

### CCWR Open House Public Meetings

Comments received July 14 - August 15, 2011

QUESTIONS:											
Should the highway districts consider preserving a corridor for future traffic needs?			What are the three most important factors to consider in choosing where a future highway corridor might be located? What else should be considered?	Corridor Alternatives: Do you agree with the preliminary rankings? Why or Why not?			What other alternatives should be considered, and why?	What alternatives should be eliminated, and why?	Access Control : Should the corridor include existing roadways, or avoid them , why?	Should the highway districts implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use of the corridor in the early years of use, or fully restrict access (like I-84) from the start?	Additional Comments (What have we missed)?
	Yes	No			Yes	No					
COMMENTS:											
It will be unloading freeway and provide access to different paths of valley.	X		You got it all. Special Facilities	Goodson Road is the best choice because of existing overpass etc.	X		None	Sand Hollow Road exit, because it has mental institution just by the exit. Need to keep places like that isolated.	It should avoid existing roadways because if it opens through existing roads it will affect dwellings and properties.	It would be great if interim access management plan would be implemented. It would help development of the area. It would help determine need for future exits upon impact of traffic.	
Canyon County growth is inevitable. We need to stay ahead of the growth by making sure the road system is in place.	X		Ease of access and cost of right of way. Potential service to the community.		X				By all means avoid existing roadways. Because there are too many private driveways to contain and to many nice homes to remove.	Have limited access so the speed can be faster.	I hope this new highway takes into consideration the environment wild game and nature.
Cost	X		Don't use good farm land. Cost.		X				Avoid. Cost. Less Home destruction.	Like I-84	Need a bike highway from one end of valley to the other.
Current data is not valid for making choices so far in the future.		X	Only one - Need	Based upon unverified assumptions.		X	None	All	That choice would depend on future conditions.	No	There must be real today problems for IDT to solve without playing "What if" games.
	X		I think you should incorporate Highway 95 into alternatives.	I believe Highway 95 should be first with Weitz Road the 2nd choice.		X	Highway 95 most of it is already in place. It just needs to be widened and bypass Parma and Wilder.				
It's too early, we'll have to see some more growth first.		X	Consider using Highway 95 because it is already existing and more cost effective.	Highway 95 first then Weitz Road.							

<b>QUESTIONS:</b>											
Should the highway districts consider preserving a corridor for future traffic needs?			What are the three most important factors to consider in choosing where a future highway corridor might be located? What else should be considered?	Corridor Alternatives: Do you agree with the preliminary rankings? Why or Why not?			What other alternatives should be considered, and why?	What alternatives should be eliminated, and why?	Access Control : Should the corridor include existing roadways, or avoid them , why?	Should the highway districts implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use of the corridor in the early years of use, or fully restrict access (like I-84) from the start?	Additional Comments (What have we missed)?
	Yes	No			Yes	No					
<b>COMMENTS:</b>											
To help elevate traffic on existing interstate around valley cities.	X		1. Acquire land that will bear the least impact on existing properties. 2. Put in a mini not a lot of on-off ramps. 3. Use existing state Highway if possible.	Only if they are tied into the proposals.	X		Don't block game crossings and fly away zones.	?	Yes, if possible.	Restrict across as much as possible.	
			How many retired people on a fixed income that will lose their homes. What ancient native area you build through.								
	X		Safety, Building, Future	Beet Road was not on the map for planning.		X	Hwy 55, Beet Road its all these to move the planning forward.	Pride Lane, School in the way.	Existing, for cost, its in place.	Yes	No
Use the road that are there. There is no money and it the tax payers keep getting the bill for it and again there is no money. Our nation in debt the state is in debt and the country. Get the job back before you do anything else.		X	1. On the road that are there. 2. Money, Money, Money	There is no money.		X	Develop the roads that are here.	The people that thought this should be eliminated.	Yes, too keep the cost down. Don't build the dam thing this is rural country.	No, If we have to pay for it we should be able to use it.	We don't need it. We don't have the money for it. Use the highway that are here. Make Hwy 55 four lanes from Marsing to Nampa, with a turn lane.
