

Where do we grow from here?

Public Survey (June 1 – July 11, 2020)

Open-Ended Comments

Thank you to all commenters.

All open-ended comments will be used to inform the goals, objectives, and implementation policies for Communities in Motion 2050, shape the Communities in Motion 2050 Vision, and be provided to the COMPASS Board of Directors.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	Comment <small>(The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)</small>
Values Rank Your Top 5 Values In Order of Importance Lower number = higher rank; NA = did not rank in top 5	
Value: Effective Transportation	
5	It's important to me to preserve what is great about Idaho. Rural areas are becoming overrun with housing developments that the transportation system cannot support. Farms are becoming subdivisions. There are no really good transit type options so more cars are on the road than ever before.
1	Surely we can do better than to continue re-paving roads into huge highways instead of finally accepting good public transportation.
1	If disney can build a monorail system in 1956 why don't we build a system for the treasure valley in 2020? If we build it ridership will be there to fill the seats.
NA	I had lived in several out of state cities, this is the worst transaction issues I had seen. Canyon I don't see busses as much, people complain that they can't visit people in hospitals, assistant living , and they can't go to lakes, malls, downtown Boise, and even movie theaters
NA	Without planning for effective transportation we would become just another ant hill.
1	This category seems to get ignored until needed. This needs to be a proactive part of growth. Expansion of lanes for traffic needs to happen before the growth hits for effective traffic controls for all.
4	Increase speeds on roads, more arterials, move traffic. Let the public choose our safety parameters not engineers!!
NA	We already have choice in transportation ... the fact is most people do not want to be paying for mass transit that few use.
2	THIS...we really need dedicated rapid line transit
1	Effective transportation is a vision, implementation in an complicated and not done in a vacuum. Options for safe and efficient transportation are important and integral to quality of life as well as economic well being.
4	There is no Master planning, with developers having free reign. P & Z commissions are almost a farce with developers ALWAYS winning. Transportation issues are caused by dense housing. Enough triple level apartments!
5	Higher population means less safe and efficient transportation. Keeping the population low will help to keep us safe.
2	I think there should be intercepting transit hubs.
4	Would love to see a railway or something to that effect from canyon county to ada county. I think this would create so many opportunities for both canyon and ada counties.
3	Our lack of mass transit, light rail, and sufficient travel corridors is tragic. Free right hand turns and round-abouts will not solve the congestion problems. Think out of the box! Be progressive!! The urban sprawl will only get worse and we need solutions to REDUCE traffic on our road systems!
3	More road development to support the incoming population is essential.
NA	Keep area small and rural. Public transportation does not fit here.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
NA	The "flying wye" only has two lanes of traffic from downtown Boise to I-84 west. It should be at LEAST 3 merge lanes, probably 4.
4	The road should safely handle the traffic flow and allow people entrance and exit to destinations. Being able to live close to ones work and acquire essential services near your home should also help.
4	light rail lines to Boise from Caldwell
NA	Need good roads, sidewalks and bike lanes. NO public subsidy for transit.
4	Often times the full impact of development and the surrounding impact to multiple neighborhoods and streets are NOT taken into consideration when feasibility is determined. We moved outside of Boise because we appreciate the small town less congested life. This is not being used as a factor in helping to mitigate congestion and noise.
5	I suggest incentives for creative workweeks to reduce traffic. 1. People working more at home Perhaps 3 days at home 2 days in the office or any variation on that theme. 2. Staggered schedules Start work in 30 minutes intervals between 6:30-10:30. End work in a similar fashion. 3. Don't build more roads: Use technology to its best and work from home.
1	I think ACHD can easily and inexpensively re-stripe lanes to keep traffic flowing. For example, at Eagle Rd and Chinden, if the left turn lanes on Eagle to head east on Chinden were lengthened it would allow for more cars to stack in the turn lanes and allow traffic to flow more smooth. I have many more suggestions of similar intersections so please ask if you are interested. [Email address provided; removed here for privacy]
5	Since you seem opposed to ever creating a N-S expressway, then please create a good public transit.
NA	Good roads are the first priority. Any public transportation must be cost effective NA including the cost of onboard security. A tax of hundreds of dollars per year on those who do not use it, and get little benefit from it, is not acceptable.
NA	Good roads are the first priority. Any public transportation must be cost effective NA including the cost of onboard security. There must be a method of preventing people from getting on without paying, otherwise it is no better than the Portland MAX, which shuttles freeloaders with their open cans of beer around. A tax of a hundred dollars per year on those who do not use it is not acceptable. Yes they get little bit of positive benefit from it and the pleasure of driving them as well. This is the 21st century. Why would you want to have jobs concentrated in a larger city, instead of spread out closer to where the people live?
NA	Left turn lanes. Cloverdale 5 mile etc
2	Need to get rid of all the 2 lane roads. This is no longer a 1 horse town.
3	Please consider building a freeway system around Boise and implement the use of feeder roads. Then you have the best of both worlds. Freeways in Texas are a good example.
1	The area is so far behind on adequate roads it must rev up its road expansion to accommodate the huge influx of new people each year. Synchronizing more lights could help mitigate all the idling and consequent poor air. One of my friends is actually leaving the area because the traffic is such a mess. When it takes twice as long to get somewhere as it should, that is OPPORTUNITY LOST. I am now ordering many things on Amazon Prime because I despise fighting traffic to shop. That means less business for the local businesses. Plus valuable time is wasted in congested traffic. That is also lost opportunity. Most importantly, the congested traffic is Not safe and safety should trump everything.
1	We need to work on getting our primary transportation corridors up to snuff to handle all the modes of needed transportation at an acceptable LOS. [level of service]
3	This makes it sound like congestion is a desired trait! What about human powered options NA walking, cycling?
5	What does Compass do for us? Are they just wasting our money? Answer: COMPASS is the forum for regional collaboration in southwest Idaho that helps maintain a healthy and economically vibrant region, offering people choices in how and where they live, work, play, and travel. Its primary responsibility is to conduct regional transportation planning as the metropolitan planning organization (MPO) for the Boise and Nampa urbanized areas. An urbanized area with a population over 50,000 must have an MPO to be eligible for federal transportation funding.
2	Crucial to a well functioning community. Public transportation must operate frequently from early morning to late at night

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	<p>The biggest problem with effective transportation is every time an area starts to build up we are in behind to keep up with the growth. Eagle Road is a classic example. This is a state hwy and yet between Overland and State Street is so overbuilt now even though the speed limit is 50mph, there are so many traffic lights, so much traffic, and so much growth around that corridor it is standstill traffic much of the time. We have to react to the traffic situation and try to expand into new lanes after development has already happened. This is expensive, time consuming, and should be done before development has taken place. Eagle Road should really have been designed more like the I184 extension so it would be more effective. Now, to try to do something like that would be very expensive and there is no room. It's only going to get worse because of planned development on the NW corner of Eagle/Fairview that will cause even more traffic and more nightmare. That parcel shouldn't be developed at all and leave it alone. Take the lessons from the over blown growth to 10 mile, Star Road, Black Cat, South Cole, South Cloverdale. Get it done before the growth is there and let the developers pay the price.</p>
2	<p>Wider roads to handle the increase in people and goods for a vibrant economy.</p>
3	<p>If the growth was controlled and the transportation system was developed prior to the influx of all these people that would more effective than trying to play "catch up". Out current roads can't handle the present traffic, let alone 1 million plus people with a minimum 2 cars per household.</p>
NA	<p>Roadways need to be expanded before additional growth is approved.</p>
NA	<p>ACHD needs to place greater consideration on a multi-use roadway system that is safe for many types of users, not just how to get vehicles from point A to point B the fastest at the expense of other road users. If people have safer alternatives to driving a vehicle, they will use them, thus reducing vehicle congestion on roadways, improving our environment, and creating alternatives for roadway users regarding their transportation choices.</p>
3	<p>We need a rail system that can eventually grow to encompass the entire Treasure Valley and reduce the cars on the road.</p>
3	<p>Public transportation is necessary especially since low wage workers are being pushed to 2C. Having buses that can fit at least two wheelchairs on at one time is also necessary for individuals living with disabilities.</p>
5	<p>I think of effective transportation as the same as transportation options: no matter what the option is, I want it to be effective.</p>
4	<p>bike,walk,drive and park</p>
2	<p>An effective transportation system, defined as making personal transportation as effective as possible. One way might be reducing the restrictions on vehicle type would be beneficial. For example in France they have the VSP, a voiture sans permis - a small two-seater. In Japan they have the Kei car. Known variously outside Japan as Japanese city car. This class of car is small thus greatly reduces the foot print required and pollution.</p>
NA	<p>Rail</p>
NA	<p>Build roads and highways before building new communities.</p>
NA	<p>Plan more road construction now.</p>
3	<p>Train from Twin Falls to Ontario with stops in Mtn. Home, Boise (a couple of stations) Meridian, Nampa, Caldwell and then on to Payette.</p>
NA	<p>Nice ideal but it would not happen due a Republican system.</p>
5	<p>Quit putting the cart before the horse and build the roads before to handle growth before allowing new development.</p>
NA	<p>Completing Route 16 to I84 is paramount!! Do that first!</p>
4	<p>Highest priority should be given to light rail system utilizing existing rail corridors</p>
5	<p>And in all things compliance with the now 30 year old Civil Rights law of ADA which seems ignored even now in some growth and communities for equal access</p>
5	<p>Boise was the first city I lived in with a bus system that was affordable, safe, easy to use and navigate and had shelters at stops during poor weather. Purchasing tickets was quick and easy and near the bus stops themselves. That was in the 3 years around 1989-1993. When I returned to Boise in 2016 permanently, I and my two adult daughters gave up trying to figure out the current bus system. What happened? We tried. It was worse than the mess in the greater Kansas City metro area. The bus system here was one I had bragged about in our time stationed away from the Treasure Valley area. I wish it could be restored to what it had been. I would certainly use it again, but not as it exists now. I'm still at a loss for route maps and easy access to passes. Thank you for asking the residents though.</p>

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	I believe this state is the worst when it comes to effective hwys. I've lived here 30 years, Chinden, Karcher(hwy55), and State have NEVER been widened yet we keep bldg all around. This should NOT be allowed to happen. Roads should be improved BEFORE we build around them.
NA	Wider streets and transportation for the general public <i>[Translated from Spanish]</i>
NA	That they can integrate the Nyssa and Ontario Oregon area for all public and special for people who do not drive <i>[Translated from Spanish]</i>
Value: Choices in Where I Live	
5	I want accessible and affordable housing! Why does your survey not include accessibility?
3	more areas within counties need to protect agricultural lifestyle
2	Bigger lot lines in development, houses way to close now. People need their space and these small lot line developments look like hell after developer exits. Lowers value of the community.
NA	We feel that "the market" should dictate the types of housing built ... NOT the government. People in the building field are much better at knowing what people want than government agencies are.
NA	The time to maintain status quo in the way we work and live is over. Packing together like sardines with oceans of concrete is not the way.
3	Over growth/higher population will not allow for the size and type of land most Idahoans prefer to live in.
5	Sprawl. Car-centric, vehicle induced sprawl and its environment destroying consequences.
NA	I believe nice walking paths can accomplish both an outdoor lifestyle and transportation needs. My wife and I would love to walk or bike to coffee shops nearby, but the lack of good sidewalks, bike paths, or other options means we end up driving.
NA	Stop building apartments.
NA	Picture example is definitely NOT what should exist in Eagle. Unfortunately there are too many apartments.
NA	Fewer apartments/townhomes.
5	Progress is not progress when it destroys the land, quality of life, affordability and culture of Boise & Idaho. Stop building and turning over farm abd outdoors to developers. We do not want Californication for the live of the love of the dollar. People that want things that Boise and Idaho don 't offer, can go live in those states that do. There is nothing wrong in keeping Idaho and it's cities small & rural. Quit pouring cement!
5	Any new development has incredibly small lots and small yards. I want larger yard/lot options.
3	TOO MUCH high rise building of ugly barracks style apartments. Haven't we learned from CoVid that densely populated areas where people are housed together like sardines are prime breeding grounds for the virus and conflict?!? 9 million people in NYC pancaked together proves it. 66% of people who got Covid19 never left their apartment. Shared air systems in buildings. Thin drywall between them and the sick next door. Our communities do NOT have a housing shortage. There are PLENTY of apartments available now. More apartments are NOT what Idaho needs. Hubble and CBH Homes make fine entry level homes that are affordable. Despite what you think, most people do NOT want to live in an apartment. Especially the elderly!
2	Have that now.
NA	The Treasure Valley is already a nightmare due to lack of decision making (smart growth) on big development, infrastructure and disregard for nature. If you are sincere, you will try to protect any natural spaces you can because that is what makes this valley special for now. For example, the Simplot River park was over crowded the first year it opened because people had few other choices.
NA	It's RIDICULOUS that the Boise commissioners were able to pick and choose from Boise Blueprint in my COUNTY single family dwelling neighborhood (Victory and Cloverdale) and force an apartment building down our throats. There are no services around for apartment dwellers and no options for children to play. What in the world are they going to do with a gazebo???
NA	Larger lot sizes
NA	We do not need more multi-unit housing. It will ruin Meridian/Boise and our way of life here. We want our city leaders to be actively engaged in preserving the way of life we have enjoyed prior to this huge influx of people over the past several years.
1	This should include quality of life, ability to sit in a back yard with a barbecue with my neighbors, throw a ball to my dog, Not live on top of each other .
4	we need to ensure managing the growth and required transportation infrastructure isn't an after thought. Plan now for managing the growth and effective transport options
1	We have had a relatively quiet neighborhood and would prefer to keep it this way.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	No More Apartments
4	Less high density housing!
1	Most important issue for me
2	larger lot sizes required by the city's general plan is imperative in order to keep the density down! Stacking people on top of each other creates trouble.
4	I put my answers above the line in the order of preference but it did not list them in the correct order therefore I have rearranged them in proper priority
NA	Let the market decide.
4	Keep more choices in Boise without overcrowding.
5	More housing density closer to downtown and major commercial areas and less sprawl.
5	Six years ago I was on section 8 and living in a older but nice home on Etheridge Lane. The owner's daughter-in-law felt they were not making enough money off the property so they made things tough for me and I knew I would have to move. Experience had taught me few landlords would take section 8 because they believed you had to be a druggie or a criminal. And having cats was another strike. So I dropped the section 8 as it was no help and bought an old motor home and have been living in an RV park in Caldwell ever since. RV is breaking down and at my age and health issues there isn't much option. But at least I have my kitties. I suppose I could get into some kind of housing but experience has taught me that many people who live in low income housing may just be druggies or criminals. I moved into a duplex where I got very sick. I got a test kit and the place tested 11 times higher than the state would allow for meth contamination. I would love to live in a nice house or apartment that wasn't on wheels. You would be amazed how many senior citizens live in old RV's because they can't afford anything else. But they at least have their pets and that many times gives them a reason to get up every day.
3	Tiny home living could be set up so as you get on in years you have less to take care of but you maintain independence
5	Land, bugged lots. Not just these cookie cutter neighborhoods stacked on top of each other. And NO more apartments in nice neighborhoods
NA	Yes I'd like this option
NA	Hav[ing] the opportunity to buy a home instead of renting very expensive <i>(Translated from Spanish)</i>
Value: Growth Management	
1	I care most about how growth affects the ability to grow food. Agriculture should be protected.
1	My main concern is the protection of farmland. This is especially important as the Treasure Valley is one of the largest seed producing areas in the world. Growth management plays a vital role in farmland protection.
5	Maybe someday you will actually do something that will allow major transportation options to happen.
2	we seem to simply approve everything that demolishes farms, grasslands and open space. It scares me.
5	We need more green spaces on building lots along with sidewalks, bike lanes, and transit amenities. Urban farm areas provide green space and access to safe food sources for both people and animals.
NA	Affordable parking in downtown Boise is most important to me. I live downtown.
3	Concentrate growth in down town areas.
NA	Our growth rate is happening too fast to keep up with school, transporation, roads, etc
1	I really hate that so many little houses are taking over our farms and fields. We don't need housing for everyone. If we don't they will move on. No stores are being built to keep up with the housing, to me it is already not being managed well. All the store are over crowded. You want another CA keep doing what your doing. I'm very disappointed with the powers to be, shame on you.
NA	Cities should keep on eye on their spending. I had noticed that Idaho likes spending money like crazy by giving contracts out to the most expensive bid and many out of state companies
NA	Planners have failed to incentivize locating growth in areas that are less of an impact to our agricultural lands. We should be zoning scab lands so as to make lots affordable and opposite direction of travel from the west which helps congestion.
NA	As a Geographer with studies in Urban Geography, it is important to manage just where industrial, commercial, residential and other urban developments are zoned in relation to the interactions between the different zones.
2	I would suggest that higher development impact fees on both commercial and residential growth would motivate higher collaboration for smart growth ideas from all interested parties (business, citizens, developers, politicians, et al)

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
NA	I feel like the "Growth Management" definition is ambiguous and doesn't indicate if it means to promote or dissuade growth.
3	Doesn't mean bunching up areas to create public transportation opportunities. Waste of money now that Uber/Lyft exist! Let those firms invest in assets not the public!
NA	Roads should be built BEFORE subdivisions go in ... even if it means more impact fees. Right now the system is seriously broken ... just drive south on Maple grove at evening rush hour. Very poor planning on part of ACHD
4	Growth needs to be managed so Boise doesn't get over loaded. People live here because of the culture. Increased population changes that culture, we have been seeing this already over the past few years. Crime is becoming an issue and it will only get worse.
2	STOP turning the farm ground into subdivisions and apartments. People need food and where is it going to come from. Build in the desert
2	Sprawl. Car-centric, vehicle induced sprawl and its environment destroying consequences.
4	Growth management means managing growth!! I don't see much of that here in Boise. Every other license plate is from out of town. The sprawl continues to widen and creep up the foothills. MANAGE IT!! We all know growth is inevitable but it should happen slowly with well thought out planning and infrastructure (streets and mass transit) to support the new population. Those of us who've been here don't want to live in L.A. - that's why we are here and not there. Let's not lose sight of why this area is so attractive in a quest to grow, grow, grow without an end in sight!!
NA	More police and enforcement of the laws (speed, loud pipes all vehicles)
1	We moved to Eagle based on the amount of open space and less density than some neighboring cities. We want larger residential lots to retain the beauty of this city.
1	It is clear that growth has not been "paying for itself." Adding more growth and density simply increases expenditures that are not sustainable, as shown by the fiscal impact slides for Ada County. The LLUPA does allow appointed and elected decision makers to turn down a rezone request for higher density based on the undue burden and adverse impact on the political subdivisions. It is time the decision makers begin applying this provision of the LLUPA as the fiscal data is clearly showing that adding more to the existing condition will be an undue burden.
1	We don't seem to hold builders accountable for increased need of infrastructure. They should be required to contribute heavily!
1	when I hear growth management, I hear smart, PLANNED years in advance and taking the long-term approach to growth. Based on your outline your definition of the growth management IS NOT the same as mine. I am not worried about taxes. I am worried that long-term planning is not happening. It is: build as fast for as much as possible for the developers and contractors to make as much as possible with little concern for long-term impact of transportation, schools and lifestyle.
1	Keep green space. Don't plow up good farmland for city growth.
3	See previous 2 comments, existing neighbors are suffering from new development due to lack of growth management and mitigation of traffic - this include traffic counts and speed. The City needs to have more input and authority, not just ACHD. TAPS was written in 2016 and is not being respected
4	The Environmental Health aspect could tie hand in hand with Outdoor lifestyle to have preserves with walking trails.
3	control, preserve and limit growth in agriculture lands.
NA	F*** Californians!!!! I have lived here my whole life and they are destroying everything I call home!!!!
2	We need lower property taxes even if it means fewer services. Government needs to focus on basics - law enforcement etc and stop welfare programs. People need to take personal responsibility and pay for their own needs.
1	I am also concerned about the loss of agricultural land. Farming is not only a part of our heritage in the Treasure Valley, but a necessity if we are to have a fresh, local supply of healthy food.
1	Growth management also needs to be more proactive in developing the roads prior to allowing new shopping centers and neighborhoods.
2	We are losing the spacious, relaxed feel of our communities. There is TOO MUCH high density building going on! Apartments should be limited to 2 story with lots of common area and green space to maintain the "city of trees" feel and natural feel that Idaho is known for.
NA	Too many people from California screwing up my standard and quality of life here in Boise.
1	Developers have no thought to how much development they are adding. More thought should go into this.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
NA	Today growth is not managed. It happens and their is not real control on how much growth per year to match what can be afforded and maintained. Roads and services can't keep up. We need a Percentage Rate of Growth that other States have put in place.
2	Growth management requires planning for the FUTURE !! It means new growth has to finance tomorrow's costs including costs of the unknowns e.g. grey-water systems, renewable energy, 5G, autonomous cars, etc.
1	Unrestricted growth is always taken as a given, but growth has destroyed the beauty of one "America's most desirable" city after another, from L.A. to Phoenix to Denver. It would be a tragedy to allow that to happen to Boise. We must LIMIT grown, not just manage it.
NA	what can be done re: traffic?? and cost of in boise?living?
1	I agree
NA	Impact fees for everything Schools roads police. No more bonds or levys. Growth to pay for itself
1	I think it is imperative that growth pay for itself. The developers that profit from this growth should be assessed an impact fee adequate to build the schools, roads and other infrastructure necessary for their development. And infrastructure should be in place before building.
NA	Sorry, I don't see anything advocation family or moral values in the "values" section.
1	The growth in the Treasure Valley has been artificially hyped and manufactured by the City of Boise, the Chamber of Commerce, and the growth industry. Market forces should be allowed to operate without the heavy hand of government bending it in the direction of manipulated in-migration. The first step in "growth management" is to turn off the spigot that has been allowed to flow full-blast, over-stressing infrastructure and contributing to a housing crisis. We have caused the very problem we now desperately seek solutions for.
2	Much of the growth will come from outsiders coming in and when some one says "Idaho" most will first think potatoes but the next thought is Western outdoor lifestyle so that factor has to be maintained. The other factors are all about how that growth is effectively and efficiently managed to best accommodate all of the incoming population. Not all of the employment will be higher income placement but supporting enterprises so affordability and transportation factors are needed to make the accommodation liveable.
1	I am fortunate to have purchased a house in a nice, old, neighborhood. As a result, my property taxes have risen dramatically, even though the public costs of supporting my nice, old, established, neighborhood, have not. I, and all of the other existing residents of Ada County, are effectively subsidizing growth, effectively just putting our financial resources directly into the pockets of real estate developers. Impact fees, impact fees, impact fees.
1	Why are we so worried about transportation? Build a freeway AROUND Boise and push the new growth OUT, then there won't be such a problem with transportation. When you build OUT, jobs will go out there too. Work with businesses to grow in the outer areas too, and people won't have a problem with congestion to get to their jobs.
1	Slow growth way down, this is ridiculous. My hometown is being ruined.
1	I would like a good quality of life for me and my family. Not too much traffic.
NA	I think if growth mgmt is done properly then jobs, housing choices and affordability should follow.
1	Do not plan any subdivisions where the homes are built on zero lots. Design more open spaces between each building lots.
NA	Future growth should not jeopardize the livability of the community. Future build out into the foothills like what is currently happening on Bogus Basin Road should be permanently banned.
2	I am from Virginia and the cost of living is much lower than Idaho. I cannot figure out why GROWTH is not supporting itself and just keeps raising our taxes. Something is very wrong. The FIRST thing COMPASS needs to do is get some oil refineries/holding tanks in Idaho so Idaho does not have the 8th highest gas cost. That is make people poor here. Gas is way too high. Salaries are below par here and to have gas costs so high is outrageous. WHERE is the leadership to change this? This item should be NUMBER 1 for Compass. Take leadership and make a plan to change this so gas cost is reasonable.
2	We need good growth projection data and the tools to properly MANAGE, not limit, growth. Growth should pay for growth.
NA	Slow down growth! Let infrastructure catch up! Traffic is a huge problem because of lack of future planning.
NA	No more Apartments
5	The transportation corridors. Should be identified and right of ways purchased 30 years ago.
NA	Control growth with better planning

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
4	Too much of an assumption of growth NA what about its destruction of agricultural land,cultural assets, community.
1	Growth management has to happen first. Quit catering to developers or nothing will work.
NA	What will Compass do for us. Are they just wasting money?
1	Less high density living situations.
2	We have got to control the growth in our cities with larger lots required, more open space, and more parks.
3	I am very concerned that ground water is not being used as factor in limiting growth. Our ground water is not being replaced by the decreased snow pack & rain. When you cover up land with buildings there is less ground for water to sink back into the earth to replace what is being pulled out by development. We do not want to empty our water supplies & end up like California having to divert rivers and ending up with more fires
NA	I care about all of these, and I also think we should include valuing our historic & cultural neighborhoods and sites and not simply bulldozing them to get more density. Balance is needed and people from historic preservation groups at the planning table too.
5	I care about all of the given options, but I also think that people from the historic preservation & cultural groups in the area be at the stakeholder planning table. I am concerned that significant historic neighborhoods and buildings are being bulldozed in exchange for gentrification and generic buildings bringing more density. There needs to be a better balance & process before historic buildings, sites and neighborhoods are razed.
1	Hard issues of growth and choices growth forces on us. How to maintain our lifestyle and encompass change.
5	We need excellent school.A modern functioning correctional system. Also economic vitality.
3	Property taxes are out of hand. Stop using taxes to support a social agenda. taxes should be used for public safety and limited services.
1	Growth should pay for itself. We should not have to have to have new school bond elections once or twice a year to pay for more and more schools. It's getting to the point that people on a fixed income are having trouble with all the taxes. Start meaningful impact fees now.
2	I really just want to stop allowing such large businesses come into southern idaho in hope's to maybe slow the amount of people coming from out-of-state. I truly hate how populated our awesome state is becoming. Our farmland and wildlands are also hugely endangered from this crazy amount of over development.
2	The developers need to build the schools and the parks, not placing the burden on the existing folks. I am tired of my taxes going through the roof! Impact fees that pay for all the needs of the population. Control the growth!
NA	We need better growth management. There is too much new building, both residential and commercial, with no apparent thought to the additional traffic volume that will be generated. Also, do not build new schools immediately adjacent to major roadways. School speed zones on major roadways is a bad idea.
2	There doesn't seem to be a sustainable plan to manage growth in several cities in the valley. I strongly believe developers should be paying impact fees as well as bearing the brunt of infrastructure costs, e.g. the recent issue with West Ada S.D. having to pay for roads into a subdivision bordering the new Owyhee H.S. rather than requiring the developer to pay. We also have to consider the environmental impact on the rapid growth in this valley and restrictions on water usage, slowing the rapid decline of farmable land, and other major issues that affect quality of life in the Treasure Valley.
1	Providing for education, especially in West Ada, Kuna, & Canyon County is a big issue, they can only utilize property taxes to deal with growth.
1	All of the farm ground is being eaten up for homes. How we feed ourselves? Wide open spaces are what make Idaho unique. This is becoming less and less the case.
1	I am REALLY tired of seeing the explosive sprawl into open agricultural land. Just one faceless subdivision after another. And roads that can't keep up with the demand - always lagging not leading. The planners of this valley's growth really needs to look into how Oregon manages it. Ever travel to the west just outside Portland?
NA	Growth management drives up costs. Only required as a last resort.
5	As an Idaho Native for 69 years, I believe the transportation system must include a rail system between Caldwell and Boise!
3	New home builders should be paying for roads and school infrastructure as is common in other states.
2	Stop building apartments

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
NA	I don't want to see all areas developed with infill. Keep a variety of housing and lot sizes to preserve Boise's beauty and history.
1	Quit rubber stamping new subdivisions and get the infra structure in place before development
5	Fundamentally, government needs to enable mobility for *all*citizens. Roads, transit, dedicated bike infrastructure, safe sidewalks etc.
NA	I only have two the others are typical left policies and unnecessary.
3	Legislature must pass legislation to enable school districts to impose developer fees. Good quality growth accepts and expects to invest in communities to offset their impacts. Existing residents will be more amenable to new growth that pays their way in...and be more willing to vote in new bonds as needed. Developer fee schedules for other public facilities/infrastructure need to be continually reviewed and adjusted for long term public benefit.
1	My spouse and I are close to retirement and we worry about how we will get about and how high our taxes will get.
1	I believe the 'Growth Management' covers some of the other items.
1	This is an umbrella which would include Transportation, Environmental Health and Living options and other factors.
1	NO increase in TAXES...
2	Protect our Agricultural resources
2	I have higher property taxes than my boss who lives on the Boise Mesa. Why is that? NO, I'm not in some fancy neighborhood. Also, we need to improve roads BEFORE we build any more developments. Make the builders contribute to the road improvements.
Value: Transportation Options	
2	Public transportation isn't anywhere near ready to be taken seriously. Investment desperately needed.
5	Complete streets. Buffered bike paths. Traffic calming. Reduces speed limits. The end of mass transit (Covid -19).
NA	Our public transportation has never been good. it doesn't cover areas of Boise that are farther out then the core of down town. Hours of service hour make it difficult to use.I love our down town core, but with all the parking changes, lack of parking that is reasonable and affordable, we no longer go to the down town area for dinner or services.
NA	Buses should go to.hospitals, malls, from Canyon County to Ada County especially special events.
NA	Specifically safe bike commuting and recreation options
NA	Growth should be to the east and south into scablands that will ease the traffic from the west
3	I would suggest that local and state support of public transportation be a higher priority than support of roads as means to ensure environmental health
1	I've grown up in Meridian, but I am looking to leave the Boise area in the next few years, and the almost complete reliance on driving is a major factor
NA	We already have freedom of choice in transportation ... the government doesn't need to be involved in this as they usually make bad decisions.
4	Variety of transportation options is key to serving multiple housing options
1	Sprawl. Car-centric, vehicle induced sprawl and its environment destroying consequences.
5	Choice is not the issue! Our bus transit system is a JOKE! Hardly anyone uses it. Why? Because it's insuficiente and other options (Uber, Lyft) are far more reliable. Quit wasting our tax payer dollars on these lame programs and invest in light rail or other mass transit systems that are reliable and cost efficient for the public!
5	Boise is the primary City payer of VRT - the other cities need to step it up and contribute more to this solution, otherwise they are simply part of the problem by allowing more growth without paying for growth to have readily available transit.
5	Yes. I agree. Lots of options to lots of neighborhoods
NA	No public transport clutters streets.
NA	A light rail system on state street from Middleton/star into downtown would likely ease traffic congestion significantly. As would a parallel track running along I-84/connector into downtown
1	Please keep the disabled community in mind. Too many of transportation planning and city planning leaves out this part of our communities. True wheelchair access on ALL busses. Proper and safe sidewalks with correctly designed ramps. Cross walk signals with noise alerts for the blind and extra time to cross for the mobility challenged so we are not having to dodge impatient car drivers for the last half of crossing.
5	efficient rail option between caldwell and boise, even MtHome.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	The hours the buses run isn't long enough for those who work off hour shifts, or for those who would like to enjoy being downtown without having to find, and pay for, a parking spot. Another consideration is reducing DUIs. A rail system like Portland has would be even better!
NA	Need more routes from Canyon County and the Treasure Valley as more people move because of the increase in traffic in Boise and Meridian.
NA	Light rail only
5	You are way behind. Chinden and State Street should have been five lanes to I-84 twenty years ago. Now there are plans to do that in the next ten years.
NA	Good roads are the first priority. Any public transportation must be cost effective NA including the cost of onboard security. A tax of hundreds of dollars per year on those who do not use it, and get little benefit from it, is not acceptable.
NA	Good roads are the first priority. Any public transportation must be cost effective NA including the cost of onboard security. There must be a method of preventing people from getting on without paying, otherwise it is no better than the Portland MAX, which shuttles freeloaders with their open cans of beer around. A tax of a hundred dollars per year on those who do not use it is not acceptable. Yes they get little bit of positive benefit from it and the pleasure of driving them as well. This is the 21st century. Why would you want to have jobs concentrated in a larger city, instead of spread out closer to where the people live? Concentrating homes and jobs jobs in a large city increases transportation cost, congestion and crime.
2	Accessible transportation options. For example, Wheelchair Accessible taxis, Uber and lift options. Accessible Public transportation that runs seven days a week
3	Please don't build neighborhoods where there's nowhere to walk to recreate, shop and be at peace.
NA	Again, push the incoming population OUT. Expand Boise, don't allow Meridian to become even more congested. Build out, and the businesses will follow. There is no reason we all have to live on top of each other.
3	I would love to see commuter rail from Caldwell to Boise
NA	The fact that the region doesn't seem to be considering commuter rail is shameful, especially when the east-west tracks (the commute pattern here) are already there.
3	This is very important in our area
5	Lots of young people do not want to drive, and a better public transportation system would help many people.
NA	A north route of some sort of hwy would be a great addition to the valley. also a pull through from state to chinden, down either cloverdale or 5 mile would be a nice addition to get some traffic off eagle rd
4	It's time for light rail. It's going to be expensive at first but the freeways and roads are filling up fast. Morning traffic from Ontario to Mountain Home is a nightmare. Major roads like Overland, Chinden, Franklin, and Fairview are taxed to the limit. North South routes like Eagle Road are ridiculously overtaxed. There are only a couple of straight north-south routes that don't force a segment to go east-west first because of bridges. Those streets that do connect like State are again very busy. Light rail with options to go both east-west and also north-south, coordinated with busses would be helpful. Study places like the BART in the Bay Area of CA or the Metro in Washington DC.
NA	Options need to be considered valley-wide, not just concentrated in Boise. North-south corridors are just as important as east-west corridors. Safe pathways or routes to access transportation pickup stations should be considered as well.
1	This is not a survey. A train between Boise and Caldwell? Are you kidding.
NA	All of the methods listed in this option require additional taxes are ineffective at getting a diverse workforce (many different skills) to disparate work locations, and are inefficient with regards to time of travel and cost.
3	A good transportation system including a rail option would reinforce environmental, economic and housing issues.
NA	The train is asinine. Enough already continuing Bieter and not his little lap dog Lachiendo pushing this stupid train. It is too late and too expensive to obtain enough property without infringing on people's rights to get a line in and enough spurs to make it work.
2	I imagine a shuttle of some kind to easily and quickly transport many people at a time through the Valley. It may be expensive but it just may also end the yearly rebuild of I-84.
2	A quality rail system from Canyon thru Ada would open travel an cut down on congestion. Once established people would change their habits to utilize such systems
3	Mass transit
3	Rail needs to be an option
4	Do NOT want rail....COSTLY

