

## Comment Form Transcription February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House Comment Form

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.</b>	<b>2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?</b>	<b>3. Additional comments:</b>
1	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route?		
2	How much right-of-way may be needed construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Parks and recreation areas?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- provide east/west commute option between Canyon &amp; Ada/Eagle in an expeditious manner.</li> <li>- provide east/west cycling options that are separate from the commuting vehicle traffic – i.c. – please stay away from Floating Feather, etc. as the Hw 44 route.</li> </ul>	
3	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	Limiting access to the Hwy!	
4	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Wetlands?	Please stay as far as possible away from the Boise River.	My family lost their/our farm to the west end of the Eagle Alternative Route. The man that represented ITD in the land acquisition was rude – horrible actually.
5		Don't put the road thru Star – by pass it please! I prefer a northern route – Ballantyne or Floating Feather.	Hwy 16 to Interstate. Eagle to Hwy 16 please get it done!!

#	<b>1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.</b>	<b>2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?</b>	<b>3. Additional comments:</b>
6	How much right-of-way may be needed construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Other – Animals – on the river corridor which is Hwy 44.	Slower Traffic On this Corridor – I know this sounds crazy but it is not like Eagle Rd – We are along the river and so are many species of animals – Birds – “Bird of Prey”	
7	Yes. Is the route consistent with regional, city and counting planning documents?	Limit access as much as possible to facilitate the through traffic the state highway carries.	
8	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Wetlands? Other – Existing rerouting plan not addressed at the Ballantyne/SH44 realignment site.	Safety & traffic signals that are needed for safety seem to be less important than a straight nonstop route.	
9	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses? Parks and recreation areas?		
10	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? Obtain ROW for future 5 lane express way. What impacts would a route have on:	Establish concepts of access management and get local planning & elected officials to buy in so development fits into access management long range plan.	Plan for future signal spacing at not less than ½ mile + median U-Turns @ ¼ mile points. Provide for a transit corridor. All options need to look at long range – like 50 to 60 yrs from now – what will this area look like and how should be served by transportation once all the adjacent properties are developed.

#	<b>1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.</b>	<b>2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?</b>	<b>3. Additional comments:</b>
	Homes and businesses? Limited Access – either Frontage Roads, Backage Roads, Parallel/Secondary Access Cultural sites? Preserve Wetlands? Preserve or use wetlands banking. Parks and recreation areas? Incorporate river access & bikeway into plan.		EIS/Location will take 10 years – 2020. Initial Projects will take 10 more years – 2030. So you have to look ahead to 2050/2060 – What are the transportation needs when area is fully developed.
11	How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Other – Planned development	Cost of construction.	
12	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county <u>planning documents</u> ? – Poor Judgement What impacts would a route have on: Other – You asked the wrong questions – Nampa now claims 64,000 people Caldwell has also increased but has barriers to Southern expansion. There is virtually no employment expansion both in Nampa & Caldwell – roads to & out of Boise feed bedroom communities & minor growth in employment. Solve those problems & keep 44 expanding mildly! It is a <u>small</u> traffic pattern – run them to Hiway 20 + expand there!		
13	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route?	That whatever is decided in the plan considers growth demands far enough out.	

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
14		The main issue here is do not go thru any towns. No reason to build wide roads if you're going to slow traffic to 25 miles per hour. Build bypasses. Merchants cannot control where roads are built. The public should control	
15		<u>Public Transport</u> should be started as soon as possible. Less costly in the long run.	
16		A public transport system with incentives to use it, would be a cheaper option.	
17		Please look to bike and pedestrian safety when planning. I see that the new park and ride lot in Eagle now has a crosswalk and light which is good. Unfortunately that road is so busy that I would feel uncomfortable crossing it. We may not have much bus service today (1 per day in the AM, 1 in the PM) but surely that will change. Bus stops will be more safely accessible from the north side of the road – there's more population in Eagle to the north – The Winco parking lot would be a good place for a bus stop. If routes are safe then more people will feel comfortable to walk.	
18	What impacts would a route have on: Other – I think we should stop condemning peoples homes! NOT RIGHT!!	Yes, to think ahead to have public transportation in mind, but turn outs, pedestrian bridges, bike access. All play an important role in street design. Light Rail access, along the roads, when time is right to put trains in use. As I see it we are <u>only</u>	

