U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow April 13, 2005 Open House

Transcription of Comments

The Idaho Transportation Department hosted a public open house on April 13, 2005 for the U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow project. The purpose of the open house was to display the results from the January 2005 alternatives/alignments workshops and show the next steps of the project.

Approximately 100 people signed in. There were 27 comments received, including those by submitted by mail and email. People had the opportunity to submit comments on the Western Alternatives/Alignments, Central Alternatives/Alignments and Eastern Alternatives/Alignments. Each alternative/alignment had its own comment form.

Following is the transcription of comments. They have been sorted by Western Alternatives/Alignments, Central Alternatives/Alignments and Eastern Alternatives/Alignments. The comment sheet number corresponds to the sheet from which it was transcribed.

	Western Alternatives/Alignments
Comment #	Comments Received: 12
1	All alignments: comments presented at the open house are, for the most part (as I'm sure you are aware), based on little to no data – as there was no rigorous set of data available. Comments are generally feelings and there are conflicting arguments (e.g. W2 "less weather impact + "wx concerns"; "appears to avoid … wildlife habitat"; "goes through wildlife corridor."
	The W1 'like' comment that 'existing U.S. 95 could be used after (construction) as a local road" does not take into account that the existing road would be left as is (and probably deteriorate) – as 'unsafe' as it purportedly is now!
	I still prefer C1 followed by W2 – of those presented. Eager to learn more about the 4 new routes.
2	W1 <u>please</u> !
	Safer, less elevation, better (hopeful-future) access to Pullman, WA, less obtrusive. Better fits Idaho landscape Safer
3	Other than their impact to farmland, I find the western routes attractive. I like that they avoid Paradise Ridge, and they avoid most homes. These routes also have the location at a better elevation, so that the winter inclement weather condition of the eastern routes are much less a factor

12 Utilizing the northern- most section of alignment W-2 just South of Moscow to skirt current businesses and homes in that stretch is a logical idea. From there the new 4-lane HWY could logically tie into the current HWY 95 somewhere near Jacksha Rd. (as shown on your topo map for the CENTRAL ALIGNMENT) This avoids unnecessary additional divisions of farmland and reduces the new "footprint" of an improved 4-lane HWY while at the same time avoiding unnecessary invasion and destruction of Paradise Ridge. A safe 4-lane HWY could be constructed with the least impact on people, farming, and the entire ecosystem of Paradise Ridge.

Improvement in acciden surface, camber, curve r stability, and audio-tacti	es not meet current design standar it experience would be expected fr adius, lane width, grade, sight dist le lane lines.	om appr	ropriat	te upgr	ades in	
The influence of speed of				i wiati	i, snou	lder
speed yield large benefit limits and by <i>reducing</i> s	on accident severity is so substanti ts ² . Accident experience can be in peed limits ³ .					
	vo-lane roadway instead of buildir native Palouse Prairie ecosystem abitat.					
contributing air and nois	urage eighteen-wheelers to highba se pollution. Economic impact ana operty values due to noise emissio	lysis for	highv			s a
The best alternative wou	ald be enhancement of the present	two lane	e road	way.		
<u>Ent</u> • •	Improve the roadway to current s Optimize speed limit enforcement Reduce the speed limit if necessa	standards nt		<u>7</u>		
	Comparison of Alternativ	es				
	Enhancement of the Present Two Lane Roadway	C-1	E-1	E-2	W-1	W-2
Least acreage consumed	Х					
Least environmental impact	Х					
Least cost	Х					

¹ See http://www.northwestmedia.net/us95/.
² See e.g. http://www.saferoads.org/issues/fs-spped.htm
³ For example, introduction of speed photo radar devices results in reductions of roadway deaths as much as 30 percent. http://www.saferoads.org/issues/fs-speed.htm
 ⁴ Rodrigue, J: "Transportation Pollutants and Environmental Externalities." http://people.hofstra.edu/geotrans/eng/ch8en/conc8en/ch8c3en.html, 2004

