



Planning

[FHWA](#) > [HEP](#) > [Planning](#) > [TCSP](#) > [Archive](#) > [Idaho](#)


TCSP-1999 Grant Proposals

[TCSP Documents](#)
[TCSP Projects](#)
[Evaluation](#)
[Resources](#)
[Links](#)
[Site Map](#)
[TCSP Home](#)

**"Treasure Valley Futures:
New Choices for the American West"
Ada/Canyon Counties, Idaho**

[[Previous Page](#) | [Grant Recipient Information](#)]

I. Treasure Valley Futures: Alternative Choices for the American West

Planning Grant

Project Name and Location:

Treasure Valley Futures: New Choices for the American West
Ada/Canyon Counties, Idaho

Organization:

Ada Planning Association

Key Contact:

Clair Bowman, Executive Director

Address:

Ada Planning Association
413 West Idaho, Suite 100
Boise, Idaho 83702-6064
(208) 345-5274 voice
(208) 345-5279 fax

Project Abstract: The primary purpose of this project is to build the capacity of decision makers from the public, private, and non-profit sectors, as well as the general public to understand and implement the Transportation and Community and Systems Preservation Pilot Program (TCSP) goals in conjunction with the goals of many local Treasure Valley entities. This will be accomplished through an education process, defining barriers to attaining these goals, and identifying a range of alternative choices for policy implementation that can be incorporated directly into the existing land use and transportation policy framework. When this grant is completed, there should be a significant increase in the number of policy decisions being made by transportation agencies, local governments, and other groups that directly support local as well as regional objectives related to efficient land use, transportation, and infrastructure systems; environmental protection; access to jobs, services, and trade centers; and private investment patterns. The grant's approach is specifically designed to work within the Treasure Valley's fragmented political framework and deeply held beliefs around the importance of private property rights.

II. Project Description

Project Description. The *Treasure Valley Futures* Proposal's primary objectives are to educate urban and rural residents, elected officials, and members of various public interest groups about alternative choices to current development patterns, to identify the barriers to choosing these alternatives, and to define realistic tools for overcoming these barriers. These alternative choices will be defined in terms of their ability to meet the TCSP Program goals including, improved transportation efficiency, reducing impacts of transportation on the environment, reducing the need for future infrastructure investment, ensuring more efficient access to jobs, services, and trade centers, and encouraging private sector investment patterns that will support these objectives, as well as the goals of several local Treasure Valley entities. This regional effort will help policy makers from the public, private, and non-profit sectors understand that, if the Treasure Valley is to reap the benefits of compact development and efficient infrastructure investment, no land use, transportation, or infrastructure decision can be made in a vacuum. The consequences of each decision must simultaneously be evaluated at both the local and the regional level.

Local elected officials in the Treasure Valley have already begun working together to address the myriad of issues raised by rapid growth. In 1997 nine elected officials representing the seven cities and two counties that had been most impacted by Boise's growth participated in a two-day institute on growth in the Treasure Valley. Based on the discussions held during the Institute these nine elected officials wrote and then signed the Treasure Valley Partnership Agreement pledging their support to working cooperatively toward achieving

four primary goals related to land use, linking transportation to land use, community identity, and open space/recreation (see Attachment A). Using this agreement as its guide, the Treasure Valley Partnership continues to meet on a regular basis, and has already had a significant impact on the region. The Partnership is currently forming a nonprofit entity to manage its activities.

This Partnership Agreement is a starting point for the *Treasure Valley Futures* project. While the collaboration among Mayors and County Commissioners has been very successful, it is time to expand the reach of this group to include additional partners such as the region's many highway district commissioners, environmental groups, other community groups, local health interests, and the development industry. Together, these groups will create a more integrated approach to planning the region's future.

Geographic Scale. The project scale will encompass the Treasure Valley region of Southwestern Idaho. This region, which includes two counties and 14 cities (six in Ada County and eight in Canyon County), including Boise, is a group of typical western cities. Most of the development in these communities has occurred since World War II, is primarily auto-oriented, and is dispersed over a large geographic area. Although the region's economy was historically primarily resource based, high technology related sectors have increasingly been attracted to this location because of the quality of life. As a result, the region has become a major growth center, with annual growth rates in the early 1990's reaching almost six percent per year. A map of the Treasure Valley and current population data are included in Attachment B

Expected Results. Expected results from this project include: an increased awareness across the Treasure Valley region of how future growth can be more efficiently accommodated; identification of specific tools individual jurisdictions can use to effect compact land use patterns; and the elimination of current barriers that could impede orderly future growth, and greater cooperative collaboration among all participating partners.

