

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
1	Y This was a very suitable location, with ample room	Y However, there was so much information, it was like overload. The facilitator at our table (#1) was very good.	Y Again, overload! However, there was so much information, even for those of us who had been to the other two presentations, it made sense.	Y This seemed, to me, to be the best way to a lot of people to become involved. It was very obvious that many of the participants had their own "agenda" – but, there were many knowledgeable people who helped everyone else with insight concerning the need for bridges, widening or "rural highways" etc. that we were able to use judgment skills	
2	Y	Y	Y	Y It afforded the opportunity for a free exchange of ideas – to hear arguments for all options.	
3	Y	Y I appreciated the opening remarks of what has been done and what was expected of us this evening.	Y	Y It is a good way to bring a variety of people together to work out a compromise among differing views of how we wish to see our communities grow and develop. It was a challenge and an opportunity to see first hand the difficulties involved with planning for growth.  I do hope our ideas will be considered by those who will ultimately do the development!	
4	Y	Y	Y	Y The chip sets "A,B,C" were a bit limited. We chose A because there were long new roads, widened roads & a railroad. Additional chips would have helped.	
5	Y	Y	Y	Y No consideration given to restricting growth, or dealing with finite resources N (see over).	
6	Y	Y	Y	Y Great format for input. N Needed a lot more input from residents in outlying areas. Almost too many options. Surprising how hard it was <i>to</i> spend the money.  Overall I was impressed with the process. I was also pleased with the common desire for transit & transportation improvement. How do we raise the \$\$?	
7	Y	Y	Y	A lot of information at one time. Confusing to properly apply transportation planning outside of the very big picture. Felt like we're being led some times.	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
8	Y [Yes and No] N	Y	Y	Y Yes, but... [refer to additional comments]	
10	Y	Y	Y	Y Maybe a little too structured as to the budgets (A,B,C) given the amount of time allowed. There was not enough time to reassess and revise.  However, the exercise was fun, informative and we also accomplished our group objective to go for light rail transit with a [feeder] [bus] system and also meaningful arterial improvement.	
11	Y	Y	Y	Y	
12	Y	N Slower – have handouts – repeat	Y B/c of facilitator	N - too rushed - need better presentation – again, handouts - let people know what to expect before they come	
13	Y	Y	Y	Y	
14	Y	Y	Y	Y The process was ok – (majority ruled). Maybe more theory or technical input could have been implemented for Rules and Guidance & for direction; thereby expediting findings  Did not talk about other studies going on and the potential of benefits that may be [found]	
15	Y Short though on being able to record items of importance in debate	Y	Y	Y Need more policy makers for Title II: <u>STATE Code</u>	
16	Y	Y	Y	Y Good mix of participants. Excellent to work within <u>Real</u> budget constraints.	
17	Y	Y	Y But it does take a [bit] to absorb the detail	Y Very much so. I like [voting] at the table. I can live with results of votes the mix of people was nice, but day time did seem to bring out [agency] people.  Could have used about ½ more – give 45 minute bell also	
18	Y	Y	Y	Y Good <i>exercise</i> – 24 years of growth is very difficult to plan. This study shows how important transit will be in the future.	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
19	Y N/A	Y	Y	N To actually plan spending the 25-yr. budget needs more time. As advice to the planners, put more credence in the general ideas & not specific implementation	
20	Y	Y	Y Need good facilitator to help explain, which we had!	Y Great approach – “game” Effective way to illustrate the tough decision process and the tradeoffs necessary to implement improvements within funding constraints.	
21	Y	Y A lot of info in a short time – would be nice to have some ahead of time	Y Good leader @ table	Y Would like to see tables more mixed. Terrible Chairs !	
22	Y	Y	Y	Y Would like to have had more copies of traffic impact for all to better understand where traffic was impacted most.	
23	Y	Y Overview – kept it shorter & simple. Interaction, Q&A with facilitators was more helpful	Y	Y Needed more direction on the scenarios; difficult to distinguish real distinctions btw. corridors and satellite cities. Need more time.	
24	Y	Y	Y	Y Loved working with the people at my table. Great facilitator!	
25	Y	Y	Y	Y It was my first time – I learned a lot.	
26	Y	Y	Y	Y The workshop is a wonderful way to gather constructive feedback from the inhabitants of Treasure Valley.	
27	Y	Y	Y Only we couldn’t build up all Treasure Valley in time allotted to get done.	Y	
28	Y	Y	Y	Y It was a good blend of goal and the hands-on process.	
29	Y	Y	Y	Y Excellent way to get participants to cope with the difficult trade offs in a simple and understandable format.	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
30	Y	Y	Y	Y It took diverse folks to make this type of <i>exercise fly</i> ... Different people were very familiar with different 'hot spots' ... Everybody pitched in with excitement and passion. Amazing! No one person was an "expert" in all segments of the large map.  S. Lamb, 853-3452, <lamb@spro.net>	
31	Y	Y	Y	Y This is a complex topic – ✓ I liked the chance for all to participate ✓ I didn't have a clear picture of the entire area – learned a lot. - Thanks much – I look forward to participating in the future.	
32	Y	Y Very good facilitators.	Y	Y For rural counties which have significant growth (i.e. Boise County); more research should be conducted because long range planning should take in projected impact.	
33	Y	Y	Y	Y	
34	Y	Y	Y	Y We need to always cover all counties and city's to get more participation.  Being from the outlying area makes me want to make sure I participate because of us being in a "bedroom community" to Boise.	
35	Y Meridian location would be nice	N Too much information in the time	Y	Y Would like more traffic data numbers and projects	
36	Y N/A	Y	Y	Y I feel, we can expect some more traffic data, more projected traffic data, which could [so] useful for future planning	
37	Y	Y	Y	Y [ ? ] the boulevard chips. We need to do more of that ☺	
38	N Evenings	Y	Y	Somewhat.  Please place me on your mailing list – T.F. Haddock, 10601 N. Horseshoe Bend Rd., #48, Boise, Idaho 83714	
39	Y	Y	Y	Y New sophisticated process. Showed [yield] excellent results.  ACTION: Acquire a laser printer for presentations and coach them not to walk in front of the slides.  <u>THANKS !</u>	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
40	Y	Y It was difficult to choose a map in a short time without more opportunity to review specifics	Y	Y	
41	Y	Y	Y	Y	
42	Y	Y	Y Less clear than Nov N workshop	Y Future scenarios: 1. Please clarify difference in land use between Agriculture & Farmland (from the opening PowerPoint) 2. Please keep HOV as an alternative for road use, especially at high impact times.	
43	Y N/A	N Need to go slower and more detail regarding strip sets and land use scenarios. Too Rushed !	N	Y	
44	Y	Too much – too fast	Y Reasonably	Y We would like to see the maps of the various findings to see if we missed the target.	
45	Y	Y Very well organized and fun	Y	Y We had great discussion and recommendations	
46	Y	Y	Y Good PowerPoint presentation	Y Very enjoyable. Fast-paced.	
47	Y	Y	Y	Y However, it is inappropriate for an elected official who arrived late to come in and say, “No this isn’t how it is going to be,” and wipe away all the work the group had done by sweeping the strips off of the map. This has happened in both workshops with this particular elected official. She should be told to stop ! !	
48	Y	Y	Y	Y	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
49	Y	Y	So, so. The amount of colored tape represented the \$1.25 B for whatever scenario (A B or C)	Y	
50	Y	Y	Y But – should perhaps be more emphasis that pre-set A/B/C spending mix could be altered – reduces new ideas	Y Good back and forth between participants. Staff “facilitator” [caused] too much emphasis on existing plans and official studies as inalterable.	
51	Y	Y	Y	I think the process was very enjoyable. The time was well spent and educational. A good mix of people seemed to be involved.	
52	Y None	Y	Y	Y	
53	Y N.A.	Y	Y	Y Should have more time.	
54	Y	Y	Y	Y	
55	Y Meridian	Y	Y	Y	
57	Y	Y	Y	Y I found it to be informative and sensible – really enjoyed	
58	Y	Y	Y	Y	
59	Y	Y	Y	Y	
60	Y	Y	Y	Y	
61	Y	Y It was helpful to have visual illustrations on PowerPoint	Y Facilitator at table was <u>great</u> (Ross), helped to re-explain directions. Program with info was also very clean & helpful.	Y This was a great way to discuss the issues. I liked being at a table with people of very different backgrounds & professions. I learned a lot about the developer & IDT perspectives because of their input. End presentations illustrated how many different solutions are possible.  * BOISE NEEDS ALTERNATIVE TRANSPORTATION	
62	Y	Y	Y	Y Excellent process for handling a lot of material and involving the participants.	
63	Y	N Too much jargon	Y	Y	