15	 The safest and most environmentally sound routes farms are split throughout the country & continue to thrive some of the opinions in this issue sound like farmers vs. "rich hill" people are taking precedence over logic W1 makes the most sense as far as future options for bypass
19	To me the Western alignment appears most attractive because it is a natural for a future bypass around Moscow. The population density is less than the Central or Eastern Alignments. The watershed off of Paradise Ridge would not be negatively impacted to the same or greater extent as with the Central and especially Eastern Alignment. Likewise there would be lessened destruction of wildlife habitat and native soils and grasses. From a weather standpoint, this route would be much safer than one at higher elevation. There would be less impact from wind, fog and drifting snow.
22	Please consider doing a hybrid of alignments C to around Eid Road & then going to W2. This combination is a win-win situation for farmland, displacing of people (it would minimize that), wildlife, & the existing native prairie.
24	For whatever it may be worth, I prefer a combination of the northern portion of W-2 with the southern portion of W-1, although I acknowledge that the rugged topography in a segment of W-1 might engender cut-and-fill problems. In fact, following the present location to Jacksha Road makes some sense to me, but that, I suppose, would eliminate some present homesites and interfere with the intermittent stream that flows nearby.
25	The W-1 proposal is too extreme in distance and earth movement, and therefore, should be avoided. The W-2 proposal is much better, but could be improved by utilizing the compromise route described above under the Central Alignment comments. I am concerned about the data being collected for the EIS. I realize the cost and time factors involved, but one year's or season's data is not very relevant in the Palouse. Every year is different, and this winter, particularly, is way off the norm weather wise. This impacts distinguishing differences among the alternate proposed routes. Weather effects on road conditions and wildlife movements are particularly impacted. Extrapolation of data from other years from another area with a weather station, such as the U of I Plant Sciences Farm is irrelevant. Distinguishing among proposed routes must be based on microenvironment, including microclimate, differences. Any differences have to be measured in the microenvironments themselves.
Email	I like the north half of W2 because it avoids "prime" farmland and the dense housing. Staying to the west makes sense in terms of an eventual by-pass and the fact that traffic will only continue to increase between Moscow and Pullman. The north half of W2, when combined with the south half of C1, makes a very appealing tandem. See comments on Central Alignment.

Email	From Jacksha Road north along Clyde-Druffel property
	line. Then along Clyde-Garrison property line. Then
	across Renfrew property and go on the west side of
	Clyde Hill on Clyde property. Then across Deesten's
	to the grain elevators on 95.

	Central Alternatives/Alignments
Comment #	Comments Received: 9
4	My strong preference is for the central route, which is a "composite" or "hybrid," combining the existing Hwy 95 from Thorn Creek Rd., then a part of a western route, so that fewer homes and businesses are impacted. It has the advantage, also, of being at a more desirable elevation and avoids the undesirable location for the highway, near Paradise Ridge.
5	No action: <u>Some</u> money is available – not <u>all</u> of it.
	Interesting to note public comments substantial enough to report on dislikes, not as safe, but not sufficient awareness on public's part that the old 95 would still be traveled if non-C1 route chosen, and <u>no</u> safety upgrades would have been done on it. And maintenance would likely drop w/ county funding. Usage would drop for an unknown period of time, but added development and general continued growth would make use increase again. And, if new routes were too much too long (time/miles) then fewer people will go on new route.
	Public has not cost figures to accurately assess relative costs.
	Prefer C1 south to W2 north
6	New C1 to W2 or new modified C1 are the alternatives I prefer. My concerns are the noise, destruction of wildlife habitat, aesthetics of Paradise Ridge and destruction of the small %age of native Palouse Prairie. I think the 2 alternatives – new C1 to W2 and new modified C1 minimize impact to prime farmland and affect fewer residents and landowners that the other western alignments. The elevation is lower which may be better in terms of icy roads. No runaway truck route is necessary. Context sensitive design should be a high priority.
	I know limited access is considered important, but I believe sound alternatives have been established – meaning putting a road through the most pristine portion of a landscape where there are few county roads in order to develop limited access is not the only option.
	I applaud the maps which showed sections and property owners and possible historic locations.
	I believe most highway create weed corridors and lead to development. These would be a devastating impact to the remnant Palouse Prairie.
	Western alignments prevent the need for a future by-pass to cross from east to west, which would prevent the noise, traffic and impact to area surrounding Moscow caused by the bypass traversing the slopes of Clyde Hill.

