

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
E1		This choice seems to have the most effect on people. It has the least favorable weather conditions and the cost is higher than other alternatives.		
E2	Eliminate from future consideration.	Carry forward.	Eliminate from further consideration	No.
E3	Ok, bad alignment.	Here we are again, considering this option after a whole slough of new studies. I still believe the S. Latah County Highway District guys are still trying to push this option, their clear choice since the beginning. This is still a bad option, opens up too many new areas to roads, impacts too much habitat, creeks, farmland, etc. While still effectively constituting a conflict of interest for some members of the highway district. While possibly the “least worst” of the E. alignments, this and all W routes are irretrievably worse than the C alignments.	Ok, bad alignment.	
E4	I would love to see any of the Eastern routes.	See above.	See above.	
E5	Absolutely eliminate.	No way. Absolutely awful and craziness. Affect wetlands, Boo! May affect 2.9 acres of habitat. Its climate figures on the matrix just cannot be identical to C3 climate figures. Somebody has goofed or distorted something. Check the methodology and the results. These figures are not believable.	Eliminate, yes eliminate!	Well...some persons must have overlooked a number of things to even consider any of those high “eastern” alternatives. Good job on your information presentations. Quite impressive!
E6	Most direct. Straightest route. Or costly because of cuts/fills.	Ok		
E7	On the stretch of highway from Thorncreek Rd. and the top of Reisenauer Hill there should be possibility of down sizing to a five-lane road with a turn lane into the Reisenauer. Also with the Davis household put a concrete barrier between the lanes top to the turn lanes. These already exist on top of the Lewiston Highway and you see them coming into Moscow and Coeur d’Alene. This would only affect a half mile or less.	(Noise Level) possible sound barrier like the ones you see on the Spokane I-90.		

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
E8		This is the best recommendation.	This is the second best.	No
E9	This higher altitude will burden the road with more snow and ice and fog.			
E10	Too expensive, more disruptive than E2.	Recommended—least expensive, least disruptive and best option to solve the real issues.	More expensive than E2, more disruptive than E2, not recommended.	Been involved since brainstorming group several years ago. Husband ___ from ITD. Have lived in Moscow—now live in Genesee—travel 95 regularly all weather and all times of day. Its time to replace current 95 milepost 338 to 344!!!! E2 does it best.
E11	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
E12	Maybe-best hopefully not—too much impact on the environment and farmland.	Nope, too foggy, too odd, too much impact.	Nope—too close to Paradise Hill, to cold, too foggy.	They are one step up from the Western routes, but still not viable—the central routes are the best.
E13	This alignment passes too close to ___ prairie. I agree it should be eliminated.	This alignment passes too close to prairie, I think it should be eliminated.	This alignment passes too close to remnant prairie, I agree it should be eliminated.	
E14	Could the stretch between Thorncreek Rd. and the top of Reisenauer Hill be reduced to five lanes with turning lane in the center. Mainly between the Reisenauer estate and the Davis Estate.			
E15	No this route is foggy, icy and dangerous	No this highway is foggy, icy and dangerous.	No this route is icy foggy and dangerous	
E16	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
E17	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	<i>Circled carry forward in the question.</i> Excellent choice—absolutely the best route. The visual from the drivers view is spectacular, consumes the least prime farm ground, safest.		Yes. The visual impact of the spectacular view of the area coming down toward Moscow from the drivers perspective.
E18	Recommend because of fact that much of route is through non-used for farming land *CER) also in good direct route.	Second choice to E1 for similar reasons.	3 <sup>rd</sup> choice. Same reasons as E1.	
E19	Any of the E1, E2, E3 are the most economical way to go with less impact on all concurred.			
E20	Glad it is recommended to eliminate it.	As a resident of Moscow for 36 of the last 55 years, it offends me from an aesthetic standpoint to put a highway across the west flank of the ridge. And from a safety standpoint these routes have the most	Glad it's dead.	Aesthetics, by-passing Moscow to the west, deciding the highway route before deciding a by-pass route.

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
		variability.		
E21	This seems okay, I agree.	I think this one should also be eliminated from further consideration.	I agree.	
E22	I don't support any of these plans.			
E23	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
E24	Agree.	Strongly oppose this because of wildlife issues and other reasons.	Agree	
E25	I would be fine wit this option, but E2 is better.	Only 6.76 miles, pretty safe, cheap, less dirt moves... This option makes the most sense of the Eastern alternatives. In my opinion, the best option overall.	Good option, but not as good as E2.	Every eastern alternative is better than both the Western and Central alternative. The eastern options just make sense in my mind.
E26		Agree—this route goes through least valuable farmland and won't harm the ridge. In fact it will become a scenic highway.		
E27	Good because Reisenauer Hill eliminated.	My favorite for project. Eliminate a lot of Reisenauer Hill problems. Carry Forward!!	Good. Reisenauer Hill would be eliminated.	No
E28	Eliminate	Eliminate—it goes too high on Paradise Ridge.	This is the best one. Do not eliminate. It solves all the problems with the current road, it avoids neighborhoods, it stays relatively low on Paradise Ridge. Use this one!	
E29		No-other routes better		
E30	No	E2 is the proper choice—carry forward due to cost estimate—environmental impact and shortest distance to Moscow.	No	
E31	E1 is the best choice: straightest, shortest, cost competitive, fewest projected accidents. Best proposal of all 10.			
E32	Not bad.	The best option for everyone who will drive this road (safest). The best as far as cost and takes into consideration those who will be displaced and the environment (there is going to be an impact no matter where it is).	2 <sup>nd</sup> best road to choose from	
E33	Agree	Prefer a route to the west as E2 carries traffic too far from where most want to go; UI, Palouse Empire Mall, WSU, Spokane. Visual analysis poor (50%).	Agree	

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
		High impact on ungulates.		
E34	Agree	I strongly oppose. This will get into, on close to	Agree	
E35	I am not in favor of any eastern alternatives. Agree.	I particularly dislike this alternative’s proximity to Paradise Ridge, which should remain undisturbed. The fragile environment would be placed in jeopardy. Further, the climate (fog, snow line) at E2 is a disadvantage. The wildlife would be threatened, and attempts to accommodate their crossing the highway appear inadequate. The steep incline also presents a safety problem.	Agree	The eastern alignments are less advantageous because most traffic is heading to the west (university, shopping, etc.)
E36	Best choice. Build the road here. Please thank you for efforts and studies and for this opportunity for input.			
E37	Option E1 is better than any of the alternatives that include Reisenauer Hill.	I think that E2 is the best alternative those proposed.	E3 is better than any of the alternatives that include Reisenauer Hill	No
E38	Keep this as the recommendation. This recommendation has the least amount of impact on land I am purchasing in the next month. E2 and E3 both run very close or impact the pond, which will provide water/irrigation for our llama.	E2 cuts very close to the pond and has an impact on our property especially for grazing purposes. With right of way extending past fills, this could impact land/pond.	This one is a terrible option. With right of way extending into the pond this would greatly affect the pond and grazing area. It would also impact the number of acres we are planning to purchase since they would be lost to a highway.	
E39	No	No	No	No
E40		<i>Circled Carry Forward in the question.</i>		Any of these alternatives are better than the best of the other in my opinion based on all of the studies.
E41	Prefer—most direct and seems to be better pass around Reisenauer Hill. My spouse use to commute daily only this road and I prefer fastest, most direct route.	Eliminate	Possible but prefer E1.	
E42	Comment: All of these are too close to Paradise Ridge, from our point of view. If we have to choose an Eastern one, we would pick E1. It’s the straightest route (least costly in actual pavement construction) and	Too close to Paradise Ridge.	Too close to Paradise Ridge.	