The freeway we have is a perfect route. If you need to move more traffic then just widen it		X	Not through farmland and definitely not through the quiet countryside.	It should be on existing roads like Farmway or Hwy 95. No on small country roads or farmground.		X	Widen Hwy 95 or just widen I-84	Anything that causes the loss of farmland. We are already losing it to houses.	Use them	Truck traffic should not be allowed on the corridor. I-84 is perfect for truck traffic. Quiet neighborhoods shouldn't be destroyed by truck traffic.	
Stop the spending money on future needs. Fix Hwy 55 Karcher Road for Canyon County.		X	There is no money. No, job in Canyon County wake up the economy, the country is in trouble.	So the Nampa Highway District adopted a corridor from nowhere to nowhere. Why are we Canyon Highway District required to do anything.		X	Fix the roads we have. Make Karcher Road a 5 Lane Hwy to Nampa. Finish the freeway 84 make Homedale Road wider.	Don't do this.	Don't build the expressway.	Don't build the expressway.	Don't do this. We don't want it and Canyon County doesn't need it. The taxpayers cannot afford it. Canyon County does not need an expressway, now or 50 yrs. From now.

QUESTIONS:											
Should the highway districts consider preserving a corridor for future traffic needs?			What are the three most important factors to consider in choosing where a future highway corridor might be located? What else should be considered?	Corridor Alternatives: Do you agree with the preliminary rankings? Why or Why not?			What other alternatives should be considered, and why?	What alternatives should be eliminated, and why?	Access Control : Should the corridor include existing roadways, or avoid them , why?	Should the highway districts implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use of the corridor in the early years of use, or fully restrict access (like I-84) from the start?	Additional Comments (What have we missed)?
	Yes	No			Yes	No					
COMMENTS:											
I think it's good to have a plan in mind in case it's needed. I would not want this done to attract "Federal Money" The money they have is ours. Then we beg for a little of it back. But if access roads are needed in the future. It's much better to have a plan in place than to try to throw it together then. And it can be adjusted as appropriate.	X		Existing productive farm land truly rural communities.	Map #14 Going up Weitz Road seems like the least disruptive as it is closer to existing development. But the area around the Baxter Farm south of Lake Lowell should not be disturbed.	X		Possibly utilizing Farmway Road, as people there are already accustomed to traffic.	In my opinion, Pride Lane is too rural and further from the encroaching development. Imaging a Highway of this type there seems out of place.		I think allowing access would be appropriate unless and until it became a safety problem.	
	X		Present commercial business - wineries and stores.	The existing new lanes from Marsing Road to Hoskins Road is less costly disruptive and supports existing commercial business.		X	The other alternatives are more costly and disruptive.	The blue area	Should include existing roadways new lanes on Hwy 55 and Pride Lane.	Implement interim across along the gray route from Marsing Road to Hoskins Road should be includes as part of the interim access route.	The gray area is the better route, Marsing to new lanes on Hwy 55 to Pride Lane.
In the 10 years that I have lived in this area, I have seen so much growth. The main roads such as Marsing Road to Hwy 55 needs to allow more traffic.	X		Current connection like Highway 95 towards Marsing Road. Business locations that exist. Gas stations and food stores and wineries. Caldwell information office would be nice too. Many travelers use Hwy 55 in and out of the state.	I believe the Corridor should connect to Marsing Road and Hwy 55 / Karcher Road. Would be good for the current wineries.		X	Maybe the tan alternative.	Close to Lake Lowell it should be an enjoyable area for families. The blue area should be eliminated.	Yes, we have large properies and would like to connect to the access then to Hwy55/Karcher Road.	I think two would work but I would need to see the options first.	It's very pleasant to live out in the country. But, I like the available gas station, grocery store, postal service, etc. According to #14 display maps I liked first choice: Gray area, Tan area (green on map) blue area.
Provides developers notice for development. Less expensive now then later.	X		1)Cost 2) Access to Interstate 84 3)Coordination with other counties to provide access to I84 at Blacks creek.		X				Include where economically feasible.	Allow local use as soon as possible?	
			1) What it could do to home owners that can't replace; 2) Cost	Do not want it opening up like it would do to bring too many people			None. We live out in the country and like it	All. Same as above.			There is not enough people in my area to need this and would like to keep it that way.

