

Appendix A

REPORTED ROADWAY DEFICIENCIES

**Table A-1
US Highway 89 Corridor Plan
Reported Roadway Deficiencies**

Deficiency No.	From/At	M.P.	To	M.P.	Reported Deficiency						
					Description	Type*	Time Frame		Frequency	Source	Findings/Status
							Existing	Future			
1	Utah State Line	0.00		0.00	Turnaround needed for school buses, snow plows. Must now back up onto highway to turn around (illegal for school buses to do so).	O	x		1	Open house	Existing deficiency
2	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven Creek	2.58	Cars from residences on east side of highway parked on highway. Boats trailers backed out of driveways onto highway.	O	x		1	ITD staff	Field survey found vehicles parked on shoulder. Also, due to low lake level, many vehicles were parked directly on beach/lake bottom.
3	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven Creek	2.58	Lake comes up to fog line at some locations when water line is at higher levels	O	x		1	ITD staff	Existing deficiency
4	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven Creek	2.58	Narrow shoulders, so parked vehicles occupy portion of travel lanes.	O	x		1	City of Montpelier staff	Shoulder width deficiencies identified for this section.
5	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven Creek	2.58	Narrow road	G	x		2	Open house	Lane widths adequate, but shoulder width deficiencies identified for this section.
6	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven Creek	2.58	Numerous driveway traffic conflicts.	O	x		2	Open house	Driveway spacing does not meet ITD's 300-foot spacing standard.
7	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven Creek	2.58	Too many driveway traffic conflicts. Need to consolidate access points.	O	x		3	Stakeholder interviews	Driveway spacing does not meet ITD's 300-foot spacing standard. Several locations have potential for consolidation.
8	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven Creek	2.58	Driveway approach grades too steep.	G	x		3	Stakeholder interviews	Several driveways found that exceed public roadway approach grade standard (3%).
9	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Major realignment or bypass needed in Fish Haven. Highway should be located to west up hill so there would be room to expand to 4 lanes. Need to preserve ROW now before more development occurs.	O	x	x	2	Stakeholder interviews, TF/TAC meeting	May be examined in improvement phase of study.
10	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Bike lane needed in Fish Haven that connects to existing bike lane in Garden City.	B	x		4	Stakeholder interviews	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
11	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	School children must wait for buses on highway and cross highway because local roads too steep for bus service.	S	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Existing deficiency
12	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Congestion will get worse.	O		x	3	Open house, stakeholder interviews, TF/TAC meeting	Will be analyzed in future conditions phase of study.
13	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Is/will be need for scenic overlooks and pullouts.	O	x	x	4	Stakeholder interviews, TF/TAC meeting	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
14	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Will be need for more lake access parking.	O		x	1	Stakeholder interviews	Parked vehicles observed on shoulder and beach/lake bottom, exceeding capacity of existing off-street parking area.
15	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Lower speed limits needed.	S	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
16	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Congestion in summer.	O	x		3	Stakeholder interviews	Level of service standards met for 30th-highest hour conditions for road segments and intersections in this area. Access spacing deficiencies found, however.
17	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Center tun lane or passing lanes may be needed.	O	x		3	Stakeholder interviews	May be examined in improvement phase of study.
18	Utah State Line	0.00	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Designate Fish Haven area as no-passing zone.	O	x		3	Stakeholder interviews	No-passing zones are established based on passing sight distance deficiencies. No such deficiencies were identified for Fish Haven area.
19	Utah State Line	0.00	St. Charles	8.06	General traffic operations problems. Alternate route needed to west, with existing US 89 alignment used as frontage road.	O	x	x	2	Open house	May be examined in improvement phase of study.
20	Utah State Line	0.00	St. Charles	8.06	Deficient shoulder widths	G	x		2	ITD staff, county staff	Shoulder width deficiencies identified between m.p. 0.0 (Utah state line) and m.p. 6.83 (south of St. Charles)
21	Utah State Line	0.00	St. Charles	8.06	Sight distance from highway poor at certain locations.	G	x		1	City of Montpelier staff	Measured intersection and stopping sight distances meet standard at each surveyed location.