11	Utilizing alignment C-1 from its southern end up to about Eid Rd and then cutting over to W2 creates a very wise route. It cuts the "footprint" of new alignment in half by utilizing the existing pathway from the southern end up to Eid Rd (as shown on the topo map for the CENTRAL ALIGNMENT). The new "footprint", which joins with the most northern stretch of W-2, skirts around existing homes and businesses on current HWY 95 South of Moscow. Keeping to the west of the current HWY entering Moscow will be a logical tie-up to a future by-pass (that will be necessary within 20 yrs according to the study, and that may become increasingly needed with additional traffic resulting from the improved 4-lane HWY) It will also be a good connection to the Moscow-Pullman HWY. This route causes the least impact on people, farmland, wildlife, and native prairie. It eliminates the problem of displacing people and businesses on the current HWY 95 South of Moscow and preserves the unique and invaluable landform and ecosystem of Paradise Ridge.
16	A nice compromise & preserves the view of residents of Southern Moscow If cheap is the priority this makes the most sense. Can Reisenauer Hill still be straightened out?
18	The existing route (C-1) in its entirety should be avoided due to undo disturbance of existing residences and businesses. A new proposal utilizing the existing route (C-1) coming from the south (Thorncreek Road) to about Jacksha Road, then diverting to the west to join the W-2 route the rest of the way to Moscow seems most desirable. Such a compromise route would utilize much of the existing route, yet avoids most of the existing home/business structures. The actual route selected could minimize curves, cuts and fills, bridges, hills, structures, and all the concerns noted above for the eastern alignments. This type of compromise minimizes the tremendous footprint that a divided highway creates.
20	The Central Alignments have the advantages of minimizing negative impacts to the environment by aligning with the current highway. An alignment that minimizes displacement of homes and people is highly desirable. It appears that this alignment minimizes negative impact on the environment, wildlife, native soils and grasses. This alignment is safer from the viewpoint of adverse weather conditions at higher elevation. As any road that enters Moscow must result in speed reduction and increased traffic congestion, it may be possible to lower the speed on the highway for safety prior to the road actually reaching Moscow. It also appears that this alignment increases the options for a future bypass around Moscow, which I believe is an inevitability when viewed from the point of population growth and expansion of the city impact zone.
23	We strongly support the central Alternative for many of the stated reasons

Combining the south half of C1 with the north half of W2 makes the most sense to me. By Email using the south half of C1 (to Jacksha or Snow roads), the overall footprint of this construction project can be greatly reduced. Because the south half meets design specifications, it will be safe, including the reconstructed Reisenauer Hill portion. Using the south half of C1 that is at lower elevation will reduce weather impacts. The number of access points is probably no greater than the Thorncreek to Genesee project. Limiting future access points along the south half of C1 will reduce potential for sprawl. Following the existing south C1 makes the best use of existing infrastructure. The net total roadway (including the old 95 and new 95, would only be about 7 miles, compared to, for example, 6.7 old and 6 new for a total of 12.7 miles if E2 were built). Whether it's ITD or North Latah, my taxes will pay for the additional maintenance. Following the south half of C1 meshes with natural topography of the Palouse and is more in line with FHA's directive of context sensitive designs. Using the south half of C1 also allows residents of Hidden Village more efficient access to both northbound and southbound lanes of an improved 95 and avoids potential water/well concerns with this community. It's unlikely that new roadway can be built (on any of the completely eastern or western alignments) moving less dirt per mile than following an existing footprint where substantial cuts and fills have already been accomplished. Using C1 rather than any of the eastern routes reduces noise impacts on the densely populated Hidden Village and, when combined with the north half of W2, eliminates the need to condemn and/or move homes. Joining the south half of C2 with the north half of W2 satisfies the design criteria and ensures a safe road. By connecting C1 to W2 near Jacksha, or perhaps even more so at Snow, the new highway can essentially avoid all the homes from Thorncreek to Moscow. Granted, it is still in close proximity to several existing homes, but they already have noise and visual impacts-impacts they were fully aware of when they purchased their property. Following the north half of W2 would reduce traffic impacts during construction similar to those achieved by either the complete western or eastern alignments. Traffic impacts on the south half of C2 would be no more pronounced than those along other portions of construction between Lewiston Grade and Moscow, particularly along the Lewiston Grade work. Aren't short-term traffic delays worth it terms of building a highway that will serve generations and preserve the natural features of the Palouse? Using the north half of W2 stays out of the "prime" farm ground. Potential sprawl would be limited to the 3 mile section of old 95, rather than 6.7 miles if any of the western or eastern alignments are used. Access could be greatly limited on the north half of W2 and the south half of C1 to

enhance safety and reduce sprawl.