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	topography makes most sense. Our #1 choice is C3.			
E43		This is best overall choice save C3. My primary concern is to leave as much farmland undisturbed as possible. C3 rates, highest on that issue.		
E44	Large number of ones involved.	Concur regarding impact upon nature Palouse plant species.	Very high impact upon existing residences and businesses.	Shorter, scenic, less expensive route is desirable. Minor concern about fog hours. Main concern involves ____ impact upon existing structures.
E45	<i>Eliminate is circled in the question.</i>	Ok, concurred about Reisenauer turn comes—should be eliminated, no access from existing US 95 on South end.	<i>Eliminate is circled in the question.</i>	
E46	Eliminate			
E47		The biggest concern about this whole project is spending a bizzion dollars without thinking ahead—the future WILL REQUIRE alternative route or detour around MOSCOW. Which plan would make the most sense with this in mind?		Yes, future growth in Moscow and the size of loads currently driving on tiny streets in downtown Moscow (example Washington and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street intersection) Right now logging trucks hog all traffic lanes to make that corner going north turning west. This situation must be addressed in the near future—probably by the time this construction starts!! So why not consider the alternative routes around Moscow at the same time so you don't spend gazillion dollars on this only to find an alternate route around Moscow doesn't tie in well and costs us another gazillion dollars to change it. This is why the government wastes our money.
E48	Agree with rec. <i>Circled Eliminate in question.</i>	Do not agree. I don't trust the findings on the white matrix sheet and even if I did I still would recommend its elimination.	Agree—eliminate	
E49		Eliminate	E-3 is my preference, shorter distance, fewer displacements/relocations. Lower construction costs.	I didn't notice any.
E50	I like it the best—it impacts me the least. I lose no land and maintain my wetlands.	I am moving to the acreage east of the pond off Eid Rd. The further you keep the right-of-way away from the pond, the happier we will be (maintain pond, maintain north pasture).	Fill appears to directly impact my pond (off Eid Rd.)—don't go there! I Was specifically assured at the last meeting that there would be no impact to the pond. Fill also appears to take approx. 2 acres	

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
			of my pasture. I was prepared for around ½ acre to 1 acre.	
E51		Please eliminate from further evaluation. The western alignments are the best alternative.		Future development between Moscow and Pullman. Thus plan for this highway to intersect onto west side of the University. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.
E52		Best route possible, least impact on Ag ground, best cut-fill ratio, shortest route, could you build viewing turnouts? Beautiful entrance to the Palouse and to Moscow. Keep wildlife under passes.	2 <sup>nd</sup> consideration route, see comments on E2.	
E53	Is there really any discussion—the safest route should be chosen.	Same comment.	Same comment	Same
E54	No	Ok, but prefer E3 over this option.	My preferred option.	More wildlife under passage portals.
E55	Don't like.	Don't like.	Don't like.	
E56	No	No	Ok	
E57	No as per ITD recommendation.	No! Worst alternative for wetlands, wildlife, prairie. Too close to Paradise Ridge—an unnecessary sacrifice of a valuable community/regional asset. Compared to C3, my preferred alternative, E2 has bad weather stats; this means reduced visibility and driver safety—ditto E2 has increased wildlife collisions.	No as per ITD rec.	Yes—I have yet to see an honest explanation of how and why the eastern alignment (over Paradise Ridge, previously alternative 10-A) came to be the apparent consensus choice of ITD even prior to full public involvement and input.
E58		I am adamantly against this site. It is too far up Paradise Ridge and will have a definite effect on the habitat. Living on the other side of Paradise Ridge gives me some personal insight into weather conditions and the road will remain hazardous far much of the winter because of its elevation.		
E59	My favorite of the eastern options. It seems to consider the possibility for a future ring road around Moscow that the central options do not.	I don't understand why (even after looking at the reasons posted in the matrix) this is the option being most supported to move forward. E1 makes more sense—staying closer to the existing road while straightening out the road.	Ok. <i>Circled eliminate from further consideration in the question.</i>	I don't like the impact on wildlife that E2 has. I also feel that C2 is the best overall option and E2 is as far away from that option as you can get. As the bumper stickers say around Moscow...don't pave paradise! Thank you for listening to the people here.
E60	2 <sup>nd</sup> best route	Best route for the new highway. Can you put turnouts on this route for viewing of the Palouse and	3 <sup>rd</sup> best route	

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
		for Moscow?		
E61		Best route for a new highway less hills and less farmland Damaged by road cuts.		
E62	Just another alternative that does not fit. Elimination is best.	This seems to be the best choice of all possible alignments. Too bad it wasn't allowed to get forward two years ago.	E2 is the best so elimination is appropriate.	You covered it all.
E63	Eliminate	For an eastern choice, I really like this one if it can eventually be into a circle route around Moscow.	No. Eliminate	
E64			Best in this way _____. This is probably best route overall.	
E65		I strongly disagree that E2 be carried forward. The route will obviously encounter adverse weather, threaten environmentally sensitive area, threaten cultural, historical areas, direct development toward areas that should be preserved, create adverse interactions with ungulates, adversely impact aquifer, encounter granite during cuts/fills, and be aesthetically unattractive.		
E66	I do not recommend that any E alternatives occur—wildlife such as ungulates would be impacted and this area contains many wetland draws that attract many species. The overpasses required to reduce the number of ungulate/vehicle collisions that would potentially occur throughout the Eastern alternatives would be costly. However constructing the highway without such structures would prove even more costly in terms of collisions, lives, automobile damage.			
E67	Though more expensive than E2 or E3, those whose motivation for protests is their view or preserving Paradise Ridge will fuss less and abandon lawsuits sooner. Though E3 is cheapest, the protest might be too much.	It might be least expensive but will garner the most protests.	This could calm those whose only consideration is their view. The plant and animal habitat issues somewhat balance out. Still not as good as E1 or E2	