**Table A-1
US Highway 89 Corridor Plan
Reported Roadway Deficiencies**

Deficiency No.	From/At	M.P.	To	M.P.	Reported Deficiency						
					Description	Type*	Time Frame		Frequency	Source	Findings/Status
							Existing	Future			
22	Utah State Line	0.00	North Beach Rd.	8.74	Bike/vehicle conflicts - need bike lane.	B	x		3	Open house, TF/TAC meeting, county staff	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
23	Lake West Blvd.	0.14		0.00	Poor sight distance	G	x		1	County staff	Measured intersection and stopping sight distances meet standards at this location.
24	Lake West Blvd.	0.14	Fish Haven Canyon Rd.	2.72	Congestion	O	x		2	Open house	Level of service standards met for 30th-highest hour conditions for segments and intersections. Access spacing deficiencies found, however.
25	Lake West Blvd.	0.14	Fish Haven Canyon Rd.	2.72	Poor sight distance from intersections and driveways.	G	x		2	Open house	Measured intersection sight distances meet standard at all surveyed public intersections. Vegetation could create obstructions on some private driveway approaches, however.
26	Lake West Blvd.	0.14	Fish Haven Canyon Rd.	2.72	Center turn lane or turn lanes at intersections needed.	O	x		3	Open house, TF/TAC meeting	Intersection turn lane deficiencies identified within this section at Lake West Blvd., Loveland Ln., and Fish Haven Canyon Rd. Center turn lane may be examined in improvement phase of study.
27	Lake West Blvd.	0.14	Fish Haven Canyon Rd.	2.72	Lower speed limits needed.	S	x		1	TF/TAC meeting	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
28	Bear Lake West Beach	0.72		0.00	Parking along shoulders near beach.	O	x		2	Open house	Parked vehicles observed on shoulder as well as beach/lake bottom.
29	Bear Lake West Beach	0.72		0.00	Beach has no parking area.	O	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Private unpaved parking area is available for less than 20 vehicles, but no other off-street parking is provided.
30	Lakeside Dr.	1.17		0.00	Poor sight distance	G	x		1	County staff	Measured intersection and stopping sight distances meet standards at this location.
31	Loveland Lane	2.02		0.00	Poor sight distance	G	x		1	County staff	Measured intersection and stopping sight distances meet standards at this location.
32	S. of Fish Haven Creek	2.46	N. of Fish Haven Creek	2.59	Inadequate horizontal curve.	G	x		1	ITD staff	No deficiency identified based on ITD HPMS data and field survey.
33	Fish Haven Creek	2.58		0.00	Bridge too narrow with no shoulder for bicyclists and pedestrians. Walkway or bike lane would be big improvement.	B, P	x		1	TF/TAC meeting	Bridge width meets ITD standard.
34	Fish Haven Canyon Rd.	2.72		0.00	Poor sight distance due to parked vehicles north and south of intersection.	G	x		4	Open house, stakeholder interviews, county staff	Parked vehicles north and south of intersection can create intersection sight distance problems. Without parked vehicles, measured intersection sight distance meets standard.
35	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	Fish Haven Cemetery Rd.	3.40	Reduce existing 65 mph speed limit to 45 mph to provide transition to 35 mph speed zone in Fish Haven.	S	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
36	Fish Haven N. Boundary	3.09	N. of 3rd South St. (St. Charles)	7.62	May need to lower existing 65 mph speed limit in future due to increase in traffic accessing US 89	S		x	1	Open house	Will need to be addressed in future.
37	Fish Haven Cemetery Rd.	3.40		0.00	Scenic pull-off needed in this area.	O	x		1	Open house	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
38	Fish Haven Cemetery Rd.	3.40		0.00	Poor sight distance	G	x		1	County staff	Measured intersection and stopping sight distances meet standards at this location.