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	We need to protect our farmland
NA	I'd like this option yes
NA	[need] a public transport that reaches Nyssa and Ontario Oregon for all public or people who cannot drive <i>[translated from Spanish]</i>
NA	[need] for the Nyssa and Ontario Oregon area for all public and people who cannot drive <i>[translated from Spanish]</i>
Value: Outdoor Lifestyle	
NA	This is going to happen regardless of this survey; nothing is going to affect cities building parks, greenbelts, or access to the mountains. That's why I'm placing last.
1	Including sidewalks to make neighborhoods walkable.
NA	Idaho has beautiful parks, very family friendly and outdoor space. We need to preserve that part of Idaho even though we are experiencing growth.
1	Having great options for getting outdoors is a big part of what makes Boise and the valley a great place to live.
1	No more building in the foothills.
NA	Without this particular issue addressed effectively, Boise, IDAHO would not be Boise, Idaho.
5	I would suggest that a focus on parks and recreational features will support environmental health
5	Maintain and grow outdoor areas, making ADA accessible.
NA	We like the outdoors options in the Boise area.
3	A personal value for many residents in the Valley, but planned preservation of open space supports bio diversity which will be key to safe and healthy environments, especially in the face of growth.
5	Really all 8 are very important.
1	Higher population will make my outdoor lifestyle crowded. It is already getting that way. I want to be able to not see another human when I am in the wilderness.
NA	Someplace isn't worth living in if you can't afford it.
1	This critical!!! It's why so many people want to move to the greater Boise area. Let's not ruin what we had to begin with and what so many people treasure about this valley (hint) and the surrounding mountains
2	We moved into the area with the knowledge there was going to be a large park in West Eagle. We expect these amenities as we paid a premium to live here.
3	Equal protection and benefits that make all neighborhoods across the county a desirable place to live has been neglected. The City of Boise has collected park impact fees in its Area of Impact (AOI) since 1994 yet does not spend the fees in the AOI except for land acquisition. The fees are used within the City limits and primarily within the north and east end neighborhoods. The NW and SW areas have seen very little expenditure of impact fees. This is a critical issue as the impact fees are based on an adopted Level of Service standard that MUST be met.
5	To maintain our quality of life, it is crucial that Ada County maintain and grow its walking, biking, and trail network. And do everything it can to reduce motor vehicle use and sprawl. DO WE WANT TO BE ANOTHER LOS ANGELES??
1	It's important for outdoor spaces!
2	Absolutely preserve the parks and trails, rivers and other nature areas for use by all.
1	foothills and farm land development needs to be avoided and regulated...this affects our healthy and nature of animals and plants
2	Please keep the disabled community in mind here as well. I know not all nature options can be made accessible, but some sure can. Deerflat Refuge is a good example with some of their paths being paved to allow all Idahoans of all abilities and disabilities to access the nature and the wildlife viewing opportunities. We need more areas like this please.
5	Keep it.
3	Recreation, Climate, Sports, Nature, all contribute so much to the quality of the area's lifestyle. In sum, it means how "happy" we are.
1	With the onset of Covid 19 We have seen a greater need for expansion and widening of our trail systems. Bike sales are up 50% and e-bike are up 80% over the last year. Trail counts here are up 400% over last years numbers
NA	It is hard to see all of the farms go under. This increases food costs, air quality.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
2	This is why people love Boise - preserve it! DO NOT take away our use of these beautiful lands because of environmentalists. We love riding our ATV's on this beautiful country, shooting our guns, and camping. Environmentalism is out of control - don't let what has ruined liberal communities ruin ours.
NA	This is tied in with growth management as well; future build out into the foothills like what is currently happening on Bogus Basin Road should be permanently banned. The foothills belong to everyone.
4	The outdoors is a life save for everyone NA- good for the mind, body, and soul. For many years I have served on boards for the National Park Service and Virginia State parks and we are constantly increasing the number of public parks for the good of citizen health. There needs to be many more local parks and more access to the Boise River. Star needs to have put ins and take outs for kayakers.
5	Parks, greenbelt paths with more effective monitoring of bikes and electric scooters
2	I feel we should also preserve farmland. Too much of Boise's agricultural identity (and economy) is lost to urban sprawl.
1	this has been well done so far.
3	Stop developing every square inch of land. In order to preserve the feeling we're not a concrete jungle, we need to leave open space.
NA	ensure laws are in place so that anti hunting, trapping, fishing ect liberals who harass outdoors men can be arrested and imprisoned.
NA	Educating newcomers about trail use policies and effective signage are important. So many people are using the trail system now that it may be time to look into a every other day format for hikers versus bicyclists.
4	Our quality of life is rapidly deteriorating with the rapid and seemingly, unchecked growth in the valley. I can no longer see stars in my backyard due to the light pollution and the sound pollution has also increased considerably in just the past few years. It is also more and more difficult to "get away", with camping areas quickly filling and the foothills being slowly eaten away with development.
2	Outdoor benefits needs to be protected wisely!
5	Ineffective public transportation will never work in the Treasure Valley. Most people prefer their independence when driving.
NA	Outdoor life style is generally reserved for those who live outside of the metropolitan area. There are exceptions to this of course, but chasing this utopia will heavily impact the economic vitality of the region.
3	Yes!
1	Boise is a wonderful place to live with so much outdoor space and availability of things to do , like walking, hiking and running.
1	Outdoor recreation and hunting and fishing
5	I do not want any of my taxes going to the busing system or mass transit. Neither will ever work in the Treasure Valley.
3	Stop outside big money from buying up and blocking access to our beloved Idaho public access lakes and hunting areas.
1	Keep Idaho values safe, outdoor activities should be enjoyed without favoring people with money. Every should be able to hunt and fish. Special tags should be on a point system not a monetary system
1	need to protect high value wildlife from encroachment/overuse impacts. Example, proposed new trail on east side Lucky Peak would have significant adverse impacts to critical winter range big game animals
3	Yrd
Value: Environmental Health	
1	Agricultural property also needs to be preserved.
3	I fear all of the wildlife being displaced and all of the concrete being laid which contributes to heat.
2	Strong pollution controls on vehicles.
1	I would suggest that COMPASS help develop a water conservation policy that will ensure adequate resources as the population grows.
NA	Any environmental "impact" must be looked at from the economic impact governmental regulations may have. Things like wind and solar are not really cost effective so should not be forced upon us.
5	Ever more important as an area grows, but particularly important to to one of the top reasons people live here. Environmental economics and responsibility are an important component of any wholistic view of development.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	Enough with the uncoordinated and dense housing in Meridian and Boise. Triple level apartments will be the death of streets transportation. Developers own legislators and the P & Z commissions are without courage.
1	Encourage landowners to consider agricultural easements to protect farm land.
2	Larger population will damage our environmental health. Look at a big city and you can see this. Please do not turn us into a concrete jungle.
3	Sprawl. Car-centric, vehicle induced sprawl and its environment destroying consequences.
2	We are so fortunate to live in an area with abundant wildlife, birds, clean water, natural viewscapes, etc. Without prioritizing the protection of our wetlands, wildlife habitat, and foothills, urban growth will ruin them.
2	The climate science is providing evidence that the near-future impacts on water will be a problem. This needs to be included in the actions going forward.
3	Air and water quality is important but not extreme view.
NA	The sky is significantly less clear in a four year time frame. Please those in power here consider more than just more money for you your city and developers and consider taking a REAL pause for REAL thought consideration
5	Preserve habitat for wildlife and green space for humans. Preserve Idaho farm and ranch lands forests and water for all Idahoans. Be wise in land use planning.
2	Traffic speed and noise for high density areas needs control and re-routing of cars and trucks through established neighborhoods. New development should not be degrading existing areas
1	A healthy environment controls everything else. Tough to improve once the genie is out of the bottle.
NA	We live in Boise because we love to USE the outdoors. We love to ride our ATV's on this beautiful part of the country. We love camping, we love our way of life, and don't want what has happened in liberal cities to come here. Environmentalism has gone too far.
NA	This is tied in with growth management as well; future build out into the foothills like what is currently happening on Bogus Basin Road should be permanently banned.
3	Air quality in the Treasure Valley is awful. The dry often stagnant air holds dirt, pesticides from farming, and fumes from air and vehicle traffic. A number of air quality monitors needs to be placed around the 2 counties and government leaders need to improve traffic congestion to lower exhaust fumes (made higher by idling at long red lights), and work with farmers to spray in a less harmful way. The bad air hangs in the valley forever, until a storm finally settles the toxic air particles to the ground. Many people I talk to have chronic breathing problems as a result. Increased population will only worsen air quality if mitigating measures are not taken now. I am from Virginia and have never had such terrible breathing problems as I do here.
1	The best, most vital thing about this valley is everyone's easy access to wild outdoor spaces and the local farmland that is still nearby. We want a strong ringed boundary for urban growth with NO further foothills encroachment.
NA	Please consider industry noise, electronic emissions and especially my concern responsible lighting (like darksky.org recommendations-kelvins,electronic,streets) that will protect our health and wildlife near developments and in cities.
1	Hunting, fishing, camping, horseback riding& outdoor activities provide about 1/3 of Idaho's economy through tourism. If our water & forests are despoiled by development, mining & drilling we not only lose our outdoor heritage and way of life but our economy
2	We need to stop crowding the river, flood plain, with development that is only going to flood in future years. There are areas that need to be left as farmland so when the floods happen we aren't having to deal with residential neighborhoods underwater. We need to review the old growth plans and leave some areas available for wildlife and open space instead of infilling and building up every single acre of land that doesn't already have something on it.
NA	This is only at the bottom because it's hard to prioritize everything to the number one spot! Again, this is crucial to the overall quality of life in the Treasure Valley. Without effective growth management, sustainable infrastructure, more transportation options to reduce single-vehicle use, housing choices allowing people to work closer to their home, maintaining our environmental quality in the valley will become increasingly difficult. This has already been a concern for a very long time in this area, but our rate of mitigating environmental hazards has been slower than the rate of creating them (i.e. pollution).
1	I'm extremely concerned about some cities' views on what is sustainable and careful growth. It seems like subdivision after subdivision is going in without any regard for the sustainable land, air and water management.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	Due to it's location up against the Boise front, the valley has always had a struggle with clean air, especially in the winter. The explosive sprawl into open land is making it worse. Longer travel times, more time sitting at stop signs and stop lights, construction vehicles clogging the roads and raising dust and pollution everywhere. Very disheartening to see.
NA	It is called mitigation. Try using it. Also, the "science" utilized to make these decisions is increasingly proven less than reliable.
1	I think if we consider environmental health first, then growth management, effective transportation, outdoor lifestyle, etc will be easier to achieve.
3	We should also avoid building over agriculture ground, farms should come first
Value: Economic Vitality	
1	Rail! We cannot continue to keep putting more lanes on the roads, thus more vehicles. I am tired of hearing that people want to drive their cars. And, that started years back when the roads were not overcrowded. Given the opportunity today, I believe people would feel differently. I'm going to refer you to an excellent article in the Idaho Press from Sunday, Sept. 30, 2018 by Rich Pagoaga, Jr. "Idaho Should Embrace Rail Transit for New Path Forward. Or, go to www.IdahoRail.com for route maps of his proposal. I grew up in a large city with all types of transportation, including rail. Riding the train to work, people can read, listen to music, do work on their laptop or just plain relax! Driving the freeway is stressful!
NA	If you don't take care of the area, economic vitality will decline. Businesses should also pay their fair share of taxes, impact fees and should be help responsible for environmental impact
5	Somewhere along the line we were sidetracked into thinking that growth was a good thing. Now we are seeing the consequences. It is good for developers, but not really good for the rest of the people, the environment and our limited resources.
NA	Raise all construction fees
NA	One thing this pandemic has proved is that alot more work will be done from home which will lower transportation problems and central city congestion and reduce the size of space needed by office based enterprises. Many commercial office space will be filled by other enterprizes. What will they be?
5	I would like to see more emphasis placed on making it easy for people to walk and bike ride in their communities and get us out of our cars.
NA	Most important is a good economy and good jobs.
4	Economic vitality does not need bike or public transit options. There seems to be some bias in these descriptions.
1	A wide variety of jobs for all skill levels
4	The state needs to sufficiently fund education in order to provide an educated workforce that the employment sector is seeking. The internet sales tax should be allocated to schools and the ongoing bonds and levies being asked for the public to vote on need to be limited.
NA	Eagle is a suburb. Boutique shops yes; industry no. Keep it small
2	Salary pay and hourly pay here is extremely EXTREMELY low in comparison to the cost of living here now. Changes must be made on this QUICKLY or ordinary people could lose their homes. Add further tax exemptions to home property taxes. You guys are killing us there!
4	We need jobs that pay enough to be able to afford housing and still have necessities of life.
2	Minimal regulation; the more government meddles in the economy, the more it impedes it.
3	Stop letting ITD sell the false economic gains of highways to the region. Plenty of studies now show economies do not stagnate as a result of congestion (Look up research by Mathias Sweet and Wes Marshall).
5	I believe growth management is critical if Nampa is to avoid the urban sprawl of a city like meridian.
4	This and Growth Mgt. go together. If we plan for expected costs, do the benefit analysis, and have the guts to address the costs now - Economic Vitality will follow by attracting the higher and better jobs.
2	Any public transportation must be cost effective NA including the cost of onboard security.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	Growth Survey. Good roads are the first priority. Any public transportation must be cost effective NA including the cost of onboard security. There must be a method of preventing people from getting on without paying, otherwise it is no better than the Portland MAX, which shuttles freeloaders with their open cans of beer around. A tax of a hundred dollars per year on those who do not use it is not acceptable. Yes they get little bit of positive benefit from it and the pleasure of driving them as well. This is the 21st century. Why would you want to have jobs concentrated in a larger city, instead of spread out closer to where the people live?
4	Incentivize business growth to go outward and the housing and roads will follow.
5	Ride sharing/car pooling should be promoted more.
5	We need the jobs, and good ways to get to them in any weather
NA	Refview how tax is set up. Too many apartments are not paying their fair share and are bringing most of the population.
NA	Wages MUST increase! We are quickly enticing people to relocate here and forcing existing long-time residents out with the "small town" wages.
2	Keep regulations and business restrictions down. Don't pass ordinances that prohibit businesses from succeeding. there are no free rides. Someone is paying the bill.
5	Property taxation MUST be reeled in. Many of us want government to do LESS.
NA	An effective rail system coordinated with the buses would go a long way to help make travel within the valley easier. The new Amazon warehouse is set up perfectly for light rail. Anything along the Franklin Corridor is ripe for light rail. There is a lot of undeveloped land between Cole and Nampa along Franklin, you know it will be developed whether we really should or not, so plan to have major work centers along that corridor so it can be accessed by workers using light rail. Plan at least two or three large parks or wild areas along that same stretch for recreation that can easily be accessed by light rail.
NA	keep regulations low, less government the better. i moved out of California after liberal leftists destroyed the state by micro managing every aspect of life with stupid regulations and "social justice" initiatives.
1	I would like to see our leadership and planners actively solicit to bring high paying jobs that are sustainable, not more service industry jobs. We need to balance that growth with sustaining our culture and livable community. Hopefully we do not become another concrete jungle. We value space and outdoor activities so let's not build more of these high density living arrangements - keep the density down.
5	Stop allowing these developers to ruin the valley. They need to pay for transportation, education, public services and safety, if they want to continue building in the valley. If the leadership begins to require them to do that the growth will slow down. And it needs to, the valley has been ruined, don't let it get ruined anymore than it is already. You need to go look at the city planning like places in Oslo, Norway, where any new development is strictly securitized. Maybe they are able to do it because their leadership isn't bought out by favors
1	We need to support the most flexible transportation method to get workers to the most disparate employment locations efficiently. Personal transportation, a vehicle, is the only method that does that. Flexibility of the work force to get to any employment location must be maintained.
NA	PLEASE build a light rail between Caldwell and Boise!
3	Public transportation is a money loser all the way around. Stop it.
1	Boise should be marketing to out of state companies and provide incentives for them to move here.
NA	I want the freedom to choose, not have some bureaucrat choose for me
1	These values are not different enough. You reference transportation in everyone. I do not want to be voting for the efficient movement of cars to call center jobs out in the desert. I want to be voting for high paying jobs in our Downtowns so I can afford to live in a thriving urban area. We should be greatly concerned about how low paying jobs are here.
4	Make all major roads in Boise (Maple Grove, 5 Mile, Cole, McMillan, Chinden, State, Cloverdale, etc.) at least 4 lanes all the way through Boise, Meridian, to get people in and out without so many bottlenecks!
5	Most of us here have grown up w/transportation indipendance. Riding a bus, train or bike to work & shop are not second nature. I also live 20 miles from "shopping". I plan my shopping days to include multiple stops.

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
Value: Affordability	
NA	This is important, but nothing at the regional level is 'really' going to affect it.
4	Install 500 tiny homes in the former Race Track at the Expo Grounds.
NA	Boise's taxes and housing cost are getting too expensive to live here. I have grown up in Boise and our wages do not keep pace with all the influx into the area. I can not afford to live here if the property taxes, housing keeps raising
NA	For many any housing above \$200/mon. is unaffordable.
4	I would suggest that an index that combines the costs of housing and transportation is a more effective affordability tool than either taken separately
NA	It is not the governments place to decide the price of commodities such as housing.
2	Affordability is key to sustained economic and environmental health of the Valley
NA	Affordable house no more apartments
3	taxing people out of their homes especially those on a fixed income. stupid
4	It is way bigger than just house and transportation. Groceries are way higher! Gasoline way higher! Restaurants and activities used to be way cheaper here. I could go on forever. The influx of high income retirees and work from home people and technology jobs has changed things drastically in a mere 4 years that I have been here living in a middle class income more than adequate then but a thread now.
5	We need responsible growth that provides economic opportunity to all, while preserving the environment and outdoor lifestyle, and a variety of housing at various price points to accomodate a diverse socio-economic population.
3	Affordable housing in keeping with the local economy is essential. People who have lived here all their lives should not be taxed out of their homes.
NA	We don't need anyone to manage the growth. We need agencies that claim to be able to plan to step out of the way, refuse federal funds and let the people that live and move here do it organically. Planning agencies are nothing more than the modern version of past's technocratic oligarchs of the past.
5	New development should always be required to have low income housing, green access and be routed through multiple streets to arterials and not just on one street which places a huge burden on the home owners living on that street, along with the noise pollution and safety
5	more affordable housing, new home range from \$280,000-\$300,000+
4	We need lower property taxes even if it means fewer services.
5	Affordability should include diversity. A civic region cannot exist without all types and levels of skills, cultures, and ethnicities,
NA	Growth Survey. Good roads are the first priority. Any public transportation must be cost effective NA including the cost of onboard security. There must be a method of preventing people from getting on without paying, otherwise it is no better than the Portland MAX, which shuttles freeloaders with their open cans of beer around. A tax of a hundred dollars per year on those who do not use it is not acceptable. Yes they get little bit of positive benefit from it and the pleasure of driving them as well. This is the 21st century. Why would you want to have jobs concentrated in a larger city, instead of spread out closer to where the people live?
NA	The explanations seem to just gloss over what might really happen. How about some more detail??
NA	The way to solve this is to push businesses further out along with housing. To do that Boise needs a freeway that goes AROUND Boise in a circle. We can't keep cramming multi-unit housing into Meridian/Boise/Eagle. There is plenty of room to push OUT. That is where the growth needs to continue going. Meridian will become a ghetto if we continue the growth path we are on. Just look at other big cities to see that this very thing has happened from multi-unit housing.
4	We could use more affordable single family detached product in the TV.
1	Mass low income housing and mass transportation will destroy the treasure valley the same way it did Portland. I watched it happen.
4	Runaway housing costs hurt all homeowners.
4	This is very important. People are currently being forced to make unpleasant decisions because planning is penalizing existing housing in favor of new housing farther away.
NA	Until the wages can coincide with the new growth cost of housing, we will only lose the scope of what our community really means to those of us who appreciated it.
5	Growth is out of control and its ruining our lifestyle. It needs to be controlled before its too late!

Score (Lower number = higher rank)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
NA	Time to revisit the rules that say no building can be as tall as the Boise Railroad Depot. We need to encourage more vertical development vs. spread. Productive farmland is being sold off fast. Farmers know they can sell for a lot more to developers and the problem with trying to continue to farm in a developing area only make it worse. Start to take county zoning seriously instead of looking at them as suggestions. Build taller, with lower end apartments toward the bottom of the structures and higher end up top.
5	There should also be more independent housing for people with disabilities.
1	The cost of the owning a home does not meet the current wage, making this near impossible for young families.
NA	do not regulate land development. do not mandate "affordable housing". do not set quotas and rent control. if the cost of living is too high than poor people shouldn't move here. rather than make home lots smaller they should be larger, 1/2 acre is the smallest a single family lot should be. i live on 2.25 acres and id go insane if my neighbors were any closer.
5	Current infill growth policies are choking neighborhoods while creating monocultures. Real neighborhoods need to be people-scale, not crowded warehouses. A lot can be accomplished by investing in county-wide mass transit that is reliable.
5	Real estate has become more and more expensive for those with modest incomes, creating a greater divide between economic classes. I don't know how it would be possible to reduce the rapid price increases while attempting to manage growth, but it would help in a state where wages are low and expenses are high.
2	Idaho is full of low wage jobs. More places to eat and places to shop do not pay enough for people to afford to live in homes. Affordable housing must be planned for and be a priority for the Treasure Valley.
5	We don't have California or Willamette Valley or Puget Sound wages but we are moving towards those valuations in housing and transportation. I'm getting tired of my property taxes taking a rocket to space.
1	This is really key, especially as someone who has been a renter!
NA	Let the market decide.
5	We have many people that work jobs that keep the city thriving but they can't even afford to live here. We need affordable housing in the city! And if people do have to commute it should be as stress free as possible. Like a train!
1	Low income families have few options for affordable housing in Canyon Country. I'd like to be able to buy property but that dream is out of my reach here.
1	As a senior on a fixed income I now live independently but in 10 years (or less?) I will likely need some assistance or supervision. I worry that my income won't provide for a standard of living equal (or similar) to what I currently enjoy.
3	I totally agree with the printed comment here and would add that prices are becoming unreachable for first time buyers. Folks have to live farther from work and yet we do not improve the roads.
NA	more possibilities to buy a house or a little place instead of paying a lot of rent <i>[Translated from Spanish]</i>

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
Future Scenarios Rate Each Scenario on a Scale of 1 to 5 Higher score = higher rating; NA = did not rate	
Scenario: Let It Be	
2	Road widening on key corridors will still need to take place. Let's face it most people prefer driving alone even when other transportation options are available such as mass transit and bus lanes. I heard on the news this morning that the CDC is discouraging people from using mass transit and carpooling.
3	"Let It Be" sounds horrible because clearly it's not ideal. BUT, this option can work. It simply needs to be ramped up so that roads (mostly highways and arterials) predict and encourage growth in areas instead of reacting to growth.
3	When you say "fewer transit options" are there more than two options? Buses and trains? Trains are expensive. Buses routes have to be cheaper to implement and more flexible than a train.
1	I hate this scenario. It's basically what ACHD is already doing and it is dangerous for cyclists, pedestrians, and our environment.
1	I oppose ACHDs effort to cover Boise in cement as if car transportation is the answer to our problems. It's not.
1	In each of the scenarios there might be one reasonable idea, but overall none of these considers actually putting serious limits on growth. We'll turn the Treasure Valley into another Silicon / Santa Clara Valley with all of the same problems.
1	Transportation needs to be forward thinking, not merely widening roads, but creating a more efficient system.
1	CANNOT continued cheap development options for the profiteers versus affording us good transportation routes. STOP the growth. MAKE the developers pay the TRUE COST of growth!
1	I don't see growth management happening now. Loss of open land, development controlled by individuals whose self interest overweigh the betterment of the city. Some the land in Nampa is allotted to developers to over build, i.e. land bordering green belt.
1	We can't expect the TV to continue to consume green space and widen roads we need a transportation plan that incorporates open space with rural cities urge to expand their budget
1	We need to step into the 21st century and eliminate bus and pov modes of transportation where ever possible. You do this by making it very expensive to park a pov in the downtown area, and eliminate street parking except for dellivery and pickup. Buses should be small feeder lines to the main transportation backbone.
5	Lower taxes for people already living here !! Charge the higher pricing to incoming people, to cover the extra impact on expenses
1	No no no! This will lead to ever more unaffordable housing, gridlock, and increasing pollution
NA	Raise construction fees a lot
3	Growth patterns are dependant on a price of bare land and the plans for available infrastructure. So there is a market component that is at play and consumers tend to drive where they want to live. planning can only work on the margins
1	We can't keep doing this
3	Again the widening of roadways and freeways needs to happen prior to all the congestion build up. Idaho waits way too long to do these projects. Also studies need to be performed on how best to time lights in Nampa. Especially in the area on Garrity from the Idaho Center until you get past Winco. This area is a joke when the Idaho Center has an event and that is because of the timing of the lights.
1	I would suggest that we need more solutions like bus rapid transit and fewer widening projects although I recognize that immediate needs reflect the reality that past growth management priorities "push the can down the road"
1	In the "More about this" document, at the bottom, the table with the stars is misleading. Particularly for financial related items, e.g. personal transportation cost for "Let It Be" is one star, meaning worse performance, meaning higher cost. The translation from one star to higher cost took me several iterations of working through it for it to click.
1	urban sprawl is the result of racists from the 1950s. Sprawl is nothing but disease.

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	Allowing low-density suburban sprawl, even with huge roads capable of the throughput needed, is going to just continue to increase the average commute time and level of pollution. BRT is good to see as a consideration, but it won't do much to bring down commute times since it will still be limited to the top speed the roads, even with dedicated lanes and signalling
3	We need more affordable housing. My employed, adult children can no longer afford to live here because rent is so high and buying a home at current prices, with Idaho wages, is out of the question.
1	Stop building homes and apartments before establishing the needed infrastructure!! Start charging builders higher impact fees and require them to make the needed infrastructure BEFORE they build. Impact fees also need to go towards schools. This legislation should be #1 priority--add the words to include schools to collect impact fees.
1	I think we should have more urban housing and transportation options that are not just cars. Perhaps with more urban housing options some people will choose not to own a car.
2	Stop encouraging people to move here!
5	I do not agree with your conclusions about the affect of "let it be" on the various priorities.
1	THIS is not working...
4	Use buses more wisely and efficiently
5	Was the intent to make even a rudimentary attempt at fairly ranking the scenarios? How on earth is the let it be scenario not at least in the green on economic vitality? This scenario by definition is ruled by the economy with out side planning. You easily could argue that the other priorities would suffer, but you couldn't even bring yourself to fairly present this scenario.
2	We need more commuter transportation that is affordable and covers the whole valley.
2	We have to change our growth pattern, going up rather than out. Denser populations allow for better public transportation options. The muni from Caldwell to Boise would have been a better choice over adding lanes to I-84 over the years, losing the median right of ways for public transportation
2	The proliferation of dense housing will be the death of city transportation and will keep young couples in poverty.
3	Stop the explosion of apartments. They keep young couples in poverty, create nightmare traffic problems, and vmcfeate suburban blight.
5	Development impact fees should pay for the infrastructure as they are built - widened roads with center turn lanes, traffic signals and signage, donated land for parks and schools, retail on corners at every mile. Widening existing roads to improve traffic flow, healthy air, and quality of life should be a top priority.
2	I think we need to put roads/connectors where we expect people and not play catch up.
5	bus transit is old thinking, so many alternate ways to move about exists today. Bus lanes \ transit always operate with very few riders, wasteful.
1	If we want to become LA, this is what need to do. If not, this option is not "speaking words of wisdom"
1	This is an unsustainable model. Visit any other metropolitan area in the west. We don't want this model.
3	Infill first then plan in the rural areas and for Pete's sake build the roads before the houses
1	Horrible outcome
1	We cannot continue to just widen the roads. The most current projects where the roads have been widened are concrete nightmares. No greenscapes. Just ugly hot concrete, with no thought for heat islands and our warming planet. We should not be proud of these projects or aim to duplicate them.
5	Widening the roads should aim to keep ahead of the growth. Widening chinden to 4 lanes now is 5 years too late. It should be widened to 6 lanes. Within 3-4 years, 4 lanes will be insufficient for the rapid rate of growth in the western suburbs
2	I would strongly suggest a rail system between Ada and Canyon Counties.
1	Quit ruining farm land with subdivision housing. We need it to produce food
3	bring in light rail from the outlying areas. that is how state street was developed originally. not just a light rail around the central core. that was a stupid idea. more functional buss routes like other cities have not just occasionally.
1	We can't afford this. We are already unable to pay for current road maintenance
1	PLEASE NO!!! Suburban sprawl has downsides to numerous to list in this comment box...
4	Please, no government funding for public transport.
5	Please more lanes and no buses. Even in highly dense downtown areas no one uses it.

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	I am fine with leaving is as is, but failing to plan where the growth will go and what services will be affected can no longer work.
1	Transportation funds should continue to improve what we already have. For example widening and upkeep on I-84. We don't need more housing developments taking over farmland. Growth is ok, but not at the expense of homegrown food or dairies.
5	I think this is the most realistic. I do not like that farmland could be affected negatively.
NA	Let it be... what is that? Are we God to speak something into existence? Some kind of magic that by the power of our word and planning we will make the world x, y or z?
1	NO! This trend has ruined historic and existing neighborhoods which should not have happened. It is led to loss of nature and farmland and created a city which had the potential to be livable. There needs to be aggressive changes in traffic behavior and Boise city needs to have authority and enforcement for its streets. What does ACHD have all this control?
1	I don't think this is sustainable for the Treasure Valley - we need more transportation options and mixed housing.
5	Not sure if this is asking me if i agree whats currently going one. As I don't agree with the current development plan. The current housing situation doesn't take in to account, transportation, schools, fire/police and parks, at a minimum
NA	This beautiful area will end up like all of the s*** cities in California! They need to go home! We do not want them here
3	We need some kind of freeway heading into Eagle. Eagle road has WAY too many cars. Every road leading to Eagle ends up backed up for miles!! We need a road that doesn't stop. You can get in and off, but no stops.
1	The funny thing about this is the COMPASS plans from 20 years ago also said this was not desirable, yet nothing had changed.
1	The current trend has resulted in an unplanned mix of commercial, low and high density development. Development seems to be based solely for growth alone to the detriment of the homeowners in Nampa. To be fair it does appear the current city government appears to be changing this unrestricted growth.
2	I would prefer to see more funding go into public transport and less suburban projects. I want to see more protection for farm land and natural resources
5	We need an annual Percentage Rate of Growth that will limit growth so that infrastructure can keep up.
1	Should not even be an option.
1	Please find an effective means to slow down and mitigate this option. It's what has happened in nearly every large American city. Can we be the first to break out of this future and provide a more livable metro area with transportation options NOT focused towards single-occupant motor vehicles?
1	This is the failed model of suburban sprawl we see in other aging cities and which is taking hold in Boise.
4	unable to affect ratings. No stars came up to select, could not move arrows.
1	No stars for "Let it be" STOP big developments! Big is not always better and usually bad for the environment, air quality, traffic, etc.
2	Mass Transit more frequency, options
1	We cannot let things continue the way they are. Changes have to be made to our transportation system as traffic grows heavier. We need a good mass transit system across the valley.
1	BRT on State Street should not be considered part of the current status quo when there is still so much work to to make it a reality
NA	We are doomed. We need to encourage people who want to live in a Los Angeles Area to please move there and not turn Boise area into Southern California. Leave State Street alone. There is no more parking in downtown Boise.
1	Stop packing Meridian with housing-streets are packed all day long, schools are overcrowded, teachers underpaid.,crime is increasing rapidly. Don't let it turn into California or Washington or New York or other out of control places.
5	A commuter train on the Union Pacific tracks might add some value. Idahoans like to drive their own cars/trucks!
1	Just no. Hell, no.
1	more growth equals more cost, higher cost of living, more congestion, more smog in the valley, more crime..... need I say more ?

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	Housing in Canyon County is little to non existent in downtown areas. Instead mass permits are being granted for large contractors to build huge subdivisions off the hwy. Car accidents have increased because the roads near all these builds are not being updated to accommodate all the new residents. This poorly planned growth has resulted in multiple deaths.
2	We need to keep as much of the farming community as possible.
5	If we can't have self-funding mass transit, run only during peak hours, then I would prefer to leave things as they are.
2	Not good, need more high paying jobs and getting more companies to move here. We will still need transportation options and road maintenance but also focus on environmental factors.
1	Impact fees reasonably covering the infrastructure and all other costs of growth create free-market forces that help guide development into appropriate and sustainable configurations.
5	If we care to maintain our way of life, we need to build a freeway in a circle AROUND Boise and this new growth. It will improve transportation issues for everyone, as well as push growth OUT where it should go.
1	Our city and county street and highway planning are terrible. Not expanding for the new surge in traffic
1	Stop building subdivisions with compacting as many houses in a small space like Meridian does. Require larger building lots in subdivisions. No more zero lots!!!!
1	Future build out into the foothills like what is currently happening on Bogus Basin Road should be permanently banned. The foothills belong to the people.
1	Cramming the "growth" into small areas making the city look more & more crowded!
1	We cannot build enough roads to keep up with growth and have people in cars. Never has worked
2	This scenario with suburban building is converting some of the most productive and important agricultural lands in the area.
1	didn't want a star here
1	Bus rapid transit is not enough. Road maintenance and widening key corridors creates barriers to working poor and pushes people into cars.
1	Suburban development takes away from community building and public parks. It also eats up land for farming and animals to roam while creating longer commutes.
1	State Street transit is good but suburban sprawl will bankrupt our local governments
3	Priority should be on adding additional river crossings (Five Mile, Ten Mile), additional interchanges west of the WYE, continued widening of US20/26 & SH44, as well as widening of major arterials in all towns.
NA	No More Apartments
5	Large lot suburban housing with as little as possible "mass" housing and no "mass" transportation is the only way you will keep from destroying the treasure valley. This is not made up, this comes from experience.
1	Suburban development on the 1-mile x 1-mile section lines is very short sighted, it's motivated by profits for developers primarily, not on a robust and sustainable infrastructure for the rest of the community.
1	Not everybody can afford to live in the suburbs nor can everyone get transportation to travel back-and-forth between the outskirts and in-town! The buses don't exactly go to Meridian or beyond in Ada County.
5	Approving every developers project is a nightmare for residents. We need to slow development by raising fees.
1	Continued suburban development (with our dangerous streets and subpar highway layout, with no north-south freeway; insufficient public transportation for the low-income neighbors increasingly pushed to outskirt neighborhoods) would be the destructive to the environment and to TV quality of life.
1	Tried to delete my star on this one!
2	It's hard to rate any of these scenerios without finding out what the owners of farmlands want - since many of neighbors land has been replaced by subdivision and is there next generation interest in farming.
1	no more sprawl

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	Increasing the number of driving lanes is not in our best interests if we are serious about the environment. We need an effective mass transit system to get people moved Between living and working locations. We also need to prevent continued loss of farm land. So, refocusing to the development of living and working locations in downtown areas or living/working focus zones would help to reduce the need for driving. Keep the focus on bicycle lanes going.
1	Nothing should be built like Meridian
1	Urban sprawl is bad for the economy, bad for the environment and bad for commute times. Housing should be clustered nearest the city's center and parks as possible with lots of public transportation as possible.
3	Denser housing and rapid transit
1	This is a recipe for congestion and unsustainable community practices. We need to develop meaningfully around environmental protection and healthy active lifestyles.
1	This will just continue the sprawl without advance planning for services, transportation, etc. Developers need to pay for the infrastructure.
1	I selected one star but really would select none
1	This scenario would result in expensive capacity improvements with high rates of diminishing return, lower quality of life due to long commutes, and a lack of different housing/ transportation options
1	NOT AN OPTION
1	I am pretty sure that there is research that shows widened roads are filled to capacity within 4 years. This does not solve any problems and increases the sprawl. Look at bigger cities to see how that works in the long term, I am pretty sure we do not want to replicate their path
1	WE must not "let it be" and continue to develop at breakneck speed. We are growing faster than the services and schools we have putting a HUGE burden and tax increase trying to "catch up" building roads and schools etc...
1	Suburban development is at the expense of open spaces and contributes to the sprawl and congestion we see now. Growth in this manner eats away at our our identity, one farm, field and hillside at a time. Every day we look more like SLC or southern California, tract home boxes peppering the landscape.
4	But stop widening streets and invest instead for long-term and effective public transportation. Create shuttle buses for the near downtown centers so that neighborhoods survive.
NA	I am skipping this exercise because I'm not quite sure I understand, and I don't want to skew data based on my inaccurate guesses on how this exercise works.
1	urban and infill should be within 2.5 mile of downtown. Currently they are allowing infill all over, even in areas that do not have regular bus services
2	No buses, no rail.
4	There needs to be another interstate developed that runs from boise Y to south Nampa or lower. needs to be built prior to more homes coming in and we will need it, just like LA.
1	We must decrease reliance on single-passenger vehicles and limit urban sprawl
1	Please please don't do this. Once high density population arrives the problems are so bad. Please get ahead and lead the way with more effective planning
1	Need to stop more development by HUGE impact fees - this will drive the developers else where
1	Keep Idaho quaint.
2	so anti Western lifestyle, but vertical could allow many benefits
2	The current trend of high density infill in Boise, Meridian and Eagle has been a failure. Wake up city and county leaders and stop the overcrowding. We have a lot of space, preserve country lifestyles and limit zoning variances stopping the higher density trend.
3	Too much too fast. Stop building!! It only encourages more people to move here which increases the tax base I understand. Surely research has shown densely populated areas incur high crime rates.
2	All the options I have listed need to be in the green. Not only 1 of them
2	We need more housing development closer to urban areas that are affordable with transportation options more available and accessible easily by citizens (an app must be developed, something similar to Seattle or other city that handles accessibility better).
1	This is not sustainable.
1	There currently is NO plan. New growth should be paying for the new infrastructure needs. All cities and counties should be following the lead of the City of Star in collecting infrastructure fees to assist with new transportation corridors.
1	must stop the current reliance on cars

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	What's happening now is not working
1	sad state of affairs
1	I disagree with the listed Let It Be scenarios. Having lived in Seattle for the last 40 years, I can see the same old tired solutions that did not work.
1	move people, not cars
5	This interface is confusing and my rating is due to my belief that the below assessment is accurate not that I WANT that to happen
2	No more apartments!
5	Don't MESS with MY area. We don't WANT you aor anyone else who isn't ELECTED to do ANYTHING.
1	Stupid choice
1	Not sustainable
1	Continuing suburban development will only worsen traffic and smog.
1	Economical Vitality is extremely important to native Idahoans. It is getting to the point where we can't afford to live in our own state because out of staters are driving up the real estate prices by paying cash for their homes. The current job market does not support the current cost of living in this state. Those born and raised in Idaho don't make enough in the current job market to buy a basic house in the current housing market.
1	Stop encouraging californians to come here and ruin Idaho.
1	Farmland is what makes Idaho different- the wide open spaces.
1	Key corridors need to be converted to freeways.
3	Compatibility between housing types and commercial uses is important, and smart connectivity needs to be implemented. Relying upon older and existing neighborhoods to inject collectors in front-on housing neighborhoods is not the answer to solving poor traffic planning and hodge-podge development. You should spare residential streets with families from becoming de facto collectors and quasi-arterials because the Cities and the County did not plan for growth adequately. Shoe-horning the mid-mile collectors policy onto older City miles with front-on housing is an unfair policy in some situations. Keep local traffic local in the square mile blocks through speed and traffic mitigation, otherwise current approaches results in those seeking cut-through routes to avoid arterials by those seeking to skip traffic lights. Our streets/arterials should be designed more appropriately.
1	Stop letting developers knock down the old trees. The ones they plant are too close to the building and will cause problems and have to be taken down in 5-8 years.
3	We need more transportation options between Boise and Eagle and Caldwell. Use existing train lines or develop other options.
2	Look at Google's satellite view and one can see that Ada County (I don't know about Canyon County) are overrun with @\$%^& apartments. How can city councils and Ada County Commissioners keep on approving variances for all this Density?
5	Less high-density housing. There's room here, use it.
1	Road widening is a waste. Waste of \$, skills and environmental resources. Don't create more opportunity and incentive to commute by car... road widening discourages utilizing alternative commute options bc the level of risk increases substantially.
1	This is not sustainable. This is failed approach of the last 60 years.
1	Unsustainable and destructive practice that doesn't address the average Idahoans concerns in living in their home state
2	Idahoans are strong proponents of capitalism and private property rights. Many individuals and landowners want to make a quick buck from the growth that is occurring. They view their property as an asset and want to make as money as possible from their land, which happens to housing and strip malls rather than agricultural crops. Another issue is that the agricultural commodity market is experiencing low prices. In addition, politicians have to say no to this constituency unfortunately, I don't see that occurring as it didn't occur for Blueprint for Good Growth. The horse has already left the barn for Ada County we still have a chance to preserve some of Canyon County's agricultural land.
1	No. The status quo is NOT WORKING.
3	We need more public transportation options throughout the Treasure Valley
1	Try to keep the development closer into the cities and towns. Quit putting subdivisions out in the country where the roads cannot handle the added traffic. Same thing with schools. More planning on the location is needed. Stop sticking schools in rural areas where the infrastructure can't handle the overload. The land may be cheap, but the added expense to the taxpayers to upgrade the roads and utilities will skyrocket.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	I would like let it be more if farmland wasn't affected as much. We live in an area where farms are disappearing rapidly yet the Snake River plain has a unique farming environment that cannot really be replicated elsewhere.
4	Any of this options need to be focused also on compliance with now 30 year old Civil Rights law ADA for equal access and it is my observation even now ignored - also for housing options for aging populations - we all get there - to provide options for universally accessible housing and far too many apartments and condos built even in the last 5 years fail these FHA / ADA rules for access which apply to ALL buildings four or more units under a single room with the exception of 2 story townhomes
2	It's not working - we aren't adequately paying for growth and it's eating up farmland
2	Most of that scenario sounds okay, but we really need more mass transit options and more apartments and condos adjacent to the downtown area.
5	The bus is a waste! I have ridden them to see how it is working. Need smaller buses! Too many empty seats! Only need big buses for downtown and major hubs to deliver to smaller routes! Busses to Nampa, especially after Amazon is going needed more. Specific places!
3	No Bus lanes at the expense of car lanes
3	Who rides the bus when not doesn't go where I want to go?
1	We need to build 2 highway loops. One north from memory road to Middleton and one south from memory road thru Kuna to Middleton before the property cost quadruples
2	What happens when you can no longer widen corridors. Need better alternatives.
1	sprawl is not a sustainable growth plan but it's what Ada Co Commissioners choose.
NA	This survey needs to be drastically simplified. Far too complicated for the average citizen
3	Density to Infrastructure needs to be a part of the consideration/conversation in managing this growth. Only so much land (farm land) to build on. Better to look a the lower and surrounding hills for a direction in this growth.
2	Suburban sprawl is a temporary solution to a long-term problem
1	I think that widening streets is not a sustainable answer, and that suburban sprawl is harmful and inefficient, especially when it takes up farmland.
5	This question page is jumbled up. We do need safer road surfaces & more lanes on major roads. (We need less distracted drivers) I carpool whenever I can. Busses, taxis, trains, bike lanes, etc, do not exist where I live. The nearest park&ride is 16 miles away, but I have used it occasionally.
1	Don't understand
1	Roads NEED to be improved upon BEFORE we build anymore. I am also very concerned about our ag environment is disappearing. When we depend on our food sources coming from other countries, what happens when that country gets angry at us? No more food!
2	I don't believe suburban sprawl at the expense of farmland is smart for the future
5	This option can be a combination of the others including housing along main transportation corridors and including a high speed rail in the current/future population densities. There needs to be choices but it's critical to develop a strategic growth management plan today that incorporates feedback from current residents and that can achieve a balance of our priorities, which for me the most important include growth management and affordable housing while maintaining a quality level of outdoor lifestyle and environmental health. I appreciate the work that went into creating this survey and options, but the plan will most likely employ a portion of all options to some degree and whatever plan(s) is chosen the treasure valley absolutely needs a growth management plan with effective public transportation, which means we should be planning a route today for a future subway.
NA	I am not for developing farmland and suburban sprawl - rather denser development near major corridors
1	#1 – Let it Be – STOP! “Wrong Way” – this is not the way to continue!

