## A consor



COMPASS, City of Boise, and Idaho Transportation Department

## SH 55 Pathway Connection Baldcypress to McMillan

September 2023

PREPARED BY:<br>Consor<br>Point of Contact: Robert Cleere, PE<br>345 Bobwhite Court, Suite 230<br>Boise, ID 83706<br>p: 208.947.9033<br>e: rob.cleere@consoreng.com

PREPARED FOR:

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

# SH 55 Pathway Connection Baldcypress to McMillan <br> COMPASS, City of Boise, and Idaho Transportation Department 

September 2023

Consor
345 Bobwhite Court, Suite 230
Boise, ID 83706

THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK

## Table of Contents

Chapter 1 ..... 1-1
1.1 Project Summary ..... 1-1
1.2 Summary ..... 1-6
1.3 Project Description ..... 1-6
1.3.1 Project Development ..... 1-6
1.3.2 Scope of Work. ..... 1-6
1.3.3 Assumptions. ..... 1-6
1.3.4 Existing Conditions ..... 1-7
1.3.5 Regional/Network Connections for Pedestrians/Bicyclists ..... 1-9
1.3.6 Comprehensive Purpose and Need Description for Grant Narrative ..... 1-9
1.4 Applicable Strategic Goals and Performance Measures (Communities in Motion 2050) ..... 1-11
1.5 Identify and Evaluate Project Constraints ..... 1-12
1.5.1 Coordination with Local Highway District, ITD-District 3, and City of Boise ..... 1-12
1.5.2 Coordination with Irrigation Districts ..... 1-12
1.6 Define and Recommend Alternative for a Detached, Paved, Multi-Use Pathway ..... 1-12
1.6.1 Description/Configuration of Alternatives Considered. ..... 1-12
1.6.2 Analysis and preferred alternative selection ..... 1-15
1.6.3 Description and details of preferred alternatives ..... 1-15
1.7 Assess Right of Way/Easements Needed ..... 1-15
1.7.1 Right of Way/Easements Needs Summary Table ..... 1-15
1.8 Environmental Scan Summary ..... 1-16
1.9 Project Stakeholders ..... 1-17
1.10 Summary of Public Involvement Plan for Next Design Phase ..... 1-17
1.11 Project Schedule and Milestones, including Future Phases ..... 1-17
1.12 Summary Cost Estimates in Federal Dollars ..... 1-18
1.13 Potential Funding Sources ..... 1-18
Appendix A Design Concept Layouts
Appendix B Cost Estimate
Appendix C Right of Way Costs
Appendix D Crash DataAppendix E ITD Environmental DocumentTables
Table 1-1 | Right of Way and Easements Needed ..... 1-16
Figures
Figure 1-1 | Vicinity Map ..... 1-1
Figure 1-2 | Project Extents Map ..... 1-2
Figure 1-3 | Abrupt shift in sidewalk alignment ..... 1-3
Figure 1-4: Existing Drainage Swale ..... 1-3
Figure 1-5: Canal and Irrigation Feature ..... 1-4
Figure 1-6 | Irrigation Box Near Canal ..... 1-4
Figure 1-7 | Large Canal and Corresponding Feature ..... 1-5
Figure 1-8 | Utility Poles Adjacent to Existing Sidewalk ..... 1-6
Figure 1-9 | Discontinuous Sidewalk. ..... 1-9
Figure 1-10 | Sidewalk Width Constriction ..... 1-10
Figure 1-11 | Misaligned Sidewalk. ..... 1-10
Figure 1-12 | Pathway Obstruction ..... 1-11
Figure 1-13 | Typical Section - Existing Condition ..... 1-13
Figure 1-14 | Typical Section - Proposed Condition ..... 1-14
Figure 1-15 | Typical Section - Proposed Condition with Curb and Gutter. ..... 1-14

## CHAPTER 1

### 1.1 Project Summary

Consor Engineers came under contract on October 1st, 2022, to provide the following report on the feasibility of expanding the existing multi-use pathway along the east side of Eagle Road from Baldcypress Street to McMillan Road.

Figure 1-1 | Vicinity Map


Located on the west edge of the city of Boise, the area surrounding the immediate project limits largely consists of residential and commercial developments. This area has seen rapid growth and development over the past several decades from a strictly agricultural and rural area to the residential and commercially focused developments present today. Eagle Road, or SH-55 as designated by local jurisdictions, is a major arterial road running north-south that collects large amounts of vehicles travelling north from I-84. Eagle Road primarily consists of an 8-lane roadway, with the composition varying along the corridor as dedicated center turn lanes and right turn slip lanes emerge as needed. Sidewalk runs intermittently along this segment of Eagle Road depending on the proximity to local business fronts and residential neighborhoods. Eagle Road serves as a principal arterial from I-84 to the central Idaho region and beyond. Historically, Eagle Road has steadily expanded in width over time to serve the increasing population of the Treasure Valley region, which encompasses Boise and the surrounding municipalities south of the Boise foothills and north of the Snake River.

Figure 1-2 | Project Extents Map


Within the project extents, pedestrian facilities exist discontinuously along the east and west sides of the roadway. Immediately adjacent to the roadway are drainage swales that serve to collect stormwater and separate pedestrians from the high speeds present along Eagle Road. The existing pathway on the east side, which is the primary focus of this concept study, consists of a concrete sidewalk that varies widely in width and alignment. The outlined section along Eagle Road, approximately 0.62 miles in length, was identified by Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) and the City of Boise (City) as in need of improving the consistency and capacity of the existing pathway and for Americans with disabilities Act (ADA) compliance. The proposed pathway will serve local pedestrian and bicycle traffic traveling to and from various residential and commercial areas, as part of the larger pathway plan for west Boise.

The core concept of the future proposed work involves expanding the concrete sidewalk to 12 feet in width throughout the identified corridor. A second concept was developed that aimed to maintain the 12 -foot width wherever possible but could be constrained to 8 feet in width as a measure to avoid relocating large utility/electrical poles. A large consideration for cost other than basic materials for this concept is Right of Way acquisition. The vast majority of existing concrete walk throughout the project extents lies on property outside of Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) Right of Way. Development constructed the existing sidewalk segments; however, easements were not granted to the city to maintain or improve the sidewalk without obtaining the needed easements. Because of this, the sidewalk varies widely in width depending
on the section. Figure 1-3 below showcases an example of this, and emphasizes the project's need to maintain consistency to the route for ease of use and level of pedestrian and bicycle service.

Figure 1-3 | Abrupt shift in sidewalk alignment


In an effort to minimize the cost of Right of Way (R/W) acquisition, each concept design attempts to maintain the existing back of walk alignment where possible, expanding the concrete sidewalk towards Eagle Road and away from private property. A prominent feature of the existing corridor is large swales between the sidewalk and the roadway shoulder that serve as a means of stormwater drainage.

Figure 1-4: Existing Drainage Swale


Also present in a smaller capacity are lengths of curb and gutter. Due to the desire to expand the pathway towards Eagle Road, the swales will be reduced in area and capacity. Because of this, curbs and gutters along with collection inlets have been proposed in areas where swales become too small to capture and store water. Various stormwater and irrigation features are found in close proximity to the sidewalk along the project extents. Two irrigation canals, varying in size, are present within the identified project limits and belong to the Settler's Irrigation District of Idaho. The first (Nourse Lateral) is encountered approximately 1,280 feet north of Baldcypress Street. The existing walk ends abruptly and does not avoid the structure. As such, both concept designs shift the alignment of the sidewalk to avoid the wingwall structure that serves the canal.

Figure 1-5: Canal and Irrigation Feature


Present within the vicinity of this canal is a box structure thought to aid in diverting water from the canal to residences and other facilities in need. This structure borders the existing back of walk as shown below.

Figure 1-6 | Irrigation Box Near Canal


A much larger canal, the North Slough, crosses Eagle Road approximately 2,130 feet north of Baldcypress St. This structure protrudes to the east, away from Eagle Road, and takes up a considerable amount of R/W. As such, the existing sidewalk alignment veers east to avoid this structure. The proposed concept will continue to veer east to not impact the structure, which will require an easement or $\mathrm{R} / \mathrm{W}$ acquisition.

Figure 1-7 | Large Canal and Corresponding Feature


The existing walk immediately north of this canal continues north and ends prior to a residential property. North of this residential parcel, the sidewalk alignment veers west, not aligning with the sidewalk to the south. This section immediately south of the residential parcel has been identified as an area of sidewalk removal, with the proposed alignment moving west to match up with the sidewalk north of the private parcel.

Several wooden utility poles are in close proximity to the existing sidewalk and will need to be relocated during construction. As mentioned previously, also present in this stretch are large power transmission poles with electrical lines that are meant to be avoided by either altering the proposed alignment or narrowing the width of the proposed sidewalk down to a minimum of 8 feet.

Figure 1-8 | Utility Poles Adjacent to Existing Sidewalk


### 1.2 Summary

The proposed project will reconstruct and widen the sidewalk width along the east side of Eagle Road from Baldcypress Street to McMillan Road generally to 12 feet in order to improve the capacity and usability of the multi-use pathway and provide connectivity to other regional pathway facilities. Challenges to widening include obtaining easements, as much of the existing pathway resides on land outside of ITD R/W. Additionally, the east side of Eagle Road is an important utility corridor, therefore, close coordination with utility companies is necessary to develop a pathway alignment that meets community needs and maintains use for utilities present.

### 1.3 Project Description

### 1.3.1 Project Development

This project is needed to provide pedestrian and bicycle access through this corridor and to provide connectivity to other pathway systems that already exist north and south of this segment of Eagle Road.

### 1.3.2 Scope of Work

The scope of work for this project involved developing a multi-use pathway design concept with alternatives for expanding the existing sidewalk to 12 feet in width. The proposed layout needed to adhere to a few constraints including but not limited to the avoidance of large power transmission poles and irrigation features present throughout the project extents. A cost estimate for materials and labor was also to be prepared.

### 1.3.3 Assumptions

Assumptions in developing the project concepts include:
> 12-foot multi-use path is preferred
> Relocating large power transmission utilities at project expense is not preferred.
> Relocation of Nourse Slough facilities is possible, but not desirable.
> Relocation of North Lateral facilities is not feasible or preferred.
> Drainage swales are to be maintained where feasible, and drainage systems will need to be installed if the distance from roadway to pathway becomes too narrow.
> Placing the proposed multi-use pathway at the back of the existing sidewalks is desirable to keep the pathway as far as possible from the roadway, while not requiring additional R/W.

### 1.3.4 Existing Conditions

> Land Use

- The immediate area surrounding the project extents consists of a mix of residential and commercial uses.
> Vehicle Volumes
- Roughly 50,000 AADT per ITD’s OpenData ArcGIS software
- The forecasted traffic demand for 20 years from now is 57,700 (2045)
> Bike/Ped Facilities
- Discontinuous segments of sidewalks of various widths constructed by commercial and residential properties to meet the development agreement requirements when they were constructed. Easements were not established for the City of Boise or ITD to maintain or make improvements to these sidewalks.
> Transit
- Aside from a small bus loop near the Village (Eagle Rd \& Fairview Ave) and on-demand service in Eagle, there is currently no dedicated transit service or stops along the corridor. Two routes utilize SH-55 south of the project, which runs between River Valley Street and Pine Street. Valley Regional Transit (VRT) is working with agencies to establish the HWY-44 Express route (ID\# FR-017-0). The project is currently unfunded. When operational, the route would run along SH-55 from St. Lukes to SH-44. The Communities in Motion 2050 unfunded public transit system shows a few more routes crossing Eagle between River Valley and Overland, but it's unlikely any would need a stop on SH-55.
> Crash Data
- COMPASS provided 5-year crash data for 2016-2021 that occurred within the identified project extents related to pedestrian activities. Two of the crashes were reported with a severity level of $B$, which indicates that a minor injury visible to a third party occurred due to the crash. One crash was reported with a severity level of A, which indicates that an incapacitating injury occurred.
- 2016 - crash between a bicyclist and a vehicle occurred at the crosswalk at Wainwright Drive at the intersection with Eagle Road. Failure to obey the signal was cited. This crash was listed with a B in severity.
- 2019 - The second B-severity crash occurred 50 ' east of the intersection of Baldcypress Drive and Eagle Road. This crash also involved a bicyclist and a vehicle and occurred at an unmarked crosswalk at a commercial access.
- 2021 - The A-severity crash occurred at the intersection of Meadowdale Drive and Eagle Road. A cyclist was travelling on the roadway shoulder and was impacted by a vehicle-tovehicle crash sending the cyclist into the swale. This crossing is also an unmarked crossing.

