

Appendix B – Steering Committee Documents

US95 Steering Committee
ROSTER

Marv Lekstrum, Chair
Commissioner, Lakes Highway District
Phone: (208) 667-8202
Email: mlekstrum@verizon.net

Joe Wuest
Supervisor, Lakes Highway District
Phone: (208) 772-7527
Email: joe@lakeshwy.com

Damon Allen, PE
District Engineer, ITD District 1
Phone: (208) 772-1200
Email: damon.allen@itd.idaho.gov

Mike Porcelli, PE
District Traffic Engineer, ITD District 1
(208) 772-1200
Email: Michael.Porcelli@itd.idaho.gov

Anson Gable
Councilor, City of Hayden
Phone: (208) 772-2866
Email: cagable@yahoo.com

Jeff Zaugg, PE
City Engineer, City of Hayden
Phone: (208) 209-2018
Email: jzaugg@cityofhaydenid.us

Al Hassell
Councilor, City of Coeur d'Alene
Phone: (208) 769-2300
Email: ahassell@CdAID.org

Gordon Dobler, PE
City Engineer, City of Coeur d'Alene
Phone: (208) 769-2300
Email: gordon@cdaid.org

Jonathan Coe
President, Coeur d'Alene Chamber of
Commerce
Phone: (208) 415-0109
Email: jonathan@cdachamber.com

Glenn Miles
Executive Director, KMPO
Phone: (800) 698-1927
Email: gmiles@srtc.org

John Goedde
Idaho State Senate
Phone: (208) 664-9223
Email: john@johngoedde.com

Committee staff:

Carole Richardson, Transportation Planning Engineer
crichardson@srtc.org

Staci Lehman, Public Information/Education Coordinator
slehman@srtc.org

Jenny Wash, Administrative Assistant
jwash@srtc.org

US95 Access Study Roles and Responsibilities

Steering Committee Members

- Approve scope and schedule
- Agree on key messages to be conveyed to public
- Serve as project ambassadors with elected leaders and key stakeholders
- Provide technical information to modeling consultant
- Agree on scenarios to be studied
- Attend public meetings if possible
- Make final recommendation to KMPO Board

KMPO Staff

- General project management, including monitoring scope and schedule, etc.
- Facilitate steering committee
- Provide adequate information and materials for Committee decision-making
- Coordinate stakeholder meetings
- Coordinate public outreach
- Keep KCATT and KMPO Board in the loop

Modeling Consultant

- Coordinate with technical staff at ITD, Hayden and CdA to obtain classification and turning movement counts, signal control, and other information necessary for accurate modeling.
- Develop current conditions simulation
- Develop simulations for 5 to 6 alternatives
- Provide information on operational impacts of each alternative to US95 and other arterials within the study area, including intersection delay and level of service, queue length, travel time, etc.
- Prepare graphics and visualizations for up to three alternatives
- Support KMPO public involvement staff and participate in outreach activities.

US95 Access Study Steering Committee

Meeting #1
January 30, 2008

Steering committee members in attendance:

Marv Lekstrum, Commissioner, Lakes Highway District (Committee Chair)
Damon Allen, District Engineer, ITD District 1
Joe Wuest, Supervisor, Lakes Highway District
Anson Gable, Councilor, City of Hayden
Jeff Zaugg, City Engineer, City of Hayden
Lucas Braden, Public Affairs Manager, Coeur d'Alene Chamber
Mike Porcelli, District Traffic Engineer, ITD District 1
Gordon Dobler, City Engineer, City of Coeur d'Alene

Steering committee members absent:

Al Hassell, Councilor, City of Coeur d'Alene

Staff present:

Carole Richardson, Transportation Planning Engineer, KMPO
Jenny Walsh, Administrative Assistant, KMPO

1. Introductions

Marv opened the meeting and asked for introductions.

2. Project overview

Carole provided some background for the study.

The IT Board has asked us to look at intersections and median treatments along the US95 corridor through Coeur d'Alene and Hayden.

ITD's access control policy indicates the goal for US95, as a multi-lane principal arterial, is Access Type IV. In urban areas, the current policy would allow signals at ½ mile intervals, and frontage road access at ¼ mile intervals. Damon mentioned that ITD's policy is currently under discussion and may change in the future. He advised that the goal of the study should be to optimize the performance and safety of the corridor, not to simply apply the access management policy.

The corridor currently has signals at ½-mile points between I90 and Hayden, with two additional signals in this segment at Bosanko and Canfield that are out of compliance with ITD's current policy. The study area has no signals currently at ½ mile points between Hayden Ave and SH53.

Carole provided brief excerpts from two previous studies; ITD's US95 Corridor Study from 2003, and the City of Hayden's Transportation Strategic Plan from 2007. Both studies recommend adhering to ½ mile signal spacing. The Hayden plan has additional recommendations for turning restrictions at ¼ mile points.

An earlier scope of work that KMPO had prepared was provided for review. Committee members asked for the following additions and clarifications:

- Damon asked that planning level cost estimates be included. A menu of project alternatives and costs would be helpful for him.
- Gordon asked that we clarify that the study will include intersection analysis.
- Mike Porcelli asked that we clarify that a signal timing plan for the corridor should not be prepared. Study analysis should be based on current signal timing.

Carole provided a preliminary schedule and noted that it's subject to change. Originally the IT Board had asked for recommendations from KMPO by July, however the current schedule does not show completion until fall. The committee agreed that it was more important to do the study right than fast. Damon indicated he would apprise the IT Board of the schedule.

3. Roles and Responsibilities:

The committee reviewed proposed roles and responsibilities for themselves, KMPO staff and a modeling consultant. Marv noted that a correction was needed since U of I will not be doing the computer modeling for the study. The committee otherwise concurred with the roles and responsibilities and a corrected version is attached to these minutes.

Anson stated he believes it is appropriate to limit the steering committee to its current membership. Each local agency is represented both with an elected official and a high-level staff person. He feels this is the right committee composition to ensure things stay on track. Lucas noted that the chamber's participation on the steering committee will help provide a business perspective. While the group agreed that individual business owners and stakeholders on the corridor will need to be involved, there was unanimous consensus to keep the steering committee as is.

Mike Porcelli asked that Don Davis also be kept in the loop as the study progresses, since he will likely be administering any funds contributed by ITD.

4. Travel Modeling

Initially, U of I had been asked to develop a VISSIM model of the study area and perform the technical analysis for the study. U of I has had difficulty finding student interest for the project and will unfortunately not be able to assist us. So KMPO recommends that we retain a consultant to perform the technical work.

