

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C1	Not Bad.	Not Bad.	Makes the most sense! (of these 3)	
C2	Agree with recommendation. <i>(Circled Eliminate in question)</i>	Agree with recommendation. <i>(Circled Eliminate in question)</i>	Agree—carry forward. <i>(Circled Carry Forward in question)</i>	
C3	This is my preference to build.	Better than any of E's. Better than any of W's.	This would be my second choice to build.	
C4	No. <i>(Circled Eliminate in question)</i> .	No. <i>(Circled Eliminate in question)</i> .	Best of these central choices/ not good though.	
C5	Eliminate. Too crooked too many displacements/relocations.	Eliminate lost farm acres, extra length.	Eliminate too crooked	Didn't notice any.
C6			Concerned about impact on population at Clyde/Cameron Road.	
C7		This plan appears to have the least impact on people, the most favorable weather conditions, modest impact to wetland acres and the cost is the same as other recommended routes. Why wasn't this a recommend route?	This plan appears to be moderately disruptive to people, has the least impact on wetlands, is the most cost effective.	
C8	Is there really any question/discussion regarding this. The safest route should be chosen.	Same.	Same	Same
C9	Agree, considerable impact on existing homes and businesses.	Viable alternative. Less noise and visual impact for residences just south of Moscow.	Concerned about noise and visual impact upon homes new Moscow.	
C10	I don't think that any of the central routes address the real problem areas.	See above.	See the other side.	
C11	Eliminate from further consideration	Eliminate from further consideration	Carry forward	No
C12	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	No	Reisenauer Valley causes recurring western snowmalies (ice, wind) that can't be fixed. Abandon this approach!!
C13	Eliminate!		Carry this forward	
C14	Glad it's eliminated	Glad it's eliminated	Yes! You've listed all the reasons. They're good ones! Suggest someone recheck methodology and/or figures for Climate of W4 and C3 but somehow I just cannot believe that the climate number on the matrix for C3 and E2 are correct. Just last week when I drove to and from Lewiston, I could clearly see the difference at road level and up higher to the east on Paradise Ridge near Kas Dumrose's property. It was white and frosty up there. Rainy down where I was.	Probably, but you've done an outstanding job in presenting info this time. One suggestion: for next time re-do the visual color coded foot print Alternative Routes in the prime farmland section and accompanying tables of area to be converted for only the alternatives that are to be carried forward. Make it a bigger Still display and incorporate it into video too. It's very helpful. More noticeable.
C15	Ok	Ok	As the cheapest of all C3, E2, or W4 to construct, this is clearly the best choice. New roads associated with this alternative miss all wetlands, and no new wetlands are	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
			impacted along the existing road. Some of the existing residences are by-passes, making this the best of the C alternatives and the best overall.	
C16	See C3	See C3	This seems the most practical eliminates the residential impact on roadway. “Straight Shot” from Johnson trucking into Moscow. Stays away from Paradise Ridge and wildlife considerations. This is a big consideration for us.	
C17	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
C18	No	No	No	No
C19	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
C20	Impact on current homes and businesses—not as good as C3 but better than any of the western or eastern routes.	No need to stretch out so far into farm land and impact Clyde Hill.	This is the BEST choice with the least impact on farmland, least impact on environment, straight shot right into Moscow.	
C21			I agree that C3 is a likely and acceptable route. It seems to be the most cost effective without significant property/residential displacement or other environmental affects—good alternative	
C22			Best Choice—meets the concern about improving safety on Reisenauer Hill, cheapest, shortest, less ice.	
C23	Eliminate	Eliminate	#1 recommendation. Only downside is the amount of fog, but really 69 hours per year is not very many hours. This is the best solution.	
C24	The present route would require the least purchase of land. It’s the most logical cost wise.			
C25	Does not address the basic safety and maintenance concerns. Not recommended	Does not address basic safety concerns—not recommended. Does not solve the real life problems. Expensive for what we get.	Does not solve certain existing safety problems. Expensive construction, least objectionable.	Replacing current highway with slightly improve road does not solve the real problems—especially safety.
C26	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
C27	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	This does not solve some of the major problems—safety—because it doesn’t eliminate Riensnauer Hill. Why spend this amount of money and not fix some of the biggest issues. Please eliminate	
C28	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	Eliminate	Road access and safety are still major concerns on these alternatives.
C29			I think this is the best choice of the central routes. Maybe the best choice overall. I like the fact this choice	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
			disturbs the fewest number of acres of farm land.	
C30	This route affects way to many businesses and homes.	This is my favorite central route. It seems to be safe and low impact.	This route is foggier than the other central routes. This means it is more dangerous and should not be considered.	
C31	This alternative has very high accident rates and numbers of residences to be relocated and should be eliminated.	This is a safer alternative than C3 with fewer homes destroyed and should be considered over C3.	This alignment is more accident prone than C2 and so C2 should be considered. Also, this calls for the destruction of more homes with other measures being so close; I think C2 is the better alternative.	
C32	I support C3.		This is the one I favor.	
C33	Eliminate	Eliminate	This is the best alternative	
C34	Agree	Agree	Agree	
C35	Cheap when compared to other options, but still relatively high accidents per year estimation. Basically the same route as current US 95—so why bother?	Not a bad alternative, but most expensive of these options.	Best option of central alignments. Shorter, cheaper, less ROW required.	