Vision for the Project's Ultimate Impact. The ultimate impact of this project will be to establish mechanisms for accommodating growth that allow individual communities to make their own decisions about land use within a clearly defined regional context. Planning activities among cities and counties will be better coordinated with the highway districts, as well as with the Idaho Department of Transportation and the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality. This coordinated approach will allow communities to retain their unique identities, but also ensure that local decisions around future growth are synergistic, not fragmented within the regional context. Ultimately, this will provide better environmental protection, reduce water consumption, enhance air quality, minimize infrastructure investments, maintain farmland, and preserve the wild and scenic places that Treasure Valley residents value so highly.

III. Purpose and Criteria

Purpose

This proposal has three objectives:

Objective 1: Educate policy makers, advocacy groups, business leaders, and citizens about why they should consider all land use and transportation policy decisions in a regional as well as local context to attain their individual goals as well as those of the TCSP program and why land use and transportation planning in the Valley must be more closely linked.

Objective 2: Identify ways to overcome the major barriers currently impeding compact development and efficient infrastructure systems in the Treasure Valley.

Objective 3: Define realistic alternative choices to existing land use and transportation implementation policies in the Treasure Valley so that individual communities can accommodate future growth in a more efficient manner.

Most regional planning efforts to date, like Envision Utah, typically focus on presenting a series of alternative land use scenarios on an aggregate scale, quantifying the implications of each scenario, and then guiding the community at large to select an alternative that will engender compact development and minimize sprawl. This approach tends to be very "top down" and does not necessarily indicate what role individual communities can take in achieving the regional "vision" once it has been established. The *Treasure Valley Futures* project will take the opposite approach and use a "bottom up" strategy by identifying specific local and small-scale implementation actions to create a cohesive regional picture. This bottom up approach is designed to be effective in a fragmented jurisdictional landscape where key policy decision-making authority regarding land use, transportation, and other infrastructure systems is spread out among a variety of elected bodies.

Criteria

The primary criteria for evaluating this proposal will be its ability to address the five goals of the TCSP Grant Program. The proposal's responsiveness to this and other criteria are listed below:

Meeting the Five TCSP Grant Program Goals. All five TCSP grant program goals are central to the *Treasure Valley Futures* project process. (See Attachment E.) The benchmark activities outlined in Section VI are specifically oriented toward demonstrating the benefits the Treasure Valley would achieve from meeting

these goals. Each benchmark uses these goals, as well as the goals established by several key regional entities, as evaluation criteria against which future development activity and infrastructure investment can be measured. Thus as policy making bodies, including city councils and highway districts, incorporate the products of this project into their regulatory framework and decision making processes, all aspects of the TCSP program will be implemented.

Commitment of Non-Federal Resources. As Section VII shows, the *Treasure Valley Futures* partners will contribute a significant amount of both cash and in-kind resources to this project. Based only on resources that can be quantified at this time, it is estimated that non-federal contributions to the project will equal almost 20 percent of the total project cost. Additional in-kind contributions not included in the project budget will come from public agency staff time and from donated office space. All of the major communities in the region, the two counties, the highway districts, several state agencies including the Idaho Transportation Department and the Department of Environmental Quality, Boise State University, and the University of Idaho have all participated in developing this proposal and are committed to working on the project as well.

Non-Traditional Partners. The "leadership partners," as described in Section V, represent a diverse range of groups including cities and counties, who control land use and most non-highway related infrastructure investment; highway commissions, who regulate locally directed transportation funds; state transportation and environmental agencies; and local community groups concerned with smart growth and livable communities. These groups have not previously worked together, and all expect to see enhanced capacity to meet their own organization's goals by participating in the *Treasure Valley Futures* program and working toward the TCSP program goals in addition to their own agency/organizational goals that are consistent to those of the TCSP program. In addition, more than 60 organizations have been identified as "community outreach partners." Although these groups will have a more limited role in the overall process, they will provide the critical link between the *Treasure Valley Futures* project and the development industry, health and social welfare organizations, major employers within the region, and other groups whose participation is critical to ensuring that the *Treasure Valley* achieves its goals for compact development and efficient infrastructure systems.

