The parents in our family ride bike or walk most often. The times we drive it's because we are driving our kids (almost 18) to activities, volunteer jobs, etc. They will need more transportation options than we need.
My personal vehicle	Currently driving is only option
My personal vehicle	We drive but for local trips we also ride bikes.
My personal vehicle	I drive very few miles a year due to everything being close and convenient for me. Public transportation would not be feasible especially when I go grocery shopping. I need a larger space than public transportation allows for all of my groceries. It would be very difficult for me to carry them from the store to the transit pick up place and walk home. Not feasible.
My personal vehicle	Like to bike when weather is good, so would like to be interchangeable with a train transit system when weather is a factor.
My personal vehicle	Sometimes choice is not to go for reasons of known difficulty in parking downtown.
My personal vehicle	I live in a rural area and the only option we have is to drive; fortunately we are able to afford our vehicles & our health permits us to continue to be independent;
My personal vehicle	Telecommute
My personal vehicle	Nothing beats a private vehicle. You make your own schedule, it's easier to carry your purchases home, you're flexible to change plans. Your car is clean and you don't have to share a seat with drug addicted transients who urinate and crap on the seats.
No response	We're not California, we don't need this, and we don't have the funds. Increase wages, lower property taxes, and help the homeless before it gets worse.
My personal vehicle	Risk of disease compacting people in a transit vehicle together, but may be helpful to some.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: How do you get there now?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Which did you use for most of your trips around town before COVID?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	Most of my errands and daily trips are done by bicycle, weather permitting. If weather is poor, we drive our personal vehicle. I have not had much success integrating use of the Boise Urban system schedule into daily life.
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	Bike sometimes. Bike to bus. Sometimes drive.
My personal vehicle	My car is the only way that I have to get to work. It costs me way too much money.
My personal vehicle	NO RAIL SYSTEM!
My personal vehicle	I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration.
Bus	I ride the bus but sometimes I need to Uber because the transportation system doesn't run late enough for me to get to and from.
My personal vehicle	I drive my car. However I'm considering moving to Nampa and I would love to use the light rail to get to and from work.
My personal vehicle	Mass transit too inconvenient. Wait for ride in heat or cold, spreads disease from ill patrons, is a tax drain and totally unnecessary
Walk or ride a bicycle or scooter	I live in a walkable neighborhood, so I generally just stick to that. If I'm running errands in other parts of Boise I'll take the bus. If I'm going out with family or friends, I'll carpool with them.
My personal vehicle	Depends on the time of year. When it's warmer I bike. I try to use the bus when I can but the schedules and stops are horrendous even for someone that works 8-4 and lives close-ish to downtown (off state street in Boise)
Bus	I highly prefer public transit, but when the bus routes are less convenient than driving, I'll take my personal vehicle
No response	I drive my CLEAN car
My personal vehicle	For trips I would use this transit service for.



Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's close enough?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>How close would a transit stop need to be to your home for you to use it?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
An easy walk	Easy walk in winter is much shorter than in the summer so I'd go for winter close walk distance
A short bicycle ride	Pre-Covid I would bike a mile on one end and walk 0.25 on the other end.
An easy walk	For an ten mile commute I would not travel more than a mile from my house to a station. The benefit of transit becomes nil if it takes more than twice as long to get to work, including the walk to the station and from the station to work.
A short bicycle ride	living near downtown, having a main station downtown would work, but more important are the lines and how close the outbound stops are to destinations.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	The longer the transit ride I'm aiming at is, the longer I'd be willing to travel to get there. Boise to Nampa, I'd take a decently long bike ride to get there. Boise to The Village, short ride. Downtown Boise to Costco, a short walk.
An easy walk	I'd like the total walk time to the mass transit and/or the destination from the dropoff to total 30 minutes or less
An easy walk	If the bike rack on a bus is full, it's harder to bring a bike along and still make it to work. Also, in winter or bad weather, bikes aren't always reliable (or at least not enough to arrive in the usual time)
An easy walk	I would also bike but prefer walk
A short bicycle ride	A walk of less than a mile seems reasonable. Beyond that is getting a little far. Biking to transit is an option only if there is secure bike storage at the transit location or I can safely take my bike with me.
An easy walk	1/2 mile
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	A longer bicycle ride or short drive if there were accommodations for those vehicles.
I would not use it no matter how close	In all honesty. I probably wouldn't use it. But if I needed to, I would want it to be a walk away,
An easy walk	I grew up in Salt Lake City where they have a great Transit System. I could catch a bus going downtown by walking east or west from my home and find a major terms of line. I don't think I How to walk more than a mile.
An easy walk	I am disabled and need it to be close for it to be an option.
No response	Short bike ride
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	As long as there was somewhere to park, I'd use it. Ideally, I'd be able to walk, but I'm not sure how well that would work.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	Park-and-ride lots work well.
No response	How lazy is laziness? If rural outreach is a goal, sidewalks and bike paths will need to be considered for budget analysis as well. Lake Lowell dam received upgrades last year. The new bike path is well travelled in the summer months now. If you had anything to do with procuring federal funding for a better design, THANK YOU!
An easy walk	Rule of thumb for me is a 15 minute walk
An easy walk	I live close to Gekeler and Boise Ave, which should be on local routes... so walking is preferred.
An easy walk	For day to day use, a close walk would be the best, but I would be willing to use a park-n-ride type system for trips further afield.
No response	You need bus routes within a mile of houses to be a viable system.. this valley always has been short on bus routes.. so a rail system is out of the question
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I would want to see increased bus capability to funnel passengers to and from train stops. Large parking areas at the train stops in Caldwell, Nampa, and Boise. Only three parking lots are needed regardless of train stop quantities.
A short bicycle ride	1/2 mile from high density areas
A short bicycle ride	A short walk is best, but I would use it if I had to ride a bike a short(ish) distance to get to the stop.
An easy walk	This is the most important. Mass transit should accommodate those that physically can't go miles after stop. Frequency of stops is critical too. 4 stops a day at a location is worthless.
A short bicycle ride	There is close bus stops next to my home

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's close enough?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>How close would a transit stop need to be to your home for you to use it?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Definitely would use Park and Ride lots! I used these a lot in Portland, OR. My parents live in Caldwell and I would love to take a light rail out there. I would use a park and ride for this
An easy walk	A few blocks is not difficult, even half a mile. I've lived with transit and loved using it instead of fouling the air, looking for parking, using fuel... Many of us lived in large cities and walk easily, even with packages. We adjust for that.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Ideally, I'd rather not have to drive too far but I would drive a little bit to access a stop IF there is reliable parking at the stops.
No response	Within a mile or I can shuttle to the stop.
A short bicycle ride	I don't mind waking or biking to a transit stop, but if the commute to the transit stop ends up taking longer than the commute itself, then I would likely opt to use a personal vehicle.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	If there was a parking lot near the transit stop, I would leave my vehicle and take transit option to where I needed to go.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	In a perfect world I would prefer it to be within walking distance. However, realizing limitations of the Treasure Valley I'm willing to travel a little to get public transportation.
An easy walk	Not more than a quarter mile.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	I'd use it no matter how far away it was? Seriously, that is a stupid question. What do you think you will learn from someone picking this answer?
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I'd likely use transit for errands and entertainment and my job, but I would also most likely go for rides just to get out of the house and see the scenery.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Would also depend on how far I was going in comparison to how far I have to go to get on the light rail
An easy walk	Are used to live six blocks from a train and will take it frequently, and then lived 12 blocks from a train and would not take it as often. Took too long to walk. I would not want to ride or leave my bike anywhere
An easy walk	Not more than a few blocks. If I have to drive there, I might as well just drive myself all the way.
An easy walk	Within a quarter mile. I'm not super mobile but I can walk a quarter mile to a bus stop near my house.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Stops near less busy overpasses (Cloverdale, Linder, etc) could allow for people to drive or carpool and ride in
An easy walk	And easy bicycle ride sounds good, but I need to know that there are plenty of spots to secure my bike. I don't want to take the bike on mass transit
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	If I can drive there is 5 minutes or less and the service is reliable, I'll probably use it. The presence or absence of sidewalks changes the reasonable distance a lot.
I would not use it no matter how close	You have got to be kidding me.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	So long as there is a parking lot at a station I could drive to to leave my car, I would use it.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	I would prefer the shorter bike ride, but wanted the car option too. I would walk too if that were an option.
An easy walk	For me, walking between 1-1.5 miles is manageable even in the winter. Given the colder temperatures during winter I would like an enclosed or heated stop once I arrived.
An easy walk	2 miles and under is an easy walk for me.
No response	I don't want light rail
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Short drive would be enough. Would like closer, but understand Kuna is a ways off from where the transit line would likely be placed.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	No problem parking in a lot to catch rapid transit that is within 5 minutes from my home.
An easy walk	An easy walk is under 10 blocks.
An easy walk	I would use it if I could walk there in 30 minutes, or catch a bus to get there or if I could get there via bike lanes/green belt.
A short bicycle ride	A short bicycle ride or close driving (1-3 miles away from house)