C36	Impacts too many people, what to do with wildlife with the road at the bottom of the draw?	Impacts too many people, what do you do with the wildlife with the road at the bottom of the draw.	Too much impact on people and homes. What are you going to do with the wildlife movement.	
C37	Good recommendation	Good recommendation	Better than E1,2,3 and not as good as W4.	Not that I can see other than the lack of foresight about how to get US 95 around Moscow.
C38	Eliminate	Eliminate	Yes, carry forward, but it solves few of the existing problems. It has too many access points.	
C39	Do not consider—no improvement over the present road, all the hazards still exist.	Too long with no major adjustments.	Best of the central alternatives—but do not consider because it follows the Reisenauer Hill	
C40	All are bad choices, don't consider further.			
C41	Agree	Please reconsider this route. The fact that it follows the existing highway for a good distance, therefore causing less impact, should be taken into consideration. It also avoids most of the population and businesses.		
C42	Agree	Agree	This is the best alternative. It is straight, takes up less wetland, in short doesn't disrupt native vegetation.	
C43	Agree eliminate.	Maybe needs to be reconsidered.	Not really a favorite for me because: hazardous potential, noise (15 hours, 19 businesses).	
C44	I agree	I agree	I agree with this recommendation. The reasons are good ones.	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C45	See 3.	See 3.	This appears to be the most direct route and I assume less costly. This C3 routes is my recommendation. Thanks for all your effort to inform the public about this needed project.	
C46	All the central displace too many people and the road is still too crooked.			
C47	No	No	No	NO
C48			This would be the best and shortest plan except for notes below.	Did you take into account the future bypass to the west of Moscow. C2 seemed to be best and cost effective for this plan.
C49	No—Reisenauer Hill not enough of a change—too many deaths associated. ELIMINATE.	No—Reiseinauer Hill not enough of a change—too many deaths associated. ELIMINATE.	No—Reiseinauer Hill not enough of a change—too many deaths associated. ELIMINATE.	No—Reisenauer Hill not enough of a change—too many deaths associated. ELIMINATE.
C50			Agree—Short, straight, cheap, safe	
C51		Ok		
C52	No, as per ITD recommendation, through preferable to any east alignments.	Ditto.	Yes! This is the most direct alignment, with the best weather stats, hence safest route.	
C53			I like this option best of all the ones being considered today. Although we would have to purchase land in this option we would save current homeowners and businesses from losing their property and yet widening the road where it can be widened at existing 95 locations The development that would be able to happen along the newly created county road would be positive for Latah County and the families who live in the area.	I am wondering though if these option are forward thinking enough to consider a future connection to a ring road around Moscow to consider the public safety of pedestrians/bikers in the downtown. Considering that we have limited parking for large tucks downtown in Moscow, 95 through downtown really doesn't add to our downtown's vitality. Just a thought. Eastern route could be connected to a ring road more easily.
C54			At first glance on the map this routes looks most direct. However I feel it has too much of an impact on current businesses. Also the farther east of current 85, weather conditions become more of a negative factor and the closer the road comes to Paradise Ridge the more impact it will have on habitat.	
C55	Can't have them all. Elimination is appropriate.	Good recommendation for elimination.	Carry forward is okay but E2 is the best route	No.
C56			Displaces fewer people, costs less, shows historic places, fewer floodplain, no wildlife difficulties, too bad about hazardous sites. Not too difficult to encourage, sorry about destroying farm _____, Ice is less than other two highways.	
C57	I don't like any central ones.	See above.	See #1.	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C58	Eliminate	Best in this group. Probably fewest of accidents, cost and home displaces		
C59	I recommend this expansion—this alternative appears to have the least impact on wildlife and wetlands. The area is very open and straight which would reduce potential for vehicle accidents			
C60	Eliminate. It leaves all the curves intact. How silly to do all that work and only solve half the problems.	Climbing Clyde Hill seems silly. Road ice does not improve until you go east to C3.	Obviously the best of the center alignments. However all the curves around Reisenauer Hill are left intact. This does not seem good.	
C61	Curves not improved significantly. Give those people who've had to live with the highway hassles a break.	Goes almost as far west as W1 but not for long enough.	Short sighted, only looking at short term economic and human costs.	The fog, ice, and wetness is not very good in any of these routes. It will worsen with time from microclimate change from exhaust of vehicle. Exhaust from vehicles and dissipation was not considered in any of your study calculations. Microclimates in Valley + exhaust= smog and a mess!
C62	Yes, good, eliminate it.	Yes, do.	I do not like this option because it goes through so much prime farmland. Don't disrupt this wonderful valley and community.	
C63	This route has the most displacements of homes and businesses and surprisingly not much less prime farmland impact, also most noise impact. Eliminate.	Still much prime farmland impact, and wetland impact without must cost saving. Eliminate.	I agree with this as best of 'C' routes, with its least visual impact, low wetland area impact and low cost. Possible best overall route.	
C64	This route has too great an effect on residences and business and should be eliminated.		This route appears to be the best of all that are being considered. Low impact on agricultural land, straightens the road and is relatively short, lowest construction cost.	
