

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
W1	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
W2				My concern about carrying W4 forward is that it has the most impact on displacements/relocations. Maybe most politically controversial of western alignments.	I prefer the western alignments to others (central, eastern). More westerly alignment into Moscow facilities western bypass!
W3	I agree, this alternative would divide future Southside neighborhoods and encourage sprawl.	This one has the lowest accident rate of all the W. alternatives and that should count for a lot. I think this is the best of all the alternatives—it is far from the prairie, has a low accident rate, impacts no residences, and doesn't cross high-ungulate use areas.	Ungulate crossings are going to account for a lot of accidents; I agree this should be ____.	This has the highest wetland impact of all alternatives and is the only W. alternative that affects residences. I don't think should be carried forward.	
W4		I like this route the most. It stays west and affects few houses and businesses. It is also the shortest of the western routes.	Route seems to be unnecessarily longer than route W2.	This route affects more houses and businesses than all the other western routes. Because of that I am against it.	
W5					I don't like any of the western routes.
W6	Eliminate.	Use the south part of W2 with the north part of W4.	No.	Use North section of W4 with the South section of W2	South section of W2 with north section of W4.
W7	I agree with the recommendation to eliminate.	I agree with the recommendation to eliminate.	Should be eliminated.	Should also be eliminated.	The prime farmland studies do not truly reflect the quality of the farmland taken out in these alternatives!
W8	<i>Circled Eliminate in question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in question.</i>	The prime farmland study is flawed seriously because proven yields are not considered—Eliminate.	Yes, proven yields on prime farmland.
W9	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Preferred Alternative.	
W10	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
W11	Eliminate	Eliminate			
W12				Don't think its necessary to go that far West when existing corridor is adequate if improved.	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W13	No	No	No	No	No
W14	<i>Underlined Eliminate from further consideration in question.</i>	<i>Underlined eliminate from further consideration in question.</i>		The W4 recommendation utilizes a greater degree of existing road but and would require the least modification to it. It bypasses the Clyde and Snow residences of which I am in favor of. (There would be fewer accidents if drivers would “drive the road condition.” Low and not think in winter they can stop on a dime while driving 60 mph.	
W15	All the west is too expensive.				
W16	Agree	Agree	Agree	My favorite. Use existing 95 where there is little interaction with other homes, etc. (good use of resources). Straightens curve, which will make safe. Visual analysis (31%) respects the palouse. A good approach to a possible (?) bypass to the west of Moscow.	
W17	Too long	Best of the west alternatives— because it eliminates Reisenauer Hill.	Do not consider because it follows Reisenauer Hill	Do not consider because it follows Reisenauer Hill	No
W18	All are poor choices add unnecessary distances and impacts! Don’t consider further.				
W19	No comments agree.	No comments agree.	No comments agree.	This alternative is going to wind around and be quite a big curve. St. goes thru a lot of wetland. If we are trying to minimize accidents, it would seem that a straighter highway alignment would be more appropriate.	
W20	Agree	Agree	Agree	The alternative has the advantage of following most of current highway 95, thereby disrupting land less than others. The fact that it is located towards the most	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
				highly traveled and used area is an advantage. Thus traffic patterns would be followed. It impacts the environment less than others.	
W21	Not bad.	Not bad.	Not bad.	The best of the west!	
W22	Too long—Eastern alternatives work just as well. Road conditions worse than Eastern alternatives. Eliminate.	Too long. Icy roads a long period of year. Eliminate.	Eastern alternative better, eliminate.	Eliminate.	
W23	Should not be considered at all because of increased length and cost.	Please do not consider because this route would not be a great improvement over current route, especially when considering the cost involved.	Eliminate from consideration.	This may be the cheapest route, but it will not improve the current highway enough to justify the cost.	
W24	As impacts on the state of Washington were not considered, this alternative, which hugs the state line, was not properly belted in my opinion.	OK.	Ok.	DISAGREE. The explanation of how W4 has less impact on farmland than C3 or E2 was totally inadequate. It goes though the best farmland! Ask a farmer!	Value of farmland (to a realtor or a farmer) is highest for western routes. That land has the highest yield—why was that not considered in “farmland impact?”
W25	This is a good one—consider it!	Eliminate.	This is ok, consider it.	This is a BAD PLAN—eliminate. It solves more of the problems with the existing road.	
W26	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
W27	Too many cuts & fills. Covers too much Ag ground.	Too many cuts & fills. Covers too much Ag ground.	Covers up too much Ag ground. Too many cuts & fills.	How are you going to manage wildlife with the road in the bottom?	
W28	I do not live on or near the proposed routes. I think people who know more about all of this should choose the straightest, lowest cost, most sensible and safest route and just do it!				
W29	<i>Check mark above eliminate on the question.</i>	<i>Check mark above eliminate on the question.</i>	<i>Check mark above eliminate on the question.</i>		Ken Helm and ___ (ITD) are to be commended for the extensive effort to find a reasonable solution.
W30	Eliminate all W1, W2, W3, W4.				