**Table A-1
US Highway 89 Corridor Plan
Reported Roadway Deficiencies**

Deficiency No.	From/At	M.P.	To	M.P.	Description	Type*	Reported Deficiency		Frequency	Source	Findings/Status
							Time Frame				
							Existing	Future			
39	S. of St. Charles	7.00	N. of 3rd South St. (St. Charles)	7.62	Existing 65 mph speed limit too high due to residential development.	S	x		3	Open house	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
40	1st North St. (St. Charles)	8.06	North Beach Rd.	8.74	Existing 55 mph speed limit too high due to number of driveways and turning vehicles at North Beach Rd. Reduce speed limit to 45 mph.	S	x		3	Open house	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
41	1st North St. (St. Charles)	8.06	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	Conflicts between general traffic and cattle and farm equipment.	O	x		2	TF/TAC meeting, county staff	Existing deficiency
42	North Beach Rd.	8.74		0.00	Conflicts between vehicles slowing to turn onto N. Beach Rd. and faster-moving through vehicles (NB right-turn lane needed). Proposed food mart/rental shop will add to problem.	O	x		2	Open house	Turn lane deficiency identified at this location.
43	North Beach Rd.	8.74		0.00	One-half mile back-ups on WB N. Beach Rd. in summer. Need to add WB left-turn lane.	C	x		2	Open house	Turn lane deficiency identified at this location.
44	North Beach Rd.	8.74		0.00	Poor sight distance from EB approach to north.	G	x		5	Open house, ITD staff	Measured intersection and stopping sight distances meet standards at this location.
45	North Beach Rd.	8.74		0.00	Existing 55 mph speed limit too high because of congested conditions at intersection.	S	x		1	County staff	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
46	North Beach Rd.	8.74	Minnetonka Cave Rd.	8.93	Significant traffic volumes between North Beach area and Minnetonka Cave along this segment, with many vehicles towing boats and camp trailers. SB left-turn lane needed at North Beach Rd. and NB left-turn lane needed at Minnetonka Cave Rd. Speed limit too high. Poor sight distances.	S	x		5	Stakeholder interviews, county staff	Left-turn lane deficiencies identified at North Beach Rd. and Minnetonka Cave Rd. intersections. Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition. Measured intersection and stopping sight distances meet standards at these locations.
47	North Beach Rd.	8.74	2nd South St. (Paris)	15.64	Need bike lane.	B	x		1	Open house	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
48	Minnetonka Cave Rd.	8.93	Bloomington S. City Limit	12.83	Existing 65 mph speed limit too high.	S	x		1	County staff	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
49	Worm Creek Rd.	11.69		0.00	Conflicts between trucks accessing gravel pit and general traffic.	O	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
50	Worm Creek Rd.	11.69		0.00	Fatal bike accident in this area.	S	x		1	County staff	Bike lane for this area will be examined in improvement phase of study.
51	Bloomington N. City Limit	14.04	Paris S. City Limit	14.95	Narrow shoulder widths.	G	x		1	ITD staff	No shoulder width deficiencies were identified within this section.
52	Paris Cemetery Rd.	14.95	2nd South St.	15.64	Existing 65 mph speed limit too high due to numerous driveways and residential development. Reduce speed limit to 45 mph.	S	x		2	Open house	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
53	Paris Cemetery Rd.	14.95	Lanark Rd.	18.31	Reduce existing speed limits.	S	x		2	Open house	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
54	1st South St. (Paris)	15.79	1st North St. (Paris)	16.09	Existing 25 mph speed limit through middle of Paris may be too slow.	O	x		1	Open house	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
55	2nd North St. (Paris)	16.23	Paris N. City Limit	16.95	Existing 65 mph speed limit too high due to numerous driveways, residential development, school bus stops, children in area. Reduce speed limit to 45 mph.	S	x		4	Open house	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.

