

How long have you been a resident of Boise?	In what area of Boise do you currently live?	Are you a member of any group related to this topic (i.e. neighborhood association, Preservation Idaho, development group, etc)? If so, which group? If not, please answer none.	I am a current resident of the City of Boise.	In your opinion, who will benefit if this project is built? (Scenario 1)	In your opinion, who will be disadvantaged if this development goes forward? (Scenario 1)	In your opinion, what impacts most concern you about a development like this one? (Scenario 1)	In your opinion, who will benefit if this project is built? (Scenario 2)	In your opinion, who will be disadvantaged if this development goes forward? (Scenario 2)	In your opinion, what impacts most concern you about a development like this one? (Scenario 2)	In your opinion, who will benefit if this project is built? (Scenario 3)	In your opinion, who will be disadvantaged if this development goes forward? (Scenario 3)	In your opinion, what impacts most concern you about a development like this one? (Scenario 3)	After reviewing these hypothetical scenarios, is there anything else you'd like to the City to know or be aware of?
Response	Response	Open-Ended Response	Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response	Open-Ended Response
6-10 years	West/Northwest	none	Yes										
20+years	North/Northeast	EENA, Friends of Military Reserve, Keep Boise Connected, Central Additional Advisory Committee, Armony Subcommittee (EENA)	Yes										
20+years	Southeast	Nextdoor	Yes	only the developer	Neighbors and tenants - no place to park so tenants will park on public streets. Decreasing values of single family homes in the area. This practice needs to be stopped now. David Case and Jim Tibbs should be voted out	Tenant won't stay. No parking. Cars will be buglarized. Value driven down in area	Stop allowing developers to build without ample parking. Tibbs and Case should go to jail	All tenants and surrounding homeowners	insufficient parking. tenants will not stay....buglaries	Out of state developer only	The roads are so crowded now...expand the roads first and develop later	With Cloverdale bridge down commuters are terrible. Fix roads first	Case and Tibbs are fat cats who only care about money. They are ruining Boise. Planning has gone out the window and all that matters is putting people in substandard housing. Shame on you
20+years	West/Northwest	Collister Neighborhood Association	Yes	Renters, developer/owner, city taxes	existing neighborhood	height of buildings, lack of parking, lack of school space, high rent	developer, city taxes	current neighborhood lifestyle	lack of buffer to existing neighborhood, inadequate parking, no access to bus	developer, city taxes	current neighborhood	no bus access, limited bike/pedestrian facilities	Concern about infrastructure keeping up, police, fire, wastewater, water, electric, schools, transit
1-5 years	West/Northwest		No										
20+years	Bench	none	Yes	All levels of income that wish to have easy access to city amenities. Of course the developer and banking institutions and the city due to additional tax revenue.	Additional crime in the area. My opinion is based upon experience living near apartment complexes in the Boise area. Boise city residents forced into paying for school bonds to cover additional needed school capacity (I would prefer that the development pay for the needed capacity).	Almost 50% of my property tax bill consists of school bonds. With the absence of impact fees for school infrastructure, existing residents that have already paid for their infrastructure needs are forced to pay for the new resident needs. Even though there are impact fees for roads and police, the additional crime will impact the quality of live of those around the apartment complex.	The developers, Realtors and banking institutions as well as the city by increasing tax revenues.	Existing neighbors that must deal with the additional population density and construction to increase infrastructure capacity. I also believe that the long term school capacity will be impacted (this has occurred everywhere I have lived in the valley)	Short term, the construction phase impact to surrounding neighbors. Long term, school capacity requiring bonds, increased pressure on roadways to access shopping, schools, jobs, etc...	The developors (both out of state and local), Realtors, Banking institutions and city tax revenue.	Existing residents that have become accustomed to open space and quiet sound levels. Eventually, the schools will be out of capacity leading to school bond levies.	No major concerns other than for those who will no longer be living a rural lifestyle.	I would wish that the growth of Boise would also include bring quality employment opportunities like what was provided by HP, Micron and other higher income employers. It appears that the majority of the growth involves building more shopping opportunities and low paying employment such as food service, salespersons for shopping. I am surrounded by low quality businesses that contribute little to the quality of life and very little to bringing in top talent that contributes to the caliber of new residents.
11-15 years	Southwest	none	No										
16-20 years	Southeast	Idaho Fair Housing Forum	Yes	Current renters seeking reasonable market and affordable rental rates; local businesses.	Depending on current and projected capacity, schools (including teachers, parents and children affected by overcrowding).	Long term impact on roads and traffic congestion.	Median income families struggling to find market rate homes in Boise. Retail and other businesses looking to expand beyond Boise metro. Opportunity to develop and expand bike and other non-motor transportation networks.	Low income individuals and families (low income tax credit, etc.). We need more affordable housing.	New construction not including affordable housing; immediate lack of bike infrastructure for families and those seeking walkability; environmental impacts of auto dependence; increased traffic congestion.	Middle and low income families and individuals seeking single family housing.	Potential loss of open space to the community.	Sprawl vs. carefully developed density. Lack of new construction for affordable housing. No bus access or bike infrastructure. Increased traffic and air pollution.	Only appreciation for the opportunity for our community to share input and concerns (via multiple mediums) as we face rapid growth!