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	Consider this. I totally support an eastern route. The future benefits will be greater. Straight road will eliminate accidents and save on fossil fuel.			
E68	I prefer E1 to E2 or E3 for its least impact on habitat and least impact on prime farmland of the E routes.	It has more prime farmland impact and no improvement in fog, precipitation or ice conditions over E1 or E3 and has most residential impact. I don't like this route—eliminate.	E3 has a fair amount of prime farmland impact as well as poor climate condition—eliminate	
E69	Do not consider any of these alternatives suitable. They are all quite alike and do not protect drivers and the businesses which will develop in these corridors. Too much moisture too close to Paradise Ridge.	Ditto	Ditto	Ditto
E70	That is a good recommendation—do it!	In general I do not like any of the E options because of their social and environmental impacts but I like E2 the least because of its impact on the wildlife and outdoor experience of Paradise Ridge, one of the most awesomely quiet and spiritual places in the area. I love the grass prairie and view at the top and don't like straight-shot highways anyway. They make people fall asleep because they are too straight.	Yes, eliminate it.	I think as little change as possible eliminates weed corridors which form on disturbed land.
E71	I agree that this should be eliminated.	This should not be carried forward! It opens up too much area to development, has major visual impact and will have to be maintained at the same time as the entire length of the existing 95 has to be maintained. It is also close to the natural areas of Paradise Ridge and has the highest negative impact of any of the alternatives on endangered species.		
E72	Note: I don't think/agree with any of the Eastern Alignments. Agree with reasons for elimination.	Disagree, too noisy to Moscow area by driving over Paradise ridge too many wildlife layouts; visual eyesore when viewed from high points in Moscow but can also see road from downtown too also wildlife hazards to drivers.	Agree	Don't pave Paradise!! Increase risk of wildlife—related hazards
E73				All three eastern alignments have a high impact on the



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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
				existing community of homes along Eid Rd. They all have the greatest potential to affect the ungulate population on Paradise Ridge. I don't favor any of the three eastern routes.
E74				Yes, I'm sure there are some that have been overlooked. How about this one: Consideration to elevation gain in the three-mile or two-mile stretch (one each alternative) that has the most change in elevation. That is important information for safety, energy consumption, weather factors, etc. What "grade" is involved in each on and for what distance? Also not sure that it is rational to weight everything in environmental studies equally... This is a P.S. to my other comments: E1, E2, E3 might look sensible to some people...until they are told among other things the elevation gain difference, grade difference and cut and fill difference and area to be converted from print farm land. When compared to other choices.
E75	Unacceptable (see attached	Unacceptable—see attached. This site impact one CDC plant survey site despite what your matrix says. See attached.		CDC plant sites for E2. Costs of Wildlife mitigation not considered but construction costs are. There will be high accident rates, do not increase for wildlife/vehicle collisions or for bad weather conditions up on the ridge. This is an environmental impact study but plant and animal impacts are minimized.
E76		This alternative is the worst of the recommended to carry forward because it would adversely impact a valuable local resources—one of the few native Palouse habitats—which will become more important in the future (scientifically and recreationally) the future. Future impacts would be noise, visual, and environmental this applies to all eastern routes but especially E2.		
E77	Don't do it!	Don't do it!	Don't do it!	Eastern alternative too many impacts on wildlife, too much snow and ice.

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
E78	All eastern routes will be very visible and we are losing our viewscape	After listening to several speakers talk about weather, wildlife, visual effects, plant life. This is still a very bad idea—you will have weather problems.	Bad idea because of weather and cost.	
E79	Has the most impact on families and dwellings all other issues are similar to other E-routes.	No specific arguments pro or con with many ahead.		Any of the E routes seem reasonable from most all perspectives. I do not see glaring issues about them save deer population potential. If this is managed or quantified it doesn't seem to be a problem.
E80	Too high an impact on wildlife habitat! Higher fog problem. Too high cost.	Too high on impact on wildlife habitat! Higher fog problem, higher cost than C3, leave paradise alone, don't build this one.	Don't build this one. Too high an impact on wildlife and habitat. Fog problem.	
E81	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	"E" proposals are too damaging to the Paradise Ridge area and the sound carrying would be awful and the visual sight of the road there would be awful for the city.
E82	Not quite as good as E2	Best alternative—I drive hwy 95 every day to Lewiston and back. Let's get E2 build ASAP in the name of public safety.	E2 is better.	
E83		This is a disaster. Stay off Paradise Ridge. Other alignments are nearly equally as safe. The visual impact with this alignment is not acceptable. Stay off the Ridge please.		
E84	Carry forward with E2	Carry forward.	Eliminate	These appear to be the safest of all the alternatives. I think both E1&2 should be carried forward.
E85	Best route, will take out Reisenauer Hill, which seems to be problematic. Carry Forward.	Same, Carry forward. East is Best.	Carry forward.	
E86	Eliminate	Carry Forward	Carry Forward	No
E87	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	
E88	Best choice, low cost, shortest distance, very safe, less controversial than E2.	Good choices, 2nd least costly, very safe, also direct.	My # 2 or 3 choice, direct location, short distance, low cost, safe, very practical.	
E89	Do not eliminate—good choice!	Acceptable location—reasonable length, right of way acres, construction cost, less effect on environment, less hazardous materials than some, reasonable noise impact, safer, least ice on road.	Shortest distance, safer, only 2 residences affected, doesn't affect habitat population, least ice on road.	
E90	This would also make a good choice do to the	Please use this route. It is the best choice due to cost,	E3 is also a good alternative but not as strong as E2	No. I don't think so. It is a best to follow E2. I believe it

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	course following section lines keeping farm owner borders relatively unaffected. Also has a slightly lower elevation with less fog than E2.	environmental and population impacts and safety gained by lack of side road access. Also, I farm and move equipment N and S through this area and Moscow, it would be nice to have the existing highway for use for farm equipment and local traffic without have to enter a highway with more traffic on it, adding to safety factors.	because of effect on move residences than E2.	is the course that was originally suggested in the beginning. It is too bad we have to go through all of this extra time, money, effort and legal B.S. to get the conclusion that you had it right the first time!
E91	Agree	Do not carry forward—route is disruptive to prime farmland and wildlife habitat.	Agree	
E92	Got that right. <i>Eliminate from further consideration is underlined in the question.</i>	Why would one carry this plan forward. _____ insight on their kind of disruption this alternative would cause?	Concur with decision to eliminate from consideration.	Just a question—why should Moscow residents ensure any plan that allows for more development of what is currently agricultural land? Why does—the ITD think this is preferable. Has development really benefited areas like Valley County?
E93	Unacceptable—but best of the E alternatives.	Unacceptable—high environmental impact—too much additional asphalt. High farmland impact.	Unacceptable—high environmental disturbance.	
E94	Recommend as primary alternative.			
E95	Agree—eliminate, too many negative impacts.	Eliminate—too many negative impacts.	Agree.	
E96	Circled eliminate in the question.	Eliminate.	Agree to Eliminate it.	
E97	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	None of these should be considered.
E98	Agreed, straight but high farmland impact.	Disagree due to impact on farmland.	Agreed.	
E99	No! May affect animal habitats. Too much fog, too close to hiking we do at Paradise area.	No! May affect animal habitats. Too much fog, too close to hiking we do at Paradise area. There will be more ungulate crossing danger for these options.	No! (same reasons)	
E100	See 2. I agree.	Destroys or threatens endangered Palouse prairie habitat by weed propagation—see plant report. Winds are gusting above 80 mph every winter I have measured them, i.e. trucks may be blown over. More snow on the ridge than alternate routes. Pine habitat threatened. Cost are not useful aspect. I disagree!	I agree. See 2.	The cuts & fills will threaten hydrological aspects of Paradise Ridge, i.e. potential lawsuits.
E101	No Reisenauer Hill/curve issues, straighter route than C & W (6.6), few intersection—good.	No Reisenauer Hill/curve issues, straighter route than C & W (6.7), few intersection—good.	See 1 & 2 other sides.	What are sight issues at intersection at top of Reisenauer? Turning and accessing traffic issues? Of W, C, E alternatives most interest on these, as they are straighter