Damon indicated that since David Evans and Associates had just completed Hayden's plan it would make sense to ask them to expand their previous work over the rest of the corridor. Carole noted that we will need to have a competitive selection process for a consultant. The consensus of the group, however, was that if DEA could be retained, the study process would likely be expedited.

Carole explained that modeling efforts for the study will be limited to a current conditions analysis. Future year scenarios requiring travel demand forecasting are not anticipated to be necessary.

Mike asked if an air quality component could be included in the scope of work in order to support CMAQ funding applications for recommended improvements. Carole said she would look into this.

Funding to pay a consultant was discussed. Gordon indicated he has some funds available. Damon said he would see if ITD could contribute planning funds. The City of Hayden has a significant amount of data and analysis that they can contribute from their recent transportation plan. Gordon indicated a cooperative agreement would be needed. Anson noted that KMPO has had similar agreements in the past, such as the one for public transit funding.

Carole suggested that we wait to determine actual dollar amounts for the agreement until after a consultant has been selected and we have a detailed scope, schedule and budget. She will work on the consultant selection process as soon as possible.

5. Public Involvement

Carole noted that the schedule shows two public open houses. She believes this is adequate to engage the general public. There will need to be some extra effort, however to engage stakeholders (businesses) on the corridor. The group discussed a number of interested parties who had attended prior meetings about US95. Carole said she would appreciate committee assistance with stakeholder outreach when the time comes for it.

Carole said that KMPO/SRTC staff will handle the public involvement and stakeholder outreach effort in-house so a consultant will not be needed. Damon asked that Barbara Babic be included in the process. Jeff and others had several suggestions for advertising meetings and getting the word out about the study. Carole noted that study information will be made available on the KMPO website.

6. Next Steps

- KMPO staff will summarize the meeting.
- Carole will start working on the consultant selection process.
- Damon will talk with his IT Board member about the project and schedule.
- The next steering committee meeting will occur after a consultant is on board and the current conditions modeling is complete.
- The committee will work together by email on a cooperative agreement, consultant selection and other tasks until the next meeting.
- Carole will send items to Marv first for his approval prior to distribution to the rest of the group.

US95 Access Study Steering Committee

Meeting #2
April 22, 2008

Steering committee members in attendance:

Marv Lekstrum, Commissioner, Lakes Highway District (Committee Chair)
Al Hassell, Councilor, City of Coeur d'Alene
Joe Wuest, Supervisor, Lakes Highway District
Jeff Zaugg, City Engineer, City of Hayden
Lucas Braden, Public Affairs Manager, Coeur d'Alene Chamber
Mike Porcelli, District Traffic Engineer, ITD District 1
Gordon Dobler, City Engineer, City of Coeur d'Alene

Steering committee members absent:

Damon Allen, District Engineer, ITD District 1
Anson Gable, Councilor, City of Hayden

Staff and consultant representatives present:

Carole Richardson, KMPO
Mazedur Rahman, David Evans and Associates
Kayla Kruse, David Evans and Associates

1. Introductions

Marv opened the meeting and asked for introductions.

2. Scope of Work

The final consultant scope of work was distributed and Carole gave a quick overview.

The group discussed potential options and combinations of options to be analyzed. Carole reminded the committee that the scope includes four initial options, with an additional two options that could be developed during the course of the project. If we decide more options will need to be analyzed, Carole and Sean will need to work out a scope amendment.

The details of the first four options to be analyzed still need to be worked out. Carole suggested we may need to have technical staff meet separately with DEA to develop the specifics of each option. We will need to have exhibits of the corridor prepared showing the elements of each option.

3. Finalize Work Flow Plan

Rahman distributed the draft work flow plan and reviewed each stage. Some adjustments to the timeline were made including:

- Add a stakeholder meeting in mid May
- Add a steering committee meeting in early June
- Move the July steering committee meeting to the end of July or early August.
- Move the public meeting to August, followed by the KCATT presentation in late August

4. Identify initial measures of effectiveness

The group determined that the following MOE's should be established:

- LOS on the local system (intersections on Government Way and Ramsey)
- US95 Travel Time
- Delay at US95 cross streets
- Safety benefits
- Business community impact
- Queue length
- Cost effectiveness

After identifying these MOE's the group discussed potential scope changes that might be necessary. Travel time estimates are best done using SYNCHRO's companion software, SIMTRAFFIC. We had not anticipated doing this in the original scope. Also, although the group had initially determined that a signal timing plan would not be included in the scope, it may be necessary to do some signal optimization work in order to show the true effectiveness of some of the alternatives.

5. Public Outreach and Business Owner Coordination

A meeting for business owners on the corridor needs to be set up as soon as possible. The group determined to shoot for the week of May 19. Lucas said that the meeting could be held at the Chamber, however it might be better to meet somewhere on the corridor. Al Hassel suggested that Lake City High School might be a good place, and also noted that they have the facilities to videotape meetings for the City cable channel.

Carole and Lucas have met with Barbara Babic to discuss citizen and business owner outreach. Carole will send committee members the stakeholder outreach strategy that was developed.

We will need to have exhibits of the initial four options to be examined ready for the first business owner meeting.

6. Next Steps

- Develop exhibits showing of initial options – DEA and committee members
- Schedule business owner outreach meeting – Carole and Lucas

**US95 Access Study
Steering Committee**

**Agenda
Meeting #3
June 9, 2008 at 9:00 am**

Steering committee members in attendance:

Marv Lekstrum, Commissioner, Lakes Highway District (Committee Chair)
Al Hassell, Councilor, City of Coeur d'Alene
Damon Allen, District Engineer, ITD District 1
Joe Wuest, Supervisor, Lakes Highway District
Jonathan Coe, Executive Director, Coeur d'Alene Chamber
Gordon Dobler, City Engineer, City of Coeur d'Alene

Steering committee members absent:

Jeff Zaugg, City Engineer, City of Hayden
Anson Gable, Councilor, City of Hayden
Mike Porcelli, District Traffic Engineer, ITD District 1
John Goedde, Idaho State Senate

Guests present:

Don Davis, District Transportation Planner, ITD District 1

Staff and consultant representatives present:

Sean Hoisington, David Evans and Associates
Carole Richardson, KMPO
Staci Lehman, KMPO
Jenny Wash, KMPO

May 20 Meeting De-brief

The group discussed general themes from the May 20 meeting. Carole asked committee members for feedback on the format of the meeting. The group concurred that the meeting format was acceptable. For the next outreach meeting to the business community, Carole explained that the plan is to continue with this type of format where a presentation is given and an interactive dialogue occurs with audience. Jonathon indicated this style of meeting is preferred over an open-house format.