#	1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.	2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?	3. Additional comments:
		<p>thinking of car/truck traffic, with not looking at other way of getting around. Yes, car/truck is important but, let's think ahead. Also, think of large/fast – small/slow traffic. <u>So</u> many roads are becoming freeways like, Eagle Road. I don't own a car, I ride scooter and a motorcycle and would like to have some slower areas. More bike access. Thanks for your time.</p>	
19	<p>Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Cultural sites? Wetlands? Hazardous material sites? (just clean them up) Parks and recreation areas? Other – preserve the river corridor! It will only become more valuable to all (people &amp; wildlife) in the future.</p>	<p>All access points should be right turn only. Then every ¼ to ½ mile a left U-turn should be permitted and also at lights. A center median would prevent left turn access and crossing multiple lanes for both safety and a higher speed.</p>	<p>Bike paths and walking paths are a must, and must be part of contiguous plan, not just segments in isolation. Noise walls may need to be erected near some residential areas.</p>
20	<p>What impacts would a route have on: Cultural sites? Wetlands? Other – Recreational cycling. Other – Preservation of undeveloped area along the river.</p>	<p>If you could carefully assess and make adjustments to preserve recreational cycling I would much appreciate it, as would many others in the valley. Restricting access on 44 would require added access elsewhere.</p>	<p>I'd like to see improved transit alternatives along 44 – improved bus coverage, light rail as an alternative, e.g. Good access along this route to downtown Boise would be a huge benefit. The entire length of this project should have a center median strip that can only be crossed at specified points. This would greatly reduce accidents. Also please coordinate closely with the ACHD bikeway project. This may be a great opportunity to positively impact bicycle commuting</p>

#	<b>1. The Idaho Transportation Department will be evaluating (screening) many route options to improve the Idaho 44 corridor. Please check the questions that are most important to you.</b>	<b>2. Are there other issues that you would like ITD to consider when evaluating options?</b>	<b>3. Additional comments:</b>
			and protect recreational cycling opportunities.
21	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? How much right-of-way may be needed to construct the route? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	If <u>possible &amp; reasonable</u> build road around Star & Middleton. If new road requires purchase of MANY subdivision R/W's – Use existing R/W.	I think the road should be constructed on the existing routes with adequate left turn options and with run outs for existing roads on the right side. Traffic lights constructed in towns & access to subdivisions should be adequate in numbers for safety & coordinated or timed to maximize traffic flow. Please minimize time and dollars spent on studies & <u>BUILD THE ROAD</u> . THANKS for your consideration. Do not waste time Or money on the three bridges over the Boise River.
22	Is the route consistent with regional, city and county planning documents? What impacts would a route have on: Homes and businesses?	The two Southern Routes have environmental constraints. Going through downtown will not allow for the orderly and natural growth of the central area of the city. As well will kill the walkability the city is trying to promote.	The North Route Option 1 is the best route for a host of reasons, first not disrupting the downtown core, second it has fewer R/W constraints, mostly bare land and three it confines and defines the city growth pattern providing the emphasis for transit options in the future.
23			
24			
25			

**Comment Form Transcription**  
**February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House**  
**Segment 1: I-84 to Canyon Lane**

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	No	Best. Stay with it. Most cost effective.	No	No	
2		How do you accommodate existing highway access?			
3	No need to divert route.	Preferred section impacts least amount of ground.	No need to divert route.		
4	I feel sorry for all the homes, private land you want to run a road thru!	Just widen it like all the other damn roads you turn into super freeways!!	Stay off the river, why do we want to destroy this Great River!		
5			Needs to preserve a wide green belt.		
6		Any of these options must allow for easy access for recreational cyclists wishing to cross from north to south at Freezeout or Canyon, e.g.	A number of recreational bicyclists use Channel Rd. to access Caldwell and other connections in the valley. This route would cause a nasty implication for those		

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			cyclists.		
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					

**Comment Form Transcription**  
**February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House**  
**Segment 2: Canyon Lane to Duff Lane**

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	No, too many existing structures. Too costly.	Need alternative to expedite E/W traffic.	South Route appears to be the only and viable (____) route. I support it.	No	South Best
2			This route looks favorable to me by bypassing downtown Middleton with as little impact as possible.		
3	I like Floating Feather or Ballantyne. Please put Hwy 16 to interstate!	Star!!! Stay out of it! Traffic is ridiculous 25 mi per hour thru town.	Too many bridges – more money.	I'm so glad the governor is driving State Street – perhaps this will get done!!!	
4			Route adopted in City's Comprehensive Plan		
5	Goes through too many small properties & would have a big negative impact on the City neighborhoods.	Get H44 out of the City!!	Best choice by far – minimize traffic lights & curb cuts to keep speed limits higher & move regional traffic – utilize frontage &		