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W31	Still best route for future population density heading north between Moscow and Pullman.	Glad to see it dropped, although I believe it would be good from Snow Rd. South and W4 north.	Glad to see it dropped.	Would be best if combined with W2. W2 to Snow Rd. from South and then W4. At least it is on the west side of Clyde Hill. Best overall route.	Bi-passing Moscow altogether.
W32	All three would spoil our views of the Palouse Hills and increase traffic noise.				
W33	Agree eliminate.	Agree eliminate	Eliminate.	Eliminate too close to Arbore farm.	Eliminate
W34	Agree	Agree	Agree	Strongly support this route.	
W35	Absolutely not—this uses the most land and makes the most impact on the Palouse.	Almost as bad as W4—it goes through too much farmland and moves too much of an impact on the Palouse environment.	Nope	Nope—a very pessimistic maybe	The Western routes are the least favorite of the bunch due to their impact on the farmland and environment.
W36	Keep if bypassing Moscow—otherwise eliminate—don't like curves into town.	Eliminate.	Eliminate	Eliminate	
W37	All Western routes are long, costly, and totally impractical. Affects too much farmland.				
W38	Ok	Ok	Ok	Too much habitat, wetlands and farmland impacted; opens up a whole new area to roads. New roads should stay near the existing road corridor.	
W39				Eliminate	
W40	Glad it's eliminated you gave good reason for eliminating	Glad it's eliminated (ditto)	Glad it's eliminated (ditto)	No reason to spend \$8 million more than proposed C3. No reason to disturb (approx.) (5) acres more of wetlands than C3. icier hours—significantly more—than C3.	You must be joking! You are asking me in my one hour of discretionary time to answer that question?! Seriously, I think you have taken lots of good info on the matrix. But why did you not include the differences in amount of cut and fill required! The visual color-coded footprint “alternative routes” and the “areas to be converted” were some of the most helpful things here.

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W41				This is the most logical alignment of US 95. Please proceed using the alignment.	Plan ahead for tying into Moscow-Pullman highway on the west side of the University.
W42	Agree with recommendation and eliminate.	Ditto.	I agree with rec.	Agree again—carry forward recommendation.	
W43	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	No.	Use/improvement of Reisenauer Valley doesn't recognize persistent weather _____ caused by topology it can't be fixed, shouldn't be used.
W44	Eliminate from further consideration.	Eliminate from further consideration.	Eliminate from further consideration.	Carry forward	No
W45	I don't that the routes deal with the worst problem areas.	See above.		Would be the best of these.	
W46	Safest route should be chosen	Same.	Same.	Same.	Same.
W47	Relatively expensive and high prime farmland impact.	Concur.	Longer route, more expensive.	Most concerned about noise impact and relocations.	
W48				This seems to have the least impact on people. This appears to have the most favorable weather conditions. However the cost is significantly more than other alternatives.	
W49	This one might make the most sense when it comes to creating a traffic route detour around Moscow. It might be longer and cost more now, but could save gazillions in just a few years when everyone wakes up to the fact a new bypass is needed around Moscow! Desperately.				Explained on another sheet.
W50	Note: this person scratched out Western Alternatives and replaced it with General Comment. His comment is: BUILD SOMETHING!! (ANYTHING)				
W51	Eliminate structure costs farm acres	Eliminate structure costs, farm acres	Eliminate—structure costs, too many	Eliminate too many curves, farm acres lost.	No in my opinion you people did ok.

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	lost extra length.	lost, extra length.	farm acres lost		
W52	Better than all E's.	Better than all E's.	Better than all E's.	Best of the W's. Better than all E's.	
W53	Would like this if could incorporate into the future of roadway all the way up State line to North side of Moscow.	No.	No	No	
W54		My favorite alignment!			
W55				Yes-let's get it done!	
W56	No	Ok—west portions of current alignment.			
W57	No, as per ITD recommendation	No as per ITD rec.	No, as per ITD rec.	While certainly better than any of the Eastern alignments, esp. in terms of weather safety, and habitat/species, this alignments is bad for farmland loss, and is considerably longer than C3, my preferred choice. Bad ice numbers. (158 as vs. 128 for C3)	
W58		Of all of the recommendations for western development this alternative seems the best for the drivers and businesses straightening out the section closest to Thorncreek Rd. would help eliminate accidents along the curves.		I understand that the matrix for this option works out the best (with the least amount of land to be purchased) but when comparing W4 and E2 wouldn't we be buying land anyway?	
W59	<i>Underlined Eliminate from further consideration in the question.</i>	<i>Underlined Eliminate from further consideration in the question.</i>	<i>Underlined Eliminate from further consideration in the question.</i>	I am in favor of W4 as the best choice of the three recommended sites. Even though it is a few _____ of a mile longer, I feel it will have the least overall impact on habitat and fewer businesses will be affected. Also have the least amount of fog.	
W60	I believe that it will be not too many years until there is some sort of western bypass around Moscow. The northern portion of W1 would				

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	better fit with such a bypass, and would probably be the shortest route from Throncreek to the north side of Moscow. If desired, it should be possible to combine the northern part of W1 with the southern parts of W2 or W4 to shorten the length compared to W1 alone.				
W61	Too Long Too much cut & fill What will you do with wildlife Too much farmland ____ out.	Too much cut & fill Too much farmland out for the highway	Too much cut & fill Too long	Best of the west routes.	
W62	Too much cut & fill	Too much cut & fill			
W63	Elimination is fine.	Elimination is fine.	Good choice to eliminate	Go ahead and carry this one forward but E2 looks the best.	Looks good.
W64	I like it! The further west of town, the better in case we need to go around the city and some point in time.	Eliminate.	Eliminate.	A very good plan also. Either W1 or W4.	
W65	Eliminate, cost, no of homes, farmland, and accidents.	Probably best in cost and no of home displaced. Best in this group.			
W66	I do not recommend any of the Western alternatives. This region contains many prosperous wetland areas that are important to plant and animal species as well as to watershed quality. Wetlands filter wastes from our environment. Roads construct near these area will pollute waterways, in turn affecting the invertebrates and amphibians that use these habitats. These species are critical to functioning food webs.				