6-10 years	North/Northeast	NENA; City of Boise	Yes										
1-5 years	West/Northwest	LEAP Charities	Yes	Tenants, the City as a whole	adjacent neighbors' concern about view being blocked could be legitimate	Traffic impact - tenants need incentives to forego parking spaces in favor of public transportation/biking. Aesthetics - need to ensure quality design since it's in historic neighborhood.							
20+years	North/Northeast	none	No										
11-15 years	West/Northwest	none	Yes										
20+years	North/Northeast	none	Yes	The developer and people who can afford to rent there and want to live near the downtown core but in a nice residential neighborhood.	Surrounding neighbors who lose views and may deal with higher traffic loads on already crowded streets, possibly kids, parents and teachers experiencing effects of more children in their school	My income is less than the median you indicate so, for me, it's one more thing to tax me out of the home I do not wish to leave. I think it's probably good to have some higher density, upper scale housing nearer to the city core to stave off deterioration of neighborhoods closer to downtown. There probably isn't a way to keep these neighborhoods from such deterioration without introducing higher end, higher density housing. Though I'm not, at all, sure that is what the housing in this scenario is meant to depict.	The developer, new residents moving into town who want to live fairly close to downtown but in somewhat established neighborhoods, any others who might like to live in the area and can afford the pricing.	Existing neighbors who lose the "open space" elements of the vacant farmland, all of us, in terms of general lack of preservation of open spaces, any who end up dealing with heavier traffic that results from the additional population density.	Whether anything is done to maintain any kind of open spaces. Parks are one thing but they're not the same as natural open spaces and we don't necessarily do that great of a job even preserving park space. Or we use our park space as summer child care facilities, leaving the parks not terribly welcoming to those who sought a peaceful outdoor experience.	The property owner, the developer and the wealthy who get to live away from higher density areas.	Anyone who was actively enjoying the open space the area had been providing, anyone who had other ideas for what might have gone into the area, other than housing, taxpayers who will get to share in the tax consequences but not necessarily any of the benefits.	The fact that ongoing fringe development has to, ultimately, mean the valley ends up just one big pile of humanity with no natural open spaces left. Yep, that's a broad brushstroke answer but it's what strikes me as worrisome about all this stretching out of any city.	I'd like the city to look to maintain flexibility, to whatever extent it can, and to slow growth to the extent that it can. I'd also note that with growth comes both good and bad, in terms of things noted in the scenarios as well as homelessness, poverty, mental illness, crime rates, accessibility to basic needs as well as those beyond basic. There's a lot to think about and I simply hope the city does a good job of that. And, as for me, personally, I am concerned that I am not the only one who's lived in the north end for awhile who must wonder if we're on our way to being taxed out of living in our homes there. Is there a way to prevent that; to protect existing modest income homeowners from being unable to remain in their homes?
11-15 years	Southwest	none	Yes	Developer	Residents	Very High Density in non High density area. Secondly traffic estimates are not correct based on actual experience. Thirdly, road infrastructure is never invested with necessary improvements and instead the fees and taxes which developer pays, a fraction of the same is kept for that area with minimal changes and investments in surrounding roads including feeders. Same is true for policing and education institution too. More policemen in same ratio are not hired and neither are adequate schools constructed prior to approval, leading to deteriorating living standards, higher taxes in later years when schools and policing needs expand. And that money goes from residents and not from developers pocket and City just passes on the buck to residents to take care of the same. Now instead of just sharing problems, I can share solutions too, having lived and travelled across major hubs of the world.	Developer and the City	Not many and no one specific in any major manner	Lack of collection of enough money to avoid tax burden on residents of the city to maintain existing standards / ratio per resident for police, firemen, schools, medical providers and the width + quality of roads infrastructure.	City and its residents		Lack of wider roads and maintenance for the same, enough quality schools, medical providers, policeman without any additional burden on city residents for next 10 years at minimum.	I am for complete support for development but am opposed to unhindered expansion without applying all tests to not only present needs but also our needs in future and how we would handover this beautiful city to our future generations. We need to be responsible to nature too and not just approve projects just because of the fact that they get money.....I have seen first hand as to how "planned development" leads to significant issues and create an impression of unplanned working. I have seen it as how it creates issues related to crime, poor and crumbling infrastructure, deteriorated living standards. Many folks who live in the valley (including Meridian, Eagle and even Star / Kuna) love what valley has to offer and when they oppose, authorities need to seriously listen and introspect, and then re-calibrate the reviewal and approval process which achieves win-win for all. City and Residents on a confrontation path because of development definitively shows that something is seriously wrong as this was never the case in past....I am more than happy to share examples of good developments and bad developments across the world in some of the cities across the world.