#	1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?	5 Additional Comments:
			backage roads.		
6	Accommodation of access.	Accommodation of access.	Appears to provide potential for partial access control.		
7	Too many homes disturbed increases cost significantly.	Not enough right of way. Would impact Businesses too much.	This Route has already Been Planned for and has the least impacts.		
8	Stay out of going thru private property and condemning peoples homes.	As far as I am concerned 44 is fine. Run to 20/26 from 44.	Stay off the River!! We are just slowly killing this great River!		
9		Gaining right of way through Middleton could cause some really sad changes in a cute little old town. Please preserve historic buildings and that cute little park on the east side of town.	For this segment I don't have a strong negative relative to the south option, and might even prefer it if development along that section could be <u>strongly</u> discouraged.		
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
18					
19					
20					

**Comment Form Transcription**  
**February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House**  
**Segment 3: Duff Lane to Kingsbury Road**

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	Not needed Wasteful	<u>Best</u> No need to change.	<u>Too expensive</u> Wasteful of \$	No.	
2	Access management is a problem.	Access management is a problem.			
3	No need to divert route.	Existing Route will work Best.	No need to divert route.		
4			If chosen, please discourage development – make this a true thoroughfare.		These are all good with me – fairly equivalent.
5	<u>Best option.</u>	Too congested.	Too many bridges & environmental impacts.	No.	
6					
7					
8					
9					
10					
11					
12					
13					

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					

**Comment Form Transcription**  
**February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House**  
**Segment 4: Kingsbury Road to Idaho 16**

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	<u>Best option.</u>	Too congested.	Too many bridges & environmental impacts.	No.	
2		The existing route is least expensive and preferable to more traffic, albeit at a slower pace but in a direct line. South route should connect to existing route at this point.	The south route option works well from Segment 1-3 but not here.		
3			I would like the route to stay away from the Boise River. The environmental impact on this south route is too dire.		
4	The property has been platted – but not much building has been done, so the developers should be more	Too many trucks and too much traffic thru Star.	This route – either option – is too expensive and would impact the river use too much. Bridges are		

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
	agreeable to selling some of this property at this time.		not feasible as they are very expensive to install and maintain.		
5	Access Management	Access Management	River Crossings		
6	No better than existing and will be more expensive.	Best option.	River crossings dramatically add to costs.		
7	North Route Option 1 is a <u>major</u> route for recreational cycling. Utilizing this route will push/destroy that very beneficial use.	For this segment, the existing thoroughfare seems the best option.	I really dislike messing with the river. While it has advantages in terms of through traffic, and mitigation can be done, I think these routes are likely to be costly, and there will be pressure for development long term.		
8	Floating Feather is a major bike route that would be disrupted.		Both of these will be highly disruptive of the river corridor and will be expensive. They will also be in a flood zone. We keep shrinking the river wildlife zone. They would also make a greenbelt much less		

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			desirable with all the noise.		
9	The two southern options have too many environmental constraints, but if any option would be the most viable it would be the far southern route – allowing the city to grow around a river very attractive. But for the costs and very few major issues the North Route, Option 1 may be the best route.	Yes, this route would <u>kill</u> any hopes the Star Economic Development Committee has been working on to bring businesses to town. It would also, negate the walkability improvements the city and committee have been working on with both the School District and ACHD!	See comment above (to the left.) To be able to grow a city around a river environment would really be exciting, but not at the huge expense of the rest of the state.	The North Route, Option 1 is the most cost effective.	The Star Chamber, local newspaper and the Star Economic Development Committee strongly support the North Rt., Option 1. As chairman of the transportation sub-committee the North Route, Option 1 is the best alternative. The key is to choose it fairly soon so notification and selection is known to all.
10					
11					
12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
20					

**Comment Form Transcription**  
**February 11, 2009—Eagle Open House**  
**Segment 5: Idaho 16 to Ballantyne Lane**

*Comments are transcribed verbatim. A blank line (\_\_\_) indicates that the comment was not legible.*