QUESTIONS:											
Should the highway districts consider preserving a corridor for future traffic needs?	Yes	No	What are the three most important factors to consider in choosing where a future highway corridor might be located? What else should be considered?	Corridor Alternatives: Do you agree with the preliminary rankings? Why or Why not?	Yes	No	What other alternatives should be considered, and why?	What alternatives should be eliminated, and why?	Access Control : Should the corridor include existing roadways, or avoid them , why?	Should the highway districts implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use of the corridor in the early years of use, or fully restrict access (like I-84) from the start?	Additional Comments (What have we missed)?
COMMENTS:											
Planning ahead is always a good idea	X		Expense; Impacts - social, agricultural, environment	Not sure which criteria have been used to arrive at the rankings			I think long range it makes sense to make the corridor extend farther north/ Perhaps to Black Canyon or New Plymouth and run it farther away from Lake Lowell on the south end.	The shortest ones - Just doesn't provide for enough future growth	That would be a case by case thing	Same restriction would be preferable from a safety standpoint.	
Traffic flow with limited access is vital to industries involve heavy equipment and trucking.	X		Impact on existing property owners, logical topography plan, Use of existing roadways w/o cutting into existing farm land.	Logical Plan	X				Including existing roadways might save labor an new construction while limiting splitting of farm land.	Allow limited access.	
			People land not land locking anyone or splitting up their land without give them access under or over road so they can get to it pay price for splitting land.	Need to learn more and think on it.					Use as many road as possible so not splitting land.		Really need to think more about.
To control development in effected area.	X			This idea has been around for years. It's time has come.	X						
To prevent development from hindering on adequate corridor.	X		1. Cost 2. Safety 3. Congestion	Hwy 44 should be higher		X	Proximately to urban areas. Reduces traffic loads on rural road.	Impacts to existing building. Buildings can be rebuilt.	Existing where ever possible.	Yes	Nice job of long range planning.
				Close to I-84							
Rather see the farm land preserved		X	Safety (school @ corner of Ustick Road and Pride Lane. Preserving farm land. Least amount of impact.		X		Route towards Parma Hwy 95	Pride Lane, because the school is located there.	Existing roadways (Would use up less farm land)	Unclear of the question.	
Long term planning allows citizens to better plan for the environment they choose to live and biz to develop accordingly.	X		Location impact to future planning for economic viability and safety in transport.						Include existing roadways.	Implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use.	

QUESTIONS:											
Should the highway districts consider preserving a corridor for future traffic needs?			What are the three most important factors to consider in choosing where a future highway corridor might be located? What else should be considered?	Corridor Alternatives: Do you agree with the preliminary rankings? Why or Why not?			What other alternatives should be considered, and why?	What alternatives should be eliminated, and why?	Access Control : Should the corridor include existing roadways, or avoid them , why?	Should the highway districts implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use of the corridor in the early years of use, or fully restrict access (like I-84) from the start?	Additional Comments (What have we missed)?
	Yes	No			Yes	No					
COMMENTS:											
Yes, but years ago - from Nampa exit to other side of Boise. A true beltway. I'm not sure it will be used. ( This one).	X	X	1. Least impact on farm land and homes. 2. Use existing roads (even if you have a sharper curve) 3. Do not cut diagonally - it cuts farms in half making it hard to get water to land and might ruin a way to make a living.	Stay away from the lake. Make a route far from corner. Black route look the best, most straight lines.		X	Go from Marsing Road to Pole line at north end curve at Purple Sage Road connect to freeway at Purple Sage Road.	Malt Road and Weitz Road - A. To close to Caldwell - Allow Caldwell to grow west. B. Least impact on the lake.	Existing Roadways- A. Less Expensive B. Preserves farm land - How a person makes a living.	Interim - allows time to build new roads to move local traffic.	1. Compensate people for 2006 prices (before the crash) for lost income of land. 2. Compensate land at 2006 prices. 3. Inform public of projected start dates ( construction). 4. Inform public of costs and how to pay for it. A) Grants? B) Taxes? C) Stimulus? 6. Think of the future - when houses are built between Nampa and Kuna the growth will turn west. The beltway will become an unnatural block. (use black lines)
To plan for future traffic needs and reduce long-term costs associated with the corridor.	X		Good fit into overall local and regional traffic plans. Minimize impact on existing land uses. Minimize cost.	A new interchange in the Goodson/Galloway area is the best alternative. It minimizes the impact to existing housing, buinesses, and other land uses. A new interchange will also help reduce congestion on I-84	X			I think that tying in at highway 44 would be very expensive and disruptive to existing land uses. This alternative should be eliminated.	The corridor should use existing roadways, where possible, to reduce overall costs and reduce the amount of additional land needed for the corridor. However, this should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and cut a new route when necessardy to avoid substantial disruption to existing uses.		