Score (higher score = higher rating)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
Scenario: Ticket to Ride	
5	You still need to provide money to widen roads. People in the Treasure Valley love their cars. The people who moved here from out of state didn't move here for bus system.
3	I'm all for utilizing the rail line to create an improved transit system, but it can't be all rail. Highways, road widenings, and ped-friendliness should also be considered here
2	<p>I am skeptical. "New local funding..." How much does the "Ticket to Ride" cost? So this would be on the existing tracks by the Boise Towne Square Mall to Nampa? What are some examples of recently constructed rail projects in cities of around 1 million that were not over budget and extremely expensive to build, and after completion have riders. How big would the activity centers need to be to support trains and who would build them? Wouldn't buses be cheaper and easier to get people from where they live to work?</p> <p>Answers: <i>The transportation improvements in Ticket to Ride are estimated to be \$2,099,000,000, based on the cost of commuter rail along the existing rail tracks. That said, neither that type of rail nor exact alignment have been selected yet. COMPASS is studying different options to see which would be best for the valley. In fact, a survey for public input into different types of high capacity transit, including rail, is scheduled for January 2021. Watch for your opportunity to weigh in. Areas around train/transit stations offer attractive opportunities for developers to build both housing and retail/office space for "activity centers" that both generate transit trips and create destinations. Many factors into the "critical mass" needed to support a light rail or passenger rail station, including accessibility to the station, the frequency of the train, the land use mix, and more. However, typically a good rule of thumb is at least 12 units per acre is needed within ½ mile radius to support bus rapid transit or light rail. The COMPASS Communities in Motion Implementation Guidebook gives examples of various density projects for comparison: www.compassidaho.org/documents/prodserv/rftp/ImplementationGuidebook_entire.pdf. Salt Lake City has been successful in building its passenger rail system of both commuter rail and light rail, with robust ridership and plans to expand service. Such a rail system can get people efficiently from where they live to work because it avoids congested roadways. Successful rail systems also include bus service to get people to and from the stations. Some other metro areas around 1 million population with a rail transit system include:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Norfolk, VA. Opened in 2011. The full metro area is 1.7 million in population, but this service only serves Norfolk, which is about 250,000. It is about 8 miles long; similar to Eagle Road to downtown Boise. https://gohrt.com/routes/light-rail/</i> • <i>El Paso. Opened in 2018 when the metro population was just over 800,000. http://www.sunmetro.net/</i> • <i>Tucson. Opened in 2014 the population was slightly under 1 million. https://www.sunlinkstreetcar.com/</i>
5	This is great so long as we can actually agree to build a lite-rail system. ACHD and the State Legislature seem to be opposed to such a move, so how likely is this to occur? Also, relying solely on VRT, which is under-funded, to shoulder this burden will not result in better transportation choices.
4	This is optimal as long as it serves Boise and surrounding areas. Property tax increases should be focused on wealthier parts of the community, such as Star and downtown Boise.
3	You don't have viable trade roads available to support retail, manufacture and agriculture in this region. You have got to be kidding about rail and nodal development along stops. FIX THE ROADS WE HAVE...STOP THE CHEAP COST OF GROWTH!
4	we need transit, but rail is probably not the best option, too expensive and fixed. It does not anticipate the future of autonomous driving and shared vehicles
4	<p>Wondering if 'new urban activity centers' refers to the design of 'new urbanism' or 'new' as in new built urban activity centers. Maybe both?</p> <p>Answer: <i>The "new" in "new urban activity centers" refers to new built activity centers.</i></p>
1	After watching Portland waste huge dollars on a train to nowhere I will fight this idea tooth and nail!!!!
4	growth is managed by strategically allowing density near transit lines and services. Stop suburban sprawl! Like the emphasis on preserving farmland. Counties should also encourage rural lifestyle so families can enjoy raising animals, 4H, equestrian activities etc. Need to maintain county zoning in areas with no existing services. Densities should decrease as you travel away from city center.
4	as long as the rail vision is monorail and elevated above traffic. There is no doubt that farm land is going to hard to maintain in an urban setting so lets look at taking them vertical in an urban setting with the market on the first floor to sell what they grow. As far as new funding Idaho needs to invest today for a secure future tomorrow. If we do it right our public transportation could become self sustaining over time.
5	I would suggest that growth management would also be better in this scenario with impact fees that recognize that the capacity of existing neighborhood public transportation systems is less expensive to expand than roads

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	Using the existing rail corridor is an obvious and effective way forward to increasing mobility while minimizing the impact on both the environment and on existing infrastructure. For a metro area such as Boise that is as spread out as it is, reliable, long-reaching rapid transit will be essential for growth, and rail fits that perfectly. While the cost of this project would undoubtedly be more than the other options presented here, the cost to us in the future if we don't plan this now will be even greater
1	Do not agree with your priority assessments.
3	Forget about preserving farmland in the treasure valley. The rest of the entire state is FULL of farmland. Don't do a rail system, it's not realistic
1	Rail would wipe out the transit ridership in Boise by sucking out all the funding. Rail is a boondoggle. Buses are better for cost and ridership - increase frequency or change routes as ridership changes. Don't be fooled. Look at Phoenix, look at Philly, look at DC. Trains turn into climate-controlled homeless encampments, with disgusting public health conditions. No one will ride.
5	I think we squish people into living places and leave well planned open spaces and parks. Build up not out. Plenty of parking garages, not parking lots.
1	Utilizing railways for public transit always operate at a loss. Its wasteful and not necessary.
1	Rail and mass transit in general but especialy rail, is the death nail to every major city in the US. Why go there? Only politicians who profit on the graft of rail want rail. Put money in the schools and let people be in charge of their own transportation needs.
5	This, but with a variant: The same idea, but we don't need rail, per se. BRT can fit the bill just as well. The key is the mobility and development patterns it enforces, not the technology used to implement it. Because when it comes to frequent trains or frequent buses, "My baby don't care, my baby don't care" and they both need tickets.
5	We need to reevaluate our funding structures. Yes, we need funding to support this, but we need to curb funding in other areas (e.g. bloated police department spending) to allow for this growth while curbing the ballooning of taxes. This growth must happen, but it cannot happen on the back of residential property owners (that reside in their own homes).
2	This would be higher on my list except for the cost. I suspect homeowners would get taxed to pay for this option. A better plan would be for new residents and businesses to be taxed at a higher rate since they are driving the need for mass transit. A blend of the options offered that maximizes traffic reduction and still minimizing cost to homeowners would be my vote. PS - the City should have built a light rail corridor into the plan years ago when I-84 was widened.
2	So far "the mix" part is not happening. Townhomes are offered but are not required to be for sale therefore they are simply a glorified apartment that does not enable an individual to build equity. This scenario has significant potential to overload the State Street coridor with rental units, and adversely impact the existing quality of life for the neighborhoods along this corridor. In addition, the emphasis on transit is not always being honest about the real motive behind this initiative. Furthermore, scientific studies show that children who grow up near heavy traffic and air pollution have long term impacts on their brain development.
2	Nobody rides the d*** bus. Just stop
5	Growth management means planning, right now we are not planning. PLEASE help the area to grow in a sustainable and responsible manner. THIS does mean raising funds because we have shirked this responsibility for so long.
4	Although this is strong preference, i feel as if the 4 forced choices exclude other options.
1	Please, allow no government funding for public transport.
1	I will never vote to spend money on buses or rail.
3	I am not worried about preserving farmland between Boise and Caldwell. If we were really worried about that as a community we would start building between Mtn. Home and Boise as NO farm land is that direction. I am more worried that our continued failure to look forward 20-30 years we will continue to get what we have: poor management. I really like the idea of a rail system in the valley - roads can only get so wide.
2	Even though this option fits my priorities better, I just don't see transit becoming so popular.
5	BUT, need to correct lack of mitigation of foothills and northwest/Eagle traffic into Historic NE. The East end has Parkcenter bridge that was built to mitigate traffic from large new development out east, but all foothills and northwest traffic comes down into NE on only 2 constrained streets with no mitigation and loss of livability, safety and vitality in a historic district .
5	Affordability and economic vitality are going to be key factors in the future, along with transportation options for better quality of life. This option seems the best fit.

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	more over 55 living residents, include subdivisions in this
1	Most rail projects are grossly wasteful spending and failures. Don't make Boise yet another statistic here.
4	Lower property taxes ! Any new funding should come from sales taxes (on food and everything) so that tourists help fund it, from federal funding and from rider fees.
3	Agriculture never comes back once it is lost. Local agriculture is clearly a fundamental for both economic viability and affordability (they go hand-in-hand).
3	Rather than increased taxing, why not build alternative transportation options using existing infrastructure (like the canal network)?
5	need bike system that is usable, safe, efficient. Esp from S West Boise area to downtown and west to Meridian and Nampa. possibility - along rail lines or current irrigation ditch row's
4	Why do the houses have to be closer together? They're already only 10 feet apart, which is a fire disaster waiting to happen.
5	Why is a scenario with more transportation options being considered less affordable? Is the savings of not needing to own a car being taken into consideration? Answer: <i>The Ticket to Ride scenario provides the best personal or household affordability of the four growth and transportation scenarios. However, the overall cost of the transit improvements are estimated to be \$2,099,000,000, making it the highest cost transportation infrastructure of the four scenarios.</i>
1	The last thing we need is rail. You have got to be kidding me.
3	Light rail does not work, I used it for years and except in downtown areas where parking was expensive and hard to find, it was faster and easier to drive my car. I got a free ticket from my employer, so I tried to use it at least a couple times a week.
1	Light rail NEVER works. I do NOT support this.
2	Canyon County transit company regularly changes it's routes. This makes it very hard for individuals to use the service, it's not reliable. Nice bike paths to the downtown area & paths for recreational use are unsafe. Bike paths are set on busy streets and unshaded. Many times I've tried to stick to the paths to find that individuals use designated paths to park their vehicles.
1	A better bus system would nice, but I don't think we need a rail system
1	No rail, please, unless it will be self-funded after genesis, unlike Portland.
2	Impact fees reasonably covering the infrastructure and all other costs of growth create free-market forces that help guide development into appropriate and sustainable configurations.
1	Higher taxes to construct commuter rail and then subsidize Transit just isn't what I live in Idaho for.
5	When Salt Lake City put in the light rail, many people said it won't work. We all know it did and now they can't build it fast enough. People like not having to drive, farmland has been preserved, people are less stressed and the easy choice is the healthy choice. People are walking more too. Walking to the bus, rail, to their office, downtown, etc. Helps reduce bad air which is a problem in the TV.
5	Public transit investments must be made NOW so that private investments will follow. Currently, it is bass ackwards and public \$ from feds, state & local incentivizes sprawl
3	Rail would be nice throughout the valley, but hard to retrofit
1	No More Apartments
1	No mass housing. No mass transit, unless you are for actively destroying the way of life here.
5	IN other words how much does it cost to move people per mile? When you ask about bike lanes and how much the cost is per biker, you are dismissed. Our weather doesn't behoove some means of transport. Answer: <i>We have not calculated a "cost per mile" figure for the scenarios. It is an interesting, but complicated, approach. There are a lot of factors to consider — from the cost of the infrastructure itself (e.g., a freeway vs a bike lane), to individual costs (e.g., vehicle or bike ownership, fuel, insurance, bus ticket), to the cost of housing in different locations, and the value of time spent commuting, etc. ... and conversely the value of benefits, such as health benefits of active transportation.</i>
3	We need to widen roads that lead out to Star and Middleton. Meridian has done a good job of widening the roads to accommodate increased traffic. Hwys 44 and 20/26 need to be 4 lanes to the interstate.
3	Confused as to why less road widening is considered "con". Too much emphasis on driving!
1	Veto rail. It only works in cities like Chicago, NYC... and who wants that density taking over the desires of the entire county. I don't believe farmland / outdoors will be saved by any scenario, as cities will keep annexing, increase multi housing causing rapid growth

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
4	we don't need light rail its too expensive, but good bus rapid transit and commuter rail would be great.
NA	I support this.
4	Missed the opportunity for another freeway or 4! Have to bite the bullet and get some roads built. Stop grow in corridors!
5	I believe that a rail option from Caldwell to Mt Home would ultimately be less expensive & less disruptive than repeated widening of the highways.
3	Please create high housing density and transportation near the city's center (urban core) and existing parks so it maximizes people's use of the outdoors
5	We are whistling in the wind if we don't plan for rapid transit.
5	It seems the most important issue in the valley is getting people to and from everything west of Boise. A rail is the only way to do it along with a robust bus system in destination cities. I believe this has been recommended for at least 20 years. At some point the city leaders are going to have to come to a solution as to who pays how much. Maybe a certain dollar amount per person is the most fair. Either way, we can't keep widening roads indefinitely. We have already seen successful business shuttered through eminent domain and eventually having a 15 lane State St or Interstate seems ridiculous.
3	This sounds great but getting the local funding will be tough.
5	Over the past 30 rail has been on the option list. WE NEED RAIL to get people into downtown BOSIE. The Ada County fairgrounds has space to make that happen.... Let's do something...
5	Would love this scenario, but don't know how practical it is given the amount of development that has already taken place that is adverse to this type of scenario.
5	I realize this is expensive, but we actually have a lot of room to make good choices about where our new urban centers will be. Light rail in Seattle is super effective and here in Boise the terrain is easier to work with, making it cheaper.
3	This seems like it has a decent way of managing our natural lands and farmlands.
1	Not sure where the rail will be built, Idaho has not secured the right-of-way needed for the widening of most roads. NO FORE THOUGHT of future development.
2	mixing housing is unappealing.
2	My concern with this option is the SIZE of the apts being built near residential areas; .they are too tall and too big - they are their own mini cities. Established residences lose their view and their privacy.
NA	If you stop growth you need to change the transportation system
4	Must keep housing is kept for those who are lower income and near the resources they need.
5	Rail should really be looked at expanding, possibly even the rail that goes through Boise Depot that connects to other PNW cities as well as northern Idaho.
5	Rail options from Canyon County to City Center is my most preferred option
2	High density infill needs to end. Promote planned communities. Realize that the bus system is a failure!
2	This "mix" has done more harm than good to the valley. It is not a true mix as High Density developments have already ruined SW Boise and SE Meridian. No more property taxes. The bus system is not effective and there is no need to spend more on a failed system.
3	You can do all the survey questions you want on this topic, but the Idaho legislature is not going to allow local option.
5	I believe the solution will help for the longest term, our growth is unsustainable and traffic is terrible
1	Rail, you must be kidding. In Seattle less than 3% of the people taxed will ever ride the system. I will fit this with my vote for ever.
2	Need new formula for taxation for apartments. Are they paying their fair share? I don't think so!
1	Make property taxes for anyone who has moved to Idaho from another state in the last 15 years 30% or higher, to stop them from ruining Idaho.
1	New local funding is bad for our community. New development should pay for new services, transit, infrastructure.
5	A monorail system to connect centers are an excellent way to reduce road congestion. No one wants to sit in traffic everyday.
5	Rail line is key to so many other aspects under consideration in areas of keeping agricultural lands, the environment, affordable housing, outdoor living AND having integrated communities of all ethnicities and financial status.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Come on. No, transit lags way behind population areas. We are stressed now because failed policies are still pursued.
5	I live in Columbia Village (SE Boise) and there is NO public transportation here.
1	These rail systems don't work in medium density areas, they continue to loose large amounts of tax payer money
3	Farmland should be considered as an opportunity to expand transportation. Many farms take up huge tracts of land and are corporate owned. How about changing our paradigm that large scale farming is the only way to grow crops? We could start thinking about smaller scale farms with more diversity of crops.
4	Only will work if land preserved for farming is affordable and attainable, with incentives provided to the average person that wants to farm in the form of promising homesteading activities and/or farming export or local consumption products so the land is actually used for such and not to just sell it and turn into subdivisions
4	We can't take money away from roads and give it to transit. We still need money for roads. We need to find other sources of funding for mass transit. Unfortunately, I don't see a strong demand for people to take transit or use alternative transportation. Nationwide there is a stigma to taking mass transit, particularly, busses. Busses are viewed as a method of transportation for poor people. Middle class and rich people think taking the bus is beneath them. The rail will help, but it is not the end all or cure all. We will still need new and wider roads. I had a colleague who lives in the 36th & State Street area and use to take the bus to work for her job downtown. During the last economic downturn ValleyRide and the Boise School District made an agreement to transport Boise High students on the State Street ValleyRide bus route. The teenagers became an annoyance to my colleague on her way to work as the high school students were loud and made the bus overcrowded in the morning as the bus became standing room only. She eventually stopped riding the bus and started driving alone to work.
1	I am opposed to light rail, it is extremely expensive and is only very lightly used by the public.
4	Any of this options need to be focused also on compliance with now 30 year old Civil Rights law ADA for equal access and it is my observation even now ignored - also for housing options for aging populations - we all get there - to provide options for universally accessible housing and far too many apartments and condos built even in the last 5 years fail these FHA / ADA rules for access which apply to ALL buildings four or more units under a single room with the exception of 2 story townhomes
4	I'd love this - but don't know that it's feasible. How are we going to pay for it?
1	This is a total waste of public money as light rail will not reduce automobile traffic. For proof, look no further than SLC with its TRAX system and massive road congestion.
1	The farmland will be sold as housing demands needs the property. Farms will move further out of town.
5	It only makes sense to keep downtown living near downtown.
5	I'm hoping for LIGHT RAIL so we can take parking lots and convert them to green spaces so I can use a loop system to connect Ada and Canyon Counties (a minimum) and I can get to friends, church, doctors, and commerce without the expense of supporting a car. I'd prefer to rent a car for the 1, 2, or 3 long distance trips I might take. Also 1 car per household would be my goal and vehicles fees would increase as the number registered at once address increases. Also, fees must be collected -- compliance would reduce the tax burden on those of us contributing to a greener community.
5	I think transportation options will benefit the environment and traffic. I appreciate multiple urban centers instead of a central downtown.
3	Unless you are going to model the transportation system after Seoul Korea, it isn't worth it here. Privatize it, and make it accessible.
1	Don't understand
1	The majority of folks in Canyon County won't be near any kind of "rail system". We already live here and I don't see moving just to be near a transportation hub. We should've built a rail system 20 years ago.
1	I don't believe rail transportation is viable with the current growth style. to many routes are required.
4	I like the high speed rail in this option and feel it can be included in all options even if it includes more park and ride lots for those options not building housing on the main transportation corridor. Additionally, including bike and walking paths is a must in all options
4	#2 – High numbers is most values, balanced. Must be a way to improve score on “growth management.” Less expensive options than rail could improve costs as well as more options of work at home.

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
Scenario: Penny Lane	
4	I noticed in the description that sounds like you want banks to loan more to people who purchase in Downtown Boise. Based on personal finance experts such as Dave Ramsey individuals should not spend more than 25% of their take home pay on a mortgage. This is the same whether the property is downtown or out in the suburbs.
3	Agree - a focus on developing tighter homes near employment centers is a good strategy. Hwy 16 expansion is also key to this, which I support, but the lack of focus on the 84, State, Chinden won't make this plan stand on its own two feet
1	This seems wrong on a variety of levels. It poses the idea that we have the section of particular parts of neighborhoods as "affordable" and connotes the idea that these areas are "ghettos." It would be much better to figure out how to integrate mixed-use and mixed-income housing along transportation corridors and in half mile radii from activity centers.
NA	I'm really confused about what I'm suppose to do in this scenarios section...
2	This would not help a large number of individuals.
4	A much better way to manage and sustain responsible growth. Takes the land away from the BIG DEVELOPERS who only know how to building cheap homes in huge subdivisions with BIG pricetags. This helps re-establish older neighborhoods, allowing for re-development of already assigned residential use..
2	affordable housing can be woven into existing developments by requiring developers to dedicate x% of units to affordable. It's been done successfully in my home state of NJ for many many years. what we don't want is a concentration of "low income" that has a way of degrading over time.
4	If we do this right the longest pov commute would be about 10 minutes to the nearest monorail station or a shuttle bus.
4	I envision this option as similar to Bown Crossing
3	I would suggest that to the extent that commercial develop requires an economically viable work force then affordable housing should be available in all areas
3	I feel we could do better...
1	Don't use any of these as an excuse to tear down existing historic structures or bury them next to "unlimited height buidings". This city should not be run by developers who "wine and dine" make money and leave us all to deal with the negative outcomes.
4	"Affordable" housing should be in outlying areas and should consist of multi-story apartment buildings with ample parking. This should be alongside already frequently used and well served bus lines. Vista, Broadway, state, and chinden are all good candidates. Empty retail should be converted as soon as possible to cheap, parkable apartments.
3	This is still an option where you build up and not out. More parking garages and less parking lots.
2	It's a huge miss to think you can displace cars for peds when the number of each is disproportionate to the other.
1	This option isn't that different from where we're heading already. All we'll be with this option is "There beneath the blue suburban skies" with all the traffic that comes with
2	Infill first
1	This doesn't fix our problems. This is what we are doing now and we can see that it doesn't work.
4	Greenbelt expansion is automatic 5*. ID-16 will help future Star and Emmett expansions for getting into Boise
1	this almost sounds like the Pullman car company. lived and work in the same place paying rent or buying from your employer and if you quit or are fired you lose you're accomodations.
5	Please, no government funding for public transport.
1	No, this seems same as let it be. Affordibility should be required in all areas of Boise, including new development.
3	No public subsidies!
2	This would only work if the sidewalks and paths are made truly accessible by all and maintained well in order to stay that way. The blind and those with mobility challenges, whether in wheelchairs or using walking aids or braces, will be cut off from our communities in this plan unless extra care is taken to ensure otherwise. A bus route that is more disability friendly would be vital too.

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
4	3 story or more high rise apartments are erasing the laid back/enjoyable quality of living in Idaho. You are turning the Treasure Valley into any other big urban area. The native Idahoans as well as all those moving here are in Idaho for a slower paced, more relaxed quality of life. We don't want the Treasure Valley to become like Seattle, or Portland or San Francisco!
3	Look at co-op housing!
3	<p>Why is a scenario with fewer transit options considered more affordable? Is the added cost of needing to own a car being taken into consideration?</p> <p>Answer: <i>The Penny Lane scenario considers the overall housing + transportation costs to measure affordability. In this scenario we looked at adding growth in rural areas where land is cheaper, but transportation costs are higher, and in areas where land is more expensive but there is close access to employment so people could walk/bike/bus to jobs and lower costs.</i></p>
2	If the areas are already less expensive then I wouldn't worry about "affordable" housing.
2	it's understood that the population is growing in Canyon County and we need sufficient housing. I'm an "average Joe" and even I know that there are some considerations that need to be made PRIOR to starting to build huge apartments/subdivisions. How many units are being built? What recreation options are available to residents of the new community (or do they need to drive somewhere to go on a bike ride, take kids to the park etc)? What main roads does this new traffic filter into? Are builders being required to provide SAFE turning lanes/merging space/ emergency shoulder/ space for future road expansions?
4	with reasonable access to affordable housing. Meaning, if the rent will be at or above 30% of a person's take home income, they should have access to it.
1	Impact fees reasonably covering the infrastructure and all other costs of growth create free-market forces that help guide development into appropriate and sustainable configurations.
2	Many of the implementation methods are just too dependent upon bike/ped solving transportation problems. I fear this will fail since bike/ped is a low percentage of the commuters even in Cities like Portland and Phoenix.
4	Businesses have a stake in this too. If they insist on paying low wages then they need to help pay for housing that is affordable for those they hire. They will end up paying in other ways if they don't see that employees need shelter, food, affordable daycare, quality education, etc. All of the glaring deficiencies of our current system that has left so many Idahoans without the ability to meet their basic needs and beyond.
1	Walking and biking should be emphasized everywhere.
2	This is NOT economically viable nor affordable. Your gauge is flawed. The Housing+Transportation index needs to be part of the analysis. Affordable homes must be fostered in EVERY neighborhood.
3	Not too many folks live near where they work. Would only work in new work centers located in more rural areas.
1	mass transit, walking and biking encourages those who want to pursue a lower quality of life than what those of us here desire. It also will change the demographic and politics that is what make and keep our state great as opposed to those major cities on the west coast. Is that not obvious?
4	Why is it every renter or owner in the downtown areas still dreams of a house with a yard? How do you tell them kids don't need yards and their own space? Affordable housing occurs when you have an abundance of units offered not when the government sets the price.
1	This is a false choice and will cost too much
NA	I suppose this.
2	The infill has been painful. It seems all infill has been giant apartment complexes. Or something built the max of what the rules will allow without regard for how this will impact schools or traffic. It appears as if developers are in the pocket of the planners.
3	Good scenario that takes advantage of new, small employment centers (i.e., barbar park area)
1	This one seems almost identical to the let it be scenario, with the exception of an intent to try to pay for cheaper housing. It feels more aspirational than anything. If you look at bigger cities, the developers will just pay the penalty to not include affordable housing because the fee is never set high enough it is always watered down, which then raises the cost of living which then makes it more unaffordable. This is a vicious cycle and I don't think we are likely to take a firm hand with the developers in order to make this work. We will just spend a bunch of money with little to show for it.
1	This may be a great option for those that like living in town. It would keep them off the existing roads. Not all people like living in town and crowded on small lots and multiple story units.

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
2	We need to quit expanding our cities, and concentrate on in-filling undeveloped space within our cities first. Once it's all infilled, then lets talk about expansion. And these crazy annexation boundaries are absurd.
3	Stop small lot thinking. People deserve better as well as affordability.
2	what they are considering affordable housing...definitely is not affordable. Affordable housing needs to be near downtown
NA	We can't give away the ranch at the expense of owners, there is enough pressure on tax paying citizens
1	Encourages increased crime and poverty zones. Look how well that works for Garden City
1	High density infill needs to stop. It has led to more traffic and air pollution at a much quicker pace.
1	This is a terrible practice that has already ruined rural areas with too many apartments, eight plexes, four plexes and other overcrowded new subdivisions.
2	All scenarios should prioritize walking and biking options for the health of all!
1	Better option is to make it incredibly expensive for Californians to move here
1	If affordable housing were near employment centers, OK. But affordable housing has been placed everywhere. The Boise City Council is the worst violator in this practice.
5	Unfortunately, with the COVID-19 crisis I see a bigger demand for larger houses and yards because the of the closures of public playgrounds, pools, and the increase of working at home. People will want more space in their homes for a home office and a home gym and a big backyard for the kids and room for a pool.
4	Any of this options need to be focused also on compliance with now 30 year old Civil Rights law ADA for equal access and it is my observation even now ignored - also for housing options for aging populations - we all get there - to provide options for universally accessible housing and far too many apartments and condos built even in the last 5 years fail these FHA / ADA rules for access which apply to ALL buildings four or more units under a single room with the exception of 2 story townhomes
3	This one doesnt make 100% sense to me. Why can't it be urban housing at town centers? Why can't we be more urban in Meridian? Why are they building suburban office complexes? Why cant we provide a choice of housing in each town and people then can afford and have housing options in each town. Why if you want an urban lifestyle your only option is Boise?
1	Remove all street parking from downtown. Make the roads all 1 way and synchronize the lights so car traffic flows.
1	managing growth into ag areas and large lot suburban areas is important to keep green space around the city Think Boulder, Colorado but less draconian
3	Seems more inefficient and places a bigger burden on people needing the affordable housing options.
1	If "affordable housing" is what it always has been in all major cities, This will only increase crime.
NA	Don't understand
1	The majority of folks that live in Canyon County work in Ada County. They do so because Ada County became too expensive to buy a house.
4	This is NOT where I would want to live, but it could be low cost housing option.
1	I'm not a fan of houses on small lots. I don't believe it's what the home buyer really wants but that is all they can afford. The smaller home lots are an huge profit base for both the developer and the city from taxes at the expense of the home buyer
2	Description sounds very ideal – but low scores in my top 3 values priorities caused me to rate it low – can't the environment, open space, & limited growth be improved while still performing well in other values?
Scenario: Come Together	
1	Buses won't solve our connectivity/congestion problem - people don't move to Idaho to get on buses, they move here to get off buses. The cost of living will go up in this scenario because growth is strangled. Regional pathways make it seem like they will be everywhere, but the reality is the Treasure Valley is not walkable or bike-able for 3-4 months out of the year (end of November thru end of February, at least) this expensive build-out of pathways are essentially unusable. Our city doesn't need to become an urban hub. We should be encouraging businesses to come and infill areas instead of trying to get bus routes added for people who won't ever use buses because they'd rather have the freedom of their own vehicle or autonomous pick-up in the future

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	Again, relying on buses to serve the valley when we are projecting 300,000 people to be here in the next 30 years will only further contribute to congestion. This would require HOV lanes to make it efficient. HOV lanes are currently not allowed in Idaho. And while the State Street TOD attempts to do this in Boise, without REGIONAL funding and a dedicated funding source for the bus system, this will never work. We need to quit putting so much emphasis on our bus system and look ahead to newer technologies and strategies that will help us manage transportation. And we need to focus more on regional transportation solutions above and before inner-city transportation solutions since a great number of people live outside of the cities in which they work.
2	Buses buses buses - no one rides the buses. Why are these constantly presented as the answer to transportation issues?
4	You'll never achieve sustainable mass transit options in a post-Covid world. Better to improve the existing trade/market roads to sustain manufacturing, industrial and agriculture assets in the region. Force big developers to allocate more of their PUDs and large subdivisions to parks, pathways, school and make them pay the true COSTS of their developments. Build less...charge them MORE impact fees.
3	This is a viable option if development fees are high enough to cover costs of services without existing homeowners going broke to pay for needed improvements.
5	Don't know why affordable housing can't be included in proposed developments. Especially large ones. Should be policy that % of units are affordable. Encourage infill development by providing breaks on fees. Impact fees for suburban developments outside of service areas should have enormous impact fees. That's how you stop developers from buying cheap land and saddling all of us taxpayers with the fall out! Like focus on preserving farmland. Would like to see more families have opportunity to experience rural lifestyle on small acreages. That can provide buffer between farmland/farm activities and suburban housing.
5	scrap the buses and move to the 21st century. smaller shuttle buses should be utilized from monorail stations. Or consider a short walk to and from the office
5	None of these seem to address transportation for elderly. I see the need for some type of convenient, inexpensive "on demand" public transportation which could help encourage reduction of poor driving by those progressively experiencing age related problems driving safely.
3	Buses are not sufficient as they get just as caught up in gridlock as cars and trucks.
3	this option appears to favor urbanization
4	I would suggest that exploiting existing centers of population and related services would also support overall affordability
3	This is closest to my first choice.
4	Zone Density and Rail added to this...but ticket to ride sounds better
5	It is not necessary to destroy SW Idaho for another Call Center. Stop the massive expansion of apartments. Consider Tiny House options for home ownership to build home ownership.
2	That's fine to infill develop, but building out Boise and adding a lot more highway will help. We need to route thru-traffic around the city center and build up infrastructure to support the larger population.
5	This would be great, if the bus system was actually effective and useful. But the system here is very flawed and needs a lot of readjustment.
5	This would connect transit routes from the non-Boise cities to each other and to Boise.
1	Buses and regional transit will only account for a small percentage of people movement. Better to plan on capacity improvements (widening) before its too late.
4	Although I think this is a good option, it relies on communities to truly come together and put the good of the whole over the individual. And for you to think that's happening without any government strongly overseeing the pact, you "Got to be a joker he[they] just do what he[they] please" The cities tried a partnership in the past that fell through for just this reason. Self interested parties killed the deal. How do we stop this from happening here also? At least the Ticket scenario requires a binding ballot measure. This one is a wish. A nice one, but a wish. It could happen, but the stars would need to align.
2	Preserving farmland is necessary, but this seems like a fallacy.
2	Services do not exist in areas of Boise that have been, and are continuing to be, approved for development. They are promises on paper that have not happened. The approvals need to be postponed until the infrastructure catches up otherwise the decision makers are placing everyone at higher and higher risk.

Score <small>(higher score = higher rating)</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	Totally sounds like infill first. Busses really. Nobody rides the bus
3	Busses are only a part of the solution. Look at any large city and transportation options are one of the key differences between function and terrible.
5	Yes. Infrastructure first. Always.
5	Add ID-16 to this and maybe take away some bus routes and pathways
3	In general, all of these scenarios are WAY TOO simplified to provide substantial feedback. I am afraid I am not providing ratings on clear information. The "ask" is not clear.
3	Preserving farms is of utmost importance. Build UP in cities, not out.
3	Buses are slow and for the last 50 years it has been one bus on a route maybe every hour. Not enough, fast enough or adequate. more light rail lines serving the entire valley that work in conjunction with each other.
2	Please, no government funding for public transport.
5	Encouraging more bike/walk/non-motor single person cars is key
4	Great, but don't find this with property taxes! We need lower property taxes even if it means fewer services.
4	This valley is in dire need of a high speed rail system. Ideally this would stretch from Ontario to Mountain Home. Simultaneously, there needs to be a business spur of I-84 that traverses the northern end of Boise and connects as far as Caldwell. Chinden road may serve as a good location.
4	Having the buses serve most of the valley would be very helpful if it really comes true. Those buses though need to be made truly and fully accessible to be of real value to all Idahoans. And their routes need to include more than just shopping centers and business streets. The disabled community wants to enjoy festivals, fairs, parks and local nature reserves like Lake Lowell/Deerflat just as much as able bodied people do, but some can't get there without better transportation help.
1	Too much apartment living in this scenario! Too tightly/densely populated. Loses what makes us Idaho. No longer has the relaxed "Idaho"vibe.
4	Agriculture and Environment must be preserved!
5	Do this right and the area will attract higher paying jobs, diversity, desirability, stability, good governance, and affordability will follow.
5	Why can't we turn our elaborate canal network into a transportation opportunity for e-bikes and other future personal active transport options? Solve the legal liability problems and get the US Bureau of Reclamation and other agencies that control the canal network to contribute to the growth planning for the Treasure Valley. Surely the existing 'highway' of canals would lead to more bike commuting to business centers?!
4	Build some city owned mobile home parks with income based rent. Put a 40 year lease on each spot so the home depreciate to zero and are replaced.
4	Again, big fan of buses, if they are self-supporting. This is likely to mean that, in spite of potential union wishes, we won't run them throughout the day, when they would be largely empty -- again, not like Portland.
5	Impact fees reasonably covering the infrastructure and all other costs of growth create free-market forces that help guide development into appropriate and sustainable configurations.
5	Its more important to preserve wilderness than farmland. Future build out into the foothills like what is currently happening on Bogus Basin Road should be permanently banned. The foothills belong to the people.
1	Transportation funding isn't helping my area?! They actually REMOVED any public transportation from anywhere NEAR my development?!
4	If we build on the farm land how will Idaho's agricultural sector make it. We need agricultural land, need animals, better farming practices that nurture the soil with greater biodiversity. Effective transportation is essential, this is not the Idaho of 25 years ago and we have lost many opportunities to keep important land that is essential to the health of all of us.
3	Most folks will not uses public transportation...too spoiled and want more control of their time and location.
5	LET IT BE. Large lot developments. Let those that want to come here be able to and WANT to afford the values we have. Want to be INDEPENDENT, not the opposite. Otherwise, the beautiful valley will crash the way Portland has. I watched it all happen through adding mass transit, mass housing. It's a fact.
3	Transportation options (i.e. public transit) in Boise are pretty limited currently. Most of the area has been developed in an auto-centric manner. Therefore trying to just expand where transportation currently exists is not a great idea.
2	Not the best option but only one available on this survey that manages growth.
3	This sort of gets it right, but not sure about some of the metrics
NA	I support this
5	Please create high housing density near the urban core (city center)

Score (higher score = higher rating)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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	I think this far and away the best option.
3	Not quite a nice as Ticket to Ride but probably more attainable.
4	Another favorable scenario. But will buses be an effective way to transport a significant amount of employers from the suburbs to downtown Boise and other areas of high employment?
1	Farm land is not going to survive. In the 1960s outside of Phoenix, very much like Boise today, they planned for growth, lots of growth and you find signs in the middle farms 10 miles from town stating future xxx freeway or loop. I ran across a Maricopa county from the 60s the other day that all the freeways laid out on it that were built in the 80s and 90s. Their planning was so far ahead they build overpasses in the middle of farm fields miles from the center of town years before a freeway would ever connect be build much less connect them. The developers took note and bought up the farms and those on and off ramps are now the center of mini-communities with their own downtowns (think Hyde Park) but larger). Ada and Canyon Counties need to start thinking past their 10 year planning cycle and start making 20 and 50 year plans (like other cities) and start drawing the map for the Hill (road) Freeway Connector, the Kuna Inner Loop Freeway and the Ustick Bypass.
1	This scenario ignores the fact that many people already find those activity centers to be unaffordable. You provide no help to anyone outside of areas that already have a lot of support. That doesn't seem like a "good for all" plan, but a "good for the north end" plan.
5	This sounds like it is one of the better options to help preserve our beautiful state's natural land and farmlands.
3	I do not want to see nothing but houses. We must preserve our farmland!
5	Infill before expansion.
1	City centers already bear too much of the brunt of growth. Expanding outward should still happen, while homeowners should be better incentivized to rehab existing properties. Rentals proliferate at the expense of generational home ownership, and that trend needs to stop. We need people to be able to invest in their homes instead of becoming part of rental cash cows.
2	I don't really like any of your scenarios. Some where along the way too many people have been brainwashed into thinking that growth is good and unavoidable. Let's consider a scenario that doesn't assume there will be 1.1 M people living here by 2050 and figure out how to make the population stabilize near where we currently are.
1	development is out of control. Infrastructure can not support it.
3	I do not want to see buses or rail lines in Ada County. I agree - preserve farms, county acreage to allow small farms for 4H animals, etc. Please do not turn our beautiful city into urban sprawl.
NA	Preserve farmland and stop the growth is what I am for - once huge impact fees are implemented trust me the developers will go else where
3	Preserve Idaho's Farmers and Farmlands.
4	Really like the preserving of farmland and open space.
1	Planned communities should not be stereotyped as big impacts on local government budgets. A recent study shows that planned community residents do pay more for first responder services!!
1	Make Idaho how it was when it was only a bunch of farming and forestry, back before Californians moved here.
2	Bus systems need to have cost/benefit analysis. What I've seen is they are slow and ridership is low.
3	We need more than buses
2	CBH and other cheap developers have raped our farmland. These developers find level farmland, do a minimum for grading, and build cheap, small houses. Our schools are crowded, our roads are a decade behind, and safety be damned.
2	Buses primarily rely on fossil fuels —unless they are electric powered. This option of reliance on fossil fuels in future is not strategic nor healthy for the environment.
1	We will still need to have some greenfield development. Unfortunately, services are deficient in most areas. We still need to find a way to fill those holes. ITD needs to increase the amount of funding they spend in the Treasure Valley. In addition, we need to have better coordination of transportation and land use decisions. Our politicians seem to take the short term view rather than the long term view. For example, ITD should have developed Eagle Road as a freeway and not bended to the desires of the City of Meridian and commercial developers to make the state highway a retail destination rather than a highway to move people faster through the region. ITD and the City of Meridian didn't learn from Eagle Road and are turning Chinden Blvd into the next Eagle Road. It is important that we provide a sufficient supply of housing so that teachers and our public servants are able to afford to purchase a home. If we don't build new housing the Treasure Valley will be just a home for the rich California and Seattle transplants. Where will our children live?