C65	This would be preferable if the ITD would consider a smaller footprint from Jacksha Rd. north to Moscow—all improved 2-lane highway with turning lanes. As it is, it impacts too many homes.	Too much prime farmland, negative impact of "new land" opened up to the west of Clyde Hill!	This seems like the best of all the alternative—west, central and east. It would be even better if you were to stay on the existing 95 going North to Zeitler Rd. How cut to the East. (i.e. follow Cut to Zeitler Rd., then shift to C3)	
C66	Agree	Agree	I agree with carrying this alternative forward. Shortest route and appears to be the best choice of all 12 alternatives.	
C67	This might work—lowest accident rate if consider accidents on remaining US 95.		Possibly Ok	Add a 2-lane well-engineered central alignment along current alignment preferably!!!
C68			This is the best of the 3 recommended alternatives. It has the least impact on agricultural and native habitat	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
			acreage.	
C69	I favor this route because it is closest to the current alignment. It would not affect wildlife as much as the Eastern Alternatives or farmland as much as the Western ones.			
C70	I agree—too much disruption of existing life, residence and business. Poor access to existing driveways etc.	I think the C2 is actually better from an access standpoint than C3 at Hwy 95 and Clyde Rd. The grades of access will be difficult. C2 will have snow problems on the leeward side of Clyde Hill.	It is better than C1 but not by much. Access is poor on the north side, driveways, will be steep to meet new road height and are only maintenance once per day currently *during a sow day) this will make entrances treacherous.	Of the central routes C2 would be the best for access, safety, etc. Maintaining as much of the old 95 for local access will keep farm and heavy equipment off of the new road—I think that is a positive things noise for residents will have more impacts with all of the C routes. Mitigation will be necessary.
C71	Eliminate	Eliminate	Yes, this is my preference!	
C72	Reasonable cost.	Cost too high, too much ice.	This is the one to build! A good central alternative across the board, minimum impact, low cost, reasonably straight, no wildlife habitat impact, minimal ice and fog problems.	Elevation changes, grades, climate data for this region. How can you state fog and ice numbers when there was no weather station/data collected for the central region.
C73	Makes no sense	Makes no sense	Makes no sense	
C74			This one seems by far the best route, regarding impact, cost, need for new construction and new disruption of undeveloped land. I prefer this one over all the others routes.	
C75	Eliminate	Eliminate	Continue—carry forward. Still high accident per year compared to East routes.	It is unfortunate this stretch could not have been the first to allow for each greater movement exists and a reduction in potential traffic through town where loud traffic interferes with highway traffic
C76	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
C77	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	No
C78	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
C79	Eliminate	Eliminate	A good choice, “low cost”, fairly direct, low impact because of small impact areas.	
C80	Eliminate	Consider impact on residents (homes)	One of 2 best choices probably.	
C81			I recommend the C3 option. Less impact on homes/businesses and less impact on animals/animal crossings. With the length of the proposed highway being 6.8 miles, the cost (estimated) seem also to be less.	
C82	This is a poor choice due to impacts on people and their homes.	This is a poor choice also due to impact on people’s homes and businesses.	This is the best of central alignments, but E2 is a better choice, E2 would leave the entire old highway for travel	No

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
			of locals without needing to add entrance to the highway C3 also has a more detrimental effect on people’s homes and businesses.	
C83	Makes most sense as it most closely align with existing road bed. Causes least disruption to natural habitat.		Can live with this option.	
C84	Agree	Agree	This plan seems to me to be the best option. It has a low impact on farmland; no impact on key wetlands and fewer hours of icy conditions than other C options and W options. This option is the most desirable in my opinion.	
C85	Bad: Historic site impact, high farmland impact.	Unacceptable.	Best alternative of all—the least new road is built in this way. Also, it’s the cheapest and it’s short. Displacement of 3 residences is unfortunate but tolerable. Low ice conditions, noise impact are drawback.	
C86	Consider only if C3 is unacceptable.	Consider only if C3 is unacceptable.	Best of all alternatives. Minimal impact on farmlands.	
C87	Consider only if C3 is not acceptable.	Consider only if C3 is not acceptable.	Best of all options least farmland impact, least wetland impact.	
C88	Eliminate	Eliminate	Best of C alternatives	
C89	I recommend C1 for many reasons (cost, land impact, etc) but noise and displacement are problematic— maybe compensate people along highway by relocation to other areas, which in turn would noise cost, therefore C2 or C3 are possible alternatives.	See above	See above.	Please straighten out the bridge at bottom of Reisenauer Hill!
C90		#1 Choice debate between C2 and C3. I like C2: less impact on people’s homes. Don’t like curvy Reisenauer would like to see a deeper (lower) Reisenauer road than present. It would be neat to build at rest area at R. Hill. Although the improved grading and road width sound good. Or another choice is C2 connects west to W4 as we enter Moscow. Less “animal” danger. Would like a better connection into Moscow.		I feel the slowing of traffic should begin at the top of the hill—before Johnson trucking. My experience is that as people approach Moscow going slow 50-55 (sometimes from top of Lewiston Hill) they finally begin to speed up as they approach that last hill and then fly down. I feel the slowing should begin at the top of the hill. Starting the slow down into Moscow at the grain elevators is too late. Because they don’t really slow until they get to the Troy Highway light.
