

WELCOME

Thank you for attending today's open house.

The purpose of the open house is to give you an opportunity to:

- **See visual representations of all 10 alternatives/alignments that have been studied**
- **Learn and provide comments about the alternatives/alignments being recommended to be carried forward**
- **Review and provide comments on the environmental studies conducted for the alternatives/alignments and talk to the experts who completed them**

THANK YOU FOR ATTENDING TODAY'S OPEN HOUSE

What's next (short term):

- The Idaho Transportation Department will review your comments and make a final recommendation to the Federal Highway Administration on the alternatives/alignments to be carried forward
- The Federal Highway Administration will review and approve the alternatives/alignments recommended by ITD
- A summary of your comments will be included in an upcoming newsletter and posted to the project Web page

What's next (longer term):

- The public will have an opportunity to provide input on the alternatives/alignments that ITD recommends for inclusion in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS)
- Using data from the environmental studies, input from the resource agencies, and comments from the public, ITD will analyze the impacts of the alternatives/alignments and make a recommendation for a preferred alternative/alignment. This analysis will include the projected cost.
- The DEIS is expected to be released in fall/winter 2006 and will include the preferred alternative/alignment
- ITD will hold a public hearing on the DEIS in fall/winter 2006

EVALUATION PROCESS AND GUIDELINES

ITD evaluated all proposed alternatives based on criteria developed with input from:

- The public
- Federal Highway Administration
- Environmental Protection Agency
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services
- Idaho Fish & Game
- Idaho Transportation Department

After discussion with the resource agencies and a review of public input, alternatives/alignments were eliminated from consideration based on project findings shown on the matrix.

The following guidelines were used:

- The selection of alignments recommended to carry forward were based solely on evaluation criteria identified in the alignment evaluation matrix
- All evaluation criteria was considered equally. When criteria was equal across alignments, it was evaluated as beneficial to each alignment.
- One alternative/alignment from each corridor (west, central and east) was recommended to be carried forward
- The alternative/alignment from each corridor that demonstrated the least amount of overall impact to the human and natural environment was recommended to be carried forward

The resource agencies will continue to participate in the evaluation process.

WESTERN ALTERNATIVES/ALIGNMENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS

W1 – The ITD project team recommends W1 be eliminated from further consideration.

Reasons:

- **Longest alignment in the corridor (8.2 miles)**
- **Highest projected accident rates (13.07 accidents per year)**
- **Largest amount of right-of-way needed (320 acres)**
- **Highest cost (\$58 million)**
- **High amount of cultural impact probability (114 acres)**
- **Adverse effect on one historic structure**
- **Wetland impact (5.1 acres)**
- **Seven tributary stream crossings**
- **Eight regulatory floodway or floodplain hits**
- **Socioeconomic effects one mile south of Moscow – significant increase in property values, moderate potential to induce development, challenge for future growth.**
- **Visual impacts – 45 percent of the corridor occurs in an area of moderately high to high areas for visual impacts**
- **Highest prime farmland impact in corridor (IR of 204)**
- **Impacts two CDC plant survey sites**
- **Alignment crosses 29.2 acres of known ungulate (deer, elk, moose) use**

W2 – The ITD project team recommends W2 be eliminated from further consideration.

Reasons:

- **Large amount of right-of-way needed (285 acres)**
- **High cost (\$49 million)**
- **High amount of cultural impact probability (90 acres)**
- **Adverse affect on one historic property**
- **Wetland impact (5.2 acres)**
- **Six regulatory floodway or floodplain hits**
- **Five hazardous materials hits**
- **Concern about noise – 13 total noise receptors within 300 feet of centerline**
- **Visual impacts – 61 percent of the corridor occurs within area of moderately high to high areas for visual impacts**
- **High prime farmland impact (IR 197)**

W3 – The ITD project team recommends W3 be eliminated from further consideration.

Reasons:

- **Length (7.8 miles)**
- **Projected accident rates (12.43 accidents per year)**
- **Large amount of right-of-way needed (290 acres)**
- **High cost (\$55 million)**
- **Six tributary stream crossings**
- **Seven regulatory floodway or floodplain hits**
- **Concern about noise – 12 total noise receptors within 300 feet of centerline**
- **Visual impacts – 54 percent of the corridor occurs within area of moderately high to high areas for visual impacts**
- **High prime farmland impact (IR 202)**
- **Impacts two CDC plant survey sites**
- **Alignment crosses 29.2 acres of known ungulate (deer, elk, moose) use**

W4 – The ITD project team recommends W4 be carried forward.

Reasons:

- **Least amount of right of way needed (255 acres)**
- **Lowest cost (\$41 million)**
- **No effect on historic sites**
- **Five regulatory floodway or floodplain hits**
- **No effect on threatened and endangered species**
- **Socioeconomic effects on the rest of the corridor – no effect on minority or low-income populations, no change in property values, moderate to no potential to induce development**
- **Lowest visual impacts – 31 percent of the corridor occurs within area of moderately high to high areas of concern for visual impacts**
- **Lowest prime farmland impact (IR 187)**
- **No effect on Conservation Data Center species of concern**
- **No CDC plant survey sites**
- **No effect to ungulate (deer, elk, moose) populations or identified habitat areas**
- **Precipitation levels consistent within corridor (74 percent)**
- **Total fog hours consistent within corridor (49 hours)**
- **Road ice conditions consistent within corridor (158 hours)**

CENTRAL ALTERNATIVES/ALIGNMENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS

C1 – The ITD project team recommends C1 be eliminated from further consideration.