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's close enough?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>How close would a transit stop need to be to your home for you to use it?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
An easy walk	1 mile
No response	There needs to be safe, secure designated parking available at major stops
A short bicycle ride	A short bicycle ride/long-ish walk (1/2 mile) would be great if bike storage was easy (either on or at the transit).
A short bicycle ride	A short bike ride, especially if the light rail could accommodate bikes.
An easy walk	With kids, a short walk. Or a short drive w easy parking bc of car seats.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	easy to park and drive locations, like they do in portland
An easy walk	This is merely preference, I think initial point of interest should be downtown Boise.
An easy walk	Walk up to 1/4 mile
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	As long as there is vehicle parking, I would use it.
A short bicycle ride	I'd classify short at 15 to 20 minute biking distance.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Having a short drive to the stop would be fine with me if it meant I didn't have to spend 30-40 minutes in traffic
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	When we lived in Portland we walked or drove to a bus stop and commuted into downtown. We loved it.
No response	Need adequate bus routes connecting to multiple locations off the mass transit route
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Short drive would be great with a good parking lot availability
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	Presumably parking by a stop would be easier than downtown
An easy walk	My work is close by but for those that do commute a park and ride option would be so nice
An easy walk	Few biking lanes make it too dangerous.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	Make use of Park & Ride lots where people can park their cars to use the light rail.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I would really make a point of riding public transportation if I could ride a train.
An easy walk	Must have stops or some way to prevent long walks that take more than 5 or 10 minutes
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	I may use it once a week since i live so close to work. But many other people would benefit from it
An easy walk	Disabled, so proximity is important
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	Easy walk means 20 minutes, not necessarily a block away. I would also use park and ride going to Nampa
A short bicycle ride	Less than 2 miles from my home
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Short drive, park and ride
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	In my area there are a lot of small towns i think if the transit came even just to the freeway exit near Fruitland and had parking available people would drive to it and use the transit to get to the other end of the valley. More people would visit Nampa and Boise on day trips, more people would attend College and more people would be able to get and keep better jobs if they didn't have to drive.
An easy walk	Easy walk, or accessible via bus line, nearby car parking
I would not use it no matter how close	I cannot in good conscience encourage the installation of this system. It is a bad idea.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Closer is better obviously, but driving to a station is not a big deal. I wouldn't mind having to drive to catch a train at all.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's close enough?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>How close would a transit stop need to be to your home for you to use it?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	Depending on destination, I would drive a short distance to use a lightrail. Especially going to/from the Nampa/Caldwell area. For trips around Boise I would likely walk or ride a bike.
A short bicycle ride	If there was a transit station located somewhere near Kuna and the weather was decent I would be willing to ride my bike to the station. If weather was bad i could still drive and bring my bike with me.
I would not use it no matter how close	I tried public transit, I've been stranded and had to call taxi for a ride. I had 2 babies in diapers. I don't trust government run/public transportation.
An easy walk	Approximately a block or two
An easy walk	typically public transit would need to be within a 5-10 min walk from the house to use for dining, etc. Otherwise we could walk/bike all the way there faster. For trips to Bogus Basin, driving to the carpool lot isn't a problem, but the transportation would need to be frequent, not 2-3 times per day. People still want to arrive/depart on their schedule not 2 arrival times and end of day departure.
A short bicycle ride	My husband could probably do a longer bike ride to get to a stop for his work commute, but in order to use service for other things like errands, it would need to be closer so I could carry things and bring kids with me.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	Drive to Meridian city area and park. Ride train to downtown Boise
An easy walk	A half mile
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I would drive and park to be able to use transit.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	I'd likely use it to get to places I'd rather not drive, so it wouldn't matter too much if it was close. But I would use it more if it was closer
No response	.5 mi
An easy walk	As important as it is to have a stop within a mile, is to have the time be reasonable and reliable. I used to take the bus HP to downtown in the evening when I worked, but the route went away and sometimes the bus was so late I rode my bike home anyway.
An easy walk	Somewhere around a mile seems to be the best option, although within an easy bike ride would be fine too, as long as it's on a safe route (not through heavy traffic, for example). On that note, bike paths are a must in general - we can always use more.
An easy walk	Car parks that would allow easy access to public transit would help commuters. No need to get stuck in rush hour. So even rural riders could use it even if they had to drive in part way. Partway keeps the traffic down, eases congestion, relieves stress on people
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	When I lived in NYC, the subway was my main source of transport. I don't mind walking/biking/bussing/driving to a drop point. If it went from Caldwell to Boise, with stops at Nampa and Meridian, that's good enough for me.
An easy walk	Even if I don't use it, we NEED it so we can start to slow down unsustainable sprawl and start offering people housing, work, business, recreation options where they can use transit.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	If there were light rail from Eagle to Meridian or Eagle to Boise I would be happy enough catching that from downtown Eagle
An easy walk	These questions need to be "mark all that apply". Several I thought I was making more than one thing and he wasn't. Ugh.
An easy walk	Currently my main objection to using the bus system is the routes don't run late enough or close enough to where I want to go, especially late at night.
An easy walk	Walking distance or park and ride situation when accessing large attendance events
An easy walk	Transit stops should have "park and ride" lots so that people can drive to the terminal and board the light rail vehicle.
No response	A reasonable walking distance, since I try to go for walks several times a week anyways.
I would not use it no matter how close	Way too expensive of a boondoggle.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	A short drive (2 miles from my apt to I84) if parking is available at the stop

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's close enough?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>How close would a transit stop need to be to your home for you to use it?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
An easy walk	i need to be able to get there without having to worry about holding up the schedule by mounting/dismounting a bicycle
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	It would still be beneficial to drive 10 minutes, park and get on the transit for a faster commute to wherever. Walking distance would be great but that's less realistic in the short term.
A short bicycle ride	Walk, short bike ride, or a short ride on a frequent bus would be close enough.
An easy walk	Both options are moot since all the roads near me are built for cars first. I assume that it'd be easier to add a footpath than a bike path, but good transit would make either option viable.
An easy walk	We don't bicycle. Transit should be a walkable distance from origin/destination. Within 5 blocks.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	If it was by the Garrity freeway exit, then that cuts out over half of my commute. Personally I'm thinking of it like the Seattle light rail system. A short to moderate drive for people, they park their cars, and they take the rail into the city from Tacoma, or Kent or other places.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	There's a fine balance. The distance between the stop and what errands I need to run would be the deciding factor
A short bicycle ride	Ideally it should make Idaho more accessible to pedestrians. If most people needed to drive to a stop it would significantly less useful.
A short bicycle ride	An easy walk or a short bike ride. It wouldn't be very helpful if I had to drive ten minutes to the station, at that point it wouldn't be saving me time or money.
An easy walk	Would prefer being able to walk but hubs if time frequency is often and day passes are available is totally fine (similar to Portland's MAX). City bikes and scooters and Uber could be used to move around from the hubs
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	This one is a bit of a trade. If it opens possibilities at my destination, almost anything goes. I used to drive 5 miles to a park and ride lot that gave me direct light rail access to downtown Portland...no parking hassles downtown, no being stuck on the "freeway" that was acting like a parking lot. Easy....
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	As long as it's within biking distance and there was a secure lockup for my bike, I would definitely use it.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	As long as there is parking available
An easy walk	2 miles or less
An easy walk	I have medical limitations that limit my physical activity.
An easy walk	I'd be willing to transfer between multiple systems (light rail to bus, or subway, etc.) if the distance between was a short walk, and if the process was easy to navigate with all fees on the same card or payment system. Transitions should be timed so I don't have to wait too long between connections as well.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	I'm in Middleton. I assume a short drive would be required to get to a close stop, but it would be a better alternative to my 45min commute every morning in my personal vehicle.
An easy walk	Not more than 2 miles.
A short bicycle ride	Sort of depends on weather and parking availability. And the ease of facilitating bikes.
A short bicycle ride	A short ride or long walk would be ideal to keep from driving. Though some park and ride locations would help with planning free overall stops and higher speeds.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	If I need to drive to the location, sufficient 8-hour+ parking would need to be available
A short bicycle ride	To me this would be 3 - 5 miles I would also do a longer bike ride if the destination was significantly further than the longer bike ride. I would also be happy to walk up to 1.5 - 2 miles. Access by bike assumes there is protected, safe parking for bikes and/or one can readily take their bike with them.
A short bicycle ride	By short, I mean I'd be willing to bike up to 10-15 minutes to get to a stop. Maybe longer, but definitely not above 25 or so minutes. Driving negates the purpose of transit a bit. From my home on Broadway south of Boise Ave, a stop somewhere around campus or near front/main/myrtle would be good.
An easy walk	If the transit stop had adequate bicycle locking areas I would. Otherwise I would prefer to only walk to the bus stop. Especially if it was a frequent enough route.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's close enough?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>How close would a transit stop need to be to your home for you to use it?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
No response	Again I would never use a terrible system like this.
A short bicycle ride	I don't mind traveling a little to get there, up to a short car ride of it's a park and ride area
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	origination distance is less important than destination distance
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Obviously the closer the better, but we need to start somewhere.
An easy walk	The best systems I've used (Washington DC and London, England) were setup such that you were a ~15-minute walk to a train station from anywhere in the higher-density metro area. Stations that enabled commuting into town from the suburbs were a 5-30minute drive from residences.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	the intent is to help reduce traffic congestion and improve outdoor activities so I would use it regardless of destination
A short bicycle ride	Preferably an easy walk, but short bicycle/longer bicycle ride would be fine provided transport after that point was a good speed.
An easy walk	Easy walk for me could be a short bike ride for others
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I'd use it no matter how far away it was but I have the finances to make that decision. Please consider those who NEED this service. Stops should have easy access via bike, free or subsidized ride share programs, or bus systems making them easily accessible by all.
An easy walk	At my age I cannot imagine walking all the way to State Street or Highway 55 from my house every day to go to work. The kids in my neighborhood don't walk to the middle school, which is less than a mile.
No response	In california stay out!
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	Just think with all the growth we are behind the 8ball now We need the workers from MSP here who built the light rail
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	My expectation is that I would need to drive to it and park my car.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Within 5 miles
An easy walk	For my daughters, an easy walk (could be up to half mile) would be necessary to connect to transit. If the adults in the family were commuting right now by transit - a drive or bike ride would work for us.
I would not use it no matter how close	What about the noise that it will create through out the valley next to homes and next to offices how would you create no noise during the evenings
A short bicycle ride	Anything under a mile is a walk, anything between 1.5 miles and 2 miles is a short bicycle ride.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I would walk if close enough but would also drive to a near by parking lot. I have used several different rapid transit systems in other areas I have lived and believe they are a huge asset to the community and population
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	An area where I can park my vehicle;
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I am willing to drive to the transit stop in my hometown.
A short bicycle ride	I ride a tricycle. So, the bus would need to be accessible enough to where I could store my tricycle on it. This is very important to me. Otherwise the stop would have to be walking distance. In the summer I ride my tricycle everywhere. Being able to hop on a bus with it would be amazing.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	I don't mind driving to a park & ride if it makes getting to the final destination easier and more economical
No response	We're not California, we don't need this, and we don't have the funds. Increase wages, lower property taxes, and help the homeless before it gets worse.
An easy walk	I'd be willing to drive to a park and ride location if there was secure parking available
An easy walk	Easy walk.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's close enough?</h2> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>How close would a transit stop need to be to your home for you to use it?</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small></p>
An easy walk	If the transit system made it easy to load and unload a bicycle, I wouldn't mind a short bike ride. It may be difficult for most if they're wearing business clothes though.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Up to 10 miles
A short bicycle ride	We would definitely use this depending on where the train stations and stops are located. It should be set up so that it's integrated and convenient with local commerce centers. We have 3 kids and 2 heavy e-bikes to transport everyone, so having the capability to transport our bikes on the train would be crucial.
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	Short bicycle ride would be ideal, but I'd probably bike to wherever it was.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I lived in Europe. Lots of train stops have parking. I would drive there and take the train to town.
An easy walk	I live in a more rural part of nampa closer to caldwell,
I would not use it no matter how close	NO RAIL SYSTEM!
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	If there were secure well lighted parking areas near the transit stop I would be inclined to use it regardless of distance from my home. < I live in the rural area now altho that is rapidly changing >
I would not use it no matter how close	I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration. Taxpayer expenditures are unjustifiable.
I would not use it no matter how close	Nothing
A longer bicycle ride or short drive	I'd like bus stops to be within walking distance, but I'd bike or drive to get to a central light rail station, like the Boise Depot.
A short bicycle ride	A short bicycle ride. There are some that have the luxury of living on the street. But I do not have that luxury of doing so where a bus stop or transit stop is in front of their door
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I'd be fine with taking a shuttle or a bus across town to get to a rapid transit stop. I would want the connecting transit to come close to my home though.
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	I would end up getting there and using it one way or another more often than not. I really prefer not to drive whenever possible.
A short bicycle ride	I don't mind walking for a while, or biking to a bus stop
No response	Not at all I won't use it
I'd use it no matter how far away it was	Within 5 miles
An easy walk	Or a park and ride.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Location	Location is number 1, but schedule is a close 2nd.
Schedule	As a 74-year-old living in the foothills, I won't use a high-speed rail very often, if ever, but I support it to serve commuters to/from Canyon County and west/southwest Ada County so they don't have to drive, pollute air and need more roads built. Ped and bike transport is great for the 20 percent of citizens who are physically fit and want to use it, but the rest of the population needs better VRT service (more often, more places) in the short term and rail in the long term.
Something else	Cost and location are more restricted for fixed income, yet we could benefit greatly from having it. Safety is also a consideration
Location	Schedules can be flexible and I think will be more so Post-Covid. I've taken the bus long enough to know saving time is NOT why I take transit.
Schedule	Definitely needs to be timely. My team needs me at work on time.
Schedule	Time and again, transit that is AVAILABLE, like water/a utility, is shown to be the type of transit that gets people out of their cars. Hard to remember schedules, frequent off-hours, and no weekends will kill some of the appeal.
Schedule	When used for events/entertainment it needs to get you there on time and be there when the event is over.
Schedule	It is a tie between location and schedule
Something else	It would need to save me effort. Driving is a fairly strenuous task, and I would love if that was replaced with checking my phone for the transit schedule and walking a little to the nearest stop.
Cost	Currently the time and cost are what's most important: I put cost because right now I have a personal vehicle that I use, but a public transportation system that would save me more money in addition to getting me to work quickly (without having to get a too-early bus to be in time) could convince me to take public transportation more often
Schedule	Both schedule and location are important.
Something else	That it actually runs. Train and bus systems that work together like Seattle, or sort of like Portland or Paris Or New York. Under the road trains and buses for getting into neighborhoods.
Cost	Schedule and being on time is also important, especially if I use this for work. I will need the timing to be reliable
Something else	It's crazy to see all of the traffic coming into the city each day so they can work at Micron, Amazon, Lukes, AI's or downtown. WE HAVE A TRAIN TRACK RIGHT NOW. We just need to take hold of this last precious corridor that runs to ALL OF THOSE WORKPLACES (except Lukes). Create vast parking lots in the outlying cities and place 10 minute round trip buses from the stops (Boise Depot, Micron, Amazon, AI's) that can take all of the commuters into town and then back again during the busy hours.
Speed	It would be nice to spend more time with the family than on the road stuck in traffic.
Schedule	When my wife and I decided to sell our second car we experimented with public transit. Current public transit in Boise is challenging at best. My route to school is a 6 mile bike ride that takes about 25 minutes, a 5 mile car ride that takes about 13 minutes or a bus ride that has an exchange and takes 56 minutes and has me arriving at my school either way earlier than necessary or nearly late.
Something else	I do not see how the cost of this system justifies it. I witnessed Boise City spend millions on this system down town and every bus I see down there is empty. It is a waste of our money in that case and I feel the same about this one as well.
Location	Speed, cost, location, and schedule.
Speed	It would also need to stop near where I want to go.
Cost	I would travel to Boise and do more shopping and recreation if I could get there in a reasonable time and save money on gas.
Location	Speed would also impact my decision. If it took longer than 35 minutes to travel from Boise to Caldwell, I would probably choose to drive. I would like to take public transport to save money as well.
Something else	Finding greener more environmentally friendly commute option
Cost	It has to be cheaper than taking my own car.
Schedule	And cost



Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Something else	I had to answer Something Else here. If I'm using transit to get to work I need it to be on schedule and I need it to take me where I need to go. If the schedule is consistent I can adjust my leave time to get to work (as long as its not like I'm getting to work 1.5 hours early and have to stay 1.5 hours late). It should save me money, especially going to work, discounted rush hour times, but I would pay a little more if I were going out for fun or to take my dogs with me.
Schedule	When I have ridden the bus in the past, there are only a few routes going downtown in the morning that were convenient and then coming home there were only a few routes and if I missed my bus I was stranded downtown because there were no more buses for the evening.
No response	Location
Location	One major issue in Idaho is a lack of transit that goes to places people actually wish to go to.
Schedule	I would need to catch my flight if I'm going to the airport.
Location	Location, Vocation, Locution
Schedule	I have more than one "Where do you want to go?" I go to Boise for doctor's appointments, shopping, meeting friends, entertainment. This should have provided the opportunity to check as many as apply.
Schedule	Our current Bus transit runs so infrequently, its ridiculous to use. I never see the buses more than 5-10% capacity. Transit needs to run frequently. That said, it also needs to accommodate the needs of its users. Local routes need to go where people live, work and shop stopping frequently. Longer commute routes need to go faster, stop less often and either go where people need to get off or link to local transit that can get them there.
Location	I am unlikely to be a regular user of a high capacity transit system, however, I am a firm believer that quality public transit is critical to the future success of the Treasure Valley. I will support the best solution for our long term needs and am willing to pay more in taxes if that is what is required to make it happen. Lastly, specifically to this section of the survey, I believe location is the most important factor. We need public from Caldwell, Nampa and Meridian to downtown Boise.
Location	I indicated that Location was the most important to me, but Speed is also extremely important - a toss-up between the two
Location	I wish I could select more than one. I see the light rail as a way to get people to work/school and a way to increase business traffic. Business lease/rent downtown and in high traffic areas of Boise are expensive. Linking business/shopping districts of Caldwell, Nampa, Meridian, and Boise would allow more consumerism as long as the train system is intuitive to use and specifically aimed at guiding passengers to shopping districts with ease.
Schedule	Energy efficient trains. Getting less cars on the road. Safer for pedestrians and bicycles
Speed	When I worked on the other side of town, I used a vanpool. Every other person in the vanpool didn't have children under 18. Everyone I talked to that had children absolutely would not join the vanpool, even with the option to get a taxi. Something to think about when you're planning.... Also, we need options to Caldwell, Indian River, and Emmett.
Speed	Speed and cost are both important factors
Cost	Save a little money OR save a LOT of time.
Something else	I wouldn't have to worry about parking at my destination, and it would be helping the planet.
Schedule	Schedule is 80% of why I don't use the treasure valley's existing bus system. The other 20% is locations.
Schedule	I would use it mostly to get to and from entertainment, events, restaurants and certain errands. It would have to have scheduling beyond typical commute times.
Schedule	I would sacrifice some time to my commute but nothing more than a half hour. Right now it's over an hour difference between car and bus.
Something else	I have enjoyed transit in Denver Colorado, not for speed but the fact I didn't have to drive 1 hour in traffic. Also it cost less to take transit than to park in Downtown.
Schedule	Location and schedule are most important together.
Something else	Personally, I wouldn't need to use mass transit that often, but it benefits me by taking numerous cars off the road, leading to better air quality & less congestion
Something else	It's a combination of speed, schedule, and cost.
Something else	It would need to be a combination of being on time and location - I wouldn't mind a slightly longer walk to get to a stop, but it would need to be dependable.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Location	when Metro rail started in Miami, it didn't even include the airport. Crazy. It did in LA, in DC the 'underground' is VERY helpful.
Something else	Convenience - parking is a big issue downtown and many would use mass transit so they didn't have to pay for parking. Also those who live in Meridian, Nampa and Caldwell get fed up of sitting in traffic - if they could relax on a train rather than stressing in a car they might use the system
No response	Cost, location and schedule are all factors.
Location	Location would need to be the most important. If it is not near where people want to go, no one will use it.
Cost	with the new move in traffic, we can no longer afford to not have public transportation
Something else	What's most important to me is that it isn't a gigantic waste of money, which it most certainly will be.
Speed	I am willing to trade on speed if it saved wear and tear on my vehicles, the environment, and money
Speed	I would be happy to ride my bike to a relatively close rapid transit stop. If the schedules are perishable it would quickly become my primary form of commuting.
Cost	Speed and cost are important
Location	Convenience of where the stop near my house is and it going where I need to get to
Location	I would use the current bus system more but it is not convenient to where I live or work.
Location	If I can't walk to my destination from where it stops, there is no reason to take it
Speed	Time saved. Avoiding driving downtown along with everyone else for events. Having a drink and not wanting to drive. Avoid parking costs. Avoid trying to find parking as we continue to grow
Schedule	It needs to be reliable. If I can't count on it, I won't use it.
Something else	Better for the environment.
Location	Location is most important. But schedule is almost as equally as important. If it's reliable, I will use it and others will too.
Something else	Keep me out of traffic jams! Not really the speed that I need. More like less stress.
Something else	The freedom to come and go as I please when I please without others all up in my business.
Cost	It would need to be cost effective for me to use it - I would often be taking kids with me if we were going to the aquarium, parks, etc.
Location	Schedule is critical too.
Something else	Personal autonomy
Location	Ease of access and stops where I need to go would be deciding factors.
Location	Locations are key with speed being the next important. People are more likely to walk if the stops are convenient.
Something else	Rapid approval, planning, and implementation. What bars a lot of places from installing this kind of transportation is heavy previous development. The Treasure Valley is headed that direction but it can still be easily installed, and should be before it becomes more difficult.
Something else	I simply consider it a critical investment for the Treasure Valley to hedge against accelerating growth.
No response	I don't want light rail
Location	Would need to go all the way to Micron
Cost	Location is obvious, it must actually go where I need to go, but cost would be next important
Something else	It would need to run along the places I don't want to drive: Eagle road
Cost	Not having to park or deal with traffic downtown. Also not having to use a taxi or Uber to leave downtown
Something else	Reducing traffic/congestion/pollution
Schedule	The biggest issue with the bus system I encountered in the past was inconsistent times when living further out. Unsure what it's like closer to downtown, but to Victory was a mess.
Schedule	I think availability is the biggest deterrent to using our current public transit. But of course going where I want to go is also necessary.
Something else	Don't waste our tax dollars!
Schedule	Location and time are most important to me as is ease of use.
Location	Location is important to be useful.