<b>Communities in Motion</b>		<b>February 2005 Public Workshops</b>			<b>Evaluation</b>
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
64	Y N/A	Y	Y	Y	
65	Y	Y	Y	Y The land use and transportation investment choices were excellent. The trading of pieces could have been more explained and quantified. [i.e. (10) Boulevard = (2) widening = (1) new road]. The answering of the three big questions of funding should have been filled out as a group or individually on a form.	
66	Y	Y	Y	Y	
67	Y	Y	Y	Y	
68	Y The central location was good – I used the bus to arrive!	Y	Y	Y	
69	Y	Y	Y	Y	
70	Y	Y	Y	Y	
71	Y	Y	Y	Y It tried to [incorporate] the prior work and still gave us options.	
72	Y	Y	Y	Y Very interesting. I worked with some very knowledgeable people who also listened to my ideas.	
73	Y	Y	Y	Y	
74	Y	Y	Y	Presentation geared to yield nearly predetermined result.	
75	Y	Y	Y	Y Very good everyone had a good chance to participate and we had plenty of choices to choose from	
76	Y	Y	Y	Y It was a little confusing at first but the facilitator was great	
77	Y	Y It was as clear as it could be for people unfamiliar with a complex set of choices	Y	Y I think we all got a little tired and kept laying down strips after we stopped thinking clearly	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops		Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.
78	Y	Y	Y	Y There has been a lot of thought done. If all information is put together there should be a good plan.
79	Y	Y	Y	Y This was a terrific opportunity! Thank you for involving the community. Based on what the results from each group – there was lots of good thought and concern.
80	Y Emmett	Y	Y	Y I liked the interaction among community members. It was helpful to hear different concerns and interests.
81	Y If it didn't I wouldn't be here ☺	Y	Y	Y
82	Y	Y	Y	Y Maybe more clarification of “professional terms”
83	Y	Y	Y	Y
84	Y	Y But a lot to soak in	Y	Y
85	? Same night as state-of-the-union address by Pres. Bush. Wed. & Thur. are good.	Y	Y	Y It went so fast during the preliminary presentation, that it was rather overwhelming at first.
86	Y	Y But our knowledge of the project is slim	Y	Y
87	Y	Y Allow more time for clarification questions	Y	Y • Great opportunity for interaction • More time for actual placement of strips (vs. choosing map)
88	Y	Y	Y	Y
89	Y	N First time coordinator was good Toni	Y	Y I enjoyed knowing what's happening and could happen. Representing the community of Glenns Ferry was important for us and having our concerns expressed.
90	Y	Y	Y	Y
91	Y	Y	Y	Y It gave you a [chance] to see what kind of issues that could come up when you are trying to up grade roads

<b>Communities in Motion</b>		<b>February 2005 Public Workshops</b>			<b>Evaluation</b>
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
92	Y	Y	Y	Y It was a lot to do in only 3 hrs. more time would have been a better plan	
93	Y	Y	Y	Y	
94	N Hampton Inn & Suite on Franklin Rd. off I84	Y	Y	Y	
95	Y	Y	Y	Y	
96	Y	Y	Y	Y	
97	Y	Y	Y	Y	
98	Y	Y	Y	Y	
99	Y	Y	Y	Y	
100	Y	Y	Y	Y	
101	Y	Y	Y	Y	
102	Y	Y	Y	Y	
103	Y	Y	Y	Y	
104	Y	Y	Y	Y Planning is essential	
105	Y	Y	Y	Y The group collaboration was both enjoyable and informative. The group outcome was different from my personal views, but the process was interesting.	
106	Y	Y	Y	Y	
108	Y			Y	
109	Y	Y	Y	Y Not quite enough time to get maps marked up. (Although that may not have helped.)	
110	Y	Y	Y	Y	

Communities in Motion February 2005 Public Workshops Evaluation				
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.
111	Y Locations great	Y Very clear, in [17]. I could make sense of what you all were talking about	Y Very clear. Not so use to the terms but I got the hang of it, there was enough resources to help me understand better	Y All of the above comments! ☺
112	Y	Y	Y To me yes, others in the group no	Y
113	Y	Y	Y	N Were limit to those scenarios rather than just planning what would be best
114	Y	Y	Y	
115	Y	Y	Y	Y
116	Y	Y	Y	Y
117	Y	Y	Finally	Y I liked the satellite approach so growth can be done well & make outlying communities economically viable
118	Y	Some terminology was over my head (out of my box)	Y Not sure if we were on N current or future at first	Y
119	Y	Y Well presented	Y Fun & interesting exercises w/strip set!	Y Yes – I like the interaction among group members – good variety of people!
120	Y Worked well with my schedule	Y	Y	Y More time is needed for the planning aspects of the meeting/development decisions.  Brian Crawford, 824 S. Diamond St., Nampa, ID 83687
121	Y	Y	Y	Y
122	Y	Y	Y	My only comment is our facilitator did about half the talking. I found this suppressed developing ideas and kept us on a pre-conceived track.
123	Y	Y	Y	Y Other than trying to get consensus!
124	Y	Y	Y	Y Well done!
125	Y	Y	Y	Y Received lots of input from several people.