#	<b>1. North route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option</b> <b>Do you have any issues or concerns with this option?</b> <b>Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
1	No waste of \$.	<u>Best.</u>	No. Waste of \$.	No.	
2		By far the best route and the only route that makes sense from a practical point and economically.			
3	Impact too many people/homes.	(Best Option)	Too much environmental impact.		
4	This segment should stay in the existing corridor. North Route is too disruptive to residential areas.	This is the best route for this segment. The power lines are already in place & Eagle & Eagle Sewer District have already made concessions to allow a “frontage” Road just south of the existing alignment.	Lots of bridges? This route is an environmental disaster. How many times does it cross the river? No No No		
5	N/A – This won’t work but would be nice. The only way I could see this happening would	Several home owners on 44 could still use there personal driveways. We do not	I would love this but it would be too costly. Bridges, etc. & impact on the river & wildlife.	Please consider Stop Lights & Signs. Unlike Eagle Rd we run along the river “Hwy 44”	

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
	have to be further West & miss the majority of the neighborhoods. 2603 West State – 3 of us at least	want to lose access to our driveways. When the Road was expanded last time they took from our side. This new expansion should go to the north side. Not anymore from Us. Plus it would take out several homes. Looking forward to seeing what turns up later.		and we would have to consider it to be a slower speed limit say at least from Eagle to the outer edge of Star going West. The Wildlife on the River are <u>always crossing</u> and live on or near the river. Even if we say, “OK a few deer get killed” What about the people in the cars trucks hitting them. There personal loss and possible death.	
6		I prefer this option. I think H-44 should be the main people-mover (East-West) in N Ada County. Do not increase capacity on Beacon Light (or other smaller roads) without first expanding H-44 to handle today’s traffic and traffic far into the future.			Minimize stop lights. Minimize curb cuts for every property owner (require & use frontage roads). Keep speed @ 55 MPH for as much of project as possible. Use lengthy right-hand turn lanes at all major intersections.

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
7		We are concerned about 2 Artesian wells we have on our 3 acres that are close to the highway. Our home is 4210 Old Valley Road and our property runs clear to Highway 44. Mr. & Mrs. Marion Moore			
8	1- Yes, you are already scheduled to a realignment of Ballantine/SH44 & your proposed northern route overlays that new intersection. 2 – Are you going to really go through all those homes to reroute 44?	I believe this route to be the most logical, straighter & least expensive to build & maintain. By weaving through neighborhoods you create traffic nightmares.	Too many bridges & obstructions to the river. Flooding would be a likely result of the meandering river/highway plan & the high water table would also be a concern.		
9	I think this route is more economically feasible.	Too many trucks and traffic.	I believe this route would be too cost prohibitive as there would be 6 bridges to build – if property could be purchased ahead of time while property prices are		

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			lower the North Route would be more feasible.		
10	Access management – existing subdivision proximity to high school.	Probably with some additional road and access management.	River Crossings.		
11		Best option. No reason to move route.			
12		Existing route in all cases looks fine to me. Would like to see us stay away from Floating Feather Road, make sure to add sidewalks and pedestrian safety features anyplace the road goes through town or near a school.			
13		Keep 44, just widen it. Also, I would like see <u>more</u> options for roads. Like from 16 to 20/26 – cut a road(s) from there.	Please reduce the amount of bridges.		
15			Stay out of the river zone. It can't be		

#	<b>1. North route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>2. Existing route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>3. South route option Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?</b>	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
			duplicated whereas a subdivision that gets whacked is a dime a dozen.		
15	This one's all right as well.	This is my favorite for this segment.	Part of this route looks like it goes through the Sali property, which recently became part of a conservation easement. I really dislike this option for this segment due to the interaction with the river.		Please add more mass transit options at least this far into the project.
16		44 works fine for my needs. Going thru towns is no problem to me.	No river access, stay off the Boise River! We have way too many bridges over the river as it is. Why not just put a road to Hwy 20/26 since I hear you are going to widen it.		
17	Yes it goes through existing neighborhoods when current alignment and R.O.W. is available. Much more costly.	Make sure you coordinate with ACHD for the Ballantyne alignment.	Yes the environment and river will be greatly impacted. The cost of building a road here will be much more costly.	Please consider reducing dependence on Federal funding. If we used I.T.D. & State dollars, and partnered with local cities. We could build roads faster and less costly. Cities can give incentives for dedicating the needed R.O.W. to Developers thus cutting the costs of purchasing R.O.W.	

#	<b>1. North route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>2. Existing route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>3. South route option</b> Do you have any issues or concerns with this option? Have we missed anything?	<b>4. Is there another option you would like ITD to consider and why?</b>	<b>5 Additional Comments:</b>
18					
19					
20					