It is important to note that all accidents occurred at intersections and two of the intersections lacked crosswalk markings.
> Utilities and Irrigation

- Large transmission power poles belonging to Idaho Power are present throughout the project.
- Wooden service utility poles also span the entire project length to provide local service.
- The following list of Utility companies found within the project vicinity was developed with the consultation of as-builts from a project with limits very near to this project.
- Cable One/Sparklight - Internet service provider with both underground cables and equipment spanning across and along Eagle Road. Consistent presence across project limits, contact made during report development for confirmation.
- Century Link - Internet service provider. Strong likelihood of presence within project limits, no contact made at this stage.
- Integra Telecom/Electric Lightwave - Telecommunication company, no contact made. Upon closer inspection this company no longer has a presence in the area.
- Veolia- Water main on east side of Eagle Road within the project limits. Contact made with company where presence on more than half of the identified project limits was stated.
- Syringa Networks - Telecommunication company with fiber optic cables running underground and overhead along the entire project limits. Contact was made to confirm presence.
- Zayo Fiber - Telecommunication company. No contact made. Likely present with either overhead or underground lines.
> Irrigation Facilities
- Settler's Irrigation District has two canals running across Eagle Road. The North Slough is a larger canal facility and poses an obstacle to the multi-use pathway design. Relocation of current irrigation facilities would be very expensive and require extensive design and coordination. The Nourse Lateral is smaller in size and is avoided via a slight change in the multi-use pathway alignment. The Nourse Lateral headwall on the east side could easily be relocated eastward, if needed.
> Stormwater
- The majority of stormwater facilities in the corridor consist of drainage swales that directly receive and infiltrate stormwater from $\mathrm{SH}-55$. There are limited amounts of curb and gutter, particularly associated with local road connections to SH-55. Water is directed via the curb and gutter to infiltration facilities associated with the local roadway connections.


### 1.3.5 Regional/Network Connections for Pedestrians/Bicyclists

> A sidewalk connection to the Mahogany Park residential neighborhood exists approximately 3,000 feet north of Baldcypress St and will need to be maintained with the proposed design.
> There is also a pathway north of McMillan Road that this project will connect with, using the pedestrian street crossing at McMillan Road.

### 1.3.6 Comprehensive Purpose and Need Description for Grant Narrative

> Benefits Expected

- Currently, the existing sidewalk is not compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards, limiting its use by all users. Including Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant features will ensure this route is accessible to all who wish to use it. Expanding the sidewalk width to a consistent 12 feet along the outlined project route will increase serviceability and safety to both pedestrians and bicyclists. Shifting the overall alignment of the multi-use pathway where needed will also provide users with a comfortable and intuitive multi-use pathway to follow throughout the route, while maintaining the existing irrigation and utility features.
> Evidence Problem Exists
- The existing sidewalk varies widely across the project extents in terms of condition, width, and useability. The following images following help exemplify this fact:

Figure 1-9 | Discontinuous Sidewalk


Figure 1-10 | Sidewalk Width Constriction


Figure 1-11 showcases the existing issue of sidewalk discontinuity and misalignment. The sidewalk abruptly ends and has a vertical discontinuity, making it difficult and unsafe for pedestrians and bicyclists to traverse, particularly for people with disabilities.

Figure 1-11 | Misaligned Sidewalk


Figure 1-12 shows an obstruction that encroaches into the existing sidewalk width. Bound on the other side by a retaining wall, this section is a potential conflict zone for two-way traffic and does not meet ADA requirements.

Figure 1-12 | Pathway Obstruction


### 1.4 Applicable Strategic Goals and Performance Measures (Communities in Motion 2050)

- Safety - The proposed multi-use pathway provides a continuous pathway for both pedestrians and bicyclists that will meet ADA standards. The pathway alignment will also maximize separation between the pathway and SH-55 to provide the most comfort and safety for both vehicle and pedestrian users.
- Economic Vitality - The project will improve the multimodal transportation system along SH-55, making it more accessible to pedestrians and cyclists. There are also several businesses along this segment of SH-55 and the multi-use pathway will increase public access to these businesses making these businesses more accessible to all users. The multi-use pathway will also increase the regional pathway connections in the area, which will enhance the economic vitality of the region.
- Convenience - The proposed multi-use pathway will improve the regional transportation system by providing access and mobility for all users via safe, efficient, and convenient transportation options. The multi-use pathway will also improve the regional transportation system with higher connectivity that enhances capacity of the regional system and encourages walking and biking.
- Quality of Life - The proposed multi-use pathway will enhance the quality of life along this corridor by providing a safe and walkable corridor for the many neighborhoods and adjacent business owners and patrons. The multi-use pathway will also provide equitable access to safe, affordable, and reliable transportation options for more users than was previously provided along SH-55. The
project will also preserve open space along SH-55 and promote connectivity to open space areas, natural resources, and trails through the larger regional pathway system in the area.
> Consistency with Existing Plans and Documents
A joint Eagle Road corridor plan was developed beginning in 2016 (City of Meridian, Boise, COMPASS). From that plan, the proposed multi-use pathway has been highlighted as a need on the Bike Walk COMPASS Tool as a 10 sidewalk. This project looks to further develop this pathway concept towards the ultimate design and construction of the multi-use pathway.

The proposed multi-use pathway project will provide connection with pedestrian improvements north and south of the project and as part of the regional improvements envisioned by the City of Boise and Meridian.

### 1.5 Identify and Evaluate Project Constraints

1.5.1 Coordination with Local Highway District, ITD-District 3, and City of Boise

Ada County Highway District (ACHD) does not have any direct jurisdiction over SH-55, but representatives were invited to the initial project meetings. They declined and stated they would be interested in engaging in the next phases of the project, as they have local roads that connect within the project limits. All project meetings have been attended by staff from ITD District 3, City of Boise, and COMPASS. There has also been coordination with ITD District 3 regarding stormwater uses along SH-55 and ensuring the proposed multiuse pathway maintains the needed stormwater function in the proposed design.

### 1.5.2 Coordination with Irrigation Districts

Efforts were made to reach out to the Settler's Irrigation district to discuss the proposed multi-use pathway project, determine their use requirements, and discuss potential relocation of their facilities. As calls were not returned, the proposed multi-use pathway concepts avoid relocating their facilities. Future efforts will be made to connect with the irrigation district during the next phase of design.

### 1.6 Define and Recommend Alternative for a Detached, Paved, Multi-Use Pathway

### 1.6.1 Description/Configuration of Alternatives Considered

Two concept designs were developed over the course of the study. Both alternatives targeted a proposed width of 12 feet. While being reduced in width, the drainage swale will be re-established as the primary method of stormwater collection and infiltration, as shown in Figure 1-14 below. When the sidewalk becomes too close to SH-55 ( $\sim 18$ feet), the drainage swale will be eliminated, and curb and gutter will be installed, as shown in Figure 1-15 below. Here, curb inlets will be utilized to capture stormwater, directing water to subsurface storage and treatment facilities. Figure 1-13 illustrates the existing condition found in the corridor today.

Figure 1-13 | Typical Section - Existing Condition


Figure 1-14 | Typical Section - Proposed Condition


Figure 1-15 | Typical Section - Proposed Condition with Curb and Gutter
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> The first alternative aims to maintain the existing back of walk alignment to minimize impacts to adjacent property owners. Where needed, the multi-use pathway width will be narrowed to not less than 8 feet to avoid relocation of large power transmission poles located in the corridor.
> The second alternative is very similar, with the exception that the 12 -foot width will always be maintained, meaning that the sidewalk will extend further into adjacent properties, requiring the purchase of either an easement or property acquisition.

### 1.6.2 Analysis and preferred alternative selection

> Description of selection process - Initial analysis looked at creating a 12-foot pathway that would require the relocation of all utilities encountered and not impact adjacent properties. In discussions with ITD and the City of Boise, it was not clear that relocating power transmission poles would be paid for by the utility, and the project might bear some financial costs in the relocation. To avoid the cost and associated project delays, it was decided to adjust the design to avoid impacts these poles.
> Justification for preferred alternatives - The first alternative described above has been selected as the preferred alternative for the following reasons:

- It is constructible without requiring additional easements, except at the North Slough irrigation crossing.
- It maintains the 12 -foot width and only narrows where obstacles are encountered, including the power transmission poles.


### 1.6.3 Description and details of preferred alternatives

> Configuration details - The preferred alternative will construct a 12-foot multi-use pathway that follows the back of existing sidewalk throughout the project area, except where the multi-use pathway will briefly narrow to avoid impact to power transmission poles.
> Safety improvements - The multi-use pathway will replace the narrow existing sidewalk and fill in the gaps where there currently is no sidewalk. The pathway will also be ADA compliant and improve pedestrian crossings at local roadway crossings by placing pavement markings at all street crossings and installing pedestrian push buttons at signalized intersections that do not currently have them. The project will also look for opportunities to improve pedestrian and vehicle sight distance.

### 1.7 Assess Right of Way/Easements Needed

### 1.7.1 Right of Way/Easements Needs Summary Table

The table below summarizes R/W that may be required for each parcel found along the project extents. The parcel number and identity of each parcel owner was obtained from the Ada County Assessor's Map, an ArcGIS based open-use software.

As expected, Concept 1 has slightly less impact on R/W acquisition, as the multi-use pathway will be constructed such that the multi-use pathway will not widen towards adjacent properties, but will widen towards the roadway. The 12 -foot width will be narrowed to as small as 8 -feet where obstacles are encountered. Concept 2 has a larger footprint as it will maintain a 12 -foot pathway width along the corridor and widen towards adjacent properties where an obstacle is encountered.

Table 1-1 | Right of Way and Easements Needed

|  | Acquisition Cost (USD) |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Concept 1 |  | Concept 2 |  |
| Owner | Easement | Purchase | Easement | Purchase |
| Home Federal Bank | 3,138.20 | 6,276.40 | 3,138.20 | 6,276.40 |
| Brophy-Kulemin Trust One | 2,880.00 | 5,760.00 | 2,880.00 | 5,760.00 |
| First Church of the Nazarene | 10,727.00 | 16,090.50 | 10,910.80 | 16,366.20 |
| Cameron Park HOA Inc | 193.20 | 289.80 | 194.00 | 291.00 |
| Cameron Park HOA Inc | 288.80 | 433.20 | 535.20 | 802.80 |
| Biolife Plasma Services LP | 5,060.80 | 10,121.60 | 5,060.00 | 10,120.00 |
| Grace Bible Church of Boise Inc | 232.80 | 465.60 | 232.00 | 464.00 |
| Moon Properties LLC | 752.60 | 1,505.20 | 937.00 | 1,874.00 |
| MEC Investments LLC | 1,755.40 | 3,510.80 | 1,756.00 | 3,512.00 |
| Pathway Properties LLC | 1,264.40 | 2,528.80 | 1,264.00 | 2,528.00 |
| NPS SOLO 401k Trust | 72.00 | 108.00 | 72.00 | 108.00 |
| Arabian Meadows HOA | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Arabian Meadows HOA | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Mahagany Park Neighborhood Association | 6,144.40 | 9,216.60 | 6,393.40 | 9,590.10 |
| Boise McMillan's Corner LLC | 242.00 | 484.00 | 242.80 | 485.60 |
| Mountain Grove LLC | 2,709.00 | 5,418.00 | 3,051.20 | 6,102.40 |
| McMillan's Crossing LLC | 3,554.00 | 7,108.00 | 3,554.00 | 7,108.00 |
| ABS ID-O LLC | 2,810.60 | 5,621.20 | 2,810.00 | 5,620.00 |
| Joshnik LLLP | 2,068.40 | 4,136.80 | 2,068.00 | 4,136.00 |
|  | \$43,893.60 | \$79,074.50 | \$45,098.60 | \$81,144.50 |

Additional data, such as parcel numbers, property description, and area of easement/R/W needed is shown in the Appendices. Cost for easements assumed \$2 per square foot (/sq.ft.). Costs for purchasing the R/W assumed $\$ 3 /$ sq.ft. for residential properties and $\$ 4 /$ sq.ft. for commercial properties.

### 1.8 Environmental Scan Summary

$>$ Historical Resources - The only potential historical resources in the corridor lie with the potential for the irrigation facilities to be listed as historical resources. These will be avoided so no impact is expected.
$>$ Wetlands - The only potential wetlands in this corridor are along the banks, or adjacent to the open irrigation canal. These will be avoided so no impact is expected.
$>$ Hazardous Materials - No hazardous material sites are expected in this corridor as most of the improvements will be within ITD R/W. This will be further investigated at the next phase of design to verify this conclusion.
$\rightarrow$ Noise - Construction of pedestrian facilities is not considered a noise generator; noise is not a concern.
> Air Quality - Pedestrian facilities will not contribute to air quality concerns.
> Aesthetics - Construction of the multi-use pathway with associated landscaping improvements will enhance the aesthetics of this corridor.
> Threatened and Endangered Species - There are no known threatened or endangered species identified for this corridor.
> Prime Farmland - no prime farmland is associated with this corridor.
> Stormwater Pollution Prevention - the total disturbed area will be close to one acre, which may require stormwater pollution prevention plans. Stormwater will be treated on-site and will not discharge to Waters of the US, eliminating the need to complete the permit.