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops		Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.
126	Y	Y Well some of the charts were not explained	Y	Y
127	Y	Y	Y	Y Like the fact that <i>you're</i> looking at all different input from the communities involved.
128	Y	Y	Y	Y It was made fun & interesting so the group got involved & we had a lot of suggestions to come up with united plan
129	Y	Y	Y	Y
130	Y	Y	Y	Y Very informative. It's a great chance to voice your opinion. Fun!
131	Y	Y	Y	Y It just a great collaborative opportunity to see different perspectives and come to solutions.
132	Y	Y	Y	Y The multiple group approach seems to provide the widest dissemination of ideas.
133	Y	Y	Y	Y
134	Y	Y	Y	Y
135	Y	Y	Y	Y
136	Y	Y	Y	Y
137	Y	Y	Y	Y
138	Y	Y Some info was harder to follow with out background information	Y	Y Made every thing easier to understand
139	Y	Y The different scenarios were very clear, & the transportation as well	Y But hard to know what we need to do after we pick maps	Y Gave a chance for various people to come together and come to one decision that we can all agree upon
140	Y	Y	Y	Y It was a very good experience for someone who just came here. I learned a lot as far as our money getting spent and what we can afford and so on. I loved it. It was fun.

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
141	Y	Y	Y	Y I think it was handled very well.	
142	Y	Y	Y	Y	
143	Y Was very good for me	Y	Y Facilitator was very helpful in keeping us on task	Y I still feel we need a bypass for thru trucks & traffic. Gave that us for freeway N. more in city busses. The low income people need local busses just to go shopping & to the hospitals.	
144	Y	Y	Y	Y Just remember! Those of us from the out lying areas are going to be VERY concerned about SAFE Arterials between Us (Emmett, Gem Co.) and You (Ada County). Similar sentiments are expressed by Payette Co., Wash Co., Boise Co, etc.	
145	Y	Y	Y	Y Working for a newspaper gives me a different viewpoint. It was refreshing to see the level of education & information in addition to sharing across political lines.	
146	Y	Y	Y	Being from Gem County I felt that light rail & transit is not possible in this area. Moving from Phoenix Arizona 3 years ago I have watched and was involved in planning in that area, at this time rail & mass transit is not being used there, because of cost of maintenance & land acquired.	
147	Y	Y	Pretty complex set of rules some more options	Y	
148	Y	Y	Y	Y Yes, both theoretical & practical approach – good combination.	
149	Y	Y	Y	Y Very good format. This is difficult to assimilate in a limited time, and certainly it needs more discussion and thought. It's easier to do this without the money.	
150	Y	Y	Y	Y	
151	Y Saturday would give us more time.	Y	Y Nicole helped us all along the way when we got off course.	Y Nicole was a great facilitator. She let us make our own decisions and offered guidance only as needed.	

Communities in Motion February 2005 Public Workshops Evaluation				
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.
152	Kinda. Not on such a busy day for me (it was awful)	Y	Y Nicole is a GREAT facilitator	1. Facilitator was able to clear up any questions 2. Huge maps were great 3. Facilitator was LOCAL & knew our area – was not a complete stranger w/ready-made ideas! 4. Good refreshments. Thank you.
153	Y	Y	Y	Y It was fun – I did not expect to like the process one but I was surprised! Thanks!
154	Y	Y	Y	Y I think it was planned very well. Very intense discussions with lots of insight and thoughtful planning.
155	Y	Y	Y	Y
156	Y	Y As an overview	Toni's input & directions were very helpful	Y
157	Y	Y	Y	Y
158	Y	Y	Y	Y
159	Y	Y	Y	Y Toni did very well a keeping the group on task and in [touch] with what was in the works currently as it interfaced with our design!
160	Y	Which presentation? The 100 slide PowerPoint? It was ok, but getting too long	N This is a complicated process. I'm not certain you can make it clear. It was worthwhile.	Y Many thoughts and ideas leads to a good product.
161	Y	Y	Y	Y
162	Y	Y It was tough to get brought up to speed in the beginning	Y	Y I would like to have more preliminary information and statistics. Maybe I should get involved in a development organization on a career basis. I think I would enjoy it.
163	Y	Y	Y	Y Allowed for wide range of opinions and ideas