	Eastern Alternatives/Alignments
Comment #	Comments Received: 9
7	Our considerations would be: 1. Safety 2. Shortest route 3. Construction costs It appears to us that east. alt. Would be the first choice.
8	I am most favorable to options C1 connect to W2 or the modified C1 shown on the central alignments/alternatives map. I think either of these routes is a good compromise that avoids many of the residences along current US 95 while remaining lower in the landscape and utilizing a portion of the existing roadway. These routes help avoid the possible noise and visual impacts I fear would occur with the higher elevation eastern routes. Noise and visual impacts to my neighborhood are one of my chief concerns.
9	I am particularly opposed to E-2 which is the route closest to Paradise Ridge. I am concerned about its potential impact on the environment, the Palouse Prairie, the aesthetics of our area, the wildlife. Also, this route is not a good choice because of its elevation and poorer winter weather conditions.
10	 No-no-no. Stay away from Palouse Prairie! Stay away from Steven's Spring(s) E1 "Like" leaving existing US 95 as a local road is a <u>negative</u> when considering unresolved safety issues (as I have stated elsewhere). How can wildlife use cuts as underpasses?? "Looks less expensive" is not useful information "No escape routes" – (1) untrue (2) its existence pushes E1 into a definite "dislike." E2 "Less right-of-way to acquire"?? You've (they've) got to be kidding!! Leaves existing US 95 "unsafe" "New" eastern route still too far east.
13	The Eastern alignments all traverse a continuous series of watershed routes off of Paradise Ridge and have a steep grade dropping into Moscow. The continuous high elevation most especially of E-2 (as opposed to point or points of high elevation on central and western alignments) is, in a "normal" year subject to greater effects of severe weather conditions. In addition, all 3 eastern alignments would UNNECESSARILY open Paradise Ridge to the many negative impacts of a massive "footprint" across its unique and endangered land and ecosystem. Other safer routes have been identified. For instance, the suggestion of utilizing the most southern portion of the existing HWY and tying into W-2 from about Jacksha Rd. is a good route. It disturbs less new land while avoiding the displacement of homes and businesses just south of Moscow.

17	 Aesthetically, environmentally, safety wise and meteorologically, these routes make no sense. They endanger wildlife and a protected ecosystem. These routes only benefit a few landowners and do not serve the greater good of Latah County. E2 is in a different weather zone than all of the others. Trying to extrapolate data on this route's 2005 weather is not scientifically sound (sample size = 1).
21	The Eastern Alignments have the potential to incur the greatest impact from adverse weather conditions. The likelihood of fog, increased crosswinds, greater snow accumulations and drifting are all increased by the gains in elevation incumbent on these alignments. There is also the fact that the ecological impact on native grasses, wildlife habitat and migration routes will be the greatest here. I am concerned about the possibility of adverse impact on water resources on the western drainage of Paradise Ridge from cutting a road crossing watershed. From a purely cultural viewpoint, Paradise Ridge offers irreplaceable esthetic and recreational opportunities for the residents of the immediate and surrounding community.
	It appears fairly obvious that at some time in the future a bypass around Moscow will become necessary. Moving the road east of its current position will make a bypass more difficult and probably expensive, as it doesn't make much sense to plan it farther away from Pullman as opposed to closer to it via a more westerly location for the road improvement.
	On a personal note, I am upset that a road in the proposed Eastern Alignment will severely devalue my recently completed residence on Paradise Ridge and will negatively impact the quality of life for those of us who chose to reside there before the road alignments were made public.
	If the road is going to enter Moscow and proceed through it South to North it will of course involve bottlenecking and speed reductions as it proceeds through Moscow. Is it possible to take US95 from Thorncreek Road to Moscow, improve it to two, three and/or four lanes where appropriate, improve the banking and the radius of turns and drop the speed limit to a safe level?
26	All original and new proposals should be avoided, especially E-2, because of their proximity to Paradise Ridge based on concerns about elevation and weather, safety, wildlife, drainages crossed, Palouse prairie, aesthetics, wells, steep grade to/from rejoin at Moscow, and noise. In general the footprint created by a divided highway will negatively impact the valuable natural area that is Paradise Ridge, and strongly violates context sensitive design concepts.