6-10 years	Bench	none	Yes	the developer	homeowners and neighborhood community	infrastructure to support so many people, degradation of established neighborhood	developer	the farmers	lack of public transportation, loss of rural farmland	developer	The entire community of Boise	Water issues, lack of public transportation, unfettered urban sprawl	Stop favoring the developers and start paying attention to public transportation, make it easier to build on large lots, particularly on the Bench, stop
6-10 years	Southwest		Yes	Nobody	Every other resident	The amount of Californians moving into it.	Nobody	Farmers and farmland	The amount of Californians moving in	NOBODY	Farmers and ranchers	The loss of open spaces	This city is going down the ***** because of Californians
11-15 years	Southwest		Yes	The developers	The current neighborhood	Property values plummeting, overcrowding traffic	The developers	No one	Traffic increases	The owner	People who enjoy the open view	Ruining the open space that makes the valley beautiful	No

20+years	Southwest	none	Yes	People who want to live close to downtown and some who cannot pay market value for what is otherwise a nice area of town with which to live	Those who already live in the area; noise, traffic, pollution, a/o crime may always increase with new development, particularly if high-density housing is involved	The added noise and cars; it seems apartment complexes never have enough parking so it overflows on to the nearby streets. Also, rental tenants who don't care for their property like most homeowners	Anyone looking to move into a new home, including - possibly - individuals and families from outside of Idaho	Anyone already living in the area; the existing homeowners are typically disadvantaged by growth unless that growth brings in additional assets like new commercial development or schools which could help offset any negatives	increased traffic, which bring noise and air pollution, and perhaps road congestion	property owner, developer and the people (most likely from out of state) who will buy the homes	since it's on the fringe of the community, the impact should be lessened so I'm not sure who would be disadvantaged	that it creates urban/suburban sprawl (not sure that this can be avoided but perhaps can be minimized with organization and planning)	Boise is still a great place to live and work and I'm thankful that the city is trying to be as proactive as possible and to engage the community!
6-10 years	Southwest	no	Yes	Developers	Boise Citizens	Lack of infrastructure and industry to support current rate of irrational growth.	Developer	Citizens of Boise	Lack of infrastructure and industry to support the current level of irrational growth.	Developer	Citizens of Boise	Lack of infrastructure and industry to support the current level of irrational growth.	I do not support the City's current direction or leadership.
20+years	Southwest		Yes	The Developer	Existing residents	Lack of developer impact fees to fund supporting infrastructure specifically schools.	The Developer	Existing residents and the community at large due to loss open space/farm land	Impact fees never cover actual cost of impacts to roads and schools. This scenario is not possible from the very get go as there are no schools that are not at capacity. Impact fees never benefit existing residents for example development of south Cloverdale/south Boise in general. Any impact fees vanish into thin air and the roads are left over crowded. Another false presumption in this scenario is poor use of cycling as I regularly see cyclists attempting to commute in these rural areas (I commute out to the prison via Cloverdale as I live off Cloverdale/Overland) and this scenario exactly describes this area. Sadly it took a terrible fire to get the Cloverdale overpass rebuilt and this overpass is now used by many cyclists for commuting and it is finally safe for my son to ride his bike to school, also many children are now walking to Spaulding as well now that there is a safe route to do so as the overpass is now essentially a cycling/foot bridge	The developer	Wildlife and the community at large die to loss of open space and farm land.	Again this scenario is false as there are no schools with room in them. The city will always bow to the developers wishes and not upgrade the supporting infrastructure. Boise City needs to create policy to slow down growth to preserve the quality of life that people are moving here for and stop rubber stamping developers wishes.	There are no schools that are not at capacity. Boise City gives sweetheart deals to developers in order to increase property tax revenue while the existing residents are priced out of the area. Having lived in west/south west Boise for many years I see much attention being paid to improvements in East Boise, North End, and downtown while the infrastructure and amenities in my area are non-existent and/or inadequate.
20+years	Bench	Depot Bench Neighborhood	Yes										
20+years	Southwest	NO	Yes	The developer		traffic and over crowding of schools							
6-10 years	Southwest	None	Yes										
20+years	Southwest	Neighborhood	Yes	Developer	Local homeowners	Increase in traffic without proper roadways.	Developer	Existing home owners. We already have a lack of good roadways in/ out of this area with the current increase in population. We have a lack of restaurants and grocery stores inadequate for this exploding area of town.	Increasing traffic. Lack of stores, restaurants and schools. It's like the city is always behind on catching up on the supporting structures necessary for these kind of developments. Why not improve the roads prior to putting in these subdivisions. Plan on schools needed prior. So frustrating when you build up houses and subdivisions, then realize we need more than 1 lane roadways in those areas of development. PLAN AHEAD!!!	Always the developer first. People will need these homes but they will also need grocery stores, restaurants, schools and parks.	Anybody living in or around these areas where the roadways are inadequate.	Traffic.	Plan ahead! Don't build or approve these developments until you have the infrastructures in place. I am appreciate of the extension of Lake Hazel Road to Gowan but it's like you bottlenecked it to Gowan. Huge traffic there during commute times already. Think and plan ahead!!!!
6-10 years	West/Northwest	NO	Yes										
1-5 years	Southwest	None.	Yes	People who need affordable housing which is becoming less available. Also people who rely on public transportation or use bicycles.	No one unless you are someone whose view will be affected.	Overdevelopment. Developers need to put in open space. REAL open space. Not just a patch but a park area with trees and bushes. Native habitat would be best.	Developers.	Those affected by traffic. Wildlife.	Overdevelopment. Increased traffic. There is no public transportation and no talk of adding.	Out of state developer. Isn't that obvious?	Residents nearby and wildlife will both be affected by sprawl.	Loss of open space. Especially do not like the increase we are seeing in very large homes of 3,000 to 4,000 square feet on large lots. These have a larger impact on the environment than more sensible sized homes.	City needs to be more pro-resident and not so pro-developer. We need to preserve open space and create parks outside of downtown. We need public transportation. Buses do not run far out enough. Boise is too car centric. Traffic is increasing and will continue to do so. There is an increase of goose excrement in parks because they have losing other places to go.