Survey Response	<b>Preferences: What's most important to you?</b> <b>Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</b> <small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small>
Something else	My special needs teenage granddaughter who cant drive could come use it to visit..caldwell to meridian and back.
Something else	Cleanliness, safety, and more cleanliness
Something else	Not having to deal with traffic or getting myselfthere
No response	Speed, location of stops, and schedule, are important for my household.
Cost	Assuming it was running where and when I needed togo, the cost would be deciding factor. I would prefer not to drive my car in traffic, but I don't have much disposable income, so if too expensive, I'd just keep driving myself.
Location	A bus running from five mile, down Franklin or overland, to orchard, to Gowen, to federal, and back would get a lot of ridership
Location	Accessibility is key, a short runner up then, is schedule/ times.
Cost	Both cost and distance- I'm a wheelchair user
Something else	Eco friendliness
Location	Malls, entertainment venues, downtown areas and sport venues
Location	This is pretty difficult to choose jsut one, as all of these are important to me, that said - if it doesn't start/stop near me (or where I want to go,I won't participate), then the other factors would weigh into my decision as to whether it's reasonable to do so.
Something else	Dont waste tax dollars
Something else	Use of public transportation
Location	With the weather extremes that Idaho can experience, I think that publuc transit that takes people as close as possible to their destination would beideal.
Something else	This is a bad idea.
Something else	Safety. The freeway is a mess. The city streets are filled with running stoplights, not watching for pedestrians/cyclists, cellphones in hands. It'sso nerve wrecking to drive in Boise anymore.
Speed	Schedule would also be important
Speed	Environmental impact of cars is an issue for me too.
Something else	Avoid freeway traffic
Location	It really needs to be both nearby and on a convenient schedule. I moved here from a very populated area. High capacity transit worked well there because of the population density that enabled both of the above. In a place like the Boise metro area, this will not be feasible for decades until the population catches up. We need millions more people here to keep the buses and trains full and running all day. Otherwise, you will have to rely ongovernment grants and local taxes to pay for it.
Something else	Not only would it save money, but hopefully it could be more environmentally friendly. This city is too spread out, and driving everywhere is a waste.
Location	I would love to see something that goes into downtown from Caldwell, and something that runs north south, too.
Something else	The ONLY thing that is important to me is lower taxes. I don't want to pay for busses or trains. We don't need them.
Something else	I desire a more environmentally friendly way of getting around the treasure valley. Hopefully, a transit system like this would provide that
Something else	I want it to remove as much traffic from the roadsas possible and be accessible to those who most need public transport.
Something else	Avoid freeway and parking in boise stress. Cost ifthat works out effectively
Something else	Not contributing to traffic and the environmentalimpact is important to me.
Something else	Easier to park downtown/alternative options to driving during high traffic hours
Something else	All of the above
Cost	The cost of tickets for a group of 4 would need tobe a lot cheaper than parking during events.
Something else	Having public transit can help the environment more long term
Schedule	I think it would be important to me to know it'sthere whenever my schedule permits me to use it.
Something else	It doesnt belong in Idaho. Traffic problems and too many people
Location	Convenience of location of stops, fast commuting and trains running often would be important too
Something else	All of those answers

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Something else	Saving taxpayer dollars rather than wasting them on a project which would seldom be used. Let's face it, this ain't New York.
Location	It would have to be almost free to use. Within a couple of blocks to where I'm coming from and where I need to go and conveniently timed
Location	overall time is important. If i have to walk for 15 minutes then the time saved going faster is wasted.
Speed	Speed and cost equally important
Speed	But also, if it raises my taxes and the benefits don't outweigh the costs then I don't support it
Something else	I would not use high capacity transit for any reason especially now that we have covid-19
Something else	Not taxpayer funded is most important to me.
Schedule	If the schedule does not allow me to arrive at a time close enough to when I need, what is the point. My ballet tickets are for a very specific time, I start work at a very specific time, etc. I used light rail in Phoenix to get to the airport, shows downtown, parades, and other events.
Location	College and entertainment is the most important destinations to get people to use the transit, having rental bikes in the bigger cities would be great as well to expand the reach of the stops.
No response	Balance travel time and location access. No point in getting nowhere fast
Cost	It would need to cost the people who use it not the community of people that wouldn't or couldn't.
Something else	The most important thing to me is that we don't ruin the amazing area we have here by trying to "look to the future." This system is currently my past. I don't miss it. Another important consideration is crime statistics. Take care that you don't make it easier for criminals to cover a larger portion of the valley for less cost. Been there, seen that. Don't do it.
Something else	It would keep me out of high traffic areas like the freeways and main arteries.
Something else	I would be choosing transit over driving my car to lessen traffic on the freeway. Also, for a night out, it would be another safe option home.
Speed	All of the above
Something else	Pollution, climate change
Location	There's definitely some combination of all these factors at play, but if it doesn't stop where I need to go then what's the point?
Something else	All of these factors - speed, cost, location, schedule - need to align for this to work. If any one of them is off, then this won't work.
Schedule	The primary reason I do not utilize our current bus system is the short operation hours. Extended hours into the evening are especially important for service workers who do not work typical business hours.
Cost	Personal costs as well as costs on the environment, roads and rails would be greatly beneficial to everyone in the treasure valley.
Something else	I would need to hear and believe that mass transit users will pay for the service, unlike in Portland, where it is a great cost to citizen who don't use it.
Something else	Stop your destruction of the Treasure Valley with your liberal blights. We don't want your train.
Location	All of the above
Location	If there was pick up/ drop off locations near my home and place of work I would definitely use a transit system. If the locations were out of my way to get to them then I would most likely not utilize the option to get to and come from my work. If the transit locations were to provide locations to areas that my family frequents then we would more than likely use the transit system.
Something else	The huge amount of money it costs to build, the traffic for years and years of construction. Improve what we have.
Schedule	this is more of a ranking question, but it really needs to be all of those things for people who have other options to choose public transit over personal vehicle. Schedule, Location, Time, Cost. It must be available when you need it, at a location close to your origin/destination, close to similar travel time, and equal or less cost. People simply will not pay more and go out of their way to take public transit that takes longer unless they have no other choice.
Location	All these factors are important, but if the location isn't right then it's all moot.
Something else	A combo of all. Mainly it would get cars off the already busy interstate system. Also it would be great if it ran to the airport.
Schedule	Tough question. Really it's a combination of location AND schedule. ;)

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Something else	I would likely only use it to go to high attendance events or places where I don't want to deal with the traffic congestion like concerts or the Fair or the Mall.
Schedule	I work parttime Monday - Thursday 9-2. I would want to be able to use it during those times.
Something else	It not being there to cost tax payers money for something that won't get used. High capacity transit has no use in a mostly rural area.
Speed	I could have used this several years ago. I'm retired now. I am also disabled so walking any distance would be impossible.
Location	Has to be close to where I want to go and be available when I want it. I don't want to have to walk far in the dark when I get off work.
Location	Location is number one. Schedule is a close second.
Schedule	Cost, schedule, and location all matter pretty equally. The transit system currently doesn't serve enough of the TV, nor is the operating schedule flexible enough. I have college kids in Boise that can't use the bus because it doesn't pair up with their after class jobs. If the last bus of the day leaving BSU headed to Ustick/Meridian leaves at 4:50 pm, but they don't get off work or out of class until 5:45 or later, it makes the system pretty worthless as it is now.
Something else	I believe a more diverse public transit system in the Treasure Valley would promote sustainability. In an effort to stop sprawl (single-family zoning) and through the implementation of newer practices, the Treasure Valley can become not only Carbon Neutral but Climate Positive.
Something else	Environment
Something else	A smart investment that provides robust transit choice to people and creates land use patterns that produce much greater return than the sprawl pattern of car-dependent developments we have allowed to take place over the past several decades.
Something else	I think Mass Transit in the treasure valley would help with traffic and parking issues, as well as potentially being better for the environment.
Something else	The most important things to me are the environmental benefits and providing access to low income communities
Something else	All the above. I also like to be able to leave a destination for whatever reason if I need to!
Location	It would need to be convenient and not add too much extra time to my commute.
Something else	It needs to be the more environmental choice!
Schedule	Realistically the most important thing to me is the environmental factor of a light rail system (not using gas, etc.), but also up there is a reliable schedule so I know I can get where I need to be on time.
Something else	Later hours for work and or social
Location	Schedule is just as important.
Speed	I don't need something faster than a car, but I can't regularly use public transit if a 30 minute commute turns into a 2 hour+ one (as is the case with the bus, currently).
Location	This needs to be an affordable option for students but that means that certain parts would need to be more frequent while others would need to get very close to the destination. Having a morning & evening Commie to Boise would cut down on rush hour for nurses, 9-5ers, & students in college. But the transit to help get to hospitals would need to be accurate & frequent. If this can connect state ustick or chinden to Nampa, then to south 12th like to mercy medical, there would be less accidents.
Location	It's a tossup between cost, location, and schedule. Schedule I could work around, cost is a variable of concern, and location is the main issue for me.
Something else	I want to be able to serve low income areas and connect them to the rest of the treasure valley
Something else	Environmental. Less cars on the road, better for the earth and for this who do need to drive to commute so they can get to where they need faster. It's worth the investment
Location	For me, it's a tie between location and schedule. If the train stops at the right time, but at a location nowhere near where I want to be, it's useless. Also if the location is right, but trains don't run at the times I need them, again, it is useless.
Schedule	Multiple options apply to me here. I would like something that is timely and wide range of hours (I work at 6 AM), location (as of right now, a bus line doesn't even come close to our home and I would have to drive to catch a bus and transfer way to many times to make it downtown effectively). I'm born and raised in The Salt Lake valley and have used a rail system for years... would LOVE this in Boise.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
No response	Definitely would need to stop at a good centrallylocated place to make easy to navigate to multiple locations from that point.
Schedule	24 hour to keep drivers off the road would be ideal, less DUIs at night and less cars during rush hour
Something else	Expense and wasted time that could better be spentby leaving the money in citizens pockets, mass transportation is an aboration of the past.
Something else	Needs to help allevuate some of the business hrs traffic. The TV is getting so congested with all the people moving here.
No response	all of these would be a requirement, other wise its not worth trying
No response	I wouldn't use a high transit system!
Something else	I would not use it! Waste of money for this area!
Something else	bsu games, steelhead games, music concerts, downtown access, airport, alternative to uber for the same reason I want the stops near me whenI am going out/coming home I need the same convenient locations near my destination. A close secondis scheduled and third is value.
Location	All of these are really important factors but on the topic of commute I'd want it to save me time and also stress from driving in traffic or gettingstuck in or behind and accident
Speed	I do not support high-capacity transit. Instead of moving people to jobs, we should move the jobs to the people.
Something else	It would need to be time, location, and schedule.
Location	It would have to have parking at the station if itwas not within walking distance
Speed	At this stage of the Treasure Valley's growth, there is a fantastic opportunity to build a high speed electric commuter train that will be faster thandriving. An electric high speed rail line that serves Caldwell, Nampa, Meridian, Town Center, Downtown Boise, and terminating at the Airport would put the Treasure Valley in a position to compete for the rest of this century. We must look ahead!
Location	Ultimately this is about getting from point A to point B. No amount of cheap cost or tight scheduling matters if it doesn't take to (or near) where I need to go.
Something else	If it was convenient, efficient and helped me getto where i needed in boise, i would sell my car.
Speed	Mass transit must provide an incentive that is meaningful to people. Get people to hotspots like downtown (Boise,Eagle,Star, Meridian, Nampa, &Caldwell), village, mall, and airport faster than if they drove themselves, THEN people would use it. That's a tangible benefit to the masses
Something else	Environmental Impact
Speed	When we moved here 14 years ago, I wanted to takethe bus to work, but a 15 minute car drive would have taken 1.5 hours by bus--a non starter.
Location	I would like this to appeal to the masses which might not be me. I want this to reduce environmental pollution, minimize traffic, and attract people that view public transportation as an important part of economic development and their everyday lives.
Schedule	This was hard to choose - location is also super important as my work is sort of far away from other things.
Something else	All of the above. It would need to be consistent to be reliable, if it made it to a central location downtown that would be okay to walk to work, thecost would need to be not obscene but also maybe a membership program, speed doesn't hurt any either. The one not mentioned is safety and cleanliness. This can't turn into a New York subway, it needs to be something that we all can feel comfortable being around
Cost	Make it affordable and accessible to the working and poor classes or don't bother
No response	Environmentally sound
Something else	Convenience: I dislike driving, especially with busy traffic, and public transport with a good schedule is a amazing alternative
Schedule	This is critical if you're trying to use it for ajob or school.
Speed	It would need to save me both time and money. Otherwise there is no reason to use it over my personal vehicle.
Schedule	Frequent time options. Public transportation should fit the public's schedules not force the public to fit its sparse schedule (i.e. Disney's tramoptions or Portland's MAX option). Times are frequent so if a train is missed another will show up in 15ish minutes. That's worth not having to find parking or deal with traffic