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
				routes reduce intersections, and avoid Reisenauer! Support all E routes!
E102	Like the elimination of Reisenauer Hill area 6.6 miles.	Turn lane to old 95 is at the top of a hill where there is limited visibility, reduce curve more.	Eliminate—curves not eliminated from Reisenauer Hill.	
E103		Agree with ITD this should be the route taken when compared to all of the others in all 3 groups.		
E104	1—cost not acceptable 2—accident rate is best of all 3—ice hours acceptable 4—farm impact marginal 5—impact on residence acceptable	This is the one I choose. 1—cost acceptable 2—accident rate is acceptable 3—ice hours acceptable 4—farm impact marginal 5—impact on residences acceptable	1—cost is not acceptable 2—accident rate is best of all 3—ice hours acceptable 4—farm impact marginal 5—impact on residences acceptable	To continue alignment east around Moscow, connections 95 north of town.
E105	Agree	Disagree—all of the E options should be eliminated from your study.	Agree	
E106	I feel like all three eastern routes are very similar and I hope that if something were to be a serious problem with E1 this route wouldn't be totally eliminated in favor of a central or western route.	I feel that E2 is probably the cheapest, least intrusive, most cost effective route of all of the routes, it seems to be above most prime farmland and have a smaller impact on mot homes.	E3 seems to be another route that would possibly work well and I would hate to see it eliminated if something major was found to be wrong with E2.	I think this has been investigated thoroughly.
E107	I recommend this route, it's straighter, safer, shorter and much less aggressive on the environment.			
E108	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate—there are better alternative options within the C options.
E109	I don't like any of these eastern alternatives because they have an intersection at the top of Reisenauer hill, which is dangerous. I think we should stay as far away from Paradise Ridge as possible			
E110	I would prefer E1 because it is the farthest from Paradise Ridge.	This corridor is the least preferable to me because it is the closest to Paradise Ridge.	E3 would be more preferable to E2 because it is farther from Paradise Ridge.	Thorough study—thanks.
E111	Eliminate	I am not convinced that climate and habitat issues are well addressed.	Eliminate	Prospective weather data on 2 of the mildest winters the Palouse has seen. Habitat elimination seems ___ but in concert to surrounding area changes in habitat and

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
				development this potential change is significant. Nuthatch's declining and bat is unknown better to avoid these issues.
E112		I generally like the straight alignments of all the eastern alternatives, I believe in general the straighter alignments are safer. My concern with the eastern alignments is related to climate and safety. I prefer the western alignments in general because climate will have less impact and they can be constructed relatively straight.		
E113				No, very thorough and organized study. I favor the E routes simply because it's the shortest between point A & B (most direct) and topographically it save me the most gas as I drive this road from Moscow to Lewiston every day!
E114			This would be my preference of all plans. IT seems like the most direct route, fewest impact on homes displaced (of the 2 eastern plans) and still within a reasonable cost.	Would like to see an alternate truck route built in these plans that would branch to the west and hook up with the Pullman highway. It is impossible for trucks to get through Moscow and headed to Pullman I've seen trucks drive to Rosauers, turn around and go back on the other 1-way just because they cannot turn left to get on the Pullman highway road. This would relieve a lot of congestion and unnecessary traffic, which is always too congested and slow.
E115	Agreed, eliminate	I believe this is the best overall alternative. The steeper side of Reisenauer hill is gone and there is only one overpass to consider. I think ITD has done a good job in preparing and presenting the alternative. I also appreciate the analysis of the 3 different corridors.	Agreed, eliminate.	
E116	No	Yes—like this route the best.	No	
E117	E1 or E3 would be my 2 <sup>nd</sup> choice of all routes if E2 were not to be selected. The western alternatives seem quite unacceptable as do the	I find this to be the best alternative of all the proposed roués. I am impressed with all the studies done by ITD. I have now attended 3 open houses on		Again, I'm impressed the issues of cost, land acquisition, least danger to existing homes, wildlife and environmental concerns, length of route have all been looked at—and this

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	Central one, which just continue (improve upon A) the current problems. The eastern alternative eliminates the problems.	this and have always found this to be the official route. In driving over the years, I see exactly how this would work. I especially see value in going to the east of Reisenauer Hill to avoid that most dangerous place.		is the best route of all 10/11 alternative on all counts. This was an excellent presentation of the choice and a well-organized and clear presentation. I appreciate the years of public input that have been a part of this lengthy process.
E118	No	Old U.S. 95 can be used while new highway is constructed less stress to all involved. Yes. This is the one. Least expensive, most direct route.		
E119	Carry forward— and less cost.			
E120				In general a easterly route is by far the best by not taking out the best (prime) farmland—any route has to go over the same elevation points—so if the eastern way can be keep to least disruptiveness and keeping the cost down them the eastern is the way to go in my opinion.
E121	I prefer E1 for location, distance, grade.			
E122	Any route disturbing the Flanks of the Ridge are not logical. The serene landscape is part of the reason Moscow and the Palouse is appealing. A 4 lane highway through the hills will lower the appeal of the town and surrounding areas. Just look at Lewiston and the roads that rip through the landscape. People on the original route built on the road. Not the other way around.		All ridge route should be eliminated.	
E123		Believe this option serves interest of County and City best. Best overall cost vs. disturbed homes/archeology and noise. Great job breaking out research criteria and display of compared alternative. Great reduction in potential accidents per year.		
E124	Highest est. construction cost with no additional benefits.	I strongly agree with this recommendation		
E125	Eliminate it.	Eliminate it also.	Eliminate it.	
E126	I prefer alignment E1			
E127	I recommend either E1 or E2.	I recommend E2 and or E1.	I don't recommend either alignment.	It doesn't seem so.