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W67	Too long and expensive. Period. Eliminate.		Does this climb Clyde hill? That can't be ideal.	I agree. Still longer than C3 and all E alignments and does not solve the curvy road problems in the Reisenauer Hill area! Can the north end of W4 connect with the south end of W2?	
W68	This is the best route and should not be eliminated. Fog is the least and this route is on the state line. There inevitably will be accidents and big ones in the future. Since Idaho is one of the worst states in the USA in trauma care this route should be chosen. WA if asked would most probably respond to any major accidents if asked because of proximity to state line and ability to transport multiple trauma victims. Some to Gritman and some to Pullman. No time soon will ID MD's be certified advanced Trauma support by the American College of Surgeons.	No Comment.			Yes—the one I mentioned regarding coordinated trauma care for victims. WA and ID could both respond to accident near state line since practically nobody at Gritman is certified in Advanced Trauma Life Support and because ID has the “locality rule” trauma medical care is terrible. These costs human are more ____in the long run than the cost of the road. Grade of the land in Western esp. W permits best dissipation of vehicle exhaust.
W69	Yes, eliminate it.	Yes, do.	Yes, do.	I like the part of W4 close to Moscow the best of all the options but I think the old highway should be followed up to the place where Jacksha Rd. come back in. The old highway should be regraded and improved for safety and then switch to W4 at the N. end of Jacksha to Moscow. Actually what might help most of all is to teach Idahoans how to drive more safely. Also, provide free video/TV for snowy and icy nights so people would stay home when the roads are	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
				bad.	
W70	Too much impact on prime farmland and risk of sprawl.	Too much impact on cultural, wetland, visual.	Impact on prime farmland and on exiting homes.	It's good that it uses much of the existing route. I'm concerned that the section west of Clyde Hill will encourage sprawl in this area.	
W71	Agree	Agree	Agree	Best of the choices, but don't think any of the Western paths.	Should weigh impacts to farmland more than appear to be the case all of western routes impact farmland too much!
W72	I agree to eliminate this one with its long length high accident rate, poor climate conditions and especially prime farmland impact—also high cost-eliminate.	High cost, high farmland impact, high home and business impact. Eliminate.	High farmland impact, but low wetland impact, high cost, not much improvement in climate conditions. Eliminate.	Highest wetland impact, moderate prime farmland impact and moderate cost—no climate improvement lost of residence and business impact eliminate.	
W73				The best to carry forward but still at relatively high cost and with high impact on agricultural land.	
W74					
W75	From a purely safety and maintain perception. I would expect W1 would be easier to keep clear of snow than other W routes. The reason I say that are the snow accumulations on the leeward side of Clyde Hill are significant.	W2 same comment as W1 but on southern end only. I like the Southern half but the northern end has a lot of cuts.	I agree with the recommendation.	I agree to carry forward—however there is a lot of earth moving to make this go. I would support it.	Stated earlier heavy snow loads on east side of Clyde Hill.
W76	Shoot the highway northwest toward the western side of the university, continue north to an overpass near the state line/Wal-Mart intersection. Continue northeast toward existing highway 95, 5 miles near Palouse turn off, call WS alternative				
W77					Yes there is a growing need for a bypass route around the City of Moscow. There has been