11-15 years	Southwest	South Cole neighborhood association	Yes	The city and the developer	The community that already exists and the residents way of life	Putting something in a neighborhood that doesn't want it there and doesn't fit in with the current neighborhood	The developer and the city. No benefit to existing residents	The schools, the residents, the roads and infastucture.	Affecting the rural culture of the area, losing the open space. Increased traffic from adding density the road weren't built to handle affecting the safety of the area, crime rates will rise. It will impose on the likely hood and lifestyle of the area.	The outside property owner and developer	The rural community. Farmers.	Taking up more potential farm land. Tax payers are going to foot more of the bill for infrastructure instead of the developer	These are very probable scenarios. The city needs to do it's best to regulate growth as we are in an urban sprawl which doesn't benefit anyone. Need to keep higher density closer to the core of the city and not put multiple apartment complexes in the middle of a rural community. Our roads in the south do not have the capacity for this kind of density. Again we need to focus on slowing growth until roads, schools, and infrastructure catch up.vmake the developers pay more in impact fees. If that's not possible maybe we need to change the laws. The main thing we should all think about is the safety and well-being of our CURRENT residents, not future one. If we don't fix current issues people won't want to come here in the future. Mr. Bieter, you want Boise to be the most liveble city, so we need to do these things to maintain that modo
20+years	West/Northwest	none	Yes	developer	local residents	High concentration of people and not enough parking	Developer	Local residents	Loss of open space and not enough parking. cars parked on the streets	land owner and new residents	no one	increased commute traffic	I have been her for 45 years and life is definitely changing. I would like to see the roads improved before these developments are built.
11-15 years	Southwest	None	Yes	The Developer	Anyone living next to the apartment complex	Impact on rising cost of property tax and the decrease of home value due to proximity of the rentals.	The Developer	Anyone that chose to live out there because there was space. More open land and not feel claustrophobic. This project would ruin that serenity.	The way the houses are stacked right on top of each other. We are not San Francisco! Nor do we want to be! Developing homes is fine, but we should set a minimum standard on lot size.	The Developer and anyone looking to move to Boise for the beauty that it is and appreciate the open spaces.	The tax payers, however we are always burden when there is new growth.	Roads. Boise and ACHD have done a horrific job of making sure roads are taken care of prior to developing new sub-divisions. The intelligent thing to do would be to update to widen the roads prior to building. That way it's actually capable of handling the extra traffic. You all allow this city to grow exponentially but continue to keep 2 lane roads at 35mph. That is asinine.	Referring to my last comment, widen ALL roads and increase speed limits before you ever allow growth! That should be common sense.

						the reason everyone suffers from this development is because of the parking plan. a minimum of two spaces per unit is needed, or the streets will be clogged with parked cars, making driving those streets more hazardous. availability of mass transit will not reduce the number of cars owned by residents, even if it reduces the usage of those cars. School children and their parents will be affected by limited school availability - parents will need to drive their children to schools farther away from home, or children will spend additional time on busses, if they are available to the schools that they can attend.	developer, city, residents of new homes	residents of new and existing homes.	again, parking is inadequate for residents of townhomes and median income housing. Families have cars for each driver, and parking on streets makes navigating roadways - and maintaining roadways - difficult! Also missing is neighborhood shopping and dining opportunities. Everything is a 15 minute DRIVE away from home, which increases traffic at all times of the day, not just rush hour. Neighborhood business also increases jobs in an area, which is good, especially for young workers who don't have a way to commute into town to work!	land owner, developer, city, residents		First, this is a high-density-living plan, not leaving much space for people who are likely to have more storage needs for the "toys" of affluence. Also, one development leads to more - plan for future road needs in addition to the needs generated by this development - if homes are too close to the road, widening/improving later is significantly more difficult.	
20+years	Southwest	South Cole Neighborhood Association	Yes	developers, residents of the complex	everyone, school children								
6-10 years	West/Northwest	Steering committee	Yes	The developer	I think it's not a win for anyone	Four stories high puts his back into looking like a ghetto	The people who Supply building material	I don't know but it looks ugly and it looks really really Stepford wife	I do not have enough information	Everyone	The blight on the appearance of our fine City	Lots of open space	Try to make smaller apartment complexes not so great in height smaller places throughout the city that's what we need with parks in between
20+years	West/Northwest	Nope	Yes										
20+years	Southwest	none	Yes	The developer and the builders	Anyone in the near vicinity and everyone who travels in that area. I dont know who would project only 60 vehicles but every home has at minimum 2 drivers with vehicles these days. 100 homes = 200 vehicles. Has anyone traveled our roads these days??? Our infrastructure could NOT handle that. Few people ride the bus because our bus service in Boise is horrible and few people ride bikes...and who rides a bike in the snow??	I dont know who would project only 60 vehicles but every home has at minimum 2 drivers with vehicles these days. 100 homes = 200 vehicles. Has anyone traveled our roads these days??? Our infrastructure could NOT handle that. Few people ride the bus because our bus service in Boise is horrible and few people ride bikes...and who rides a bike in the snow??	Developer and builder	Anyone and everyone anywhere near where this is to be built.	Same as the other one. Traffic, Crime. Why does Boise believe it is a good idea to encourage people to move here? Our infrastructure can not handle it. Crime continues to grow. The income base does not support those who already live here to be able to buy houses. Housing prices dont drop, they continue to increase while wages do not. Encouraging out of state individuals to move her increases the already horrible situations and NO ONE is addressing traffic or crime.	Again, the developer and the builders	Again, anyone living near this. Now add the wild life that is affected.	Same as previous. Lack of thought to traffic issues and solving infrastructure problems, increased crime, increasing home prices, no increase in income, encouraging out of state people to move to Boise that can not handle the amount of people who already live here.	The building permits need to stop being handed out like toilet tissue. Fore though is seriously lacking on the problems all this growth brings to the area. Boise is quickly becoming a not so great place to live.