Serving as a National Model. The *Treasure Valley Futures* project will provide leadership to small and mid-sized communities that lack a clear vision of how they can be "smart" about maximizing the benefits and minimizing the adverse impacts of growth. To date, the most commonly cited examples of "smart growth" in the U.S. are Portland and several states, including Maryland, with state mandated growth management programs. Many smaller communities find the growth management strategies employed by Portland to be politically unrealistic, and cannot expect any initial support from their state government regarding land use or transportation planning. At the same time, residents in these smaller communities often moved there to get away from more urban land use patterns, and may feel that "sprawl" is not necessarily a bad thing (see "Choices Between Asphalt and Nature: Americans Discuss Sprawl: Analysis of 20 Focus Groups Across the U.S." conducted for the Biodiversity Project in partnership with the Nature Conservancy). The *Treasure Valley Futures* project offers a model for better coordinated regional growth that utilizes existing political structures, offers multiple alternatives to current growth patterns, acknowledges that growth and "sprawl" are not necessarily synonymous, and does not rely upon a supportive state legislative framework. A recent cover story from *Builder* magazine indicates that the homebuilding industry considers Boise as one of the top ten emerging residential growth markets in the country. Clearly the other nine communities cited in this article could benefit from Boise's experience with the *Treasure Valley Futures* project (see <http://building.hw.net/monthly/1998/dec/covstry/>).

National Information Dissemination Capacity. Because the TCSP program is a national pilot intended to generate results that can be applied in multiple communities, it is important that the project's results, including early work products, be quickly and easily disseminated to a national audience. Many national organizations that circulate newsletters, magazines, or other publications on a regular basis have already begun to publicize the activities of the *Treasure Valley Partnership* (see Attachment C). This recognition has spawned many requests for more information and for copies of the Partnership Agreement, as well as invitations for Partnership members to speak at conferences. Many of these same national organizations are likely to show continued interest in the *Treasure Valley Futures* project. Articles and other coverage of the project will enable FHWA to maximize its investment in the *Treasure Valley*.

The *Treasure Valley Futures* project is already well positioned to become a national model because it is an extension of the Partnership. Groups like the Joint Center for Sustainable Development, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, the Urban Land Institute, the Local Government, and Congress for the New Urbanism have already featured the accomplishments of the *Treasure Valley Partnership* in newsletter, magazine articles and conference presentations. The Northwest Council of the President's Council on Sustainable Development has recognized the Partnership as one of the "Founders of the New Northwest." Idaho Smart Growth and Ada Planning Association have also received national recognition for their work. Once the *Treasure Valley Futures* project is up and running, the aforementioned groups and others with large national memberships, including the Surface Transportation Policy Project, National Trust for Historic Preservation, American Planning Association, American Farmland Trust, The International City/County Management Association and the Mayors Institute on City Design are likely to continue to publicize the *Treasure Valley Futures* project and the project partners accomplishments.

IV. Coordination

Ada Planning Association (APA) is the Metropolitan Planning Organization for the Boise, Idaho Urbanized Area within Ada County, Idaho. It is responsible for the preparation of the regional transportation plan covering Ada County and performs data and mapping services for the region. As the recipient/financial manager of the TCSP grant and one of the Leadership Partners, APA will be closely involved in every aspect of the *Treasure Valley Futures* project. The current regional plan, called *Destination 2015* is in the process of being updated, and one of the key recommended changes in this update is the evaluation of regional growth patterns as envisioned in the *Treasure Valley Futures* project. *Destination 2015* now encourages the type of transit and pedestrian oriented land uses advocated by Smart Growth, and *Treasure Valley Futures* project will provide a vehicle for fulfilling these goals.

APA is also undergoing a change in its membership and area from Ada County to a more regional approach. The APA Board, composed of elected officials representing every general purpose local government in Ada County along with officials of transportation and educational agencies, approved a change in the organization's articles and bylaws to eliminate restrictions on membership to Ada County entities. This major change will allow Canyon County entities to join APA, which shortly will become the "Regional Planning Association" or RPA. Three cities (including Nampa and Caldwell, which account for 60% of the population of Canyon County), the Canyon County Commissioners, and two Canyon County highway districts have already indicated their intent to join RPA by the end of this fiscal year. The expansion will vastly improve the ability of RPA to coordinate the *Treasure Valley Futures* project.