Damon mentioned that continued education on the balance between safety, mobility and access will be important. Staci noted that the average person needs

to hear something three times before it sinks in. Damon suggested that an educational piece with the community on signal progression might be worthwhile.

Marv mentioned that right turn lanes seemed to be of interest to many at the May 20 meeting. Sean explained that there is a “tool box” of minor improvements such as right turn lanes, dual left turns, etc., that DEA could use to fine tune the alternatives.

The Dalton intersection got some attention at the May 20 meeting. Al advised that he regularly travels through this intersection, and that getting across US95 at Dalton is a challenge. The green time for Dalton traffic is short, the cycle length is long, and often Dalton traffic sits at a red light when there are gaps in US95 traffic. Committee members discussed the difficulty in providing progression on US95. Optimizing progression on US95 often means that the experience of travelers on the side streets is not optimal. Gordon mentioned that several other cross streets are in the same boat.

Other themes included questions about the long-range plan for US95, and how new development on the corridor will affect the study. Carole explained that responses to these and other questions raised at the meeting have been put into a Q&A document and posted on the website. She will circulate the Q&A to steering committee members again.

Alternatives to be Analyzed

Before launching into a review of the alternatives, Sean asked for some scope clarification. The consultant team is struggling with how to deal with the fact that if access changes are made, corresponding signal timing changes would also likely be made in the real world to optimize the system. But the current scope does not include an analysis of signal timing for the corridor.

After some discussion, Sean and Gordon suggested that one approach might be to do a first run using a high-level planning approach that assumes the current signal timing. As one or two options float to the top, then more detail could be developed on them. For the options that involve relocating or adding signals, Sean’s staff will just use their judgment on a planning-level timing scheme for the new signals.

Gordon had some questions about how each option will be judged. For example, if the only criteria are safety and mobility, then it may be hard to beat the option that closes all the median crossings. The group noted that closing median crossings may make those crossings safer, but may also place more turning traffic at the signalized intersections, making the signalized intersections less safe. So there will probably be tradeoffs on each alternative. Damon noted that in judging intersection safety, the consultant will need to consider the severity of

collisions that occur at the unsignalized median openings vs. the type of collisions that typically occur at a signal.

Carole reminded the group that at the last steering committee meeting, we had talked about “measures of effectiveness” that will be used to judge the alternatives. She will send those criteria out to the steering committee again.

The group made two changes that will apply to all of the alternatives:

1. Assume four lane divided highway from Wyoming to SH53
2. Assume a signal at Lancaster for all options.

Alternative 1 – Median closures at all non-signalized intersections

The group determined that although this option is unpopular with the business community, the Idaho Transportation Board has specifically asked that we examine median closures. After much discussion, the group agreed that we should not assume this option will perform the best from a safety and mobility standpoint. While it would improve safety at the unsignalized intersections, it may have consequences on the local system or at existing traffic signals that are not immediately obvious. For this reason, the group determined that it is important to analyze.

Alternative 2 – Median modifications on US95 at non-signalized intersections to restrict turning movements.

The group concurred with analyzing this option.

Alternative 3 – New signalized intersections along US95 at ½ mile spacing

Sean asked the group to look at the Hanley-Canfield-Wilbur area. The draft alternative has signals at all three locations. Sean asked if we should not show a signal at Wilbur under this option since the existing signal at Canfield is only ¼ mile away. (If the Canfield signal was not there, then Wilbur would be the ½ mile point.)

Gordon suggested leaving those three signals as shown and noted that the analysis would help us answer the question of whether the ¼ mile spacing hampers performance of US95. The group concurred with this.

The group determined to break this Alternative into 3A and 3B. 3A would leave all remaining unsignalized median crossings open. 3B would place turning restrictions at the remaining unsignalized median crossings.

Alternative 4 – Remove or relocate signals and close or restrict turning movements at the medians along US95 at signalized intersections that do not currently meet the ½ mile spacing requirement.

Sean noted that on this option, former signal locations at Bosanko and Canfield are shown with median closures. After significant discussion about the impacts of these median closures, the group determined that DEA should use their judgment in determining how to deal with the Bosanko and Canfield intersections under this alternative. Carole suggested a “4A” that has a turn restriction at Canfield, and “4B” that has a closed median at Canfield, a new connector from Canfield to Wilbur, and a Wilbur extension to US95.

Citizen Outreach Next Steps

Carole advised that KMPO has done a post card mailer to all property owners in the corridor (I90 to SH53, Ramsey to Government Way, including properties on both sides of Ramsey and Govt.) Jenny noted that this was over 3,700 postcards. The card advises property owners that the study is underway and lets them know where they can find information about it.

All information about the study is available on KMPO’s website.

For the May 20 meeting, the Chamber did an email notice to all Chamber members, and Jonathan advised that he could do this again for the next meeting. Staci also brought flyers around to area businesses, and posted them at gas stations along the corridor. She also did a press release and a public notice for the meeting.

We will repeat all of these outreach activities for the next meeting. Staci will also take some flyers to the Chamber office.

Jonathan asked if there would be another public meeting prior to a decision. Carole said yes and noted that the purpose of the next meeting will be to present the technical findings and get feedback before a decision is made.

Next Steering Committee Meeting

The week of July 21st was selected for the next steering committee. Jenny will coordinate the meeting date, time and place.

**US95 Access Study
Steering Committee**

**Meeting #4 Summary
July 21, 2008 at 10:00 am
ITD District 1 Office**

Steering committee members in attendance:

Marv Lekstrum, Commissioner, Lakes Highway District (Committee Chair)
Al Hassell, Councilor, City of Coeur d'Alene
Mike Porcelli, District Traffic Engineer, ITD District 1
Joe Wuest, Supervisor, Lakes Highway District
Gordon Dobler, City Engineer, City of Coeur d'Alene
(Sen. John Goedde was also present for part of the technical findings discussion.)

Steering committee members absent:

Jonathan Coe, Executive Director, Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce
Jeff Zaugg, City Engineer, City of Hayden
Anson Gable, Councilor, City of Hayden
Damon Allen, District Engineer, ITD District 1

Staff and consultant representatives present:

Sean Hoisington, David Evans and Associates
Mazedur Rahman, David Evans and Associates
Carole Richardson, KMPO
Staci Lehman, KMPO

Marv called the meeting to order at about 10:05 and the group immediately launched into a discussion of the preliminary alternatives and the technical findings that David Evans and Associates had developed to date.