Score (higher score = higher rating)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
4	Any of this options need to be focused also on compliance with now 30 year old Civil Rights law ADA for equal access and it is my observation even now ignored - also for housing options for aging populations - we all get there - to provide options for universally accessible housing and far too many apartments and condos built even in the last 5 years fail these FHA / ADA rules for access which apply to ALL buildings four or more units under a single room with the exception of 2 story townhomes
4	Best, most realistic scenario
1	Let the market decide. Farm land does NOT need protecting. Force developers to put in adequate infrastructure BEFORE they are allowed to build. Account for the new growths impact on the EXISTING infrastructure and make developers pay for it. I.e. The Ustick rd widening Should have been 100% financed by IMPACT FEES.
5	This is the best idea ever. It keeps our green space, our less traveled rural roads, concentrates growth in areas where it's most sustainable. Let the farmers farm and the millennials breed in the condo's and work downtown. Close down the LDS stake system and move it to town!!
4	Seems efficient to grow where there is already growth, and preserve farmland.
NA	This section makes no sense
3	Out of your 4 options, I guess this is the best.
4	What is the lowest cost public transportation model? Answer: <i>Generally a bus-based system costs the least and light rail costs the most, with bus rapid transit and commuter rail in the middle.</i>
5	Best overall in values I support – surely affordable housing & choice can be addressed & improved while keeping other values strong. Have to say I don't really understand the performance scores – more info helpful.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
Implementation Strategies Rate Each Strategy on a Scale of 1 to 5 Higher score = higher rating; NA = did not rate	
Scenario: Let It Be	
Strategy: HOV (High-Occupancy Vehicle) Lanes	
2	I would only support HOV lanes on the segment of Interstate 84 that at least four (4) lanes going in each direction.
1	We didn't plan for enough lanes to begin with, this won't help. Go to Phoenix and you'll see a city that DID plan for enough lanes, including HOV lanes. Makes sense when you plan ahead, not when you're behind
2	Does NOT work in Oregon, California, Colorado...why, oh why, would it work here???
1	Increases dangerous traffic weaving. Inefficient use of lanes in non-peak situations.
4	Buses still require amenities for people to ride, and routes where people need to go.
NA	good for emergency vehicles. utilize for ACHD vans. it wont reduce traffic.
3	Seems to support environmental health
1	Maybe these do actually work, but I've lived places with them and never saw them used
2	Children should not count to qualify for HOV lane use. They could not otherwise be driving their own vehicle so their presence in a vehicle isn't helpful at reducing the cars on the road. I support HOV lanes if this is included.
4	This would be absolutely essential to accommodate more vehicle traffic, but that doesn't mean there aren't other solutions that would work to minimize vehicle traffic in the first place
4	As long as it adds an additional land and does not take away a current lane.
4	Don't need this yet but could in the future.
3	We don't even have enough lanes to do a HOV lane anywhere
1	No it would not be needed. There is no relation between between HOV lanes and this scenario
5	Allow people to purchase use of these, funds going ONLY transportation.
1	they don't work.
1	Never under any circumstances
2	Toll lanes would be better.
1	HOV lanes make little sense when the majority of roadway users are single occupant vehicles.
2	Only if passenger vehicles require 3+ passengers and you can't pay to use the HOV lanes as a single driver like in some other places.
1	NO
4	encourage HOV usage
2	We dont need to be like California
1	Ya let's take a lane out of service for the 3 percent that will use it. No that's dumb Christ go back to California with that thinking
5	One tiny piece of the transportation puzzle
1	People cheat HOV lanes all the time, leaving honest travelers to languish in the non-hov lanes
5	No new taxes.
1	Don't see the current fit for this unless employers work together for transportation use such as shift starts and bus usage to specific destinations. Difficult to carpool at present due to individual family and employment scenarios.
4	an option but hope that COMPASS does not vote for LET IT BE
1	No. Just no. I've lived in cities with this, and while it's nice to be the "special" ones in the HOV, it ultimately just means one less lane for everyone and doesn't help traffic all that much.
3	only after roads with HOV are widened
3	You would need many more lanes on the freeway for this otherwise you will just be causing other traffic issues. But incentives for carpooling are great. Companies those folks work for should subsidize this
4	I have used them in other states and I am unconvinced how effective they are. Would be amenable to using this approach.
3	Use ZIP lanes! Then immediately begin looking at public transportation systems like in Portland, OR.
1	This doesn't address the underlying need of effective public transportation.
5	This is a no brainer

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	This is an intrusive regulation and a waste of a lane.
4	As long as they're enforced. I've lived places that had HOV lanes, but they were never enforced, so didn't work.
1	Lanes are congested enough already without losing one to this.
NA	Do not work, adds to crashes because people cheat and cross over the posts
5	Residential developers will always be developing on the suburban fringe because many buyers want new homes. HOV lanes will be a necessity and inexpensive to facilitate with existing lanes.
1	HOV lanes are a farce and don't work. They force the majority of traffic into fewer lanes. Put in more lanes if necessary, but forego the "entitlement" lanes.
1	I spent years in Los Angeles areas. I don't think carpool lanes work. Buses should have special lanes.
3	Lanes must be funded by the Valley Regional Transportation system, not funded by property taxes, not funded by state/county road funds.
4	HOV lanes during designated high traffic times is a great idea. I hope implementations are being done now to provide this option... Some areas of the Canyon County freeway are still two lanes.
NA	I do not support this in the Treasure Valley at this time.
5	More bike lanes.
1	No!!! We had these in Seattle and it was an elitist system!!! On those that made enough could afford the HOV lanes. Horrible for everyday people.
4	Not sure we need this yet.
5	I would vote for this.
2	Most large metro areas have this. Seems to be decent, but still just a bandaid unless we increase buses availability.
1	Transit is MUCH more important than HOV which requires extra space and \$ for enforcement
3	I agree with HOV lanes if our bus system was graciously expanded.
5	Only by adding a new lane, not converting an existing lane to HOV
3	The roads need to be expanded. Other areas of the country like Phoenix metro area have built adequate roads before development came so when it did develop there was plenty of lanes for cars. ACHD and ITD are way behind on this.
1	Hov don't work, look at Seattle, pdx, etc
1	This makes traffic worse by robbing the bigger crowd of an extra lane. "tried" this one in portland too. Made things worse, I lived it!
4	These become revenue streams where wealthy pay and don't carpool. A downside in my opinion.
1	This requires policing which is another cost and slows traffic in non HOV lanes so you actually pollute the air more. Sorry I saw it in CA and so many times the HOV lanes were sparsely used or not at all as you inch at 25 mph on freeway. It's a pipe dream.
1	This would work if roads were wider but as they exist now it would just lead to more congestion.
2	Road design is missing controlled access through fares. Eagle road is a great example of a missed opportunity and now we must live with short sighted thinking.
1	don't work as advertised. Waste of energy to get them approved
1	NO STARS AT ALL!! Don't do this. The beauty of our area is the less than modern freeway.
2	These fill up quite easily and then don't help the people they are meant to. It is supposed to help push folks into a different transportation option. Bus lanes are better.
1	There are not enough lanes on I-84 to handle the daily commute now so how could we have a HOV lane? Answer: <i>If HOV lanes were to be allowed, any specific project and location would be studied first to ensure an HOV lane would be an appropriate use of resources in that location. That said, if an HOV lane were to be added to I-84, it most likely would be a newly constructed lane so as to not decrease the number of lanes available to all users.</i>
4	Also in favor of charging to use HOV during certain hours. While this has pros and cons attached to it, this would help roadway widening pay for itself, since taxes earmarked for roadway construction is currently insufficient.
1	Hate them , cause more congestion on the roads.
NA	No buses. Business or agencies that need to support their workers can figure out their own carpools or van pools. Let each business figure out their own solutions.
2	Don't think it will be utilized heavily, thus will create more congestion in other lanes. I think this is better suited for much larger cities.
5	It is silly that in 2020 we don't have the option of HOV because of some State Statute.
NA	Reduce car traffic by reducing growth
2	These are implemented in California. They don't improve carpooling very much, and increase traffic

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Zero stars. No HOV lanes in Idaho
1	do not need this at all!!!
1	These aren't even effective in heavily urban areas...I am from the I-5 corridor, and trust me, I know what they are and how they work....
1	HOV doesn't fit here. It doesn't even work well in more urban locales with less car dependent populations.
1	People like their cars. This didn't work in CA.
1	I lived in a state that had HOV lanes. They aren't the best option for the investment. If a wreck occurs in this lane, it totally defeats the purpose.
1	Sounds good but has been a failure in other states who then sell passes for single passenger vehicles thereby defeating the purpose. All it does is consume tax dollars to build, then becomes a toll road.
4	This moves more people quickly, but doesn't really address the full issue.
NA	No way not ever.
NA	HOV lanes DO NOT WORK!!! Study after study shows that it does NOT encourage ridesharing, yet costs billions to implement. DONT do it!
4	Interstate only at this time
5	Include motorcycles and EVs
1	These increase traffic and worsen congestion. I've lived this in the Seattle area, it's a nightmare. Imagine taking all the highways right now and destroying the left lane to make them one lane smaller. That's all the commuter lane does. You have one lane that hardly anyone can use. Horrible idea.
4	But, wealthy cannot buy access
NA	Absolutely NEVER!!!!
4	You must include improved bike lanes and means to efficiently commute via bike.
3	We will need to have wider roads. For example, the interstates would need to be at least 4 lanes in each direction.
3	In other cities where these are I use them but I am not sure how effective they are at reducing traffic
1	No. We already don't have enough travel lanes. Get rid of the "zipper" lanes. They cause too much road rage because people use them to "take cuts" instead of simply merging in.
1	I don't understand why the Legislature won't move on this
3	Perhaps during certain times of the day.
5	This works great in many large cities as long as there are sufficient lanes for other traffic.
3	Need more lanes for everyone! People here will buck the system and drive in them anyway!@
4	Would be nice. However, we can't even fix/build roads that we need now.
NA	There are already carpool. Citing the individuals that are going slow in the fast lane and keeping trucks out of the fast lane will help more.
2	Literally what is the point of this???
3	Does not seem to improve traffic in dense population areas I have visited. Not
2	This does not seem to improve transportation in the high population metros I have visited, (Los Angeles, Las Vegas). There is not enough use of the HOV lanes because people continue to independent travel.
1	Proven ineffective. Adds to traffic congestion and citizen frustration. An outdated nanny-state approach.
5	I've wondered why we don't have these after riding around in Washington near Seattle. Would maybe help normalize other mode of transport if they're a good option
3	With how little I see ISP doing anything on I-84 I do not see them enforcing keeping single drivers out of the HOV lane
NA	Survey sucks
4	Because our state has been reactive vs pro-active, this would be a viable option.
3	For the HOV Lanes, are there enough lanes now for room to do this, considering the low percentage of HOVs? I realize this is probably an if-you-build-it-they-will-come situation. Would like to know more about how this has worked elsewhere – places that started out with our same very high percentage of single-occupancy vehicles. Otherwise, I worry about blow-back from some in the public about this, which could negatively affect their willingness to embrace other progressive transportation & growth strategies as well. That's why I rated it a 3, without having more info. Answer: <i>If HOV lanes were to be allowed, any specific project and location would be studied first to ensure an HOV lane would be an appropriate use of resources in that location. That said, if an HOV lane were to be added, it most likely would be a newly constructed lane so as to not decrease the number of lanes available to all users.</i>
2	Currently every lane available needs to be accessible to everyone – and we're all sick of continued road construction. Future traffic patterns might make it more sensible without construction and cost.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
Scenario: Let It Be	
Strategy: Vehicle Mile Travelled Tax	
1	This penalizes people who live in small towns who have to drive to Meridian or Boise for medical appointments or for higher order goods. The Vehicle Mile Traveled Tax would penalize those who do a lot of long road trips, which portions may occur outside of Idaho.
1	I'd rather see a gas tax increase than whatever this is
3	Hmmm? Still thinking about this one.
4	But, you cannot do this unless you have more and better alternative transportation!
5	Apply this same approach to the big developers...make them pay all the true costs of their LARGE developments, forcing them to think longer-term and better pricing for their inventory. This churn-and-burn attitude of rampart & massive residential development with tiny retails on every major market-trade road intersection is killing the Treasure Valley and Idaho.
1	Should INCREASE the fuel tax to incent use of electric vehicles
3	I like this in theory, but I think it would need to be coupled with strong affordable housing policies to allow options for all socio-economic groups to live near jobs and amenities.
5	I'm tired of having a smaller yard and paying higher taxes close in, so others can live farther away, use the roads and impacts them twice as much, and then pay less into the system. No subsidies!
1	Privacy concerns.
5	Strongly support. Also support gas taxes. Strongly support removing most parking minimums, which has a similar effect, with the added benefit of cheaper housing and improved land use and walkability.
NA	use instead of fuel tax. electric vehicles have the same wear on the road as do gas vehicles.
1	Not a chance in hell I'd want this ever.
1	Boo- no more bull taxes. I feel like this is a punishment for people who want to live farther outside the cities, cramming us all into smaller spaces.
3	I'm no economist but I believe in the concept of a usage tax
5	I was unsure what the pros or cons of the differing tax methodologies are. It would've been nice to see that a bit here, specifically what the benefits are, if changed.
2	While this sounds good in theory, it's not clear how this would be enforced or how it would apply to out-of-state vehicles
1	illegal
1	This is ridiculous. Another tax on those that drive
1	I don't like this, it is essentially a stealth tax, as gasoline is already taxed; you want the \$, tax the gas and people know what the driving expense is real time.
1	No new taxes ... although at some point in the future it may be done.
1	Again, how is this related?
1	People commuting are already paying a 'use' tax because they buy more gas.....mileage tax could be implemented for electric transportation.
1	This is the absolute worst idea
1	Quit with the money grab. Charge the contractors 100,000 dollars for every tree over 8 years old the cut down, to build a parking garage.
1	Absolutely never
1	That sounds ridiculous. People who have to travel farther to get to work because they can only afford something far away will then be hit again. Absolutely stupid idea. We have to make roads wider to add bike lanes and cyclists don't pay a penny, its about time they are required to register their bikes and follow traffic laws while they're on the road. Revenue from bicycle registration and traffic violation fines would ensure that everyone who benefits from the road also pays for the road. Common sense.
1	Bad idea
1	Unfair tax for those who can not afford to live in urban area
1	This would reduce the incentive to purchase fuel efficient vehicles, it could also put an additional burden on those who choose to move further from the city center for more affordable housing. This would be a disadvantage to those who are already lower income.
2	Toll lanes would be better
1	The gas tax already accomplishes this. The more you drive the more fuel you need to buy. A vehicle mile tax unfairly penalizes commuters who are forced to live farther away from their jobs do to housing affordability.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	This penalizes those who must buy further out due to housing prices. No.
1	No way do I support this. This would severely impact travel thus decreasing fuel usage hence taxes to maintain roads. Horrible idea.
1	This is ridiculous. It would require some sort of monitoring. We don't want to be tracked. We like our privacy and our freedom. This takes away from that
1	This is inequitable. Wealthy can live near work. This doesn't allow for work mobility. This impacts rural communities and families with multiple breadwinners. This is just wrong.
1	This is a terrible idea that penalizes lower income folks who can't afford to live near work, school, family, etc.
1	NO
1	Many workers often have to travel from affordable housing to work in the cities
3	Why no fuel tax? Would this be applied to electric vehicles?
1	Registration based on how many vehicles owned. More cars, higher prices.
2	This does not really seem to address anything, as more miles driven means one buys more fuel and already pays more. Plus people are very clever at "turning back the odometer." But this also appears to be a (hidden) worry that the growth in electric vehicles will drive down fuel tax revenue. This can't be an "either" "or" decision as gas vehicles are not going to dissapear over night. Consider making the tax on miles driven apply to only electric vehicles, but be aware of clever ways to roll back the miles.
2	fuel tax encourages fuel efficiency
1	This is a garbage idea
1	Nope. #go back to California with that stupid idea. Ya like I'm gonna let you put a GPS on my car to track my driving . Nope
3	Both would be better
3	I like this idea IF the burden doesn't fall on people who must commute far because there is no affordable housing near employment centers.
3	From a roadspace allocation perspective, congestion charging would more directly address congestion. From roadway impacts it probably also would make sense to charge larger vehicles more as well.
4	How will this be implement? What about a London-type urban perimeter toll zone?
1	No new taxes. Cut costs. Be more efficient.
NA	Heck no.
1	This might be reasonable for commercial vehicles?
2	could harm people who can't afford to live close and have no other public transport system
1	No more taxation. The budget will increase as more people are paying taxes; you don't need to find more ways to squeeze us. Terrible idea; I was tempted to use expletives here.
5	Good luck getting the trucking industry on board with this. They have more power over Idaho transportation policy than any organizations of cities and counties who could influence policy change.
5	Not sure how to do this one, many challenges, but some change is needed.
4	how would out of state travel people be charged for road use? partial vehicle mile tax and partial gas tax? Definitely do not add VMTtax in addition to full gas tax.
3	Why not both? We should still be encouraging better fuel economy and efficiency of vehicles. Also we need more encouragement of electric cars
1	Slippery slope. Taxes are high and this opens up another can of worms. Absolutely a no on this for me.
1	Stupid idea.
5	Dedicate these taxes to incorporating future modes (like autonomous vehicles) of travel, etc.
1	This taxes people who can't afford to live close to their job
1	As long as the gas tax was actually repealed, a mileage tax would be worth considering. How has this worked in other areas? Answer: Oregon was the first state in the nation to implement a mileage tax program. You can learn more about their program at https://www.myorego.org/ .
5	only if you STOP/REPLACE the tax on fuel
1	If people choose to live further out and commute, why penalize them with this kind of tax?
NA	Unfair to people who can no longe live in places in Boise due to allowing the building of McMansions, etc.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	How would Miles Driven be verified? Answer: <i>Details such as how miles would be verified would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. However, as an example, Oregon allows participants to choose from different types of devices that plug into a vehicle that track mileage. These range from simple units that only track miles driven to more complex units that provide additional information to the participant. You can learn more about Oregon's different options at https://www.myorego.org/get-started/.</i>
5	Commercial vehicles should be taxed as well as they heavy trucks put the most wear and tear on roads. ACHD needs to focus on purchasing the right of way now in the farmlands before the cost of the farm land gets too high. ACHD needs funding for right of way acquisition and I suspect the quickest option is a gas tax. A gas tax is also a "vehicle miles traveled tax" in a different form.
1	Here's a better idea: If you're going out for dinner, pay more to travel. You obviously have more money. This is tied with HOV lanes as the most terrible idea. This is biased against sales and service industries who don't get to choose in which direction or how far they have to travel. Build more lanes, improve the timing on the traffic lights. Just improving the traffic light situation would make an enormous difference. The lights slow traffic down terribly.
1	We need less taxes, not more.
4	There should also be a factor in the tax assessed based on vehicle weight. A heavier vehicle has more impact on the roadway. There should not be a punitive tax on electric vehicles as there is currently.
1	After we start a per mile tax on all electric vehicles in the state.
4	All funds should go to road infrastructure (with sidewalks)
1	This is not a fair tax or assessment in such a large rural State of Idaho
NA	This is an idiotic idea in the Treasure Valley. Vehicle weight is the driver for roadway destruction, and such destruction is most appropriately repaired via fuel taxes. Higher fuel taxes are unquestionably the best alternative for our society, for a multitude of reasons. Any and all system expansions should be fully funded via impact fees, not subsidized by taxes on existing residents and vehicle registrations fees.
1	Let the heavier, less efficient vehicles bear the burden through fuel taxes. This is a thinly veiled attempt to tax e-vehicles.
1	This is a really bad idea which would result in more accounting from EVERYONE. Who would this benefit? How would this help our city? How would this help Meridian residents? Again, this is a terrible idea.
2	if all the vehicles out there with expired registrations would play up and renew, that you help funding. We need to add a separate moth sticker to our license plates (like Oregon and many other surrounding states) to make it easier for Police to see expired tags.
1	As a Realtor - this is a sucky idea
1	My job is home health and I must drive hundreds of miles a week to meet the needs of home bound Patients. Being taxed to provide medical care to disabled/homeland patients would be unfair
4	The people who drive the most are typically those with the least disposable income. Let's not punish them for living in Caldwell or Mountain home.
1	DO NOT WANT THIS!!!
4	REPEAL ELECTRIC CAR TAX!!!
1	This would burden those who travel outside the TV.
3	I like this yet am concerned about people who have moved far out to find a place they can afford to live and would have to pay more of their low wages to a travel tax. As cars have gotten more fuel efficient we are generally seeing less gas used per vehicle.
1	This punishes those who live here and rewards the out of state transport trucks. By taxing gas everyone who fills up here (both commercial and non) are charged.
2	This sound like a good idea, but seems like it would lack broad appeal to the entire valley.
1	This sounds like it could impact rural living families more than city dwelling families
5	Tie all road maintenance to VMT without using property taxes to subsidize car use. People need to know what it actually costs to maintain roads
2	I agree with this in theory, but I believe the current planning and transportation habits we have now would impact low income folks who cannot afford to live near economic centers.
NA	Need more comparative data on this to respond.
1	I am against any new tax.
1	No more taxes
1	This is a liberal program that directly taxes people for their freedom!
1	HELL NO!

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Fuel tax is an incentive for fuel efficient vehicles and electric vehicles.
1	This could hurt the average working man and is a nonstarter.
1	This is unmanageable.
1	Just increase sales tax rather than try to add another unmanageable layer.
2	You cannot determine how many miles are driven in the state vs in others states so not sure how this will work unless nation wide.
5	should be instituted in any case
1	How would this work given miles driven outside our immediate community? Answer: Details such as how miles driven outside the area would "count" (or not) would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. However, as an example, Oregon allows participants to choose from different types of accounts with different features. Some of these accounts provide for credit for out of state miles, while others do not. Learn more at https://www.myorego.org/get-started/ .
1	Since you missed, why penalize us?
NA	If it isn't broke, don't fix it
2	Might unfairly hurt people who have to commute due to housing prices
1	Unless other transportation options are available, this penalizes low-income households that have no choice but to "drive till you qualify."
1	Hell no
1	We have so many monster trucks on the road that use way more than their fair share of fuel. Tax fuel not Miles. A Prius traveling from Caldwell should not be charged more than a f350 with one occupant from meridian.
1	tax the vehicles that are the least fuel efficient. Give incentives to the vehicles with good fuel economy. Mileage driven in a fuel efficient vehicle shouldn't be punished.
1	Why don't we limit on how much people can talk too!
3	Those families who live further out, did [do] so out of necessity (\$\$ home price) vs choice are now penalized for their decision or inability to live closer?
4	This is an interesting option but I'm curious how it would be implemented and how often. I assume you'd have to submit an odometer reading but the question is would this be done quarterly, bi-yearly, or annually? How would you prevent tampering of odometers? Gas tax is paid a little bit at a time, at the time of a fill-up. Paying a big bill all at once could be a problem for some folks. Answer: Details such as how often payment would occur would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. However, as an example, Oregon allows participants to choose from different types of accounts with different features, including different options of how often and when you pay. Mileage in Oregon is tracked via a device that plugs into the vehicle; again, they provide different options for the type of device. You can learn more about Oregon's different options at https://www.myorego.org/get-started/ .
1	Or you could plan for the future rather than current traffic issues. Like a southern bypass. This not only eliminates through traffic but allows the valley to grow and expand rather than just congest and stifle.
1	punishes people who can't afford to live closer aka your low income folks
1	NO NEW TAXES!. it doesnt matter how much tax revenue is raised the government will find new ways to waste it.
2	Seems regulation of this would prove difficult and inaccurate. Increase in gas tax would be more effective. This would not make constituents happy, but paying for services rather than subsidizing vehicles is an education the general car-centric public could benefit from.
1	tax on fuel is best as those who drive clean cars should reap benefits
1	Tax is already too high.
1	How would you avoid paying taxes on miles driven outside the state? Answer: Details such as how miles driven outside the area would "count" (or not) would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. However, as an example, Oregon allows participants to choose from different types of accounts with different features. Some of these accounts provide for credit for out of state miles, while others do not. Learn more at https://www.myorego.org/get-started/ .
1	No way!
1	No more taxes - period. Plus, this would hurt those who live further out and drive further. No more taxes.
2	Does not makes sense if you take long drive trips out of state.
1	Don't do what California has done. It is NOT the way to do things.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Just stop given people their taxes back each year. people pay in \$2000 and get back \$15,000! this is the problem.
1	This seems invasive. How would you know how many miles one drives? Is this a toll road? Toll roads are a horrible idea, they slow traffic down. Also, taxes on fuel seem to be in relation to how many miles one drives as if you drive more you buy more fuel. Answer: <i>This is different from a toll road. Vehicles would be charged based on how many miles they drive, as opposed to if/when they drive on certain roads. Details such as how miles driven would be could would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. However, as an example, Oregon allows participants to choose from different types of devices that plug into a vehicle that track mileage. These range from simple units that only track miles driven to more complex units that provide additional information to the participant. You can learn more about Oregon's different options at https://www.myorego.org/get-started/.</i>
NA	Tax Canyon county
4	People who use the roads the most should pay the most for them. My husband works from home and I work part time two miles from our house.
1	F*** this. I moved my family to the country because of the unacceptable growth & congestion in the valley and now you propose penalizing us? This sounds like a solution straight out of California. Please send it back there with anyone who supports it.
1	important to tax fossil fuel users
1	this is most likely a tax that will negatively effect small businesses especially in the home services sector.
1	This is a terrible idea, many people come to Idaho to go to the outdoors. The outdoor lifestyle is important but our towns and attractions are very spread out
1	Zero stars. Do not track people
2	Have to get the privacy issues worked out first
1	not in favor of this at all
1	This would disincentivize fuel efficiency and punish those who must drive further because they can't afford to live closer to their jobs.
1	Hell no
1	This seems like it would have the most significant impact on low-income residents of canyon county who commute to Ada county for service and hospitality industry jobs. This seems like a counterproductive and regressive policy that I don't support.
1	Tax on fuel puts more burden on inefficient vehicles and less on efficient and/or hybrid/electric.
1	Taxation is theft
1	terrible idea
5	yes.
2	Given the current situation where lower cost housing is located further from central Ada County, this would tax the economically disadvantaged more than those with higher incomes.
NA	Just no ,repeat no
NA	Absolutely NOT! The tax at the pump is sufficient to capture miles driven without digging into peoples personal information.
1	Penalizes vehicles that get good fuel mileage.
1	This is spending money to create and implement a different form of tax. How about just taxing the fuel, it accomplishes the same thing. You drive more, you pay more through the fuel tax.
1	Punishes those who have to live farther out because of housing prices.
NA	Absolutely NEVER!
1	No new taxes. What drives people to innovate and move their businesses here are low taxes.
2	This hits electric vehicle drivers particularly hard, when the significant environmental impact of driving EVs should be encouraged not discouraged.
1	Not everyone can afford to live near their workplace. It negatively impacts our senior citizens in outlying areas who need to travel to medical offices far from their homes.
1	Absolutely not!!
1	This will hurt the people that already can't afford housing close to the place of employment
1	This would be an invasive and an intrusion of privacy to keep track of the miles traveled. Leave the tax on the fuel. The more fuel you use, the more taxes you pay. Pretty simple.
4	This is how I pay for my auto insurance. You think twice when you pay by mile.
1	NO

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Some people need to travel farther for work and adding a mileage tax might put them at a disadvantage. Keeping the gas prices low is more desirable.
1	I feel like this would most likely impact poor individuals the most, because the poor will be more likely to have to travel further from urban areas to afford housing
1	Larger vehicles cause more wear/tear than smaller vehicles or MCs
1	How would you even manage this? This would require a lot of overhead I would think. And isn't fuel tax doing essentially the same thing?
1	Enough F_____ taxes!
1	Forget it.
1	Some people commute from the farmlands to town for the benefits. Some commute to the farmlands for support work. Taxing them would not be a good idea.
1	Harms people who have to commute a lot
1	No. That is unfair for workers who commute from areas they can afford to live in and higher priced areas they work in. This is punishing the lower wage earners and drains resources from more affluent communities. It takes all of to keep all of our communities thriving. Economic segregation is just wrong.
2	Hard to manage fair reporting and could easily be inequitable to those with mid to low incomes.
1	Likely to be difficult to manage/enforce accurate and fair data collection. Also will likely be inequitable to those with mid to low incomes.
2	Never heard of this, but should be interesting. In the growth scenarios if low income housing is located away from services and jobs this may be hell classis
1	Idiot idea...TAXES again...
1	This will bankrupt companies.
NA	Survey sucks
1	Because our state has allowed this growth without improving the roads and the cost of housing in Ada County is so high, a lot of us have to travel a ways to get to work. While this may seem fair to some it is very unfair to those of us that wanted to live in a decent size house in Canyon County vs an apartment or condo in Ada County
5	At first it would seem this would disadvantage lower-income people who are living far away from their jobs out of necessity (due to housing costs) rather than choice. But the current gas tax does the same thing. I do feel that those of us driving hybrids (such as myself) or full-electric vehicles should pay our share of road & other transportation costs. Yes, definitely. At the same time, I'm not fond of the idea of an automated tracking device on the vehicle itself, due to privacy concerns and so forth. Could the emissions test mileage suffice for all the vehicles subject to that process? For the rest of the vehicles, could we self-report annual mileage, perhaps with random audits of a certain percentage of people each year?
1	No more taxes!
Scenario: Let It Be	
Strategy: Urban Renewal Districts	
3	The use of Urban Renewal Districts have been abused in Idaho. Urban Renewal Districts should only be used for existing decrepit neighborhoods such as the Curtis Road tank farm area. It should not be used for greenfield development by the airport, City of Kuna's Industrial Area in the middle of sagebrush, or Nampa's Idaho Center.
5	I would specifically say I'm also all for option taxes to make these larger projects a reality
3	Just another tax & spend tool for public entities who are NOT doing any sustainable nor strategic planning. You can use IMPACT FEES where it counts and charge them to the developer who continue cheap/front-end financing of projects reaping them huge profits selling homes a single-family CANNOT afford.
5	Preferably these specific infrastructure investments favor active transportation.
3	Do these district ever sunset or are they a perpetual additional layer of bureaucracy? Answer: <i>Urban renewal districts sunset after no more than 20 years (I.C. §50-2903A).</i>
1	Tired of our abusive over utilization of UR Districts
NA	these are basically a way around our constitutions prohibition against indebtedness and any use is a tax transfer to the taxpayers of the county. should be eliminated.
3	If they are managed correctly, and not used for City projects.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
5	Seems to support managed growth and a way to motivate environmental health as well as affordability, parks and recreational options
1	URDs are impacting property taxes, negatively affecting affordability, and diverting g resources from core services such as education and fire. URDs need to be abolished.
1	This will only increase taxes on homeowners. We are taxed enough
1	Urban renewal districts have been terribly overused by Bieter, may be one reason he lost the election.
2	Not a fan of this really
3	Meaning one district could potentially end up paying for other's infrastructure? Answer: <i>Property taxes with an urban renewal district are used to support development only in that district.</i>
3	Once city council districts go into effect I think the representatives should be able to vote on if their district thinks the project is worthy/useful of city money
3	I do not know enough about this subject. I understand what is being said & that being taxed would deter the usage of revenue usage for specific infrastructure projects, but I don't know to what extent it is needed to deter such activity. If it is currently being abused & such activity needs to be deterred, then I am for taxing.
1	not relevant
1	NO! In courage's people to make decisions that are not necessarily to the benefit the majority, self serving.
1	TAX TAX TAX, you need to look at New York, California, etc. You cannot tax your way in to prosperity.
1	No more. leave property taxes alone
2	Never quite understood this. If the residents want it, great! But if they don't, why should they have to pay more for improvements in their neighborhood that they don't want or even consider to be "improvements".
5	CCDC should focus less on demolishing existing buildings and more on working with owners or requiring new owners to utilize tax credit programs to blend the old with the new. Streetscape work is generally a positive and they have done some good things around town.
2	Tax giveaways to companies to build in urban renewal areas should be backloaded so the reward comes only if the business stays in the area for 15+ years. Urban renewal districts should focus on beauty, charm, and comfort of being in that place. Roads should be upgraded and landscaped. Parks built and shops/restaurants/food carts zoned in. 4+story apartments built with parking lots so people can park their work truck
1	Gentrification is bad for everyone.
1	Urban renewal is a failure. They do what they want without giving the people a voice. We shouldn't have to pay for things that we didn't approve of. Too much money is spent through this. When tax money is used, we should get a voice. And our property taxes are high enough. Mine have gone up every year, increasing my house payment by \$120 a month.
1	Property tax is not a good way to fund things. It causes people to lose property they bought and own just for taxes.
1	URDs are out of control in Boise. There needs to be strict criteria for what qualifies as an URD.
1	NO
1	My neighborhood is many who are on fixed retirement income who are being squeezed by rising taxes
3	Depends on the specific project
NA	NO. I pay more tax due to the Urban renewal fraud.
3	If used in a fair manner this can be beneficial, but this has not appeared to be the case from some of the projects for CCDC that I have read about. The State Street Corridor is being considered for URD status and the worry among some residents near the edge of Boise's city limits is that the TIF funding will simply be scraped off of the high-density projects in the NW section of State Street to pay for great projects closer into the city center.
1	Nope. Developers want to build houses let them pay for the infrastructure. Call city of Fresno CA and ask about the ugm program. Might learn something
2	Not terrible, but we need much more
2	I hesitate on this because this has often driven people out of their homes because they can no longer afford it. So it would depend on how this was executed.
3	Deciding on what infrastructure projects get funded is where this becomes a bad idea.
1	My concerns about affordability are centered on the disproportionate impact of property taxes on people with fixed incomes.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	I watched as the Boise urban renewal district cost more than it helped. a lot of wasted money for very little gain.
2	I think infrastructure here means "new and wider roads?" No thank you. Please don't encourage more sprawl and traffic and air pollution.
1	No new taxes. Seek private services. Cut government costs. Be more efficient.
2	Urban renewal districts concern me because they pull funds away from public schools. Schools can't afford to be left out of funding as communities grow and they are asked to provide services to more and more students.
4	Any increased development should pay for the transportation changes necessary for that affected area.
5	This would at least help people who want to or have no other choice but to live in urban area to improve the area
1	this is taxation without representation don't like it.
1	No more taxation. The budget will increase as more people are paying taxes; you don't need to find more ways to squeeze us. Terrible idea; I was tempted to use expletives here.
5	Yes! ACHD has ignored basic pedestrian and bicyclist needs on streets like Orchard and Overland for decades. It now takes an urban renewal district to prioritize safety because the highway agency who manages the streets refused to do so.
1	Get rid of URDs.
1	NO urban renewal, urban renewal is out of hand already.
3	I have concerns this renewal districts work as advertised.
1	No. Use a builder impact fee or restructure the developer requirements to expand roads and add stop signs or lights as needed for their development impact. Dont pass the buck in higher tsxes that never go away
3	Would be more in favor of a general sales tax (for example on gasoline.)
1	This won't sell. Property taxes are a wealth tax. The wealthy are too powerful. Not practical. Besides we need schools and basic services first!
1	This drains the underlying tax base by diverting funds it results in tax increases since diverted funds have to be replenished.
1	Seems like another layer of inefficient government to me. However, Trump's opportunity zones have worked well. Consider trying something that provides incentives for investment rather than another tax and spend scheme.
4	these have been only moderately successful and are a very long term solution - take forever to have an impact
NA	Does Urban Renewal involve kicking out low income folks to "beautify" the area? It often does.
1	Impact fees
4	Urban renewal districts should benefit longtime residents more that future residents. They are only wise if the do not displace.
2	Maybe if it's an extra tax purely within that district. Other districts should not have to pay special taxes for these areas.
1	Not sure what this means.
2	Specific? Not here. These districts are constructed to last forever.
1	No to these. Property tax should go to existing agencies
4	This should be defined better. I assume you mean to redirect funds for road projects. Is that what it means? I'm not sure. Answer: Taxes collected in urban renewal districts can be used for many things, including for roads, utilities, parks, recreation facilities, off-street parking, public buildings and other facilities, and other improvements, as long as they are consistent the urban renewal plan established for that district.
4	I like this idea if we know the funds will go to infrastructure. The Central Bench has tried to become an URD so we could get sidewalks on Orchard and make the entire area more walkable. It has been so difficult, over 7 years to get sidewalks on Emerald and narrowing of the road so we could have bike lanes. Now people say why didn't we do this earlier?
3	Sounds logical and smart.
5	Making areas productive with public investments produces returns. Stop putting \$ in sprawling areas that are NOT productive
4	As long as URDs continue the progress they are making now and do not revert to their ways of the 60s.
1	Less tax, not more! More tax is another left ingredient to ruin a state!