ITD provided the most recent environmental document for this corridor. A review of this document found no environmental resources present of concern. The environmental document is found in the appendices.

### 1.9 Project Stakeholders

Project stakeholders include:
$>$ ITD
$>$ City of Boise
$>$ COMPASS
$>\mathrm{ACHD}$
$>$ Property Owners adjacent to the proposed pathway (these are listed in Section 1.7 above)
> SH-55 Travelling Public
$>$ Valley Regional Transit (future use)
$>$ Nearby businesses and neighborhoods not immediately adjacent to the proposed pathway

### 1.10 Summary of Public Involvement Plan for Next Design Phase

Standard public involvement practices will be utilized to engage the public, both to inform and to gain feedback during the design process. Activities such as Open Houses, Public Meetings, and mailers will be utilized throughout the design process.

### 1.11 Project Schedule and Milestones, including Future Phases

Future phases for this project should include the following:
> Approval of Concept Report
> Pursue and Obtain Funding for Design and Construction
> Design Phase

- Topographic and Boundary Survey
- Environmental Clearance \& Permitting
- Public Outreach
- Design and Plan Development
> Right-of-Way/Easement Purchase


## > Construction

### 1.12 Summary Cost Estimates in Federal Dollars

Construction quantities were developed from the concept designs described earlier in the report. Unit costs for these construction items were taken from recent bids as found on ITD's website. The detailed construction quantities and cost estimate are found in the appendices. A summary of costs is shown below, which includes costs to purchase easements versus costs to purchase R/W to help guide requests for funding. Also shown is anticipated design costs and construction engineering and inspection costs, based on a percentage of the construction costs.

| Construction Total | $\$ 1,151,684.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 percent Contingency | $\$ 172,753.00$ |
| Construction Total with Contingency | $\$ 1,324,437.00$ |
|  |  |
| Design Costs (15 percent) | $\$ 198,700$ |
| Construction Engineering \& Inspection | $\$ 331,000$ |
|  | $\$ 43,894.00$ |
| Easements for Concept 1 | $\$ 79,075.00$ |
| Full Purchase for Concept 1 | $\$ 45,099.00$ |
| Easements for Concept 2 | $\$ 81,145.00$ |

Total Recommended Cost = Construction + R/W + Design + Construction Engineering and Inspection
Total Recommended Cost = \$1,935,282.00 then rounded up to $\$ 2,000,000.00$

### 1.13 Potential Funding Sources

Potential funding sources for design, easement/right of way acquisition, and construction of the proposed multi-use pathway include:
> IIJA/Federal Opportunities

- Safe Streets for All Program - Funding to support local initiatives to prevent death and serious injury on roads and streets, commonly referred to as "Vision Zero" or "Zero Death Initiative."
- Rebuilding American Infrastructure with Sustainability and Equity (RAISE) - Surface transportation infrastructure projects that will have a significant local or regional impact.
- Active Transportation Infrastructure Investment Program (ATIIP) - Program will establish competitive grants that invest in projects that connect active transportation networks and spines, accelerating local and regional plans to create safe and convenient walking and biking routes to everyday destinations and to fill gaps in trails between communities.
> State Funding
- Idaho Department of Commerce (IDC) Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) - Assists Idaho cities and counties with the development of needed public infrastructure.
- Recreational Trails Program (RTP) - Transportation Alternatives Set-Aside - Provides funds to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both nonmotorized and motorized recreational trail uses.
- Transportation Alternative Program (TAP) Administered Through Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC) - LHTAC and ITD administer this program which is meant to provide for a variety of ITD's strategic goals of Mobility, Safety and Economic Opportunity.


## > Other Potential Funding Sources

- People For Bikes - Funds for bike paths, lanes, trails, and bridges.
- Rails to trails Conservancy - Strategic investments that support significant regional and community trail development goals.
- Bloomberg Philanthropies - Releases specialized grant opportunities related to transportation, safety, and public health.

Eagle Road Pathway - Concept 1


Eagle Road Pathway - Concept 1



Eagle Road Pathway - Concept 2


Eagle Road Pathway - Concept 2




## Project Cost Summary Sheet

Round Estimates to Nearest $\$ 1,000$

| Key Number | Project Number |  |  | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | 9/21/2023 |
| Location |  |  |  | District |
| SH-55, Baldcypress Way to McMillan Rd |  |  |  | 3 |
| Segment Code | Begin Mile Post | End Mile Post | Length in Miles |  |
| 2812 | 39.192 | 39.942 | 0.75 |  |


|  | Previous ITD 1150 | Initial or Revise To |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1a. Preliminary Engineering (PE) |  |  |
| 1b. Preliminary Engineering by Consultant (PEC) | \$197,200 |  |
| 2. Right-of-Way: Number of Parcels 19 Number of Relocations | \$82,000 |  |
| 3. Utility Adjustments: $\square$ Work $\square$ Materials $\square$ By State $\square$ By Others |  |  |
| 4. Earthwork | \$99,000 |  |
| 5. Drainage and Minor Structures | \$195,000 |  |
| 6. Pavement and Base | \$36,000 |  |
| 7. Railroad Crossing: <br> Grade/Separation Structure $\qquad$ <br> At-Grade Signals $\square$ Yes No No |  |  |
| 8. Bridges/Grade Separation Structures: New Structure Length/Width $\qquad$ <br> Location $\qquad$ Repair/Widening/Rehabilitation <br> Length/Width $\qquad$ <br> Location |  |  |
| 9. Traffic Items (Delineators, Signing, Channelization, Lighting, and Signals) | \$34,000 |  |
| 10. Temporary Traffic Control (Sign, Pavement Markings, Flagging, and Traffic Separation) | \$18,000 |  |
| 11. Detours |  |  |
| 12. Landscaping | \$72,000 |  |
| 13. Mitigation Measures | \$7,000 |  |
| 14. Other Items (Roadside Development, Guardrail, Fencing, Sidewalks, Curb and Gutter, C.S.S. Items) | \$587,000 |  |
| 15. Cost of Constructions (Items 3 through 14) | \$1,048,000 |  |
| 16. Mobilization 10 \% of Item 15 | \$105,000 |  |
| 17. Construction Engineer and Contingencies 44 \% of Items 15 and 16 | \$507,000 |  |
| 18. Total Construction Cost ( $15+16+17)$ | \$1,660,000 |  |
| 19. Total Project Cost ( $1+2+18$ ) | \$1,939,000 |  |
| 20. Project Cost Per Mile | \$2,585,000 | \$1,000 |

## Instructions

1. Under Character of Proposed Work, mark appropriate boxes when work includes Bridge Approaches in addition to a Bridge.
2. Attach a Vicinity Map showing the extent of the project limits.
3. Attach an ITD 1150, Project Cost Summary Sheet.
4. Signature of an appropriate local official is the only kind recognized.

Note: In Applying for a Federal-Aid Project, You are Agreeing to Follow all of the Federal Requirements Which Can Add Substantial Time and Costs to the Development of the Project.


| Standards | Existing | Proposed | Standards | Existing | Proposed |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Number of Lanes |  |  | Roadway Width <br> (Shoulder to Shoulder) | ft | ft |
| Pavement Type |  |  | Right-of-Way Width | ft | ft |

Sponsor's Signature
Title

Additional Information to be Furnished by the District

| Functional Classification | Terrain Type | Flat | 20 | ADT/DHV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

SH 55 Pathway Connection - Baldcypress to McMillan
Right of Way Costs

| Owner | Acquisition Cost (USD) |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Concept $\mathbf{1}$ |  | Concept 2 |  |
|  | Easement | Purchase | Easement | Purchase |
| Home Federal Bank | $3,138.20$ | $6,276.40$ | $3,138.20$ | $6,276.40$ |
| Brophy-Kulemin Trust One | $2,880.00$ | $5,760.00$ | $2,880.00$ | $5,760.00$ |
| First Church of the Nazarene | $10,727.00$ | $16,090.50$ | $10,910.80$ | $16,366.20$ |
| Cameron Park HOA Inc | 193.20 | 289.80 | 194.00 | 291.00 |
| Cameron Park HOA Inc | 288.80 | 433.20 | 535.20 | 802.80 |
| Biolife Plasma Services LP | $5,060.80$ | $10,121.60$ | $5,060.00$ | $10,120.00$ |
| Grace Bible Church of Boise Inc | 232.80 | 465.60 | 232.00 | 464.00 |
| Moon Properties LLC | 752.60 | $1,505.20$ | 937.00 | $1,874.00$ |
| MEC Investments LLC | $1,755.40$ | $3,510.80$ | $1,756.00$ | $3,512.00$ |
| Pathway Properties LLC | $1,264.40$ | $2,528.80$ | $1,264.00$ | $2,528.00$ |
| NPS SOLO 401k Trust | 72.00 | 108.00 | 72.00 | 108.00 |
| Arabian Meadows HOA | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Arabian Meadows HOA | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Mahagany Park Neighborhood Association | $6,144.40$ | $9,216.60$ | $6,393.40$ | $9,590.10$ |
| Boise McMillan's Corner LLC | 242.00 | 484.00 | 242.80 | 485.60 |
| Mountain Grove LLC | $2,709.00$ | $5,418.00$ | $3,051.20$ | $6,102.40$ |
| McMillan's Crossing LLC | $3,554.00$ | $7,108.00$ | $3,554.00$ | $7,108.00$ |
| ABS ID-O LLC | $2,810.60$ | $5,621.20$ | $2,810.00$ | $5,620.00$ |
| Joshnik LLLP | $2,068.40$ | $4,136.80$ | $2,068.00$ | $4,136.00$ |
|  | $\$ 43,893.60$ | $\$ 79,074.50$ | $\$ 45,098.60$ | $\$ 81,144.50$ |

APPENDIX D CRASH DATA

## BIKE/PED CRASHES:

Crash 1: Crash Locations: Ada - See Report at the end of this section for greater detail on this accident

| Street1 | Eagle Rd |
| :--- | :--- |
| Street2 | Meadowdale Dr |
| Date/Time | 2021-01-18 17:45:00 |
| Units | Clear |
| Fatalities | Dry |
| numberofinjuries | 6 |
| workzonerelated | Yes |
| UnitType | A Injury Accident (Incapacitating Injury A Any injury, other than a fatal injury, which prevents the injured <br> person from walking, driving or normally continuing the activities the person was capable of performing <br> before the injury occurred. Often defined as "needing help from the scene." |
|  | Pedalcycle |
| Injury Suspected Serious Injury <br> Ejection No Helmet <br> Year Thrown From Cycle/Animal <br> CountyName In Intersection |  |
| Intersection? |  |

Crash 2: Crash Locations: Ada

| Street1 | Eagle Rd |
| :---: | :---: |
| Street2 | Wainwright Dr |
| Light | Dark, Street Lights On |
| Weather | Rain |
| RoadSurfaceConditions | Wet |
| Severity | B Injury Accident (Visible Injury (B) - Any minor injury that is evident to someone besides the injured person at the scene of the accident. Signs may include a lump on the head, abrasions, severe disorientation, shallow cuts, and bruising.) |
| Person | 3 |
| IntersectionRelated | Yes |
| Milepost | 39.47 |
| numberofinjuries | 1 |
| workzonerelated | No |
| Latitude | 43.64 |
| Longitude | -116.35 |
| Accident_Date/Time | 1/22/2016 5:00 PM |
| Street1 | Eagle Rd |
| Direction | West |
| UnitType | Pedalcycle |
| Action | Crossing at Intersection, Crosswalk |
| Age | 39 |
| Injury | Suspected Minor Injury |
| ProtectionDevice | No Helmet |
| Ejection | Thrown From Cycle/Animal |
| IntersectionRelated | Yes |
| ContributingFactors | Failed to Obey Signal |
| Sex | Female |


| Crash 3: Crash Locations: Ada |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Street1 | Eagle Rd |
| IntersectionDistance | 50 Feet |
| DirectionFromIntersection | S |
| ReferenceStreet | Bald Cypress St |
| Light | Dark, Street Lights On |
| Weather | Cloudy |
| Road Surface Conditions | Dry |
| Injuries | 1 |
| Agency | Meridian Police Dept |
| Severity | B Injury Accident (Visible Injury (B) - Any minor injury that is evident to someone besides the injured person at the scene of the accident. Signs may include a lump on the head, abrasions, severe disorientation, shallow cuts, and bruising.) |
| City name | Meridian |
| Person | 4 |
| Intersection Related | No |
| Number of injuries | 1 |
| Workzone related | No |
| Latitude | 43.64 |
| Longitude | -116.35 |
| Accident_Date | 5/17/2019 6:00 PM |
| Street1 | Eagle Rd |
| IntersectionDistance | 50 Feet |
| DirectionFromIntersection | South |
| Direction | W |
| UnitType | Pedalcycle |
| Action | Crossing at Mid-block, NO Crosswalk |
| Age | 16 |
| Injury | Suspected Minor Injury |
| ProtectionDevice | No Helmet |
| Ejection | Thrown From Cycle/Animal |
| Citation | YIELD From alley, driveway, other |
| ContributingFactors | Failed to Yield |
| Sex | Male |
| Numberofinjuries | 1 |