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
					discussion about developing a greenbelt of ring road around Moscow which would serve as a bypass route. This should be considered regardless of which of the final 3 routes is selected. I am not aware that this has been taken into consideration by ITD.
W78	Makes no sense	Makes no sense	Makes no sense	Makes no sense	
W79				Any of these western alignments are preferred a low visual impact is important. This alignment will improve public safety just about as well as the eastern alignments.	
W80	Eliminate	Continue	Eliminate	Eliminate-insufficient safety	What about eliminating all 4 of the Western routes and continuing 2 of the eastern?
W81	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
W82	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	No
W83	Eliminate all W routes; too long, costly, and too much impact on farmland.	Same as above.	Same reasons as W1	Same reasons as W1	Same reasons as W1
W84	Eliminate, <i>Note: W1 is circled in the question.</i>	Eliminate, <i>Note: W2 is circled in the question.</i>	Eliminate, <i>Note: W3 is circled in the question.</i>	Eliminate, <i>Note: W4 is circled in the question.</i>	Totally bypassing Moscow
W85	These are all poor. Due to length and cost to build, also the effect on prime farm ground would be extensive.	Poor route	Poor route	Poor route. The best solution for cost, safety, and effect on people's homes and businesses is E2.	No
W86	Concur with eliminating all W alternatives. <i>(this was written across the whole front page)</i>				
W87	Agree	Agree	Agree	Do not carry forward icy for longer periods at time longer road than option C3.	
W88	Too much impact, too expensive, too long. Good: no displacements.	A little better than W1, but nothing much.		Drawback: wetland impact. Lowest cost among W, but still high (much more than C3)	
W89	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	This is the best alternative for W's.	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W90	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	Best of Western alternative; consider if C3 is not possible. <i>Please note underlined and circled W4 and Carry Forward in the question.</i>	
W91	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	Best of “W” options—consider only if C3 not possible. <i>Note: Circled W4 in question.</i>	
W92	Extreme Scenic	#2 choice. I liked W2 the best because _____ Reisenauer is not a problem. If you must use Reisenauer please cut the hump out of it or another choice is W2 and then enter Moscow via W4 where the road maps cross. More view of animals less danger.		W4 is ok to me—because of less danger from animals.	East looks nice and simple but only had #3 choice E2.
W93	Does not endanger Palouse Prairie near Paradise Ridge. Weed propagation is very likely on Eastern routes. Please keep.	Same as above.		Best of the western routes. Please keep.	
W94	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed	Close to C1 alternative—more east but less effect on displacements and noise.	
W95	Too long. Too much animal use.	Too high visual effect.	Too much animal use.	This look the best of all to me, for all of the reasons identified, and will be less foggy and impact to Paradise Ridge than eastern or central routes.	
W96	Not in favor of any of the western routes due to the higher cost and the impact on farm ground.				
W97	1-too expensive 2-accident rate not acceptable 3-ice hours excessive 4-farm impact too high	Same as W1	Same as W1	Same as W1 5-impact on 3 residences	Have you consider going around Moscow?
W98	<i>Agree, with Eliminate underlined in questions.</i>	<i>Agree, with Eliminate underlined in questions.</i>	<i>Agree, with Eliminate underlined in questions.</i>	The benefit of the route over C3 would be the best continuance of this highway to	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
				circle rather than enter Moscow.	
W99	Thank you for setting up this most informative open house. I have heard many positive comments from community members of their appreciation for having this opportunity to learn about the project and to have input. We as a community appreciate the ITD being so available to the people whom they serve. Personally, I have found Jim Carpenter and Dave Couch responsive. We are most fortunate to have these two people in Dist. II and hope that David Ekern sets the example to continue such great public service				
W100	Too long, goes through too much farm ground. It does help reduce county road accesses.	Too Long.	Too Long.	The thing I dislike about this route is that it follows so much of the existing road that it doesn't eliminate many county road approaches (which will increase accident rates) and will be hard to construct because of traffic. It does help with saving residences.	I'm sure not much.
W101					Jim Carpenter: (following per your suggestion) Please provide a DVD of all routes for further study and sharing with son who couldn't be here tonight. Thank you.
W102	I agree to eliminate	I agree to eliminate	I agree to eliminate	I would eliminate this option as well. The floodplain hits and regulatory floodway areas are major concern. 100 year floodplain notice plants, moisture. There are other and better consideration. In addition	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
				it is to close to WA border.	
W103					1) It would also be helpful to see a summary of what would be involved for each corridor, # bridges, # overpasses, dirt removed. 2) Providing a visual of current route and showing its problems would help solidify the need for a new route.
W104	I realize that total of all numbers was involved in decision. I understand this one.	I understand this recommendation.	I understand this recommendation, as far as total numbers are concerned. However, numbers for items important to me, the numbers are better: archeological, wetlands, and tributaries, hazardous sites, I would prefer W3.	The numbers on W4, in the items that are important to me.	Thorough study—well done.
W105	Eliminate	Eliminate	This is good alternative—eliminate Reisenauer more of a straight shot, eliminating curves from Eid Rd. north.	If Reisenauer Hill grade is lessened and curves from Eid Rd on are reduced using existing right of way is good idea.	
W106	Cost is a factor but no route complaints.			I do not like the fact that Reisenaur Hill and curves will still exist in any form. I still think this will be a safety problem.	
W107	Too long.	I like this alignment probably the best. It has the shortest length of the western alternatives. The alignments are relatively the straightest of the western alternatives. I also think from having driven from Moscow to Lewiston for work for 11 years that climate impacts are lowest with the western alternatives. More sun exposure (including less fog). Normal ITD ___ operations would make this alignment a relatively safe		This alternative is acceptable as well though, I prefer W2 of the western alternatives. I prefer the western alternatives too to the central or eastern alternatives.	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
		drive. I realize the cost is higher than some of the preferred alternatives, but it does seem to offer the best of the evaluation criteria. Also no displacements.			
W108	<i>Note: These are the same comments for W1, W2, W3, W4.</i>  Not the best choice for those who drive this road daily, too far to the left and too expensive. Also impacts too much prime farmland. Only benefit is 0 impact on housing on 3 of 4 options and possible truck route development behind Moscow.				
W109	NO	NO			
W110	Impressed with detail. Am willing to defer to ITD expertise and support ITD choices.				
W111	Too expensive, too many archeological site disruptions.	Too expensive, too many archeological site disruptions.	Too expensive, too many archeological site disruptions.		
W112	Agree with ITD recommendation.	Agree with ITD recommendation.		This is the best western alignment.	
W113	Eliminate it.	Eliminate it.	Eliminate it.	It's not as good an option as C1 or C3 unless you're planning a bypass on the west side around Moscow.	
W114				This route is acceptable, but not my first choice.	
W115	I don't recommend this alignment.	I recommend W2 alignment.	I don't recommend this alignment.	I don't recommend this alignment.	It doesn't seem so.
W116	Eliminate	I recommend this option.	Eliminate	Eliminate	?
W117	All things considered, I agree with this choice.	I agree.	I agree.	I agree—carry this one forward. It is vital to the future pattern of economic growth that the alignment go WEST of Clyde Hill in order to preserve the option of connecting	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
				to the Pullman-Moscow Hwy and promoting development of the Pullman-Moscow corridors. With respect to the potential impact one mile south of Moscow of “challenge for continuous growth and future connectivity” PLEASE engineer the road for the flexibility of installing an underpass in this “one mile south of Moscow” areas, or some other feature which would allow for a north-south pass way of some type This would greatly mitigate the potential for the challenge for continuous growth and future connectivity impact.	
W118	The elevation is an issue.	This looks like the best option—using some of the old road yet straightening it out.	Seems to “cut up” to many existing residents unnecessarily.	The cut back to join I-95 will become the new dangerous area.	
W119	I don’t like it either	I don’t like it either.		This makes sense to me #1 lowest cost and least amount of right of way (purchased). Low farmland impact, no effect on endangered species and CDC plants, doesn’t munch up Paradise Ridge above all, doesn’t make the project bigger that is needs to be.	We have better things to spend our taxes and use our resources on than moving more dirt and laying more concrete and using more asphalt than necessary. This appears to be a satisfactory and workable plan.
W120	I agree	I agree	I agree	I disagree: this alternative has a greater probability to have ice on road.	No
W121	Why cut another scar? People can always move. The landscape can’t. Some human group is not going to be happy—so at least make the landscape happy. The least disturbance to the landscape the better.		?	This route seems as most logical—utilizes existing rd without further disruption of the landscape yet avoid the concentration of Bus. Etc near town. People affected on route should be compensated for their loss. Wildlife, plants, people who chose to build/live (habitat) away from a main	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
				thoroughfare shouldn't pay for those who did.	
W122	No	No	No	No	
W123	Agreed, eliminate.	Agreed, eliminate.	Agreed, eliminate.	Based on the analysis by ITD, I would agree that this is the better of the western alternatives, however the desire to keep Reisenauer Hill doesn't appeal to me.	
W124	Too expensive, ice may be a big problem.			Good. Minimal wildlife habitat disruption, minimal fog, ice may be a problem here, cost higher than C3.	
W125	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Prime farmland—do not use for road.
W126	<i>Circled W1 in question.</i> Too long, too expensive, dangerous, too disruptive.	<i>Circled W2 in question.</i> Expensive and too long.	<i>Circled W3 in question.</i> Too long, too disruptive, does not solve problems.	<i>Circled W4 in question.</i> Too expensive, fog, does not solve problems, least descriptive.	
W127	I concur with ITD—this route builds far too much new road and does not use existing infrastructure.	I concur with ITD—same as above.	I concur with ITD—same as previous.	I concur with ITD. Although W4 places poorly when compared to all other routes (see my comments on the Eastern alignments sheet), W4 makes usage of the most existing roadway. Being that this stretch of highway is being rebuilt to reduce accidents, W4 should be built if (and only if) W4 offers a significant improvement over usage of the existing route (C1).	Please see my comments on the East Sheet, paragraph #4.
W128	I don't agree with any of these west routes. They involve more miles of travel, (the longest). They go through good farm ground. The most expensive to build.	I agree to eliminate.	I agree to eliminate.	No, I don't agree with any of these west routes.	
W129				If this alignment is selected, please provide for 5-lane between Reisenauer/Davis residences.	
W130	Should Eliminate	Should Eliminate	Should Eliminate.	Should Eliminate	I think all these routes well create future connectively issues for Moscow and will create a