C91	Conserves animal habitat and eliminates wind hazard. Please keep.	Please keep.	I agree.	
C92	No—for all the reasons you identified.	No—for all the reasons you identified.	Too close to Paradise Ridge—too much fog.	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C93	Too many access points. Still has curve/grade issues at Reisenauer. Eliminate alternative.	Curves/grade issues still potential with this route. Good to use existing 95 project south of Moscow.	Curves/grad remain issues with this route. Re: Reisenauer. Intersection too many? Good route as far as straighter.	Center turn lane too far south?
C94	Do not like Reisenauer Hill—eliminate.	Eliminate	Still too much curve in Reisenauer Hill area. This area is a weather break area and gets very slippery.	Still overlooking the safety issues of the Reisenauer Hill area.
C95	Not in favor of.	Not in favor of.	I'm still a little concerned about the corners on the top and bottom of Reisenauer Hill in winter conditions; they look to be straightened out. Could they be straightened to avoid the property at the bottom of the hill? My initial favor lies with the east routes.	
C96	Cost is acceptable, accident rate not acceptable, ice hours excessive, farm impact too high, impact on residences not acceptable.	Same as C1. Cost not acceptable.	Same as C1, except cost is acceptable, ice hours acceptable.	Have you consider going around Moscow?
C97	<i>Agree underlined recommendation: eliminate from further consideration in question.</i>	<i>Agree underlined recommendation: eliminate from further consideration in question.</i>	I appreciate this recommendation for the short distance involved and low environmental impact. It seems straight and I appreciate that it remains near 95. Safety and aesthetically are also taken into consideration with this route.	I heard many comments that it's unfortunate that all routes go through Moscow. With this respect and looking to a further business alternate route W4 seems more likely to accommodate the north/south need.
C98	This route eliminates a lot of homes and doesn't appear to reduce county road accesses. I also believe this to be a traffic nightmare to rebuild.	This route seems to have a very large hill to contend with by Clyde Rd. which seems to increase construction costs and still has several county Rd. approaches.	I agree that this route makes the most sense of the central routes. It does seem to me that it crosses through a lot of farm ground that it could divide up.	I have no doubt that these routes have been more thoroughly investigated than most any other project in Idaho history.
C99	This route is much to curvy, alignment is very bad. <i>Circled eliminate from further consideration in the question.</i>			
C100			I think that this alternative presents the most reasonable priced plan considering the other effects of moving the highway to this path. One suggestion that I have is to consider is how the eastern plans are going to affect the quality of the air on Paradise Ridge.	None that I can think of save how the busing system will be affected by the re-alignment.
C101	<i>Circled eliminate from further consideration in the question.</i>	<i>Circled eliminate from further consideration in the question.</i>	C3 is most cost effective to build and maintain. Doesn't involve wetlands.	Way too much tax money spent on this bickering back and forth. Next time try to do this right the first time. So you don't have to go overboard like this to appease everyone. Audiotape?? Can't people read and understand those great maps you made? This is sad
C102	This is the existing road and as such I believe could be used, widened and expanded.		Carry forward. I do not agree with using non-road and agricultural lands for more development and roads.	The rationale put forward for C3 is convincing but I still favor existing road. I often NEED to use the highway

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
				going South and then turn off onto roads. The overpasses and underpasses prevent me from doing this! UGH!
C103			This is pretty safe because there is no intersection at the top of Reisenauer Hill, which appears in other plans. I prefer the no-build option to any of these plans. If Reisenauer Hill is such a problem, why not just lower the speed limit?	
C104	I understand this recommendation.	I understand this recommendation.	C3 would be my choice of the C recommendations. I agree with this choice. In fact, I would prefer this one C3 to all other corridors.	Excellent study—very thorough.
C105	Eliminate	Eliminate	Seems the best all around alternative.	
C106		This may be the poorest alternative.	In general I don't like the Central corridor alternatives as much as the western (preferred) and eastern alternatives, but of the central alternatives I prefer this one. Primarily the straighter will make it safer to drive.	
C107	For someone who has driven this route for 7+ years, they're may be modifications but not enough to eliminate the dangerous corners. Reisenauer Hill and the Zeitler Rd. (C1 especially) are the 2 most dangerous areas. C1 also impacts too many homes and businesses.	Too expensive, in contrast to better routes through the eastern corridor and still follows too close to the dangerous areas.		Reisenauer Hill and Zeitler Road both need to be eliminated (C1 is the worst). Also, too many inlet/outlet roads.
C108	Agreed, eliminate.	Agreed, eliminate.	This is the best one to carry forward, but I still don't like Reisenauer Hill.	
C109	No	No	No	
C110	No	No		
C111	Impressed with work involved. Support ITD in recommendations.			
C112	N/A	N/A	Utilizes existing roadway yet cuts out curves/short cut—creates a straight shot and doesn't disturb the hills.	
C113	Too many displaced homes and businesses, too much noise over homes, too much archeological disturbance.	Too much archeological disturbance	Too much archeological disturbance, too much potential hazardous material removed	None immediately apparent.