16-20 years	Southwest		Yes	The developer	Neighbors	Impact on already crowded schools	Developer	Neighbors and surrounding neighborhoods	Increase in traffic on roads that are already ill equipped for current demands	Out of state land owner, developer	Taxpayers paying for new needs	Changing the dynamics of area	It would be nice to get ahead of the growth instead of trying to play catch up indefinitely.
1-5 years	Southwest		No										
20+years	Southwest	none	No										
20+years	West/Northwest	no	Yes	The people living in the development.	The people living in the existing development.	Traffic, among other things.							
20+years	Bench	development group	Yes	Everyone	Adjacent properties	The schools - We should ALWAYS consider the schools when adding density. Creating a diverse housing ecosystem is important. All housing types and income levels should be incorporated, but the kids shouldn't suffer. It should enrich their lives by adding diversity, not overcrowding their classrooms.	Developer and some first time home buyers (not enough)	environment	environmental, infrastructure... These types of developments don't serve the community. They need additional components such as appropriately sized markets. Residents should be able to walk or bike to fulfill basic needs. This should be connected to public transit and safe bike paths.	Developer	Community and environment	Everything. We have too much of this already!	We need more infill and density. We need to consider the school capacity BEFORE it becomes a problem. We need to build our bike infrastructure, our public transportation system, and our roads with equal importance. We need to provide services to people within their neighborhoods. We can't build housing without considering the needs of the people living there ... schools, transportation, food, work, exercise, daycare, healthcare. We should have a sustainable and holistic mindset when developing housing. Housing should be a balanced ecosystem, we need diversity of housing types with the amenities and services to support them.
1-5 years	Bench	none	Yes		Nicer apartments that specifically cater to bus/bikers seem like they would appeal to younger people just moving to boise. This would also appeal to lower income folks, which we do need to consider as service industries don't pay well and are a part of a growing city	People who have lived very nearby for a long time and who don't like change. E.g. new traffic congestion. Tendency toward xenophobia or fear of new/strange people.	Average people who need homes and are looking to buy instead of rent.	I am concerned about the loss of farmland. However people need homes. I think as a result, if farmland is being usurped, it needs to be done with homes planned at a reasonably high density. I feel like the lack of nearby services might be an issue, making this a highly car-dependent community, which is unfortunate.	Inability of farmland to compete with housing market means that as a community, we need to DECIDE to keep open spaces somewhere. Lack of services means that these people need to drive miles for any small convenience. In an era of climate change, planning live-work areas with nearby community centers seems prudent.	Very wealthy people with little desire to be part of a community	These types of developments would probably anger/irritate the fewest neighbors, but if too many of these are built, there is essentially nowhere for younger, less wealthy, people to live	It just seems like a crappy way to build a community. A car-based suburb with no soul of its own and every little thing you need would require a car trip into an urban area. It caters to the ultra wealthy, putting them in a gated community where they don't have to engage with the larger population. It is essentially a form of segregation.	
11-15 years	Southeast		Yes	Californians	Idahoans	Higher population density and crime							
20+years	Southwest		Yes	Developer		Not enough parking	Developers	The homeowners around the development	Traffic on an area that can't support more.	Developers and property owners	Current residents of the area	Loss of space and the increase to traffic on roads that might not be able to support it	Think of the impact to residents in the areas, not just the need for more homes
20+years	Southwest	Mill creek	Yes	The property tax commission and the city	The current neighborhood	Traffic, schools being full already and no development on new schools. These big time developers should be hit with impact fees, they are making huge profits and it seems like no regard is given to the surrounding areas of impact	This one seems to help the community moreso	The neighbors directly attached to this farmland	More people, more crime, I'd rather see single level homes and not duplex type	The city.	Commuters	No impact fees for ACHD, if this development is on the outskirts we need a freeway system for the outskirts	We need to make these big developers accountable for the impact of traffic, our roadways and way behind
1-5 years	Southeast		Yes	The people who get to live in those awesome apartments	The neighbors. Their roads are going to be messed up with extra cars and loud apartment dwellers. Rats and roaches love dense human dwellings and they spread through the sewers and backways	Nothing	The people who get to live here. This is what my family of four was looking for when we moved to Boise. Nice quiet neighborhood, plenty of room to roam around, nice neighbors	Nobody. Snobbish city planners, maybe	None. This seems perfect. Build more things like this.	Everybody. The tax base. The people who get to live in house beautiful houses	Nobody	You probably need to build quite a few like this. I don't see housing starts keeping pace with demand. 75-80% of people want o live in single family detached houses. This is consistent across decades of research. Got to build these, with apartments nearby, and those great townhouses, too	The city needs a lot of below-market apartments, for students, for recently divorced people, for blind/elderly/disabled people, for the unemployable. We should be building apartments above every retail establishment. I drive down Broadway and I can't believe all the single story businesses. Why can't you build six apartments over a tire shop, over a music store, over a thrift store, over a family restaurant? Why doesn't the new Albertsons have 25 apartments upstairs? It's crazy. All new commercial building should incorporate apartments (or most...). People here complain about traffic, but Boise traffic is pretty tame. One way to tame rush hour traffic in Boise is to say public employees must ride public transportation. Everyone who draws a paycheck from the state, the county, or the city should ride the bus, from the governor and the mayor to the teacher and the janitor. Get all those cars off the road. Public servants could serve the public in the nicest possible way: by easing the public's Commute. Barring that, public services should be open from 7 to 7 and there should be two shifts. 6 am to 2 pm, then 11am to 7 pm. Forty percent of the people employed in Boise work at the taxpayer's expense. Get their cars off the road.