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	When poorly managed, can be counter productive
1	Another pipe dream that takes increased revenue stream from schools, roads, etc,. We need to seek developers that are willing to do the upgrades rather than the taxpayer!
1	Transportation cost should be usage based. Not allocate by where you live.
1	I've only seen them being used as loopholes - state one qualifying reason, than grab land or do pet projects.
4	Depends on what it is used to support
3	If property taxes were used for infrastructure how would schools be funded
3	This sounds like a good idea.
5	Incredibly important to bring change that cannot happen by the private sector alone. Stadiums and large, carefully planned mixed-use developments are a great example of public use facilities that could only happen via Urban Renewal Districts.
2	I won't support blanket funding to hidden funds, but I would be open to voting to do fund certain projects, but I would want to vote every single time.
1	not specific enough
5	local funding for local projects is a great idea, gives back more control
5	Revitalization to areas ripe for a TIF structure is crucial to creating a thriving economy in once-blighted locations. All for it!
3	benefit wrong people too often
NA	I don't understand this well enough to comment. If it means each city can make their own decisions, then that is fine. Their elected leadership will decide what is best for their residents.
1	This category is unclear to me. I believe we should vote on how tax dollars should be used. Let the population of boise directly decide where their tax money goes.
5	Not only urban, but I think there should be a tax for all suburban builders to have to contribute to road improvements. The roads are not going to keep up with the rate of houses being built. Karcher road in Nampa/Caldwell is a perfect example. New subdivisions going in along and just off of Karcher, but that road is still two lanes in most spots. It is becoming a travel nightmare and only getting worse every month as population numbers increase. In my opinion, if the builders want to build, they should have to pay to ensure the roads support the quantity of people they plan to move into those houses, townhouses and apartments.
2	I've heard mixed things on this, would like to learn more.
3	only if the people currently in those districts vote to approve
2	CCDC is a Bieter run (even after his defeat) self-interest program. It makes other tax payers carry a subsidy.
NA	I don't understand what this means
4	Actually use the money to fix roads when impacted, do not out in general fund
2	These have been managed poorly, in this city, thus far, with very little actually being done for neighborhoods. Other than for businesses downtown, this has not worked well, and has served the people of Boise poorly at best, dishonestly to an almost criminal degree, at worst.
1	No, NO, NO!
1	no.
NA	I would rather see the developers share in (pay for) cost of infrastructure changes required when building a new housing area than put it on existing property owners
1	A political crime that needs to end.
1	Overwhelming record of destroying neighborhoods and history for efficiency.
2	This works for middle to high income neighborhoods where people can afford it, but can hurt low income homeowners. Not ideal but helpful in some cases.
1	Increasing taxes will decrease economic progress. Businesses and homeowners do not need additional taxes. Make your existing budgets work.
2	Urban renewal districts promote sprawl. Urban renewal districts should only be used in dilapidated areas and not on barren ground on the edge of the City. It has been abused by the City of Nampa for the Idaho Center and Kuna wants to abuse it for an industrial center in the middle of nowhere.
2	No! The use of urban renewal districts has been abused by Boise city leadership for years which has created an unbalanced and unfair property tax burden on Boise homeowners.
4	I think a one time road tax on a newly built house or apartment building should be implemented. The builder should have some responsibility for the added traffic created by the build.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	Urban renewal attempts have failed in the past. In order to do it well, there needs to be members of the community that are centered in these discussions around urban renewal. If there isn't a active conversation between the city planners and community then this won't be effective.
2	Responsibility and accountability is a must when managing / spending other's \$.
3	As long as it's not Beautification crap and someone wants a bathroom in their park! Too much money being wasted now on stupid stuff. McMillan road past Hyatt 2 lanes....new curbs and sidewalks instead of making it and Maple Grove 4 lanes....come on! Who comes up with these stupid ideas!!
1	Urban renewal needs new rules. I'm tired of seeing tax dollars held back for projects that are not truly urban renewal - like the Ten Mile project next to 84 - that's a scam on taxpayers.
4	This will help to rebuild some old areas that need an upgrade.
NA	? You want to tax a district that pays it's own taxes For special projects? This question is not clear.
1	this seems to have been a popular approach but I think we've seen it can be misused. Can't lose affordable housing that is in such short supply.
4	Don't get rid of already low income housing in these distinct. No more Blue Valley situations please.
2	Hard to support this when there have been many instances where these districts funds were misused
NA	Survey sucks
3	Yes, yes, yes. I hope there's a lot of support from your survey takers, so you can give the data to the legislature, governor, media, etc. We need a change of mind within a significant % of politicians on this topic. Although, I hope this is about commercial property taxes, and not individual / homeowner property taxes. If it's the latter, then no. I'm finding property taxes to be more and more regressive, especially as the housing market gallops away from being affordable for so very many people.
2	concerned about the subjectivity of these choices.

Scenario: Let It Be

Strategy: Traffic Management

3	I understand this needs to be part of "Let It Be", but I'm not even sure what the current Traffic Management System looks like. There should be a sophisticated TMS for ANY scenario that's implemented
5	We have the technology and the brain trust living here. Tap it. Use it. Make it work for all of us!!!
1	This is actually available right now through one or more web apps.
NA	alerts are good, but getting the vehicles expeditiously off the road is more important.
2	Without alternate routes not sure this approach would be all that useful
1	Congestion should be accepted as a given by those who advocate for "Let It Be"
3	Nice to have, but if I have to be at work by 8am and there's only 1-2 ways to go, it doesn't matter if I know they're congested. I still have to go.
1	We already have most of this on our phones already, and there's a definite asymptote to how effectively drivers can make use of this
1	Not everything needs to be "high tech" . if the system were to crash most would be helpless. image if the internet cuts out at work....who's getting work done. I would be skeptical of how robust this system is.
2	ACHD needs to take a class in this subject. a 6 lane road to no where is not the answer (Eagle Rd. anyone) A giant overpass is built (Meridian Rd.) with 1 on ramp lane. Well 3 into 2 into 1 lol so smart. Plan smart. residential areas need to stay residential. Create feeders into main routes into arteries WITH FREEWAY access.
1	Already exists in phones
1	Nice to have, but knowing what the weather is doesn't change the fact that you are still going to work and there are only so many routes.
1	People have this on their phone
2	ACHD already has equipment to do this. The city of Nampa is working on a TMC with Amazon funding. This is unnecessary.
1	Don't we already have this with weather apps and google maps/waze?
3	Torn on this one. This would mean you are watching everyone, yet it would help with commuting and traveling.
1	Sometimes this results in people cutting through residential neighborhoods and speeding while doing so.
5	prefer technology over legal changes and tax incentives where possible

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	#google. Why reinvent the wheel?
2	Great, but again, it is only a tiny part of the solution
4	How about control traffic at the Interstate Interchange. Lights at the on ramps of high volume interchanges during high traffic times.
2	Don't we already have these resources?
2	better management of lights, closeness of lights better corridor planning. Probably too late for that. Too much political over engineering reliability
5	No new taxes.
5	Should be easy to improve as we have the technology and resources for this through cell phones blue tooth, radios, etc.
3	Always an overrated investment, especially when that money could be used to complete basic sidewalk needs on major arterials that have been ignored for decades.
1	Don't we all have this on our phones already? Waste of money to post this on the highways. In CA it was hijacked to put out "safety" messages. Waste of money.
3	If really wanted and expected to have a positive outcome, the system MUST provide alternate routes. So, it could get expensive.
5	This is a good use of our money. Shoot, I'd be happy if we'd just time the stop lights properly.
5	how could this hurt ?
5	This would be nice. So would proper timing of traffic lights.
NA	While this might work it also cause folks to drive on side streets that are not used to heave speeding traffic. What will you do to protect these neighbors?
3	Impact fees
2	I'd imagine self driving cars are the future and should solve a lot of traffic issues by 2050. At least I'd hope so.
5	Now you're talking! This is desperately needed in Meridian.
NA	Specifics of this "technology"???
NA	When growth causes existing transportation systems to become overburdened, they should be expanded using money collected via impact fees. Transportation capacity expansion is horrendously expensive, which means the impact fees will have to be outrageously high, which is entirely appropriate and best for the existing residents. Otherwise, the horrendously high capacity expansion costs fall on the existing residents, which is effectively subsidizing the Treasure Valley's runaway growth and enriching a few at the cost of everyone else. Often referred to as "wealth transfer".
4	Other states have this 'SIG Alert' based off State Patrol interactive maps.
1	There are TOO MANY cameras on our street corners. Are we China? Take them down. No one needs more technology - google maps tells you all you need to know for a commute.
1	Where not LA. Not sure that is needed on a daily basis
1	This is already here and will only improve via private companies (Google, etc..). No need for Gov't engagement. Gov't should leverage the tech.
4	Simply reducing the light cycle times will reduce much congestion and improve air quality. Very low cost option.
3	We have apps that can do this now so not as sure of how well this would work. Better if we would learn how to drive better, how to merge, how to keep a more constant speed, the physics of traffic flow, https://youtu.be/8ivycTcNvJQ
1	This sounds like a marketing tool that wastes money while pretending to help.
1	Driving a car means assuming the risk of delay due to construction or congestion when everyone else wants to drive. Prioritize putting \$ into transportation options rather than creating false expectations for drivers about having a stressless drive
4	I think this is a great idea. Perhaps technology that combines pulse point and google maps. An update of bike/ped walkways on google maps would be awesome.
2	see WAZE
4	This only helps notify where traffic is at. It won't relieve congestion.
1	Widen 84, let it be. Remove more 4 way stops and create more roundabouts, which will improve flow in rural areas.
2	This seems like a band-aid fix to an underlying structural problem.
3	WE already have some of this already.
4	This is just smart even though lighted road signs are a driving distraction. Radio announcement like they do at some airport may be a effective approach.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	lets reduce traffic
5	Will Idahoans give up their vehicles for riding a bus? Highly doubtful.
2	Too minimal of and effect
1	Design and implement laws for safer roads i.e. cell phone laws.
1	We already have that; its called the internet.
5	Cameras are great but using drones, airplanes, or helicopters is still the best possibility.
1	Apps can already do this. What would you add/change?
3	Again, not very much information provided to make an informed choice of how many stars to give
5	ACHD's traffic light division needs to be restaffed with qualified staff. Currently there is greater traffic congestion because of poor traffic light and crosswalk management.
5	Yes
3	All roads need to be widened, too many bottle necks
1	We've needed a mass transit option for over 20 years between Caldwell and mountain home!
5	This is the bare minimum.
2	Bandaid
5	100% behind this as long as data is made public for third parties (not paid contractors) and the public to frequently review and make changes to the laws/traffic patterns if they aren't working.
4	to improve
NA	Alternatively, implementing synchronized lights will help keep traffic flowing.
1	Technology is already here. We need common sense in ACHD to have efficient traffic flow. ACHD's current grade: D-
1	This already exists on many different formats: app alerts, google maps, news, radio...
5	Back in the 90's I was a long haul truck driver running 48 states. It was so beneficial in the cities that had electric signage that could warn a driver before they got on a freeway. And warnings of crashes ahead was a benefit. There is some warning signs on the freeway here that helps. What I'm finding here locally is speeding and no signal lane changing. And I rarely see State Police out there on my trips from Caldwell to Boise. Without a law enforcement presence it seems to be everyone for themselves. The freeway is a free for all and a very dangerous place to drive. It's worse than the freeways around LA in the 90's.
5	This is an area that could be down now. I noticed that in some areas of town like Southeast Boise ACHD has done a good job; however, in other areas they need to make improvements on signal timing.
1	The problem I see here is that everything in the valley resides along I84 for the most part. So without real alternatives, people will still travel the same way even if traffic is bad.
1	Make roads wider all the way out of Boise and problem solved! Man, who gets paid to come up with such lame ideas! Simple! More lanes on major roads in and out of Boise all the way...not partial!
1	No, tax resources do not need to be utilized to provide this when the free market already provides it (Waze, google maps, etc)
5	co-ordinate traffic lights through out the vally
1	Technology has this information available on your cellphone.
2	Other more pressing problems will require the staff
5	Having the traffic report along the I-84 going into canyon county would be nice and also going away from I-84 in Canyon county
1	Look at Google Maps, it is already there.
NA	Survey sucks
5	I think most people would love this for their own interests – to save their time and reduce their stress. I love it because of the reduced air pollution and reduced fuel use that would occur by avoiding extra idling during stop-and-go traffic.

Scenario: Let It Be

Strategy: Transportation Demand Management

2	This is not necessary. If we are a 1M metro by 2050 and can't handle transporting those people around we've failed badly. Just to mention Phoenix again (Metro of 4M+), it is no problem getting around and you don't need to time when you leave. We're not landlocked or constrained by anything but the foothills (which we want to protect), but it should be up to people's personal responsibility to create schedules that work for their lives. Nothing needs to be forced
---	--

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
5	COVID 19 is proving that we can adjust work schedules and where we work.
5	Perfect in a post-c=Covid world where employer have been forced to put their intellectual & managerial assets in a home-office environment.
2	This has been an historical reaction to increasing congestion that is already occurring in the valley. This is not a pro-active item.
NA	telecommunication of work should be promoted. it removes vehicles off the roads, cleans the air and cuts transportation costs.
1	This approach rarely seems to work well
3	raise construction cost greatly
2	It seems like WFH is expanding with technology but traffic patterns are more predictable in the MA than in the PM
4	Great idea, but not sure how you enforce it?
3	I'm writing on June 2nd 2020, where most large companies are still encouraging or enforcing WFH, and the roads are still regularly fairly crowded
2	Not realistic
1	This is not a viable option for many.
1	seems least likely to change
5	CoVid showed us that many people can and should work from home if even on a rotating schedule to reduce traffic congestion
5	I.E. letting people respond to challenges organically
4	Could be good if it supports business demands.
1	Again the status quo of "Oh the commute" leave CA in CA!. Issue building permits to spread out industrial areas closer to the workforce. Stop thinking you have to cluster all the factories in one big pile. Stop creating high density downtown's What would you rather look at out of your office window? Mountains, woods, fields, or some fool scratching their head in a cubicle? Plan smart. Be innovative. Don't turn Idaho into New York, LA, Portland, Dallas those failed cities already exist.
5	This is what all government employees should be doing now, setting the example for the private sector.
5	Since all the public services have been unwisely sited in downtown Boise, all the public aervants drive inbound/outbound and cause congestion. Boise/Ada public employment is more than 30% of the workforce and their work schedules contribute massively to congestion. This fix is under the city's immediate control and is free (and actually of benefit) to taxpayers: Require public employees to take public transit or chartered park-and-ride shuttles to work. At all levels of public employment, in all departments downtown, including city hall, county admin, Idaho state workers and the courts. Alternately, implement a split shift schedule for all downtown public offices. Shifts are 6am-2pm and 11am-8pm. All public service offices will be open 7am-7pm to serve the public. Meetings can be scheduled for the overlap times. This will eliminate most of Boise's traffic problems and does not cost the taxpayers anything.
4	This requires a high level of employer buy-in, which isn't going to happen.
4	This is one ideal solution, but a lot of employers, especially state agencies, don't support their staff doing this. Too bad.
5	Make a push for flexible work hours from companies that can afford to do so.
2	This would be good, but isn't practical. Not everyone has a job that they can work from home. Most people don't.
2	Changing work hours and working from home is up to the discretion of the employer and not a choice of the employee.
5	Yes on this one. Employers need to be a part of the solution mix.
5	this minimizes peak periods and helps to offset demand for other options
1	Fix the overbuilding issue so traffic isnt so congested
3	Ummm, yeah, how is THAT gunna work?
2	Not a bad start, but only a small step in the right direction
5	Allowing employees to work from home would be another way to get vehicles off the road. During this recent Covid event we have seen that it works. It would be nice if executives would really consider the value of this and start implementing the changes necessary to make this a permanent change in the work place.
3	Not sure how this would be implemented. How could the city have people working from home, or change working hours? This is great in theory, but how does this get implemented?

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	This is a nice idea, but unrealistic for the majority of people.
2	this is at least 20 years too late. I remember Eagle road as a highway. Poor planing and development turned it into a virtual ribbon parking lot.
5	No new taxes.
2	Dependent on employers efforts.
3	good idea but requires support from employer etc.
5	Great idea, but is hard to force employers to do this.
5	One easy thing that could be done without wasting tax dollars is to encourage businesses to vary work hours and split shifts up so that not everyone is coming/going at the same time. Lead by example, start with city employees.
5	Encourage businesses to relocate workets closer to the jobsite or to offer more remote job opportunities and offer staggered shifts to reduce traffic
5	Haven't we all proven that this works quite well in the age of CoVid?
3	Better public transportation. Park and ride. Higher taxes on fuel. More options to live near you Work.
1	This doesn't address the underlying need for effective public transportation
1	What's the incentive for businesses to do this? If there's a business value, then yes, this might help. If all you're talking about is creating another agency full of hall monitors, then no.
3	no one in Idaho wants to reduce their personal flexibility by taking public transportation. Will only happen when things are so bad that it is less repugnant - like in huge metro areas.
NA	This might help but from what we see today, there are TOO many people driving dangerously.
5	Subsidized van pools for large companies may be on option if the ridership interest is there.
1	You are too late. In the 80's there was a plan to have I-84 bypass Boise. It never happened. Now I-84 is over capacity and will get worse.
4	Except for the sharing rides part, this was the second best idea. We need to provide some kind of incentives to get businesses to stagger work hours a little. This may also incentivize local businesses to keep slightly longer hours, reducing the stress on Saturdays.
NA	When growth causes existing transportation systems to become overburdened, they should be expanded using money collected via impact fees. Transportation capacity expansion is horrendously expensive, which means the impact fees will have to be outrageously high, which is entirely appropriate and best for the existing residents. Otherwise, the horrendously high capacity expansion costs fall on the existing residents, which is effectively subsidizing the Treasure Valley's runaway growth and enriching a few at the cost of everyone else. Often referred to as "wealth transfer".
3	When where possible this helps. SMART(er) traffic light controls and on map metering in peak/congested areas.
1	These things seem out of the control of the Transportation department, or any government agency. What we need is a freeway built AROUND Boise that uses feeder roads. One freeway is not enough anymore.
5	Realtors, sales ppl, etc?
3	Not sure people will cooperate.
4	COVID-19 has shown many people want to work from home and are just as productive if not more.
3	This wont help, the roads need a big overhaul. Mainly a light rail between boise and nampa and a freeway bypass so people don't have to drive thru the valley to continue towards Oregon
1	People shouldn't have to let traffic conditions have this much of an outsized impact on their lives.
2	We should rethink work times but also I have found that it can allow for employers to push employees to work hours that impacts their quality of life and time spent with family. I'd rather just focus on providing safe pedestrian forms of transportation to cut back on vehicles on the road. Every cut back on a cars emissions means the air is healthier for everyone.
4	TDM makes sense. But priority must be to providing real transportation options. VMT can be tied to congestion pricing.
4	This is such an easy solution. If companies can use telecommuting and working off the typical hours, congestion would go down. Next step would be getting people less reliant on their vehicles!
4	Need more info on how this would be implemented
1	This is a direct rob of freedom. These type of rules are nothing than government overreach.
5	This requires employers to cooperate. Need feedback from them.
1	This is not something the cities can mandate/enforce so I don't see the point of it in the survey
1	I don't see how the government can drive this unless it is a financial incentive to employers.
3	done well

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	As long as it is a choice and not a demand.
2	It's much better to concentrate people in housing located close to work (downtown core) and play (parks)
1	Too minimal of an effect
5	What possible legislation could support work from home and off-hour travel? This will never pass. People are WAY too spoiled with their schedules and won't tolerate you f***** with them. I'd rather work from home forever, but most people aren't me.
5	i hope that many companies have seen the positive impact of having employees work from home and work to reduce commutes.
5	From lessons learned from COVID-19, this is [has been] a viable alternative.
2	Impossible. The very 8 - 5, five day week makes this scenario impossible to implement. This would require a complete retooling of society.
5	Like my earlier comments, the two counties need to plan now and then submit their needs plans to the Idaho Department of Transportation, who like the counties need to start futuring on 20 and 50 plans, not be stuck at 10 year plans. The counties should drive the need, the state should fill the need to plan for the future to reduce freeway congestion. Compass Idaho can play a HUGE role in facilitating the future if you can go back and look at how other cities dropped overpasses with on and off ramps in the middle of nowhere and controlled the growth, very accurately in my opinion, by showing where the developer should start their dream community. BTW if you want to see the 1960s map with future freeways in AZ give me a call at 208-890-5363 or robertkuhn01@gmail.com.
3	Again there is single minded thinking. While most of us appreciate the improvements to our road system in the valley, we seem to forget that when you improve a road that has a tendency to divert traffic to the improved road. So in the end things don't really get much better even after investing millions of dollars.
4	Great start, but again, creating safe infrastructure for people to choose different modes of transportation should go along with this policy. For the most part this could be part of a "let it be" scenario, in that ACHD roadway design would shift toward creating more of a "complete streets" design in identified areas.
3	Great idea!
3	Lots of work can be done at home now - post-COVID changes to work routines are already taking care of this. Encourage more telework.
5	still need another interstate installed south of I-84
NA	The people who live in Meridian (LA East) and Nampa need to work there
2	Only if this is something along the lines of incentives - the government will be overstepping it's boundaries if they attempt to mandate things like travel hours and telecommuting.
4	This plan has great potential. The public & private should help by encouraging the various options. However, ACHD traffic management is terrible. At a minimum, ACHD should have a citizen advisory panel to receive helpful suggestions.
4	Yes, education is key
1	Lame, government dictating personal life
3	Not an effective solution--depends more on employer flexibility than individual or government choice.
NA	Very employer driven
4	it has to met the requirement of both city. time is important
3	This sounds good, but in reality we don't have a lot of control over when we travel - work, school, etc.
NA	Majority of workers don't have a choice in when they travel the roads
3	This option is about 20 years overdue.
4	This is ideal, but not necessarily attainable by most people. Are schools going to have varied hours to accommodate this? Doubtful.
4	seems more plausible post-covid
1	Just do it! No work arounds and business analysts that don't know crap!
4	Yes, govt employees should be forced to have a different commute schedule than the rest of us. Ever notice how light traffic is on govt holidays?
1	This requires employers to change the work hours of employees. More highways north and south will eliminate most traffic on the single highway we have look at what Las Vegas and Phoenix had to do. They only had one highway 40 years ago like Boise has now.
5	My family and our co-workers already do this.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	Shortening the light cycles on Chinden, Eagle, and Fairview would eliminate a lot of congestion at intersections and upward and downward from the intersections.
1	This can only be done through privatized incentives. Government can't do this.
NA	Survey sucks
3	I would want to see the data that shows this would work. Most folks don't get to choose their own hours.
5	Another idea is to help people rethink the vehicle they are driving. This is more about the environment (air pollution, damage caused by drilling oil) & road maintenance. If people rented giant pickups only during the weekend or two or three that they really need that type of rig, they could save so much of their own money as well as help our air quality and wear and tear of the roads.

Scenario: Ticket to Ride

Strategy: Signal Priority

1	I have no idea how this will work. I could see this causing more congestion.
3	Should already be happening, not sure what I'm really voting on here
2	not sure this will work well enough
5	IF and ONLY IF, you truly fund sustainable transit out to the metro reaches where we live to be able to work here (e.g. Kuna home, work Boise)....
3	Sync of traffic lights is needed in the area. This is needed first.
2	Any signal pre-emption can elimination any corridor efficiencies in progressive timing. Most efficient with one-way cross streets, which are uncommon in the valley.
4	I am unsure how "freight" plays into this. I can imagine the scenario where signal priority benefits public transit, but I am unsure how the freight plays in and what the implications are.
1	Make it as cheap/convenient/fast/etc as you want...I'm not riding a bus.
4	Should have this already
NA	Need more info
3	<p>What does this option mean? I don't understand the impact that it would have on me as simple commuter just trying to get around town. I wouldn't want to be treated as second rate to a semi-truck just because it is carrying freight. I don't care if it is carrying something. We both have the objective of getting from Pt A to Pt b</p> <p>Answer: <i>Signal priority means that at an intersection buses and/or trucks would get an advanced green light or have the green light extended to allow them through the intersection, thus avoiding the need to stop and start, which reduces delays.</i></p>
1	no. still trapped in the box
1	Just widen the roads, or create time-of-day single direction traffic corridors to facilitate inbound/outbound traffic. The one way corridors should be State, Chinden, Franklin, and Victory
2	ACHD already possess the technology to do this. Priority should be given to the majority of roadway users, not the minority.
3	A little torn on this one. Some intersections already have really long light times, Like Eagle and Franklin. When the light for Franklin turns green, only 2-3 cars get through before it is red. I get it, Eagle is busy, but so is Franklin. We don't have time, nor patience, to sit in a line of cars for 3-5 cycles of the light before we get to go through. The one at the BLvd and Midland in Nampa is also messed up. Sometimes the light turns red before I get all the way through, & I was the first car. Timing already needs to be fixed, don't make it worse.
5	Freight vehicles should be diverted to specific corridors. Large trucks on State and Chinden are excessive and clog the flow of traffic.
3	Transit yes. Freight hell no.
5	use technology with machine learning and artificial intelligence to optimize vehicle flow
5	Please!
3	Good incentive if employees are being bussed to work or school children to school perhaps.
1	Assuming rails/buses are only on major arterials, then this seems feasible and fine. But should not be on neighborhood streets
2	If, and only if, traffic engineering can demonstrably prove this is going to improve traffic flow. Decisions need to be evidence-based, not feel-good based or ideological.
1	This almost always results on defaulting to minimum times for pedestrians. It's sold as a magic bullet by traffic engineers under the guise of "transit" and "freight" but it's really meant to shave a few seconds off a motorist's experience at the expense of other modes.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
4	If what you mean by this is timing the traffic lights to allow for a better "flow" of traffic along a corridor, then I think that is good.
5	This could work if autonomous vehicles and autonomous commercial freight were prioritized (e.g. 75% of the lanes) at night!
5	Good idea.
4	Better coordination of the traffic lights would help a lot.
NA	And people caring live animals
3	This can piss people off when their left turn light is canceled so the bus can save a couple minutes.
1	Just what does "prioitize transit" mean? We can tax the bike people. Road taxes were not set up to have separate lanes, etc. Answer: <i>Signal priority means that at an intersection buses and/or trucks would get an advanced green light or have the green light extended to allow them through the intersection, thus avoiding the need to stop and start, which reduces delays.</i>
3	Only on major roadways
NA	I do not feel this is a fair and equitable way to management traffic and balance everyone's transportation needs
2	Prefer not to be "encouraged" to use mass transit by having my commute become more frustrating in favor of mass transit.
NA	When growth causes existing transportation systems to become overburdened, they should be expanded using money collected via impact fees. Transportation capacity expansion is horrendously expensive, which means the impact fees will have to be outrageously high, which is entirely appropriate and best for the existing residents. Otherwise, the horrendously high capacity expansion costs fall on the existing residents, which is effectively subsidizing the Treasure Valley's runaway growth and enriching a few at the cost of everyone else. Often referred to as "wealth transfer".
3	You need to fix the signal system now. You sit at red lights when there is no cross traffic. The signal system you have sucks.
5	this is cheap and easy...isn't this being done already?
4	get signals synchronized so we don't have to stop as much and fix existing signals that see "ghost cars"
1	No special privileges! It's not necessary.
1	Traffic signals are the problem, the roads are
5	Especially transit. Freight can happen in the night and must be with smaller vehicles.
5	Prioritize carpooling and public transportation to incentivize use.
5	During COVID-19, a lot of traffic signals were altered to change quicker. It was incredibly helpful for flow and I think eased congestion downtown compared to longer lights trying to get cars through. This was especially helpful as a bike commuter.
2	Problems I see is that subordinate feeder streets are given more priority than major arterials, causing a lot of backup. Examples are Chateau at Locust Grove; Mitchell at Ustick.
4	No trucks permitted on certain roads during rush hour.
2	Optimize signal priority for bike and pedestrians encourages alternate modes of transportation.
1	This looks like stalling vehicles and creating more pollution.
NA	They can flow wirth the rest of us, just like farm equipment!
5	If we are to get serious about public transit, we have to make it as easy as possible for people to use. Reducing commute times vis signal priority is a great option.
5	Give priority to working vehicles
3	Pro transit not freight vehicles
3	Freight and Large Trucks should only be allowed in town certain hours
5	Yes; smarter technology is needed.
1	No, we need to time traffic so it flows more easily from light to light. By giving signal priority it completely throws this off. Trucks and transit vehicles are only going to move as fast as the cars in front of them. Timing not signal trippers.
4	Or you could plan for the future rather than current traffic issues. Like a southern bypass. This not only eliminates through traffic but allows the valley to grow and expand rather than just congest and stifle.
5	yes! Please give us traffic adjusted light timing. We know that works well!
5	Paired with dedicated lanes for transit vehicles would make this even better.
3	I'm not sure I understand this one.
NA	Get Truck out of the down town
NA	do not want technology affecting drivers - already too many distractions

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	Freight vehicles I prefer to have their own roads to use. Less wear and tear for smaller cars and commuters.
4	this could be helpful
3	none stop from point A to point B .
1	This area is not dense enough to support mass transit. Let's keep it that way.
1	ACHD hasn't mastered this yet. I don't see the staff or technology at ACHD doing this effectively.
3	Depends on how it affects other workers.
1	More lanes!
1	Cars should have #1 priority. Synchronize the major arteries so traffic flows. Make developers build adequate roads to handle the traffic. We should NOT be incentivizing growth. There are already too many people here.
3	Only in urban areas
4	So this is something that the ACHD should have done a long time ago. What good is ACHD if they can't even time the traffic lights? 9-5 jobs with low wages = less than acceptable work
2	Having spent several years in a larger metropolitan area, I suggest a study and adjustment to existing patterns of lights in heavily trafficked areas. You have several 7 minute lights that take several cycles to get through. This may be annoying for drivers but critical for first responders. Visiting family and friends frequently comment on the length of stop lights in those areas and the number of cycles it takes to get through an intersection.
1	No need for signals to prioritize 'special' types of vehicles. Just keep all traffic moving with shorter waits at lights.
3	Already our signals often do not support traffic movement. Some signals are timed to go green if you keep the speed limit-- others do not. Its like they are trying to create a bottleneck.. If I could see a use for it-- like transit vehicles. but often they stop me when no one is coming from the other direction. A Californian told me Boiseans should not be upset about having to wait thru 5 red lights. Well, we are! Everyone is griiping about the traffic. I hope we can find a way to improve it.
4	Do we have a survey of what precent support train? Answer: <i>In a survey conducted by COMPASS in fall 2019, 62% of respondents said they were "likely" or "very likely" to use rail if it were available and convenient. See www.compassidaho.org/documents/prodserv/CIM2050/Input/SurveyResults_Fall2019.pdf.</i>
NA	Survey sucks
5	Yes, especially for buses, so as to help public transportation be as smooth as possible, and also to provide additional incentive to take public transportation. I'm not understanding the freight angle. Are there so many delivery trucks that they're affecting congestion? I suppose large vehicles all would be lumped together for more clarity at signals. ;o] Answer: <i>An example of signal priority for freight vehicles is using "smart" traffic signals that can detect a truck approaching a traffic signal and can either advance or extend a green light to allow the truck through the intersection without having to stop and start. This would improve travel times for freight and also reduce delay for other vehicles at signalized intersections when trucks would not have to stop and start again.</i>

Scenario: Ticket to Ride

Strategy: Impact Fee Flexibility

2	It seems to that the lack of bike and pedestrian facilities is an existing deficiency in the transportation system and is not caused by new growth. General tax funds should paying for the bike and pedestrian facilities on existing roads. The ACHD Commission needs to increase property taxes to pay for these improvements. The elected officials need to be direct and straightforward with the public that it takes money to build infrastructure. The public needs to be educated. It seems like there are some projects where they are multiple plans made on a road before any improvements are made on that roadway.
3	Yes, but I'd rather not have all impact fees go to things I don't necessarily need or use
1	So few people ride a bike back and forth to work. Therefore, it's a pity that any money is going to the creation of bike lanes. And, those who ride bikes to work cannot do that most of the winter! Poor use of transportation \$\$.
5	Make sure that when a development project is approved, the developer pays ALL of the additional costs to support that development and none of it gets pushed off on existing tax payers.
1	Make the land use restrictions requiring large developments to allocate land for parks, trails, bike paths, schools, etc. If BIG developers want to make money here, they need to invest their land for ALL of us...not just to houses!

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	Are you talking operational versus capital use of fees? Answer: <i>The "flexibility" would be to allow impact fees to be used for facilities for transit, walking, and cycling, as well as roads. This is not allowed under current law.</i>
5	impact fees need to be changed! Lower fees where services exist, make fees much higher for developers proposing suburban type development in rural areas (fees should be reasonable for rural type development in rural areas).
NA	impact fees should be applicable for new construction and perhaps vehicles.
3	a way to better engage the developer community to support innovation for environmental health and affordability
5	I am assuming that the impact fees would be paid for by the developER, but it is unclear. Answer: <i>Yes. Impact fees are paid by the developer.</i>
5	Especially for developments where residents will likely use only cars, they will still benefit from, for instance, the decrease in car traffic from increased bus service
5	Include impact fees for schools! Make the developers pay higher fees. Idaho has some of the lowest impact fees in the nation. No wonder developers are flocking here. Make them pay for infrastructure!
2	Devil is in the details with impact fees and there is insufficient info here for me to judge fairly.
1	Need impact fees for more roads when subdivisions built ... NOT bike paths that are not used.
NA	Need more details
3	Depends on where in the city this is going into place. Also a good portion of the year here, the weather makes it really unfavorable to walk or bike anywhere
4	Development that is focused on density and proximity to in place infrastructure should be burden less by impacts than suburban development
1	just another TAX. enough already
1	No fees. Don't even think about it. Just stop. If it costs money we don't need it.
1	Bicycles need to be licensed to pay a share of the cost of bike lanes now paid entirely by automobile drivers gas tax, etc.
1	No. All arterials are required by ACHD to have sidewalks and bike lanes anyway.
NA	No. Impact fees serve a very specific purpose. Improvements to pedestrian facilities should be built into building agreements and contracts.
3	We need to increase travel flexibility. I would ride my bike more if there was a safe and feasible means to do so.
NA	Still learning what impact fees are all about, so not ranking this one.
4	My choice would be for busses only. Bicycles already have too many special privileges.
5	Also change impact fee to cover the cost of increased staffing needs.
4	Re impact fees, more should have to go to the areas that generated the funds.
2	These fees should be assessed like HOA fees for the people who live in the specific areas those paths, etc will be developed - not by everyone.
1	Impact fees for schools.
1	No. Fully disagree as the current park, fire and police impact fees are not enough to keep up and should not be diverted. The ACHD impact fee could be "more flexible" but better yet, have the legislature pass a bill that is for Alternative Transportation Impact Fees.
5	communities should have flexibility in usage of impact fees to support transportation options
1	No tax for this.
1	Nope that is called a slush fund.
5	This shouldn't be a question. If only we'd have gotten started on this 25 years ago.
3	Not entirely sure on what impact fees really are, but I would support most anything to support alternative forms of transportation
5	The more we can encourage public transportation and the use of bicycles for commuting and errands the better off we will all be.
2	Transportation is for all.
5	Get ITD to implement an impact fee program.
5	New growth should pay for itself, support impact fees.
3	I need more info on this to understand better please.
3	Developers should be paying more for infrastructure changes that must be made as a result of their building in the area.
1	Not sure what you mean here.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
4	Need to allow county to assess impact fees on builders, so that current homeowners don't have to pay for new infrastructure for new houses being built. Yes, it will increase the cost of housing, but perhaps that will slow growth
5	moe bike lanes - not along highways - are needed and would be used, exp now that e-bikes and scooters are becoming commonplace.
2	Bike and pedestrian traffic only benefits those who live downtown, or very close to work. The rest of us need cars, because it's hard to get your groceries home on a bike or bus.
5	Each development must fully fund improvements to offset their impact on transportation and other public infrastructure.
NA	Everyone hates it in TX
5	Impact fees for all growth
5	this doesn't actually necessarily require a law change, infrastructure improvements needed for transit improvements can be paid for despite what some at ACHD say
1	No. Only use impact fees for new roads and signals
2	These services should be added to the cost of creating subdivisions. Ex: CBH submits permit for builds; bus/bike/ped must be included
3	Fees to be used this way only after heavily traveled corridors have been updated to accommodate heavy car traffic.
NA	When growth causes existing transportation systems to become overburdened, they should be expanded using money collected via impact fees. Transportation capacity expansion is horrendously expensive, which means the impact fees will have to be outrageously high, which is entirely appropriate and best for the existing residents. Otherwise, the horrendously high capacity expansion costs fall on the existing residents, which is effectively subsidizing the Treasure Valley's runaway growth and enriching a few at the cost of everyone else. Often referred to as "wealth transfer".
3	It depends what these funds are currently being used for.
5	Raise the impact fees. There should be enough fees on every new subdivision to expand widen the road for that stretch it covers.
3	Force developers to pay higher impact fees, so our property taxes dont have to increase. They are making the profit at our expense
2	This is confusing. We should try to limit excess fees for pedestrians and bikes traffic because of the income gaps that force some to walk due to being unable to afford other forms of transportation
5	Yes. If we want to see an ease in traffic, congestion and pollution, we MUST provide better, reliable options. The system as is is not robust enough to change peoples habits.
NA	I think public transit is not a good choice for most people. It would not be utilized for the average worker simply because you loose control and flexibility to leave on your schedule.
1	Do not put bicycles first! That directly benefits the few and negatively impacts the many.
4	Impact fees should be used broadly to eliminate the burden on those who have already paid. We should not carry the burden of development.
1	Bike lanes are not effective for traffic reduction. Have seen 3 bikes at Gowen Road exit since it was rebuilt.
1	When impact fees go away then what do you do to support bus, etc., =?
NA	Need more info to rate this.
3	I agree with trying to ride a bike or walk more, however, the valley is spread out far and wide. This would have a very minimal impact. Boise will never be Amsterdam.
4	I don't know where these go ordinarily
2	While bike lanes are nice they should not be a priority in high traffic areas
5	To my understanding, Idaho Code 67-82 does not explicitly exclude bus/bike/ped improvements from impact fee eligibility? Answer: <i>Impact fees can only be used for the types of uses specified in the law. As related to transportation, Idaho Code 67-82 specifies that impact fees can be used for "[r]oads, streets and bridges, including rights-of-way, traffic signals, landscaping and any local components of state or federal highways." This strategy would necessitate a law change to broaden the "transportation" uses to allow impact fees to be used for facilities for transit, walking, and cycling, as well as roads.</i>
5	MORE impact fees!
5	Caution here that the money could be misused to prioritize other transportation methods. Verbiage restricting misuse would be very important.
2	Impact fees need to be earmarked for area the develop is in
4	Developers should be on the hook for addressing the impact of their ventures.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	Fees and tolls are a bit extreme but the is what separates those who are willing to commit to change for the better life and those who don't commit.
2	No bike lanes, put money to widen roads
1	Stop trying to make this place more expensive to live, the Californians already did that by destroying the housing market and making buying a house near impossible.
1	Only if you force bikers to pay use taxes on the lanes they take up.
1	That's a regressive tax, impacting those on the economic margins of society, rather than all equally. No.
2	The majority of the population prefers to travel by car. Thus, the majority of the money should go to automobile facilities. I have noticed that even when we have bike facilities there are members of the cycling that don't use them. There is a separated bike path on Federal Way and I see numerous cyclists riding their bikes in the traffic lane. If the cyclists don't these facilities why should we use limited financial resources to build them?
1	People will walk, bike, and ride the sorry bus only in very specific places! Everyone else is driving their own individual car! Way it's done here!
5	Max out the impact fees. Growth should pay 100% of its impact in the first year. If you can't afford it, don't build it.
5	Yes, and charge more impact fees to developers.
5	Hey if the developers want to make utopia in rural Ada Co, they need to pony up for it!!
3	Toll booths?
NA	Survey sucks
3	I worry that some builders / developers might avoid certain types of development (affordable, higher-density, closer to town) by claiming that these fees are preventing them from being able to make any sort of profit. I heard a developer at an Idaho Statesman forum make those claims in the last 6 month. He said that smaller homes on smaller lots are so prohibitive from an impact fee standpoint that no one is willing to build them, because they simply cannot afford to. I have no idea if this is true. I would love to see the city, county, COMPASS, etc. do lots of education on this issue – in concert with the media. We members of the general public need help parsing out these issues – especially if we'll be in a position to vote on them. Without more info, I've marked this one as a 3 for now.
Scenario: Ticket to Ride	
Strategy: Local Option Sales Tax	
3	I would not support this type of tax for a train project.
1	Absolutely not. We pay enough tax already.
1	Again, a tax and spend excuse for elected folks not to strategically plan. Make developers pay for high-rise downtown apartments and sprawling metro area subdivisions/PUDs with IMPACT FEES. Invest the money BEFORE they go digging up good ag land and ripping up our roads for more traffic into longer-term strategic land use and growth. Let's use our brains...not drain our pocketbooks!
3	Prefer to see increased property taxes (!) over a regressive sales tax
3	Only with a 10-year or under sunset clause.
5	Should not apply to food or dining out
3	like this in concept but no one really seems to pay attention to how tax dollars are spent. And that gives me pause.
1	How about we find some areas of government to reduce to get funds for additional needs?!
NA	if approved should be limited to one category and limited to a single community. multi-county option taxes should not be approved.
3	works well in other parts of the USA
5	It will probably take an investment in PR to convince a lot of people who are used to the current car-centric infrastructure of the many benefits of rapid transit
1	NO! we are taxed enough
1	Sounds like a lot of lobbying will take place to decide which projects to take on. No thanks.
3	Would vote against but if most vote for it then that's the choice of the people
1	Their you go with the tax again.
1	Nothing would ever get built if tax payers have to vote on increased taxes for such.
5	Yes, only as long as these are to build 6-lane bypass highways or limited-access toll roads.
1	Taxes are already high enough. Money needs to be managed better.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
NA	Zero stars on this one. Our taxes are already high enough. What we need is for the money to be used properly and wisely. So much of it is wasted. Prove the money we pay can be used wisely, then we can talk if you need more.
4	Only if it's for mass transit.
1	I don't need to be taxed more. Boise City needs to quit wasting money on things the public doesn't want.
NA	No. Because the people who end up paying are not users.
1	I do not support shifting the cost and impacts of growth onto the general public. And like most taxes, once it is in place, it will simply increase over time.
1	Nope. That's is called a slush fund
5	Obviously!! This doesn't happen magically, we need the ability to raise money!
1	No more taxation. The budget will increase as more people are paying taxes; you don't need to find more ways to squeeze us.
1	No
3	I need more info on this to understand better please.
1	NO.
1	We don't need another way to be taxed. It won't end well.
NA	Loaded question, more details would be helpful
5	this should be the NUMBER ONE issue in our state, this is the single most important step that needs to be taken to reshape our transportation landscape and as many government and non-governmental resources as possible should be directed to publicly and unapologetically fighting the legislators who oppose this
1	Specific projects my foot. These taxes NEVER go away.
1	NO!
2	Taxes to cover genesis of transportation options, not most of continuing cost.
NA	Opposed. Repairs to the existing roadways need to be paid for by fuel taxes, any and all expansions should be paid for by impact fees.
2	Depends on the project
1	NO MORE TAXES!
1	No, and he'll no.
1	sales tax is already high enough in a state with wages below par
5	Yes let the people vote on the direct impacts of the dollar.
5	Tie VMT to road maintenance to free up property taxes to match sales taxes so funds are leveraged. Let cities lease land near transit stations to help pay for the cost of transit. Transit fares should be zero, at least in the city core.
5	This would help cities address their own needs while working within a regional transportation system like VRT.
1	No more taxes!
1	hell no
1	Forget it people are already taxed enough and this is hard on working people.
5	Unfortunately, it takes money to pay for things to enhance our quality of life. A sales tax is a great way of doing this.
5	WE NEED THIS
2	This is a regressive tax and hurts poor people more than rich developers.
1	NO NEW TAXES!
4	If this is the only option because other funding sources aren't allocated directly to these initiatives, then I'm in favor of it.
1	Taxes are not the answer. Use your budget wisely, please!
NA	No more taxes.
4	I'd rate it 5 stars if this were for a light rail system
NA	Reduce sales tax - don't need more public transportation because the busses are empty the way it is. The only ones using it are the homeless bums
NA	do not support higher taxes
2	This should be funded by the government as an option of existence.
1	Not at all taxed too much already
2	Unfortunately taxpayers rarely vote in support of a tax for improvement projects. I think it would get voted down even if it was needed.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	No more taxes!!!!
5	This is a long overdue change that the Legislature needs to address.
1	Taxation is theft
1	Never. The valley politicians have proven to be poor stewards of taxpayer money and spend too much on environmental and social issues to be trusted with local option taxes.
4	The marketing for such projects would need to be TOP NOTCH to counter the inevitable anti-tax backlash.
NA	Absolutely NEVER!
3	Provided a clear budget and timeframe, voters should have this option. The contract should be binding with provisions for overruns to be absorbed by the contractor, not the citizenry.
NA	NO
1	No! This pits cities against cities and creates more conjection from people traveling to avoid the tax.
3	no one is going to vote for a tax on their local options - this is a pipe dream. That's why we have towns like Star and Kuna making up their own rules without Ada Co oversight.
4	If its voted on and not just imposed.
3	I'm not sure the "through commuters" would be sharing in a local tax.
NA	Survey sucks
1	Maybe if all of our other taxes were lower (property, gas, utility fees) I might consider this.
5	Same remarks as for Local Option Levies. Although now I thought they were the same thing with terms used interchangeably. You are indicating they are different things. I need to learn more... Also: I love the excellent rail options in Salt Lake City, UT; Washington, DC (the metro is so easy to understand and use), Chicago, IL, and so forth. The new train from Sea-Tac to downtown Seattle, WA is a dream come true. Thank you for continuing to work so diligently and creatively to find ways to increase public transportation here in the Treasure Valley.