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
					very ugly view shed. I don't like any of them. Bad from a quality of life issue. And expensive.
W131	See comments on 4.	See comments on 4.	See comments on 4.	This looks to be the best option of them all, by far! I appreciate the fact that it avoids Paradise Ridge and utilizes existing road.	
W132	ITD did a wonderful job. What a great presentation. I know you will pick the best route. Let's just get it built.				
W133				I really don't like any of the west alternatives. Too much farmland impact and the roads are too long.	
W134	No—western routes—all too expensive.				
W135	Reject this because of visual & noise impact on U.I. Arboretum, and because it consumes too much farmland.	Reject this because of visual & noise impact on U.I. Arboretum, and because it consumes too much farmland.	Reject this because of visual & noise impact on U.I. Arboretum, and because it consumes too much farmland.	Reject this route because of visual and noise impact on U.I. Arboretum.	This whole project is a huge waste of resources. 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!
W136	No! it will have a bad impact on the UI Arboretum which I value much more than any 4 lane road. It also consumes too much farmland.	Same as W1.	This consumes too much land and might be visible from the UI Arboretum.	Same as W3—visual and noise impact on U.I. Arboretum.	Yes! Consider that we don't really need a new highway—lower speed limits and enforce them. Give this money to something else—health insurance, schools, litter control, etc. Don't pave over farmland. Keep Idaho rural. It doesn't matter how fast we can get to Boise!
W137				Does not eliminate the S curves at the bottom of Reisenauer Hill. Down hill grade on Reisenauer Hill is to the north. Less sun in winter, takes out too much prime farm ground, this would be my 2 <sup>nd</sup> choice.	
W138	Agree, should eliminate because: 1) Crosses 29 acres ungulate habitat 2) Very high impact on prime	Agree. Should be eliminated for reasons 2, 3, and 4 & 7 as above.	Agree. Eliminate as per the reason for W1.	Agree, of the W alternatives this is best. 1) No crossing of ungulate habitat 2) No native plant communities affected 3) Lower impact to prime farmland	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
	farmland 3) Affect high number of wetland acres 4) Is very expensive 5) Is the longest route 6) Impacts native plant communities 7) High visual impact.			4) Lower visual impact	
W139	Do not consider.	Do not consider.	Do not consider.	Carry forward—but least likely for further consideration.	
W140	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Carry forward. Using the existing footprint of highway as make sense.	
W141			Don't like this one too costly & impacts too much farmland.		
W142	Agree with you.	Agree with you.	Agree with you.	Can support route based on cost and lack of disruption of home sites clustered along 95 south for Johnson trucking.	Structure values, conditions, and permanence. Disruption of farming & other businesses.
W143	I agree with elimination.	I agree with elimination.	I agree with elimination.	This would be my second choice behind C3. I like how this route follows the existing 95 until it comes into Moscow.	
W144				This route will be dangerous. Why retain Reisenauer Hill?	
W145	I agree with this recommendation.	I agree with this recommendation.	I agree with this recommendation.	This route should be the preferred route for a re-designed highway. It has the least impact on existing residences, land use, wildlife, native plant communities of any of the alternatives. It would be the safest and least invasive choice. Go with it!	Overall, W4 has the least negative impacts on the area south of Moscow. It will provide the safest, context-sensitive route of all the alternatives.
W146	I agree with recommendation to eliminate.	I agree with recommendation to eliminate.	I agree with recommendation to eliminate.	I think this is a reasonable route. Lower impact on farmland than E2 route essentially equal to that of C3 route.	
W147	Agreed	Agreed	Agreed.	I don't like this one either.	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W148	See over	See over		W4 shifts westward approaching Moscow. A new bridge would be required at Snow Rd. School buses traveling on old section of 95 would be endangered. Eliminate W4.	
W149	Should eliminate. Swings too far west. Will impact Arboretum at UI, goes through ungulate area.	Seems like a good route: Bypasses Reisenauer Hill; doesn't go to far west; doesn't seem to impact a lot of people' avoids ungulate areas I think this route should be forwarded.	Should eliminate/ Goes way west, goes though ungulate area, (better than W1, through & possibly W4)	Should eliminate—north end will impact UI Arboretum (this is why I like C2)	View/noise impact on the UI Arboretum
W150				These are just longer and cut through really good farms/high yield farmland. Shouldn't even be considered.	
W151	Not a good route—too much farm ground impacted.	The north end of W2 and W3 are good.	The north end of W2 and W3 is good.	Good plan if top of Reisenauer is lowered and curves straightened out. Then incorporate the N end of W2/W3 or C2. Make a frontage road from Eid to Jacksha then use old 95 as a frontage rd. Leaving the new road no accesses.	See #4.
W152	I like W1. Even though it is longer route, it does not displace any residences or businesses. It would also give us our best choice for a desperately needed western bypass of Moscow.	W2 is my number one choice. It is a much straighter route and it is not much longer than the eastern alternatives. It does not displace any residences or businesses and it seems as if it would less harm in terms of environmental/animal factors. All in all, I think that this would be the safest and wisest choice.	W3 appears to connect from W1 to either W2 or W4. This would be an acceptable alternative.	W4 appears to emerge from several different routes (preferably from W2 or W1). My only concern with W4 is the displacement of 3 residences.	The main thing that is over looked is the greater picture I realize that your focus is just from Thorncreek to Moscow. However, Moscow desperately needs a western bypass around town (an eastern bypass is just unthinkable). These western routes give us a better chance to accomplish this goal. I think that more weight should be given to this consideration.
W153	Eliminate all western routes. Takes out way too much high yield farmland. Still has curves, too long, chops up valuable farmland. Not safest option.				