C114	Displaces too many residents. Has an extremely high accident rate. I agree with ITD recommendation.	Agree with ITD recommendation.	Of the central alignments this is the best option.	Still does not adequately deal with Reisenauer Hill problems. Number of traffic fatalities in past should be highlighted.
C115	C1 should be reconsidered, it's least expensive & least disruptive to improve existing road.	Eliminate it.	It's an option.	C1 could go to five lane, or four lane undivided with turn lane sooner (further south) to reduce impact on homes, if

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
				speed limit was also reduced.
C116	I do not like any of the C alignments!			
C117	I recommend eliminating this.	I recommend eliminating this.	I recommend eliminating this.	I recommend eliminating this.
C118	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate
C119	Okay	Ok	This alternative would eliminate Moscow’s future option to have a western connection to the Moscow-Pullman corridor. This is a large potential economic and land use impact that is not addressed in the current analysis. Please provide information about this impact and incorporate it into the environmental assessment as well as other analyses in the future.	See #3
C120	Ok	It is close to existing footprint limiting the total amount of disturbance. It has lowest accident rate except C1. Eastern routes and C2 have little impact on Valhalla or Hidden Village—nice site with all the trees		
C121	Don’t much like	Don’t much like	This makes a lot of sense: lowest overall cost, lowest overall visual impact, shortest of all alignments. I think this fixes the worst problems, corrects safety concerns and does not use our resources in a wasteful manner.	
C122	I agree	I agree.	I agree. This recommended routes should be pursued. In no order: cheap, no sensitive species impacted/few wetlands impacted, least amount of farmland impacted, least amount of icy conditions, direct route (straight)	No
C123	I think C1 should remain as a viable route until the final determination is made—C1 has many more positive notes than does either W4 or E2 (please see my comments on the Eastern Alternatives Sheet). I believe we should use as much existing infrastructure as possible—but we also should consider how this road will meet/join with future Moscow expansion—i.e. the “Ring Road” that continues to be mentioned.	I think that C2 should remain as a viable route until the final determination—C2 uses as much existing infrastructure and is extremely comparable to W4 (in predicted accidents cost, disturbance, of existing homes/businesses, environmental concerns). It there any benefit by placing the highway east of west of Clyde Hill? Has any thought been made how this highway will meet with the “Ring Road” or what the impact on Moscow expansion will be? I have a hard time believing that there will be little chance of development off a major north-south route!	I concur with ITD for many reasons—especially on the fact that this proposal uses much of the existing infrastructure while minimizing impact in local residence (few locations). One major concern I have is that the environmental study was done during a very warm year—this route may be susceptible to more fog than predicted during a “normal” winter.	As I stated on the Eastern Alternatives sheet, when all routes are compacted together the following results are obtained: Bet routes—C1, C3 Next best—W1, W2 Tied for 5 th —W3, W4, C2 Bottom Tiers—E2, E3 (E1 is last!) C1 and C3 should both be advanced for consideration. W1, 2 and 3 build far too much new road. W4 and C2 should be advanced for consideration. NO EASTERN ROUTE SHOULD BE BUILT!
C124	I agree to eliminate.	I agree to eliminate.	This is my second choice. Pluses are uses a lot of the	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
			existing hi-way, fairly straight shorter in distance, negatives=disrupts quite a few people and homes. It goes through good farm ground, and splits it up in small places.	
C125			If selected please provide for 5 lanes between the Davis/Reisenauer residences. See letter.	
C126	Eliminate	Eliminate	Carry forward—of all the possible routes—eastern, central and western, this is the best. Keeps the road short. Little impact on view shed, lowers accidents and not too much impact on farming. Seems best from a conservation impact. Also low cost to build (very important).	
C127	See comments on 3.	See comments on 3.	This option is much worse from an ecological and recreational standpoint than the western option, but much better than the nightmare presented by the eastern option.	It is hard to be certain from this map, but it appears this option also cuts through the large “Access Yes” property managed by Idaho Fish and Game. Many people from all over Idaho enjoy this area, and it would be a shame for it to be ruined when better options exist.
C128			I like this route but I don’t like that more would not be done at Reisenauer Hill. This hill should not only be brought up to standard but it should exceed them.	
C129	No	No	This route is ok if none of the eastern routes are chosen.	
C130	This is the best (least bad) of all ten routes because it stays closest to the exiting route, consumes the least farmland, and has the least visual impact.	Reject this route because it might be visible form the U.I. Arboretum, and because it consumes too much farmland.	Reject this route because it consumes too much farmland.	This whole project is a huge waste of resources, and Route C2 and C3 destroy too much farmland. Keep the existing alignment, lower the speed limit, hire more cops to enforce it, and give the rest of the money to the school district.
C131	This route is the least objectionable of all because it uses less new land. It does impact the most homes and businesses but less land will be paved over, both options are bad so, therefore leave the highway the way it is.	Not in favor of this because it may be visible from the UI Arboretum and because it uses (paves over) farmland or land that is not paved.	No—paves over unpaved land.	Yes—we do not need this project. I like that it is harder to get to Boise than if it was all a 4 lane highway. I don’t want land paved over any more than it is already. There are things much more important than moving cars faster. This highway could be safe if speed limits are enforced & people learn to slow down by having strict enforcement. This is a great waste of money which could be useful for truly important things—health insurance, schools, etc.