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
164	Y	Y I found it informative as to how the data from the meetings in November was collated	Y We were able to start our plan without needing to ask clarifying questions	Y It gave me a lot to think about and a better understanding of what needs to be considered for the Treasure Valley.	
165	Y	Y	Y	Y Definitely a difference of opinions – realistic versus idealistic	
166	Y Evening sessions work best	Somewhat difficult to see from tables in the back	Y Notification of time remaining could have been done more frequently as to facilitate better planning	Y Allows for public participation in the planning process	
167	Y	Y	Y	Y	
168	Y	Y	Y	Y Veggie or vegan choices for food – not just fruits and crackers – etc.	
169	Y	Y	Y	Y Vegetarian <u>hot</u> food would have been nice. Non-dairy.	
170	Y	Y	Y Although I wasn't sure they were clear [ ? ] we started doing it.	Y	
171	Y	Y	Y	Y Vegetarian hot food option would have been nice ☺ A recycle bin for water bottles would be a good idea next time.	
172	Y	Y	Y	Y	
173	Y	Y	Y Some of the terms were unclear, maps should be better marked with current points of stress and problem and issues that [need] or have to be addressed	Y	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
174	Y Great job providing multiple times	Y Too much technical language and too many assumptions that citizens know a certain level of knowledge	Y Tricia was a great and patient facilitator	Y It encouraged (and forced) the integration of numerous viewpoints, ideologies, and backgrounds. It was an excellent way to include citizens in the process of planning.	
175	Y	Y Good explanation of results from previous workshop, and analysis of different development & transit options.	Y	Y	
176	Y	Y	Y	Y	
177	Y	Y	Y	Y	
178	Y	Y	Y	Y Well done	
179	Y	Y	Y The instructions to the whole auditorium contained too much information in a very short time, but our table facilitator did an excellent job of explaining and keeping us on track.	Y It was very enlightening to see the options, the potential problems and to personally have to decide on which priorities were the most important and how to solve them.	
180	Y	Y	Y	Y Allowed for excellent conversation, yet kept the groups on task!	
181	Y	Y	Y Dean did a good job.	Y Interesting concepts used. We had excellent interchange in our group. Everyone contributed ideas & suggestions. I enjoyed the workshop. [Darrel McRoberts]	
182	Y	Y	Y	Y I have heard some discussion of adapting a similar presentation as we continue our work on a local county comp plan – Thank you!	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
183	N Evenings & weekends	Y	N Not enough time to look at alternative options/maps/benefits before making decisions. Good people, but a lot of info to absorb to be effective. Most important issue ← <sup>[arrow to back of page]</sup> Quality ← <sup>[arrow to back of page]</sup>	N Too much ground to cover in too short of time. Group diversity interesting, but might be more productive to group people with shared locality, needs & interests, & information. How likely is it that political will in different communities will work together to implement? Too much area & too little time for deep thoughts and adequate discussion before spending transportation money. Liked the round table format – but not a realistic approach for mapping & spending.	
184	N Need more time for the exercise	Y	Y	It was ok.	
185	Y	Y As clear as it could be. This is a complex process.	Y	Y Assertive people tend to dominate the process.	
186	Y	Y	Y	Y Maybe a little more time to work out solutions.	
187	Y	Y	Y	Y Would like to have seen more demographic data and research on growth areas.	
188	Y I liked having choices of locations & times.	Y	Y	Y <u>Additional ideas</u> There needs to be a bus or rail between Idaho City and Boise on the week days. Highway SS to McCall/Tamarack needs widening or an expressway/lane on weekends and holidays. I don't think that people would take a bus or rail up unless McCall/Cascade became more pedestrian friendly.	
189	Y	Y	Y Our representative was very helpful (Linda).	Y	
190	Y	Y	Y	Y <u>However</u> , more weight should be given to opposing opinions. The majority could be dead wrong when they voted for satellite cities. Forward looking people are often not the most popular.	
191	Y	Y	Y	Y A lot of planning went into this, and that is appreciated.	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
192	Y You offered 3 time sections. Choice!	Y	I was late and not totally clear for a bit.	Y Created involvement, allowed for presentation of many plans & areas to be considered. Great exercise for community participation & education. Informational to be able to see the areas of issue in our metro transit system.	
193	Y	N People need to understand the different road types and their uses. Suggest sending out information prior to meetings.	Y Clear but people did not have ample time to develop an understanding.	N There are 2 many people at our table so it was impossible to reach any consensus. Group of [3] or 4. Also our group had their own individual desires and could not be objective with respect to preparing a plan. This could be minimized with better upfront instructions.  People needed to have their own copy of the map that shoed road capacities and their own legend of designated rd. colors.	
194	Y	Y A little confusing to start, N but we got it together	Y	Y New ideas  Lots of possibilities	
195	Y	Y	Y	Y But covered too many options for time allotted.	
196	Y	Y	Y	Y	
197	Y	Y	N Would have been helpful to see map scenarios prior to workshop online	Y Great opportunity to look at long-range planning & thought process & involved. It was difficult to keep in mind all of the valley, to make sure improvements went to extents; Mitigation. Home, Parma, Emmett.  Really liked both workshops (today & November).	
198	Y <i>There</i> were enough choices to accommodate anyone who wished to participate	Y	Y	Y	
199	Y	Y	Y	Y	
200	Y	Y Many buzz words and N expert concepts not fully explained	Y N	Y	
201	Y	Y	Y	Y Time a little <u>short</u> !	
202	Y	Y	Y	Y Thanks for getting public comment/planning	
203	Y	Y	Y	Y	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
204	Y	Y	Y	Y Our group had a slow start but moved along once we had selected a preferred scenario & chip set.  Some questioned premises of the scenarios but overall acceptance as stipulated by workshop organizers.	
205	Y	Y	Y	Y I think workshop formats work well when well-organized. Allows anyone that wants to – to participate. Gives participants a better knowledge of process and decision making and a better understanding of proposed solution – whether in agreement or not.  Don Belts	
206	Y Like having day & night options	Y Much better – not so leading or comments that could be taken as problems that need to be fixed. Seemed a little biased against satellite idea.	Y	Y This workshop was much better. Should let participants know they should not use their position to influence others → everyone’s idea should have equal weight. I attended day session this time → people more knowledgeable. The lessons learned was very helpful.	
207	Y	Y	Y	Y This is my second workshop and it worked better this time.	
208	Y	Y	Y	Y More time	
209	Y	Y Good introduction with important background and summary	Y	Y	
210	Y	Y	Y	Y	
211	Y N/A	Y Less handoff between people on initial presentation	Y	Y Time constraints always an issue	
212	Y	Y	Y	Y	
213	Y	Y	Y	Y Glad to see community involvement; truly hope the planning incorporates efforts to shift “travel” mindset from individualism to community.	
214	Y	Y	Y	Y Flexibility to trade.	