			1. Protection of Ag land 2. Protection of Ag land 3. Protection of Ag land.								Need to protect of greatest natural resource; Ag land!
Along property lines and farming can continue for many years to come?	X		Easy Wagner Road, Shaffer one mile west with bridge crossing canal?	Widen to control weed?	X		Widen bridges on Wagner Road, Shaffer Road		Yes, to go along propety lines and irrigation ditches	Early access raods should be considered? But not unimproved roads.	Time will tell and labor camp is large enough.

QUESTIONS:											
Should the highway districts consider preserving a corridor for future traffic needs?			What are the three most important factors to consider in choosing where a future highway corridor might be located? What else should be considered?	Corridor Alternatives: Do you agree with the preliminary rankings? Why or Why not?			What other alternatives should be considered, and why?	What alternatives should be eliminated, and why?	Access Control : Should the corridor include existing roadways, or avoid them , why?	Should the highway districts implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use of the corridor in the early years of use, or fully restrict access (like I-84) from the start?	Additional Comments (What have we missed)?
	Yes	No			Yes	No					
COMMENTS:											
Not at this time. Focus attention on Hwy 55 and utilize the section of Sunnyslope that has already been widened and developed. Evolve what is there and paid for into the express way when and if it becomes a need. Then tie into existing roadways.		X	1. Do not go through the middle of farms and good agricultural land for an expressway. 2. Use what is already there (Sunnyslope) and prepared to be used ( and wants) high traffic-Keep the flow to and thru the "wine country". 3. Don't devalue property by putting an " Expressway" stamp on it for 30 years.	1. Keep the traffic through "wine country" 2. Stay away from Lake Lowell 3. Use existing 4 lane section of Sunnyslope. 4. Use existing roadway paths. Don't forge new roadways through agricultural land and homes.		X	Wait until you know for sure there is a need. Don't label or lock-up property on a 30 year guess.	Eliminate all but the third ranked alternatives - Those are least disruptive and damaging to Canyon County land owners and taxpayers.	1. Include them! They've been anticipated to be commercial areas. Those along the existing Hwy want the traffic (wine, store, restaurants). 2. A lot of \$ was already spent on the Sunnyslope section. 3. Stay away from farm ground when , and as much , as possible.	Allow access.	That which you've deemed " Top Choice" runs right through prime farm ground and country homes and land. Whatever ground is "stamped" for expressway is going to alter the value of the land in a negative manner. We have invested in our home and land for 18 years and if it is deemed "expressway" you've just de-valued everything we spent our life growing. Keep traffic on existing like roadways. Use the Hwy 55. Fix whats there and use whats there before you go after more.