U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow April Open House Transcription of Comments

I dislike all of the eastern alignments because they fail the premise of context sensitive Email design as encouraged by the FHA. A straight shot highway bisecting the hills of the Palouse and slashing across the flank of Paradise Ridge will destroy the viewshed. An Idaho highway visible to Pullman, Washington, residents 7 miles away is not sensitive. Residents on the south side of Moscow will also be exposed to more highway than if W2 is used because most of the cuts for W2 will be hidden on the south side of Clyde Hill. The eastern alignments unnecessarily disrupt residents of the densely populated Hidden Village community, threaten their water supply, and increase noise levels. Eastern alignments unnecessarily endangered Palouse Prairie remnants by serving as potential vectors for invasive weeds. The most easterly alignments unnecessarily disrupts historic Steven's Springs. The eastern alignments will require at least one bridge, possibly more depending on eventual wildlife concerns. Seems to me bridges are more expensive to build and maintain than roadways without bridges, the possible situation with a C1/W2 hybrid route. Eastern alignments unnecessarily reduce habitat, and potentially reduce populations of species listed as being of special concern by the Idaho Conservation Data Center-it's doubtful any species of concern are located along the current C1 or the north half of W2. At the marathon workshop, ITD showed truck escape ramps on E2-how can that route be safer if you need to take care of runaway trucks hurtling into Moscow? In addition, E2 and perhaps E1 both have two large grades: one going over Eid Road and another before dropping into Moscow. This affords no advantage over the hybrid C1/W2 route.

	General comments received by email
Comment #	Comments: 8
	I attended the open house in mid-April and participated in the group sessions. I was glad to see some of the ideas the groups came up with presented at the open house.
	I think the C1 route from the south and then connecting to W-2 is a great compromise and the best route. It avoids the prime farmland of W-1 and the homes along the existing highway will not be as affected. This route is much more context sensitive than either of the 2 eastern routes. I am not in favor of the eastern routes at all. The elevation, weather, straight road (dangerous), long decent into Moscow, impact to view, and the fact that the eastern routes will not align with future western ring road proposed by the city of Moscow are all large negatives.
	First of all, I would like to say thank you for the opportunity to provide comments about the proposed highway project. To help refresh my memory, I tried to find a map with the alignments but had a hard time finding it. I spent over a half an hour trying to find them. In the future, putting a link directly on the home page would be very helpful instead of or in addition to the links found in Past Meetings.
	First of all, I live in the city of Moscow and use the highway to travel primarily to Lewiston. My husband travels it on his way for business in southern Idaho.
	I like parts of the W2 alignment because it avoids what I'll call "prime" farmland and dense housing. By staying towards the west side would make sense if a by-pass were perhaps in the future and the fact that traffic will continue to increase between Moscow and Pullman.
	Perhaps consideration of a combination of the south half of C1 and the north half of W2 might be possible. Using the southern half of C1 which is at a lower elevation would help with negative weather effects. It would also help make use of the existing infrastructure. Following the south half of C1 seems to follow the natural topography of the Palouse as well. Why not try to make the highway fit with the Palouse hills instead of cutting through it just to make a straight arrow approach to Moscow.
	It also appears that using the south half of C1 would reduce the noise impact for Hidden Village and if you combine it with the north half of W2, it would decrease and/or eliminate the moving or condemnation of homes.
	Utilization of the north half of W2 also seems to spare "prime" farmland.