6-10 years	Southwest		Yes	The city	Residents of the surrounding area	Not enough road to handle that much traffic.	City and builder	Residents in surrounding areas	Commuter time. Increase in property tax for surrounding area residents	The city and the developer	The surrounding residents due to increase of property tax	Increased property tax that surrounding area residents have to absorb	
20+years	Southwest		Yes	Developer	Single family homes	Traffic, lack of needed infrastructure, schools	Developer	Farmers and existing homes	Traffic and the type of existing character	Owner and developer	Not as many if the parcels are larger and less density	Density	The influx of people needs to be developed responsibly to keep the character of our rural areas
20+years	Southwest		No										
11-15 years	Southwest	No	Yes	Developer	Neighborhood and Commuters	Traffic. Our roadways are horrible and need to be addressed prior to adding more traffic to them.							
1-5 years	Southwest		Yes	Developer	Neighborhood	Not enough parking spaces							

6-10 years	Southeast	none	Yes	The entire city of boise	Maybe the neighbors but if the city was concerned about upset neighbors nothing would ever be able to be built or developed again in the city.	none	The city and residents (reduced housing prices)	Maybe the neighbors but again neighbors seem to always have something to complain about new developments.	none	Again the city of boise and its residents	no one	none	
1-5 years	West/Northwest	none	Yes	Anyone new who wants to live close to the city center.	Current residents in that neighborhood.	That a good developer is chosen to take into account where the new building is going. A bad developer can ruin an entire neighborhood.	Newly wed couples and families looking for a house to buy.	The current residents as the increased traffic could be an issue.	The lack of transportation. Our city doesn't have the biggest roads and adding more cars to some areas could cause major issues. Preferably a better bus system would be put in place.	People looking to move here out of state.	Anyone looking to live close to activities in the city.	This is aimed at high income families. We need more affordable housing and this isn't the solution.	Affordable housing and reliable public transportation are the most important to me. If public transport is improved that would help spread people out but still allow them to enjoy the perks of the city center.
1-5 years	Southwest		Yes	Developer	Current residents	Parking. Not enough spots invites theft by parking on the street	Future residents	Current residents	Traffic	Land owner	Residents using the same streets to commute and tax payers	Environmental	
20+years	Southwest		Yes	City government through increase in tax base	Service workers	Continued production of high density housing that is not focused for the lower income service community.	The government though taxes	The current residents of the community	Increased use of infrastructure, which was probably maxed with other developments in the area. Increased levies for schools and everybody who has their hand out looking for fundings.	Owner, developer and the county government	All the animals who would either live, winter or pass through the area.	Losing the open area for nature and its creatures. The visual "trash on the hillside" would detract from the beauty of the city.	Better start intelligently thinking about what you are doing. This money grab will soon come to an end and the city will be left with the problems of poorly managed growth.
16-20 years	Southwest		No										
6-10 years	Southwest		Yes	The developer	The immediate neighborhood	Bringing in people who do not value this community, they're just looking for a cheap place to live	The developer	The surrounding neighborhoods	Losing our Farmlands. These people bought here because they liked the open space & rural feel.	The developer and the city of Boise	The immediate neighbors and anyone using the streets around there.	Traffic, noise, losing our open spaces. Turning everywhere into a congested city.	Slow down The growth of Boise. if it must grow then create more walkable communities to help with all this traffic. We need our open spaces and rural culture to continue.