C132			Does not eliminate S. curves at the bottom of Reisenauer Hill going down the north side of a hill less sun during winters takes out prime farm ground makes to many small field’s. This would by my 3 rd choice.	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C133	Agree. This alternative should be eliminated since 1) Highest number of dislocations/relocations/displacements 2) Higher accident rate than most of the others.	Agree. C3 is similar but superior to C2 in the following ways: 1) Shorter 2) Fewer wetland acres affected 3) Less expensive 4) Lower visual impact So eliminate C2 in favor of C3.	Agree, this is clearly one of the best alternatives <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is one of the shortest • It's accident rates is in the middle of the values • Least expensive • Affects the least amount of wetlands on any animal or plant species • Average number of displacements/relocations • Lowest visual impact and farmland impact • No impact on environmental justice. 	Some inconsistencies 1) Why is C3 6.8 miles, the same as No action, when it is clearly a shorter route on the map?
C134	Eliminate	Eliminate	Carry forward—my second most favorite option for consideration.	
C135	Eliminate	Eliminate	This alignment is lowest in elevation and uses the existing road and causes the least amount of disruption.	
C136			I prefer C3 for 2 reasons lowest cost and follows highway 95 right of way in front of property. Also has less impact in farmland.	
C137	Agree with you.	Disagree with you, but without a lot of knowledge of area. Seems to be similar in impact to W4, which you endorse. (Costs, disruptions seem about the same.)	Disagree. Would rather not see a highway run between residences and businesses clustered along existing highway 95, if such would be the case.	No distinctions made as to structure values, conditions, and permanence when citing displacements/relocations. No apparent value placed on disruptions of farm and other business operations.
C138	I agree with elimination.	I agree with elimination.	Of all the recommended routes I believe this to be the best. Shortest to build, least expensive, least visual impact. I also like the route to follow the existing entry back into Moscow.	
C139			Not as good as E2. _____ and access shouldn't be more important than safety. Plus, increased development isn't what I want to see south of Moscow.	
C140	I agree with this recommendation—there are significant impacts on existing features.	I agree with this recommendation.	Of any of the C alignments, this would be the preferred route. However, it is less desirable than W4.	As a group, these routes make sense because of close proximity, to the existing highway 95. However, C3 is the only one that does not significantly impact existing residences and has low right-of-way requirements.
C141	Agree.	Agree.	I think this best route of all three corridors. It is only 0.1 mile longer than E2. Takes out less farmland than E2 and not significantly more than W4. Has far less effect on wetlands than any other route; is cheaper and requires less right-of-way acreage.	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C142	Disagree—let’s work with what we already have.	Agreed.	Agreed.	Yes, it’s called working with what we have.
C143	This alignment, C1, would be best. Re-work existing dangerous areas. Displaces least amount of businesses, maintains prime farmland, protects prairie and wildlife. Recommendation: Carry Forward.		New bridge required at Zeitler Rd. Eliminate from further consideration.	Consider rather than 4-lanes, a safe row divided highway with passing lanes and turn lanes. Signage in the most vulnerable areas would be a great addition, accompanied by lower speed limits. Blinking lights and written info could be set up to provide __ the road info on road conditions.
C144	Looks like it will run over many existing homes. Eliminate.	Seems like an okay route. I don’t know its impact on the UI Arboretum.	Looks like it might run over more homes than C2.	
C145			All of these central routes come down off Reisenauer Hill—which makes no sense, and stay on existing 95 for a ways/too much access points by families and small roads/cuts through farms. All don’t make sense!	
C146	C1 is not a good alternative. It seems to follow too close to the old road, which is not a good road. It also displaces far too many people and businesses.	At first I thought that widening the old highway would be best but I have since changed my mind. I think we should avoid the old road entirely especially around Reisenauer Hill.	This would be probably be my 4 th choice where it veers off from C1 and C2. Perhaps starting off (from the south) on W2 and connecting to C3 would be a good choice.	I think there needs to be a greater emphasis on not displacing residences and businesses. The southern part of the central alignments should actually be W2 (see above).
C147	OK.	Ok.	Too many residences/businesses will be impacted. Access is major problem. Have not addressed these issues from Merickel house on North. Will not be a safe route, buses and residents will have more access and safety issues than they do now. Does not eliminate Reisenauer Hill problem either.	
C148	To my way of thinking, this option is the least desirable. Too many homes, county roads would need to be accommodated; it would be disastrous during construction; it would not be possible without tremendous eminent domain costs.	Agree with elimination from consideration.	Taking off wit a large portion of existing highway 95 and Reisenauer Hill in unacceptable (cost/safety/accessed) than cutting through existing farms seems unacceptable.	
C149	Eliminate.	Prefer this route with changes to Reisenauer Hill—less loss of farm ground.	Too much loss of farm ground—would prefer this route to eastern and western routes however.	
C150	Eliminate...affects too many residences and businesses...accident potential high.	Eliminate...paves prime farmland—too long—accident potential too high.	Eliminate—affects too many people from Johnson Trucking Hill into town—accident potential to high.	