Yes, The land needs to be preserved by purchasing it now. To stop any future conflicts like houses being built in the right of way and you should not be telling a property owner this is their land but cannot be used because the Government may some day want it for a freeway.	X		1. The future freeway should include pacles of access to places like Marsing, Homedale, Wilder and Parma, Nyssa. Going from the Nampa Highway Corridor down the hill to Marsing and picking up the 95 corridor west of town. Or following the mora canal at the top of the hill on the high side to just above Homedale and hitting the 95 corridor will accomplish that. 2. You do not need to split the valley in half when you already have Hwy 95 on the west and I84 on the east. 3. The only persons benefitting form the plan, that cuts the valley in half are those living south of Lake Lowell as an easy route to Caldwell or Ontario.	Because you are splitting the valley in half when about 6 miles on either side. You already have a corridor Hwy 95 on the west and Interstate 84 on the east.		X	Tempoorary fix for trucks would be to take Pride from Hwy 55 to Hwy 19. Only a half mile right of way would be needed from Lower Pleasant Ridge to Hwy 19.	All those cutting the valley in halfthe ground below Lower Pleasant Rideg Road over to Hwy 20/26 has to many swamps, springs, low areas being drained by ditches not to mention the spread of the Boise River.	The corridor should be Hwy 95 from either the point of Marsing or Homedale all the way to where it crosses I84 just above Ontario.	The Highway District should build it like I84.	There is no reason to cut the valley in half just so truck drivers and vacationers can miss Boise. It would be better to include access to small towns along what is Hwy 95. This corridor is already established and would benefit the far west end of the valley rather than just splitting the valley in half. There is approximately 3 to 5 miles of low ground (wetlands) between Lower Pleasant Ridge Road and Hwy 20/26 depending on which route is taken (Weitz, Pride, Notus). These wetlands area migratory route between Lake Lowell and the Parma area. These birds, ducks and geese land in fields, ponds and swamps all along the way. Deer and other small animals graze and raise their young in these fields. Wild life conservation groups would have a fit and rightfully so.

QUESTIONS:											
Should the highway districts consider preserving a corridor for future traffic needs?			What are the three most important factors to consider in choosing where a future highway corridor might be located? What else should be considered?	Corridor Alternatives: Do you agree with the preliminary rankings? Why or Why not?			What other alternatives should be considered, and why?	What alternatives should be eliminated, and why?	Access Control : Should the corridor include existing roadways, or avoid them , why?	Should the highway districts implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use of the corridor in the early years of use, or fully restrict access (like I-84) from the start?	Additional Comments (What have we missed)?
	Yes	No			Yes	No					
COMMENTS:											
		X									<p>I do not see the need for such a plan to be adopted for a future corridor, and indeed believe that this is a bad idea from the beginning, for the following reasons: First, your data states that the need was indentified after a 50% increase in population from 1998 to 2008. This time was an economic boom for the area, the likes of which may never happen again. In fact, the 2010 census showed that Canyon County grew by only 43.7%. If there truly had been a 5% average growth per year from 1998 until 2008, then the data shows that with the onset of the recession (2008), the population growth was much less than 5% for the rest of the decade. That slow growth continues today. Therefore, the expected growth may not occur for many years after 2030, 2050, or beyond. Next, I do not believe the impact that this would have on the local economy has been adequately considered. There are dozens of restaurants, gas stations, and motels that line the I-84 corridor from Sand Hollow to the Black's Creek Exit. These could potentially lose a large base of their business. Boise would also be circumvented by travelers, creating a loss of business within the city, and within the state. The environmental impact on the Lake Lowell Wildlife Refuge also needs to be considered. All of your routes cross into areas that are routinely used by migratory birds and waterfowl around the lake. An expressway through this area could significantly harm this important migratory corridor. Finally, I do not understand the logic behind the creation of such an expressway based off of population. Most of the local population would need to travel along the existing Interstate in order to get to either side of the expressway. We already have an existing interstate that has plenty of room for the addition of more lanes in the future. I do not believe it to be wise to incur such a large cost for the building of an expressway that is not needed, and could instead cause great harm to the economy of the region. The reasons I have listed above are just a few of the thoughts that I have regarding this issue. Establishing a corridor now will open the possibility of lawsuits and other cost incurring activities to maintain the integrity of the corridor. In this time of fiscal austerity, any money spent on this project is a needless cost. I therefore disagree with any planning for such a corridor, and believe that it is a complete waste of resources.</p>
By 2025 there may be more bicycles than cars. Fuels and cost thereof may take the automobile out of our future.		X	1. Population 2. Workplaces 3. Recreation area access	Malt Rd. maybe. Not far enough to the west. Hwy 95 looks better.					Yes, avoiding them just used up more farmland.	No comment.	