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W154	Agree with elimination from consideration.	Agree with elimination from consideration.	Agree with elimination from consideration.	Eliminate also from consideration; goes through prime farmland, is too long, too expensive, would breakup very productive farms.	
W155	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Good but, follow similar to Moscow end of C2 and straighten Reisenauer Hill.	See comments on #4, add frontage road from Eid to Jacksha and _____ into old highway—leaving the new road with limited access.
W156	Eliminate—too long—too expensive—paving some of the best farmland in Latah County, accident potential too high.	Eliminate—again paving prime farmland—too long.	Eliminate—too long accident potential too high, too expensive, eliminates prime farmland.	Eliminate—too long—accident potential too high, paves prime farmland.	
W157	Support. There is no excuse for taking up prime farmland, splitting up farms, and trashing the Jackshaw Rd area.	Support. W2 is better than W1 on being shorter and avoiding the Jackshaw Rd area, but still takes up prime farmland.	Support. W3 also takes up prime farmland and has the incredible feature of going right over Clyde Hill.	Do not support. It includes Reisenauer Hill. It may be the best of the W routes, but it still knocks out a lot of prime farmland.	What “prime farmland” is.
W158	Remove from consideration	Remove from consideration.	Remove from consideration.	#1 pick...”keep” Carry forward...this route best for western bypass and uses mush existing route. Stays clear of large prairie remnants giving distance from weed depredation. If we have to build, build this one.	City bypass should be molded into all routes.
W159		Eliminate	Eliminate		I prefer W1 or W4 if the choice is to do a western route. These would connect with a western bypass around Moscow. Still I’m reluctant to see more ground paved over. Improve the current route of hwy 95 and hire more _____ patrol to enforce speed limits and safety rules. But I still like improving current route.
W160				Concern here is cost plus, the high density population of neighborhoods on south side would require additional auditory screening.	Could W4 follow W3/W2 at the entrance of Moscow?