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
E128	Ok	This alternative would eliminate Moscow’s option to have a Western connection to the Moscow-Pullman Hwy and corridor. This is a large potential economic and land use impact that is not addressed in the current analysis. Please provide information about this specific impact and incorporate it into the environmental impact assessment as well as other analysis in the future.	Ok	See #2
E129	Worst conditions as to amount of bad weather conditions. Averages are not as important here and for E2.	More fog, more precipitation (more snow) Prairie ground to the east—adjoin remnant plant communities. Palouse Prairie ecosystem most endangered forrestrial ecosystem in nation. Visual impact from my home, highest for E2—who wants to see a 4-lane highway on Flank of Moscow Mtn.? Adverse effect on Hidden Village. Its traffic accident estimate is flawed—C1 has lowest rate of accidents.		Panel member—no one with environmental perspectives. EPA suggests maximum use of infrastructure suggesting a central route. Eastern routes would require truck escape routes on approaching Moscow—Federal Highway Administration stimulates “context sensitive design.” Mat Finer’s study on pollutions of Palouse ecosystem. He was against E2-E3 sites as developed roads. Western and Eastern alignments would have greater potential to induce development immediately south of city.
E130	I recommend this.	I recommend this.	Eliminate	?
E131				I just didn’t like moving the highway up toward Paradise Ridge. It would be ugly up there. Please leave the prairie alone.
E132	I agree with recommendation	I disagree; there are other alternatives that meet the objectives for this construction yet have no impact to sensate species. Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	I concur.	Everything well documented and analyzed.
E133	I concur that this route should not be built.	I disagree with ITD—this route should be eliminated. This route creates far too much new roadway—we should use existing infrastructure as much as possible—and invites sprawl into a relatively undeveloped area. Also, when the Eastern routes are compared to the others, the East routes are the worst—please see my comments in paragraph #4. I also think this route will destroy the quality of life for the folks living on Eid Rd.	I concur with ITD.	I was extremely surprised at how ITD’s recommended routes were chosen. According to one of ITD’s personnel during the 19 January Moscow meeting, only the routes within a sub-category (i.e. East, Central, West) were compared—for each evaluation criteria, the route with the best results within that subcategory was given a point—the points were the totaled and the sub category’s winner was selected. However, this does not compare every route against the others (i.e. W1 vs. C2). Using ITD’s

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
				methodology, I compared all routes against each other—my results are as follows: 1) best routes—(C1, C3; 2) Tied for 3 <sup>rd</sup> place—(W1, W2; 3) tied for 5 <sup>th</sup> place (W3, W4, C2; 4) Tied for 8 <sup>th</sup> place—(E2, E3; 5) in last place—E1. This shows that no eastern route should be considered!
E134	I agree to eliminate this route.	Yes I agree, this route is one of the shortest distance, straightest, safest and disrupts less people homes & etc. It crosses some of the poorer farmland. I very much agree with this route.	I agree to eliminate.	None. That I am aware of.
E135		If selected, please provide for 5 lanes between the Reisenauer/Davis residences. See attached letter.		
E136	Eliminate	Eliminate	Eliminate	These are all bad alternatives. I can't believe they want to build on Paradise Ridge. Huge impact on quality of life.
E137	Disastrous on all counts!	Disastrous on all counts! Why would you even consider bulldozing a path through this ecologically important, recreationally important, and beautiful area?	Once again, disastrous on all counts.	Your roads all cut through a heavily utilized "Access Yes" area enjoyed by hunters from all over Idaho.
E138		I am hopeful that at long last the dangerous Reisenauer Hill and curve will be eliminated. This E2 alignment will also eliminate other curves that are bad in icy conditions. It will save on construction time and costs, and will minimize impact on motorists during construction. It is straight without up and down dips alternative alignments have.		
E139		It is my hope that the E2 alignment is chosen as the new highway route between Thorncreek Rd. and Moscow. Over the years, I have seen numerous accidents on this section of Highway 95. I myself had a very close call on Reisenauer Hill several years ago. The levelness of the E2 alignment between Reisenauer Hill and Clyde Hill, I believe, would prove to be the safest route. The fact that the E2 alignment affects the fewest number of individual homes and businesses is a positive; also the estimated		



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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
		lower cost to taxpayers is very important.		
E140		Any one of these 3 options would be fine with me with E2 or E3 my favorites. I am happy to see only a small number of homes have to be moved. I also like the fact that there would be less impact to traffic during construction since over half of the construction would take place away from the current roads.		
E141	No	This route is my 2 <sup>nd</sup> choice of the eastern proposals.	This is my choice of all proposals. I am satisfied that the public has had the opportunity to view and respond to all the different routes being considered. I would like to compliment ITD for all the information and public meetings. My hope is we can get this project completed while I'm still around.	
E142	Reject this route because—adverse impacts on wildlife, etc. Consumes too much farmland, too high, susceptible to snow, ice & fog, too steep at north end, will look ugly looking south from Moscow.	Same comments as E1.	Same comments as E1.	This whole project is a huge waste of farmland, natural areas, and other 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!
E143	No! Paves over too much farmland. Looks bad looking south from Moscow.	Same as E1.	Same as E1.	Yes! We don't need a new highway! Lower speed limits and enforce them! Putting a policeman in the troublesome areas and have him/her give tickets is a much less costly solution. Eventually people will slow down. Don't pave over more land! Please! Farmlands are nicer than asphalt!
E144		Straight, least amount of curves, grades will be consistent, less disruption during construction. This is the best route of the 3 purposed. Number 1 choice.		
E145	All eastern alternatives unacceptable for following reason. 1) High average wetlands affected 2) Only alternatives with environmental justice impacts (high human impacts) 3) High visual impact	Crossing of ungulate habitat. These E alternatives overall have a high negative impact on the human environment (visual impacts/environmental justice) farmland as well as the natural environments (myotis, nuthatch, native plants, ungulate habitat) wetlands). Thus should all	Agree, see #1.	Inconsistencies: 1) All E routes cross ungulate habitat yet no affect on populations? The major N/S highway in the state going through ungulate habitat and no mortality to ungulates? 2) The matrix shows these as amongst the safest if the