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Location	This is a combo...has to go where I want to go, when I want to go. Events downtown Boise on weekends and evenings are a prime example. Serving downtown during the day doesn't help.
Schedule	It's frankly ridiculous that mass transit in Boise doesn't run til at least 2AM like it does pretty much anywhere else the size of Boise! The current mass transit hours (and its unreliability), means I will likely never use it when I can easily ride my bike to most destinations. I'd genuinely prefer that mass transit were available and I'd totally pay for an annual pass if that were the case.
No response	Density is what is killing the Treasure Valley. Building codes allow for too many homes and people in too crowded of a space. Reduce density, eliminate desire for mass transit.
Something else	All of the above would be ideal. A schedule that runs more frequently
Location	Convenience is key!
Something else	Reducing traffic and congestion for commuters and most importantly improve air quality. Air quality is a big concern for me
Location	If it can't take me where I need to go (or at least very close) I'd be less likely to use it.
Something else	People not moving to Idaho, stop the urban sprawl! Send liberals back to California, Oregon and Washington.
Something else	Reducing cars on the road, vehicle emissions
Location	Location is important also running all times of the day for late night fun or early morning mountain biking.
Something else	Convenience of not having to find & pay for parking; eliminating traffic congestion on highways; ability to visit Caldwell, Nampa, and Boise downtown destinations without needing a vehicle-- for entertainment, tourism, activities with friends & families/large groups that require multiple vehicles....this is Idaho's capitol city, these types of services are not only necessary, but expected for this type of population in the modern world. :)
Something else	I am more than happy to make detours, or do my work in transit on a longer ride. What I most care about is reducing our vehicle use. 4 cars in my house, and we can't get anywhere without them...
Something else	Environment. It would need to be a practical and environmentally-friendly alternative to personal transportation.
Speed	Saving time is key to saving money. Saying that the schedule would have to be convenient or people won't use it.
Location	This is the biggie. The reason MAX works in Portland, OR, is due to the complex network of buses at each light rail station. I can take MAX to a station and know I'll be on a bus to my destination within a few minutes. If I can't connect all the dots in a timely manner, what's the point?
Location	Location followed by schedule. Love to see early morning and late night options, as well as weekend service.
Something else	Safety! I love the idea of having this available, but I worked in downtown Phoenix literally at a light rail stop and I had frequent bad experiences with riders. Even walking across the street from my office to pick up lunch didn't feel safe. I was chased down the street, followed into stores, and yelled at by people getting off the rail. I eventually had to stop leaving the office alone because it was so unsafe. As long as there is a plan for safety at the Boise light rail, I'm happy.
Schedule	A wide range of operating hours is more useful to varied schedules and events. Major cities I have previously lived in operated from 5am to 12am - 7 days a week and extended hours for certain holidays to account for late night riders.
Schedule	I dislike driving enough that I'm willing to pay a little more to avoid that stress. The stops would have to be at times when I could use them, and location is secondary. I can find other ways of traveling short distances
Something else	Reduced stress from dealing with rush hour traffic. Reduced risk of accidents, less wear and tear on personal vehicle. Able to work on mass transit or get my day started. Service interruptions are expected infrequently, can grab a drink downtown without having to be sober to drive home. Planning around service hours is not difficult. Quick, convenient mass transit that doesn't rely on our already overtaxed roadways is a very important piece of infrastructure to me.

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Schedule	i need it to be every 15 minutes, maybe every 30 minutes. every 1 hour is horrible (depending on the transit type) For a high speed train it can be every 1 hour but for a bus it needs to be every 15 minutes.
Something else	Effect on environment compared to personal vehicleuse.
Something else	All of these would effect if/how I would use it
Something else	Reduce fossil fuel emissions.
Location	reducing fossil fuel use of private vehicles
Schedule	The schedule is most important, but speed is linked to it. I don't mind waiting a bit for transit if I'm still able to travel to my destination in a reasonable time. With the current system, taking the bus would add over two hours to my daily commute
Speed	All of these are important. Obviously a balance isbest at the beginning, but speed of total journey encompasses a bit of the other options. People always complain at first that the initial investment was a waste because it doesn't meet any of thesegoals, but over time the system expansion meets the needs of more and more people and becomes a quality service. promotion needs to be done up front to let people know what the end goal is.
Location	For me to use it personally, it would have to go to/from the right locations.
Something else	It is more about decreasing overall traffic. And if I were still working, would love it for commuting.
Something else	Structure to city planning. The current system ensures continued sprawl. Urban centers that are linked with high-speed transit provides structure andenables preservation of the in-between spaces.
Cost	If it was more convenient and cost effective thanmy car, INCLUDING the tax dollars going into it, then I'd use it.
Location	I think a system like SLC has would be ideal. Needto start now or we will be in the same problem as Nampa with no traffic corridors and there is no possibility to address the problems
Cost	It would have to save money, why else would you use something if it costs more then what already exists?
Schedule	Schedule, location, cost, and speed. I understandthat it won't be as fast (probably) as my personal vehicle, but schedules and location are the two biggest factors, and cost just needs to be less than what a personal vehicle would be for me to consider it a viable option of transportation, which with scale should be feasible.
Something else	Simply not have the stress of the daily rat race.
Location	I would accept doubling my commute time, but in myhead I think any system I would have to walk to would take more time. I cannot imagine a system could be built that would get me from where I live to work that would not cost a \$1,000,000,000.
Location	Location and frequency are crucial
No response	We dont need you stay out!
No response	All those points are important ones
Something else	We di not want a metro in Boise. Downtown is already too crowded, and it would RUIN what little beauty we have left in our city. The urban growth andpopulation growth is a detriment to our values as a family oriented city, and as the City of Trees.
Location	It needs to be near a location where I am going, but don't discount Cost, Speed and Schedule. For example, I live in the area of Chinden and Eagle Rd. If I want to go downtown, I don't want to have to go to the Mall and switch buses, which is an hour longer than if I drove. It also needs to be cost effective.
Location	Location then schedule being most important to me.Cost and speed both come in third.
Schedule	The 7 and the 5 currently run late frequently andI miss connecting down town I know that this survey is for Caldwell service ,but being timely is important for workers in any city.
Schedule	For me, the biggest difficulty with the current bussystem is i never know when a bus will show up and they dont run during the hours i need them.
Schedule	Why did we spend hundreds of thousands of dollarson creating a big new better transit system in downtown boise and now you want us to spend more of amillion dollars system which would do nothing for the community but put money into your pockets. Take this and shove it up the whazoo and get out of this state



Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Speed	I anticipate my commute time will significantly increase over the next decade. Currently, driving is 35-45 minutes. If I could take a light rail and do similar amount of time, I would. I anticipate my commute time is going to increase to over an hour if nothing other than road widening and installing lights is the only plan.
Something else	All of these are of significant importance to me. I don't want to go to a place that is far, costs more, and not at a convenient time. That is why my own car or means of transportation is important to me.
Something else	Whatever costs the taxpayers the least amount of money. My preference is if it can't pay for itself with ridership, it shouldn't be done.
Location	Walking distance of school for the kids
Something else	Avoiding traffic, parking, pollution and less stress
Location	It would also be super important for it to run longer than 8am-6pm. There should be late night maybe until 11pm or 12am routes if there were to be a downtown Boise station. Also service 7 days a week.
Something else	It would save time and money but mostly it would save me from needing a car, which is one of the most expensive aspects of my life. I want to be done with car repairs, maintenance, gas, insurance, bank payments, forever. That is worth higher taxes for a decent public transportation system and probably is much cheaper for me and the city. Also, think of all the DUI's that would be prevented!
Something else	Speed, then proximity to a destination, and finally the ability to cheaply/safely visit Idaho wineries in the Sunnyslope/Caldwell area and encourage others to do the same, while using transit to get back to our home in Boise.
Something else	Cutting down the amount of traffic on the interstate, reducing our carbon footprint.
Something else	Eliminate driving in congested traffic
Something else	If it were a privately funded, for profit business, I might possibly use it because then there would be a profit motive to make it useful. Publicly funded mass transit just becomes a way for politicians to take money from the public and move it to labor unions and companies that lobby them for the transit largesse
Something else	This sounds like the same thing the government tried in CA, wasted millions upon millions of dollars and nothing was brought to fruition.
Location	Our cities here aren't really "walkable" to the point where everything is convenient once you'd get off a train... I guess that could change in 20 years but right now I don't see this as convenient for most of my current destinations
Something else	I see absolutely no advantage to mass transit.
Something else	All of the criteria would need to be met. I can go directly to my destination by bicycle or on foot faster and at more convenient times than I could travel using the current bus or vanpool systems. A new transit system would need to take me where I need to go when I want to go with reasonable speed and cost. I have used good transit systems in Seattle, Portland, California, Boston, and worldwide. They can be designed to be convenient and efficient.
Location	I would only use it if it went to places I frequented that made my trip more convenient
No response	We're not California, we don't need this, and we don't have the funds. Increase wages, lower property taxes, and help the homeless before it gets worse.
Something else	Environmentally friendly. Less congestion, less farmland turned into roads.
Something else	All of the above? In order of importance I guess I would list it as: 1 - Location (but only because if I have to walk to my destination after I get off my stop, this could take a lot of time) 2 - Schedule (It doesn't matter how fast it is or how far it is, if it doesn't go where I need to go when I need to be there, I'm not using it) 3 - Cost and speed are tied (if it costs too much or takes too long, use will drop. Both of these are limiting factors)
Speed	All of these reasons are valid I would choose them all, but I could only choose one.
Location	Most importantly, it's got to go where we are going... and have the means to support easy walking or riding when we arrive. The schedule is also important, but not as important as location. Cost should be reasonable on a per ride basis and there should be additional options such as a weekly, monthly, annual pass, etc. Speed needs to be part of the feature that drives people to come... if I can get there in a fraction of the time of my drive, I will definitely do it!