Property Damage (additional property damage may be added in the Narrative)

| Item Damaged <br> Street Light/Utility Pole | Estimated Damage <br> Owners Name <br> ACHD | Owner Address |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Item Damaged | $-U$ |  |
| Owner's Name |  | Owner Address |
|  |  | $\$$ |

Witnesses (additional witnesses may be added in the narrative)

| Witness Name Payne, Matthew | Home Phone | Work Phone |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Witness Address |  |  |
| Witness Name | Home Phone | Work Phone |
| Witness Address |  |  |

## Unit No.: 1

* If turning, select direction before turning



## Unit Type

## Unit Use

| 1 Pedestrian | 21 Truck - 2 Axle/6 Tires | 32 Pickup |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{2}$ Pedalcycle | $\underline{22}$ Truck - 3+ Axle | 33 SUV/Crossover |
| 3 Motorcycle | $\underline{23}$ Truck With Trailer | 34 Cargo Van |
| 4 Moped | $\underline{24}$ Bobtail/Tractor - No Trailer | 40 Construction Equipment |
| 5 ATV | $\underline{25}$ Tractor - 1 Trailer | $\underline{41}$ Van-1 to 8 seats |
| 6 Car | $\underline{26}$ Tractor - 2 Trailers | $\underline{42}$ Van/Bus - 9 to 15 seats |
| 10 Motor Home | $\underline{27}$ Tractor - 3 Trailers | $\underline{99}$ Other |
| 11 Snowmobile | $\underline{28}$ Train | -U Hit \& Run |
| 12 Equestrian | 30 Farm Equipment |  |
| $\underline{15}$ Bus - 16 or more seats | 31 Scooter |  |


| $\frac{0}{0}$ No Specialized Use | 10 Bus - Intercity (e.g. Greyhound) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{1}{1}$ Police | $\underline{11 \text { Bus }- \text { Public Transit, Commuter }}$ |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ Ambulance | $\underline{13 \text { Bus }- \text { Tour } / \text { Charter }}$ |
| $\frac{3}{4}$ Driver Training | $\underline{14 \text { Limousine }}$ |
| $\frac{4}{4}$ Government | $\underline{15 \text { Military }}$ |
| $\frac{5}{6}$ Taxi | $\underline{16 \text { Shuttle }}$ |
| $\frac{17 \text { Snow Plow }}{7}$ Fire | $\underline{9}$ Wrecker |
| $\frac{9}{8}$ Bus - School | $\underline{\text { NA Non-Vehicle }}$ |

## Emergency Use

$\frac{1}{2}$ YES: In transit, Emergency Lights Activated
$\underline{2}$ YES: In transit, Emergency Lights NOT active
$\underline{3}$ YES: STANDING or PARKED, Emergency Lights Activated
$\frac{4}{5}$ YES: STANDING or PARKED, Emergency Lights NOT active
$\underline{5}$ NO: NOT on an Emergency Response

Attachment

| $\underline{0}$ None | $\underline{3}$ Travel Trailer | $\underline{9}$ other |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{1}$ Boat Trailer | $\underline{4}$ Towed Vehicle |  |  |
| $\underline{2}$ Utility Trailer | $\underline{5}$ | Mobile Home |  |

## Unit / Vehicle / Owner



## Damage



## $\downarrow$ Contributing Circumstances (3 possible)



## Commercial Vehicle



## Driver / Pedestrian / Pedalcyclist



Passengers (additional passenger information may be added in the Narrative)


## Seating



Injury

| A Suspected Serious Injury | $\underline{K}$ | Fatal Injury |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{\mathrm{B}}$ Suspected Minor Injury | $\underline{\mathrm{O}}$ | No Apparent Injury |
| $\underline{\mathrm{C}}$ Possible Injury | $\underline{\underline{U}}$ | Unknown |

Ejection

| $\frac{1}{2}$ Not Ejected |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{2}$ Totally Ejected | $\underline{3}$ Partially Ejected <br>  <br>  |

Trapped

| $\frac{1}{2}$ | Not Trapped |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{2}{3}$ | Trapped, extrication unit use |
| $\underline{3}$ | Trapped, other extraction method |

## Airbag Deployment

| 1 | Deployed |
| :--- | :--- |
| 2 | Deactivated |
| $\frac{3}{3}$ | Missing |
| $\frac{4}{4}$ | Not Equiped |
| 5 | Not Deployed |
| NA Not Applicable |  |
| $-U$ | Unknown |

## Airbag Location

| DEPLOYED: |
| :--- |
| 1 Front |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ Side |
| $\frac{3}{3}$ Combination |
| $\frac{4}{4}$ Curtain |
| $\frac{5}{5}$ Other |
| NA Not Applicable |

## Transported By

| $\frac{1}{2}$ | Ambulance / EMS | 4Private Vehicle |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ | Police Car | $\underline{5}$ Not Transported |
| $\underline{3}$ | Helicopter |  |

## Unit No.: 2

* If turning, select direction before turning



## Unit Type

Unit Use

| $\underline{1}$ Pedestrian | $\underline{21}$ Truck -2 Axle/6 Tires | $\underline{32}$ Pickup |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{2}$ Pedalcycle | $\underline{22}$ Truck $-3+$ Axle | $\underline{33}$ SUV/Crossover |
| $\frac{3}{3}$ Motorcycle | $\underline{23}$ Truck With Trailer | $\underline{34}$ Cargo Van |
| $\frac{4}{5}$ Moped | $\underline{24}$ Bobtail/Tractor - No Trailer | $\underline{40}$ Construction Equipment |
| $\frac{5}{6}$ ATV | $\underline{25}$ Tractor -1 Trailer | $\underline{41}$ Van -1 to 8 seats |
| $\frac{6}{6}$ Car | $\underline{26}$ Tractor -2 Trailers | $\underline{42}$ Van/Bus -9 to 15 seats |
| $\frac{10}{11}$ Motor Home | $\underline{27}$ Tractor -3 Trailers | $\underline{99}$ Other |
| $\frac{11}{12}$ Snowmobile | $\underline{28}$ Train | $\underline{-U}$ Hit \& Run |
| $\underline{12}$ Equestrian | $\underline{30}$ Farm Equipment |  |
| $\underline{315}$ Bus -16 or more seats | $\underline{31}$ Scooter |  |


| $\underline{0}$ No Specialized Use | 10 Bus - Intercity (e.g. Greyhound) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{1}{1}$ Police | $\underline{11 \text { Bus }- \text { Public Transit, Commuter }}$ |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ Ambulance | $\underline{13 \text { Bus }- \text { Tour / Charter }}$ |
| $\frac{3}{4}$ Driver Training | $\underline{14 \text { Limousine }}$ |
| $\frac{4}{5}$ Government | $\underline{15 \text { Military }}$ |
| $\frac{5}{6}$ Taxi | $\underline{16 \text { Shuttle }}$ |
| $\frac{1}{7}$ Fire | $\underline{17 \text { Snow Plow }}$ |
| $\frac{9}{8}$ Wrecker | $\underline{9 \text { Other }}$ |
| $\underline{\text { NA Non-Vehicle }}$ |  |

## Emergency Use

$\frac{1}{2}$ YES: In transit, Emergency Lights Activated
$\underline{2}$ YES: In transit, Emergency Lights NOT active
$\underline{3}$ YES: STANDING or PARKED, Emergency Lights Activated
$\frac{4}{5}$ YES: STANDING or PARKED, Emergency Lights NOT active
$\underline{5}$ NO: NOT on an Emergency Response

Attachment

| $\underline{0}$ None | $\underline{3}$ Travel Trailer | $\underline{9}$ other |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{1}$ Boat Trailer | $\underline{4}$ Towed Vehicle |  |  |
| $\underline{2}$ Utility Trailer | $\underline{5}$ | Mobile Home |  |

## Unit / Vehicle / Owner



## Damage



## $\downarrow$ Contributing Circumstances (3 possible)

| 00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \text { None } \\ & \underline{1} \text { Exceeded Posted Speed } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underline{8}$ Overcorrected | 17 Wheel Defect | $\underline{27}$ Physical Impairment | 38 Failed to |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 10 Improper Backing | 18 Light Defect | $\underline{28}$ Improperly Parked | 39 Foot Slip |
| 00 | 1 Exceeded Posted Speed <br> 2 Speed Too Fast For |  | 11 Improper Turn | 19 Other Vehicle Defect | 31 Previous Accident | 40 Wrong |
|  | Conditions |  | 12 Failed to Signal | $\underline{21}$ Alcohol Impaired | 32 Distracted IN or ON Vehicle | 41 Brakes |
| 00 | $\underline{3}$ Too Slow for Traffic |  | 13 Failed to Yield | $\underline{22}$ Inattention | 34 Drug Impaired | 42 Steering |
|  | 4 Improper Overtaking 5 Improper Lane Change |  | 14 Failed to Obey | $\underline{23}$ Vision Obstruction | 35 Improper Use of Turn Lane | 43 Truck Coun |
|  |  |  | Stop Sign | $\underline{24}$ Asleep, Drowsy, | 36 Animal(s) in Roadway | Safety |
|  | $\underline{6}$ Following Too Close |  | 15 Failed to Obey Signal | Fatigued | 37 Emotional - Depressed, | 44 Wipers |
|  | 7 Drove Left of Center |  | 16 Tire Defect | 25 Sick | Angry, Disturbed | 99 Other |
| Distracted By (if \# 32 selected) |  | 1 Electronic Communication Device (Cell, CB Radio, Etc.) $\underline{2}$ Other Electronic Device (Navigation device, DVD player, IPODS) $\underline{3}$ Passenger 4 Other Inside the Vehicle $\underline{5}$ Previous vehicle Crash/Ticketing Incident/Abandoned Vehicle 6 Other External Distraction Outside Vehicle |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vision tructed By 23 selected) | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{0} \text { Non } \\ & 7 \mathrm{Brig} \\ & 14 \mathrm{~Pa} \\ & \underline{20} \mathrm{Paig} \end{aligned}$ | urve In Road $\underline{2}$ Hill Crest lights 10 Rain/Snow/Ice O icle 15 Traffic Sign 16 ers/Decals on Windows | way Slope/Snowbank 4 Tr 11 Cracked/Dirty Wind ence 17 Building 18 V | Bush 5 Reflection From Surfa Splash/Spray From Other Veh opped on Roadway 19 Conte | Sunlight ving Vehicle Interior |

## Commercial Vehicle

| Cargo Body |  | $\begin{array}{lllllllllll}\underline{0} \text { None } & \underline{1} \text { Bus } & \underline{2} \text { Van/Enclosed Box } & \underline{3} \text { Cargo Tank } & \underline{4} \text { Flatbed } & \underline{5} \text { Dump } & \underline{6} \text { Concrete Mixer } & \underline{7} \text { Auto Transporter } & \underline{8} \text { Garbage/Refuse } & \\ \underline{10} \text { Pickup Bed } & \underline{11} \text { Belly Dump/Hopper } & \underline{12} \text { Intermodal Container Chassis } & \underline{13} \text { Log } & \underline{14} \text { Pole Trailer } & \underline{15} \text { Vehicle Towing another Vehicle } & \underline{9} \text { Other }\end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GVWR Total |  | $\underline{10,000}$ lbs or less $\underline{2} 10,001-26,000 \mathrm{lbs} \quad \underline{3}$ More than $26,000 \mathrm{lbs} \quad \underline{\text { NA Not Applicable }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carrier Type |  | $\underline{1}$ Interstate Carrier $\underline{2}$ Intrastate Carrier $\underline{3}$ Not in Commerce/Government $\underline{4}$ Not in Commerce/Other Truck or Bus $\underline{9}$ Other Operation/Not specified |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Carrier Name |  |  | Carrier Address |  | City |  |  |  | State | Zip | Country |
| MC / MX No. | DOT No. | o. Hazardous Materials |  |  | Placard $\square$ Yes | $\square \text { No }$ | Unknown | Spilled <br> $\square$ Yes |  | Plac |  |
| Hazard Class Number | 1 Explosives $\underline{2}$ Gases - Compressed, Dissolved or Refrigerated $\underline{3}$ Flammable Liquid 4 Flammable Solids - Combustible, Water Reactive $\underline{5}$ Oxidizing Substances - Organic Peroxides $\underline{6}$ Poisonous (Toxic) and Infectious Substances $\underline{7}$ Radioactive Material 8 Corrosives $\underline{9}$ Miscellaneous Dangerous Goods | $\begin{array}{lllll} 1 & \text { Explosives } & \underline{2} \text { Gases - Compressed, Dissolved or Refrigerated } & \underline{3} \text { Flammable Liquid } & \underline{4} \text { Flammable Solids - Combustible, Water Reactive } \underline{5} \text { Oxidizing } \\ \text { Substances - Organic Peroxides } & \underline{6} \text { Poisonous (Toxic) and Infectious Substances } \underline{7} \text { Radioactive Material } \underline{8} \text { Corrosives } \underline{9} \text { Miscellaneous Dangerous Goods } \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Driver / Pedestrian / Pedalcyclist