Some notable general findings included:

- Closing the existing unsignalized median crossings appears to have a detrimental impact on both the local system and US95. The total delay on US95 actually would increase under this proposal, and the reason is that more traffic would be forced to the signalized intersections to turn on or off the highway.
- None of the alternatives appear to cause a significant change to the overall vehicle miles travelled on the system. There were small differences but nothing that the committee considered statistically relevant.

- The problem identified in previous studies that is caused by the two signals at quarter-mile points was confirmed. A 160 second cycle length is needed in order to achieve progression on US95 with the signals in their current spacing. This is the reason for some of the complaints from the public about side street traffic being held too long. There are times now when a driver on the side street will have a red light, but observe no conflicting traffic on US95. This is an unfortunate byproduct of the mathematics for progression, and is directly related to the geographic location of the signals at Bosanko and Canfield. This issue is very difficult for laypersons to understand. The consulting team and ITD will need to think about how to best explain it
- The alternatives that removed the quarter-mile signals, or relocated them to half-mile points showed strong possibility for improving operations for side street traffic and US95. These alternatives may allow the cycle length to be reduced to 80 seconds, allowing green lights for the side streets for frequently.

The committee decided to add a new measure of effectiveness for cross-street delay. There was also agreement to combine features of several alternatives. A scope amendment for DEA will be needed to add alternatives.

In particular, the group determined to add an Alternative 5 at this time. This alternative would include new signals on the half-mile points through Hayden, relocating the US95/Canfield signal to US95/Wilbur, extending Wilbur from US95 to Government Way, adding a connecting street from Wilbur to Canfield adjacent to the Target complex, removing the signal at US95/Bosanko, and installing turn restrictions at Bosanko, Canfield and all of the other unsignalized median crossings. Turn restrictions at the unsignalized intersections would allow traffic to turn left off the highway, but not cross US95 or turn left from a side street onto the highway.

The group discussed the next public meeting and graphical presentation of the results. The exhibits will need some revisions to make them understandable to citizens. Marv noted in particular that we need to use plain language when describing points of concern and measures of effectiveness. Staci will work with DEA on the exhibits for the public meeting.

Mike Porcelli distributed a handout to the committee entitled "Why is the signal always red" from the Denver Regional Council of Governments. Mike suggested that this information might help citizens to understand the complexities of signal progression. Copies will be made available for the public meeting, and the handout is also posted to KMPO's website under the US95 Access Study page.

The next steering committee meeting will be the week of August 18, with a public meeting to be scheduled the following week. For the public meeting format, Staci suggested having a couple of scheduled presentation times, followed by free time for citizens to roam the room and view the exhibits. Staci and Carole will work on the best way to elicit comments from citizens who attend.

The meeting was adjourned at about 11:45.

**US95 Access Study
Steering Committee**

**Meeting #5 Summary
August 18, 2008 at 3:00 am
ITD District 1 Office**

Steering committee members in attendance:

Marv Lekstrum, Commissioner, Lakes Highway District (Committee Chair)
Al Hassell, Councilor, City of Coeur d'Alene (Al had to leave at ~4pm.)
Mike Porcelli, District Traffic Engineer, ITD District 1
Joe Wuest, Supervisor, Lakes Highway District
Gordon Dobler, City Engineer, City of Coeur d'Alene (arrived about 3:30)
Jonathan Coe, Executive Director, Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce
Jeff Zaugg, City Engineer, City of Hayden
Anson Gable, Councilor, City of Hayden
Damon Allen, District Engineer, ITD District 1

Steering committee members absent:

John Goedde, Idaho State Senator

Guests present:

Andrea Storjohann, Assistant District Engineer, ITD District 1
Don Davis, District Senior Transportation Planner, ITD District 1

Staff and consultant representatives present:

Sean Hoisington, David Evans and Associates
Mazedur Rahman, David Evans and Associates
Jeremy Clark, David Evans and Associates
Carole Richardson, KMPO
Staci Lehman, KMPO

Marv called the meeting to order at about 3:05 pm.

Technical Findings

Sean reviewed the technical findings for Alternative 5. This alternative built upon prior alternatives reviewed by the group. It includes:

- Allowing new signals on the half-mile points through Hayden
- Relocating the US95/Canfield signal to US95/Wilbur

- Extending Wilbur from US95 to Government Way, and adding a connecting street from Wilbur to Canfield adjacent to the Target complex,
- Removing the signal at US95/Bosanko
- Installing turn restrictions at Bosanko, Canfield and all of the other unsignalized median crossings.
- Turn restrictions at the unsignalized intersections would allow traffic to turn left off the highway, but not cross US95 or turn left from a side street onto the highway.

Like most of the other alternatives, conflict points at unsignalized crossings were significantly reduced when compared to the existing scenario. Total hours of driver delay for the study area is approximately ½ of the existing hours of driver delay, however the major reductions in delay are for cross street traffic. Delay on US95 increased slightly under this alternative from 134 hours (existing) to 155 hours in the northbound direction, and held constant in the southbound direction.

Like the other two alternatives that involved removing Bosanko and relocating Canfield (4a and 4b), this alternative could allow more efficient use of green time on the corridor, reducing delay for the cross street traffic.

DEA also provided travel time information for all of the alternatives, which the group saw for the first time. It was noted that Alternative 1, which was the median closure alternative that the Transportation Board specifically asked that we evaluate, resulted in a significant increase in travel time for northbound US95. Rahman explained that the reason for this is that any northbound vehicle that would turn left today at Orchard, Dakota, Miles, Lacey or Wyoming, would be forced to the signalized intersections at Prairie and Hayden if the unsignalized medians were closed. Jeremy showed the group a SimTraffic animation that demonstrated how traffic would back up, especially at the Hayden signal, under Alternative 1.

Adaptive Signal Technology Discussion

The discussion turned back to the potential for removing/relocating the traffic signals at Bosanko and Canfield. Prior to the meeting, Sean and Carole had discussed the possibility of trying a new adaptive signal technology on the corridor, and whether it would negate the need to remove or relocate those two quarter-mile signals.

Sean explained that many adaptive signal systems installations in the country have had disappointing results. In some cases, municipalities have abandoned adaptive systems because the anticipated benefits did not materialize. However there is a new adaptive system available that has had several successful installations in Kansas and Arkansas. Unlike prior adaptive systems which

required a pre-set cycle length, the “InSync” system is completely adaptive. Sean described some of the features of the new technology for the group.