<b>Communities in Motion</b>		<b>February 2005 Public Workshops</b>			<b>Evaluation</b>
<b>Comment Sheet #</b>	<b>1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?</b>	<b>3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.</b>	<b>4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.</b>	<b>5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.</b>	
215	Y	Y	Y	Y	
216	Y	Y	Y	Y Diverse group with varied background	
217	Y	Y Quite well done.	Y	Y Obviously, trying to distill the growth alternatives down to a manageable number to try to get consensus on is a near-impossible task, and requires adoption of a number of trade-off assumptions. I was not comfortable with the available alternatives and the way they were presented.	
218	Y	Well, couldn't actually see or read the opening charts.	After clarification	Y Liked to listen & learn from the other participants. We had an extremely knowledgeable group.	
219	Y	Y	Y	Y It works for people who already have some background in these issues &/or who have a specific agenda. It is hard for older people to hear & participate very much.	
220	Y	Y	Y	Y Thank you. Very well organized.	
221	Y	Y	Y	Y Effective facilitation! The content and purpose was succinctly communicated. Our group facilitator Morris was very effective. The summarization of previous workshop was clear. The materials were useable and effective.	
222	Y	Y	Y	Y Excellent opportunity to help define the infrastructure within the Treasure Valley. Thank you!!	
223	Y	Y	Y	Y	
224	Y	Y	Y	Y	
225	Y	Y	Y	Y	
226	Y	Y But complicated	Y Some confusion on just what strips represented in length	Y A bit too much to do in time allotted	
227	Y	Y	Y	Y Very informative	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
228	Y	Y Too rapid	N Too rapid	1. I would have preferred that the pieces be magnetic – <u>moveable</u> – easier to deal with. 2. More time / <u>smaller</u> groups 3. Use aerial maps that show the <u>reality</u> of what’s already <u>existing</u> (Although, I recognize that reality may have been <u>intentionally</u> absent.)	
229	Y	Y	Y	Y Good exercise in consensus process needed to make planning decision	
230	Y	Y	Y	Y	
231	Y	Y	Y	Y Well organized. Table coordinator did a good job in keeping to the subject.	
232	Y	Y	Y Some confusion about what all the colors stood for	Y	
233	Y	Y	Y	Y [No] enough time or too much to do.	
234	N	Y	Y	N The group was too large, and the time too short. This quickly degenerated to mob rule driven by emotions. The result is a hodgepodge of agendas. Also, most of the people have no concept of the road types such as highways and arterials.	
235	Y	Y	Y	Y But organization too much to cover in the time, too broad to get efficient concentration – better to take by smaller increments.	
236	Y Time & Y location were appropriate	N I was unsure of what our goals were and the group was extremely hard to keep on task	N I was unsure of what our goals were and the group was extremely hard to keep on task	The format would have been better if there were more clear. The group was very difficult to keep focused and were all over the board.	
237	Y	Y	Y	Y It was a good exercise in hearing diverse opinions and trying to mesh together a realistic plan.	
238	Y	Y	Y	Y It allowed a small group to express their ideas.  Little thought was given to removing traffic from I-84.	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
239	Y	Y	Y	Y Tough exercise to perform in limited time. Tough to build group consensus if that was the objective.  Enlightening experience to hear a diverse group of views regarding [expansion] of transportation issues within the Treasure Valley.	
240	Y	Y	Y It would have been good to have more elaboration regarding the different scenarios (land-use).	Y	
241	Y	Y	Y	Y This was a good way to create ideas and get people involved.	
242	Y	Y	Y	Y Good involvement.	
243	Y	Y	Y Great to have a facilitator at each table.	Y Great active involvement & participation.	
244	Y	Y Being absent from the first workshop made it challenging for many of us – the PowerPoint in the begging was good, but little too quick.	Y Sonia was good!	Y This was incredibly interesting. There was such a diversity of age, length of time living in Idaho, employment and general transportation attitudes. This is how I always envisioned Treasure Valley residents to be – working together, listening, making logical compromises that benefit everyone. I look forward to participating again.	
245	Y	Y	Y	Y Sonia did a wonderful job facilitating our group. She helped different temperaments and convictions come to compromise.	
246	Y	Y The new people didn't get the concept for a while but eventually caught on	Y	Y	
247	Y	Y	Y	Y	
248	Y	Y	Y	Y Needed more time.	
249	Y	Y	Y	Y	
250	Y	Y	Y	Y Good interactive format.	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops			Evaluation
Comment Sheet #	1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule?  If not, what is your preference?	3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.	4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.	5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.	
251	Y It was fine	Y	Y	Y I believe this actively brings in new and positive ideas from the people who <u>elect</u> you.	
252	Y	Y Well done.	Y	Y	
253	Y	Y	Y	Y Facilitator did a great job to [line] us out & give direction	
254	Y	Y	Y	Y A handout describing the various terms may be helpful to private citizens who are not familiar with all the terms.	
255	Y	Y	Y For the most part	Y	
256	Y	Y	Y	Y	
257	Y	Y Great overview of the last presentation & what was expected out of this workshop.	Y See #3	Y Like the group interaction. Good feedback from participants.	
258	Y	Y	Y	Y	
259	Y	Y	Y	Y	
260	Y	Y	Y Part way into strip activity, could have benefited from knowing difference b/t arterial, freeway, rural highway with functional class map	Y Very Good!	
261	Y	Y	Y	Y Great input but we needed more time. after we got the plan layed out – many of us would have chosen to go with a different plan (once we saw the impact)	
262	Y	Y	Y	Y Good overview - Good facilitators - Question about Treasure Valley growth – Do we really want to double our [ ? ]	
263	Y	Y	Y	Y Good overall participation at my table  Exception: not enough discussion about walking & biking replacing “short” auto trips & the infrastructure in place to suggest it. Most of the transit discussion sounded like transit could solve everything which it cannot.	

<b>Communities in Motion</b>		<b>February 2005 Public Workshops</b>			<b>Evaluation</b>
<b>Comment Sheet #</b>	<b>1, Did the time and location work well for your schedule? If not, what is your preference?</b>	<b>3 Was the presentation clear? Explain.</b>	<b>4 Were the instructions clear? Explain.</b>	<b>5 Overall did you like the workshop format? Explain.</b>	
264	Y	Y	Y	Y	
265	Y	Y A little long. Please don't read PowerPoint slides aloud	Y	Y	
266	Y	Y	Y	Y Scott was excellent	
267	Y	N Too fast of a review of the different development models – the trip time & mileage compensations were useful – but not available during the discussions	Y	Y Terrific opportunity to participate. However, I would have liked the facilitation to help insure make [ ? ] & fact to [ ? ] discussion.	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops	Comments
No.	Please provide the Communities in Motion project team with any additional comments regarding today's workshop.		
2	<p>While the exercise was productive, I remain skeptical of the "beauty contest" process of planning where a few activists make decisions for the community's future. And I also fear the outcome is predetermined to meet certain official's agendas, or the study leader's objectives.</p> <p>I have less concern for <i>CIM</i> but seriously believe the blueprint for growth <i>IS</i> preconceived.</p> <p>It will be interesting to see if that proves correct.</p>		
3	<p>This workshop was a good learning experience and an opportunity to work with others [&amp;] who might not agree with my views for how growth should be managed. It was enlightening to experience first-hand how difficult [ ] the development process is. Again, I just hope our ideas will be considered by those "in charge" – our legislators, developers and planners. What is done under our watch will affect generations to come. I hope we can "get it right!"</p>		
5	<p>The rocky mountain states have been on a roll for at least the past ten years. People and businesses will move here in spite of the efforts of Chamber of Commerce &amp; other growth promoting groups. We no longer need to "bullhorn" to the rest of the world that the Boise valley is the only place to live &amp; work.</p> <p>Quality of life and overgrowth are an inverse proportion – this has proven to be true in countless cities across the U.S.</p> <p>No one mentions water, the resource [which] will ultimately decide how many people can live here. Regarding clean air, we can enjoy 6 months of inversion if we continue uncontrolled growth.</p> <p>Lets attack the cause of our problem instead of dealing forever with the effects. It is not un-American to protect the natural resources and life style that brought most of us here.</p> <p>CB</p> <p>P.S. The "money trail" should not be the only consideration in our planning.</p>		
6	<p>I firmly believe that the valley needs to take advantage of the Nampa-Boise rail line. Rail transit is expensive but we have a route that will save a lot of money.</p> <p>Even with rail transit there is a need for massive widening of arterials.</p> <p>Dave [Thangas] 208-841-0580</p>		
7	<p>I think the concept is good. The practical use of drawing [anything] but "overview" desires and wants of the people is all you can expect.</p> <p>Need larger debate of the practical issues of mass transit, specifically light rail. I'm of the opinion that a valley as spread out as we are &amp; based on 25 yr projection of 800,000 that rail can't be supported. Bus &amp; BRT make more sense. We should include discussion on what we want to look like.</p>		
8.	<p>[refer to commentor's question 5] We were given four scenarios from which to choose, with a guideline to select one that would establish a condition that "you would like to see when completed." To my mind, that guideline <b>skewed the process</b> away from working on solutions to our existing growth problems and toward dreaming about pie-in-the-sky transportation facilities for a popular future scenario. Naturally, almost all the table groups in the room selected the "Satellite Cities" scenario. This was predictable at the outset, because of that guideline, and I told our facilitator so (Nicole).</p> <p>At our workshop table, two (of nine) of us initially opted for the "Trend" scenario because we were focused on facing the reality of Treasure Valley's existing growth trends, and we hoped to focus on establishing a condition that would alleviate current and forecast traffic/transportation issues as we know them. Reminded of the guideline, however, we relented and went along with the "dreaming" in our group to establish the group's best-forecast scenario for Treasure Valley.</p> <p>I am pessimistic about the continuing effect of existing growth trends. This is mostly because we citizens do not have an effective means of controlling growth, as your workshop might suggest. Our existing planning and zoning ordinances only facilitate growth and do little to control it. Poorly written regulation shave had the effect of putting the developers in charge – wherever they want to establish a residential or commercial development, all they have to do is acquire the land (with tits water rights) and follow the rules for submitting a proposal to the proper authorities. Suddenly, infrastructure is needed in a former agricultural location that was fully serviced by one farm family. Then the consequences: inadequate impact fees associated with the development lead to rising taxes for existing citizens who do not necessarily benefit from it. Schools, arterials and public transportation needed to service new development get addressed only after the fact, when the need becomes painfully pressing ...like now! All the while, developers and realtors are playing Monopoly with Treasure valley resources, and we residents get to pay the bill for schools and highways and public</p>		