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	4) Higher impact on prime farmland 5) Affect on habitat for Myotis, nuthatch 6) Affect on native plant sites.	be eliminated!  <i>Crossed Carry Forward out of the question and wrote Eliminate.</i>		routes. Does this take collisions with ungulates into account?  3) See Att, climate data/analysis is insufficient. We all know it often rains lower in the valley and snow a littler higher on the ridges. Thus these eastern routes will have more ice conditions and higher accident rates.
E146	Eliminate	Eliminate! This alignment has more fog and snow. It would affect wildlife more than other alignments. Eid Road residents would have their country neighborhood badly affected.	Eliminate.	
E147	Eliminate	Carry forward—my first choice of all the options. Let’s get this construction started and completed as soon as possible.	Eliminate	
E148			This would be my 2 <sup>nd</sup> choice but reduces the value of our property by limiting highway access. We have the least to lose of our neighbors. So E3 or C3 are ok.	
E149	Agree with you.	Agree with you on basis of safety, cost and undesirability of other options. Would be a scenic entry into Moscow area and fit well with a possible “ Moscow Bypass” that many of us have been hoping for.	Agree with you.	Structure values, conditions, permanence (is it a trailer or a house, for instance?) Disruption of economic activities.
E150	I agree with elimination.	I believe this route should also be eliminated due to the proximity to Paradise Ridge, the high cost & visual impact.	I agree with elimination.	
E151	Poor ground, less division of farms.	It makes the most sense as far as safety and future decisions. It won’t be as disruptive to construct and maintain, and won’t be as dangerous as the other options.		
E152	I agree that this alignment should be eliminated.	This recommendation is seriously flawed! The criteria in the consideration matrix are not significantly different amount the E alignments. IF E1 and E3 are recommended for elimination, then E2	I agree that this alignment should be eliminated.	There are several issues that have been overlooked. As a group, the E alignments present more impacts on wildlife, native plant communities, and aesthetics. Also, there was no mention of the relatively steep, downhill descent of

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
		should be too. The factors such as wetland areas, prime farmland impact, etc. are no better or no worse than for E1 and E3. If anything, the potential impact of E2 on highly ranked (from conservation standpoint) remnants makes it equally as unsuitable as E3—this is stated in the plant ecologists report, but has been misrepresented in the evaluation matrix.		these alignments from their high point just south of Moscow. This creates safety and noise issues that have been ignored. Also, fog on these routes and high winds make them unacceptable from a safety standpoint. All 3 of these alignments should be eliminated.
E153	Agree with recommendation.	I do not think this route or any of the eastern corridor routes should be carried forward. The higher routes will have more snow and ice. I have been driving hwy 95 for years and notice how even small increases in elevation result in more snow and ice. I question your climate data. If the 69 hours of fog is correct there must be more ice in winter as ice and fog go together. At 6.7 miles this routes is not significantly shorter than C3 (which I prefer).	Agree with recommendation	
E154	Agreed	Disagree—all eastern routes are unacceptable	Agree	Apparently. Even considering going east—toward the fog—seems poorly thought out at best.
E155	E1 displaces more businesses and affects more prime farmland. Recommendation—eliminate.	E2 displaces as much as E1 for businesses. E2 affect rare plants and Palouse Prairie remnants. Recommendation eliminate from further consideration. E2 affects prime farmland.		
E156	Horrid route—eliminate	Horrid route—eliminate	Horrid route—eliminate	Yes! Ungulates and weather. Although their impact has been studies, the weather, especially, during the time frame was abnormally warm. Paradise Ridge is often covered with clouds and snow when the rest of the area is not. I feel ITD had downplayed both ungulates and weather as they want an eastern route. (also, unfair route to low income people in trailer parks on Eid Rd.)
E157	A little too far down off the ridge, into farmland.	This seems like the smartest route to pursue; it's straight, out of people's way, and probably cheapest.	Might work.	
E158	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	Eliminate also because of impact to farm ground, splitting large tract. Weather issues, visible impact from cuts to south side of Moscow, need a truck	<i>Circled Eliminate in the question.</i>	I think if a weather station had been put up by the N (E-W) power line it would have told a different story.

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
E159	Please eliminate all eastern alignments from consideration.	ramp, etc. This is the worst of the Eastern alignments. It is too high up on Paradise Ridge. There is more potential danger to humans on this route. Higher speeds, more fog, slush and rain, more moose add up to a recipe for disaster. Another factor is that this road would be too steep. If a road calls for runaway truck ramps, then that road is too dangerous. Since we have several alternatives. It makes a lot of sense to choose a safer route.	Please eliminate all eastern alignments from consideration.	At the last ITD breakfast meeting (1/10/2006), I drove down from the other side of Paradise Ridge (NE). I was roughly at the same altitude as E2. It was bare and wet in town but I had to plow through six inches of slush. It was very dangerous and I was only driving 25 mph. Please do not choose any of the eastern routes.
E160		Yes!! Possibly modify a little to go west around E1 Kas _____--then back east to E2 the rest of the way. A small realignment.		
E161				<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Adverse Visual impact (adverse domination of the view shed)—The higher the ground the greater the area over which traffic will be visible.</li> <li>2. Adverse traffic noise impact over a greater area—the higher the ground the greater the area over which traffic noise will be heard. (I dispute the implication in the evaluation matrix that traffic noise is relevant only to 300 feet from the source. Traffic noise is generally unwelcome and can often be heard over an area with a radius of many times that distance).</li> <li>3. Adverse environmental impact—crossing identified deer, elk and moose habitat; negative impact on habitat of vulnerable/imperiled species; could destroy rare remnants of native vegetation including Palouse Prairie.</li> </ol> <p>We urge that all Eastern alignments be eliminated from consideration. We own and operate a tree farm. We are ten-year residents of Latah County.</p>
E162		E2 seems to have the best solutions for overall consideration. Each question in my mind has been answered. This is one of the best solutions with the		

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
		least amount of prime farmland taken for road surface. I vote for the E2 solution.		
E163	Agree with elimination from consideration.	This route makes the most sense in particular because it is the straightest, shortest, presumably least costly, but mostly because it would be the least number of accesses to deal with and would ultimately be the safest. Game passage could be dealt with, farmland_____ would be the least disturbed; environmental issues/impacts could be mitigated.	This route would alternatively (to E2) make sense. The ground it crosses is no high yield farm ground, and access point would be minimal; more safe, straighter, flatter than any of the other routes with the exception of E2.	
E164	Eliminate	Not a good choice—impacts more farm ground, visibility poor, and other weather condition, truck route needed.	Eliminate.	Weather conditions should have been considered (measured) from a point on the proposed route.
E165	Carry forward—all eastern routes appear shorter, safer, and affect fewer people and are more economical.	Carry forward—appears to be the shortest, safest route. I would concur with your decision and would abandon carrying forward with W4 or C3.	Carry forward—all eastern routes are shorter, safer and directly affect fewer people.	
E166	I support the recommendation, though the difference between E2 & E3 does not seem great. Perhaps E1 is getting close to usable farmland.	I support E2. I would also support E3 (the middle route of the 3). The farmland for both is not prime despite your report. Either would make for a beautiful road coming into town—the visual impact from the car! Safety consideration favors the E routes.	Support recommendation—but see notes on E2. E3 has the advantage of being further away from the houses on the ridge.	What “prime farmland” means—no acknowledgement that the farmland on the E routes is much poorer than W or C.
E167	Eliminate from further consideration. Steven’s spring would be impacted. Small prairie remnants taken out or too close to road. Impacts Hidden Village and of course my own home. Is better than E2 or 3 though.	Remove from consideration. This is the worst route for weather issues overall. Will impact Steven’s spring and is interconnected with largest local identifiable Palouse Prairie plant community. Already under too much stress from weed infiltration.	Remove for the same reasons give for E2.	Lack of models connecting with city bypass.
E168	Please eliminate	Please Eliminate	Please eliminate	All 3 eastern routes have too many negative impacts for wildlife and native plant species. Also these routes are foggier than the other routes. I don’t favor any of the eastern routes and ask you to eliminate all of them
E169		Safest, shortest route, almost cheapest option. Consider lower speed on down grade into Moscow to abate noise to the city, no Jake brakes. Obvious first		