Scenario: Ticket to Ride

Strategy: Open Space Levies

3	I'd focus on encouraging tax incentives from private land owners and companies on this before giving up city/county revenues to make costly purchases. And increase open space requirements, if applicable (though this obviously increases the cost of living)
3	Only if voted on by the electorate with a major majority (not simple). We seem to have school/fire districts who have yet to meet a levy it didn't like. Re-introducing them with threats of cut-backs & layoffs. NO more tax and spend options unless it's truly desired by more than a simple majority of the people.
5	The only way to preserve agricultural land in Ada County is to purchase the property or a conservation (perpetual agriculture) easement.
5	would like to see development rights purchased from farmers so their only option isn't to sell to developers
NA	only with voters permission.
5	all ready working in the Treasure Valley
5	What is the source of the local funding? Answer: <i>Local funding would be in the form of a property tax, if a levy was approved by the voters within that taxing district.</i>
1	You dont need funding to preserve these spaces. You just dont allow building on them.
5	Please preserve farm land! This is more important than foothills as food is more important than bike rides.
5	I believe this is a vital step if you valuable people to want to live in your city. Make the Treasure Valley incredibly livable and the rest will follow.
1	let the state do that
4	The open space needs to be reserved for farm ground!! Don't take our valuable farm ground for development.
3	This is a great idea and should come out of the existing budget
3	This sounds like a good idea in theory, but is a precipice. The more land that is turned into open the space, the less land is available to build affordable housing upon.
NA	Again, I'm not okay with taxes going up. We shouldn't have to keep paying more and see any anything change, anything good come from it.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
5	Need to start buying riverfront land before it's all owned by luxury condo developments with no public access.
1	We already have open space, but p&Z keeps changing the zoning. Hold the accountable accountable.
2	Boise has already done this twice, yet the funds do not get allocated equitably. Most of the expenditure has benefitted the north and east ends near the foothills.
3	we need to pay more attention to preserving the farm land used to grow our food instead of prioritizing recreation. Both are important
1	Nope. Have the developers pay for it
5	YES! If we lose everything that is good and unique about our area then what is the point of people wanting to live here. It does cost money, but multiple funding options will make it easier. Growth needs to pay for things like this in part.
5	Yes, future generations will benefit from this foresight.
5	Needed to prioritize
5	If you are going to use tax dollars, do stuff like this. Just spend carefully, please.
3	This has the potential to be taken too far and serve political special interests which would be a concern.
1	This should be a part of each development and paid by the developer. You are not requiring as much open space in developments as in previous years and it is drastically affecting the quality of life in these new neighborhoods - and NOT in a good way.
5	Goes directly to Quality of Life. Absolutely!
5	This scenario talks about preserving open space and farmland and your open space comments cite "foothills, parks, etc). There has to be a policy approach that respects the private property rights of a farmer and incentivizes the preservation of farmland over sprawling development - that costs the public money in order to preserve the farmland that this scenario purports to 'save'.
3	As long as these decisions aren't dominated by Boise North End tree huggers, it would be fine.
2	more taxes are not welcome - and will fail to be supported
NA	Always and forever, after all, this is Idaho
3	Developers need to plan this into their developements.
5	Include farm ground forever
1	We have already protected the property values of all the "friends of the mayor" that need it. NO MORE!
1	NO! no increases to property tax bills
5	This has worked well in Boise and needs to add the other cities in Ada County as we are users as well
3	Preserving farmland is also important. County Codes can be changed so that farmlands remain farmlands.
5	Our foothills are a treasure. We must protect them.
3	Private funding not tax payers
5	THIS IS IMPORTANT! Future build out into the foothills like what is currently happening on Bogus Basin Road should be permanently banned. The city/county should be buying as much land as it can, use eminent domain if necessary. It is not easy to provide fire protection, water or other services to housing in the foothills, and the blight of buildings detracts from the natural beauty and recreation opportunities the foothills provide. Not to mention the wildlife impact.
5	All mental health research points to open space and green areas as a necessity for helping maintain people's mental health. We definitely should prioritize open space.
5	Also, free up property taxes so they can be used for this and not for road maintenance.
5	We have got to stop building into the foothills. Not only to keep our quality of life and recreation, but to protect the environment of the foothills such as fires, wildlife habitat and erosion.
5	There is no direct benefit to mass growth, other than to the budgets of government. Truth!
5	It is the only way to preserve the 'Look' of what we love.
2	IN Boise there is little space to build on. When do we say enough open space. You are actually increasing the housing cost by sealing off land for housing.
1	should be part of developer fees.
3	Parks and open spaces are critical to our quality of life
2	not just in Boise city
5	Open space is what sets Boise apart from other larger cities. Now is the time to set aside the space to be able to recreate outside and not just a small park here and there. The foothills and trail system are a goldmine.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	As long as this is applied across the board including those people who have already have their home in the foothills for example and expect the rest of the valley to support their space.
5	I've supported them in the past and will continue every time they come up.
5	This should include preserving city neighborhoods.
3	For this, but also goes along with ensuring lawmakers don't sell the land we currently have.
1	if property sizes are large enough, you would need open spaces as much. Ie: 1/2 acre lots
NA	Open levy? What does this mean? More taxes?? Answer: <i>An open-space levy would be a voter-approved tax to be used specifically to preserve open space within a given area.</i>
NA	we have enough open space as long as no more development - it has already been ruined
5	Taxes approved by the voters that would pay them are acceptable.
5	I would love to preserve the land and build farm life and wildlife shelter to avoid standing/sleeping in harsh elements
2	Purchase land to make a freeway from I84 to I55
1	Make that a condition of development. Taxpayers don't need to be taxed.
1	Leave the management of public lands to Idaho Department of Lands, they have a better idea how to manage land for recreation and revenue then any other organization in this valley could do.
3	use existing track .
4	Don't build on farmland. Build in desert or other areas that don't impact our ability to feed ourselves
3	ONLY if management funds are considered and appropriated FIRST. Just buying up land does NOT solve any problems!
1	No. New. Taxes.
4	The only concern here is wildfire management cost with more foothills. But I'd rather save the save for everyone instead of watching the rich build their big houses on the hills.
2	Only if it dcoes not increase proprty taxes.
NA	no additional taxes
2	Yeah, we did that in Boise a long time ago. Interesting how the land is somehow being developed anyway...
5	There's awhile lot of people who do not use our open spaces around Boise! Make people pay to use them! That's fair! Pay to play...pay to use trails, pay to use greenbelt, pay to use foothills. Toll booths@
1	No, make the developers donate it. They'll get a tax write off anyway, so make them do it.
2	It is easy to just travel 2 or 3 hours outside of Boise to find green space.
5	without the govt purchasing these land people will sell to the highest bidder
5	The open spaces are the jewels in the Treasure Valley's crown. Lose them and we are no different than other congested cities.
3	preserve farmland?
NA	Survey sucks
2	I don't believe the land would be left open. I believe someone would end up "making a deal" to sell because the land would bring in so much revenue.
5	Yes!!! I'm concerned that you didn't include farmland in your list of examples. We need lots of pocket farms (and possibly larger farms) within city limits and near cities, for a variety of reasons. This is a type of open space that's especially important for us, and healthy for us. The more we understand the full cycle of life and the interplay of various land uses on the planet, the better off we'll be as a species. I have been dreaming that the Treasure Valley could provide publicly owned ag land at low annual (or longer period) rental fees to farmers. This is the same model that's used for open range land, and for usage fees for city parks (softball league fees, for example), and publicly owned campgrounds. If the price could be set based on a hierarchy of parameters – such as organic food, fair wages paid to all of the workers on the farm, soil health, regenerative ag that helps sequester carbon – that would be even better. The more wholistic and beneficial the farm, the lower the rental fee. I never hear anyone say we should tear out a city park to make room for more housing. Let's get to that same mindset for publicly (& privately) owned ag land, too.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
Scenario: Ticket to Ride	
Strategy: Density Bonuses	
3	Yes but...don't go crazy on this. Developers will take this to the extremes. Don't forget parking is still needed - not everyone can bike and not everyone can bike year-round
1	Let's just quit promoting development. In the long run it ruins everything good about this place.
3	ONLY for affordable housing (e.g. between poverty level/Section 8 and viable single-family homes under \$200,000!
5	I agree with density bonus but object to "taller" apartments as implied only option. I highly recommend the approach of David Sim in Soft City: Building Density for Everyday Life. Very livable density increases can be thoughtfully implemented by "layering" buildings rather than "stacking"
2	Transit = Yes; (nebulous) affordable housing claims = No.
5	Upzoning everything would be better than doling out project specific bonuses.
4	ask for more ... density bonuses for certain % of units as affordable
3	Denser apartment developments need to include green space and elevators large enough for ambulance gurneys.
1	Question is too vague for a good answer. Carte Blanche over height and density without addressing other needs of those residents is a huge problem.
5	Density over sprawl.
NA	this is smart growth and it will only build the Ghettos of the future. decentralize centers of commerce and pay attention to the birth rate which has fallen below sustainability.
1	We already have too many apartments...
1	they are building way to many apartments!
4	a way to better engage the developer community to support innovation for environmental health and affordability
5	Higher density housing is almost a requirement for effective transit, and effective transit is basically a requirement for growth since we're already coming up to the limits of single-occupant vehicles for transportation
1	NO...stop the people coming in. More people create more crime, unemployment and actually increases taxes
5	We need taller buildings with more density in order to not have a ton of sprawl. A mixed used and residential tower that is 20 stories or taller would be a great addition to downtown.
1	NO
3	This is a tough one because dense housing makes sense to prevent urban sprawl. However, taller buildings block the view of the beautiful foothills. Either way is a loss.
1	quit packing. no one is happy when they are crammed together
5	This is huge. How can we hope to sustain ourselves if subdivisions continue replacing fields and pastures. Some people find high density unsightly. Those people are intellectually challenged. Unless humans (and every other species) quit procreating we're going to need more farmland, not less.
3	builders need to pay for the added road use and school use.
1	This gets used to reward developers who come in with buckets of money promising cities tax revenues. You end up selling out tax paying citizens and these guys build and go. They don't have to deal with the congestion and ugly buildings left behind. NO density bonuses. Most citizens don't have faith that they won't be abused. If these are used ONLY near transit and other historic properties aren't demolished this could work in some locations but eyes need to be on these agreements.
5	Definitely. It is chronically stupid to have apartment buildings zoned out for Broadway and Vista and Franklin and Eagle Road and Chinden. All these little tire repair shops? Sub sandwich joints? Retail wood stoves? Those should be apartment buildings with retail on the first floor. The buses already run there. Build decent, not fancy, apartments. Let the developers build big enough buildings that they can make money and require parking lots - 2 spaces per unit
5	Now you're thinking!
3	Developers shouldn't need bonuses - they make enough money. If areas are zoned a certain way, doesn't that require specific types of buildings?
1	This only works if the infrastructure is already in place for transportation needs. For some reason City Councils allow a development but do not have have the infrastructure in place for transportation. If you notice they allow this type of development in areas where "they" do not live. Funny how that works.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	Impact fees should be updated to reflect the cost of new developments and to force developers to take care of those costs (e.g. Amazon's contribution to Nampa is not commensurate with its impact or long-term cost to the city and surrounding valley.)
1	Make them all move to a different town. If there are no houses available the other areas will grow
1	Density should be in newly created developments, not existing neighborhoods. Why continue to create sprawling subdivisions and dump density in the inner city. That has failed in so many cities. Put densities in the newly created subdivisions and send the damned bus out there.
1	Why will developers not build such options without this subsidy?
4	Density needs to be carefully managed to fit well with existing community structure and comprehensive plans
1	Aweful. Stop building apartments.
NA	NO!!! They need to pay more to make improvement before building and creating more traffic.
1	Ugly ugly ugly blocks sky views and No
5	More impact fees on other types of development as well. Developers have had a free ride for such a long time that we need to start catching back up with the costs of growth.
3	No incentives for builders are necessary. They already make enough money.
3	This would only be acceptable in conjunction with DISINCENTIVES for developing new ground such as farmland in more rural areas.
3	If executed well. And built well.
5	This is one of the best ways to decrease motor vehicle use.
1	Keep our present life style. Not a big urban industrial jungle!
1	This would depend on how people would travel and through what established neighborhoods. Currently, many single drivers going through neighborhoods due to developers putting in too many homes, even single family homes.
4	I'm cautious with the use of "bonus" here - if you want to incentivize, give tax breaks, not money.
2	It depends if there is already an existing development
4	Ok near transit, but not just to be more affordable elsewhere.
3	Not specific enough to give 5 stars. We need high density but not without better planning. E.g. look at the downtown buildings jutting out over the sidewalks. There is no setback, no room for expansion, public transit, new modes of travel, parking/stopping, etc. What every Idahoan knows is that you don't "tubelock" (paint yourself into a corner) yourself. But that is exactly what Boise downtown planning / permitting is doing!
3	My concern with this is that I'm seeing high density housing going in all over, with no effort at all to expand traffic capacity nearby.
NA	Another LOADED question. NO NO NO to big developers. Might does not make right, More money should not get a green light to building.
NA	developers need to akso pay for new school buildings to support the population coming into their developement than just having existing families carry the burden. Plus road improvements/safety features.
5	this sounds like an excellent policy, its not something I've heard as a part of these discussions in the past and it sounds like a great idea!
3	This is not New York, people don't like tall building other than downtown.
1	No high density. Too much now.
2	More units = more people = more problems. Congestion, crime, etc.
3	Only on major corridors that already have adequate roads
NA	Depending upon location whether they are appropriate. Downtown mixed with multi-story buildings works, next to single family residence subdivisions is not compatible.
1	We don't want more people squished into the same space.
1	High density is ruining neighborhoods. Developers take advantage of this
1	Someone with some balls please put an end to this ridiculous building of all types out here. Should limit building permits to developers. Too much \$\$ under the table though, We get it
1	I guess this is okay, but I don't want to see the loss of single family dewellings as other cities have done.
4	need taller apartments in general
4	as long as these areas do no intrude on nice residential neighborhoods
5	Single family, high density, AFFORDABLE housing is the only way forward. Stop letting developers build properties for the wealthy and upper middle class.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	<h2 style="text-align: center;">Comment</h2> <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>
4	Every developer should have to build affordable housing units as apart of their design. They should also have to help pay for the changes in infrastructure if their building increases the amount of pedestrian traffic ex widening sidewalks Ext.
5	Public land should be retained by the city to lease so the taxpayers get a direct return at these economically vibrant transit oriented development sites.
5	Yes! Better density near transit facilities!
1	Ruin the beautiful valley.
5	45 years ago Boise City council reduced the number of apartments units and decided not add bus service because of low ridership in the area. Developments almost always are reduced in dwellings before approval. Dumb planning.
1	When you look at the spead of Covid in NYC and Chicago then you must realize that high density can create many problems. No to higher buildings. Keep the limit.
1	The developers get all sorts of zoning code wavers/changes when they form special 400+ acre 'districts', which just isn't fair to the rest and nullifies the code inputs given by citizens, working with the local governments. A code is a code, as well as agreed upon community plans and zones. Big developers should follow them too.
1	Apartments, Condo's etc are the reason for most of the over crowding. Stop that type of development or tax them to make up the differences you have to make.
5	The only way to keep costs low and minimize the impact on our environment and transportation system is to maximize housing density near the city centers and parks.
4	I support this when it is infill. I do not support this when it involves existing neighborhood homes and replacing these with unaffordable high density housing that only benefits developers.
1	How do we define affordable? Developers often abuse this
5	Certain areas are going to have to become dense, like downtown areas. Keep in mind, however, you have to stick to the plan. Just recently there has been planned buildings in downtown Boise on unlimited height lots that were shot down because they were too tall. This makes no sense. Downtown needs to be as tall as a builder thinks it can be built and start stuffing people in.
1	There are already too many apartment buildings that are popping up everywhere and they all look the same. Don't allow them to be higher than they are - it'll take away from Boise's beauty.
1	Show me a developer who needs a bonus for anything and I'll show you the tooth fairy.
5	Only if developers are required to include mixed-income housing and off-street parking for each unit.
5	This does not mean destroying the character of an area, though. If we have an area that is currently zoned as rural, don't throw a very high density area into it.
1	This is a terrible idea. It already encourages anonymizing relations among neighbors in many cities. It's a ghetto-producing idea that only favors developers.
5	As the valley prices continue to increase exponentially, affordability is a huge concern. I'm for this idea but also would like to see transit options in suburbia too...people who live in SFRs, though not a lot of them, would also benefit and welcome transportation alternatives.
5	There should not be a bonus. Developers make more revenue from increasing density.
1	NO - keep height to no taller than the Capitol building and no more than 35ft in surrounding cities. We are not Chicago - cut the highrises. Keep us small and quaint and livable/walkable.
2	This works in established urban areas where taller buildings are already established and expected but in the rural areas taller is not better. They should blend with the current residential housing; 2-3 stories MAX.
1	NO
NA	We don't want more Density here in Boise - if you want Density move to a big city
NA	no way - this doesn't work for a beautiful area to live
1	Too many strangers in one place is never a good idea. Plus taller buildings and more kitchens are higher risk for catastrophe.
4	Only if it is for existing public transportation services, not projected
1	Lame, boise meridian already have a urban sprawl problem, need to be industrial parks, things are too mixed
3	the key word "affordable" is subjective. There are units downtown with affordable housing that most people wouldn't be able to rent.
5	The whole zoning code should be reworked both to make it easier to build dense, affordable housing near transit and to prevent sprawling, car-dependent subdivisions with low connectivity.
1	Too many apartments already. Unequal tax base.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Stop encouraging people to move here
1	Not a good idea. Packing more people into an area only worsens problems.
2	no.
1	Development is already out of control. They aren't taking into consideration the people already established and living in an area.
4	Developers need to pay as they go, including paying for infrastructure. The city giving them land under these fake leases is ridiculous. Developers need to pay for the land and the infrastructure to go with it.
4	Developers should be required to build a percentage of affordable housing for each higher cost housing unit or dollar
3	Developers must to be required to pay for added traffic and congestion from their developments. One time impact fees are not sufficient and their windfall developments become a burden on all other taxpayers.
5	Developers LOVE incentives. This is a good idea.
1	This CAN BE a very slippery slope... and in many cases... a complete cop out.
1	This is how Idaho turns blue. No.
1	ONLY if not done under the cover of an urban renewal district.
2	The number of full three story single family houses/townhouses being allowed in Boise is disconcerting. It's starting to look like people live in tree houses here. Don't mind if those buildings are apartments that house many families, but the single family units are ridiculous looking. Don't fit in in the areas they are being put in like the genteel ranch style bench neighborhoods.
4	They would also have to make it affordable
NA	NO
1	HATE all the high density housing going in. Our roads were BAD before, they are going toe be TERRIBLE when all these places fill up.
3	Depends on location and how it might affect those already in the area - property values, etc.
1	Stop building in every little empty lot! Apartment buildings, townhouses or multiple dwellings squeezed into little spaces in Boise is STUPID and it has caused hate and discontent! Every person on this panel should have to experience this next door to them to apparently care!
3	Higher density near urban centers and transit makes sense, but no towering apartment buildings next to houses.
5	Hit em where they feel it most. Heck most of them don't live here anyway.
2	Please don't destroy the views with so many super tall buildings?
3	I hate high rises, but I suppose it makes sense. But what sense does it make to put apartments (3stories? whatever) into the Burlington space? that corner is already so congested. Who approves this stuff? Not the taxpayers. Each apartment will have at least one car if not two. Only tenants without a car, who plan to walk to work should be able to live there.-- employees at Albertsons, Axiom, CVS etc. Our city is becoming unrecognizeable thanks to the Growth obsession of city officials.
1	Higher density is always a bad thing. Make what is available more affordable.
NA	Survey sucks
1	I strongly believe these developers need to be the ones that improve the roads around their developments. No, we do not need tall sky scrape apartment bldgs.
5	Smart incentives are so important. I'm confused about the word "bonuses" – is this discussing a financial incentive? It sounds like zoning flexibility...? Answer: <i>It is a form of zoning flexibility, where developers can develop "bonus" (more) units in an area to help meet affordable housing needs or provide housing near transit, which makes the housing more affordable by reducing transportation costs for those who live there. It also helps preserve farmland by focusing development already developed areas.</i>
Scenario: Penny Lane	
Strategy: Dedicated Bus/Bike/Ped \$	
3	The public will need to be involved in this. Taxes for roads should not be shifted for mass transit, bike, and pedestrian facilities. I would be in favor of new taxes for transit, bike, and pedestrian facilities.
1	Not a good use of tax payer dollars
4	Our bus system needs a lot of help.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Again, so few people ride their bikes to work. We have plenty of places for them to take their bikes to ride for recreation. Thus, it's a huge waste to have bike lanes, including the fact that those who do ride their bike to work cannot do so much of the winter.
4	It's great but there's been a lot of improvement here already, and I'm a bike commuter.
1	Fix the roads we have, start licensing/charging bikes road usage fees, find a way to make transit safe(r) and use IMPACT FEES paid by profit-motivated developers to subsidize road transport alternatives.
3	Only with a sunset clause of ten years or less.
1	Redirect funds await from other govt organizations to cover this.
NA	we need a bus system, but it will always be in the red. any tax for this should be paid by the companies and commerce that benefits.
1	I hate the bike lanes that have taken up parking in the core of down town. I never see more than 2 using the lanes. The bikes are always in the traffic lanes.
5	a way to better engage the developer community to support innovation for environmental health and affordability
4	Bus only not for bike or ped
1	Charge the bikes a registration fee. put a license plate on them.
4	register the bikes, cite bikes for traffic violations (they happen more often than a cyclist obeys the law, by far)
1	Everyone need to pay for the cost of designated bike, etc lanes, not just those who drive cars.
1	Definitely not. Bike supremacy causes horrible traffic congestion and burdens the poor.
1	No. These projects should be built into construction contracts.
NA	No, no, no. Put a tax on those that actually utilize those. Make bikers register their bikes if they are going to need bike lanes. The fees for riding the bus should pay for all the bus needs. Stop putting the burdens on people that never use the items.
4	Again, only if for mass transit. Bikes, peds and busses should not be in the same category. Bikes and peds are local. Mass transit serves outlying areas.
2	alternative transportation alleviates some congestion on our roads. taxes from vehicle registration and gas tax should go to improving bike, bus, and pedestrian projects.
3	I'm for this but not for increasing taxes to pay for it.
1	Bicycles and pedestrians are taking traffic OFF the streets - why should they pay a fee for that. The more the city invests in bike and pes paths, the less road maintenance is required. I see it as an offset cost that will be recuperated in less road maintenance cost.
NA	Dont need to tax us for what transportation departments already have.
1	<p>How is this different from a local option tax? I do not support any new taxes and would prefer to see actions that show ways to be more efficient with current spending. Cut the fat first. One way to do this is if the cities and counties are providing wages that are matching the private sector, than the public employment benefits need to be skinned-down to match what the private sector offers. Move towards shared insurance premiums, higher copays, higher deductibles, and overall "less-rich" benefits that are paid for by ever-increasing taxes. Other trade-offs for keeping up with private sector pay would include less paid-time off, minimal or no dental and vision insurance coverage, etc. This will free-up funds to be used for some of the options presented in this survey.</p> <p>Answer: <i>In broad terms this would be some sort of tax, but that "tax" could take any of several different forms — for example, it could be a local option sales tax, a local option registration fee, or a locally approved levy.</i></p>
1	Nope that's California horse crap
1	Absolutely not!
1	On the surface this sounds good, but it ends up creating taller silos and politicians then don't want to spend on these modes. beyond what's in a fund like this.
3	No increases in property taxes
5	I would like to see more developments that provide lots of walking or bike paths. I would also like to see more merged developments where people can work, live and play in a local area and do not need to travel to do the things they love.
3	It seems as it would be better to shift funding, like mentioned in other options, than to simply raise taxes. Maybe a combination of both so the impact isn't so intense?
1	No! Because autonomous vehicles are coming and these mode accommodations will need to be changed again in the near future (<10 years).

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	I don't see the bike lanes being used on a regular basis. Plus, bikes aren't regularly used during the winter months, which is significant so I think more of the money should go to bus and pedestrian use.
5	again, dedicated funding streams (usually described as being most easily achieved as local option) is the SINGLE most important important step and should be the PRIMARY focus of all conversations about improving transportation options, until we accomplish this we wont be able to accomplish and other goals
1	Get it from the users, not everyone. We have been held up for decades by the bike people.
3	Not property taxes
4	Better than taking funds from ACHD
NA	When growth causes existing transportation systems to become overburdened, they should be expanded using money collected via impact fees. Transportation capacity expansion is horrendously expensive, which means the impact fees will have to be outrageously high, which is entirely appropriate and best for the existing residents. Otherwise, the horrendously high capacity expansion costs fall on the existing residents, which is effectively subsidizing the Treasure Valley's runaway growth and enriching a few at the cost of everyone else. Often referred to as "wealth transfer".
3	We should start this
3	This included rail I would rate higher
3	bike lanes need to be moved OFF highways; not safe -- cars go fast, bikes do not. Bad mix.
5	Yes. It's beyond time. Why do cars have more rights and funding for their roads but not my legs.
5	Public right of way should be assumed for all uses and vulnerable users (pedestrians, cyclists) need to be physically protected from cars. Speeds need to be limited by DESIGN not just by speed limit signs and police enforcement.
5	Reiterating what I've said before but creating better options for all will ease our traffic woes.
1	Enough already
1	More new taxes is the aim of every district but the average Idahoan is beginning to be squeezed out of their home.
3	Bus, no more expensive bike lanesp
1	Or you could plan for the future rather than current traffic issues. Like a southern bypass. This not only eliminates through traffic but allows the valley to grow and expand rather than just congest and stifle.
3	Biking and walking have a very small ability to solve the traffic problems. Very few people are going to ride a bike from Five Mile to downtown. It certainly helps for the people living in the immediate area and this is why I scored high on the livable cities initiative. New developments need to promote the ability to walk or bike. Currently, a very small amount of the valley has shops/stores close enough to walk or bike to, or a road safe enough to do it on. I would never take my family on a bike ride down Fairview.
5	Our bus system sucks, and the push to increase bicycles just creates more traffic hazards. Put the money into buses, not more bike lanes.
1	Tax the folks that ride the bikes, not the people that drive the cars.
NA	No more taxes.
3	Bike and walking projects are great. However, when it comes to busses, it doesn't take long before they bring an area down. As cities grow, busses become graffitied, attract many homeless and transient individuals, etc. making the system ineffective for most.
3	This also requires many streets to re-pave and make sidewalks for this to be fully functional across Treasure Valley.
NA	On this I would say deputize riders to collect plates from when they get harasses
5	As long as they have security cameras on all times and protect the constituents.
3	I am unsure about dedicated funds
1	Taxation is theft
5	yes
1	Homeowners always end up paying for this and rarely are the ones that use these services. Bike lanes on raid side yes, wiping out whole lanes just for busses and bikes s inefficient for all and bus riders never pay their own way.
5	Something has to be done to create means to commute via bike. For it size and layout Ada county is the worst I've ever seen
1	Only if it does not increase homeowner property taxes.
1	Most of the funding should come from the users. Bike owners should have to register their bicycles just like auto owners do. Increase bus fares as needed to support the bus system. Most people don't mind paying a little bit more for safety and ability to get "there" smoother and faster.
1	HUGE waste of money. We have tons of bike lanes. You know what is in most of them? NOTHING.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	Depends on use/needs.
1	If you use the money to acquire dedicated RIGHT OF WAY, rather than stealing road right of way, making the roads more dangerous, then yes, by all means increase taxes. I bet you won't do that however.
4	Yes, within reason. The valley is great for biking and needs to be safer and better supported. But ACHD needs to stop with the weird experiments downtown and commit to bike riders. Use Europe as examples of What to do.
1	Bus yes. sidewalks yes bike path should be funded by users
5	Biking is one of the best parts of Boise. Make it safer please. *note: There is not as much reflective quality in lane paint here in Boise and the Treasure Valley as is used in KC Metro area in midwest. We may get less rain here, but when it rains, the lane markings are all but impossible to see, especially at night. At least consider higher reflectivity for streets that are designated as emergency routes, please.
1	Yes on the bus. No on the bikes.
3	bike lanes do NOT belong on busy crowded city streets. In my opinion, its dangerous and supports the desires of a very few. Buses, ok, bikes belong on the greenbelt.
2	This would be more of a city thing than a county thing right? Most rural residents would not be able to use these services as much
2	Most city streets already have bike lanes, the issue is that bicyclists don't follow the laws, and are not held accountable for them.
NA	Survey sucks
1	Putting up bike lanes on major roads is asking for more accidents. I have seen too many cyclist riding like they are the only priority on the road. I have seen many ignore the hwy laws. Cyclist and pedestrians should not be accessing busy, higher speed roads.
3	Is this the same as impact fees, above? Or maybe the local option referenced above? I'm marking as a 3 out of uncertainty. Answer: <i>In broad terms this would be some sort of tax, but that "tax" could take any of several different forms — for example, it could be a local option sales tax, a local option registration fee, or a locally approved levy.</i>

Scenario: Penny Lane

Strategy: Livable Cities Initiative

2	Not everyone even wants to walk! Those who do, find a way and get out and do it! I do!
2	And how do we get to these developments? Drive?.
1	We already have this. It's called mortgage and construction lending. When it makes sense to financial institutions, you don't/won't need public funds to incent any one.
1	If you can't zone it right then don't take my taxes to pay developers.
3	Answered based on shifting fund and no new taxes.
5	Smart infrastructure development focusing on smart density. Maintain farm land and open spaces.
NA	should be used only for specific planned communities and tax should be limited to that community alone.
5	a way to better engage the developer community to support innovation for environmental health and affordability
1	Housing developers can create these developments without more taxes or shift in funds which then you increase the taxes to cover those funds.
5	Walkability is extremely important. One of the great things about Boise is how walkable it is. Closing off 8th street between main and Jefferson for only pedestrian use is one step in the right direction
5	not taxes, but your getting the idea.
2	These are great unless they result in huge complexes that are oversized for a comfortable neighborhood feel.
1	No. Build what the market wants to buy.
3	Sounds good in theory, but it seems no one can come to an understanding of what this should look like.
4	I visited one of these in N.C. It was genius. They had a grocery store on the lower level with parking and apartments above. The whole subdivision was walkable to include shopping and dining.
NA	Tax payers should have to pay for what developers put in. The developers, contractors, and the people who live there should pay for it.
1	Change the law to require developers to make their developments walkable.
NA	Stop trying to tax us for good planning.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	No new taxes. Plus developers should have to pay for the infrastructure to make an area "walkable" beyond just the sidewalk adjacent to the property to be developed. Especially if they are claiming their project is transit-oriented development, yet the route to walk to transit is on State Street with no sidewalks, high speed traffic (45+ mph), etc. This works against increasing transit ridership as many simply are not willing to put their life on the line to walk to a bus! And that is the reality that exists today. It is high risk and outright dangerous for people to walk on many parts of State Street. To think otherwise is putting one's head in the sand.
3	the definition of "healthy" is difficult. With work from home scenarios you also eliminate traffic congestion and provide social distancing which is a healthy choice.
1	Nope have the developers pay for it
3	Shift in funds. Spend wisely.
1	Just stop widening so many roads (eg subsidies for developers) to induce unhealthy development and it's solved without additional taxes or subsidies.
1	Developments need to be paid by developers, not citizens because mayors give them city land in exchange for campaign contributions, like Bieter did
1	Change the city plan to include the types of developments you want to see. No need to give developers grants, they are doing just fine. Have the law reflect the pathway to the city you want to be in 2050. Don't give option for developers to underwhelm or use loopholes to build where or how will be the most lucrative for them.
3	As we develop from urban area to more of a metropolitan area we need to spend/develop in this category.
4	If business and residential could be more integrated, people wouldn't have to travel as far. Better zoning would handle this.
1	Define "healthy, walkable, developments." Then I'll be willing to think about this.
1	No
4	for all levels of housing types. Not just affordable.
NA	When growth causes existing transportation systems to become overburdened, they should be expanded using money collected via impact fees. Transportation capacity expansion is horrendously expensive, which means the impact fees will have to be outrageously high, which is entirely appropriate and best for the existing residents. Otherwise, the horrendously high capacity expansion costs fall on the existing residents, which is effectively subsidizing the Treasure Valley's runaway growth and enriching a few at the cost of everyone else. Often referred to as "wealth transfer".
5	Need retrofits also, especially in neighborhoods with lower health ratings.
5	Highways are classist bulls***.
5	Walking is the best way for people to feel apart of a community while improving their health. There's so much literature out there on building a walkable city that shows it's cheaper to do than car travel. It is also safer. We should be utilizing this knowledge and improving walk ability every day.
5	Show economic return including public ownership of most valuable space which can be leased and the profits come back to the taxpayers
4	I think this could be a great idea if its implemented carefully. Places like Bown crossing is great, but lacks transit facilities (getting better) and isn't super connected to the nearby neighborhoods.
5	This should be part of every scenario.
2	good in theory, not in real life
1	If developers are making money on their projects why does the taxpayer have to fund them?? What is the tax shift? Everyone wants more from county to schools.
4	should be done in any scenario
5	This would be a great way to prevent the current dominant subdivision layout from continuing. Which is a sprawling mess of winding roads and every time you leave your house, you have to pull onto a congested busy street and drive into town. If the focus can be on having a community that has some of the most common and basic needs taken care of, a person can walk or ride a bike to a shop or store. Right now, a person living in a subdivision on Cloverdale and Lake Hazel has no option to ride a bike anywhere without a major risk of dying on a high speed busy road.
3	No more taxes.
NA	This make no sense
4	Again as long as their is security for those who choose to walk.
2	Thats fine as long as there isn't an increase in government thievery (taxes)