Survey Response	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Preferences: What's most important to you?</h2> <h3 style="text-align: center;">Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</h3> <p style="text-align: center; font-size: small;">(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</p>
Schedule	The bus system is horrid. People don't work in such strict hours, and I don't hang out with friends when they are at work. Trains till 9 on weeknights and 2 am on weekends. Even if they only come once an hour, it is still a great option.
Location	I would want to take advantage to avoid terrible rush hour traffic
Schedule	I need transit to be on time. The current bus system is very bad about this. Buses show up early and late all the time, which is why I don't use it.
Something else	NO RAIL SYSTEM!
Schedule	Location also important
Something else	Saving time during rush hour, the eco-friendly nature of public transit, and the fact that public transit is safer than driving. My husband and I only have one car. Prior to COVID he would take the bus to work most days and I would ride my bike to work. We are already committed to public transit. Now as a full-time student attending ISU meridian I am forced to drive due to the lack of bus routes to the campus & a long, un-cyclist friendly route.
Something else	There is currently no inexpensive ground/local transport once you get to a stop. The bus system is horrible and most cannot afford ride share
Location	And it would need to have a reliable schedule. Mass transit does me no good if I cannot reliably reach my destinations in a timely manner
Something else	All of these
Schedule	It is important that I can get where I need to go once I'm in Boise. If I take a train to Boise but can't get a bus from the train to a business I won't use it. It needs to not take all day to get to a single destination when you factor in transfers.
Something else	I will not use any form of high capacity transit and oppose any such consideration.
Schedule	Having a transit system that runs early enough/late enough for me to get to and from work.
Something else	Schedule needs to go later into the evening. Current transport is very challenging when commuting outside of "standard" work hours. I'd prefer rapid transit to transport a large amount of people with multiple stops in conjunction with the existing bus system.
Something else	The cost to taxpayers to subsidize it
Something else	Don't build it, period
No response	Less spending by tax payers, I've seen it be a complete failure in California and especially Seattle.
Something else	Mass transit would make the roads less congested for my personal vehicles. That's why I'm for it. The near future needs HOV lanes on the freeway.
Schedule	I've been stranded due to public transit, I would NEVER EVER, trust anything ran by the government.
Location	2. Schedule 3. Speed 4. Cost (as long as it offsets fuel cost)
Cost	Always the cost of a ticket. I have seen an outrageous price for a public transit system that it's cheaper to own own a \$20,000 vehicle than to buy for a all day pass. Especially when the day is perfect yet there is the stuck in traffic and roadrage people
Something else	Stress. I can work on or think about other things, or even just take a few minutes to relax on public transit.
Schedule	These are all good considerations, but if the transit doesn't run when I need it (or if it's late and I have to wait around, or if I barely miss it and the next run isn't for two hours, etc.) there's no point.
Something else	I've been here for 22 years and the treasure valley traffic is consistently getting worse. Environmental concern makes single-occupant vehicular use a dreadful excuse for a transportation system. It's unhealthy, a waste of space, a waste of resources, and a waste of time for everyone involved. We need mass-transit by any means necessary
No response	You would definitely need a plan for parking for mass transit. Most people would not live near it they would need some kind of transportation to get to it.
Schedule	schedule and location first, then money.
Something else	I would imagine an important aspect to alternative transit is to have ample parking at all stops. This way folks can drive/bike/walk to their stop which I would think would increase participation. It needs to be affordable and time efficient.
Schedule	I work regular hours (M-F 8-5), but my partner works a night shift. Parking is costly for work, and transit would be preferred.

Survey Response	<b>Preferences: What's most important to you?</b> <b>Which is most important to you in a choice about high-capacity transit?</b> <small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)</small>
Schedule	I'd say a mix...easy accesibility would be nice but I don't mind a bit of travel to use a system that helps cut a big number of cars off the road, even if it's not the fastest. I think a rail system like in Portland or Salt Lake is plenty fast.
Speed	It is so important to me that we get ahead of the traffic coming to the valley as soon as possible so that we don't have the traffic jams on our streets like other larger cities like Seattle and LA.
Cost	A close second is schedule. Sometimes I cannot use the bus because there is no service when I need it after class.
Something else	Environmental impact for commuters coming into the city
Schedule	Living in the Foothills, there's no alternative to a personal vehicle for those who don't ride bikes and can't/don't want to walk. We rent to CWI students who might use a bus to get to class. They also work part-time, but the hours they work are too late for the current bus service schedule. I put their destinations in as well as mine. They are Iraqi refugee brothers and share a car.
Schedule	Location and schedule go hand-in-hand for me.
Cost	I'd like to save money by being green
No response	That my taxes aren't impacted by this and a stop isn't in front of my house
Something else	Decompression time at the end of the day, social/networking opportunities

# Preferences: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

Our current bus system is unreliable and either arrives too early at a store or arrives late. There is not a good app for tracking the bus, too, as it is unreliable when you see a bus moving across a map in "real time" only to find the bus has already gone by a stop. VRT needs to improve his app to display more timely information so it is reliable. And we certainly need better bus shelters that are exposed to all the elements and sprinklers.

I need to be able to walk to the bus/railstop at any time in the day and not have to wait more than 10-15 minutes. Regular schedule is key (i.e. a bus needs to arrive every 10 minutes).

I would drive to a "park and ride" type area such as the mall (needs to be well lighted during nighttime hours). I would take this option so that I could go to sporting events or concerts or things that are taking place in Boise where a lot of people will be there and it isn't convenient to drive.

would also be willing to drive a shorter distance to get to transit stop than to drive all the way to my destination

I use to work at Downtown Salem, OR they wanted employees to use public transit and made parking very expensive for employees. We got off work at 9pm and they stopped public transit at 6pm. That makes no sense what so ever. If you want employees to use it, it must be available.

Uber or Lyft or personal car

Light rail is basically a boondoggle in Portland and Salt Lake. It would have to be privately funded and self supporting.

No rail. Not enough density to support. Lots of problems. High cost.

So long as there was a parking option, I would drive to use it. Traffic from Meridian to Boise and Eagle to Boise has become onerous. I would gladly drive to a central location and take transit

I selected something else because I would prefer speed if there was an opportunity for me to use my bicycle to/from each stop but I would also like to have a consistent schedule (i.e., I can count on it being there at a specific time, so I don't have to be at the mercy of an inconsistent schedule for work)

I know the walking distance in most studies is pretty short. We live in Caldwell about 2 miles (I think) from the freeway. Except for the hill, I could see biking, or maybe driving in cold weather.

To me, it is critical that frequency of trips be favorable to a schedule, the bussing problems in Boise currently stem from lack of frequency so that you can go to a major stop and know you will catch a ride without too much delay. That in turn boosts ridership, which in turn improves all the other variables listed. Bussing ridership will also increase exponentially once mass transit is in place, as major arterial mass transit lends itself to bus transit adjacent to major arteries.

Schedule runs a close second to location.

High speed transit from airport to downtown, caldwell nampa area.

Convenience. I regularly travel to SF and walk (cars are nearly impossible downtown) but whenever a cable car goes by, I jump on. It is so easy to get where you want to go!

Saving money for trips to downtown plus parking would be paramount. But it would be pointless if I have to walk a mile to get to my destination. My health couldn't handle that and the drive would be easier and faster. Going to BSU games, concerts, downtown shopping, downtown restaurants, shows, etc would be fantastic, but only if I can reach them.

I do not want any transit of any type in Ada County.

Most important: that it gets planned, designed, and built as quickly as possible!

Many of the places I go are close that I could even walk to them. I don't want to walk to a stop which might be half way in between. Doesn't make sense.

It's hard to answer this question without knowing where the stops would be.

current bus route options stop service so early in the evening/weekend that it cannot be used for an evening out

I work for the International Rescue Committee. Our refugee clients cannot be housed in Nampa or Caldwell currently because there is no public transportation to get them to our office in Boise. This kind of transit system would be incredibly helpful for this vulnerable portion of the population.

This is an absolute farce that will cost more and fall short of its goal while providing an opportunity for unbridled and never-ending government spending and cronyism.

I would choose multiple options on most of these questions, but most importantly the last one. I think both schedule and location are of equal (top) importance to me.

Distance isn't as important as the time it would take to get to the transit stop, or the time (and frustration) it might save on the subsequent transit ride.

IF IT WENT BETWEEN DOWNTOWN AND A THEATER COMPLEX OR A MALL, I WOULD USE IT. FROM DOWNTOWN AREA TO THE AIRPORT I WOULD USE IT FOR TRIPS. DOWNTOWN IS A SHORT WALK FROM MY HOME.

## Preferences: General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

I go now in my personal car because it isa Covid precaution, but I used to take the bus. It oculd be very slow, but was reliable. I loved it.I would love to see more options like the 9 and 9x I believe it was, where there was a faster bus that had fewer stops, as well as the normal bus. As far as a hike to the bus, I used to wak around amile to get there, or bike. The most important aspect or me, is the impact on the air quality in ourcommunity, and the earth. We need to think ahead.

Lots of golf courses throughout the valley.

Lochsa Falls. The original platting set aside the area adjacent to Chinden for a transit station but YOU DID NOT WANT IT, so it is now developed. How long are we going to throw away opportunities? Partner with a bike share service and morepeople would be able to reach the bus.

I hate driving on the highway -- I find itterrifying -- and usually use the side roads. It would be far less stressful to ride high capacitytransit and get my "homework" done during my commute.

I would use it for shopping and social events and nights out. What's most important is "C" all of the above.

I would use transit to access downtown Boise for events if late, 11 pm, bus option.

AND the Airport!

If we want to cut down on traffic + pollution, access to important/highly frequented places needs to be easy to get to. Hospital/doctor's offices, complexes, malls, rec centers + places of recreation for kids. Having plenty of room on a bus or train for bikes is important too.

1/2 mile is okay, 1 mile gets to be long. Summer brings biking, and that is fine for 5-- 10 miles.

# Wrap-Up General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

Accessibility is a HUGE bonus to public transport. While a wheelchair user may or may not be able to drive, they can almost all use public transport. The lack of public transportation in the TV is very limiting for those who cannot drive. Myson will be going to BSU and uses a wheelchair. He would use a train daily. We would also use it every time we go into Boise just to have lunch or shop.

By the time a high capacity system is in place, we'll be retired, and hopefully still alive, so I would imagine we would use it regularly rather than drive ourselves everywhere.

In my opinion, a rapid transit system must be a complete system from the beginning otherwise people will not use it. It is just goes from Caldwell to downtown Boise and there is no easy connection to other places in Boise - people won't use it. If it only stops at one place every hour - people won't use it. It must be time efficient and provide easy access to many places that people want to go (hospital, shopping, entertainment, eating) as well not just during rush hour times for work.

Not much was asked about costs. I DO NOT nor will I EVER support local option taxation to expand transit. It must be paid for directly by the people that use it. No additional tax increases should be used for this. Ever. I'm already taxed beyond reasonable levels. Do not make it worse by increasing them even further.