Reasons:

- **Length (7.3 miles long)**
- **Projected accident rates (14.59 accidents per year)**
- **Large amount of right-of-way needed (225 acres)**
- **High amount of cultural impact probability (100 acres)**
- **Adverse effect on two historic structures**
- **Wetland impact (4.6 acres)**
- **12 tributary stream crossings**
- **12 hazardous materials sites**
- **17 displacements or relocations**
- **Concern about noise – 51 total noise receptors within 300 feet of centerline**
- **Visual impacts – 24 percent of the corridor occurs within area of moderately high to high areas of concern for visual impacts**
- **Higher road ice conditions within corridor (158 hours)**

C2 – The ITD project team recommends C2 be eliminated from further consideration.

Reasons:

- **Longest alignment in the central corridor (7.4 miles)**
- **Large amount of right-of-way needed (250 acres)**
- **High cost (\$41 million)**
- **High amount of cultural impact probability (125 acres)**
- **Wetland impact (5.8 acres)**
- **Five regulatory floodway or floodplain hits**
- **Visual impacts – 44 percent of the corridor occurs within area of moderately high to high areas of concern for visual impacts**
- **High prime farmland impact (IR 188)**
- **Higher road ice conditions within corridor (158 hours)**

C3 – The ITD project team recommends C3 be carried forward.

Reasons:

- **Shortest of all alignments in corridor (6.8 miles)**
- **Least amount of right-of-way needed (195 acres)**
- **Lowest cost (\$33 million)**
- **Lowest amount of cultural impact probability (75 acres)**
- **No effect on historic sites**
- **Lowest wetland impact in corridor (1.7 acres)**
- **Four regulatory floodway or floodplain hits**
- **No effect on threatened and endangered species**
- **Socioeconomic effects one mile south of Moscow – Increase in property values, moderate to low potential to induce development**
- **Socioeconomic effects on the rest of the corridor – No change in property values, moderate potential to induce development**
- **No effect on minority or low-income populations**
- **Three displacements or relocations**
- **Lowest visual impacts – 23 percent of the corridor occurs within area of moderately high to high areas of concern for visual impacts**
- **No effect on Conservation Data Center species of concern**
- **No CDC plant survey sites**
- **No effect on ungulate (deer, moose, elk) populations or identified habitat areas**
- **Road ice conditions consistent within corridor (128 hours)**

EASTERN ALTERNATIVES/ALIGNMENTS

RECOMMENDATIONS

E1 – The ITD project team recommends E1 be eliminated from further consideration.

Reasons:

- **Amount of right-of-way needed (260 acres)**
- **High cost (\$43 million)**
- **High amount of cultural impact probability (53 acres)**
- **Adverse effect on one historic structure**
- **Wetland impact (4.4 acres)**
- **10 tributary stream crossings**
- **Five displacements or relocations**
- **Concern about noise – 18 total noise receptors within 300 feet of centerline**
- **Visual impacts – 52 percent of the corridor occurs within area of moderately high to high areas of concern for visual impacts**
- **Impacts two Conservation Data Center plant survey sites**

E2 – The ITD project team recommends E2 be carried forward.

Reasons:

- **Lowest amount of right-of-way needed (225 acres)**
- **Lowest cost (\$37 million)**
- **Low amount of cultural impact probability (42 acres)**
- **No effect on threatened and endangered species**
- **Wetland impact (4.1 acres)**
- **Seven tributary stream crossings**
- **Three regulatory floodway or floodplain hits**
- **Socioeconomic effects one mile south of Moscow – Increase in property values, moderate potential to induce development**
- **Socioeconomic effects on the rest of corridor – No change in property values, moderate to no potential to induce development**
- **No disproportionately high impact to minority or low-income populations**
- **Less concern about noise – 13 total noise receptors within 300 feet of centerline**
- **No CDC plant survey sites**
- **Precipitation levels consistent within corridor (80 percent)**
- **Total fog hours consistent within corridor (69 hours)**
- **Road ice conditions consistent within corridor (128 hours)**

E3 – The ITD project team recommends E3 be eliminated from further consideration.

Reasons:

- **Amount of right-of-way needed (235 acres)**
- **High cost (\$40 million)**
- **High amount of cultural impact probability (44 acres)**
- **Wetland impact (4.3 acres)**
- **Eight tributary stream crossings**
- **Five hazardous materials sites**
- **Concern about noise – 19 total noise receptors within 300 feet of centerline**
- **High prime farmland impact (IR 196)**
- **May affect 2.5 acres of habitat for Conservation Data Center species of concern**
- **Impacts two CDC plant survey sites**
- **Alignment crosses 4.7 acres of ungulate (deer, elk, moose) habitat**

ADDITIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL STUDIES

- **NOISE**
- **PURPOSE AND NEED**
- **CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES**
- **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**
- **ARCHEOLOGICAL**
- **THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES**
- **REGULATORY FLOODWAY**
- **WIND**

CLIMATE

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

PLANT SURVEY

PRIME FARMLAND

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

SAFETY

UNGULATES
(DEER, MOOSE, ELK)

VISUAL ANALYSIS

VISUAL DEMONSTRATION

WETLANDS

Continuing environmental analysis

**The Idaho Transportation Department is
continuing the environmental analysis
on the following:**

- **Water Quality**
- **Air Quality**
- **Habitat fragmentation –
Overall effects on geographically
separated habitats**