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Been done and failed everywhere I have seen it. Due to these numerous proposals of failed projects I have no confidence in your organization and would not support anything you attempt to do. Why even present failed ideas to waste tax dollars? Why even consider the same programs which have proven to be failures?
4	Shift in funds - yes, absolutely. Liaise with your community and make decisions. New taxes? No.
4	Who would qualify for these grants and how they be administered? Answer: <i>This program would incentivize multi-modal transportation options, public-private partnerships, and more for infrastructure investments to encourage more vibrant and livable cities. Details regarding exactly how the program would be administered would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. Atlanta and Houston have programs in place and can serve as examples:</i> <i>Atlanta: https://atlantaregional.org/community-development/livable-centers-initiative</i> <i>Houston: http://www.h-gac.com/livable-centers/default.aspx</i>
1	Only if it does not increase homeowner property taxes.
4	And ADA compliance / universal accessibility included in all initiatives
2	Depends on whether services will be used or not.
1	Boise is an extreme climate. No one wants to sit next to the smelly person that rode to work . Many people have to drive and it is way more efficient and convenient. People have kids to pick up and drop off, groceries to buy etc. Why would you want to become less efficient on purpose!
1	No shifting taxes or giving money to developers for this. This should be mandated in planning and zoning.
1	This = urban sprawl. small city centers + urban micro cities.
4	With voter approval, yes.
4	Would need to include grocery, variety & pharmacy stores.
4	Grants are good
1	This does not work in high density population areas. It is fine for pedestrians, but kills maintenance and infrastructure.
NA	Survey sucks
4	I love the "front porch" concept that encourages walkable streets, with parking behind the homes off of alleys. Also traffic calming mechanisms to help pedestrians and bikers be safer. Lots of bike lanes and bike paths. Lots and lots of trees, especially shade trees. And xeriscaped islands in the middle of streets, or in the strips between sidewalks and streets. The more of this we do, the better for the environment and our mental/emotional/spiritual health – and the more examples people will have to use as inspiration in their own yards.
Scenario: Penny Lane	
Strategy: Location Based Mortgages	
2	Does this mean that a bank will increase the mortgage loan income to debt ratio if the property is near transit? Answer: <i>Yes. It recognizes that housing and transportation costs are interrelated, so would adjust the allowable mortgage loan income to debt ratio to account for the lower transportation costs through access to transit, as opposed to driving a single occupancy vehicle.</i>
3	Consider a single-demonstration project to test viability. Again, major housing funding comes from viable lending options already supported at the federal level. No need to re-invent a financial wheel.
1	After the mortgage debacle of 2008, I am surprised you would venture into any mortgage based adventure.
NA	transit is not sustainable nor needed in an area that is composed of mostly small business. mass transit is economically dysfunctional and would raise taxes in the Treasure Valley by a minimum of \$200million a year as is proven by Portland's TRIMET, Utah's TRAX and Denver's RTD. any transit to a shopping are should be paid by those companies that benefit.
NA	Think it's too late for this one
1	What you get a better mortgage rate because you live near mass transit. What the heck is the matter with this state
NA	Need more info
1	That is grasping at straws for participation from lenders.
1	no

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
4	Just don't use this as an excuse to build huge complexes that block the sky and all views. We've already lost many views of the foothills that make Boise unique to highrises that were given variances above agreed upon heights.
1	No. Allow for it with legislation and let the market decide based on demand.
3	Good theory. It would depend on what sort of transit options are available. If you offer mortgage incentives near a train stop or bus depot the odds of property values going down is higher. Which isn't a problem. Property values need to stabilize and become a little more reasonable, but some people aren't going to like that.
1	At this point there is no transit. The bus schedules are unreliable and don't serve outlying areas.
1	I liked economically mixed neighborhoods and oppose pushing folks into certain areas based on making housing affordable in those areas.
NA	Leave the mortgage business to the banks. You are not private business. Stop the meddling.
1	If the a city wants housing near transit, they are also ususally looking for this housing "product" to be multi-story/multi-family apartment units. So the only way a mortgage would work is if this housing "product" was for townhomes that are for purchase or condominiums. I have seen very few condo projects since the impact of the 2008 recession.
1	Nope government especially local shouldn't be in the mortgage business. We hit a 2008 again and it's gonna sink dumb ass counties that think they are smart
2	Not sure what this means or how this really works.
1	Too much interference in private enterprise
1	Sounds like something ripe for a scandal.
4	Transit needs to be better accessible though for this to be fair. If living near main, heavily used roads, one should be able to catch a bus. This is not yet the case for some, but should be.
2	Nice in theory but tough to justify the ROI without evaluating the societal benefits.
5	Good.
5	another excellent idea that I have heard very little about previously!
5	This better than apartment buildings. Rents keep going up, sucking any wage increases from the people that really need it.
1	Sounds like a tapayer funded subsidy of interest rate or something else. The housing market don't need it.
3	Not taxpayers funded
1	Probably I don't understand how this would work, or what effect it would have, well enough to comment.
NA	I believe this issue should remain an entirely private sector issue. Not something I want governments attempting to control.
1	We don't really have transit options, so this is worthless anyways. Our bus is very limited.
5	Affordable housing should be required in EVERY neighborhood. If a neighborhood wants to opt out, they can tax themselves more and that money will go to support affordable housing in other neighborhoods, especially near transit.
3	I've never heard of this, but it seems smart. I think a major issue with growing cities is that they become less affordable for the workers who keep the economy robust. My little knowledge on this policy makes me think it would help with that issue.
2	My initial reaction is that this seems unlikely to help much. If people can get lower interest rates for certain properties, it will just inflate the purchase price or "value" of that home. The increase in "value" would accrue to whoever owned the property before the new rates were implemented. The new owner would end up paying a similar monthly payment as before.
4	It would be most helpful if enough of the latest housing developments were built along or near-enough to the VRT bus lines!
2	Question is who will live there? Many say this is great but when offered to move there say no way.
4	depends on the transportation choices available
5	Incentivizing people to not just use but live near public transportation is necessary
1	I'm not even sure what this one is saying. Is the city backing risky mortgages? That sounds like a terrible plan! Can the city handle the downside risk? I was pretty sure municipalities required safe investment vehicles Answer: No, a city would not be backing the mortgage. This type of mortgage recognizes that housing and transportation costs are interrelated, and adjusts the allowable mortgage loan income to debt ratio to account for the lower transportation costs through access to transit, as opposed to driving a single occupancy vehicle.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	biased? everything should be equal
NA	What is "near transit"? What does this mean? Transit in Idaho is mostly by POV. what is being referenced here? Answer: Typically within ¼ to ½ mile would be considered "near transit." However, exact details would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place.
NA	No handouts for people is what I purpose - if you want to live in an area you need to be able to afford it - no handouts
3	It's not ideal
3	Need to be careful that this doesn't promote a modern version of redlining
3	I would like to know more about this.
4	Interesting idea! As long as it only favors locations and not income classes.
1	Mortgages should be based on the strength of the loan being repaid. 2008 was preventable, but preventing ideas like this.
1	This shouldn't be used to encourage people to borrow more than 30% of their income on a mortgage payment.
3	What about people who don't own homes? Vast majority of young people rent-- this policy is tilted towards people who already have wealth
4	I'd like to know more about this
1	too biased.
1	???
1	Not the roll of government.
1	No, let the free market take care of this. This sounds like red lining to me.
5	Yep move em where they can catch the bus or train. Not drive on country roads that ACHD doesn't maintain anyway
NA	Affordable housing must be made more accessible. It seems this could go hand in hand with efforts to help put housing back in reach of mid-to-low income families.
3	Don't want to penalize farmers living in rural areas with location based mortgages
3	I do not know enough about this but it appears positive.
NA	Survey sucks
4	This sounds good, though I've never heard of this concept and would like to know more.
Scenario: Penny Lane	
Strategy: Small City Grants	
2	Um, I think most people who live in small cities like it that way or they wouldn't be living there. Don't make a small city a bigger one.
1	NO MORE TAXES
3	We already have access to "small city grants". They're called profit-focused developers, taking cheap land in the rural areas, building huge - traffic clogging subdivisions/PUD any only heading to their next targeted 'small city' even further away from the Boise metro core. Wake up, COMPASS...
1	This works better at the state level since no local city wants to give up local tax resources for other cities.
2	Focus should be placed on incentivizing economic development so that these small communities offer jobs to residents rather than just funding the development of bedroom communities.
NA	Development should pay for itself. Local option taxes are the fairest.
NA	Small cities don not want growth! They want to be left alone. People that live there want it to stay small!
3	What is the scope of the local funding? Would this be, e.g., a tax for Kuna to improve Kuna public infrastructure? Or, is this a larger metropolitan source of funding that is awarded to any qualified city via grants? Answer: Details would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. It could be federal money "set aside" specifically to accomplish small infrastructure projects or studies, or it could be staff resources dedicated to helping small cities without much staff to secure grants, mapping, zoning, and other technical services that would be expensive for a small city budget.
1	How many small cities want more growth? Do you not see what you are turning ID into???
5	Meridian needs to see growth in the downtown sector. More buildings, living options, restaurants.
2	as long as it does not involve a mono rail

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	No. Market forces will create and shape cities as the citizens want them to be.
2	Most of our cities have proved over and over again that they can't properly manage funds for development. Look at the City of Meridian where instead of attracting a healthy mix of commercial, residential and industrial, it's basically a giant bedroom community. Too many people commute to Boise where their job is.
4	I like this but in the past it was abused and needs to be closely monitored. For instance GF received a revitalization grant and they did a ton of city beautification projects but that only masked the real problems. The roads are junk, the airport pavement is junk, the stores are junk so what purpose did it serve to put up nice lights and some benches? No one is going to GF because there is nothing there but a vineyard and state park. Roads need to be maintained for safe and effective travel. That is what they should have spent the money on.
1	Not all small cities want to grow. The growth actually ruins the city. The residents don't really want that. I don't like it when the government just freely hands out my money. The small cities better want it and know what they are getting into.
1	OMG, start making developers pay their fair share of the cost of development.
NA	No taxes. Impact fees and good planning.
1	No new taxes or increased taxes.
4	some of our small cities are only growing in residential space requiring occupants to have longer commutes. Need balanced commercial, retail and residential growth
1	God no. Are you stupid? Infill first
3	If the small cities want it
4	Yes, but only if there is transit to connect these locations to job centers.
4	Rural areas can use economic opportunities and still maintain realistic expectations
2	I want to keep some of our small cities small... Worried about one huge metro area where everything appears to be the same. At the same time, I would like to see small cities be able to make improvements for livability and accommodations for the elderly and others.
3	Just stop funding projects (like SH 44 widening through Star) that turn small towns into "go through" places instead of "go to" places.
1	Shouldn't encourage growth, we are trying to maintain quality of life as growth happens.
1	Isn't this the responsibility of each city?
4	This would help to maintain autonomy. Autonomy is an incentive, use it as a carrot.
1	Giving people someone else's money isn't an incentive. Again, find ways, like the opportunity zone to open the door for private funding.
4	Let them live in Mountain Home !!
1	What is the source of these funds? Will the small cities supply the \$ or the larger cities or state? ALSO - DEFINE "SMALL CITY." Answer: <i>Details would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. It could be federal money "set aside" specifically to accomplish small infrastructure projects or studies, or it could be staff resources dedicated to helping small cities without much staff to secure grants, mapping, zoning, and other technical services that would be expensive for a small city budget. Kansas City has a similar program, where they define small cities as under 10,000 population, but the threshold would need to be defined if a program was put into place locally:</i> https://www.marc.org/Government/Local-Government-Services/Small-Cities/Overview
1	NO!
1	again, maybe not qualified to speak on this.
NA	No. Should be left up to the free market.
5	yes, push housing OUT
5	Rural communities need this. We can't leave them behind.
2	I don't like the idea of incentivising small cities to grow, I think they should be granted funds to manage incoming growth. Maybe I'm just fighting semantics here.
1	Let small cities govern themselves!
2	Boise, for one, has grown enough--rather, TOO much, and TOO FAST, especially during these past five (5) years or less. Unnecessary building of establishments such as the Boutique Hotel (Inn at 500) does not need to happen anymore for this area. Period!
2	Encouraging growth in small cities should be the local city council initiative. If you have more growth then there is a need for schools, medical, fire, police. Let them decide
1	Current cities need to use all taxes to support the rapid growth they have already allowed (aka Kuna) and then consider more. Most people in small cities don't want growth.
2	only if accompanied by growth management strategies

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Growth should occur in major metropolitan areas and grow outward, not the other way around
1	I do not want our small cities to grow any larger than they are.
1	Why would small cities want to encourage growth?
1	No more taxes and no county discussion about another small city. Small city councils will manage their own priorities.
NA	Too late, the cities of Meridian and Eagle should have been required to pay for the impact they have had on Boise
1	Diverting people to smaller cities will not improve transportation. The only way this would work is if the jobs were also located in small towns.
1	Leave this to the individual small cities
3	Too much growth can create problems. If a community is safe and peaceful with less building and growth I dont see a need to promote more traffic.
2	Our small cities are already being swallowed up.
1	Stop encouraging growth in Idaho, Idaho was great place before everyone started moving here
1	Shifting taxes is always about making those who don't use these services or subsidies pay the bill for others.
4	If local funding is approved by citizens (not just the fractional percentage that vote in municipal elections) then that's a positive. Taxing isn't a solution.
1	Only if it does not increase homeowner property taxes.
1	Only for the small towns and cities that want to grow. Some want to stay small.
3	With attention paid to full ADA compliance in the growth - city governments are required to comply under Title II of the ADA but one only needs to look at Garden City to see how it is ignored
1	Depends on what end result/benefit might be.
1	Small cities around Boise are fighting growth also! Let them deal with it there own way.
1	Growth is BAD and should not be encouraged with tax dollars. Put that money towards schools instead.
3	Yes, but strict guidelines must be in place for this to prevent abuse. Too many small cities have aging infrastructure and then over tax their residents to fix it (like in Lewiston) and end up taxing the elderly out of their homes.
1	Not the right idea - stay in the city if you want city life!!
3	With voter approval, yes.
3	I would not want to encourage the willy nilly growth like Boise's. Maybe small cities would have to put boundaries for growth.
3	I know there is a lot of "red tape" involved in this one... small Cities might not think it's worth the effort.
3	I do not know enough about this but it appears positive.
NA	Survey sucks
4	I think "encourage growth in small cities" is about embracing density over sprawl, even in smaller towns & cities, yes? If so, then I support.

Scenario: Penny Lane

Strategy: Housing Tax Abatements

1	If this were to happen, affordable housing would just be built in undesirable areas.
1	Everyone needs to pay their fair share of taxes. This is not, at least yet, a socialist state.
5	Only way to get affordable housing built or you'll just see more Section 8 rolling out in the local area.
3	I'd like to know more details about this proposal. How "affordable" "How much reduction?" etc. Answer: The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing on which the occupant is paying no more than 30 percent of gross income for housing costs, including utilities. The amount of reduction would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. It could be a percentage or all of the taxes, and it could be for a set length of time, such as a few years.
1	This is a deception since it results in a little known tax increase for other less politically connected tax payers.
2	don't like the idea of "affordable housing projects" as they have negative connotations and everyone gets up in arms over them. Instead, weave affordable housing throughout a community by requiring developers to include a % of affordable units in their projects.
2	There needs to be multiple types of affordable housing projects, not just more apartments.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Seems like this will just shift the burden to the rest of the taxpayers. How about initiatives to force growth to pay for itself. Nothing wrong with slowing it down either so it can be better accomodated
NA	this is simply a property tax transfer to other properties and should be solved by a living wage.
1	This will only encourage more crap apartments to be built in high density. Owners will captialize on that opportunity...
5	a way to better engage the developer community to support innovation for environmental health and affordability
2	Would like to see what the potential outcomes are for providing housing tax abatement in this context. For example, is there national data that shows this increases quantity, quality, etc?
3	If this includes that new developmentS with some units being reserved for affordable housing have to KEEP those units affordable I support this. If they just do it for say 3 years and then raise the rent to market value I do not support them receiving any tax reductions.
1	NO, why should I pay more in taxes than someone else. You want to be in the affordable housing projects thats your decision you still pay the same amount of taxes.
5	As an owner of affordable housing this would be most welcome.
1	Incentive to decrease housing quality.
1	Affordable housing AKA low income, ghetto's, slums. How about affordable education? How about job training, how about a hand up out of the low income life?
1	Nothing but a money grab for those developers. Typically at taxpayers expense. Seen it!
1	only if available to all
1	No. Leftist activists are prone to burning down affordable housing projects. Give all property tax payers a five-year freeze and Boise will become a much more desirable place to live. Growth should pay for growth.
5	With the proviso that the actually keep the property affordable instead of raising housing cost to increase their profits.
1	Nope, we all need to pay our fair share.
NA	Why? Why do the middle class always bite the bullet for everyone else? Reduce their taxes, and mine go up, again. We all need to be treated equally.
3	If it is owner occupied.
1	We need property tax relief for residents that reside in their own home. Those with multiple properties and commercial properties should pay their fair share. Currently, this is not the case.
1	I'd much rather see that money go directly to residents in the form of rent reduction vouchers.
1	Everybody needs to pay their fair share. I don't understand how my property tax continues to go up every year with so many new residents and homeowners in this city! Those of us on fixed incomes will get forced out of the community if the rate of increase continues.
2	So long as we don't "stick all the poor people away from everyone else". There should be only a certain amount of low income housing per area.
NA	Reduction of taxes for all property owners - accomplished by not shifting the burden from urban renewal smash and grabs to homeowners.
1	Raise the wages first, so that people can make a living that keeps up with the increasing cost of living, rather than shifting the burden onto the other taxpayers.
1	This would eventually raise property taxes for everyone.
2	Only if the landlords pass those savings on to residents.
1	property taxes based on property value creates problems with fixed income families. it's wrong, create another way
3	property tax. I don't agree or disagree with this option. I am not happy with the current property situation. Thinking there need to be a working group that looks at property for low/fixed income families. How about providing public education on why do we do what we do.
4	Why not abolish property taxes entirely? Then elderly people don't get screwed with your adjustments. Oklahoma has done this successfully. I'd rather pay my taxes in sales tax and truly own my home.
4	Reduce property taxes for everyone
3	as long as it doesn't come out of the education portion of property tax
5	Reduction in all property taxes
4	Keep them honest and fair though. Too many affordable housing developers/owners don't treat their tenants well and don't maintain the property as they should without a fight. I have personal experience and knowledge with that problem.
3	A win-win. 1. it makes the ROI attractive for developers. 2. it will assist reducing homelessness.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
5	But require those property owners to maintain and preserve the livability of the neighborhood. What other policies will incentivize property owners to ensure their properties do NOT become blighted because of the lack of maintenance and lack of pride of ownership by the tenants?
5	Good. This provides incentive for investors to solve the problem using private money, rather than over-taxing, over-regulating, and wasting resources.
2	How about property tax reduction in general? My property taxes have skyrocketed due to increase in assessed value due to growth. I can't afford to pay much more if this growth continues.
3	I'd like to see a provision that the tax savings was passed on to the affordable housing tenants.
3	Just section 8 with a different name. Promote new construction with granny units built in, these will be create rental units in upscale neighborhoods
1	A subsidy by other taxpayers of those well off enough to own these "developments". Non starter.
1	NO. maybe if taken out of tax agency budget,. Not just shifted to others
1	No.
NA	No. Having special tax rates for different types of properties is a Pandora's Box that would inevitably lead to corruption.
1	How about reduced tax for those of us not making a profit from our properties?
3	housing tax overall needs to stay down or homegrown idahoans will be price out
2	developers should be paying more to develop bc of need for more schools and services. Current real estate taxes are too high; the system needs overhauling.
3	This could easily be twisted into the rich using loopholes to work for their tax advantage. It would have to a be done with that in mind.
5	and provide free water sewer hook ups
4	Yes. Housing is no longer affordable if the taxes go up and out of budget.
1	Why? They don't do it out of the generosity of their hearts or pocketbooks. Then the need to raise taxes on owners and renters increases. How about getting rid of the free ride for nonprofit organizations? Then maybe taxes would be spread more evenly and be lower.
1	Just encourages higher densities and more traffic/enviro issues; 5 stars if the question was to reduce ALL property taxes.
3	why only here, should be in any scenario
1	What does affordable housing projects really mean?
3	But only if there are long-term accountability measures in place to ensure the housing remains good quality, safe, and secure
1	This helps landlords. F*** landlords. We need to be creating wealth among our poor, not housing them in a millionaires 45th rental unit. I don't know who is doing it, but people need to STOP advocating tax cuts for the wealthy. The wealthy don't contribute the same as they extract. DO NOT advocate for reducing taxes for the rich folks who will be buying and renting out these units. Reducing taxes for the rich hurts the poor, it's that simple. There have been countless studies showing that trickle down style tax structures are a total failure.
1	Everyone should pay the same amount
1	this just shifts taxes to others who already can't afford the increases in property taxes.
1	That does not lower the overall tax burden. It in fact just spreads it to the rest of us. And I believe we will get squatting on the cheap properties like you get with rent control
1	Let the free market determine housing prices.
1	everything should be equal
NA	Affordable housing? Where is this defined? What is meant by this? More apartments and high rises? No more. Keep Boise/Idaho small and quaint. If you are going to approve them anyway, make the developer FIRST - build/expand roads, schools, parks, sidewalks, fire/police, etc - all the things their growth will impact. Do that FIRST - not after 1000 residents have moved in and then the builder is out of money. Every development needs to have at least 25% green space, and that cannot mean grass on top of the building. Answer: The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing on which the occupant is paying no more than 30 percent of gross income for housing costs, including utilities.
NA	Reduce the taxes for Boise and push it out to the areas that are impacted Boise negativity
1	NO! We don't need to encourage "slumlords." If a person can afford to own multiple family housing units, they need to pay their share of taxes!

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	I am in favor of affordable housing, however, if this housing ends up only being occupied by people of color, we are repeating history. People need opportunities to OWN property. This is how wealth is grown. We know this because of history. "Projects" such as what has happened in big cities serve to isolate the poor and people of color in places they can never get out of and also increases incidents of discrimination. Diversified housing is what is needed - a mix of low income, middle and high. But "projects" are not something Idaho should support.
NA	this seems unfair. Taxes need to remain low for all
1	I feel like this would just encourage the already-prevalent issue of slumlords. Everyone knows that with most "affordable (which doesn't even exist seeing as people my age who have college degrees, years and years of experience, and work full-time still BARELY scrape by and usually only because we are forced to get roommates who are often not ideal)" comes more rich jerks who don't actually care about the people in their properties and will just pocket the money while letting quality of life keep sliding downward for tenants.
1	tax breaks for slumlords?
2	Tax should be the same for everyone wether you are willing to work and make more money and the same for those who refuse to work and solely live off government funding. I would prefer to be able to work my normal 40 hr a week job and get the same benefits of those on welfare. It is not fair.
1	Definitely not. Developers need to pay for the additional improvements created by their development. Ongoing and up front.
2	It depends. I wouldn't be in favor of a wealthy property company getting a huge tax break for building "affordable" housing that isn't so affordable.
3	This is just a tax shift so others have to pay more
5	There should also be consideration of naturally occurring affordable housing and not only federally subsidized housing projects.
5	Reduce all property taxes for everyone (except out-of-staters moving here, make them pay for ruining our state)
1	As long as it's an individual getting a break and not an investment company.
2	Reduce taxes for everyone. You reduce it for affordable housing, everyone else picks up the tab.
3	This must be balanced with quality standards for the housing. We don't want slums or "projects"
5	Just be really firm on what constitutes "affordable" so that the units are both desirable and actually affordable.
3	This could be a positive, but it entirely hinges on the type of tenants in said projects.
2	Not a good plan while schools are still funded with property tax.
1	Only if it does not increase homeowner property taxes for everyone else.
2	These proposals benefit those who already own property or have capital-- assumption is that landlords will pass savings on to renters, but this isn't guaranteed at all
1	Developers need to pay their share of the impacts. Especially the out of state developers that create the mess, take their profits, and leave
1	They should pay the same rate as everyone else.
4	Would require a legislative change
2	Does this mean affordable rent/loans for those in need? Also depends on volume of those in need. Answer: <i>This would mean a reduction in property taxes for owners of affordable housing, which could both serve to incentivize builders to build affordable housing and/or reduce rent or housing costs for those who live there.</i>
1	Outside of Boise!
1	They already get enough money from Section 8 and Section 42 housing. Let the market decide. Not everyone should have the right to live in Boise. If yiu cannot afford it, move to Caldwell.
2	Perhaps, only if the property is kept in excellent condition. Too many owners would take advantage of that and let their property become run down and pocket the tax savings to the detriment of their tenants.
5	as long as they stay out of the farmland please do tax millineal utopia
3	Only if checks and balances are in place to protect residents. Let's not copy other cities and allow the citizens and city policies to be used for extreme profit, please. Let's do it better and learn from mistakes and issues in other cities, please?

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
2	<p>What is the definition of "affordable?" It its highrises for the homeless, NO! did we get to vote on that? no. I do not want to encourage the homeless to come to Boise. If "affordable" means simple but aesthetically pleasing homes, then yes. In general, I want to see far more transparency in government. Allow the public into meetings, don't do large projects (like the library) without a vote and public input from the people who are paying for that stuff.;</p> <p>Answer: <i>The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) defines affordable housing as housing on which the occupant is paying no more than 30 percent of gross income for housing costs, including utilities.</i></p>
4	<p>Would this be an incentive that they keep it low income? Are there others? How to balance with service quality in low income neighborhoods?</p> <p>Answer: <i>The tax abatement would depend on the rules of the program as it is developed, but they typically are for a horizon period up to 30 years. There are many similar programs throughout the nation.</i></p>
NA	Survey sucks
2	My spouse is retired, I'd like to retire. Our property taxes are already so high I'm not sure when I'll be able to retire. If anybody deserves a tax break it's those of us that have been here, not those moving in.
5	Yes, yes, yes. Whatever can be done about literally unaffordable land prices is so important, from public land trusts to property tax incentives. It would seem that "affordable" would need to be clearly defined, and that there would need to be specifications about what happens if the property eventually becomes valued / sold at an unaffordable rate for any reason.
Scenario: Come Together	
Strategy: Adequate Facility Policy	
1	If we followed this policy we would have no new development since we already have existing deficiencies in public infrastructure. If we followed this policy only the very wealthy out of state transplants will be able to buy and live here.
1	Let's be clear...if you're waiting for a bus line, this is a joke. But if you're waiting for schools, fire, police, health, water/sewer there is some merit to this. Although I would see what the developer is willing to do - many would donate land if it means getting the project going. Again, the demand for living here is so high that this very question comes across as irrelevant
5	YES! Stop putting the cart before the horse!
5	The developers need to pay for that upgrade or creation of the necessary infrastructure.
5	This is the first "common sense" idea you folks have posted. In my world, this is called "sustainable growth". We would not have vinyl-fenced, traffic-clogging, cheap-to-build-costly-to-buy homes in the Treasure Valley. This should be COMPASS' absolute #1 mission statement. Get working on this now...it's almost too late for this region. Water is going to be your next growth choke-point and you do NOT want people coming to you for water!!!
5	Tired of being taxed to pay developers to bring in additional residents.
1	The history of this technique in other cities (Boulder CO, Petaluma CA, Ramapo NY) is that they lead to much less housing [because infrastructure doesn't catch up] and home prices skyrocket.
5	music to my ears!
5	Yes. Smart growth is necessary.
NA	development should never be subsidized with public funds. infrastructure should be paid for by the developer and recovered by the sale.
5	work to disallow urban sprawl - it's too costly to the city, county and dilutes the beauty of our area
5	This should already be a strict thing... No more forced roadwork because the infrastructure can't handle to boom.
1	This is just the opposite of needs to be putting in infrastructure where growth is desired to help transportation needs
5	a way to better engage the developer community to support innovation for environmental health and affordability

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment
4	<p>I would like to see some examples that support this. For example, when/where has this been a problem before and how would these policies be shaped to mitigate these issues?</p> <p>Answer: <i>An adequate facilities policy (also called by other names in other places) would require that adequate public infrastructure such as schools, roads, and sewer be in place before new development could be approved. Florida uses a "concurrency" law: https://www.talgov.com/growth/growth-confaq.aspx#:~:text=%22Concurrency%22%20is%20a%20shorthand%20expression,government's%20ability%20to%20handle%20it. Similarly, Montgomery County, near Washington DC has a "Subdivision Staging Policy": https://montgomeryplanning.org/planning/countywide/subdivision-staging-policy/about-the-subdivision-staging-policy/</i></p>
2	<p>Won't a lack of housing just drive up pricing for what already exists?</p> <p>Answer: <i>Most likely, yes. The restriction of land supply that can be used for development would likely cause prices to increase. The benefit of an adequate facility policy would be lower public costs for services; however, the trade-off would be higher housing costs.</i></p>
NA	illegal
5	Meaning ROADS not bike paths etc.
5	Just because there's open space doesn't mean it needs a house. Especially when the current infrastructure is maxed out and always under construction
5	The type of policy is needed throughout the entire treasure Valley to ensure infrastructure such as roads can support growth and housing
5	seems like this shouldn't even be up for debate.
4	Developers are often already required to improve infrastructure
5	YES! Developers need to be part of how our cities grow and responsible for the overall impact of their business model. No more promises of affordable housing that are used to create a handfull of units in an otherwise expensive project. They build and leave. Remember that "for-profit" is their profit and not necessarily ours as citizens.
1	No. Impact fees should pay for infrastructure build out. If they are not high enough, raise them to cover these expenses. The higher cost of building out will make infill development more attractive to developers.
4	This sounds good in theory, but if there is no money for infrastructure improvement, new development will suffer.
5	Including schools!
5	Yes, ALL DAY LONG!
2	Impact fees.
3	The adopted Level of Service (LOS) standards that are a requirement of enacting an impact fee ordinance inherently do this already. But if the LOS is disregarded when a development project is being reviewed, then the whole point of having infrastructure in place goes down the drain. Case in point; the City of Boise is ignoring the LOS for fire stations and neighborhood parks while continuing to approve developments across the City.
5	this is a top, high, key, must have PRIORITY. It has been neglected for too long!!
5	1000% this is needed. We are over provisioned.
4	That's doesn't sound dumb
5	Obviously!!!
5	Absolutely. Infrastructure has to be in place before development.
5	This is te most important step in ALL plans.
5	YES!
4	<p>Where would demand 'move' to if the development is restricted?</p> <p>Answer: <i>Growth would be restricted to areas where public services are available; generally, this would be nearby existing cities.</i></p>
5	Doing anything else is idiotic
5	Absolutely this is a current problem and something so evident to the general public about what is going on now!!!!
5	Adequate infrastructure is very important. Some limitations should be imposed if the cities can't handle growth.
5	KEY! Wish this was already in place!
5	I think the developers should pay for the road changes. Needed for the development to occur
5	This is #1!!!!!! And impact fees! Can we somehow make them help pay for new schools, fire stations and other essentials all their growth makes necessary???

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	American and Idaho were founded by people willing to do what's needed to grow. We don't need a nanny state here.
5	Great if applied to all modes. In this region it tends to mean only road widening, which runs counter to other goals for more economically vibrant communities.
2	This is a double-edged sword. Without adequate infrastructure, businesses/developments are less likely to be attracted to an area. However, without income generated to fund projects, infrastructure development is not feasible. Being growth averse, I favor reliance on developers to create the funds.
5	Developers need to pay their share of costs and there should be a limit on how much profit they can make from our community. Taxes should prioritize local company's over out of state companies.
5	Growth must pay its way.
5	Simple, get the ROW first! We cannot wait for land prices to skyrocket then ask Taxpayers to anti-up because of poor planning. This is exactly what happened to Phoenix.
5	Top critical priority here. Too many new housing developments do NOT have the appropriate infrastructure, including multi lane roads
4	But be careful that private property owners, or developers risking capital, are not completely at the mercy of public officials that may not properly manage growth. If a municipality errs in infrastructure development and that adversely impacts a property owner, that's wrong and policies like this need to account for government infringing on private property rights.
5	100% behind this. No new building until infrastructure is in place. Infrastructure also needs to be built for final development size. Example is Lake Hazel extension. We fought to get that before CBH built new housing and won, but extension should have been built 5 lanes wide, as it will be necessary to widen it once all houses are built. Should have built it five lanes wide to start with. ACHD rep said that isn't how they do things. Well, let's change that now.
5	Each development must fully fund all improvements to offset all impacts on public infrastructure.
5	Please!!!
5	This should have happened a long time ago.
5	If this means not getting subdivisions ahead of gas & sewer lines, OK.
5	When growth causes existing transportation systems to become overburdened, they should be expanded using money collected via impact fees. Transportation capacity expansion is horrendously expensive, which means the impact fees will have to be outrageously high, which is entirely appropriate and best for the existing residents. Otherwise, the horrendously high capacity expansion costs fall on the existing residents, which is effectively subsidizing the Treasure Valley's runaway growth and enriching a few at the cost of everyone else. Often referred to as "wealth transfer".
5	If you want to build, you put in the roads to support the project you are looking to build. If you don't do the roads first, you can not build.
5	This really shouldn't be that hard to figure out, c,mon.
5	Ban development entirely where adequate facilities cannot be built, like the foothills.
3	This just incentivizes cheap houses in far away places without infrastructural support.
1	Housing is a human right.
5	This is a no-brainer. Why are we entitling developments that produce more public debt? A fiscal analysis must be required for all developments and if they don't reach a certain threshold then the taxpayers can be asked to vote (not just the city council) if they want to take on that obligation.
4	I really like this idea, but it does worry me that it would stop development all together and make housing prices soar. I.E. San Francisco.
3	Encourage large developments like Amazon to contribute if they want to build. Jobs at \$12-15/hr aren't going to yield the taxes to pay for infrastructure.
5	This single policy would do so much to curb TV growth and incentivize developers to partner with infrastructure projects.
4	if its based on LOS models those are flawed and drive expansion.
1	Infrastructure should catch up ASAP; needed housing density cannot wait for it
5	This has not happened and it was a mistake.
5	Leap frog developments have been a drain.
2	Can be tough to secure funding w/o impact fees from development
1	Or you could plan for the future rather than current traffic issues. Like a southern bypass. This not only eliminates through traffic but allows the valley to grow and expand rather than just congest and stifle.
5	Make the developers pay for the improvements to the road, and schools.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
4	its not clear that restricting building will be effective, but requiring infrastructure development from developers sounds like it would be effective
3	This isn't described that well. It's hard to imagine what this really means.
5	This has been necessary for more than a decade. Infrastructure first, not after the fact of building.
5	way to many subdivisions being allowed without infrastructure to support all the people and traffic. tax the developer more
5	This is a fantastic idea!!
5	We needed this 20 years ago!
5	roads need to be built before any more homes can be built. There is already too much traffic and homes keep going up!
5	Very important, please don't forget the schools and hospitals
NA	This is what I have been talking about - but you have to deal with corrupt politicians
5	This should also include schools. Right now, Planning and Zoning commissions do not take into account the capacity of the schools around which they are allowing large suburban housing communities to be built. This taxes the local school and the voters blame the school district for asking for bonds and levies. All people should be at the table when discussing growth and schools are often left to fend for themselves at the detriment of Idaho's children who are doomed to learn in overcrowded classrooms.
5	That tihs is not already happening should be a criminal offense
5	yes!!
5	100%
3	It's the developers that help build the roads.
1	This would force development to the core areas where it is already Congested
5	Other communities require this. Look at Loveland, CO for an example. We let developers build anywhere and then wonder why we don't have adequate infrastructure in place. It can take years to catch up and creates a false economy.
4	Trying to put in the necessary infrastructure after the fact is far more difficult and expensive.
5	Absolutely! Things are already out of control as far as public infrastructure is concerned. The livability of the area is rapidly declining because of the rush to grant developers permits and rezoning.
2	Better to do both at once, probably...
4	We cannot keep dumping suburban developments in miles of two-lane roads. It isn't sustainable. A freeze would be a wise move.
3	If infrastructure means highways, this is all going to need to be reconsidered as more employers allow or force employees to WFH. There will be less traffic.
1	We are already behind on public infrastructure. Restricting development isn't going to relieve the deficit.
5	All these are what we need to build a sustainable community. Allowing large subdivisions to go in miles away from basic services like grocery stores is the epitome of poor planning. All Boise residents should be able to walk or bike a short distance to shop. As it is now, some residents literally have to drive 5-10 miles or more just to buy a gallon of milk. There needs to be policies in place that large housing tracts can only go in if there are existing or planned basic services located within a mile or so, walking distance.
5	We need this badly.
5	However, do not want this to become an excuse to constrict supply and make housing in Boise more expensive. Cities / ACHD would have to get it together and have a firm plan of when infrastructure will be adequate if we delay development.
2	Loss of economic freedom for investors is not usually good.
5	Hello! Finally a good question!
3	Maybe, but need to allow for public facilities to go beyond existing infrastructure. For example, schools, libraries, hospitals should be allowed beyond existing infrastructure borders.
NA	This only causes housing cost to go through the roof and drive low income people out of the housing market The worst idea ever!
3	This is good and bad. Less supply and greater demand for places to live has resulted in a large upswing in rent prices.
5	This is only what makes sense - unless you're a commissioner on ACHD
5	Absolutely.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
5	There are developments being approved with no apparent thought to the amount of traffic they will generate. Are developments ever disapproved? Many citizens believe that the approvers are getting kick-backs from developers. the big new subs are not appreciated nor approved by taxpayers living here. Where is the planning and the transparency?. it feels so willy nilly to many of us. Gone is the rural- feel we once had. Every empty space has stakes indicating a building is coming soon. Its depressing to us natives...
5	Public infrastructure improvements for new developments should be paid for by the developers not existing residents.
5	Yes!
5	Definitely needed...and no Developers allowed on the planning staff
3	I do not know enough about this but it appears positive.
NA	Survey sucks
5	THIS! This is what I've been saying for over 20 years. In some states it's a requirement for the developer to improve roads, put in parks, and help build new schools. Why should the developers get to make a boat load of money then those of us that have been here have to pay for the improvements.
3	I like this conceptually, and as an added bonus it would seem that it would help drive more effort toward infill and other increasing-density projects. Again, though, builders/developers seem fairly convincing when they complain about this stuff. Are they just blowing hot air in order to further pad their pockets? I for one need much more education on this. Candidly, I'd love to see some sort of understanding regarding income levels for builders/developers. The way that state employee salaries are publicly available. Housing should be a public concern and a public right. And livable wages should also be a basic human right. How much money are specific builders/developers making? Are they paying their workers a living wage? I am under the impression one of the main affordability problems is about exorbitant land values. However, there's also a lot of discussion about the cost of building homes – both the cost of materials and the cost of labor. (I don't see a lot of discussion about the profit amounts or profit margins going to the builders/developers, though.)
Scenario: Come Together	
Strategy: Fiscal Impact Policies	
2	We need to be careful with this policy. If we literally followed this policy new affordable units may not be built.
2	Hard to measure or know before building - makes me weary of giving this a thumbs up
5	Absolutely, positively, immediately, in perpetuity. How else you going to sustain affordable growth for the Treasure Valley?
5	About time.
3	Strongly depends on details of what is being asked to cover what. For dense infill developments, on average, increases in regular property taxes (without any extra fees) should more than cover other related fiscal costs.
5	With the rapid growth, there does need to be taxes or money from the developers in order to fund additional needed services like schools, new fire/police stations or increase in those services.
4	need to qualify this ... makes sense if development proposed in area with little to no services
NA	should be required. they are initially paid by the developer and recovered by the sale of the property.
1	New development should not be treated any differently than those that came before
3	I have been through all this in the 80's and I am not sure how this is written that I agree. As a builder of 1,000 homes at a time, we paid for utilities and as other builders came along we would get a small reimbursement. It was always a friendly working arrangement with the cities. The only thing that is different here is that the roadways here are way too inadequate to handle this growth, no way sho UK ld this have happened this way, no way!
5	a way to better engage the developer community to support innovation for environmental health and affordability
1	Low income housing isn't going to pay enough in taxes for the required services of those neighborhoods. They'll be left with nothing and quickly turn into undesirable neighborhoods.
1	Already the case
5	Builders need to recognize and be responsible financially for the developments they are creating that will impact already strained infrastructure. and contribute towards the financial needs of making the local infrastructure viable for all residents.
1	enough with the taxes, how about new developments include revenue generators?