Passengers (additional passenger information may be added in the Narrative)


## Seating

| Vehicle Front |  |  | 11 Sleeper Section (Truck Cab) | 16 Pedestrian | 0 None <br> $\frac{1}{2}$ Shoulder Belt Only <br> $\underline{2}$ Lap Belt Only <br> $\underline{3}$ Shoulder and Lap <br> $\underline{5}$ Helmet Used <br> $\frac{6}{6}$ N/A Non-Motorist <br> 9 Other | 12 Child Restraint System |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 12 Passenger-Enclosed | 17 Pedalcycle |  | - Forward Facing |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Non-Trailing Unit | 18 Equestrian |  | 13 Child Restraint System |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 13 Passenger-Unenclosed | $\underline{99}$ Other (e.g. child |  | - Rear Facing |
| 7 |  | 10 | Non-Trailing Unit | on lap, gas tank) |  | 14 Booster Seat |
|  |  | torcycle | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \text { Trailing Unit } \\ & 15 \text { Riding On Exterior Non-Trailing Unit } \end{aligned}$ | -U Unknown |  | 15 No Helmet -U Unknown |

Injury

| $\underline{A}$ Suspected Serious Injury | $\underline{K}$ | Fatal Injury |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{B}$ Suspected Minor Injury | $\underline{O}$ | No Apparent Injury |
| $\underline{\underline{C}}$ Possible Injury | $\underline{\underline{U}}$ | Unknown |

Ejection

| $\frac{1}{1}$ Not Ejected | $\underline{3}$ Partially Ejected |
| :--- | :---: |
| $\underline{2}$ Totally Ejected | $\underline{\underline{I}}$ Thrown From |
|  | Cycle/Animal |

Trapped

| $\frac{1}{2}$ | Not Trapped |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{2}{3}$ | Trapped, extrication unit use |
| $\underline{3}$ | Trapped, other extraction method |

## Airbag Deployment

Airbag Location

| 1 Deployed |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ Deactivated |
| $\frac{3}{3}$ Missing |
| $\frac{4}{4}$ Not Equiped |
| $\frac{5}{5}$ Not Deployed |
| NA Not Applicable |
| $-\underline{U}$ Unknown |


| DEPLOYED: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{1}{2}$ Front |  |
| 2 | Side |
| $\frac{3}{3}$ Combination |  |
| $\frac{4}{4}$ Curtain |  |
| $\frac{5}{5}$ Other |  |
| NA Not Applicable |  |

## Transported By

| $\frac{1}{2}$ | Ambulance / EMS | 4Private Vehicle |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{2}$ | Police Car | $\underline{5}$ Not Transported |
| $\underline{3}$ | Helicopter |  |

## Unit No.: 3

* If turning, select direction before turning



## Unit Type

## Unit Use

| 1 Pedestrian | $\underline{21}$ Truck - 2 Axle/6 Tires | 32 Pickup |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\underline{2}$ Pedalcycle | $\underline{22}$ Truck - 3+ Axle | 33 SUV/Crossover |
| $\underline{3}$ Motorcycle | $\underline{23}$ Truck With Trailer | 34 Cargo Van |
| 4 Moped | $\underline{24}$ Bobtail/Tractor - No Trailer | 40 Construction Equipment |
| 5 ATV | $\underline{25}$ Tractor-1 Trailer | 41 Van - 1 to 8 seats |
| $\underline{6} \mathrm{Car}$ | $\underline{26}$ Tractor - 2 Trailers | $42 \mathrm{Van} / \mathrm{Bus}-9$ to 15 seats |
| 10 Motor Home | $\underline{27}$ Tractor-3 Trailers | 99 Other |
| 11 Snowmobile | $\underline{28}$ Train | -U Hit \& Run |
| 12 Equestrian | 30 Farm Equipment |  |
| $\underline{15}$ Bus - 16 or more seats | 31 Scooter |  |


| $\underline{0}$ No Specialized Use | 10 Bus - Intercity (e.g. Greyhound) |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 Police | 11 Bus - Public Transit, Commuter |
| $\underline{2}$ Ambulance | 13 Bus - Tour / Charter |
| 3 Driver Training | 14 Limousine |
| 4 Government | 15 Military |
| 5 Taxi | 16 Shuttle |
| $\underline{6}$ Fire | 17 Snow Plow |
| 7 Wrecker | 9 Other |
| 8 Bus - School | NA Non-Vehicle |

## Emergency Use

$\frac{1}{2}$ YES: In transit, Emergency Lights Activated
$\underline{2}$ YES: In transit, Emergency Lights NOT active

| $\underline{3}$ YES: STANDING or PARKED, Emergency Lights Activated |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{4}$ YES: STANDING or PARKED, Emergency Lights NOT active | $\underline{y}$ |  |  |
| $\underline{5}$ NO: NOT on an Emergency Response | $\underline{3}$ Travel Trailer | $\underline{9}$ other |  |
| $\underline{0}$ None | $\underline{4}$ Boat Trailer | $\underline{4}$ Towed Vehicle |  |
| $\underline{2}$ Utility Trailer | $\underline{5}$ Mobile Home |  |  |

## Unit / Vehicle / Owner



## Damage



## $\downarrow$ Contributing Circumstances (3 possible)

| 00 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \text { None } \\ & \underline{1} \text { Exceeded Posted Speed } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underline{8}$ Overcorrected | 17 Wheel Defect | $\underline{27}$ Physical Impairment | 38 Failed to |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 10 Improper Backing | 18 Light Defect | $\underline{28}$ Improperly Parked | 39 Foot Slip |
| 00 | 1 Exceeded Posted Speed <br> 2 Speed Too Fast For |  | 11 Improper Turn | 19 Other Vehicle Defect | 31 Previous Accident | 40 Wrong |
|  | Conditions |  | 12 Failed to Signal | $\underline{21}$ Alcohol Impaired | 32 Distracted IN or ON Vehicle | 41 Brakes |
| 00 | $\underline{3}$ Too Slow for Traffic |  | 13 Failed to Yield | $\underline{22}$ Inattention | 34 Drug Impaired | 42 Steering |
|  | 4 Improper Overtaking 5 Improper Lane Change |  | 14 Failed to Obey | $\underline{23}$ Vision Obstruction | 35 Improper Use of Turn Lane | 43 Truck Coun |
|  |  |  | Stop Sign | $\underline{24}$ Asleep, Drowsy, | 36 Animal(s) in Roadway | Safety |
|  | $\underline{6}$ Following Too Close |  | 15 Failed to Obey Signal | Fatigued | 37 Emotional - Depressed, | 44 Wipers |
|  | 7 Drove Left of Center |  | 16 Tire Defect | 25 Sick | Angry, Disturbed | 99 Other |
| Distracted By (if \# 32 selected) |  | 1 Electronic Communication Device (Cell, CB Radio, Etc.) $\underline{2}$ Other Electronic Device (Navigation device, DVD player, IPODS) $\underline{3}$ Passenger 4 Other Inside the Vehicle $\underline{5}$ Previous vehicle Crash/Ticketing Incident/Abandoned Vehicle 6 Other External Distraction Outside Vehicle |  |  |  |  |
|  | Vision tructed By 23 selected) | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{0}{0} \text { Non } \\ & 7 \mathrm{Brig} \\ & 14 \mathrm{~Pa} \\ & \underline{20} \mathrm{Paig} \end{aligned}$ | urve In Road $\underline{2}$ Hill Crest lights 10 Rain/Snow/Ice O icle 15 Traffic Sign 16 ers/Decals on Windows | way Slope/Snowbank 4 Tr 11 Cracked/Dirty Wind ence 17 Building 18 V | Bush 5 Reflection From Surfa Splash/Spray From Other Veh opped on Roadway 19 Conte | Sunlight ving Vehicle Interior |

## Commercial Vehicle



## Driver / Pedestrian / Pedalcyclist



Passengers (additional passenger information may be added in the Narrative)


## Seating

| Vehicle Front |  |  | 11 Sleeper Section (Truck Cab) | 16 Pedestrian | $\underline{0}$ None <br> $\frac{1}{2}$ Shoulder Belt Only <br> $\underline{2}$ Lap Belt Only <br> $\underline{3}$ Shoulder and Lap <br> $\underline{5}$ Helmet Used <br> $\frac{6}{9}$ N/A Non-Motorist <br> 9 Other | 12 Child Restraint System <br> - Forward Facing <br> 13 Child Restraint System <br> - Rear Facing <br> 14 Booster Seat <br> 15 No Helmet <br> -U Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | 12 Passenger-Enclosed | 17 Pedalcycle |  |  |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | Non-Trailing Unit | 18 Equestrian |  |  |
| 4 | 5 | 6 | 13 Passenger-Unenclosed | $\underline{99}$ Other (e.g. child |  |  |
| 7 | 8 | 10 | Non-Trailing Unit | on lap, gas tank) |  |  |
|  |  | orcycle | $\begin{aligned} & 14 \text { Trailing Unit } \\ & \underline{15} \text { Riding On Exterior Non-Trailing Unit } \end{aligned}$ | -U Unknown |  |  |

Injury

| $\underline{A}$ Suspected Serious Injury | $\underline{K}$ | Fatal Injury |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{B}$ Suspected Minor Injury | $\underline{O}$ | No Apparent Injury |
| $\underline{\underline{C}}$ Possible Injury | $\underline{\underline{U}}$ | Unknown |

Ejection

| $\frac{1}{2}$ Not Ejected |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{2}$ Totally Ejected | $\underline{3}$ Partially Ejected <br> I Thrown From <br> Cycle/Animal |

Trapped

| $\frac{1}{2}$ | Not Trapped |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{2}{3}$ | Trapped, extrication unit use |
| $\underline{3}$ | Trapped, other extraction method |

## Airbag Deployment

Airbag Location

| 1 Deployed |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ Deactivated |
| $\frac{3}{3}$ Missing |
| $\frac{4}{4}$ Not Equiped |
| $\frac{5}{5}$ Not Deployed |
| NA Not Applicable |
| $-\underline{U}$ Unknown |


| DEPLOYED: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1 | Front |
| 2 | Side |
| $\frac{3}{3}$ | Combination |
| $\frac{4}{4}$ Curtain |  |
| $\frac{5}{5}$ Other |  |
| NA Not Applicable |  |

## Transported By

| 1 | Ambulance / EMS | 4Private Vehicle |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\frac{2}{2}$ | Police Car | $\underline{5}$ Not Transported |
| $\underline{3}$ | Helicopter |  |

Single Unit Collision With
14 Pedestrian

15 Pedalcycle
16 Railroad Train
17 Animal - Domestic
18 Animal - Wild
19 Other Object Not Fixed
$\underline{21}$ Impact Attenuator
22 Bridge/Pier/Abutment 23 Bridge/Parapet End 24 Bridge Rail 25 Overpass $\underline{26}$ Guardrail Face 27 Guardrail End 28 Concrete Traffic Barrier 30 Traffic Sign Support
39 Other Post, Pole or Support 40 Delineator Post
$\underline{41}$ Culvert
$\underline{42}$ Curb
$\underline{43}$ Ditch
$\underline{44}$ Embankment
$\underline{45}$ Fence
$\underline{46}$ Mailbox
$\underline{47}$ Tree
$\underline{48}$ Building/Wall
$\underline{79}$ Other Fixed Object
$\underline{77}$ Struck Barrier
Cargo or Anything set in
motion by a motor vehicle
$\underline{78}$ Thrown or Falling Object
$\underline{80}$ Traffic Signal Support
$\underline{81}$ Utility/Light Support

Multi-Unit Collision
$\underline{20}$ Parked Car - on Private Property
50 Head-On
51 Rear-End
60 Backed Into
61 Parked Car


Any Situation
98 Non-Contact Unit
99 Other

Event Location

| $\underline{1}$ On Roadway | $\underline{3}$ Right Shoulder | $\underline{5}$ Outside Right-Of-Way | $\underline{7}$ Median | $\underline{\text { A } \ln \text { Parking Lot }}$ | $\underline{P}$ Private Property |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $\underline{2}$ Left Shoulder | $\underline{4}$ Roadside or Sidewalk | $\underline{6}$ Off Roadway-Location Unknown | $\underline{8}$ Gore | $\underline{B}$ Parking Lot Access Rd | $\underline{9}$ Other |

Events - list events for ALL units in the order they occurred


## Sketch the Scene



Narrative (additional information / additional passengers - indicate unit no. and all information for additional passengers)
Unit \#3 was on the right shoulder of NB N Eagle Rd at $W$ Meadowdale Dr.