**Table A-1
US Highway 89 Corridor Plan
Reported Roadway Deficiencies**

Deficiency No.	From/At	M.P.	To	M.P.	Reported Deficiency						
					Description	Type*	Time Frame		Frequency	Source	Findings/Status
							Existing	Future			
56	2nd North. St. (Paris)	16.23	Lanark Rd.	18.31	Conflicts between farm vehicles and general traffic	O	x		1	County staff	Existing deficiency
57	2nd North. St. (Paris)	16.23	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	Conflicts between farm and non-farm vehicles in this area. May need to lower existing speed limit or provide frontage roads.	S	x		2	Open house	Existing deficiency
58	2nd North. St. (Paris)	16.23	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	Narrow shoulder widths.	G	x		3	Open house	Shoulder width deficiencies identified between m.p. 18.31 (Lanark Rd.) and m.p. 20.15 (Ovid Corner - US 89 connector.)
59	2nd North. St. (Paris)	16.23	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	Weather-related driving problems in winter (blowing snow, low visibility, snow drifts on road).	O	x		6	Open house, stakeholder interviews, TF/TAC meeting	Existing deficiency
60	2nd North. St. (Paris)	16.23	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	Sight distance problems at certain locations.	G	x		4	Stakeholder interviews	Intersection and stopping sight deficiencies found at Wallentine Road and Church Farm Road.
61	2nd North. St. (Paris)	16.23	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	Bus pullouts needed at school bus stops due to high existing speed limit (65 mph).	S	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Existing deficiency
62	2nd North St. (Paris)	16.23	Bear River Canal Bridge	22.61	Narrow roadway, no shoulders for pull-off. If shoulders can't be widened, then may need to lower speed limit.	G	x		4	Open house	Shoulder width deficiencies identified between m.p. 18.31 (Lanark Rd.) and m.p. 22.45 (Cutler Lane).
63	N. of Paris	17.17	Ovid Creek Bridge (S.)	19.84	Narrow shoulder widths.	G	x		1	ITD staff	Shoulder width deficiencies identified between m.p. 18.31 (Lanark Rd.) and m.p. 19.84 (Ovid Creek Bridge - S.)
64	Church Farm Rd.	17.61	Lanark Rd.	18.31	Narrow roadway	G	x		4	Open house	No lane or shoulder width deficiencies identified within this section.
65	Church Farm Rd.	17.61	Lanark Rd.	18.31	Vertical curves limit sight distance to/from US 89 (e.g., Wallentine Rd. and recent fatal accident at Church Farm Rd.).	S	x		5	Open house, stakeholder interviews	Intersection and stopping sight deficiencies found at Wallentine Road and Church Farm Road.
66	Lanark Rd.	18.31		0.00	Sight distance problems for NB vehicles.	G	x		4	Stakeholder interviews, county staff	Measured intersection and stopping sight distances meet standards at this location. Northbound drivers have difficulty seeing oncoming southbound vehicles when trying to turn left onto Lanark Rd., however.
67	Ovid Creek Bridge (S.)	19.84		0.00	Bridge is too narrow (needs to be as wide as approach roadway widths).	G	x		1	ITD staff	Bridge width deficiency identified.
68	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	SH 36	20.23	Safety problem due to poor intersection configuration.	S	x		10	Open house	Intersection configuration is inadequate, although it is not classified as high-accident location (HAL) by ITD. Also, collision rate is 0.39 collisions per million entering vehicles which is below statewide average of 1.13 for similar locations.
69	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	SH 36	20.23	Combine two existing intersections into one.	S	x		2	Open house	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
70	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	SH 36	20.23	Conflicts between trucks accessing/egressing lumber company on east side of US 89 (20-30 trucks per day in summer) and general traffic on US 89.	O	x		2	Open house	Mitigation measures will be examined in improvement phase of study.
71	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	SH 36	20.23	Speeds too fast around curve.	S	x		2	Open house	Speeds appear reasonable based on field survey.
72	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	SH 36	20.23	Driver confusion, especially with visitors to area. Realignment is necessary.	O	x		17	Stakeholder interviews	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
73	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	SH 36	20.23	Flasher needed on US 89 to warn drivers.	S	x		1	TF/TAC meeting	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
74	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	SH 36	20.23	Log piles next to highway at lumber mill can cause poor sight distance around curve.	O	x		1	County staff	Intersection sight distance deficiency identified.
75	Ovid Corner (US 89 Connector)	20.15	SH 36	20.23	Fatal accident caused by poor curvature. Needs to be realigned.	S	x		1	County staff	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.