Should the *Treasure Valley Futures* project be funded, APA will amend its Unified Planning Work Program/Budget to incorporate the federal funding as required under 23 CFR 450.

APA has had an excellent and long-standing working relationship with the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). ITD is represented on the APA Board and on the Technical Advisory Committee. Staff from ITD have been closely involved in the preparation of the *Treasure Valley Futures* project. ITD is listed as one of the Leadership Partners and will be the financial conduit between US DOT and APA. Therefore, ITD will be a key part of the project management team.

V. Partners

To be successful, this project will require in-depth and sustained participation from a broad cross-section of people from the entire region. It is critical that these participants develop a real understanding of the sometimes complex issues associated with the full range of policy decisions that lead to more efficient transportation systems and land use patterns. In addition, participants must begin to see what part they could play in improving the Region's future.

The process will include three types of partners. First are the Leadership Partners (LPs) who are responsible for the overall management and direction of this project. Second are groups that represent specific interests within the region, and/or are elected or appointed policy makers, such as city council members or planning commissioners. Individuals representing these groups will act as Community Outreach Partners (COPs). Third are members of the general public who can directly participate in the process through a variety of means. There will also be two focus groups set up to work from beginning to end of this project. Focus groups will also be used to monitor the project's progress and effectiveness. Because these focus groups are considered both part of the partnership structure and the project evaluation, they will be discussed in this Section as well as in Section VIII.

Leadership Partners. The Leadership Partners have primary responsibility for guiding the project's overall direction. This group, which includes partners from a broad cross-section of the Treasure Valley community, will meet on a regular basis to review project process, monitor results and make decisions about what steps to take next. Using the contributions and input from public officials, the community outreach partners, the focus groups and public participant evaluations, the Leadership Partners will collect, conduct, and assess relevant research; develop and conduct appropriate public participation and education events; interact with local media, and prepare and approve all final products. Some of the LPs may choose to focus on particular benchmark(s) within the project. All of the LPs will work to assist the project coordinator with public participation events. Throughout the project, the LPs will use an ongoing self-evaluation process to make sure all project partners understand their role and are fully engaged in the project. Current Leadership Partner organizations are shown in Attachment D. The LPs are pursuing adding a partner, preferably from the Community Development Association, an organization of business leaders, lending institutions, and non-profits whose focus is primarily on providing affordable housing in the Treasure Valley.

Ada Planning association and the Treasure Valley Partnership will act as the primary conveners of the Leadership Partners, with Ada Planning Association acting as the fiscal agent for the grant. It is expected that a half-time coordinator would be hired to manage the project on a day to day basis.

Community Outreach Partners. Community Outreach Partners are those agencies and organizations that represent specific interests and values that the project will address (Attachment D lists more than 60 entities that have already been identified to act as COPs). The COPs will commit to finding at least one member who will attend events associated with each project benchmark (see Section VI) and provide feedback on that activity. These members will also agree to share the information they have gained from participating in the

Treasure Valley Futures project with their individual organizations. COP members will be given a pre/post survey on project issues to evaluate general attitudes about those issues. Outreach Partners will also be expected to help advertise upcoming *Treasure Valley Futures* events.

The General Public. The general public will be encouraged to participate in the project on a regular basis through the use of appropriate participatory events such as public forums and/or town hall meetings, interactive workshops, design charrettes, and visual preference surveys. Events will be timed to coincide with project benchmarks. Both the public events and project benchmarks will be extensively covered by local print and both radio and television broadcast media. Project information will be updated regularly on the project web site. The public will thus have a variety of ways to access information about the project. In addition, the public will be able to access an interactive web site at any time throughout the project where they can review and comment on project findings.

Public opinion will be sought through surveys, evaluation questionnaires at public events, and email comments on the web site. Questions and alternatives will be presented in a nonmechanical, nonjudgmental manner that will encourage participants to consider the long-term implications of their choices and the relationship between the type of community they want to live in and the individual lifestyle choices they make.