This video has inspired me, a libertarian conservative, to be accepting of a light rail (bus) system in Ada County: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=fh11aVmu3Y8>

I am legally blind and unable to drive. Any and all public transportation is greatly helpful and appreciated by my family and me.

Survey is too limiting as to answers. Should be able to make multiple choices. Could use transit for many uses not just one.

I'd love a faster way to work. A parking garage near major stops would make it easy to use

Bias and fake. Where do I click if I want the mayor recalled with her socialist ideology?

I lived in Portland as the bus system and then light rail were introduced. The bus system worked, and I used it regularly. Light rail broke the bus system completely, and I stopped using mass transit altogether - the schedule, transfers, overloaded rush hour trains, etc, made the system unusable for me. Also, while Portland is held up as a model, it is hugely expensive and doesn't come close to paying for itself. This will create an expensive bureaucracy that this area can't afford.

I would like to see mass transit from the OR/ID border into Boise. I would definitely use it as I like to go into Boise. Destinations of choice (for me)...MarketPlace in Eagle, Karcher Mall, Boise Mall and Downtown Boise.

Please take a look at Rail Runner in New Mexico as a model. I lived there when they rolled it out. Immediately after it opened it was full! I loved it. Also, they have two trains running simultaneously, a rapid one and a second one with more stops. So you don't need to choose between the two.

This is a very well done survey....the format is user friendly.....Thank you. Also thank you for asking citizen input. So many positive possibilities and community unity.

It seems unlikely that a high speed or any public transit would be built that would be convenient for my personal use. If it was built to access destinations I use, and was convenient, I would preferentially choose it. However, I support a high quality transit system that would meet the needs of others as it would indirectly benefit all by reducing traffic and parking, and improve air quality. I support reduced parking and increased costs for parking, we need to stop subsidizing personal cars.

I would likely use it very rarely but would support it for the traffic easement that it would produce. THAT I would appreciate. It's gotten to where I hate to go to Ada County and even eastern Canyon County because the traffic is ridiculous. It will get a little better once the Garrity bottle neck and the corresponding I-84 widening are done but Garrity traffic and Marketplace traffic are bad and, hopefully, having rush hour mass transit options would help alleviate that congestion.

It would increase the population of this area. I prefer country not city. Just look at high speed rail in California. Money wasted, more homeless. Bad for farmers.

I really think a Gondola/Aerial cable should be considered. The manufactures have many options Funitel, 3s, etc. Much cheaper than light rail, a cabin comes every 15 seconds so service is constant, goes over obstacles like traffic, snow, rivers. Durable enough for mountain ski resorts. Past examples in the US have only failed cause they are short and scenic and don't serve the population, but South America shows it can be great for transit

Our community would benefit so much from high capacity transit!

It would be wise to study Denver's light rail system. When I grew up there, only city buses were available for mass transit. Denver-ites said that light rail wasn't needed. But once it was built, people started using it. On my last visit to Denver, I rode the light rail all over town.

I moved here from Seattle. Investing in a light rail is the best decision for treasure valley. Alleviating traffic on I-84 and State street will become increasingly important quickly as this valley booms in development. I spent 15 years commuting via express bus for 25 miles each way and then I drove another 5 miles home. I was so excited to FINALLY have a light rail being built out where I lived. Don't make the same mistake Seattle did by not investing in the future!!

There used to be a company in Boise that built locomotives for mass transit systems. Too bad this did not come to fruition before they closed production in Boise. I am one of the few people still employed at MotivePower (Engineering). Yes, I would be interested in being involved in determining routes, capital equipment, engineering, etc.

# Wrap-Up General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

Please put in a high speed train and traxsystem like Salt Lake City. Especially for commuting between Boise and Caldwell and between Boise and meridian and between Boise and eagle. It would also be fantastic to have a tracks system in the downtown corridor of boise and one that runs throughout Meridian. Think ahead and plan ahead. Don't wait until it is too late.

So you know I am super white and have zerowhite guilt. Also we DO NOT need this Idaho is wonderful don't screw it up Since I live in Boise close to my work mybenefit from a mass transit between Caldwell and Boise would be secondary in that i would benefit from reduced traffic congestion throughout the Treasure Valley. I fully support it.

I think the biggest bang for our buck willbe connecting the airport, downtown, and the BSU campus. Once COVID is in our past, that corridorwill enable Boise to host large events that bring people in from out-of-state. It's a smaller stepthat would allow us to shake the bugs out of the transit system, prove its value to the public, andgenerate revenue that could be used to expand the system to commuters across the valley.

Light rail and different commuter optionshave been talked about and public money spent for surveys for 20+ years. What makes this survey anydifferent. I don't believe the valley will support a transportation option such as this. We're too independent and family oriented that this travel option will not accommodate enough people or have enough ridership to be viable. If land will be necessary for this to work, it should be purchased nowor none will be available in 20 years.

While I would only use the service a couple of times each month, my older teen daughters would find freedom and enjoyment they wouldn't otherwise. Together we would use it about once a week, I think. I think this would also draw more jobs and people to the area as we continue to keep up with the population surge. It would make travel and congestion much more efficient. I LOVED the system in UT and would consider moving there just for theconvenience!

Building a mass-transit commuter train isa terrible idea. I lived in a suburb of Portland before and after they built the MAX. It was NOT self-sustainable. It cost home-owners and business owners millions. It took space away from widening freeways. It mobilized criminals to outlying areas. It enclosed people with violent criminals who tookadvantage of the lack of safety. Creating government jobs does not help the economy, it hurts it. Please do not ruin our beloved valley by building a train!!

These systems are never financially sufficient and require public funds to support them. We have elderly people who are already losing theirhomes due to high property taxes. Funding a boondoggle like this will only hurt the long term publicfinances.

Though optional, your income and race/ethnicity question are offensive. Quality of life, access, affordability and clean air are issues for all incomes and races/ethnicity. When will government and political organizations move past supporting/attacking the merits of community issues based on social studies based upon income/race? When it comes to community supportive decisions like thoughtful transportation for all, does my opinion matter more or less if I am low/high income, White or Hispanic?

Living in Portland for 8 years and havingtraveled to other large cities I have a lot of input in a mass transit system. In downtown Portlanda portion of the areas mass transit system was "free." This lead to homeless people heating up onthe busses and light rail system. It was dirty, smelly, and sometimes very scary to be on there. Thestations attacked people aiming to destroy our beautiful valley with trash, graffiti, homelessnessand other crime.

I do not believe that "Light Rail" willbe efficient in the Treasure Valley. It will provide limited service and be very expensive. Buses are much for efficient and flexible as a transit option, and will cost less. Believe me, I've witnessed Light Rail inefficiency in other locals.

The questions seem to be aimed at buildinga limited system that will not serve everyone and thus fail. I would definitely like to see a lightrail system serve commuters between Boise, Meridian, Nampa, and Caldwell, with connections to Kuna,Star, Middleton, Eagle, Payette, Weiser, etc. We also need convenient access to a light rail systemvia frequent widespread local bus/van service, park & ride lots, bike lanes, pedestrian walkways, greenways, etc.

This is an absolute farce that will cost more and fall short of its goal while providing an opportunity for unbridled and never-ending government spending and cronyism.

This is a horrible idea. Please, PLEASE don't waste Meridian's money building rail lines or implementing additional Bus companies. I believe that the only folks who have even suggested this are transplants from other states and politicians. Actual valley residents are not interested in this topic or the massive public investment needed to facilitate it.

The algorithms your agency has used is waybehind even for the highways if this is to be done it needs to be built to handle growth for 50 years from now and have lots of options to expand and add routes/lines.

Please bring us out o the DARK AGES!!

I personally would only use a light rail train to visit my family from Boise to Nampa. One limitation with the bus is that it does not run onthe weekends so I basically get stuck for the whole weekend. But not thinking of myself I think itis essential to get as many personal vehicles off of the highway and streets as possible. It's a no-brainer as this region grows.

Idaho HAS to get away from funding transportation with the fuel taxes. The Katy Freeway is proof you cannot build your way out of congestion and no one will stop driving until the transit system is AWESOME first. Then they will want to use it. And, the only cities that were successful at getting rid of cars imposed a congestion tax... It has to happen.

# Wrap-Up General Comments

(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected.)

If transportation is processed like this survey...it will fail. Whoever designed this site should be fired!!!!!!Terrible.

Rail system would be more efficient but harder to plan. It would need to connect to cities (Caldwell, Nampa, Meridian, Middleton, Star, Eagle, Garden City, and Boise) to predominate entertainment locations, job sites and airport via north-south and east-west routes with options for expansion as the valley grows. If missing either north-south or east-west systems, it'll be useless.

I don't think it would work in our area. Not enough people want to give up the freedom of driving when and where you want to go. I don't think enough people would use it

One aspect you didn't ask about, but which I think is worth considering: whether routes should be the same streets outbound as they are inbound. One example to consider: whether 6 should go up and back on Curtis between Cassia and Overland. Another, similar question: whether 29 should run overland both ways. Could it conceivably use Kootenai one direction? Similarly, another consideration should be where/when routes cross. Can 29 switch with 4 or 6 where they cross w/o 30 min wait?



## Comments Received via Email

I have completed the survey regarding light rail from Caldwell to Boise. This is an activity that should have been planned and built twenty-thirty years ago when the rail line became available and the cost would have been much less than today's excessive cost. The primary reason for this email is to communicate one question that was not asked in the survey. How to pay for the light rail project? The project should NOT be paid by any subsidy from cities, counties or the State of Idaho. Our current bus service/system is a very inefficient utilization of city, county and state funds. I suggest a for-profit company build and own the project. For-profit businesses will build and operate a cost-effective transportation system. Thank you and Peace, David E. Palumbo 83709

Hello: I neglected to include a statement in the survey that I presented regarding the inclusion of a stop at the Boise Airport. In my view, without a mass transit stop at the airport, the Treasure Valley will be severely handicapping its growth and transit opportunities. Thank you. Sincerely, Charles L. Honsinger 83701

Regarding the survey mentioned in the most recent newsletter in our utility bill. My comment is that no matter how much you wish for something it doesn't make it so. I have lived in both Seattle and Portland and have noticed that the trains or trams are mostly empty most of the time. It is a waste of tax dollars which could be more usefully spent on buses (routes can easily be changed to accommodate changes in needs and populations) and more roads and traffic lanes. Most people need and prefer to have their own cars because they have different errands before and after work. Also, the "greenest" thing that could be done with our tax dollars is to build nuclear plants for electricity.