It is not right to tie up people's land for years and not let them use it the way they may need to.		X	1. Somewhere where there are no homes. Or productive & viable businesses that would be impacted. 2. Away from the lake which should be more of a recreation & wildlife area. 3. Somewhere where the roads are already wide.	It would hurt too many people and farms. We are one of the most productive farming areas in the nation.		X	Hiway 55 which is already largely improved & used. Go up Pride & further to the north or just keep as today. Karcher (55) to Farmway goes straight to the freeway via Hwy 19 and works well.	Those down Walker Lake Rd. That area had been considered and/or donated for a school at one time. These alternatives would destroy our home and farming operations as well as others.	Existing- Hwy 55, Karcher, Farmway, Hwy 19 then I-84. Another option- come in from Calif & go north on 95- do some straightening on the So. End or go east with a bypass very far south...not Marsing Rd.	We need access. This is a farming Community! This is not Russia.	1. With so many problems our nation is facing, this is not the time to be putting restrictions on landowners and messing with the world's food producers. 2. People need to know what you are offering for compensation. That would certainly help in your feedback. 3. You need a comprehensive study of who & what you would be impacting...not just deciding by what is cheapest to build because of topography.
		X				X		Malt Road			14 page comment letter with maps (attached, not reproduced here)

QUESTIONS:											
Should the highway districts consider preserving a corridor for future traffic needs?	Yes	No	What are the three most important factors to consider in choosing where a future highway corridor might be located? What else should be considered?	Corridor Alternatives: Do you agree with the preliminary rankings? Why or Why not?	Yes	No	What other alternatives should be considered, and why?	What alternatives should be eliminated, and why?	Access Control : Should the corridor include existing roadways, or avoid them , why?	Should the highway districts implement an interim access management plan to allow limited local use of the corridor in the early years of use, or fully restrict access (like I-84) from the start?	Additional Comments (What have we missed)?
COMMENTS:											
With the urbanization of Canyon County, careful long range planning is critical for having a well thought out method of transporting vehicles that does not degrade into "stop & go" traffic. Examples not to follow are Eagle Road, Chinden Blvd., Highway 55/Karcher Road where inadequate planning and unlimited access makes these roads dangerous to travel.	X		1. Access to other major roads and arteries (i.e. I-84, SH 55, SH 95). 2. Least disruptive to existing facilities and businesses. 3. Enough room to allow parallel local roads and limit access to the expressway.	Please see the letter that is part of this response (5 pages letter and maps not reproduced here), both the top and middle third ranked proposals profoundly impact J.R. Simplot potato plant operations. The bottom third rank proposal would be acceptable.		X	Continue to build on the Farmway Road access by crossing the river to the north and connecting to I-84. The south end of Farmway Rd already meets SH 55, the corridor already exists for a four lane highway on Farmway Rd.	Both the top and middle third ranked proposals should be eliminated based on the impact to Simplot.	The Farmway Rd option would just expand on an existing roadway and minimize creating new infrastructural problems.	No opinion	Obviously, not enough stakeholders were involved (i.e. both Simplot and Idaho Dept of Environmental Quality, which issued the Reuse Permit for the Simplot land application application system).
			Dear Commissioners - As a beneficial interest holder in property at the south end of the Lower Lake Lowell Dam I am deeply disturbed by the proposed routes for two primary reasons: 1. Disturbance of the Deer Flat Wildlife Refuge. The route should avoid impacts to the refuge and be moved substantially westward. Why not link to the already highly expanded Hwy 55 constructed north of the Marsing Snake River Bridge? This grouping of alternative routes seems designed to disrupt farming and wildlife that should be preserved. 2. Unreasonable taking for potential future public use of development potential of Hockberger estate property. This is a fundamental flaw of the entire corridor defining effort perhaps most dramatically displayed on my family's property. Various routes criss crossing my family homestead of 100 years at the south end of the Lower Dam cast a pall over any long term private use planning, even for perennial crops like orchards or vineyards, let alone structures. The stated district intention of tying up wide ROW swaths of private property for decades with extensive building set back requirements for the purpose of suppressing indefinitely the development potential and value of properties all along the corridor is a likely immediate violation of the Constitutional prohibition of the taking of property for a public purpose without just compensation. Consequently, I urge you to reconsider or abort entirely this ill-conceived planning effort. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please keep me posted on all future information or developments.								