C151	I support the recommendation, largely for safety reasons—all the access points that would be necessary. Also the removal of homes and businesses. Also costs.	Well, C2 is the worst for us, since it goes by the west edge of our property. It is also long, costly, includes Reisenauer Hill, and eats up truly prime farmland.	Do not support in that it includes Reisenauer Hill and would take up good farmland. Of the Cs it is the best for us, but a disaster for several people north of us.	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C152	This route saves the most ag ground. If that is a high social goal then that is the one reason to keep it.	#2 pick, “Keep” less direct impact on people can still be used for multiple western by-pass routes keeps development concentration in small corridor. This would be my #1 pick if I knew Moscow was never going to get a by-pass...It will though, very soon after the completion of this project.	#3 pick, probably #1 easiest to build. Sad impact on homes and division of one original homestead allotment. I imagine this might have been the very first route proposed by the state...just an opinion though.	Lack of models connecting city by-pass Route C1 could have been under construction by now without any of this level of E.I.S.
C153	Too many displacements/relocations. Eliminate.	Would work with potential future western by-pass.	Eliminate.	If a central route is to be considered then I would prefer “no action”—use the existing route, make some sensible improvements (turn lanes, etc.) and re-allocate construction funds to the highway patrol to enforce speed limits, etc.
C154		Least expensive—obvious choice (can’t decide between E2 and C3). The 15 homes/19 businesses are mostly already along this current highway anyway.		
C155	Lower cost, but too much disturbance to structures. Eliminate.	Less disturbance to structures. Would mesh well with future west bypass. Carry Forward.	Too much impact on existing structures. Eliminate	
C156	Largest human impact for small improvements to the existing road. Nuke it.	Better than C1, but destroys more wetlands than any of the alternates. Eliminate.	Best of all of the alternatives. A keeper. Least environmental impact, lowest cost, etc. The only fault I see is that it keeps the present grade on the north side of Reisenauer Hill. Instead of dipping down to the existing road, why not stay on the hills to the east and bridge over Eid Rd.? This would reduce the grade to around 4% depending on how high you pass over Eid Rd. <i>(See attached Map)</i>	Lowering the road bed at the summit of Reisenauer Hill by 30 or 40 foot (perhaps by shifting slightly westward) to reduce the grade on the north side of the hill.
C157			Since our state is financially troubled saving 4-8 million is an incentive to this route. Also the lowest # of wetland acres impacted of all routes. It is hard to see why these routes would not be picked over the others if you compare on the matrix.	
C158	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	C3 seems like the logical choice for U.S. 95. It is the least cost, goes through the fewest wetlands. Affect comparably the least residences displaced of recommended alignments. Road conditions are relatively comparable to other alignments. Environmental impact is less than other alignments (recommended).	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C159	Despite some conflicts with homes/businesses, the route is good because it uses the current highway route. This lessens other impacts and reduces development potential that would lead to sprawl. This route is acceptable.	The impacts of this route are acceptable, but not preferred over C1.	C3 is acceptable, but not preferred over C1. C3 will lead to development that will extend the urban environment out in a ugly north-south line with more subdivisions.	
C160	Despite the seemingly high impact on homes and businesses, I find myself looking for a way to move this alignment forward because it stays truest to the current highway, which would lessen impact on the undeveloped land.	Of the 3 central alignments this one seems to have the fewest total impacts on homes and businesses, although it seems to take more farmland.	While the evaluation matrix shows a slightly less effect on many of the criteria, the “fog hours” and precipitation data do not seem conducive to this being the best alignment from a safety standpoint.	
C161	I agree. This should be the lowest priority route bases on human interference.	I disagree. This route has relatively little human interference in the densest population centers, e.g. trailer villages. Along with W4, this uses the most existing highway footprint (except for C1) in a benign part of the route, which impacts those on the existing highway route, the least. The new footprint is close to the existing footprint, keeping disturbance near the existing disturbance vs. more “pristine “ areas.	I disagree. C2 would be the preferred C-route and overall the most logical alignment, with the possible exception of W4. (see comments on that sheet.) C3 vs. C2: C3 uses less of the existing footprint and has a greater impact on the north end of the route. Thus, C2 is better of the two.	
C162	This is logical.	Maybe it should be reconsidered. This seems like a good logical solution. It allows those on current Hwy 95 S. to escape displacement while utilizing much of the current hwy 95 S.	This seems good, but it will affect those on Hwy 95 S and they won’t like it.	It is most reasonable to use as much of the existing highway as possible.
C163	Agree with recommendation.	Agree with recommendation.	Seems the best of the central corridor options. Has the lowest road ice condition rating—adding to safety of this choice over the other central corridor choices.	These central corridor alternatives don’t eliminate all the safety issues of residents in the corridor in terms of accessing their property personally or for services (bus, garbage, deliveries).
C164			W4 is my first choice and C3 is my second. The main thing is to reduce the number of accidents and fatalities on Reisenauer Hill and I think any of the proposals will do that. The next thing is to avoid encroachment on Paradise Ridge—this will keep the woodsy habitat safer for wildlife, preserve the aesthetics of the ridge and keep the elevation of the highway lower and therefore a little more weather friendly for drivers.	I was very impressed with the computer simulated animations—great job on those! Everyone could really see what each alternative would be like.