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops		Comments
No.	Please provide the Communities in Motion project team with any additional comments regarding today's workshop.			
	transportation. Robert L Knawa Meridian, ID			
9.	Unfortunately my work schedule does not permit me to attend any of this week's Communities in Motion exercises, but I wanted to express how important the Treasure Valley's future transit solutions are to me. Will there be an opportunity (e.g. online survey) for those of us who are unable to attend these exercised to weight in on these important issues? If that's not feasible, I would like to express my support for a light-rail line between Caldwell and Boise (extending to Gowen). Thank you for conducting the Communities in Motion exercises. My only hope is that we can be proactive enough with our actions today to adequately prepare for the volume of growth which will undoubtedly occur in the future. Sincerely, Kirsten Lagomarsino			
10	1. See front 2. More arterial improvements are needed on State, Chinden, Ustick, Overland, Victory (East-West) because travel demand will justify way before rail will be able to be feasible. 3. Rail on existing rail corridor (E-W) is definitely feasible in the future 20 years. 4. [Ho V] travel way long existing rail corridor is needed ASAP; then transition to 2-way. 5. [Ho v] LRT corridor in 20 years on I-84 otherwise!			
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We choose satellite cities model w/public rail transit funding (close [tie] w/concentrated mixed use – we thought it emphasized [ ? ] too much [])</li> <li>• <b>THE MOST IMPORTANT</b> consideration is that policy makers MAKE policy through zone change, state code title ii, coordination w/governor's office &amp; [comp.] plan.</li> <li>• Must make it more difficult to update – amend – change plan. Towns/cities must have placemaking efforts /renewal efforts.</li> </ul> So <u>Policy</u> must represent plan!			
19	Boise River Flood Control District No. 10 would like to receive an electronic copy of the results of this effort. The District needs to use this information for future planning efforts. As an observation This exercise, by providing the road deficiency map, essential preordained the [buck] of the results. Boise River Flood Control District #10, P.O. Box 46, Star, ID			
21	Would like to see more elected officials observing/hearing the presentations/attending ↳ To help with the “political will”			

Communities in Motion	February 2005 Public Workshops	Comments
No.	Please provide the Communities in Motion project team with any additional comments regarding today's workshop.	
30	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I am <u>vehemently</u> against <u>overhead</u> rail for miles. Boston, which is eliminating the overhead rail system and converting to <u>underground</u>(the "Big Dig") is tearing out all of their overhead rail. The massive concrete structures, the squealing tracks, the deep shadows cast, the poor business climate, the dust, trash, vagrants – have all disappeared and been replaced with miles of beautiful parks. <u>Most of All</u> ... It has brought together isolated communities on <u>both sides</u> of the right of way – for the first time in a century. <u>Nobody</u> has brought up the importance of pulling together communities on both sides of a formidable right of way barrier.</li> <li>It is strange to me that nobody has brought up the concept of reducing the enormous school bus system and putting the savings into <u>public</u> bus transportation. When I was a child in Berkeley, in late 1940's – there was <u>no such thing as a school bus</u>. Kids purchased a monthly <u>punch card</u> for a reduced rate. Low income families could get <u>free</u> punch cards. Most of all ... children using <u>public transportation</u> from the beginning ... are <u>psychologically</u> set up to accept bus transportation as an adult. S. Lamb 853-3452 &lt;lamb@spro.net&gt;</li> </ul>	
31	<p>Public transportation – bus; bus rapid transit ← interesting! In the future rail/or light rail is essential.</p> <p>Boulevards would enhance our environment</p> <p>There were many good ideas presented by the various groups.</p> <p>Bus Rapid Transit – would be more feasible in the future over light rail between areas. Busses can be moved, etc [and] routes changed.</p> <p>Maybe street cars in Boise, Meridian might be something to aim for – at least <u>long term</u>. However, the cost of rails, etc. make this expensive.</p> <p>Busses starting earlier &amp; going till 9 or 10:00 pm would make the bus available to more people.</p> <p>Also busses more frequent – at least ½ hr - - every 15 min. in areas with a lot of ridership.</p> <p>I liked the spine system – corridor for busses &amp; use of existing train tracks.</p>	
32	Our two reps from Idaho City would like to have someone from the planning staff visit and meet with our group to better understand our projections.	
37	<p>What I would do if I had more \$\$:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Add light rail where feasible and connect BRT. <u>High speed</u> transit is critical to growth. → Regular bus system gets caught in traffic and is of limited effectiveness in changing user's behavior.</li> <li>Add <u>No Access</u> bypass to freeway. This is good for moving extra traffic but limits development in the wrong areas. Do not want bypass to drive development south of town.</li> </ol>	
38	I'd like to be involved in planning	
52	I hope the sincere effort and thought provided to COMPASS will be taken as seriously and implemented.	
55	<p>Great collaborative process! We came from different perspectives and didn't always agree at the start, but reached consensus by the end.</p> <p>Now we need to build it!</p>	
56	<p>[Page, handwriting difficult to read] Bus. C – Balance transit w/needed road improvements. BRT – Rail/State/Chinden – old [interurban]. [?RT] – [ ? ? ] ½ cost Streetcar – Boise, Meridian. BRT [Spus] – Nampa, Caldwell Wider freeway – Mer &amp; Caldwell New arterial – SH-16 connection across</p> <p>NEW Road Crossings. @ Hwy 16, 3 Crx. IMP – Linder, [Middleton]</p> <p>New rural Hwy – Emmett to Fwy. Wider many existing rural hwy. Arterial Improvements – E/W corridor Ten Mile Interchange.</p> <p>Bypass. No needed extra funds.</p>	
60	<p>It was too warm in the room.</p> <p>Thanks for the snacks.</p>	