**Table A-1
US Highway 89 Corridor Plan
Reported Roadway Deficiencies**

Deficiency No.	From/At	M.P.	To	M.P.	Description	Type*	Time Frame		Frequency	Source	Findings/Status
							Existing	Future			
76	SH 36	20.23		0.00	Lack of driver awareness of stop sign on EB approach of SH 36 intersection. Many drivers run through stop sign.	O	x		19	Open house, stakeholder interviews	Mitigation measures will be examined in improvement phase of study.
77	SH 36	20.23		0.00	Poor sight distance.	G	x		2	ITD staff, City of Montpelier staff	Intersection sight distance deficiency identified.
78	SH 36	20.23		0.00	Driver confusion between EB and SB vehicles. EB drivers not sure if SB vehicles will turn to continue along US 89 or go straight to access WB SH 36.	O	x		1	ITD staff	Mitigation measures will be examined in improvement phase of study.
79	Ovid Corner (SH 36 Intersection)	20.23	Bear River Canal Bridge	22.61	Narrow shoulder widths.	G	x		3	Stakeholder interviews, ITD staff, City of Montpelier staff	Shoulder width deficiencies identified between m.p. 20.23 (Ovid Corner - SH 36 intersection) and m.p. 22.45 (Cutler Lane).
80	Ovid Corner (SH 36 Intersection)	20.23	W. of Montpelier	24.26	Numerous access points to farm fields which can create conflicts with farm equipment entering/exiting the highway.	O	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Existing deficiency
81	Ovid Corner (SH 36 Intersection)	20.23	W. of Montpelier	24.26	Need wider travel lanes and shoulders.	G	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	No lane width deficiencies identified within this section. Shoulder width deficiencies identified between m.p. 20.23 (Ovid Corner - SH 36 intersection) and m.p. 22.45 (Cutler Lane).
82	Ovid Creek Bridge (E.)	20.40		0.00	Bridge too narrow (needs to be as wide as approach roadway width).	G	x		1	ITD staff	Bridge width deficiency identified.
83	Walton Feed Co.	24.22	W. of Montpelier	24.80	Existing 65 mph speed limit too high due to conflicts with vehicles turning into/out of driveways.	S	x		1	Open house	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
84	Begin 12th St. Overpass (Montpelier)	25.14	End 12th St. Overpass	25.29	Overpass too narrow.	G	x		1	TF/TAC meeting	No existing deficiency identified based on ITD standard.
85	Begin 12th St. Overpass (Montpelier)	25.14	End 12th St. Overpass	25.29	Overpass is only access to Montpelier to/from south.	C	x		1	TF/TAC meeting	Montpelier also served by US 30 to/from south, although this connection not as direct.
86	Begin 12th St. Overpass (Montpelier)	25.14	9th St. (Montpelier)	25.41	Not enough driver awareness of lower speed limit (25 mph) in Montpelier. More speed limit enforcement needed.	S	x		1	Open house	Speeds reasonable based on speed survey data for this location (27.3 mph avg. speed).
87	8th St. (Montpelier)	25.52		0.00	Signal detection loop on SB approach of 8th St. too close to centerline so that signal gets actuated by vehicles turning from Washington St. onto 8th St. Green time for 8th St. also needs to be lengthened by a few seconds.	O	x		1	Open house	Level of service "A" calculated for this location.
88	4th St. (Montpelier)	25.98	Clay St.	26.28	Truck speeds too high.	S	x		1	ITD staff	Speed data unavailable for this location.
89	Clay St. (Montpelier)	26.28		0.00	Accidents due to WB vehicles on US 89 not stopping at stop sign. Signal needed.	S	x		3	Open house, ITD staff, City of Montpelier staff	Mitigation measures will be examined in improvement phase of study.
					Speeds too high.	S	x		1	Open house	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
					Wider lanes and shoulders will be needed along entire corridor to accommodate more long-distance bicyclists.	B		x	1	Stakeholder interviews	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
					Passing lanes will be needed.	C		x	1	Stakeholder interviews	May be examined in improvement phase of study.
					Vertical curves at some locations obstruct sight distance.	G	x		1	Open house	Findings for specific locations provided above.
					Some bridges are too narrow.	G	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Findings for specific locations provided above.
					Narrow shoulder widths	G	x		1	County staff	Findings for specific locations provided above.

**Table A-1
US Highway 89 Corridor Plan
Reported Roadway Deficiencies**

Deficiency No.	From/At	M.P.	To	M.P.	Reported Deficiency						
					Description	Type*	Time Frame		Frequency	Source	Findings/Status
							Existing	Future			
					Intersection approaches of county roads with US 89 too steep.	G	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Approach grade deficiency was identified at Lake West Blvd. intersection.
					Conflicts between slow-moving vehicles pulling onto/off of highway and faster through traffic.	O	x		1	Open house	Existing deficiency
					Highway too narrow. Should be 4 lanes wide.	O	x			Stakeholder interviews	May be examined in improvement phase of study.
					Will be increased truck traffic with completion of Logan Canyon improvements.	O	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Will need to be addressed in future.
					Limited opportunities for farm equipment to use highway due to conflicts with general traffic	O	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
					Will be more conflicts between local and through traffic in future.	O		x	1	Stakeholder interviews	Mitigation measures will be examined in improvement phase of study.
					Driveway access to the highway will need to be limited. Use side streets or frontage roads instead.	O		x	1	Stakeholder interviews	Will be examined in improvement phase of study.
					Too much speed limit variation along corridor.	O	x		1	County staff	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
					Seventeen bus stops in 65 mph speed zones.	S	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Existing deficiency
					Better transitions needed for new 65 mph speed limits near communities.	S	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.
					Increased speeds and traffic volumes have increased road kill.	S	x		1	TF/TAC meeting	Mitigation measures will be examined in improvement phase of study.
					Problem with speed limit increase from 55 mph to 65 mph due to lack of transition areas from higher speed zones to lower speed zones within communities.	S	x		1	Stakeholder interviews	Speed limits need to be addressed outside of corridor planning process, starting with Regional Transportation Coalition.

* C = Capacity, G = Geometric, O = Traffic Operations, S = Safety, B = Bike, P = Pedestrian