

Responses to ice breaker question at December 19 meeting of Coalition for Regional Public Transportation

Give one pro and one con statement about improving transit in the Treasure Valley.

PRO STATEMENTS

- Important for those who do not have a car
- Can be a cost effective solution
- Decrease air emissions in Treasure Valley (stated by several people)
- Help manage traffic congestion
- Improve air quality
- Help created a planned business corridor
- Ease congestion
- Makes getting around easier
- More cost effective to invest now because it will be far more expensive later
- Enhances quality of life of people who are transit-dependent
- Decreases Medicaid costs (because public transit reduces dependence on personal and private transportation services that are otherwise reimbursed?)
- People who use it use it effectively
- Improve air quality
- Leaves the driving to someone else, allowing people to do other things and reduce their stress.
- Industry can flourish by reducing car emissions
- Improve safety of highways
- Contribute to economic development
- Relieve/manage congestion
- Transit has role in shaping growth/development of the valley
- Frees up land currently used for surface parking (e.g. in central business districts)
- We don't have a choice; it's an important part of the solution.
- Driving can be a hassle; transit give you time to do something else
- We have an opportunity window; we can still make it work effectively
- Transit makes downtowns more accessible to lower middle class (for shopping and employment)
- We know we'll get there eventually
- Build and they will come
- Important to tie our valley together
- Facilitates economic development
- It is convenient if developed right
- Increased safety on highways

- Provides transportation options for those that drive and a lifeline to those who don't or can't.
- Transit helps develop sense of community
- It's good for tourism
- Provides opportunity for organized growth and development
- We can't be a great metro area without a good transit system.

CON STATEMENTS

- Too expensive
- Not enough riders
- By the time you have it, it may be too late and prohibitively expensive
- Operating cost per rider too high
- Hard to market
- Doesn't pay for itself
- High miss rate in projecting cost and ridership
- There is no income stream.
- Will not be used because it is not convenient
- Transit paying for itself is a myth
- Capital and O & M at facility level is high. Must balance with economic development.
- Flexibility is not there.
- Difficult to get the scale needed.
- There's a perception that transit is inconvenient
- It requires an extra tax to pay for it
- Too little frequency
- Accessibility and adapting to meet need of special populations
- Cost per user is high
- Popular destinations are inconvenient
- "O.K for you to ride" attitude.
- Today's system is not convenient or adequate
- Will people use it if it is built?
- Convenience costs money
- Perception that it only benefits a few people
- Attitudes and misperceptions about who uses it. (a.k.a. written by Jon Barrett: middle class and up won't use transit because it is associated with lower income folks.)
- Using transit is uncomfortable (e.g. security and cleanliness are issues)
- Task appears intimidating
- No one pays attention without gridlock (a.k.a. the problem is not bad enough yet)
- Don't have critical mass for some types of transit (high performance?)