Unit \#2 was in the NB \#2 lane of N Eagle Rd approaching W Meadowdale Dr.

Unit \#1 was SB on N Eagle Rd attempting to turn east onto $W$ Meadowdale Dr. Unit \#1 entered the left turn lane to turn left. Unit \#1 stopped to wait for $N B$ traffic to clear so he could make the left turn. Driver \#1 stated the \#1 NB lane stopped and he was waved on by a driver in the NB \#1 lane of N Eagle Rd. Driver \#1 made the turn but did not clear the NB \#2 lane where Unit \#2 was still driving and still had the right of way.

Unit \#2 and Unit \#1 collided and were pushed into Unit \#3 who was on the corner of the intersection on his bicycle. Driver \#3 was thrown from the bicycle into the ditch.

Unit \#2 ended up across the ditch onto a raised embankment.
Driver \#1 was cited for unsafe turn.
Driver \#3 was transported to en ER where he sustained a broken left femur, broken pelvis, broken ribs, and a head injury. As of this writing it is believed Driver \#3 will recover from his injuries.
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ROADWAY DESIGN SUPERVISOR




EAGLE ROAD: FAIRVIEW AVENUE TO CHINDEN BOULEVARD

## DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

This project proposes widening Eagle Road (State Highway 55) between Fairview Avenue and the slope north of Chinden Boulevard. Construction would begin at the Eagle Road/Fairview intersection and end approximately 3500 feet north of Chinden (see Figure 1). These project termini delineate a narrow segment of Eagle Road that lies between wider sections to the north and south. The northern terminus adjoins a section of the highway that was widened in 1977. South of Fairview Avenue, the highway has been widened to five lanes as part of a project recently completed.

The existing highway has two ten-foot lanes with narrow shoulders. The proposed highway would consist of four travel lanes, a continuous two-way turn lane, and paved shoulders for a total width of 78 feet (see Figure 2). The basic width of the right-ofway would be 140 feet. Traffic signals would be installed at the intersections of Eagle Road with Ustick and McMillan roads. The existing signal at Chinden Boulevard would be modified to accommodate the new lane configurations.

A narrower right-of-way 110 feet wide would be used for about one-quarter mile, adjacent to Lowell Scott Middle School. On the east side of the highway, a curb, gutter and sidewalk would be built instead of a roadside shoulder, sideslope, and ditch. The west side of the highway would have curb and gutter (with room for a future sidewalk) from McMillan Road to the north end of the Norm's Inn property. This "urban design" reduces the amount of land to be acquired from the school, and makes it possible to avoid the tennis courts, which qualify for "4(f)" protection as a locally important recreation resource. Another short section with curb and sidewalk would extend north from Chinden Boulevard for approximately 1000 feet, on both sides of the highway.

## NEED FOR THE PROJECT

Eagle Road (State Highway 55) is classified as a principal arterial through the project area. In the past, it primarily served Ada County residents, but with completion of the Eagle Road interchange at I-84, it has become a major north-south link between the freeway, Overland Road, Fairview, Chinden, and State Highway 44. It will be increasingly used by travelers from outside the local area.

This project would enable Eagle Road to accommodate the increased traffic generated by urban growth in western Ada County and the traffic associated with the new Eagle Road freeway interchange. In the project area, the average daily traffic on Eagle Road is currently 6400 vehicles, but is expected to reach 24,900

## FIGURE 2 <br> PROPOSED TYPICAL CROSS SECTIONS

NOTE: Figure 3 shows the approximate width and alignment of transition sections not depicted below.

EXISTING CONDITION (and "NO ACTION" ALTERNATIVE)
M.P. 13.1 to 16.8


## PROPOSED "EAST ROUTE" ALTERNATIVE

M.P. 14.6 to 15.0 and 15.4 to 15.9

M.P. 13.1 to 13.9 and 16.1 to 16.8


NEW

by the year 2015. The existing highway cannot effectively handle such a high volume of traffic.

During the three year period from 1987 through 1989, there were 85 traffic accidents on this section of highway. These resulted in 44 injuries and two fatalities. Most of the accidents occurred at intersections or were rear-end type accidents. The additional signals and the wider roadway proposed would reduce such incidents and would therefore improve safety on this route.

## ALTERNATIVES

Since the proposed project is a modification of an existing roadway, no alternative locations were considered. Three design options were analyzed initially, and were presented at a public information meeting in september 1987. The options, described below, were called the West Route, the Center Route, and the east Route. Each proposes a 78-foot roadway within a 140 -foot right-ofway. The No Action Alternative is presented as a basis for comparison.

The West Route proposes widening the highway to the west side of the existing centerline for most of the project length. A strip of new right-of-way 90 feet wide would be acquired from the west side of the present right-of-way line. This option would require up to 35 acres of new right-of-way and would displace 23 residences. Right-of-way costs were estimated at $\$ 2.0$ million and total project costs would be about $\$ 6.0$ million.

The center Route would use the alignment of the existing roadway. The total amount of new right-of-way to be purchased would be about the same as for the West Route, but land would be acquired equally from both sides of the highway. This option would result in 22 displacements. Its estimated right-of-way costs was $\$ 2.5$ million. The total cost for the project would be about $\$ 6.5$ million.

The East Route is the option preferred by the Idaho Transportation Department. It proposes that the highway be shifted eastward between Ustick Road and a point just south of chinden. Along this 1.7 -mile stretch, new right-of-way would be purchased from the east side of the existing right-of-way in a strip 90 feet wide. A narrower right-of-way centered 30 feet east of the present center line would be used adjacent to Lowell scott Middle school to avoid the tennis courts, which are a "4(f)" recreation site. Elsewhere on the project, the required 140-foot right-of-way would be established by acquiring land from both sides of the highway, as depicted in Figure 3. This proposal would require 34 acres of new right-of-way and would result in seven residential displacements. The cost for right-of-way would be $\$ 1.0$ million and total project expenditures would be $\$ 5.0$ million.



The No Action Alternative would retain the existing roadway and provide for routine maintenance and minor repairs. It would require no new right-of-way and would have no direct effects on land adjacent to the highway. It would, however, not meet the goals of this project and would not improve traffic capacity or safety on this route.

Road construction costs would be about the same for any of the above design options because they would be the same length and would be constructed to the same standards. The major difference in total cost is reflected in the right-of-way costs. Because the cost and impacts of right-of-way acquisition for the West Route and the Center Route are so much higher than for the East Route, those two options have essentially been dropped from consideration. This assessment therefore compares the social and environmental impacts of the East Route to the conditions that would prevail under the No Action Alternative.

## ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

The environmental impacts and mitigation measures associated with this project are described below. The project would have no noticeable impacts in the following areas of concern: geology, floodplains, rivers and streams, archaeology, wildlife, threatened or endangered species, and hazardous materials.

Land Use: Most of the land adjoining the project is under the jurisdiction of Ada County. Except for two small "C2" zones (designated for highway commercial activities), it is zoned "AP1" for agricultural preservation. From Fairview Avenue almost to Ustick Road, the project traverses the City of Meridian's "area of city impact". North of Chinden Boulevard, the highway is within the City of Eagle's area of city impact. These areas include a mixture of agricultural and residential zoning designations.

Land use in the project area is in transition. Historically, the dominant use has been agriculture; however, recent urban expansion has converted some nearby land to residential development. Most of the homes facing Eagle Road remain single family dwellings in a rural setting.

Although present land use patterns and trends are expected to continue, the completed project may invite additional residential and commercial development. This would be an indirect impact of the project, but the extent would be determined by local land use planning authorities through zoning and permit decisions.

Prime Farmland: Several parcels along the proposed route are farmed, and much of the land is considered prime farmland, based on the soil types present. The project would convert approximately 32 acres of prime farmland soils to highway uses. Of this, about 27 acres constitute prime farmland subject to the Farmland Protection Policy Act. The other five acres have been converted or committed to urban use and are therefore not subject to the Act.

Coordination with the U.S. Soil Conservation Service was initiated by completing a "Farmland Conversion Impact Rating" (Form AD-1006). A copy of the completed form is included in Appendix A. The score for the East Route was not high enough to warrant consideration of measures to reduce impacts on prime farmland. Considering the land already committed to non-agricultural uses and the small portion to be acquired from each affected farm parcel, the project would not have significant impact on the use or availability of prime farmland. The West Route and Center Route options would have converted approximately the same amount of farmland as the preferred alternative.

Property Acquisition: The project would require about 34 acres of new right-of-way. Although most of the land involved is agricultural land or the front yards of residential properties, seven homes would be removed and 1.3 acres of public land at Lowell Scott school would be converted to highway uses. A broad range of housing quality and property value is represented among the seven homes to be displaced. This is not uncommon in suburban settings such as the project area: where agricultural land surrounding a community is being converted to rural residential use, newer homes are often left among older ones, while farm tracts and residential acreage get interspersed with smaller building lots and subdivisions.

Monetary compensation is the principal mitigation measure for households displaced by highway projects. The Transportation Department would also provide relocation assistance to eligible residents displaced by the proposed project. In early 1991, several marketing brochures and references were consulted to determine the availability of replacement housing. At the time, these publications offered a good selection of housing in almost any price range. Displaced individuals should therefore have little problem getting settled into decent, safe and sanitary housing within their financial means. In any case, no person or family would be required to move until adequate replacement housing has been identified and reasonable attempts have been made to relocate the affected individuals.

Hazardous Materials: The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency and Idaho Department of Health and Welfare were consulted for information about hazardous materials in the project area. No sites of concern were identified by these agencies.

Between Fairview Avenue and Ustick Road, one of the properties affected by the project contains several stacks of large metal barrels that are for sale. According to the owner, most of the barrels originally contained fruit juice, not toxic substances. A small percentage are oil drums, but these are not cleaned or emptied on the property. No obvious contamination was observed in the proposed right-of-way during a June 1990 visit to the site. If hazardous materials are encountered on this property (or anywhere in the proposed right-of-way), the materials would be treated or removed in accordance with all applicable regulations. Where possible, the responsibility for clean-up costs would be established before acquiring such land for highway right-of-way.

Historic Resources: During the initial investigations for this project, there were two properties adjacent to the highway that were eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic places. The Hamming farmstead and the Yost farmstead.
since that time the buildings on the Yost site have been removed. Without the buildings this property is no longer a historic site.

The Hamming farmstead is on the west side of Eagle Road, halfway between McMillan Road and Chinden Boulevard. Figure 3 shows the location of this property.

No right-of-way is to be acquired from the Hamming property, and no physical damage would result from the project. Although the proposed roadway would be wider than the existing one, the source of traffic noise and fumes would be farther from the historic buildings than under current or No Action conditions.

In May 1990, the documentation for a section 106 "Determination of Effect" was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Office. The reply confirms that the project would have no effect on the historic Hamming property (see Appendix B).

Water supply: several diversion ditches and lateral canals for irrigation cross Eagle Road within the project termini. A new culvert would be placed at the crossing of the Thurman Mill Drain, north of Chinden Boulevard. The existing structure is a 48-inch diameter pipe 70 feet long. Its replacement would be a concrete box culvert, slightly broader than the existing pipe and 200 feet long. The additional length is due to the highway fill in that area. Work affecting this and other irrigation facilities would be accomplished when irrigation water is not in use.

Wetlands: Wetlands are present in small patches or strips along some ditches and waterways in the project area. The most evident sites are an irrigation canal (about $1 / 3$ mile south of McMillan Road) and south slough, a channelized stream about $1 / 3$ mile south of Ustick Road. The project would remove or disturb up to 0.1 acre of wetland vegetation along the canal banks, and about 0.02 acre of wetland grasses and herbaceous plants lining south slough.

The canal delivers water for Settlers Irrigation District. Its only flow is the irrigation water directed into it. since the associated wetlands are supported by a confined and controlled source of water, a section 404 fill permit is not needed. Imapcts would be kept to a minimum, in accordance with Federal Highway Administration policy on wetlands. Appropriate measures to restore or replace damaged wetlands would be implemented as required. South slough is a perennial stream under jurisdiction of the 0.8 . Army Corps of Engineers. A "nationwide" Section 404 permit would be required for construction of a "minor road crossing" at this site. No mitigation is necessary. Ditch wetlands destroyed by the project would be replicated in the new roadside ditches, which
would provide suitable conditions for the natural reestablishment of wetland plants.

Utilities: As with most construction projects, public services such as telephone, water, and power may be interrupted due to excavation. such disruptions are temporary and would be held to a minimum through prudent construction techniques.