20+years	Southwest	none	No										
11-15 years	West/Northwest	Boise Citizen, Volunteer Neighborhood Association Member, Volunteer HOA Board Treasurer	Yes	The Developer, the City's tax revenue, architects, attorneys, real estate agents, real estate brokers, financial services industry, nearby business, etc. - all will benefit first and foremost before the citizen who needs a roof over their head.	Every citizen who is paid less than \$20 hour for the work they perform. The economics simply show this is unaffordable to a large majority of Boise citizens due to a history of low education priority resulting in a State that leads the nation in low wage jobs. Boise is being impacted by the repercussions of this long-term history and so will the employment sector as citizens are forced to move away because their wages do not support the cost of living.	Does not address the root cause of the problem... low education levels = low wages. Creates a false belief of the citizens that "Affordable Housing" can be controlled by the City when it is simply a economic supply/demand outcome of a capitalistic society.	All the same parties listed in scenario 1.	The City - in terms of viewing this via "a long-view" perspective. This will erase some of the City's heritage and history - farmland. When this land may actually have a larger place in the common good if the City allows for "the long-view" to be just as important as, if not more than, private property rights to develop.	A combination of inconsistency in State and City definitions and laws regarding what a Townhouse means. Developer can plot parcels to qualify as Townhouse with no requirement to ever sell these. Leads to one less opportunity for citizens to build equity and long-term security of a roof over their head while developer avoids the cost of safety provision of installing sprinkler systems in shared-wall dwellings. This is a legislative loophole that needs to be corrected for the sake of addressing long-term housing stability and safety. Otherwise a Townhouse is just a fancier rental apartment!	The 1%	The City - development such as this results in an adverse impact on the cost of providing City services. City wants/needs density to drive demand for Public Transit - this type of development is considered "sprawl" which flies in the face of this strategy.	application meeting info. with the Developer in the PDS system. 2. Assign one primary number to a proposed development then link all documents related to it within the PDS system - this means any historical docs. where a permit may have expired, any docs. where the land address or subdivision name changed, etc. Currently, I have found that one must hunt through different methods of searching to locate all info. for a land parcel - even an address used on one permit does not always pull other permits with the same address. Sometimes the PDS system will even say no other permits exist with a given address, when they actually do exist when located via a different search criteria. 3. The system is not very transparent in locating ALL info. related to any given land parcel - to fix this and increase transparency, create a user-friendly online tool for a citizen to click on their neighborhood land map and drill down into a land parcel to see what has happened or plans to happen on that land. The City currently is not meeting the regulatory standards for safety and until it can provide the required safety services for the existing citizens within the current City limits, no additional annexations with development approvals should occur. This scenario does not specify if this land is annexed into the City limits or is in the AOI. Regardless, the current Impact Fees are not enough to cover what is already needed and required without adding more to the City's responsibility for municipal services. The City needs to take care of what is currently under its roof before expanding the roof.	
20+years	Southwest	none	Yes										
1-5 years	West/Northwest	HOA	Yes	Developers and politicians	Residents of Boise	1960's mentality about housing and transportation by politicians.	Developers and Politicians	Residents of the semi-rural area that will see their quality of life lowered.	Complete rejection of any modern mass transit possibilities.	Developers and politicians	Residents of the area.	Home values out of reach of average Boise resident, and no modern mass transit ideas.	It is the year 2018. Don't need a 1960's master plan. Need one for now and the future with driverless cars, mass transit (Not busses!) and competent management of the limited natural resources.
11-15 years	Southwest	none	Yes										
11-15 years	Southwest		Yes	Developer	Neighbor hood	Population spike for neighborhood and congestion of transportation	Developer	Neighborhood and current residents	Travel times lack of road infrastructure no commuting options	Developer and owner	Environment	Wildlife.	Need to create better ingress and regresses to deal with increase traffic and get a mass transit system that actually has timely workability.
20+years	Southwest		No										
20+years	Southwest	none	Yes	The developer, and Perhaps residents of the building	Current residents of the neighborhood	Putting high density into a lower density area	The developer and Boise City revenue	The current homeowners	Destruction of peaceful neighborhood for high density. People choose to live in particular areas because of the nature of the neighborhood and should be allowed to retain that type of neighborhood feeling and peace and quiet.	Developer and Boise City revenue will increase	No one if lots are kept large	Infrastructure streets and schools	I believe that citizens should not have their neighborhoods turned into something other than what they have historically been. We move to an area because we like the type of neighborhood and City of Boise should not destroy rural type areas with high density housing
20+years	North/Northeast	none	Yes	The people of Boise	The amount of high cost "market" rate apartments means young professionals will likely be priced out	The high cost of rent for a majority of apartments. If want to stop brain drain, have to make more apartments affordable at a starting wage.	City through new taxing income	Existing residents. No benefits for them other than more neighbors	Lack of infrastructure support. Need to plan for a future with less car-dependent travel ie. connections to bus lines	Wealthy, older people maybe from out of state	Local farmer community and those who demand to eat local	Constrains room for additional growth in future. Loss of land which creates a buffer between foothills and urban life. Lack of access to bike infrastructure or public transit	We need more connections to public transit or safe bike routes when considering building on previously undeveloped land. It's a way for the new residents to remain connected to the City, rather than on an island alone. The city needs to be thinking long term, not coming up with a \$100 million transit plan 10 years too late
11-15 years	Bench		Yes	The developer, the city, and future residents	existing neighborhood residents will oppose the development, citing decreased property values, crime, etc. - Nimby-ism. But they will by no means be disadvantaged. In fact, their property value will increase because they are now closer to a community hub	Will the rents remain the same over the long term? The project could be built under certain assurances from the developer, but when completed, could be sold/flipped to a new investor with a completely different model in mind							
11-15 years	Bench		Yes	Residents and developers	Commuters and neighbors	Fit within exiting neighborhood	Buyers and developers	Existing neighbors and overall community	Sprawl and elimination of farmland. The city would never allow this in the foothills so why here?	Buyers and developers	Immediate neighbors	McMansions	The city should allow development but not favor one area over another. The city is too focused on downtown and the foothills and doesn't seem to care about quality of life elsewhere.