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
NA	I don't understand how this would work? I need more information to answer Answer: <i>A fiscal impact policy would restrict growth and types of development to areas/types that would not financially burden public services. This would benefit public budgets, as there would be lower public costs for services; however, the trade-off would likely be higher housing costs. Details would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place.</i>
5	I'm not sure I completely understand how this would work but it seems like it could be a sound concept so it got 5 stars as well. My goal is to have growth retain the charm of small and mid-size cities while offering housing and transportation options. I have lived places where developers built and left a dearth of schools, streets, hospitals, and other infrastructure. It's not their problem unless we make it part of their business model. We pay for it during development or after development so lets make them figure it into their profit models while they make their design and price plans.
2	New developments should be required to set aside land for parks and schools and impact fees should pay to build them. All new schools should have multi-story apartment buildings situated nearby
2	The tax increase gets passed to the consumer which does nothing to increase housing affordability.
5	Yes!
NA	You cannot know what they will generate. That is guaranteeing a fee to someone. Let the market work.
NA	How is this different from impact fees? This needs additional explanation. Answer: <i>Impact fees are typically one-time payments required of a developer to be used to offset the impact of a project. For example, if it is determined that a large project would create new traffic, the developer would pay an impact fee towards new roads. The fiscal impact policy, on the other hand, could mean that developments that don't demonstrate financial benefit to the community would not be approved.</i>
5	An absolute must!
5	And make up for so much of the cost of previously underfunded services stressed by development.
5	Yes. Great
5	AND/...that developers pay increased up front fees to pay for the impact on roads/services required. build into true cost of housing.
4	would like to know what those services are
5	This kind of master planning is crucial. The lack of this kind of policy has left many communities as suburban islands, without needed services and connectivity to job centers.
5	Wish this was already in place
5	I'm willing to sign a petition or something if that would help?
5	Absolutely! It would reveal how many subsidies get thrown at road widening and how agencies like ITD, Highway districts, and cities ignore life cycle maintenance costs of roads.
4	Not sure what you mean by 'related new services.' Roads? Yes. But isn't that addressed in the Adequate Facility Policy? Answer: <i>Adequate facility policies and fiscal impact policies are similar approaches to solving the problem of financial burden of growth on public budgets. Where an adequate facility policy would often place boundaries on certain areas, a fiscal impact policy would look at proposals on an individual basis and evaluate the potential revenue and expenditures of the project. A fiscal impact policy may consider public schools, public parks, and community safety, in addition to roads, but that would need to be determined if/when a program were to be put into place.</i>
1	Too vague. None of these policies are explained in any detail. If the question is do we have to pay (have cashflo) for the improvements then this would get 5 stars!
1	The cost of the impact DIRECTLY GOES TO THE HOME BUYER AND THUS EXACERBATING THE AFFORDABILITY PROBLEM. When these impacts are put on developers the buyer pays for them.
5	Please!
5	It'd be about time. Also add to the cost of housing.
5	SO IMPORTANT! Make the developers pay out of their high profits!
5	When growth causes existing transportation systems to become overburdened, they should be expanded using money collected via impact fees. Transportation capacity expansion is horrendously expensive, which means the impact fees will have to be outrageously high, which is entirely appropriate and best for the existing residents. Otherwise, the horrendously high capacity expansion costs fall on the existing residents, which is effectively subsidizing the Treasure Valley's runaway growth and enriching a few at the cost of everyone else. Often referred to as "wealth transfer".
5	New development needs to pay for the new infrastructure, not the tax payers. Stop using people's property taxes as a piggy bank for all your dreams.
5	Once again not that hard to figure out. Reel these developers in until they start paying for their greed.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	This is classist nonsense.
5	See above comment
3	not sure if this would impede affordable housing. In general I agree but we are at crisis stage for affordable housing
5	WHY do we allow developers to get \$\$ and WE pay for the schools?
5	This makes sense. Don't make the rich developers make money off the average taxpayer.
4	with teeth maybe
4	This is good if it redistributes services to lower income people by having the wealthier pay more.
1	It's important to financially incentivize developers to provide affordable dense housing near urban centers. Taxing them will slow such development down and only lead to expensive single family homes instead of affordable apartments and townhomes
5	This needs to be done immediately.
1	Make the developers pay, not via taxing citizens. If a developer wants to make a few million bucks doing nothing but shuffling cash around, they should pay the burden, not us.
5	YES this should be a requirement for developers to build the schools, roads getting to their developments, and parks. Not placing this tax burden on the existing property owners.
5	This means that ownership should be part of the plan, not just renting.
5	Another fantastic idea!! Developers should not be allowed to develop new land unless they help pave the way for infrastructure improvements.
3	Taxes is not always the needed "go to" answer. Incorporate the price of the new developments with the needed changes in their surrounding area.
NA	this statement isn't clear.
4	It should be under locals vote on new infrastructure in their neighborhoods since they are already paying taxes in that community.
5	yes!!
5	100%
3	And the developer pays for his share
1	Taxation is theft.
1	There are impact fees that could be assessed. This would limit development envelope and cause prices to sky rocket even higher than they are
1	Might be a justification for higher housing prices, which is not a good goal.
5	If a new development requires bus service, or some other public burden to service it, then the developers should structure the development in a way that creates zero tax impact for the other residents of the municipality.
1	This would basically insure that only high end development would be built with no affordable housing.
5	YES! New developments must cover the costs of their own development. These developments MUST NOT be given tax breaks ala urban renewal districts.
5	Straight out of the book "Strong Towns" by Charles Marohn
5	Yes!
5	Tax the owners and builders!!
5	Make them pay it up front or you will get a nightmare mess like happened in Meridian. 10 years after I bought a place there, they were still driving on 2 lane section roads. Absolutely Criminal! I sold and moved to Boise.
4	Interesting, I like it. Would be curious to know what currently is paying for itself and what is not.
1	New development already does pay for new roads, sewer, water, police, fire! The problem is maintaining the current infrastructure. ACHD has plenty of money to wide roads, it just doesn't have money to fix the old roads in between the new roads. Cities and Counties don't build infrastructure developers do!
5	Really a no brainer. Who else should pay for them. Millennials have to grow up and pay their way!!
5	Please don't give away too much to attract development. We all need to contribute to the community we live and invest in.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
5	newcomers moving in, or v. large new homes, should be taxed at a higher rate. Transplants are often used to paying higher taxes. it is not right that a person who lives in the same modest home for 30 years is priced out of it by property taxes to pay for "growth". Let the newcomers pay for the growth expenses they cause. Most natives didn't want this growth; we have to accept it, but we should NOT have to pay for it-- we didn't cause it. Homebuilders should pay more impact fees to cover new schools and roads. Boiseans will soon revolt and put forth a Prop 13 like Calif.if this growth and tax insanity is not stopped.
5	Heard good thing about this from Ada County Commission
3	I do not know enough about this but it appears positive.
NA	I agree
NA	Survey sucks
5	Completely agree with this. I believe this would help those that already live here the most.
3	Similar remarks as to the above item. Builders/developers claim this isn't fair. Is that true? What are the facts? I would love to see requirements that new developments pay for the correlating services (wider roads, another fire station, etc.). That seems logical, but perhaps I don't fully understand the implications.
Scenario: Come Together	
Strategy: Accessory Dwelling Units	
3	In certain areas, yes, go for gold
2	Parking will become a huge issue for this type of housing. And, who is going to monitor this, so the dwellings are not used as AirB&Bs?
4	With caution and done in good taste - no poor development
5	Nearly every new subdivision in this region has a 'shed' on it. Add power, water and a flushing toilet - you have a single-person home without dramatically impacting population intensity. Takes the developer profit motive out of the formula...
4	As long as there is a family tie between the owner/occupant and the accessory dwelling occupant(s).
5	Reducing setbacks on alleyways and further reducing parking requirements can help with this.
5	yes!
5	Density will assist in reducing sprawl and allow for families take care of their parents.
NA	these should be allowed, but not rented as it will increase density and cause more congestion.
NA	NO! Brings additional traffic, cars to a neighborhood built for the existing home
1	Ada County will start looking like Appalachia
	What are the pros and cons of supporting ADUs?
5	Answer: <i>The advantages of accessory dwelling units are that they provide a low-cost option for housing and they can provide income for the owner of the property. The disadvantages are that they often create more density, more vehicles on the street (both traffic and parking), and can diminish privacy of neighbors.</i>
1	These look awful and are crowding
5	More changes need to be made to make this possible for homeowners to do. There are still so many fees and permits needed (including parking with ACHD) that the legal conversion of residences into ADUs is still unattainable for many home owners in Boise, although there is a strong desire to do it.
5	Citizens should have the right to do whatever they want with their property
5	These kind of housing units are a great addition.
1	No more airbnbs! Too many in good neighborhoods having to deal with crap!
1	This throws zoning out the window. Didn't buy on a big lot so that nextdoor neighbor could have a rental.
4	conditioned on parking availability if in an area where residents need cars
NA	You provides a definition and not a policy. Whats the policy?
1	Really? The new houses dont even have 3 feet between them, how and why would you build a tiny house. Multi-generational house holds are coming back encourage it.
1	Should be allowed, but not required or privileged in any way. Parking for this unit must be on the lot itself, not on the street.
4	I'm for it. Irritate the HOAs. They deserve it.
3	If not used for income. (Unless you are charging an adult child)
3	Parking can become a huge problem

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Only if the ability for an existing homeowners association is not stripped of their CC&R's which specify one dwelling unit per lot. Current property owners bought into subdivisions that have this limitation, which is an existing condition and land use right. Removing this from existing situations would infringe on private property rights.
5	Should be allowed everywhere feasible. It is key to solving the problem.
3	Not sure what we are getting at here
3	Depends on the details.
3	What is the ask here? They already exist and are allowed, so what is this ask? I would say there could be more restrictions on them.
3	Concept is good, but then raises taxes for the property and its neighbors so seems counterproductive
5	What people do with their property is their business - not an excuse for the government to tax them more.
5	I support this idea, but would like to know more information about how it would be implemented. This is something that could also support the disabled community, allowing for families with a disabled child turned adult to be able to have a bit of independence without losing the needed support of onsite help from family. Reducing the need to force them to stay or be sent to residential facilities or group homes.
4	Sadly this will only be possible on older home lots because you are encouraging HIGH DENSITY building now.
4	As more people immigrate from other countries, this is a growth demand. Don't allow it and there will be 9 people families trying to squeeze into 1200 sf. homes.
5	And these ADU's need to be more livable than currently authorized. 900sf interior living space is reasonable, but could it be slightly larger - maybe up to 1000/1200sf? Why can't outdoor living (decks) be additive to the interior living space? Currently (as I understand it) outdoor decks are included in the 900sf living space allocation.
5	This is so important for older and disabled people because it gives them dignity and privacy while still being close to support.
5	This is a question that is hard to tell what you are asking. This needs clarification. I am in favor of cities allowing accessory dwelling units to create higher density and the unit may be a solution to affordable housing.
3	Be Careful!! Could get out of control.
1	If they are in fact "mother-in-law" suites, for family, then yes. If they are cheap rentals, then no.
3	I don't know what this means. I think second, smaller dwellings are okay as long as there is proper room for the dwelling to be built.
1	The N. End of Boise is filthy with these things. You can even see the mailboxes in the assessors pictures. Nobody cares, they are still taxed as a single family property instead of the income property they are.
1	Prefer not to encourage rentals in single family home communities.
4	If they get used for that.
5	As a Bench dweller with a big backyard (there are a bunch of us), who lives a mile from downtown, it makes sense to incentivize us to build in dwellings in our backyards that don't destroy our neighborhoods.
5	Empower neighborhoods to help make this happen
5	Make sure they are accessible so folks can age in place
5	Yes! But I would like to see ACHD and the city lessen the impact fees on them where they can.
4	Only used for long term, local rentals. Not air-Bnbs
5	Not a bad idea but most owners don't understand rentals.
4	But based on past history this becomes a loophole used to abuse the intent.
5	of course with any scenario
5	ADUs increase housing density quickly and easily and also increase homeowners' ability to pay for their mortgage.
4	Should be legal, impossible to mandate.
5	this should definitely be allowed and encouraged.
5	We would love to have a mother in law home on our property if possible.
4	these just help families use their land in the best way

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	keep lots a minimum of 1/2 acre or more. if someone needs to house extended family they should add on to the existing residence for multi generational living. DO NOT allow people to convert spaced meant for vehicles into living spaces such as garages.
1	Too-few restrictions and too-little enforcement to insure owner-occupied houses and avoid AirB&B and other short-term renting.
3	This will likely cause congested parking at the residences
NA	If they are built properly they are fine, most are not. Water needs to be increased, Power needs to be upped, and sewer is not addressed correctly
4	In law suites and guest suites are a great idea!!
1	no, this will get abused
2	it's a bit of a bandaid compared to the other options and tools.
3	This seems like a personal choice of the homeowner, and would likely become an airbnb or be used for family. Not sure if or how it would help the housing situation as a whole.
5	Need to increase the stock of 1-2 bedroom houses with yards - can provide mortgage relief for the property owner. Make them tax exempt as incentive to build.
1	Government should have more pressing matters than regulating what people do on their land with consenting renters.
1	must be discretionary and not conflict with neighborhood standards or disrupt character. i.e. parking, noise,pre- existing zoning or CC&Rs
3	Yes, if helps reduce public assistance need.
1	Terrible idea! Airbnb takeover!
1	High density is awful. Most people want space.
3	Only if adequate off street parking is available.
5	This has already become a trend for some Ada county properties and helps solve a lot of these problems.
3	That would mean just 1 or 2 per lot unless you've got a lot of divorces. Enforce a must be married clause. This could be a bit taxing on septic systems tho.
5	Families caring for their own members strengths our community. I've spent time in nursing homes and observed way, way too many forgotten and discarded seniors. This option gives families more choices.
1	This is a sneaky way to add population and stress neighborhood amenities, from parking to noise to pets to traffic and more. I am opposed to ADU's.
5	Our lot is in the Northend and already signed for one. Would be cool to have conditional approval for even smaller units to allow for none moving tiny homes... That building philosophy has come such a long way from shanty town days
3	Already allowed in Canyon county how would this change anything?
NA	Would be a nice feature
NA	Survey sucks
4	After nearly 30 years of living in my home, we needed to move my mother in with us. If we would've been able to build her a "tiny house" on our property, I wouldn't have had to move into a house with much higher property taxes.

Scenario: Come Together

Strategy: Transfer Building Rights

3	Unfortunately, in Ada County we are too late to implement TDR's as cities such as Kuna, Meridian, Star, and Eagle have sprawled into our prime farmland. I would suspect that at least 80% of the irrigable agricultural land in Ada County is in a City's Area of City of Impact.
2	This sounds cool, but it feels like a massive loophole waiting to happen. Ultimately it increases the cost of living by keeping more farmland. The demand is too high to move here for this to work
1	Sound like this doesn't accomplish anything other than putting development somewhere else.
5	Another highly-desirable option for a retiring ag family who wants to avoid selling out to yet another profit-mongering developer.
1	Sounds like a zoning negation tool to me.
5	Amen!
NA	gifts are fine, but transfers to non-taxable entities only raises the property taxes of others. this is a major problem for Challis at this point.
NA	What does that mean????

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	Not sure I understand this.
5	as long as transferred building rates don't transfer to undeveloped areas of the county
3	Don't really understand this one
NA	I need more of an explanation about this in order to understand the intent of it. The short description was not helpful for me.
4	Are there examples of successful transfer of building rights within the metro? Would be nice to get an idea of how this could be used to improve the communities. Answer: <i>Transfer of building rights is currently allowed by Idaho Code (67-6515A), but has not been used in the Treasure Valley. It is a voluntary, incentive-based program that designates areas where growth is to be restricted, and property owners can receive "credits" for not building in those areas. It then identifies areas where those "building credits" can be used instead. It would preserve farmland or other conservation areas, but it would create additional density in "receiving" areas.</i>
1	I really do not understand what this is asking.
5	And do not allow builders to easily sub divide lots and turn a space that held one home into a space that holds 2-5 homes with no contribution to the neighborhood Infrastructure or schools.
NA	Need more info
1	sounds like a land grab
5	We need to preserve farm and our culture land
5	Conserve farms and open space!!
1	If people want to preserve open space, they should buy it.
3	That sounds like a doorway to corruption.
5	They did this with Hill Farms in Meridian and I love that park and driving by the old farm.
2	TDRs are very difficult to implement
NA	No program. Arms length transactions between willing buyers and sellers.
3	This already exists but is rarely looked at as an option.
5	we absolutely need to preserve the ability to grow food
3	Strangely worded I suspect this is a loaded question that will be manipulated. Are you talking about open space trusts? Answer: <i>Transfer of building rights, or transfer of development rights, is a voluntary, incentive-based program used to protect certain lands (i.e., farmland, open space, or other natural areas) by allowing the growth to occur in other locations in exchange for preserving that land. It is currently allowed by Idaho Code (67-6515A) but has not been used in the Treasure Valley. It designates areas where growth is to be restricted, and property owners can receive "credits" for not building in those areas. It then identifies areas where those "building credits" can be used instead. It would preserve farmland or other conservation areas, but it would create additional density in "receiving" areas.</i>
NA	Details matter. This would depend on how it actually works. Too hard to specula without any info
1	Give the farms property tax breaks so they aren't forced to sell!
4	not sure what transfer to other "Areas" means.. what are the "areas"? If it is preservation, then yes. If development, then I would want to know what is being proposed to develop Answer: <i>Typically, communities would identify areas where public services could support additional density. The overall net amount of growth wouldn't change, but it would be shifted from farmland and rural areas to urban areas. That said, details about "receiving area" locations would be determined if/when a program were to be put into place.</i>
3	This isn't well explained...how do you transfer the right to develop land to other areas? Answer: <i>Areas would designated for "sending" or "restricting" growth and "receiving" or "enabling" additional growth. Any of the building and development rights associated with the "sending" properties would be secured and located in an area designated for "receiving" area. Developers would pay the owner of the land (e.g., a farmer) for his/her development rights. The landowner would use that money how he/she wants, but would give up the right to develop the property. The landowner still owns the land and retains the right to farm it. In return, the developer would get "building credits" that they would use elsewhere in areas designated for growth. For example, a 40 acre parcel of farmland with 10 dwelling units allowed by zoning would be restricted to 0 additional dwelling units and those 10 units would be allowed in addition to what was zoned to a property in a "receiving" (more urban) area. So, a 10 acre urban parcel with 20 units allowed by zoning would then be allowed 30 units (10 + 20) for development.</i>
4	Yes, we need to preserve and grow our open space. Is that the intent here?
2	This one is not as self explanatory as the author thought was....
2	Would want more information on this proposal.
5	If it's their property, it's their business - not their neighbors, not their government's.
3	Don't understand this one

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	<p>I don't understand this one. One person owns the land, but someone else makes the decision on how it's used? That would never work!</p> <p>Answer: <i>This is a voluntary, incentive-based program used to protect certain lands (i.e., farmland, open space, or other natural areas) by allowing the growth to occur in other locations for preserving that land. It is currently allowed by Idaho Code (67-6515A) but has not been used in the Treasure Valley. It designates areas where growth is restricted and identifies areas where those "building credits" can be used instead. It would preserve farmland or other conservation areas, but it would create additional density in "receiving" areas. Areas would be designated for "sending" or restricting growth and "receiving" or enabling additional growth. Any of the building and development rights associated with the "sending" properties would be secured and located in an area designated for "receiving" area.</i></p> <p><i>Developers would pay the owner of the land (e.g., a farmer) for his/her development rights. The landowner would use that money how he/she wants, but would give up the right to develop the property. The landowner still owns the land and retains the right to farm it. In return, the developer would get "building credits" that they would use elsewhere in areas designated for growth. For example, a 40 acre farmland with 10 dwelling units allowed by zoning, would be restricted to 0 additional dwelling units and those 10 units would be allowed in addition to a property in a "receiving" area. So a 10 acre urban parcel with 20 units allowed by zoning, would then be allowed 30 units (10 + 20) for development.</i></p>
2	This needs further explanation. Allowing private landowners to dictate where development occurs may be problematic.
3	I am not sure I fully understand this one. Need more information.
1	<p>I don't really understand what this means. Most farms are being sold because the original farmer wants to retire and his/her family does not want to continue the farm anymore. Don't know how you can "keep" the farming if they no longer want to do it and sell off their land. Are you saying you would not allow the farm to be sold?</p> <p>Answer: <i>This is a voluntary, incentive-based program used to protect certain lands (i.e., farmland, open space, or other natural areas). If a farmer wants to stop farming he could use his property rights to develop the property. However, he would also have the option to sell his development rights to a developer. Farmers would use that money how they want, but give up their right to develop the property. The farmer still owns the land and retains the right to farm it. In return, the developer would get "building credits" that he would use elsewhere in areas designated for growth. While some farmers are set to retire and not continue farming, Canyon County conducted a survey earlier this year that determined that 84% of respondents are likely or very likely to continue farming for the next 10 years, and just over 8% are unlikely to continue, according to the survey. This program would protect property rights and give farmers an option to receive retirement money while still preserving farmland. The disadvantage, depending on how you look at it, is that would create additional density in urban "receiving" areas.</i></p>
4	Swaps are a good thing and have worked in Idaho before. Yes.
5	If we don't stop the runaway development we won't have any farmland left. Restaurants use the local food as a draw to customers
5	Please consider this!
5	Only if it preserves farmland\foothills in our tri-county area.
1	I would need to know more.
1	When landowners transfer their rights, what does that mean. I would not necessarily want eminent domain to force a landowner not to be able to sell his/her property. Need more clarification.
1	Some practical examples???
4	A landowner choosing to transfer building rights (for compensation) is better. Growth boundaries are too much government control over private property rights.
1	I gave this a 1 star because I wasn't sure what it meant.
3	Don't fully understand. Needs examples.
5	This is a fantastic idea.
5	Now this is a good idea.
3	<p>How does this work with property taxes?</p> <p>Answer: <i>Details about "receiving area" locations would need to be determined if/when a program were to be put into place. Typically, property taxes for the farmland would remain the same or go down, as the property would not be assessed for any development potential.</i></p>
NA	?
3	may not be legal, or hard to establish legal framework
NA	I don't understand this policy or its impacts.
3	I don't understand this. You need to provide better information if you want laymen to answer your surveys.
NA	Not clear

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
3	I'm not sure I understand this concept.
4	i would like to know more about this process
NA	description is unclear
1	Transferring building rights doesn't help manage growth.
NA	I need to learn more about this
5	yes!
5	Saw this work super well in Yountville, CA
1	If they own their land they have the right to do with it as they wish
NA	I don't understand this.
NA	I don't understand.
4	We are too late in Ada County, but this may work in Canyon County if we act now.
3	Only if this does not allow developers to increase density wherever they are transferring the rights. The way this is worded, it sounds like something scumbag developers or politicians slipped in so that they can hide behind it as they continue the destruction of Boise, the foothills, and open spaces.
2	???
NA	I do not understand this statement!
1	Let the market decide.
3	I don't really understand this one, need more info.
5	As long as it's used to preserve undeveloped and farm land!! Otherwise this sounds like a developer attorney's dream
1	I would like more information before answering this question.
4	only if they choose to, especially if they have lived here a long time.
5	Would love to learn more
1	I gave this a one, because this is not clear. If a landowner transfers the right to develop his/her land how does that preserve farms? It would mean someone else can develop his/her farm out from under him/her.
NA	Survey sucks
4	I feel for our ag culture. I don't blame them for selling their farms because they can get fantastic prices for them, however, we're seeing our ag disappear and that breaks my heart. What are we going to do without the land to grow food and raise cattle?
5	Yes. Brilliant. Yes.
Scenario: Come Together	
Strategy: Urban Growth Boundaries	
5	In Ada County previous County Commissioners made the mistake of giving the cities huge areas of city impact such as Kuna and Meridian. There is very little farmland left in Ada County that is not in an area of city impact. These huge areas of city impact have just encouraged the cities to sprawl instead of having a denser development pattern.
1	LOL
5	it's a descent idea if you make it really hard to increase the area withing the boundary.
5	YES...YES...YES... why should my municipal water/sewer rates go through the roof today so a development may be parked miles away from my city limits just so a development can build thousands of homes next to a golf course. Water alone a defining issue easily resolved by UGB. What developer is going to even consider land purchases and costly planning IF the needed services may not be available or would be rudimentarily expensive to achieve their much-needed profits???
3	However, no local government in the valley seems able to resist annexing to any county line. How about a state level commission to decide this question, as well as turf wars between cities over never ending construction sites?
2	Strongly oppose unless paired with very significant upzoning within current city limits. If paired with very large upzoning in city limits, would likely support this.
5	Ok, I'm all about "come together"! Yes, urban growth boundaries please. These are things my community group (fighting large scale urbanization of rural areas) has been asking for for 20 years!
2	Forcing only urban clustering isn't a cure and brings many additional problems. Boundaries to encourage development in key areas throughout the valley not just a handful of urban areas would be much more palatable.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
5	Yes please. Sprawl is inefficient without substantial transportation infrastructure. However, that money can be consolidated with smart (dense) growth.
NA	not unless it covers a potential danger such as a flood zone or unstable ground area.
3	Not sure I understand this.
5	this is what is needed to keep open space. To keep the value of Ada County it's critical that the county stop annexation of cities into open space in the county
NA	This is the worst idea in the whole growth manage toolbox. it becomes an impediment to property rights and makes hopscotch development
5	Where has this been used before and what were the outcomes? Answer: Oregon is the most prominent example of urban growth boundaries, and results are mixed. Under Oregon law, each city creates an urban growth boundary around its perimeter and growth is not allowed beyond that boundary as a way to control urban expansion into farm and forest lands. There have been many studies on the impacts of urban growth boundaries on housing costs and traffic congestion with experts making claims either way. Typically, it is agreed that the advantages are that urban growth boundaries preserve land and enable public investments to be more efficiently spent within the growth boundaries. The downside is it leads to higher housing costs and potentially more traffic congestion. Learn more: https://www.oregonmetro.gov/news/ugb-101-everything-you-wanted-know-about-urban-growth-boundary-were-afraid-ask
1	Absolutely oppose
NA	Illegal
4	Build up, not out.
3	Beats up affordability, there is a reason we are seeing people relocating from Portland. Portland's UGB has done great things on sprawl but it has decreased the affordability of Portland.
3	not so much a growth boundary, but a "Sprawl" limit
1	Definitely not. This is just a way for the rich to boost the value of their property while burdening the poor. Even, steady, well planned, beautifully designed (appealing to the eye) growth should be the goal. Freeways, bypasses, and toll roads should be built now, at these construction prices, to accommodate future growth
1	Why limit growth? Growth=more taxes which=more ability to fund projects. When growth is stagnant the only way to pay for increasing costs is to raise taxes. Building more gives a fresh infusion of money.
5	Urban sprawl is a real problem that can be managed through education of the public and our public officials. Make this a campaign.
5	I think this is a great idea. The urban sprawl in Boise has become shocking. My family has been here since the 70s and while increasing economic opportunities and diversity is fantastic, we should be building up not out.
2	Probably a good idea unless you try to pillage single family housing and take property to create density.
1	How would this be different from a designated Area of Impact (AOI)? Needs more explanation to compare this as a possible different tactic. Answer: An urban growth boundary would have more "teeth" than an area of impact. Currently, areas of impact are defined boundaries, like urban growth boundaries, but there aren't legal restrictions or financial penalties for growth occurring outside those boundaries.
5	Open space is why people like this area.
NA	Maybe. Depends on the boundaries.
1	depending on boundaries. This made prices go up crazy high in places like Boulder. I don't want to be a Boulder, where it is only the rich who can live there. I think there should be development limitations, but probably not boundaries that could drive up prices for others, forcing them out and into long commutes
5	Any measures that combat sprawl are beneficial for all.
1	I believe this does not agree with land rights. There should be guidance, yes, but people should be able use their property to their benefit.
4	Protect the farm lands and beautiful nature in our valley.
5	Foothills specifically. No more northern growth into the hills. There is no infrastructure to support additional growth North (Bogus, 8th Street, Shaw Mtn., etc)
1	Don't know how this will help plan for 300,000 additional people. How about LIMITING high density building and allowing growth to spread out to surrounding areas in a with a plan to also promote businesses to locate there and provide local jobs.

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
1	Use impact areas instead of Growth areas. But, cap the purchase values. This means an impact area like around the airport would be tied to open-unusable space property values. Or, at best, warehouse land.
5	But, certainly, learn from those that have gone before (Portland). There are some growing pains problems with this approach (government 'taking') and arbitrary line drawing that effectively 'takes' value from property owners.
1	sounds like china or Russia
3	This could be a solution, but needs heavy public input for the stakeholders involved.
5	Again, Please consider this!
3	Depends on what is necessary to be built and what should be preserved.
1	Government in general ought to have very little to say about what anyone does with their property.
5	Good luck on this in Idaho.
2	Too much government control over private property rights. A landowner choosing to transfer building rights (for compensation) is better.
1	Why would we want this? Pushing OUT the businesses and housing is the best way to grow a city, preventing overcrowding and transportation issues.
5	Again, not too hard to figure this out. There are no boundaries on developers it seems. We need to preserve our open areas. Hey Washington, Oregon, Calofornia, sorry, we are full. Go back.
5	This is CRITICAL to protect the foothills and preserve our outdoor recreation areas.
3	It's a nice idea, but is PDX all that livable outside the city? It's basically Meridian, so no.
5	Yes. There's a reason why Portland is an urban studies haven.
5	All the farms are going away. We are losing our beautiful farmland by the day. Just look at all the land being developed or for sale.
5	This will restrict growth which is a good idea.
5	yea right :)
2	I don't like it because it is very difficult to predict future needs.
3	Growth should be encouraged near existing urban centers. Cities should grow up, not out. I'm not sure if Urban Growth Boundaries help or hurt this goal.
NA	In theory this sounds attractive to limit growth, but in practice it will inflate housing values (and by extension property taxes), which will price-out current homeowners (especially those living on fixed income). Boulder, CO is an example of unintended consequences of an urban growth boundary.
1	this really, really will hurt affordability. Aka, san Francisco
1	strike a balance instead -- the pendulum has swung too far into near-downtown rental and density growth.
5	One problem the UGBs face is what to do when the area inside the UGB is completely full. Then there will be a push to expand the UGB, which defeats the purpose of the UGB.
NA	Stop growth - Bieter is out so hopefully we won't beholden to developers anymore
1	this goes against the very fabric that makes idaho what it is. this severely restricrts freedoms of landowners and potential buyers. greater government control than most idahoans would like
5	yes
1	Just stop growing in general would be best
1	This is a horrible idea... would cause increased pricing and we would turn into California with a homeless population that would increase as no one would be able afford living in our cities
4	Foothills, please. Protect the open spaces in the foothills.
1	If someone wishes to sell their land at the periphery of a municipality, it shouldn't be on the municipality, county or state to restrict them from obtaining maximum income from their land by re-developing it as they see fit.
5	This would be a great tool as it would force cities to realize that they have a limited amount of land to grow and it would encourage cities to approve denser development.
5	Compass should research other state's successful programs for ag land preservation (tax incentive contracts, conservation easements, etc and engage stakeholders to explore options and press for legislative fix. (See Williamson Act land conservation contracts, Calif)
3	This might be helpful, but a better approach would be to change zoning laws that promote single-family housing (which inevitably results in sprawl) to the exclusion of other forms of housing

Score (higher score = higher rating)	Comment (The comments below are verbatim, as submitted by the commenter. As such, typographical errors have not been corrected)
5	This must be done before the entire valley is filled with a solid coating of spaghetti-street subdivisions and remote high rise business centers, from the foothills to the Snake River. Only way to save open space, wild land, and agriculture in the ever expanding growth scenario our leaders seem to have chosen for us (against our will).
3	This made Portland housing very expensive, old and dumpy.
3	If used appropriately, would be good.
5	Growth is bad. Quit encouraging it.
3	This should be set by a cities planning and zoning and should only be changed every 10 years.
1	Another bad idea that causes home prices to go higher! Oregon is a great example of this. Their housing price are \$100,000 higher
5	This makes sense. Again Boulder, CO but less draconian. Keep green land green baby - 50 years from now the Millennial grandparents will be glad that us Boomers did for them
5	Please. Everyone would live to live along the river, for example, but in just the last 4 years, the environmental impact of development is obvious. Preserve what makes it special.
5	I've seen wildlife hugely impacted. People shouldn't be concerned that a bobcat is in their area, gee maybe they have no place to go! Our grazing areas are disappearing.
NA	I am not sure how this works. Boise Nampa, Eagle and Caldwell are already running into each other.
5	Should have already done this
NA	Survey sucks.
5	I know several people, including my daughter, that moved to more rural areas to be "out in the country" and now developments are creeping up to their property lines. How would you feel if you thought you purchased your dream property out in the country then have a housing development build right up to your property line? Then there's the traffic! Their road use to be rather quiet. Now it's like a thoroughfare. Not to mention the accidents they've witnessed because of the folks that don't seem to realize that big red sign that says STOP means STOP. They had two deaths in less than three weeks at their intersection. I realize this is a traffic issue, but with more people traveling our roads without improvement this will continue to happen.
4	I was 100% for this a few years ago but have seen a documentary and some other pieces about how this concept – as employed in Portland, OR – caused housing to become unaffordable. Again, I need to better understand all this. For example, is it better to have an external urban growth boundary, or is it more effective to have pockets of open space (farmland, parks, etc.) within whatever amount of land the urban area is consuming?
5	Common sense ideas that don't add tax without involvement of local, affected citizens. Developers should be paying for infrastructure, schools, etc., not existing property owners. No tax breaks for developers to continue destroying our valley while pocketing huge profits.

Additional Open-Ended Comments Received	Staff Response
<p>Dear Compass,</p> <p>Your survey had good intentions, but it is so complicated in its physical configuration and too "cute" in its visual presentation that it fails the usability test for most respondents. A well-executed survey instrument is simple, simple, simple. A poorly-executed survey's competing drop-down menus, multiple windows, and visually-distracting graphical elements makes it hard for the respondent to a.) consistently move from question to question in linear progression, b.) retain a sustained base of information from one question to the next, and c.) provide answers that are based on a respondents' actual views and not compromised by "process" (i.e., a survey should focus on content -- a respondent's views -- and not be cluttered by any respondent's inadvertent distraction because of the "packaging" in which your questions are presented.)</p> <p>David Klinger</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the future of the Treasure Valley and your feedback on COMPASS' survey. We will keep it in mind as we move forward.</p>
<p>Hello. I saw Matt Stoll's commentary in the Idaho Press newspaper. My comment how do I want to see the Treasure Valley grow. It's grown enough. You can't travel around here without any headache. Transportation department can't keep up with the roads. It is turning into a traveler's hell. And we're losing all the farmland. Enough is enough. All the planners...you know what? They need to take a vacation. It's out of control. Enough with the growth idea. That's my comment. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your interest in the future of the Treasure Valley. Your comments will be provided to the COMPASS Board of Directors.</p>
<p>Thank you for all your work and for the presentation this morning. I've taken the survey, and I'm grateful for your work to help manage our Treasure Valley population growth as intelligently as possible.</p> <p>Questions:</p> <p>1) Has COMPASS considered the issue of Dark Skies? (See www.darksky.org for the International Dark-Sky Association.) No matter what the Valley looks like in 2050, we could work to make this a place where everyone has over-their-heads access to one of our most beautiful resources: the stars in the night sky. We have a Dark Sky Preserve in Idaho, and Bruneau Dunes has a great location and observatory, but people need to see stars without a long drive—and light pollution is already visible from Bruneau. For example, see Lighting for Policy Makers Streetlights</p> <p>2) I teach at the college level. We are seeking to get our students more involved in the community and learn more about local issues. Do you have obvious places or ways that students might help your work or get involved--either a few individuals or a whole class of twenty or so?</p> <p>Thanks again for all you do!</p> <p>Julie Straight, Ph. D.</p>	<p>Thanks so much for attending the presentation and filling out the survey!</p> <p>Additionally, thank you for reaching out about the Dark Skies issue. We agree that it has importance in planning and we can add this topic to a future meeting with our members to discuss.</p> <p>Regarding involving students in the outreach process – we are always looking for ways to reach young people in the Valley! There are several options for involvement: one of our staff members can give a presentation to your classes about COMPASS and how to get involved, you or one of your students could apply to be on our Public Participation Workgroup, or, perhaps the most relevant right now, is to fill out the survey.</p> <p>We'd be more than happy to set up a Zoom presentation for your classes.</p> <p>Thank you for your participation and interest! Please let me know if you have any other questions.</p>

Additional Open-Ended Comments Received	Staff Response
<p>Slower, considered growth that preserves our farmlands & natural spaces overrides economic improvements – the way Ada county & much of Canyon Co. has grown since the early 1990’s is sickening – and has been discussed over & over without much change – farmland sold & developed, Walmart’s & Jackson’s everywhere, traffic congestion all bemoaned in the ‘90’s & “experts” saying build “up” within existing city limits – instead of continuing “urban sprawl” – but those in charge continued to destroy our valley & heritage. Hopefully that can change before we are totally “Californicated.” All the values are important, but some can be changed & improved moving forward, but destruction, degradation of environment, open space, farmland is difficult to remedy after the fact.</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. We appreciate your involvement in planning for the future of the valley. Your comments will be provided to the COMPASS Board of Directors.</p>
<p>Hi,</p> <p>I have lived in the Boise area for 50 years. I looked over the four options, which I found very detailed and very thorough but I didn’t spend hours studying. Thank you for compiling all this information and developing four plans to choose from.</p> <p>I now believe we need to, most importantly, preserve our farmland. Along with that, we need to manage our growth and preserve our air quality as much as possible (with hybrid vehicles) and efficient, environmentally sound busing.</p> <p>Therefore, I do not think mass transit is the way to go. Future development needs to remain around existing city centers - biking and walking and easy access for all, including our aging population, for entertainment, business, exercise, medical facilities, community.</p> <p>Infrastructure on existing heavily used roads, as in widening those corridors, needs to be a focus. I do not want this valley to look like where I came from in Southern California 50 years ago. If we do not manage our growth and farmland preservation, we will look like Southern California. Therefore, I am against mass transit and support city center development and busing within those centers.</p> <p>Thank you, Karen Knudtsen</p>	<p>Thank you for your feedback. We appreciate your involvement in planning for the future of the valley. Your comments will be provided to the COMPASS Board of Directors.</p>