Communities in Motion	February 2005 Public Workshops	Comments
No.	Please provide the Communities in Motion project team with any additional comments regarding today's workshop.	
61	I'm impressed by the number of people here and the diversity of perspectives represented. THANK YOU !	
66	Like to see more involvement for public rather than professionals in the biz of planning/design/construction.	
74	NOTE! Re: Caldwell's interchange #29 West Bound <u>off ramp</u> needs to be multilane & extended to afford safer exiting. Eastbound <u>onramp</u> needs to be multilane w/free right at the top (US 20-26) & extended acceleration length. Nampa's easternmost interchange needs to have East Bound on ramp extended & possible [multilane].	
80	Thanks for the food.	
81	It would be great if you could offer [child care]. <u>Please</u> have tape & stickers that we can remove and replace	
82	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Moderator Charles was flexible, professional and worked fluidly with group</li> <li>• A followup informational sheet would be helpful directed back to contributors might [ ? ] them to attend positively to any future public formats.</li> </ul>	
86	I think it might be more beneficial to group people in cities or communities for one of the sessions so that they can reach consensus in what is closest to home before moving into other communities & areas.	
88	Want to see developments moved toward land that is not agriculture – Future communities east of Boise where state 6 BLM lands are available.	
98	This type of planning is good. I really enjoyed myself.	
99	Really enjoyed the workshop. Feel a master plan for the whole treasure valley would be an excellent idea.	
100	Very thoughtful presentation and eye opening to some problems	
102	Very sorry that the organization has not look at water supply issues. [Another] day.	
107	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. I know I am old (78).</li> <li>2. Lived in Idaho 1938-2005</li> <li>3. USN 1949-1970</li> <li>4. <u>Demand</u> dictates supply of food, clothing, shelter, pleasure, health &amp; welfare</li> <li>5. <u>Demand</u> for above dictates supply of farms, factories, schools, government, businesses</li> <li>6. <u>Demand</u> for above dictates supply of streets, highways, towns, cities, businesses</li> </ol> <p>1900 Treasure Valley was Agriculture, and supporting enterprises. Neighbors helped neighbors. Roads, Highways, Schools, businesses and government expanded as needed. Often times the squeaky wheel got the grease. Other times tradition over ruled the need for change.</p> <p>2005 the use of computers indicates the need for information to be put in a form to accommodate the process. It seems like this workshop was a re-run of COMPASS works done in previous years.</p> <p>Funding of most projects with tax payers money is usually more expensive than by private funds. –Glen. Glen R. Grosenbach, 601 S 13<sup>th</sup> Ave., Caldwell, ID 83605-4218</p>	

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops	Comments
No.	Please provide the Communities in Motion project team with any additional comments regarding today's workshop.		
108	It is difficult to get some folks to use this method. They just want to air their opinions. This slows the process down.		
110	I liked the format and the randomness of the groups. Only suggestion would be to potentially ask participants as they arrive, where they live. Then try to distribute at least a little. Our group had no one from Gem County and thus we ignored it. Other groups only had Gem County ...		
113	Was a good idea except typically we were hung up on band-aids		
118	Definitely need more time		
121	Limited access roadways is a <u>crucial</u> need. Our roadways for moving traffic – Chinden, Star Rd., Hwy 16, State, etc. – are all [ ? ] access that slows traffic. We desperately need roadways w/o lights and numerous driveway accesses. Even one mile increments are too much on roads intended to move traffic quickly (i.e. Chinden and 16). Interchanges, frontage roads, anything but lights and another Eagle Rd. and what Chinden seems to be becoming.		
123	Thanks for asking our ideas!		
124	Well executed and effective		
126	Some of the presentations at the end prompted more thoughts & comments at our table		
132	Please provide the sources of the proposed \$1.2 B budget Please incorporate the impact on area water supplies for proposed growth		
133	Remember to keep the northern portion of the valley in mind while planning. Currently you may not receive much input from people in those areas, but by developing access to that portion the traffic burden can be reduced in Ada & Canyon counties.		
142	Good workshop – saw a lot of different designs		
150	The facilitator did an excellent job (Nicole).		
161	Time was only adequate to scratch the surface of most of the issues Format somewhat allows for dominant personalities to steer the direction of their group, but most people were outgoing and willing to speak their minds.		
163	As new major arterials are developed they need to be provided with frontage road to protect them from too many intersections		
165	The workshop was great and brings many perspectives to lite. I felt the people at my table were unrealistic since they were either from L.A. or New York. Most rode bikes or took the bus, and did not even own a car or a driver license.		
166	Vegan/Vegetarian option for workshop snacks. Young people need to be more involved. More advertising in high schools? I appear to be the only high school student here.		
167	Think about improving greenbelt path quality ( it is rapidly deteriorating). Educate public on studies that say that road widening does not work – quickly returns to traffic jam situation. I think gas taxes should provide the majority of funding along with a new development tax.		
168	Overall the exercise is comprehensive – I only wish more time could be allowed to apply solutions to areas that we might not consider until its too late.		
169	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some of the workshop organizers in the back need to SHUT UP when someone else is speaking.</li> <li>• One more hour would have been useful ([in] the option). Because we were running out of time we didn't plan carefully enough about the placements of some of the bus liens. Another hour would have made the difference between the map we produced and a more efficient &amp; better map.</li> </ul>		