One of the challenges associated with the In-Sync system is that there is no predictive tool available to model the potential benefits. Sean mentioned that the In-Sync developer is willing to show the group some of his current installations and how they function. Carole also noted that KMPO has an ITS set-aside in the program, and because the system is relatively inexpensive, there may be funding for an adaptive signal pilot project to try it out on US95.

Several members of the group expressed caution about moving too quickly to embrace a new technology. Because there are a limited number of existing installations in the country, Gordon stated that he would be more comfortable letting other additional cities implement the technology first, before installing it on US95. Both Gordon and Mike felt it would be best to keep the discussion about adaptive signals separate from the US95 Access Study project.

Mike said he understood that the In-Sync developer is working with the VISSIM software developer to find a way to model the new system, but he is not aware of the timeline. Mike noted that the City of Post Falls is considering making an In-Sync installation in the Pleasantview corridor, in association with their proposed Beck Road interchange. Mike also mentioned that ITD is already looking at other adaptive systems for US95, and it may be possible to add In-Sync to the list of systems already under consideration.

Alternative Selection and Mitigation

There was preliminary discussion about moving forward with detailed mitigation measures for Alternative 5.

Rahman gave examples where the intersection capacity at Prairie and Kathleen is not being used efficiently because of network improvements that are needed on the local system. In these cases, Prairie and Kathleen both neck down to one lane eastbound between US95 and Government Way. Drivers have learned that they need to be in the left hand lane to avoid merging, so traffic stacks up in the left eastbound approach lane to the US95 signal, and does not make full use of the right lane.

Gordon expressed concern about including recommendations for widening Prairie and Kathleen in the study results. He said that instead of being part of the study recommendations, DEA should just note these suggested improvements as observations. Carole concurred that the scope of the project is limited to recommending mitigation for US95, and not the local system. She said a separate list of obvious local improvements that would enhance corridor operations could be provided to the local agencies, but not included in the list of recommended projects for ITD.

Carole asked each committee member to give their thoughts on moving forward.

Damon noted that in looking over the performance of each of the alternatives, most of them do not improve north-south mobility on US95. This includes Alternative 5, and raises the question of why we are doing the study in the first place. It will be difficult to convince the Idaho Transportation Board to expend any funds on an option which does not enhance the movement of through traffic. He also acknowledged, however, that as the area builds out, it will be important to have a master plan. The Transportation Board will need to be sold on the benefits of any recommendation from KMPO.

Gordon said he is okay with Alternative 5. He also clarified that none of the proposals would immediately install signals – the selected alternative would just identify where signals can go when they are warranted. He reinforced his earlier comments that the adaptive signal technology discussion should not be part of this project. We need to stay the course and recommend a master plan for US95. He recommends that we pick an alternative, and then develop a phased approach for implementing it over the next five years.

Jonathan noted that there are two publics that will need to be considered. The Transportation Board is one and the general public is another. He believes that not looking at the In-Sync technology will invite political problems. It will take significant work to get public acceptance of an alternative that removes or relocates signals. Before investing the time and risking political capital in that effort, we need confidence that it really has to happen. Jonathan's comments resonated with several members of the group.

Mike said it is important to remember the original purpose of the study was to look at median closures. He also noted that past origin-destination studies have shown that the percentage of actual through traffic is small. Most of the people that are concerned about getting up and down US95 in Coeur d'Alene and Hayden are the same people that are trying to get on, off or across the Highway. In addition, signals spaced at less than ½ mile are essentially "illegal" signals since ITD's Access Management policy is an adopted Idaho Administrative Rule. Mike asked that instead of mentioning In-Sync specifically in public discussions, the term "adaptive signal control" should be used. We should consider adaptive signals as the "frosting on the cake" to help enhance any alternative that is chosen, not as a stand-alone alternative.

Jeff commented that getting across US95 is the issue, and Alternative 5 addresses that. Concerning the In-Sync technology, maybe we should wait for a predictive tool to become available before trying it.

Joe advised that in determining how to stage projects to get to the ultimate plan for US95, it will be important to make sure that things are not phased so that conditions get worse.

Anson advised that property owners on Orchard and Dakota (quarter mile points where no signals will be allowed) see existing signals at other quarter mile points (Bosanko and Canfield) and have an issue with fairness. An alternative that removes the existing quarter mile signals would demonstrate that a fair approach is being applied consistently along the corridor. Also we should not walk away from the InSync idea.

Marv said that Alternative 5 looks like the right approach for the corridor. He agreed with Gordon's proposal for an overall master plan, with a phased approach to accomplish it. He believes we should continue to look at adaptive signal technology for the corridor.

Citizen Outreach Next Steps

Rescheduling the public meeting into September has caused some awkward schedule issues for the study in general. We had hoped to have public comment on the technical findings before the group formally selected an alternative.

After today's discussion, Carole felt it would be unwise for the group to select a single alternative at this time. She suggested that the technical findings be presented in an objective manner at the public meeting on September 9. Public feedback should be collected and reviewed by the steering committee, and then rolled into any formal recommendation made by the group.

DEA will hold off on developing detailed mitigation measures on Alternative 5 for now. Sean noted that this will necessitate a time extension.

Carole suggested that the potential for new adaptive signal technology should be publicly acknowledged at the September 9 forum. Gordon expressed concern about broaching the subject publicly. He strongly advised against stating that the new technology could eliminate the need for removing or relocating the quarter mile signals. Carole and others concurred that it is premature to make that statement.

Carole will arrange to have public meeting materials sent to committee members for review in advance. Sean passed out a bulleted list of technical findings for each alternative and asked that the committee return any comments on the list to Carole by August 29.

The group adjourned at approx. 5pm.

**US95 Access Study
Steering Committee**

**Meeting #6 Summary
September 26, 2008**

Steering Committee Members Present:

Marv Lekstrum, Committee Chairman, Lakes Highway District
John Goedde, Idaho State Senate
Jonathan Coe, Coeur d'Alene Chamber
Joe Wuest, Lakes Highway District
Jeff Zaugg, City of Hayden
Gordon Dobler, City of Coeur d'Alene
Mike Porcelli, ITD

Guests Present:

Don Davis, ITD
Stuart Miller, Kootenai County Sheriff's Dept

Staff/Consultants Present:

Carole Richardson, KMPO
Sean Hoisington, DEA
Mazedur Rahman, DEA

Marv called the meeting to order about 9:00 am, and quick introductions were made.

Public Meeting Debrief

The group reviewed written comments received from the September 9 public meeting, and discussed conversations they'd had with members of the public who attended.