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.	E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.	Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?
		choice route.		
E170	No need to spend more \$ when E2 is an obvious solution.	Obvious route—1 <sup>st</sup> choice. Almost least expensive. It is the shortest—straightest, cleanest route. Will need a slower speed while heading downhill to Moscow.	Too many homes and businesses disrupted. No need when E2 works fine.	
E171	Too much impact on plant/animal species High visual impact. Doesn't work with W. bypass. Eliminate.	Too much impact on plant/animal species High visual impact. Doesn't work with W. bypass. Eliminate.	Too much impact on plant/animal species High visual impact. Doesn't work with W. bypass. Eliminate.	
E172	This one seems the most environmentally friendly of the eastern routes, with the exception of the two plant sites. I recommend this one to carry forward. See also my comments under #4 below.	I can see the attraction of this route, as it avoids the conservation plant sites and has the least impact on human structures, but the most impact on the myotis and nuthatch population. I also leery of running so high up on Paradise Ridge. Despite the climate study I still think the snow, ice and fog will be worst on this route. I can't recommend it.	The worst of the three, except for the possible fog and ice impact. Eliminate with reservations (see below #4).	I was disappointed after seeing the simulations with the amount of cut and fill these route require, especially the deep cuts at Reisenauer Hill and at the power line crossing near Cameron Rd. Since the only road these routes cross is Eid Rd., I suggest that you "decouple" the lanes, such as running the southbound lanes on E1 and the northbound on E2 or E3. Or southbound on E3, northbound on E2. This would seem to me to reduce the overall volume and impact of the cut and fill.
E173		I can see no reason to carry this forward. Comparing it to W4 and C3 the only plus in doing so is safety and cost, which aren't significant in the scheme of things. Negatives of environmental justice, greater residence displacements, impact to conservation data, and greater or equal days of fog.		I feel all the E alignments are flawed and should be eliminated. It seems arbitrary to assign "corridors" (W, E, C) to routes and carry 1 of each forward. Why is this done when none of the alignments is very far from the other. Why not 1-10 and forward 3 on. Is there a need to recommend an E alignment other than the appearance of forwarding the former 11a route onward?
E174	<i>Circled eliminate in the question.</i>	I strongly recommend not carrying out E2 for the following reasons: more residents will be displaced/relocated, it may effect 2.9 acres of habitat with data center species, and 3.3 acres of habitat for ungulates, cost is more than C3. Road conditions are similar to other alignments according to the numbers plus having hiked Paradise Ridge it is obvious that the closer one gets to the ridge the more snow there is which equals slippery roads and more plowing.		The closer the road is to Paradise Ridge, the more snow there will be on the roads making roads less safe.
E175		We both agree your recommendation for E2 would		You already have went through our property. We would

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
		be the best.		sure appreciate if we could get a more firm agreement on fixing our tile where the power and phone lines went through. They are going to be a mess and already have water backing in the fields.
E176	This alternative should be eliminated, though it has less impact on prairie, grassland and wildlife than E2 or E3. Impacts are still too great.	This route is unacceptable. There are too many visual effects, effect on grassland, etc., and it is too close to Paradise Ridge wildlife. There is more fog/ice than other routes too. E2 will promote the interests of developers too.	This route is unacceptable, as it is little better or different than E2.	All e-routes are unacceptable for environmental, safety, cultural and development reasons. Other routes are much better when all factors are considered. If there are hazardous waste sites, where are they and what are they. Should they be cleaned up?
E177	I agree this alternative should be eliminated from further consideration.	This route should also be eliminated from further consideration. The effects on plant survey and visual impact are simply not acceptable. Also, the number of “fog hours” are not acceptable in any of the eastern route. Remember the reason for doing this primarily a safety issue.	I agree that this route should be eliminated from further consideration.	I would have like to have known what the sites are that were identified as “historic sites” that would be impacted. Also what and exactly where the “hazardous waste sites” are. It was nice that you did include the “definitions” but it would be nice to know what and where they are located.
E178	Agree	I disagree. All east routes, and most especially E2 have the most and greatest environmental problems—wildlife movement, potential accidents, need for mitigation, direct and indirect impacts on native vegetation, impacts on sensitive wildlife (i.e. birds), impacts of climate (fog the highest—see climate comments on Environment Study Comments sheet). Also, wind was not considered in the study. However, this is a factor for trucks and drifting snow. It is ludicrous to draw conclusion from one year’s data! All E routes have the greatest impact on residences (outside C1), especially on Hidden Village.	Agree.	
E179	All 3 Eastern alignments pose an impact on the environment under the category environmental justice while non of the other alignments do (see matrix). All three eastern alignments score high in visibility by the entire community.	This site has the greatest area of ungulate habitat to cross even through the study map does not even identify all the habitat area that is crossed. The 1-year climate study is an inaccurate account of what actually happens normally. Although the eastern routes are recorded to be warmer than western routes for 2004-5, it is a known fact that in the winter	All 3 eastern routes (E1, E2, E3) would require the most mitigation effort for big game animals, cause the only disruptions to sensitive wildlife species, destroy or threaten more remnants of native plant, produce high cuts and deep fills and wildlife crossing structures and warning signs. All eastern routes require added expense for security habitat,	And fog it is a fact that winter weather conditions on E2 would be worse than for the central or western routes. In addition, wind has not been considered although its strength and frequency is highly more significant on Paradise Ridge. This is especially problematic with snow and drifting.