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W161				W4 needs visual and auditory screening from the south side of Moscow (existing neighborhoods and University of Idaho Arboretum). W4 should follow W3/W2 at north end near Moscow to alleviate noise concerns (C2). Too much road ice.	
W162	Lots of new R-O-W and highway cost, but no relocations. Good choice for future west bypass. Carry Forward.	High visual impact, but no impact on studied plant/animal species. Eliminate.	High cost. Eliminate.	Lower cost, but no impact on nuthatch/ungulates. Three relocations, but low visual impact. Good choice for future west bypass. Carry Forward.	
W163	Worst alternative of all. The only positive thing about this route is that it would be easiest to connect to a future bypass of Moscow running thru Washington. Longest, most environmentally damaging. Eliminate.	Not much better than W1. Eliminate.	Best of the western alternatives, but that's not saying much. Eliminate.	Worst impact on wetlands of all alternatives. Eliminate. Least expensive of western routes.	If you're going to bypass Moscow to the west, go into Washington at about a point on the state line due west of Eid Rd., i.e. bend southern portion of W1/W3 more to the west, up on the ridgeline.  I recommend you eliminate all four of these routes.
W164				If for some reason C3 isn't picked this is a close runner up. It does cost more however but does compare evenly with the C3 route.	
W165	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	W4 would be my #2 choice. The only reason I see for choosing it over C3 is more homes and businesses are effected by noise. This alignment has more road ice, goes through more wetlands, and costs more than C3.	Not that I see.
W166	W1 is not acceptable, and should be eliminated. The areas west of Jacksha Rd. is hilly, with cover and lots of wildlife. I don't like any alternative that comes around the west side of Clyde Hill. I don't want	W2 should be eliminated. It takes out farmland.	W3 is less of a problem than W1, but still should be eliminated. If W4 were uses going north to where the intersects W3, then followed W3 that might work—fewer conflicts.	W4 is better, but still goes to the west of Clyde Hill, which is unacceptable (see comments of W1). You should consider using W4 route north until it intersects with W3; then use W3 the rest of the way.	I would like to see Clyde Hill preserved from developers. Routes that come around the hill from the west will have impacts over the long term that haven't been addressed.

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	to see that view developed. It is a backdrop view for Moscow.				
W167	I agree that W1 alignment should be eliminated from further consideration. I would prefer that no routes go around the west side of Clyde Hill.	I agree that W2 should be eliminated from further consideration.	I think you should use W4 north to the point it intersects with W3 and then use W3 from there into Moscow.	I wonder if you couldn't use the W4 alignment north to the point where it intersects with W3 and then use W3 the rest of the way into Moscow. W4 the way it is now configured goes through too much farmland. I would prefer that no route go around the west side of Clyde Hill. This would be my preference if it was realigned in this way.	I think you didn't give sufficient consideration to the visual impacts from south Moscow (although this feeling is because you didn't explain in the definition whose "person's view and perceptions" could be impacted).
W168	Agree.	Agree.	Agree.	I agree, but with a possible modification. Based on environmental and human impact and safety, I believe the highway should be west of the existing route. W4 is the best of 3 routes ITD recommended to carry forward. I believe W4 would be improved by cutting East of Clyde Hill rather than West. I prefer to see W4 join W2/W3/C2 at their intersection north of Snow Rd. This actually makes W4 and C2 identical then. This would shorten W4 as well. The advantages of this are cited on my Central Alternative Comment Sheet. Overall, I would vote for the modified W4 or C2 routes as 1 <sup>st</sup> choice and W4 as it is as 2 <sup>nd</sup> choice. I would eliminate all other alternatives. <i>(Note: I typed and pasted over written comments so that they would be more legible)</i>	
W169	This recommendation seems logical.	This recommendation seems logical.	I suggest that an alignment that follows W4 up to just north of Snow	The map by the Delphi study showed a concern that "W4 might pose a challenge	An alignment that goes to the west of current 95 south is logical considering that the

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
			Rd. (where the alignments bisect each other) and then continues at the point on W3 to the entrance of Moscow would be very good.	from contiguous growth and future connectivity.” It seems by using W4 from its southern origin (utilizing much of the current hwy 95 S) up to just N. of Snow Rd. and then going on W3 into Moscow is a good logical solution. ( I suggest combination of W3 and W4)	comprehensive plan for Moscow clearly states that a western bypass is planned for the near future. With the increased commerce traffic anticipated by the Delphi team, this bypass will be soon!
W170	I agree with recommendation to eliminate from further consideration	Agree with recommendation	Agree with recommendation	This is the least expensive of the western corridor options; has no effect on any historic sites; no affect to any deer, moose or elk habitat areas. Meets the purposes of improving safety while increasing capacity.	
W171				I think this is a good alternative. Not too many new right of ways. Not too expensive. Only displaces 3 residences.	
W172	All W routes should be eliminated due to cost and farmland.				
W173	Eliminate as recommended	Carry forward W2. Most direct route with fewest curves. Have W2 become C3 just north of Eid Rd.	Eliminate as recommended.	Do not carry forward.	
W174	I agree with the recommendation t eliminate this alternative.	I agree with the recommendation to eliminate this alternative.	I agree with the recommendation to eliminate this alternative.	I don’t recommend any of the western routes because of splitting up of farms, number of accesses (esp. by farmers), long routes, large cuts, amount of wetlands, difficulty in mitigating for wildlife.	
W175	Agree. Eliminate. Too costly.	Agree.	Agree.	Agree. Least costly. Follows existing route as much as possible, then stays west enough to avoid heavy residential, last 2-3 miles into Moscow.	
W176	Agree with recommendation.	Agree with recommendation	Agree with recommendation	Agree with recommendation.	W4 seems to be the best of the western corridor options but doesn’t eliminate a treacherous piece of existing highway up Reisenauer Hill