Group members felt that by and large, meeting attendees were more focused on big picture issues like the bypass than on the operational aspects of highway 95. The written comments received did not appear to be as constructive as hoped, but several group members noted that not everyone commented, and there may be more to the story than the written comments seem to indicate. For example, in conversations with business owners at the meeting, Sean heard specific concerns about the safety of their customers. This concern was not found in the written comments we received.

While the need for more lanes or a bypass is accepted by most members of the public, the need for median closures is not well understood, even though crash data clearly demonstrates that a safety problem exists.

Emergency Responder Meeting

On September 24, Marv, Carole and Mike met with the County's Local Emergency Preparedness Committee to give them an update on the project and discuss any concerns or comments. Carole provided a summary memo for the steering committee, and Officer Miller also helped fill in some of the concerns.

Officer Miller mentioned that closing all unsignalized median openings would have a serious negative impact on the ability of emergency responders to get where they need to go. He recommended that if median closures are ultimately implemented, not every median should be closed. The ability to get across, and to turn left onto and off of the highway is essential for efficient emergency response.

Concerning turn restrictions, one suggestion discussed at the September 24 meeting was using paint to channelize traffic and restrict turns instead of physical barriers such as curbing. Like several members of the emergency responders group, some steering committee members are also skeptical about the ability of paint to keep drivers from making illegal crossing or turning movements. Officer Miller indicated paint has worked for this purpose in other areas, but it does require regular enforcement.

Mike suggested that a combination of both paint and hard features could be explored if the final recommendation includes turn restrictions. For example, pork chop islands could be installed on side streets that would discourage traffic from crossing or turning left, but would still allow emergency vehicles to make those movements if necessary. Or possibly "s"-curbing with a gap could be installed in the median.

Group Exercise to Narrow Alternatives

The group discussed the evaluation process that would be used to rate the preliminary alternatives. In reviewing the main issues to be considered, the group decided to divide the "safety" issue into "US95 Safety" and "Local System Safety".

Also, there was some discussion about whether existing and potential land uses or zoning should be considered as part of the "community/business impacts category". The group was split on this, and determined to see how the discussion went when we got to this category for each alternative.

The following matrix summarizes the committee's rating process and discussion about each alternative.

US95 STEERING COMMITTEE

PERFORMANCE RATING – MAJOR CORRIDOR ALTERNATIVES

GROUP EVALUATION EXERCISE - September 26, 2008

Rating System

☺ Much better than existing
 + Better than existing
 √ Tradeoffs balance out
 - Worse than existing
 ☹ Much worse than existing

Issue	"Measures of Effectiveness" and other info to consider	Rating as compared to existing conditions						
		Alt1	Alt2	Alt3a	Alt3b	Alt4a	Alt4b	Alt 5
US95 Mobility	Travel time US95 total delay Efficient use of "green band"	☹	√	-	-	+	+	√
US95 Safety	Number of unsignalized crossing/conflict points Potential increase or decrease of US95 crashes overall Severity of potential crashes Emergency services concerns	+	+	+	+	+	+	+
Local System Safety	Emergency services concerns Pedestrian issues	☹	-	√(+)	√	-	-	+
Local System Operational Impacts	Cross Street delay Systemwide VMT Local system LOS Volume changes on local system	-	√(-)	+	+	-	-	+
Community/Business Impacts	Access route changes Public comments received "Experience" of cross street drivers Efficient use of "green band"	☹	√	☺	+	-	☹	+
System-Wide Impacts	Total system delay Total vehicle miles traveled	-	√	√	+	√	√	+

Group Recommendation: Committee determined Alt 5 is the most well-balanced plan for both US95 and local system. New signals should not be added until indicated by development, and should be development-funded.

Technical analysis showed Alt 4a (which is essentially Alt 5 without future signals through Hayden) has *slightly* better US95 mobility. Group determined this alternative should move forward, to see if a mitigated Alt 4a (without additional signals in Hayden) could have substantially better mobility on US95 than Alt 5 (with future signals at ½ and one-mile spacing through Hayden.) Mitigation strategies will be developed for both 4a and 5. A phasing plan for Alt 5 only will be prepared.

Discussion Comments:

Alt 1 – Close Medians at Unsignalized Intersections

- This alternative had the highest increase in traffic on local roads. Committee concerned about potential for more local system crashes. Group members felt vehicle to vehicle crashes may not be as severe on lower speed local roads, but local system has higher numbers of pedestrians and likelihood of vehicle/pedestrian incidents could increase. Several comments about “just moving the problem from US95 to the local system”.
- Group felt business impacts of this alternative were hugely negative due to significantly reduced access to and from the highway and severed across the highway.
- This alternative also performed poorly from safety standpoint because emergency vehicles cannot turn left onto or off the highway, and can't cross the highway. If median closures are considered, by ITD some sort of compromise to leave some medians open would be important for emergency response.
- Most of negative local system impacts for this alternative would occur in the northern (Hayden) portion of the study area. CdA system impacts not as severe.

Alt 2 – Install Turn Restrictions at Unsignalized Intersections

- Group felt local system safety somewhat reduced, similar to Alt 1 but not as bad.
- Business impacts of this not a huge concern since this option would mean no change for traffic getting to businesses. Traffic leaving businesses would be rerouted back to a signalized intersection on US95, but steering committee members have heard from businesses that its most important to for customers to get to them quickly. Also, some businesses have expressed concerns about their customers' safety, and this option would improve customer safety.

Alt 3a – New Signals at half and one-mile spacing

- Although model results do not show any anticipated traffic pattern changes with this option, group felt in reality there may be some re-routing of traffic under certain conditions.
- Committee believes signals will decrease severity of collisions at currently unsignalized median crossings. Eliminates risky behavior of drivers waiting for a gap in traffic at unsignalized intersections. This will be more important as Hayden grows and US95 sees more traffic and fewer gaps in the north end of the study area.
- One group member commented that logically spaced signals puts predictability into the system for US95 drivers.

Alt 3b – New Half and One-Mile Signals, Turn Restrict Unsignalized Intersections

- US95 mobility is the same as 3a.
- Group felt there would be a slight decrease in safety on the local system with some higher volumes on local streets. If the turn restrictions are implemented with paint, no significant concerns with restricting emergency vehicles.
- Some increase in local system traffic volumes, with traffic more evenly distributed to local minor arterials.
- Community and business tradeoffs overall should be a positive with safer signalized access points, and ability to turn off the highway at unsignalized intersections.