Focus Groups. The project will establish two heterogeneous focus groups made up of selected citizens, members of the development community, members of the financial community, and members from local planning & zoning commissions. These focus groups will meet three to four times during the project to provide a composite picture of the project's relative success in meeting its three objectives.

VI. Schedule and Benchmarks

The *Treasure Valley Futures* project is expected to take 12 months to complete. Since the actual start date is unknown due to uncertainty regarding when the TCSP funding would be available, the project schedule is shown as the number of months required to complete each Project Benchmark and evaluation task. Figure 1 presents the expected start and completion times for the project's six Benchmarks and three evaluation tasks. The Benchmarks are described below, and the evaluation tasks are described in Section VIII. Each of the benchmarks will have a discrete work product, an evaluation component, and a public participation component. **Although community participation is a major element of the *Treasure Valley Futures* project, participation activities have not been broken out separately, but are implicit to every Benchmark.**

Benchmark 1: Introduce Local Policy Makers to the *Treasure Valley Futures* Project. Because all of the ongoing land use policy decisions and most of the transportation policy decisions are made by local officials, including highway commissioners, city council members, and planning commissioners, these people need to be included in all aspects of the *Treasure Valley Futures* program. In this initial phase of the program, working sessions will be held for all of these groups to introduce them to the TCSP program goals, the goals of existing groups in the Treasure Valley whose activities are consistent with the TCSP goals, such as the Treasure Valley Partnership, Idaho Smart Growth, and the Idaho Urban Research and Design Center. A key purpose of these working sessions will be to educate these policy makers about the role they will play in making key decisions about the region's future, and the necessity of understanding these decisions in a regional, as well as local context.

Benchmark 2: Establish a Regional "Trend" Baseline. The purpose of creating this regional baseline is to evaluate how the region will build out if it follows current trends based on the existing land use policy framework of zoning ordinances and comprehensive plans. The measure uses to quantify this build-out analysis would be based specifically on the five areas of concern articulated in the TCSP goals including transportation efficiency, environmental impacts, overall infrastructure requirements, the locational relationships among jobs, shopping, and recreation, and the contribution of the private sector (i.e., market forces).

Ada Planning Association (APA) has already compiled all of the comprehensive plans for the major communities in the two Counties comprising the Treasure Valley into a single land use map. However, the implications of the regional land use pattern created by this composite policy framework have never been analyzed. In addition, numerous planning studies and various infrastructure assessments are currently under way to evaluate various aspects of the region's long term infrastructure and resources requirements. Yet, none of these studies are being considered relative to each other, nor in conjunction with the regional composite land use policy map.

Benchmark 3: Conduct Implementation Barriers Analysis. Despite the fact that most planners, and many local elected officials, understand the benefits of compact development, there are multiple barriers built into the system (including both public regulations and private business practices) that make it very difficult to follow through with good planning practice. A first step to overcoming these barriers is to identify them within a cohesive framework.

The *Treasure Valley Futures* project would use a relatively simple method to identify barriers to compact development. The comprehensive plans, zoning ordinances, transportation plans, and other key policy documents for each entity responsible for land use and transportation planning in the Treasure Valley would

be evaluated against the TCSP goals and other local goals to determine what specific policies currently exist that impede orderly and cohesive planning, development, and infrastructure construction from taking place in the Treasure Valley. This analysis will also suggest ways to remove these barriers and enhance regional cooperation to better achieve the region's goals.

Benchmark 4: Compile an "Alternative Choices Catalog." Another outcome of the previous Benchmark will be to identify actual examples within the Treasure Valley that illustrate alternatives to the policies and practices that are working against creating compact development and efficient infrastructure systems. A catalog of these alternative choices, organized by various topic areas identified through the barriers analysis, will provide local policy makers and their staff with a tool kit they can use to begin modifying their policy framework and/or rethinking how they approach various planning issues. Each alternative will be described with a narrative as well as illustrated with photographs and diagrams. Information about project costs and financing will also be included.