C165	Bad idea. Too many residences and businesses would	This is our preferred route, because it would	We could “live with” this one but it seems like C2 would	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
	be disrupted.	make best use of existing highway corridor.	follow the existing highway further and tear up less nice landscape.	
C166	Eliminate.	Eliminate	Have W2 become (merge into) C3 just above (north of) Eid Rd. reduced mileage and cost?	Perhaps with improvements to US 95 at Reisenauer Hill and widening between Jacksha Rd and Zeitler Rd. no further improvements are needed at this time?
C167	I agree with the recommendation to eliminate this alternative because of the impact to residents and businesses as well as safety concerns with so many accesses necessary to the highway. A limited access highway would be safer.	I agree with the recommendation for the same reasons listed for C1, except the impact to residences is less. There is a higher impact to farmland.	I don't recommend any of the central alternatives. These alternatives do not improve safety. There will need to be many accesses for residents/farmers. We need a limited access highway clear into town. Rather than widening/improving for existing US 95 from Thorncreek Rd. to Moscow, we need a new, limited access highway for safety, especially if it is to be part of a future North-South interstate highway.	
C168	Agree. Too many homes and businesses affected.	Agree. I like this option due to little affect on homes and bus. But cost is too high.	Agree. Uses most of current route but takes out curves. Does not require a lot of homes and businesses relocation. My favorite of all recommendations!	
C169	Agree with recommendation.	Agree with recommendation.	Agree with recommendation.	The central corridor is too populated to make the accesses as limited as the western or eastern routes.
C170			This route is my first choice because it makes use of existing route/road and has least impact on _____ population_____ (Vahalla's Hidden Village). It will result in least potential to induce development, does not encroach on native plants and animal habitat, has lowest cost, and displaces the lowest number of residents.	
C171	Consider for implementation due to: Low cost of construction and ability to use existing right of way, and lower impact to existing growth patterns in Moscow.	Agree with ITD recommendation to eliminate.	Consider for implementation. Best of the three routes recommended by ITD to carry forward.	Was bicycle use/safety considered during evaluation? It needs to be.
C172		Too many homes affected. Wells destroyed, children waiting for school, bus on busy highway, one historical home involved, My home will be 50 years old in 2006. The highway will be 62' from my front door—well will be destroyed. Creek between my house and old highway to deal with.		
C173	I agree with eliminating from further consideration.	Eliminate from further consideration.	I recommend C3 as the preferred alignment for several reasons. First, it's the cheapest and second it has the	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
			lowest overall impact on other natural resources. I also like the fact that most of the existing highway corridor is used. This alternate seems to be a win-win solution for most of the evaluation criteria.	
C174			I am not for C3. It would have too many approaches on the new road. It would not eliminate Reisenauer Hill. Road is going through a congested area.	
C175			Not in favor of C3. Does not eliminate all the unsafe accesses or Reisenauer Hill. C3 is the most unsafe route. Impact on residents and businesses too great.	
C176	Agree on eliminate.	See comments on W4—tack in the north end as close as feasible. Is down out of the snow and wind like this one the best.	Breaking up farm ground but is better than most—would be a second choice. Go over Eid Rd. and make the frontage rd by the matrix it scores lowest on second points.	By curving C3 to the west it would impact less farm ground by making the E side a larger field.
C177			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cuts through Clyde Centennial Farms • Impacts many homes. Pearl’s house is older than she is and the Deestens will have their water supply affected. • Pearl can name each child that has been killed in from of her house—it’s chilling. • Many permanent residents impacted also permanent businesses This does not take out Reisenauer Hill or many of the dangers of the existing highway.	
C178	<i>(Note: Underlined eliminate from further consideration and put a check mark by it.)</i>	<i>(Note: Underlined eliminate from further consideration and put a check mark by it.)</i> Hard to see why this was ever in consideration.		
C179	AGREE!!! This is the worst of the 10 alternatives (doing nothing is not an alternatives) The preponderance of negative impacts, from safety to unmitigatable noise and lack of viable wildlife controls to keep them off the highway should eliminate C1 from further consideration. Not a minimum access routes.	Agree—though better than C1 route. It still runs through the most productive ag lands in the corridor (snow valley). Still not a minimum access route	C3 is the best of the three central routes, but divides ownership and farming operations. It also crosses the most productive agricultural lands in the corridor and is not a minimum access route.	

**U.S. 95 Thorncreek Road to Moscow Project
Public Open House Comment Sheet Transcription
January 18, 2006 and January 19, 2006**

Central Alternatives/Alignments

#	C1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	C3 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
C180	Eliminate, has one of the highest accident rates, actually highest!	Eliminate because of cost, length, accident rate.	I would eliminate this also for the same reasons although this would be least objectionable.	
C181			Looks like the best of all C,E, W. Follows the original route the most. Least amount of displacement. No affect on ungulates.	
C182	Disagree—It is already a highway corridor, it should remain that way. Keep the highway in valley bottoms as much as possible and avoid frost, ice and snow accumulations as much as possible.	Agree.	Marginal Agreement. Perhaps the 5 lane arrangement will calm traffic before the traffic attempts to hit the south fork of the Palouse Bridge at 70mph.	