Alt 4a – Remove/Relocate Quarter Mile Signals and Turn-Restrict Unsignalized Intersections

- US95 mobility improves for this option.
- Group felt local system safety and operational impacts are similar to Alt 2. Small amount of additional traffic on local system because traffic is rerouted.
- Community and business impacts may not be popular near Bosanko and Canfield.
- Of all the options, this one seemed to have the best technical performance, but in thinking about how they travel through the study area group members did not feel there would be a significant benefit to the most travelers. The impacts would probably balance out.

Alt 4b – Remove/Relocate Quarter-Mile Signals, Turn-Restrict Unsignalized Intersections, Add New Wilbur Connection

- Group reacted a bit more negatively to this option than 4a, with similar comments.

Alt 5 – Remove Quarter-Mile Signals, Install New Signals at Half and One-Mile Points, Turn Restrict Unsignalized Intersections.

- Considering both technical performance and the intangible community impacts, committee felt this would be the best operational plan for US95. Benefits to safety and local system of adding new US95 signals balance out slight decrease in corridor mobility. Signalized intersections enhance emergency response and more evenly distribute traffic to local system. Not clear yet how additional green time would be divvied up. ITD controls signal timing on US95 and could elect to use more green time for through traffic rather than assigning more to local streets.

Next Steps

DEA was asked to evaluate detailed mitigation measures and prepare a phasing plan for the committee's preferred option (Alt 5).

Also, it was noted that Alt 4a was the only alternative that seemed to provide improved mobility on US95. The improvement was slight, however since improving mobility on US95 was a key original purpose for the study, the group determined that this alternative should also be examined further and detailed mitigation prepared for it.

(Alt 4a could be viewed as Alt 5 without new signals through the Hayden portion of the study area. If the Transportation Board determines that no new signals will be allowed on US95 through Hayden, it will be important to know how well this option could be expected to operate.)

At the next Steering Committee meeting, the group will be asked to review the findings of DEA's mitigation work, and make a final recommendation.

Next meeting

The next meeting will be scheduled at the end of October or first part of November.

**US95 Access Study
Steering Committee
Meeting #7 Summary
November 3, 2008**

Steering Committee Members Present:

Marv Lekstrum, Lakes HD
Joe Wuest, Lakes HD
Al Hassell, City of CdA
Gordon Dobler, City of CdA
Anson Gable, City of Hayden
Jeff Zaugg, City of Hayden
John Goedde, Idaho State Senate
Damon Allen, ITD
Mike Porcelli, ITD

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Jonathan Coe, CdA Chamber

Guests Present:

Don Davis, ITD
Sgt. Stuart Miller, Kootenai County Sherriff

Staff and Consultant Team Present:

Carole Richardson, KMPO
Sean Hoisington, DEA
Mazdur Rahman, DEA

Marv called the meeting to order at 10:00 am and asked Carole to review the status of the project.

At the last meeting, the Steering Committee had determined to move forward with Alternative 5, which included correction of the two quarter-mile signal locations, new signals on ½ and 1-mile points through Hayden, and turn restrictions at all remaining unsignalized intersections.

The committee had also determined to move forward with Alternative 4A, which is essentially the same as Alternative 5, but without new signals in the Hayden area. Today's meeting is to take a look at detailed mitigation measures which can be used to refine and improve both alternatives.

Intersection Mitigation

Rahman from DEA took the group through a series of exhibits to explain recommended mitigation measures for existing signalized intersections in the study area.

Left and/or right turn lanes are proposed where needed to increase intersection capacity. In addition, DEA has identified a number of local route access changes and new connections that may further enhance the function of US95.

There were several questions about the “before” and “after” level of service for US95 through traffic at Neider and Hanley. In those two locations, the information showed a decrease in level of service for the through movement on US95. DEA explained that although there may be some reduction in level of service for individual intersection approaches, the efficiency of the corridor overall improves quite a bit. The committee was concerned because improving US95 mobility (through movement) is a primary objective of the study. DEA will revisit the locations in question and see if it is possible to improve the level of service for the intersection approaches in question.

In the exhibits provided, DEA compared the performance of Alternative 5 “without mitigation” to Alternative 5 “with mitigation”. It was determined that it would be more meaningful to compare mitigated Alternative 5 to *existing conditions*, and DEA agreed to make that change.

Mike Porcelli asked DEA to check the pedestrian crossing time on cross streets since adding right turn lanes means that pedestrians will have another lane to cross when traversing those streets. Since the pedestrians are crossing with the US95 through movement, there should be ample green time for them to get across the additional lane. However, it would be a good idea to confirm this.

In several locations, the proximity of driveways on the local cross streets to the US95 intersection is problematic. DEA suggested that closing or limiting access to several driveways could help to improve intersection operations, and they provided some suggestions for re-routing current driveway traffic. Existing access challenges at these sites should be looked at and possible changes discussed with the property owners:

- Western KMART entrance on Neider
- Western Super1 entrance on Kathleen
- Entrances to Robideaux motors and the neighboring business to the east on Dalton
- Western Silverlake mall entrance on Hanley
- Eastern entrance to Panda Express and Borders Mall on Wilbur
- Entrances to Del Taco and Holiday on Prairie
- Western entrance to Prairie Shopping Center on Prairie

- Western entrance to Super 1 on Hayden

DEA suggested looking at a connecting Crown Street (behind the Super1 on Kathleen) with Auto Center Street, a private roadway on the back side of the car dealership on Dalton. This would provide another route for Super 1 customers to get back to US95 and relieve some of the pressure on Kathleen. Gordon indicated it may be worth talking about this with the dealership.

DEA suggested realigning Cornerstone Drive so that its intersection with Prairie lines up directly across from Mineral Drive. Mike Porcelli and Jeff Zaugg advised that this has already been negotiated with the property owners as a condition of development, and the realignment should be completed soon.

At Hayden Avenue, the City of Hayden advised that a project is in the works to reconstruct Hayden to a 5-lane section. This improvement should make it possible to increase the performance of the Hayden/US95 intersection even further than initially hoped. DEA will modify their recommendations for intersection mitigation at this location to match up with the City's project.

Mike Porcelli also noted that a southbound auxiliary lane will be constructed by Walmart between Honeysuckle and Prairie. This additional lane should also be considered when developing intersection mitigation for the US95 study. DEA will revisit their mitigation proposals with this in mind.

Phasing Plan

DEA is working on recommendations for phasing in recommended changes to US95. A preliminary discussion of this occurred. Sean indicated that it may be wisest to focus the first wave of improvements on the lowest cost projects with the largest safety benefit. He suggested that "phase 1" could be installing turn restrictions at all of the unsignalized intersections.