20+years	Bench		Yes	Developers always benefit	Schools will be impacted and the developer does not have to pay. Low income. These units are too expensive. The neighborhood since the development is too high, does not fit in, and will increase traffic	Lack of affordable housing, impact on schools, impact on the neighborhood. I would deny this application.	The developer (they always make huge profits), upper middle class looking for a home.	This will destroy the character of the neighborhood, loss of farmland and rural culture.	Schools are always impacted, even when there are available seats. Developers should be paying the school district. Loss of our rural roots is so sad. Again, I would deny this development.	Wealthy home owners, developer, and money out of state to land owner.	Everyone else. These proposals decrease open land and impact our foothills. Everyone has to look at houses up there instead of beauty.	This is the worst proposal yet. It impacts our open lands and benefits no one that needs help, only the wealthy. I would adamantly oppose this one.	Whenever there is a development, these developers need to be paying the school district, even when there are open seats at schools. Growth has impacted class size which impacts learning and the developers just pocket the money. Then the district has to approach the voters to pay through levies. That is not fair. I'm sick of paying for developers to get rich, and as a teacher, I'm tired of large class sizes. While you cannot deny developments, if I were in your shoes, I would make it very hard, especially for those expensive homes that don't benefit many people.

20+years	West/Northwest	none	Yes	those who are looking for housing in downtown	those already living in the area	Height. If 2 stories are the standard then I could reasonably see a 3 story building but not 4. If 3 stories becomes a standard then perhaps 4 stories could then be approved.	Families that cannot afford to be closer to downtown.	Current travelers will be disadvantaged. Traffic congestion is a disadvantage. Particularly on a one lane road.	Only one on-site parking spot for "families" seems like there will be a lot of street parking.				
16-20 years	Southeast		Yes										
20+years	Bench	No	Yes	The developers and city tax coffers	The current neighborhood residents	Making Boise less "livable" for current residents	Developers and city tax coffers. People looking for affordable homes	Current residents.	Traffic congestion.	Developer and out of state land owner.	Current residents.	Traffic congestion and air quality.	I hope we learn from areas like Portland and don't make mistakes that create the same kind of issues areas like that have. Seems like we are headed that way with no forethought of current residents.
20+years	Southwest	No	Yes	Developer and the city.	Current citizens	The developer and city gains profit and taxes respectively. This occurs while traffic increases without mention of road improvements. If the new residents plan to use bus transportation or to walk to work/school, the impact will be less. However, we know bus usage is small in the valley. The nearby schools also have limited capacity putting a burden on current teachers and decreasing the attention students will receive. This will too, likely impact the already negative national ranking our Idaho education system has.	Developer and city	Current residents of the area	Traffic will no doubt increase. Are the current roads engineered to accept the additional traffic? Bus and bike traffic do not sound like a viable alternative nor a necessary consideration.	The owner and developer.	Current citizens	I'm concerned about an investor coming in to the community and turning a profit without any regard to the current citizens. The property owner will make money, the developer will make money. Citizens will lose scenic surroundings. These types of 'communities' or neighborhoods are started and do not finish completely. Additionally, they do not have SUSTAINING supporting business for the neighborhood. No grocery market, convenience stores, no parks mentioned. These types of areas are marketed with great amenities, yet the people have greater than 15-20 minute drive to nearby conveniences. This type of information or marketing presents false advertising.	The city should take a deeper investigative dive and analysis of property owners or developers from out of state. They swoop in, create developments, make money and leave. The 15-20 minute drives to grocery stores are usually require more time than that. Those trips can easily take 60 minutes round-trip for 'quick items' like milk, etc. The time that it takes to drive to restaurants increases to 30-40 minutes. Areas south of I84 do not have any destination shopping areas with any retail other than Fred Meyer or Walmart. There is no Target, Khols, or casual or fast casual restaurants to choose from. Same thing in east Boise. Everything has been drawn to west Boise near the mall or The Village in Meridian. Look at the ghost town that the Boise Outlet Mall has become.
20+years	West/Northwest	Northwest Boise Neighborhood Association	Yes	the developer	current residents	That the city keeps building and building without any regard to overcrowding.	developer	current residents	Once farmland is developed, it is gone forever, its not scenery we can ever get back.	developer	no one	I am very concerned that overbuilding such as this will impact the schools and roads.	The city needs to STOP with the overbuilding and overcrowding that only benefits the developer. It is okay if people want to move to Boise and are unable to at this time, the current pace of building without roads to support it or schools to hold new students is absolute insanity and it must stop!
1-5 years	West/Northwest	none	Yes										
6-10 years	Bench	none	Yes	developer, those looking to live in the area and rent (but it's pricey..)	those currently living in the neighborhood - impacts transportation, parking, density, and school capacity	transportation, parking, and general over-population of the area	developer, families looking to move into this area	those currently living there who like the view of the farmland :)	the price of housing seems high - further driving housing prices up	developer	This would have a harsh impact on the housing market and prices of homes... \$700,000 is out of this world for this area and for the incomes of Boise residents	mainly the cost of the homes and how it will further drive a wedge between average income in Boise and housing affordability.	please continue to do great work to preserve our foothills and open, green space :) This is one of many reasons we live here! and please keep it up preserving historical homes.. they give our city character!