Benchmark 5: Develop Local Demonstration Project Prototypes. While the Alternative Choices Catalog is likely to address a wide variety of topics, there will still be a need to demonstrate specific urban design, architecture, and landscape principals that can be applied to specific development projects to ensure that they are consistent with the region's goals. Five to eight opportunity sites will be selected from throughout the Treasure Valley, and actual prototype development projects will be generated for each site using a charrette/community workshop format. These prototypes will illustrate the ways in which good design can make the critical difference in terms of the relative success or failure of any given project by addressing issues like ways to density, public safety, quality of life, community character, and local property values.

Benchmark 6: Conduct Regional Forum on "Next Steps for the Treasure Valley." At the conclusion of the *Treasure Valley Futures* project, a community forum will be held to report the project's accomplishments, and establish what steps should be taken next to ensure that the Treasure Valley continues to meet its long term goals. As part of this forum, there will be a panel discussion among selected participants in the process to discuss what the process has achieved, and how they envision the region's future. A final report will be published following this Forum that summarizes the overall accomplishments of the *Treasure Valley Futures* project, and outlines a regional action program for continued implementation of both the TCSP and regional goals for the Treasure Valley.

**Figure 1: Schedule for Treasure Valley Futures
March 14, 1999**

Benchmark		Month											
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
	Preparation												
1	Introduce Local Policy Makers to <i>Treasure Valley Futures</i>												
2	Establish Regional Trend Baseline												
3	Conduct Barriers Analysis												
4	Compile Alternative Choices Catalog												
5	Develop Demonstration Prototypes												
6	Conduct Regional Forum on Next Steps for the Treasure Valley												
Evaluation Survey of elected officials Two random surveys of residents Focus groups													

VII. Budget and Resources

The total budget for the *Treasure Valley Futures* project will be \$616,000 with **\$510,000 coming from the TCSP grant and \$106,000 from local resources**. There are additional in-kind contributions expected primarily from state, county, city, and highway district, and university staffs. However, because the exact level of participation could not be calculated at this time, the dollar value of this contribution has **not** been included in the budget. In addition, negotiations are currently underway to obtain donated office space and equipment for the project which will also have monetary value. **All local contributions, except for \$7,000 of the in-kind contribution from Idaho Smart Growth will go directly to this project. The \$7,000 will be used to produce a document on local access to Tea-21, which is a related activity.** Figure 2 shows the resources allocated to each benchmark and evaluation task by categories described below.

Direct Costs. These are the direct costs of each project that will be allocated toward labor, data purchase and other direct expenses associated with each benchmark or evaluation task.

Public Involvement. Public involvement has been broken out as a separate item related to each benchmark to demonstrate the project's commitment to community outreach and public participation. The overhead costs for public participation such as postage and printing, have been incorporated into each benchmark/evaluation task's budget.

Coordination. This item includes one half-time staff person who will be responsible for managing the project on a day to day basis. Other project overhead costs, including travel, are included in this item except office rental, telephone, and office equipment. In-kind contributions are assumed for these expenses.

**Table 1: Suggested Budget for Treasure Valley Futures
March 9, 1999**

Benchmark	Activity	Federal Funding Requested				Local Contribution	Grand Total
		Direct Costs	Public Involvement	Coordination	Total Federal		
1	Introduce Local Policy Makers to <i>Treasure Valley Futures</i>	\$20,000	\$25,000	\$5,500	\$50,500	\$17,000	\$67,500
2	Establish Regional Trend Baseline	\$55,000	\$12,500	\$6,000	\$73,500	\$18,800	\$92,300
3	Conduct Barriers Analysis	\$60,000	\$50,000	\$9,900	\$119,900	\$25,800	\$145,700
4	Compile Alternative Choices Catalog	\$35,000	\$7,500	\$4,200	\$46,700	\$3,800	\$50,500
5	Develop Demonstration Prototypes	\$100,000	\$10,000	\$9,900	\$119,900	\$20,800	\$140,700
6	Conduct Regional Forum on Next Steps for the Treasure Valley	\$30,000	\$10,000	\$5,000	\$45,000	\$7,800	\$52,800
Evaluation		\$50,000		\$4,500	\$54,500	\$12,000	\$66,500
Survey of elected officials - \$5,000 Two random surveys of residents in area - \$20,000 Focus groups with development and community representatives (selected citizens, builders, financial, p&z members, etc.) \$25,000							
Total		\$350,000	\$115,000	\$45,000	\$510,000	\$106,000	\$616,000

VIII. Evaluation

This project is substantially different from run-of-the-mill one-day discussions offered to local citizenry by "outside experts" summarizing what Florida, Oregon, or some other region has done. Such sessions involve few people, offer few locally-designed and locally-relevant suggestions and leave little lasting impact. Rather, the objectives envisioned in this proposal both educate and offer concrete alternatives in the context of the local political and social climate. And these objectives are structured and implemented in a manner to lend themselves to sound pre-test/post-test evaluation in addition to the softer "How many..." and "When..." evaluation questions.