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops	Comments
No.	Please provide the Communities in Motion project team with any additional comments regarding today's workshop.		
170	Hot vegetarian option would have been nice. Facilitators and "rovers" were <u>excellent!</u>		
172	If there are clear deficiencies under all scenarios – the project team should allocate \$ for those improvements – so that the workshop participants had fewer decisions to make in such a short time.		
174	The maps were an effective tool and were great guidance during the exercise.		
175	The new highways suggested by the Governor are not all needed. The one north out of Emmett is especially bad. Cutting 15 minutes off a trip of 2 or more hours is not a good use of taxpayer funds. It also impacts deer winter range. New highways should address actual problems. Widening Hwy 16 from Star to Emmett is a good example.		
177	Would like to hear more about budget & impediments to implementation. Maybe that will come later.		
178	The message from the members/participants came across very clean – they really want public transportation. Hopefully, everyone knows what they are asking for, because they may get it. People somehow need to start planning to use the system they want instead of counting on their neighbors to make it work. They'll also need to be prepared to reach into their wallets to fund the short falls/expenses of the public transportation systems.		
180	Excellent workshop. Facilitators handled "agendas" very well! – Kept the teams working together.		
183	Need more localized focus meetings – too much to try to deal w/large area covering Boise to Nampa and wide scope of problems & interests at this one meeting. None of the issues I attended to try to address were touched on. Disappointing. * One out of fourteen } Community quality issues were only addressed by one group in their summary. Lack of adequate neighborhood/social opportunities for human interactions is a major contributor to people driving across town(s) to seek that contact, [culture], etc.		
186	Hopefully – the elected leadership will buy into and make decisions that support plan and deny counterproductive growth.		
191	The sense of under investment in transit options did come forward, by allowing horse trading of freeway expansion for bus systems. It appears that investment in transit exceeded the 35% of Set B.		
192	Keep up the efforts to involve the Public.		
193	I think you would get a better product if teams were selected based on some common [interests] and education. Teams could be allowed to meet 3 or 4 times in a 7 day period and the product would likely incorporate projected road usages. Richard Rogers 2-3-05		
194	My first workshop, I'll come again.		
197	I really hope local jurisdictions can actually follow through, & be enforced with the resultant plan. How will this plan actually be followed/enforced to ensure the good growth.		
198	Our group did not consider pathways. I strongly support the river green belt pathway being extended and improved to as far west as to old Fort Boise at Parma.		
200	Unclear what costs of alternatives means. Does cost include long term maintenance and operations? Not clear where our plans compliment or oppose current DOT and ACHD & IDOT plans –		

Communities in Motion		February 2005 Public Workshops	Comments
No.	Please provide the Communities in Motion project team with any additional comments regarding today's workshop.		
	<p>Who will operate bus system? Does cost included here include all operation &amp; maintenance costs for busses &amp; drivers?            No options for bike lanes or separate paths.            Will transportation drive growth? Growth drive transportation? Need explanation of how our results &amp; conclusions will drive planning &amp; zoning.</p>		
204	✓ Good location for workshop		
212	Let's focus on rail corridor along State St.!		
218	<p>Change "Emission Testing" of autos to a STATE wide LAW [nothing] than county's law.            [Cyprus trees] help absorb emissions from vehicles, so should be used on The Boulevards.            Since "Health" is so important as an ingredient of LIFE – we should think first of it in planning. Emission (because of geographics) is a MAJOR problem – "Clean Air" is absolutely VITAL to life – and we are planning [humans] &amp; livability!</p>		
219	<p>It would have been helpful to have more clear info on the land uses identified on our map. It's hard to match transportation needs w/land uses when you don't know what they are.            Overall, good media coverage &amp; you're getting the word out to a somewhat larger &amp; broader group of people, especially geographically.</p>		
220	Our group didn't consider a boulevard for Chinden – but it sounds like a great idea to improve vitality there.		
221	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider rail bed for national rail system</li> <li>• Extend light rail to Boise Terminal</li> <li>• Build a new Indian Valley Cutoff</li> </ul>		
222	Look at creating more bike & walk lanes within the communities.		
223	<p>In the event that in the future there is a national program to improve nationwide rail travel (Amtrak or whatever it might be called) the rail line into the Boise Depot should be preserved for the future as is &amp; not changed for light rail.            If an intercity line be developed between Boise &amp; surrounding cities, it should be on the same tracks as the Amtrak line. Many cities <u>use</u> the same line for commuter traffic as for national traffic.</p>		
224	<p>Design the following to all plans:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Bicycle lanes</li> <li>2. Trees/plantings that "absorb" noise and auto emissions.</li> <li>3. Keep rail system with expansion to a national infrastructure in mind.</li> </ol>		
228	It was difficult to hear everyone (& to be heard by everyone)		
234	I think this would work much better if you allowed people to select their own team members, and work on this for several evenings. The results would be much more thorough and coherent. Brian Renstrom <a href="mailto:bjrenstrom@rmci.net">bjrenstrom@rmci.net</a>		
236	<p>The funding options for strips was very unrealistic and gave the general public a false idea of what funding would be available in the future and what that funding could provide to the region.            If the task would have stayed on target and been more realistic, I think the exercise would have been more valuable.</p>		

Communities in Motion	February 2005 Public Workshops	Comments
<b>No.</b>	<b>Please provide the Communities in Motion project team with any additional comments regarding today's workshop.</b>	
240	I found the workshop to be useful, but it seems there are options that have been overlooked such as options to widening roads. This will only lead to the additional lanes being filled up – there are great alternatives that may have been suggested in the presentation – maybe an information session.	
243	With much public sentiment in favor of an I-84 bypass, why did each of our tables decide to not plan for it? Perhaps it is not as popular as it seems. Was the workshop biased against it? Nampa belt route to access I-84 was heavily favored. Commuter rail between Nampa & Boise seemed very popular. But many claim it won't be well used.	
244	I'm not sure how you put the groups together, but it was really random & great! I learned a lot.	
246	I think we needed more written material with statistics – there were people who were misinformed about the number of people who commute or not. Numbers about pollution & where it is coming from. I'd like to see a little about what other communities experiences were after adding a bypass or light rail – why it worked, why it didn't.	
252	Well done and hopefully will help our community figure out how to deal with growth and providing for a transportation system to deal with it. I strongly support the satellite cities scenario.	
253	This was my first meeting w/Communities in Motion, but will not be my last. Very enjoyable I learned a lot.	
254	This has been a really fun and interesting process. I learned a lot from other participants. I enjoy hearing the other groups ideas	
256	The only bad part of a workshop format is some people go out on their own without group majority. Hard to guard against though., cause people will never agree on anything.	
259	This was a great opportunity. The staff did well and participants were open and had real opinions. Good job. [Tom Holloway]	
262	Question about growth assumptions (most citizens don't favor rapid growth) Need more about short trips walkability – bicycle network.	
264	Hard to keep everyone's opinions in one direction.	
265	Not as helpful as first workshop. We had a lot of questions/discussion re: would we be enabling sprawl/far out growth if we build more roads/expand existing roadways	
266	Would have liked to include public infrastructure – For better planning we need to know where the destinations/are or will be	