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
W177				This is my second favorite route because it makes use of the existing road, had less fog, no effect on wildlife habitat.	
W178	Agree with ITD recommendation to eliminate.	Needs further consideration. May have low impact on environmentally critical areas and low impact on residences.	Agree with ITD recommendation to eliminate.	Should consider a possibility may integrate will with future bypass to Hwy 8 to the west.	Was bicycle use/safety considered during evaluation? Should be.
W179	I agree with eliminating from further consideration.	Eliminate from further consideration.	Eliminate from further consideration.	Eliminate from further consideration. I think C3 is a better alternative.	
W180				Valuable farmland is too extensive to be used for highway. High quality ground.	
W181				I am against W4. It is the longest route, most costly route.	
W182				I am against W4 because it is longer and goes through some of the best and most productive farm ground in Latah County. Also the most costly route.	
W183	<p><i>(Note: Crossed out W1 and replaced with W4)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• These routes do not take care of the safety of eliminating Reisenauer Hill.</li> <li>• It is more expensive.</li> <li>• Snow Valley is the richest farmland of any of the routes (also any of the local farmers in the corridor) &amp; look at actual crop yields. Research, what would people pay to buy that farmland?</li> </ul>	<p><i>(Note: Crossed out W2 and replaced with W4)</i></p> <p>Cutting up Centennial farms like the Snow farm and the Clyde farms will have a huge impact on those families surviving in farming. This business is hard enough to make a living as it is.</p>	<p><i>(Note: Crossed out W3 and replaced with W4)</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We definitely need a new highway.</li> <li>• It is icier here—20% lower temps than eastern routes.</li> <li>• We have to get on and off the highway 8-10 times each day, please consider the off and on numbers in your safety stats.</li> <li>• Please consider absentee landlords and rental (if temporary) vs. homesteads and family homes that are permanent.</li> </ul>	This is the _____ to our _____ as it would kill over 20 trees that are all older than 50 years, the willow trees especially provide nesting for pairs of hawks that we enjoy all year. These are 80-100 years old judging from some of the Deestin’s photographs. The 51-foot _____ and 110 ft. easement past the pavement would create an unbearable eyesore and tremendous noise. Our creek would be destroyed.	This alignment would take from 30-50% of our total land and destroy the small section of pasture that creates 80% of our hay. At that point we could no longer pasture horses because we would have to begin buying hay and would not be left with enough land for them to graze. We scrimped, prayed and served for 15 years for our peaceful place in the county. Jon says we have to sell if the highway comes this way.
W184	<i>Note: Underlined Eliminate from further consideration in the question</i>	<i>Note: Underlined Eliminate from further consideration in the question</i>	<i>Note: Underlined Eliminate from further consideration in the question</i>	Hard to see why this alternative is still in contention—looks like the only question	1) “Prime Farmland Impact” should recognize that—generally speaking—bottomlands are

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	<i>with a check mark by it.</i>	<i>with a check mark by it.</i>	<i>with a check mark by it.</i>	left is choosing between C3 & E2.	<p>more productive than highlands (retain more moisture, often deeper, richer soil). Also, should recognize that quality of farmland impacted by western routes generally better than that of the land impacted by the eastern routes.</p> <p>2) Floodplain mapping for “100 year flood zones” is clearly in error for area just North of Jacksha Rd/95 intersection. The flooding last spring created a backup extending a quarter mile further south than the upper boundary shown on the 100-year map!</p> <p>3) “Significant” or “minor” increase in property values along western routes may badly mis-characterize the situation (small property owners) people along this route whose property will not have immediate commercial values. Such properties may in fact suffer a major decline in value as places to live and raise a family, and this might very well translate a real decline in Market value.</p>
W185	Agree	Agree	Agree	Best of the western routes but cuts through best of the agricultural lands in the corridor and divides ownership and farming operations. Also still have problem with # of accesses for house and farming. The north side of Reisenauer Hill still has problems with ice and curves.	When you take into account the cost of acquiring ownership of right of way, the western and central routes are likely to be the most expensive. The most dangerous part of all the alternatives will continue to be the north side of Reisenauer Hill. Any of the routes that follow the existing highway 95 down the north face of Reisenauer Hill will require additional safety engineering consideration.
W186	Same as W4.			How can you say minimal visual impact? This route should not be considered because by going to the west and south of Clyde Hill	

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

**Western Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>W1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W2 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>W4 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
				and thus would be unsightly from Moscow—easy from University Heights, UI and the Arboretum—very high visual impact.	
W187	Agree	Agree	Agree	Agree	Pullman Road/SR270 (WA) connections.
W188	Cost and length make this the least desirable.	Again cost and length make this undesirable.	I would eliminate this route from consideration also for the same reasons.	Personally I would eliminate this route also for the above reasons, cost & length and impact on residences.	None apparent.