Have you and your colleagues actually asked the people of Idaho if they want a transit system? Do any of you know how this is going to be funded? Are the people of Idaho willing to have their taxes increased to pay for it? I think not! I answered the survey sent out recently on this topic. The questions were misleading at best, as if the decision to construct a railway system had already been decided. Your survey made no mention of how this would or could be funded. In fact, there was no information about cost, whether or not a need had been established or if Idahoans requested it. My husband and I have absolutely NO use for a transit system. We DO NOT want one constructed, as the cost is endless for ongoing construction, jobs and job training and maintenance. There is NO need for this expensive, disruptive system but the one you and your colleagues have manufactured! This MUST be vetted by the people of Idaho before any more closed-door planning discussions take place or any costs are incurred toward creating engineering plans. Peggy and Hal Nickle Ada County

*Reply: No decisions have been made regarding a future potential high-capacity transit system. This survey is one of three to gather public input to feed into an update to the region's long-range transportation plan, looking to the year 2050. Results of the first two surveys indicated that there was some public interest in high-capacity transit, so this third survey is exploring that further to help us understand public opinions, preferences, and needs. Any decisions made regarding building or funding a high-capacity transit system will include significant opportunities for public involvement.*

Some of us believe that you must crawl before you can walk ... and that you must walk before you can run. Unlike major cities in Oregon, Idaho's Treasure Valley currently lacks even a comprehensive and adequately-funded bus system. Light-rail and interurban rail are non-existent here. Much of our region's transit incapacity stems from our state government's antagonism toward local option sales taxes that could be used to support transit, and the minimalist, "tin cup" approach to bus system funding that relies on daily cashbox fares and voluntary grants from cities. Is making the leap from virtually no transit to high-capacity rail transit -- a "giant step" from "A" to "Z" -- too big a leap for an area like the Treasure Valley? Would a less ambitious, but likely more achievable, goal of, say, aspiring to have the best municipal bus system in the Northwest -- a realistic baby step from "A" to "B" -- be a more prudent objective for an area, given our political realities and resistance to governmental initiative? Doesn't transportation capability grow organically, in phased stages, rather than in leaps, especially in areas like Idaho, where we haven't fostered a culture of public transit? This is a lengthy way of asking: before we get people into glitzy, high-capacity transit, shouldn't we first be getting them into un-sexy, less glamorous buses? David Klinger Boise, Idaho

*Reply: You are correct. We do need a robust bus system before a high-capacity transit system is built. It takes 20+ years to plan, fund, design, and build a high-capacity transit system, so that work needs to occur at the same time as the bus system is expanded. This survey is one early step in what will be a very long planning process. As you note, transit grows in planned stages. Valley Regional Transit, the Treasure Valley's transit authority, has a plan in place, ValleyConnect2.0, that outlines its plans for both intermediate and longer-term expansion of the bus system. In addition, the current long-range transportation plan, which plans to the year 2040, builds off of Valley Regional Transit's plans to take them one step further. A high-capacity transit system, such as addressed in the survey, is a step beyond that; it will feed into the regional long-range transportation plan for the year 2050. All of those plans, in addition to securing a dedicated funding source, and many other things, will all need to come to fruition before high-capacity transit can become a reality.*

Not interested in ANY transit system in Ada County.....NONE!!

## Comments Received via Email

I got a great chuckle out of this one. The region's highway agencies and cities never think about--must less build--the least expensive option when they widen/add highways. But we must debate that as a "tradeoff" for transit? That's the double standard that we think about when the region attempts to debate this or when we hear claims from ITD or ACHD that they don't have enough funding to meet their "needs."

The survey seems to indicate that this is already a done deal. I know it is 20+ years in the future, but I sure hope that the whole idea is reconsidered before that time. We have lived in both Seattle and Portland and we consider mass transit, other than adding a few more busses and bus lines very misspent tax money. We have observed that the trains or trams are mostly empty except for a few homeless. Cars, busses and more roads and traffic lanes are what is needed. It appears that Meridian is doing just that right now. Keep it up around Treasure Valley.

just build a new freeway from micron to caldwell, bypassing the metro area #greatidea☺

Excellent presentation by Bob Post yesterday. Am sure the \$2 billion cost for the light rail will be cause for concern among many It seems to me the most practical option is BRT traveling on our existing streets. With pull outs for loading/unloading, but NO dedicated lanes. State St, Fairview, & Franklin would seem to be good candidates That's my 2 cents worth, and it's worth every penny! ☺ Mac McOmber

The survey on the train proposal from caldwell to Boise is open now. Its set up is manipulative because basically it says you are doing it so you are surveyed on how you will use it. Its only at the end of the survey and the person info section that you can express that you don't want it and won't use it. So you have set this up to try and get stats that back up what you have decided to do already. That is wrong. This should be on a ballot.

After filling out the COMPASS Survey I came to a realization. Mass transit in the Treasure Valley is going to need a cultural shift. I grew up in an area that had mass transitb availability. 24 hours a day. Budget and profit losses led to a decline in availability. The idea of riding the bue, train or walking was inbred. Here the reliance on cars and Freedom. will be a tough nut to crack. The vast spread of the valley, combined with bedroom communities and job locations make this difficult. Even today I have no idea about bue routes or cost. City layouts may also be a problem. Distance between major arteries. Thank you for your time. Joseph J Pukstas

I'm a true native of Boise. Except for the time in the military and the 40+ years in the Seattle area. Retired and moved back to Boise. I see the same thing happening here in Treasure Valley that happened in Seattle=Tacoma region. They played the waiting game to implement mass or public transit. It took 6 to 8 years after implementing it for the public to really start using it. When it started the morning and evening train had about 3 cars, and when I left the area there were about 7 to 8 cars. If you foresee the need, you should start now, acquiring the land for stops, arranging the stops in Boise. When we arrived at our stop there would be transit busses to take us to our destination. I would suggest the Depot in Boise as a Boise arrival station, with multiple transit busses waiting to take passengers to there final destination. I think you guys are headed in the right direction on this, but waiting to start it I field would only make it more difficult to achieve what You are hoping for. The first month +/- the rides were no charge to users. The first morning train was at 5:30 AM and the last was about 9:00 AM and they run every 30 to 35 minutes. The evening train started about 3:40 PM and the last was about 5:45 PM, running every 35 to 45 minutes. There were special trains on weekends for the Seahawks or Mariners. In our case maybe for the Broncos. I used the train daily, driving would be 45 min to as long as 2 hours. The train was 20 minutes, to the station and another 15 to 20 minutes to my work via Link Rail or transit bus. I enjoyed riding the train, sipping on coffee, reading the newspaper, conversing with others, and above all not exhausted from driving in the traffic mess that Seattle has. Hope this will help you to get an idea from a frequent user while in the Seattle-Tacoma area. B. Marks

It really seems as though the COMPASS surveys are designed to support a pre-determined solution to a particular problem we face in the Treasure Valley. One of the major underlying assumptions is that the Treasure Valley population is going to continue to grow rapidly. That may happen if government bodies don't do something to slow it down or reverse it. In my opinion there are many more significant things we should be doing instead of building more roads, freeways, transit system, houses, apartment, etc. We need to think about protecting the surviving undeveloped land. If we don't do that then we'll just have the same degraded place to live that the people of Silicon Valley (Santa Clara County, CA) have. There's that old movie slogan: "If you build it, they will come." Look around at all the stuff that's been built and ask "Did people come?" Bill Junk

I believe that the Treasure Valley needs high speed rail from Caldwell to Mountain Home. To make this work there needs to be a public transportation system in Boise, Caldwell & Mountain Home to take passengers from the rail station close to their end destinations. This would take pressure off of our roadways & the continuous need to widen them for more automobile traffic. Thank you, Arlynn Hacker Nampa

I feel the survey offered on your website left nothing for those opposed to such transit to voice their opinions. I highly oppose high capacity transit in this valley. I grew up in the Portland area and have seen first hand what this type of transportation does to a community. I understand the need some have to get from place to place, but what I have experienced is individuals using these modes of transportation (light rail specifically) for free rides, a place to sleep, Etc. All my experience has taught me is that these types of transit options more easily bring crime and are aesthetically unappealing. This valley needs to stay special, not end up looking like Portland or Salt Lake. I DO NOT want my tax dollars wasted on such a project.

## Comments Received via Email

I have some experience with Lite Rail and would like to help Ada and Canyon counties develop a user-friendly High Capacity Transit (HCT) system. I have lived in Boise since 2006, but prior to that I lived in Sacramento and used their lite rail system. In doing so, I developed some ideas how to make the system work for me. I have also navigated the HCT systems of Portland, Salt Lake City, San Diego, Washington D C, and Paris. When the Sacramento Lite Rail system was first made available, it had one medium-sized section of track that would be the equivalent of Cole Road to Downtown Boise via Franklin Road. Much of that line ran alongside existing railroad track. Key to the success of Sacramento's system were the large parking lots at remote stops where people could leave their cars. A train of 3-4 Lite Rail cars carried people to the downtown area. Over a period of time that line was extended to the equivalent of Eagle Road to Downtown Boise, Meridian Road to Downtown Boise and ultimately Ten Mile Road to Downtown Boise. (Ultimately it went to the City of Folsom—Think Nampa and Caldwell). Each of these major stops had ample parking lots to allow people to park and ride. The ample parking lots would do a lot to alleviate the parking problem in downtown Boise. Meanwhile, another line was being built (in sections) which would be equivalent to Caldwell to Downtown Boise via Chinden. This line would also serve the residents of Eagle, Star, and Middleton, as people drove to the Transit stops and parked, or took a connecting bus to the Lite Rail station. As the line is built out, it is important to constantly re-evaluate and change bus routes to allow people to get to the Lite Rail stations. Buses will need to run North/South if the Lite Rail is only going East/West, and connect to every Lite Rail station. And bus/ Lite Rail stops should have shelters to protect people from the rain and snow while they wait. Speaking of parking lots at remote Lite Rail Stations, once the location of the line is identified, a moratorium should be placed on homebuilding along the proposed Lite Rail line. Then adjacent land should be purchased for parking lots to ensure adequate parking for transit riders. One acre of land could hold one hundred parked cars without the need of a parking structure. And it would provide a nice buffer between the Lite Rail and homes. I believe that one of the most critical components of an HCT system is the convenience of the user. Planners must ask themselves "How would a person in a wheelchair or someone with a suitcase navigate this system?" When you ask this question, you realize you must minimize the number of transfers and ensure that every facet of the system has wide doors and low -threshold (roll-in) entryways. And we must ask ourselves "How might a person who has no car get to work, school, or job training?" and be sure our routes serve business schools, beauty schools, and retail outlets. Also, we need to ask "How will someone with a suitcase get to and from the airport?" Here's another thought: In 5 years, when driverless cars are common, will our central transit hub be adequate and user friendly for those arriving by driverless cars from the airport? And what kind of accommodations can we offer people who are waiting for their connecting transportation? Hopefully seating and restrooms at a minimum. I would be happy to work with a committee that is involved in planning and/or rolling out the High Capacity Transit system. I can be reached at XXX-XXX-XXXX. Sincerely, (Ms.) Bene' Paul

I am in favor of a combination system using light rail and buses. Cost is something to be considered but failing to act now will only make it more costly in the future. We rode mass transit in Washington DC and Boston from Cape Cod. I liked bus in Aus