The group briefly discussed installing turn restrictions immediately, even at locations which may receive a future traffic signal under Alternative 5 later. Gordon noted that he may have some reservations about turn-restricting Wilbur in the near term. Anson Gabel also offered his concerns with initially turn-restricting the unsignalized intersections through Hayden. The group discussed the possibility of adopting a policy to allow signals to be installed at the points allowed under Alternative 5, whenever there was a local sponsor or sponsors who are willing to pay for the installation. There seemed to be general agreement among committee members that new signal installations should be development driven, and public funds should be focused on turn restrictions and capacity improvements at existing signals.

The group will give these phasing ideas some thought and DEA will provide a draft phasing plan for the committee's review shortly.

Next Steps

DEA will draft a technical report for the committee's review, and asked if the committee could convene again on November 17. The group agreed to meet on this date at 3 pm.

Damon noted that the scale and scope of recommended improvements seem appropriate to him given ITD's funding outlook. He offered these suggestions for presenting study findings for the Idaho Transportation Board:

- Focus on the three primary issues in this order: 1) Safety, 2)US95 Mobility, and 3) Local Access/Capacity.
- Hit the highlights – don't get bogged down in detail.
- 15 to 20 minute presentation max.
- Show tax dollars going to safety improvements like the turn restrictions, other measures such as new signals funded by development.
- Board will also want to know how local business owners will react to the recommendations. Some additional outreach to key businesses would be a good idea.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at about 11:45 am.

**US95 Access Study
Steering Committee**

**Meeting #8 Summary
Monday, November 17 at 3:00 pm
ITD District 1 Office**

Steering Committee Members Present:

Marv Lekstrum, LHD
Joe Wuest, LHD
John Goedde, Idaho State Senate
Mike Porcelli, ITD
Damon Allen, ITD
Jeff Zaugg, City of Hayden
Gordon Dobler, City of CdA
Jonathan Coe, CdA Chamber

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Anson Gable, City of Hayden
Al Hassell, City of Coeur d'Alene

Guests Present:

Andrea Storjohann, ITD
Sgt. Miller, Kootenai County Sherriff's office

Consultant and Staff Present:

Carole Richardson, KMPO
Mazdur Rahman, DEA
Sean Hoisington, DEA

Marv called the meeting to order at 3:00 pm.

Draft Report Review

The group reviewed the preliminary draft report provided by DEA and provided comments on restructuring the document to expand the executive summary. The committee asked DEA to revisit the phasing plan, bracketing improvements together in blocks that depend on each other. There needs to be a way to identify development driven projects, so that readers understand that timing will be opportunistic for some developments, but not others. We also need to include an explanation of the steering committee's evaluation process somewhere in the report.

Given that ITD is proposing new "TAP" legislation, Mike Porcelli suggested that the US95 Access Study could be titled "US95 Transportation Access Plan". Damon asked that we expand the title to say "and Mobility Study".

Final Community Outreach Discussion

Carole will contact key businesses on the corridor and arrange for them to see the study recommendations. Marv will attend with Carole; other committee members may be asked to help.

There needs to be a final open house to present the study recommendations.
– Carole will ask Staci Lehman to set this up in mid-December.

Damon asked if cities could adopt the study recommendations. Both Gordon and Jeff responded yes. A powerpoint needs to be prepared for them to update their elected officials – Carole will work on this since we need one for the KMPO Board and Transportation Board too.

Next Steps and Anticipated Schedule

November 21 – DEA to have revised draft report complete by noon.

November 24 – Steering Committee will meet for last time to review report at 2pm.

November 25 – Carole will include exec summary in Board packet for December KMPO Board meeting

Weeks of November 24 and Dec 1 – Carole will meet with key businesses.

December 4 – Steering Committee Recommendations to KMPO Board

December 9 – Jeff to update Hayden City Council on study status

December 16 – Gordon to update Coeur d'Alene City Council on study status

Mid December – Public open house

January 22 – KMPO Recommendations to Transportation Board



City of Coeur d' Alene
City of Post Falls
City of Hayden
City of Rathdrum
Coeur d' Alene Tribe
East Side Highway District
Idaho Transportation Department
Kootenai County, Idaho
Lakes Highway District
Post Falls Highway District
Worley Highway District

Cooperatively Developing a Transportation System for all of Kootenai County, Idaho

MEMORANDUM

DATE: December 8, 2008

TO: **US95 Steering Committee**

FROM: Carole Richardson

SUBJECT: US95 Access Study
Emergency Responder Feedback

On September 24, Marv Lekstrum, Mike Porcelli and I attended a meeting with the Local Emergency Planning Committee in Kootenai County to collect feedback from emergency responders on the various alternatives under consideration for US95.

After an overview of the study and the types of intersection treatments we're considering, we had a brief discussion with the group. This memo summarizes the notes I took on their comments with regard to safety.

- One person stated that median closures seemed like a good idea, but that he was very concerned about additional traffic loading on Govt Way and Ramsey.
- The sherriff's office is opposed to median closures, but indicated that turn restrictions using painted markings have worked well at Haycraft. ITD Maintenance also endorsed the use of paint instead of physical barriers in the median. These comments resonated with other members of the group, but one or two expressed some skepticism that paint would actually stop drivers from making illegal turning moves.
- There appeared to be general support for new signals on half and one-mile points.
- Emergency responders felt that Hayden, Prairie, Dalton and Kathleen intersections are critical access points for them. They would not want to see the operational efficiency of those intersections reduced, and would welcome improvements.
- Several members expressed concern about additional traffic loading on local streets that could result under different alternatives. As the area has grown, emergency responders already have difficulty navigating through traffic on local streets. Adding more traffic to two lane roadways was of particular concern.

KOOTENAI METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION

221 W. First Avenue, Suite 310 Spokane, WA 99201
1-800-698-1927 fax: 1-509-343-6400 website: kmpo.net

- The Hayden intersection in particular was mentioned several times as an existing problem point for emergency responders.
- The configuration of driveway accesses on Hayden and Prairie near their intersections with US95 were viewed as a serious cause of congestion by several in the group.

After the meeting, one person provided a sketch showing a way that he felt the existing unsignalized intersections could be made safer. He suggests adding stop signs and stop bars along with painted lines or arrows so that drivers could figure out how to position themselves in the median. Mike Porcelli indicated that ITD had looked this concept in the past, however the median crossings don't appear to be wide enough for this to work. However, as an alternative, Mike noted that ITD is considering signs to advise drivers that only one car should be in the median at a time.