Recreation: Certain locations along the Thurman Mill Drain are popular local fishing spots. Construction of the new channel crossing may temporarily disrupt fishing, but no long-range impacts would result. The wide roadside shoulders the length of the project would greatly improve conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Other recreational use of the project area is associated with Lowell scott Midale school. The schoolyard contains a track, jump pits, a baseball diamond, tennis courts, and a large expanse of grass. Because the tennis courts are often used by the general public as well as for school activities, they are considered a locally-important recreational resource and qualify as "4(f) property". The project would not affect any of the tennis courts nor alter the use or safety of any recreation facilities on the school grounds. The runners' track north of the tennis courts would be at least fifty feet from the new highway.

Aesthetics: The new roadway would be approximately 1.5 feet above ground line throughout the project. The most noticeable amount of earthwork would occur as the highway descends off the bench north of Chinden Boulevard. In this area, the new roadway would be on a large fill. The fill would be about 17 feet above the existing highway at the deepest point and would be back to the existing grade about 3000 feet north of Chinden. Effects on local aesthetic values would be minimized by blending the fill material into the existing terrain, where feasible, and by establishing vegetation on the new slopes.

Noise: The noise analysis for this project concluded that noise levels for the design year- -20 years after project completion-would exceed the federal noise abatement criteria at five residencies remaining after project completion. The predicted increase in noise levels would result in minor impacts. No mitigation is proposed. For further details, please see the "Analysis of Noise Impacts" in Appendix A.

Air ouality: This project is within an air quality "nonattainment" area that has transportation control measures in the state Implementation Plan (SIP) approved by the Environmental Protection Agency on October 23, 1980. The Federal Highway Administration has determined that the current transportation plan and the transportation improvement program both conform to the SIP, and that this project is included in the transportation improvement program for the Northern Ada County (Idaho 3C) planning area.

Therefore, pursuant to the federal air quality regulation 23 CFR 770, this project conforms to the SIP.

Results of the air analysis for this project indicate that carbon monoxide (CO) concentrations would not exceed federal standards in the design year (2012) with or without project implementation. The highest predicted co concentration was 4.6 parts per million, at the corner of Eagle Road and Chinden. This is well within the Environmental Protection Agency standard of 35 parts per million for a one-hour average co concentration.

## COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

In January 1986, comments about the project were requested from state and federal agencies. of the seven agencies responding, none objected to the proposal. Copies of the letters received are included in Appendix B.

On September 29, 1987 a public information meeting was held to discuss this project. Approximately 40 people attended. Idaho Transportation Department presented a description of the project alternatives, then allowed time for questions from the audience. Several individuals had questions relating to specific design alternatives or the schedule for project development. There was not opposition to the project in general.

The ס.s. Fish and Wildife service, the U.s. soil Conservation service, the state Historic Preservation Office, and Meridian school District were contacted for information during preparation of this environmental assessment.

## APPENDIX A

TECHNICAL DATA
T10-654 6-87 (Raverse Sida)

1. DESCRIBE THE PROJECT
SEE ATTACHED DESCRTPTION
2. DESCRIBE THE NEED FOR THE PRONECT
3. DESCRIBE MITIGATION MEASURES TO BE COORDINATED WITH PROJECT DESIGN SEE ATTACHED LIST

[^0]4. CONDUCT A SITE REVEW TO VERIFY INFORMATION ON ITD-G54

## TID-654 6-87 <br> 

 PROJECT LENGTH_ 3.727 MILESCONSTRUCTION YEAR 1995 (?) COST ESTIMATE 4. 780,000 EXISTING ROADWAY TYPICAL SECTION TWO 10 EOOT LANES, YARIABLE_SHOH DERS
 CURFENT ADT,DHV, \% TRUCK, POSTED SPEED 6400 10.8\% $5.9 \%$ 45 MPH DISTANCE OF NEAREST DWELING OR BUSINESS FROM CENTERLINE (CURRENT) 50 FEET PROPOSED ROADWAY TYPICAL SECTION TWO $12^{\prime}$ AND TWO 13' TRAVEL LANES' ${ }^{\prime}$ 14' CENTER TURN LANE PROPOSED RWW WDTH_ 140 FEET_ ACRE/S OF NEW RW PUBLIC___ 2 PRIVATE_ 38 _ EXISTING USE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF RWTO BE ACOUIRED FARMLAND, RESIDENTIAL, SCHOOL PROPERTY PROJECTED ADT, DHV. \% TRUCK, POSTED SPEED (YEAR) (2012) 23,480_10_8\% DISTANCE OF NEAREST DWELLING OR BUSINESS FROM CENTERUNE (PROPOSED) _-65_FEET NUMBER AND TYPE OF DISFLACEMENTS 7 RESIDENIIAL UNIIS,_SOME_OUTBUILDUGGS AVAILABILITY OF REPLACEMENT HOUSING REPLACEMENT HOUSING IS AVAILABLE DOES THE PROJECT INVOLVE ANY OF THE FOLOWNG: IF YES DESCRIBE ON ATTACHED SHEET $\qquad$

1. Located on Indian Reservation
2. Change in Access Contro!
3. Signticant Earth Work
4. Change In Traffic Patterns or Service
5. Change in Trainc
6. Loss ol Parking
7. Cuthural Sites**
A. $E($ ( ) Lands
8. Prime or Unique Farmland
9. Prime or Unique Farmland
10. Permits Required
11. Pirmis Required
12. Permit
13. Inconsistent whocal or State Planning
14. Inconslstent w/Local or State Planning
15. Wildilfe Refuge ${ }^{* *}$
16. Threatened or Endangered Species** - It yes to these iterns, a letter of input is recuired from the appropriate agency.

- Il yes to these hems, addititonal reports or documentation is required.

PROJECT ARCHEOLOGICAL CLEARANCE: NOT APPLICABLE__ APPROVAL. DATE ת9/0R/8B
PROJECT ARCHEOLOGICAL CLEARANCE: NOT APPLICABLE_______ APPROVAL. DA
MATERIAL SOURCE REOUIRES ARCHEOLOGICAL CLEARANCE_____ YO
INCLUDE A PROUECT MAP, INPUT LETTERS, AND PHOTO'S OR DRAWINGS

DO NOT SUBMIT TTO-654 UNTIL ALL TEMS ARE COMPLETE
(COMPLETE REVERSE SIDE)
(COMPLETE REVERSE SIDE)
APPROVAL. DATE $\operatorname{SO} / 0 \mathrm{OR} / 88$.


* As of March 1991, proposal is for four 12-foot travel lanes


## DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT

This project proposes improvement of Eagle Road between Falrview
Avenue and Chinden Boulevard. Construction would begin at the
Eagle and Faixview intersection and would end approximately 3500
feet north of Chinden.
The existing highway has two ten foot lanes with a variable
shoulder. The proposed highway would consist of two twelve foot
and two thirteen foot travel lanes, fa fourteen foot two-way turn
lane and two eight foot shoulders. This proposed typical roadway
section would be constructed within a 140 foot right of way.

In order to reduce the property required from the Lowell scott school property. The northbound half of the highway in this area would consist of the turn lane, a twelve foot and a thirteen foot $\%$ 隹 travel lane, the curb and gutter and a six foot sidewalk. A five foot easement would be acquired behind the sidewalk. The right of section of roadway with curb, gutter and sidewalk on both sides would be constructed beginning at the intersection of Chinden and
Eagle and extend north from Chinden approximately 1000 feet.

Traffic signals would be installed at the intersections of Eagle Road with Ustick and McMillian Roads. The signal at Eagle Road

## NEED FOR THE PROTECT

This project is needed to improve Eagle Road to the standards
necessary to accomodate the increased traffic that has been generated by the growth in western Ada County and the increase in traffic volume that will occur as a result of construction of the $I-84$ and Eagle Road, and the fmprovement of Eagle Road between I-
84 and Fairview is programmed for $F Y ' 89$.

Eagle Road (State Highway 55) is classified as a principal arterial through this area. This road historicaliy has, served Ada
County residents. With the construction of the Eagle Road Interchange the use would increase as it would serve as a major Chinden and SH-44.

The average daily traffic on Eagle Road in the project area is expected to reach 23,480 vehicles daily in 2012 .

During the three year period of 1985 through 1987 there were 94 accidents on this section of highway. These 94 accidents resulted the intersections or were off-ramp or rear-end type accidents. The additional signals and the roadway widening proposed with this

ATTACHMENT (cont'd)
PRELIMINARY ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION FORM

## PROPOSED MITIGATION-MEASURES

1. Impacts of right-of-way acquisition would be mitigated through monetaxy compensation and relocation assistance for applicable state and federal laws.
2. Impacts on 4(f) resources (public recreation facilities) at curb and sidewalk along the school property, instead of the typical shoulder and sideslope construction, to reduce the amount mitigated through a payment to the school district so that the be court can be replaced elsewhere on the school grounds in an area

## PROJECT INVOLVEMENTS

6. Cultural Sites: Two farmsteads that may be eligible for
protection as historic properties are located adjacent to the existing highway in the project axea.
7. Recreation Areas: Right-of-way acquisition for the project would require removal of a tennis court at Lowell scott Midde
8. Prime or Unique Farmland: The project is bordered by prime

 * As of March 1991, proposal is for four 12-foot
trave1 lanes.
**As of March 1991, proposal is for two 12-foot
lanes northbound.

# HAZARDOUS WASTES/MATERIALS (HW/M) PRELIMINARY SITE ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST 

## PROJECT NAME EAGLE ROAD: FAIRVIEN AVENUE to CHINDEN BOULEVARD

PROJECT \# F-FR-3271 (37) DISTRICT 3
PROJECT FEATURE INITIATING PRELIMINARY HAZARDOUS MATERIALS SITE ASSESSMENT:

| X | NEW PWW |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | EXCAVATION |
|  | RAILPOAD INVOLVEMENT |
|  | STRUCTURE DEMOLITIONMODIFICATION |
|  | SUBSURFACE UTILITY RELOCATION |
|  | OTHER, LIST: |

CONTACT EPA \& THE IDAHO HAZARDOUS MATERIALS BUREAU, DIVISHN OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY TO SEE IF ANY KNOWN HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE IS IN OR NEAR THE PROJECT AREA. RESULTS NEGATVE
__ RESULTS POSITIVE, LIST: $\qquad$

ADDITIONAL ASSESSMENT TECHNIQUES EMPLOYED:

|  | AERIAL PHOTOS (current \& past) |
| :--- | :--- |
| $-\quad$ | TITLES \& DEEDS/ASSESSORS RECORDS |
| -X | INTERVIEWS (current landowners, local residents, etc.) |
| -X | WINDSHIELD SURVEY |
| $-\quad$ FIEID INSPECTION |  |
| OTHER, LIST: |  |

IIST \& COMMENT ON ANY SUSPECT LAND USES/OPERATIONS IDENTIFIED (Examples on back of this form): (IF NONE - CHECK HERE__) ATTACH SITE LOCATION MAP \& ADDITIONAL SHEETS AS NEEDED TO PROVIDE ALL INFORMATION AVAILABLE PERTINENITO THE PROPOSED PROUECT.

Melvin Schammeck of 2590 Eagle Road stores and sells large metal barrels on his property. In a telephone interview on June 22, 1990 he said that almost all of the barrels were obtained (empty and clean) from Meadow Gold Dairy, and originally contained orange juice. A few of the barrels are oil barrels but Mr. Schrammeck does not clean or dump these--he just sells them "as is". He says he used to sell some barrels that had contained weed killer, but discontinued that several years ago.
Soif staining and abnormal plant growth were not evident in the area between the highway and the barrel storage area (as viewed from the fenceline $6 / 22 / 90$ ). An area of light-colored baire soil is present near some of the barrels, which are about 50 feet from the fenceline. In general, the operation appears neat and orderly.
HW/M CONCLUSION: (EG., NO EVIDENCE OR LOW PROBABILITY OF ENCOUNTERING HW/M; WARRANTS MORE DETAILED ASSESSMENT/SAMPLING/TESTING; EVIDENCE OF PROBABLE HW/M, SITE(S) WILL BE AVOIDED WITH OUT FURTHER ANALYSIS - PROJECT APPROVED TO ADVANCE; ETC.)

No reason to suspect contamination in the proposed right-of-way.