As described in Section III, there are three objectives for *Treasure Valley Futures*:

Objective 1: Educate policy makers, advocacy groups, business leaders, and citizens about land use and transportation policy decisions in a regional and local contexts.

Objective 2: Identify ways to overcome major barriers impeding compact development and efficient infrastructure systems in the Treasure Valley.

Objective 3: Define realistic alternative choices to existing land use and transportation implementation policies in the Treasure Valley.

Evaluative strategies focus on the things *Treasure Valley Futures* can alter-people's perceptions of alternative land uses and transportation and concrete models of how to change what they are currently doing. This seems far more appropriate for the scope of the budget and time-frame for this proposal than believing we could possibly effect changes in the physical environment and in people's travel behavior.

The evaluation component of this proposal uses methodologies especially suited to the applied nature of the objectives. The best evaluation of the first objective would be to identify two groups, one of whom received the educational efforts and the other of whom did not, and then compare differential changes in the two groups over time. In practice, however, real world implementation of broad-based educational programs cannot be withheld from anyone for the sake of research. Therefore, we propose what we believe is an appropriate set of strategies designed for the real world and applied in such a manner that they provide sound statistical bases upon which to assess whether the objectives of this proposal have been accomplished.

Two multistage observational strategies will be employed in this evaluation. For one, survey instruments will be prepared appropriate to the general public, elected officials and department heads of all local governments and all planning and zoning commissions. These will be administered once at the very outset and again after all educational and outreach efforts have been completed in order to determine changes from pre-test to post-test. A second involves fewer subjects in a multistage observation paradigm. Specifically, we will identify six groups of twelve to fifteen individuals selected from the key stakeholder groups who will commit to multiple focus group participation beginning at the very outset, continuing throughout and concluding after all educational outreach efforts have been completed in order to determine patterns of change over time relevant to the objectives of this proposal.

These strategies will be blended with comprehensive and accurate monitoring of project accomplishments to provide a well-rounded and statistically defensible evaluation of the project. The following table identifies, for each objective, the particular multistage strategy or data monitoring activity employed.

Objective 1: Educate policy makers, advocacy groups, business leaders, and citizens about land use and transportation policy decisions in a regional and local contexts.	
a	Number of reports, etc. distributed to participants
b	Number of media reports on TVF & land use/transportation issues
c	Number of educational sessions scheduled and held
d	Number of people who attend sessions
e	Pre-test and post-test survey of random citizens regarding knowledge and attitudes toward alternative land uses and transportation (same questions would be asked in this as in the pre-test survey).
f	Pre-test and post-test survey of partners regarding knowledge and attitudes toward alternative land uses and transportation (same questions would be asked in this as in the pre-test survey).
g	Time series focus group with selected development community representatives (builders, financiers, consultants). Three or more sessions would be held (start of project, midway, and end of project).
h	Time series focus group with selected political leaders. Three or more sessions would be held (start of project, midway, and end of project).
i	Time series focus group with selected citizens. Three or more sessions would be held (start of project, midway, and end of project).

Objective 2: Identify ways to overcome major barriers impeding compact development and efficient infrastructure systems in the Treasure Valley.	
a	Number of entities engaged in a timely manner
b	List and description of documents reviewed for barriers in process
c	Number of barriers identified in each document reviewed
d	Number of positive, pro-alternative mechanisms identified in the documents
Objective 3: Define realistic alternative choices to existing land use and transportation implementation policies in the Treasure Valley.	
a	List of choices
b	Extent of public support for the choices

[[Previous Page](#) | [Grant Recipient Information](#)]

This page last modified on April 4, 2011



[TCSP Home](#) | [FHWA Home](#) | [Feedback](#) | [Privacy Notice](#) | [Site Map](#)

Federal Highway Administration - **United States Department of Transportation**