I don't feel like the eastern alignments are the best choice. It seems to cut through the Palouse (even though it may be a straighter highway). There are also safety concerns. Does having to have truck escape ramps seem like a choice for better safety? Why not choose the one without such a grade? Also, these alignments will disrupt the Hidden Village homes and families a great deal. When they purchased their homes, they were a good ways away from the highway and that should be respected. Also, it could possibly threaten their water supply and will greatly increase the noise level from the highway.
There's also the fact that using these alignments will greatly disrupt and endanger parts of the Palouse Prairie, impacting areas where moose and deer frequently travel, and reduce their habitat as well as reduce populations of species that are of special concern by the Idaho Conservation Data Center. I would like to see the area around and of Paradise Ridge not impacted by the re-alignment of Hwy. 95. Please consider a combination of the south half of C1 and the north half of W2 as a possibility for the highway. It really does seem to make sense.
Thank you once again for the chance to comment.
First, I encourage you to take into account the natural variation of the Palouse landscape and build a road that is more in harmony with the landscape than large cuts and fill $-I$ believe this is called a context sensitive design.
Second, I encourage you to use a hybrid of the proposed routes – Use the north _ of route W2 to avoid prime farmland and housing. In addition, the western route would route US-95 folks going on to Pullman an easier access route. The northern _ of W2 with the south _ of C1 helps reduce new road construction and maximizes use of the existing highway. This hybrid route maintains a safe road, minimizes impacts on the Hidden Village Trailer Park (well water, noise, and access), and does not condemn any homes.
As a home owner on Paradise Ridge, I know there are many days when it is snowing on or near the Ridge and only raining on the existing route. Proximity to Paradise Ridge increases the risk of black ice, frost, snow, and drifting which can only increase the risk for collisions.
As a professional soil scientist I know the dangers of large road cuts and erosion. These large road cuts will be especially prevalent on the eastern routes and I again encourage a more context sensitive design and use of existing road bed. In addition, the proposed eastern alignments will likely adversely impact the Palouse Prairie ecosystems by making them susceptible to invasion of noxious and invasive weeds.

I don't personally live in the area where this construction will take place and actually don't drive to Lewiston very often; however, I feel that the slashes ITD is planning to make through the beautiful hills is an outrage. I have friends whose homes and land will be affected. I realize that not everyone will ever be completely satisfied with this project, but it seems to me that more can be done to protect homes, land, and the natural beauty that was one of the reasons I chose to move here. I agree with those who don't want Paradise Ridge to become part of the highway. Why would we want such an eyesore through the Palouse when apparently there are other options available that are safer, more cost effective, and less of an impact on the ecosystem? I am attaching a letter that a friend of mine sent to me regarding the changes and what would be better alternatives. I admit, I don't know much about it and it won't directly affect me, but I can see the points that are made in his letter are valid and should be taken into consideration.
While I do not live in the area of impact, as a Moscow resident I have been carefully following the presentations regarding the reroute of U.S. 95.
First and foremost I believe that ITD should construct a highway which is sensitive to the topological and environmental context of the region, while at the same time using as much of the old road as possible. Given these beliefs I encourage you to adopt the C1/W2 hybrid route (using the central alignment from Thorncreek to Jacksha and west alignment #2 from Jacksha to Moscow). This makes the most use of the existing highway, avoids ecologically sensitive areas, avoids people's houses and will help reduce sprawl to the south of Moscow. Finally, it reduces the total number of miles of roadway when compared to the other alternatives.
Thank you for considering these comments.

Dear friends. I've been following the developments of the proposed highway heading our way north into Moscow.
I occasionally sense that the process is to continue holding "info-gathering meetings" until everybody is info-gathered out, and then the plan first floated will wind up being used. But I hate to think like that
Therefore, I am sending some more of my comments, although I live in the town of Moscow, and my property is not directly affected. I believe all of us here in Moscow, and all the voiceless trees and critters around here, are directly affected by the way in which the landscape surrounding us is carved and re-carved by highways and traffic,
I continue to believe that modifying the existing highway path is the clearest, cleanest resolution to a safer route for traffic, and a safer resolution for residents (of all kinds). We neither need nor want the dubious artwork of highways scarring our landscape further.
I agree with others who have consistently maintained that the C1/W2 hybrid route (using the central alignment from Thorncreek to Jacksha and west alignment #2 from Jacksha to Moscow) makes the most sense because it makes the most use of the existing highway footprint, avoids everyone's home, will help reduce sprawl south of Moscow, and minimizes the total number of miles of roadway.
I urge you to be wise and kind to the earth, to the affected residents, to the habitat and to all of us who call this place home.
I understand that a route is being considered that combines the central alignments from Thorncreek to Jackshaw and the Western 2 alignment from Jackshaw north. The problem all along has been exacerbated by the very natural desire of homeowners along the route to avoid having a 4 lane highway in their front yards. This route avoids the homes. The south half of the C1 route from Jackshaw or Snow road North W2 route does this.
I live in Moscow, on 7th street but travel highway 95 several times a month especially in the summer when I am towing heavy equipment.