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
		months the temps. at higher elevations are colder. The snowline which was visible this week demonstrates this fact clearly, thus with the weather data collected on percip.	animal crossing, fencing, and wildlife exit ramps for animals to escape the roadway.	
E180	Agree with recommendation.	This is the least expensive of the eastern corridor options. It has no effect on possible historic site or ungulate populations. It would eliminate safety issues of residents and services (bus, garbage, delivery) of current route by becoming local secondary route.	Agree with recommendation	During construction—there would be little or no impact to commerce or traffic flow. After construction—this would already be suitable to be part of a Mexico to Canada Interstate.
E181	I don't think any of the eastern corridor alternatives should be considered. Stay away from Paradise Ridge.			
E182	None of the E routes make sense to us. All should be eliminated from further consideration. The environmental and social factors are too great to make these routes worthwhile.			
E183	Eliminate E1.	Eliminate E2.	Eliminate E3.	
E184	I agree with the recommendation to eliminate this alternative.	I agree with this recommendation, especially because of the safety issue and the limited access concept. This alternative has the support of most of the affected farm owners, least separation of farmlands, shortest (almost), straightest, flattest route, least expensive (almost), least disruptive during construction.	I agree with the recommendation to eliminate this alternative.	
E185	All 3 east routes would be satisfactory. Cost is greater than #E2.	Agree. Least cost. Most direct route.	3 looks almost as good to me as E2.	
E186	Agree with recommendation	Agree with recommendation	Agree with recommendation	E2 seems to be the best of the Eastern corridor options and stay fairly level until it slopes into Moscow. Using this option would allow the old (central corridor) road to be used for local accesses at reduced speeds make is much safer.
E187		I strongly urge against this route. E2 encroaches an		



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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
		native plants and animal habitat. It has the largest visual impact. It is more expensive than C2 and will displace the largest number of residences. This has high noise impact to Hidden Village.		
E188	Agree with ITD recommendation to eliminate.	Should not carry forward due to: potential habitat loss, greater precipitation /fog conditions than west or cent. Alternatives higher, visual impact.	Agree with ITD recommendation to eliminate.	Safety rating in matrix based on turning movements may not account for accidents related to low visibility or higher precipitation found in eastern corridor. Was bicycle use/safety considered during evaluation? Should be.
E189		Farmland involved to be used for highway is not much different than other areas considered. Less in value. The yield in grains is less in yields than other areas.		
E190	I agree with eliminating from further consideration.	Eliminate from further consideration. C3 is a better alternative. E2 has greater impacts on other natural resources and just because the road is straighter doesn't mean that its safer. There is a myth that roads with curves are more dangerous. I don't think E2 is any safer than C3. Eliminate E2 from consideration.	Eliminate from further consideration.	
E191		E2 is the route that needs to be built. It is the less costly the shortest route. It would be the safest. Least approaches, meet the transportation plan for the next 50 years. It would impact less people, it would eliminate Reisenauer Hill.		
E192		North Latah Highway Dist. Is for this route. It would be the safest route for the dist. and its equipment. The highway District will accept into our district old highway 95. If this route chosen.		
E193		E2 is easily the best route. It provides the shortest and safest road. Cost and ease of construction are big advantages. E2 impacts the least number of homes and goes through less productive farm around.		
E194	<i>(Note: Crossed out E1 in question and wrote general)</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Safety, straightest route—much less expensive especially considering how much</li> </ul>	<i>(Note: Crossed out E3 and replaced it with E2)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Much of western route build over flood</li> </ul>	E2 has primarily absentee landowners and rentals. If a good offer was made several have indicated they would be

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Visual impact needs to include the people driving on the highway—this is a beautiful entrance into Moscow and will create a spectacular impression for those driving in.</li> <li>A limited access road will actually keep development out of these areas as it will not be easier to get to. Less hassle for not having to build off ramps.</li> </ul>	<p>money has been spent for the latest research.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Flattest Route</li> <li>Safe during construction—less people for landowners, drivers and construction workers.</li> <li>Less farm equipment on roads, less school buses, mail delivery, etc.</li> <li>Would be a “next generation” highway saving more \$ in the future because you are already set for the times ahead</li> </ul>	<p>plain</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Most land is decomposed granite/clay. Stronger for construction—poorer ground—exclusively</li> <li>Game crossing are the safest type with underpasses</li> <li>Landowners in the entire corridor support E2 (the only person on the eastern side that hasn’t given an opinion has filed papers to build subdivision homes on his property—public record)</li> </ul>	<p>ok with mitigation.</p> <p>People and their constitutional right to own land should have a larger impact on this decision than people who don’t even live in the impact zone. We want to work with you to build a safe highway that doesn’t damage people’s lives.</p>
E195	<p><i>(Note: Underlined Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration) with NO! written next to it.)</i> Why is the cost of E1 30% greater than cost of C3? Hard to dig this out of the matrix entries. Also difficult to see why E1 southbound eliminated—certainly more attractive by many measures than W4.</p>	<p>Hard to see from matrix why cost of E2 12% greater than that for C3. Do the cost numbers represent construction only? How would cost comparisons change if cost basis was construction and projected maintenance for next 20, 25 years? Would this alternate view of costs favor the straight-shot highland routes over the central and western routes?</p>		
E196	<p>Agree: Elevation changes, splits farm ownership and operation. Impacts Steven’s springs and Centennial Farms.</p>	<p>Agree: This is the best of all 10 alternatives. It is the safest, straightest, flattest, and “directly” impacts the least ownership. When the cost of arguing right of way ownership is included, it is likely to be the least expensive. It lies along the agricultural/non agricultural ownership division for most of its length and is the least intrusive of the 10 routes. It has grades on both ends but the center portion is relatively flat and straight. This provides a minimum access highway that is expandable in the future.</p>	<p>Agree: Though this would be my second choice among the 10 alternative alignments. It splits ownership/farming productions units and is also subject to elevation changes through the central portion. This route does provide direct access for wildlife on the east side of the route. Additional water access for wildlife on Paradise Ridge is mitigatable above (to the East) of E3 and E2.</p>	<p>One “argument” against the eastern routes is that a highway would bring in weeds that could displace native species. Invading species can displace native species. Invading species can displace less competitive native species, but it doesn’t matter if the source is adjacent or five miles away, it just takes a few years longer for the invader to travel the five miles. The invading species is going to get there one way or another!</p>
E197		<p>E2 is my choice, because all research has been done and there is less damage to any population—crosses and the 3.3 acres of suitable habitat area. Safety is very important. Buses having straight roads eliminate the noise of large trucks changing gears.</p>		

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

**Eastern Alternatives/Alignments**

#	<b>E1 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>E2 – Recommendation: Carry forward.</b>	<b>E3 – Recommendation: Eliminate from further consideration.</b>	<b>Are there any considerations that have been overlooked in these alternatives/alignments?</b>
		Lets make it safe and a pleasure. In building there would be less bank, hills and would be scenic into Moscow.		
E198		E2 seems the best route into Moscow as far as building and disturbing people, animals and farmers, we need safety above all else. Money and time building should be important too. The Lewiston grade top is a beautiful scene and so would this road into the Moscow-Pullman area.		
E199	This is the first of the eastern routes I would ax because primarily cost.	This is my #1 choice of any east, central, or west. Makes the most sense, reasonable length and cost. Few impact on residences, one of the lowest accident rates. Beautiful job!!	I wouldn't object to this route but I think E2 is overall better.	None apparent.
E200			I oppose a route that goes close to Paradise Ridge and also endangers Palouse Prairie and wildlife.	
E201	Agree	Disagree. Roller coasting a highway in the fog and snow zones on the flanks of Paradise Ridge is nonsensical. Severing of deer and elk browse areas from water sources is nonsensical. See also environmental studies comment sheet.	Agree	