## U.S. Department of Agriculture

# FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING 

| PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency) |  |  | Oate Of Land Evaluation Remirct, Dec. 13, 1989 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Fame Of project FAGLE ROAD-FAIRVIEN TO CHINDEN-F-FR-3271.(37) Fe |  |  | Federal Agency Higolved County And Stare |  |  |  |
| Proposed Land Use HIGHWAY RIGHT-OF-WAY . $\quad{ }^{\text {Coo }}$ |  |  | County And State <br> ADA COUNTY IDAHO |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form). |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Major Crop(s) } \\ & \text { Corn } \mathrm{Small} \text { Gran } \mathrm{Sn} \text {-Alfalfa } \end{aligned}$ | Farmable Landin Govt, JurisdictionAcres: $39.0,75 \%, 6 \% \%$ |  |  | Amount Of Farmland As Defined in FPPAAcres: 350.3951 |  |  |
| Name Of Land Evaluation System Used LESA $\qquad$ | Name Of Local Site Assessment System none |  |  | Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCSATA |  |  |
| PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency) |  |  | Site A | Alternative Site Rating |  | Site D |
| A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly (of prime farmland) |  |  | 26:7 |  |  |  |
| B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| C. Total Acres In Site (area of proposed new_R/W) |  |  | 33.7 |  |  |  |
| PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation İnformation : |  |  | - $=$ | : $\because$ | $\because$ | \%, $\because$ |
| A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmiand |  |  | 26.7 |  |  | $\cdots \cdot \cdots$ |
| B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland |  |  | - 0 |  | . | . .. . $\because$ |
| C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted |  |  | 0,007 |  | ... |  |
| D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value |  |  | 18.9 |  | - | - $\cdot \cdots$ |
| PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of O to 100 Points) |  |  | 92.0 |  |  | $\because \because$ |
| PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) <br> Site Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(b) |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Maximum } \\ \text { Points } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Area In Nonurban Use |  | 15 | 11 |  |  |  |
| 2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use |  | 10 | 8 |  |  |  |
| 3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed |  | 20 | 13 |  |  |  |
| 4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government |  | 20 | 15 |  |  |  |
| 5. Distance From Urban Builtup Area |  | 0 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 6. Distance To Urban Support Services |  | 010 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |
| 8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmiand |  | 10 25 | 0 |  |  |  |
| 9. Availability Of Farm Support Services |  | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |
| 10. On-Farm Investments |  | 20 | 5 |  |  |  |
| 11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services |  | 25 | - 0 |  |  |  |
| 12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use |  | 10 | 5 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS |  | 160 | 63 |  |  |  |
| PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V) |  | 100 | 92 |  |  |  |
| Total Site Assessment (From Part V/ above or a local sire assessment) |  | 160 | 63 |  |  |  |
| TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines) |  | 260 | 155 |  |  |  |
| Site Selected: | Date Of Selection |  |  | Was A Local Site Assessment Used? <br> Yes $\square$ No $\square$ |  |  |

Zeason For Selection:

# STATE OF IDAHO <br> TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT 

## Intra-Department Correspondence

DATE:<br>DECEMBER 8, 1988<br>PROJECT No: FG-3271(37)<br>KEY No: 2793<br>EAGLE RD, FAIRVIEW TO CHINDEN<br>ADA COUNTY<br>TO: DISTRICT 3 ENGINEER 1. Maston<br>FROM: JEANETTE GASTON, HIGHWAY ARCHEOLOGIST ENVIRONMENTAL UNIT, ROADWAY DESIGN<br>SUBJECT: ARCHEOLOGICAL RECONNAISSANCE REPORT

The Archeological Reconnaissance Report has been completed for the above-captioned project. No further archeological investigations are necessary.

DH-1500

ARCHAEOLOGICAL RECONNAISSANCE REPORT


Table 1 depicts projected noise levels at transect points located $0^{\circ}, 30^{\circ}$

 over existing noise levels is comsidered a minores．The dBA increase
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 noise levels are projected to be less in 2012 than current 1988 levels．
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## AUGUST 10， 1988 <br> ANALYSIS OF NOISE IMPACTS

$\begin{array}{lll}0 & \infty \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0\end{array}$ $\stackrel{o}{0}_{\substack{0 \\ 0}}$

| 8 |
| :--- |

 Table 1 －Projected Leq Noise Levels（dBA） 1992
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In addition to increased R／W which serves as a buffer zone，other actions
which serve as noise abatement which serve as noise abatement measures on this project include
alignment alteration，displacements and maintaining a 45 mph speed limit along the route even though the design speed will be greater speed limit noise abatement measure which is recommended for consideration by the County is to increase the minimum setback for consideration by the development along this route to $50^{\prime}$ from R／W．Noise barriers along the R／W are not recommended，because openings required for access to adjacent properties would render them ineffective．

Traffic volumes used in this analysis were provided by the Management
Services Section of the Idaho Transportation Department Management volumes are included as an appendix to this report．Travel speed was estimated at 45 mph ，as currently posted and projected．This report has been prepared in accordance with 23 CFR Part 772.
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## APPENDIX B

COMMENTS AND CORRESPONDENCE

NOTE: Some of the following letters refer to more than one project. Where this occurs, the passages that pertain specifically to the Fairview - Chinden project have been outlined to avoid confusion.

# IDAHO DEPARTMENT of PARKS \& RECREATION <br> Robert L_ Meinen, Director 

## January 20, 1986



 no disturbance to riparian habitat on and adjacent to Eagle Maintain sportsman access sites on both the north and south sides of the Boise River.
3. The sH-44 relocation will result in permanent loss of


of the four alternative routes proposed, the least damaging is
Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

yaxotawa xuinnzyoddo vชกరี
ce: Program Coordination

United States Department of Agriculture

Soil
Conservation
Service

118 W. Franklin
Meridian, Idaho 83642

January 24, 1986

Mr. Dennis Clark
State of Idaho, Transportation Department
Division of Highways, District 3
P.O. Box 8028

Boise, Idaho 83707

RE: Improvements to Eagle Road Projects: FG-3271(37), F-3271(38), and F-FR-3271(33)

Dear Sir:
The proposed projects will, depending on which Eagle bypass route is used, transverse approximately 22,500 linear feet to 26,500 linear feet of prime farmland as defined in the Federal Register. The definition is as follows:

REF: Federal Register, Public Law 97-98 - Dec. 22, 1981
Subtitle I - Farmland Protection Policy Act; Sec. 1540; paragraph ClA (A) prime farmland is land that has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for producting food, feed, fiber, forage, oilseed, and other agricultural crops with minimum inputs of fuel, fertilizer, pesticides, and labor, and without intolerable soil erosion, as determined by the Secretary. Prime farmland includes land that possesses the above characteristics, but is being used currently to produce livestock and timber. It does not include land already in or committed to urban development or water storage;

The linear feet measured do not take into consideration any land already committed to urban development or existing houses. A more detailed study on a larger scale would need to be done considering these factors and the width of right of way through these lands.

The soils affected and their approximate linear feet are listed according to the project as follows on the next page.

There are several diversion ditches and laterals carrying water for irrigation systems transecting Highway 69 via culverts and on the proposed Highway 44 Eagle Bypass. Special care should be given to maintain these conduits because without the irrigation water the landowners would suffer a markedly economic hardship and the environmental resources of the prime and other farmlands would be severly diminished.

The portion of the proposed project laying north from approximately $\frac{1}{4}$ mile north of the Chinden-Eagle Road interchange is located in the Boise River flood plain. Great care must be taken not to decrease the natural flood-control capacity of these land areas, create the need for expensive man-made flood-control measures, and endanger both lives and property. The Army Corps of Engineers should be contacted for possible permits on this area and the areas of bridging the Boise River.

The project, again north of Chinden, will pass through and/or next to several identified wetlands, (see attached map and legend), as per the National Wetland Inventory. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) these lands should be retained and not irreversibly converted to other uses unless other national interests override the importance of preservation or otherwise outweigh the environmental benefits derived from their protection.

It is also advocated that the protection of valuable wetlands, threatened and endangered animal and plant species and their habitats, designated ecosystems, and riparian woodland areas be provided whenever possible.

For these reasons the most favorable route of bypass around Eagle would be the most northerly route, staying as far from the wetlands as possible.

The only identified endangered species in the proposed area is that of the Bald Eagle. Here the Bald Eagle is a winter visitor and should not be impacted with the proposed project.

Either of the Eagle bypass options bisect the Oregon Trail in at least two sites. The Soil Conservation Service recognizes that significant historical, archeological, and architectural resources are an important part of our national heritage. The protection of which requires careful consideration in this agency's planning and implementation process. Therefore, it is recommended that you contact the State Historic preservation officer (SHPO) for investigation during the planning process.
If you have any questions or need further assistance"let me know.

Sincerely,


William 0. Moore
District Conservationist

Enclosüres: 1. Wetland Map
2. Prime Farmland Map

| PROJECT | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MAP } \\ & \text { SYMBOL } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | APPROXIMATE DISTANCE IN LINEAR FEET | MAP UNIT NAME |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Eagle Road from Fairview to Chinden | $\begin{array}{r} * 1 \\ * \\ \star \\ \hline 141 \\ * 144 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2570 \\ 810 \\ 11,350 \\ 1110 \end{array}$ | Abo Silt Loam <br> Aeric Haplaquepts, nearly level <br> Purdam Silt Loam, 0-2\% slopes <br> Purdam-Power Silt Loam, $0-2 \%$ slopes |
| Eagle Road from Chinden to Eagle | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ 25 \\ * 111 \\ 112 \\ * 141 \\ 198 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 450 \\ 750 \\ 8250 \\ 850 \\ \cdots \quad 800 \\ 350 \end{array}$ | Bissel Loam, 0-2\% slopes Chance Fine Sandy Loam Moulton Fine Sandy Loam Notus Soils <br> Purdam Silt Loam, 0-2\% slopes Xerollic Haplargids, very steep |
| Eagle Hiway 44 Bypass option A-B-C | $\begin{array}{r} * 8 \\ \quad 85 \\ * \quad 55 \\ * 111 \\ 112 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2800 \\ 300 \\ 1900 \\ 5300 \\ 1800 \end{array}$ | Bissel Loam, 0-2\% slopes Chance Fine Sandy Loam Falk Fine Sandy Loam Moulton Fine Sandy Loam Notus Soils |
| Eagle Hiway 44 Bypass option $A-B-D$ | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ \quad 85 \\ \times \quad 55 \\ * 111 \\ \times 112 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2800 \\ & 1700 \\ & 1600 \\ & 4800 \\ & 1800 \end{aligned}$ | Bissel Loam, 0-2\% šlopes Chance Fine Sandy Loam Falk Fine Sandy Loam Moulton Fine Sandy Loam Notus Soils |
| Eagle Hiway 44 Bypass option E-B-C | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ * 25 \\ * \quad 55 \\ * 111 \\ 112 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 2100 \\ 300 \\ 1900 \\ 2700 \\ 1800 \end{array}$ | Bissel Loam, 0-2\% slopes Chance Fine Sandy Loam Falk Fine Sandy Loam Moulton Fine Sandy Loam Notus Soils |
| Eagle Hiway 44 Bypass option E-B-D | $\begin{array}{r} 8 \\ * 25 \\ * \quad 55 \\ *+11 \\ 112 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2100 \\ & 1700 \\ & 1600 \\ & 2200 \\ & 1800 \end{aligned}$ | Bissel L.oam, 0-2\% slopes Chance Fine Sandy Loam Falk Fine Sandy Loam Moulton Fine Sandy Loam Notus Soils |

[^1]

##  <br> IDAHO STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY 610 NORTH JULIA DAVIS DRIVE BOISE． 83702
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RELY TO
ATTENTION OF,
Operations, Construction, and Readiness Division

Mr. Dennis Clark
Idaho Transportation Department
Division of Highways, District 3
Post Office Box 8028
Boise, Idaho 83707
Dear Mr. Clark:
This is in regard to your letter of January 9,1986 to Mr . John 01 son, of this office_requesting comments on proposed improvements to Eagle Road ( $F$ FS-3271(37) $E-3271(38)$, and F-FR-3271(33)) near Eagle, Aida County, Idaho.

Eagle Road from Fairview to Chinden (S Why Sec. 4, T.3N.,
R.1E., to SEt Sec. 20, T.4N., R.1E.) does not cross or border on any waters of the United States. Therefore, the proposed widening of this portion of Eagle Road will not require a Department of the Army permit.

Eagle Road from Chinden to the City of Eagle (SEm, Sec. 20, to SEL Sec. 8, T. 4 N., R.1E.) crosses the Boise River and its adjacent wetlands. The discharge, either permanent or temporary, of dredged or fill material into the river or wetlands will require a Department of the Army permit. This permit may be in the form of a nationwide or individual permit depending on the magnitude of any fills.

The proposed SH-44 Eagle By-pass (Secs. 7, 8, 15, 16, and 17, T.4N., R.1E.) identifies four alternative alignments. From a cursory review, it appears that only section $A-B$, which crosses Dry Creek may require a Department of the Army permit. Therefore, section E-B would likely be favored over section A-B since that route does not appear to have an apparent impact on the aquatic environment. However, information is not available at this time to allow us to consider other factors which might affect a permit decision.

Evaluation of projects which require Department of the Army permits should include consideration of both site and design alternatives which would have the least adverse impacts on the aquatic environment. Therefore, your design of the proposed project should include consideration of all means to mitigate (i.e. avoid, minimize, replace) losses to the aquatic environment. It is recommended that your application for a Department of the Army permit be submitted as early as possible. This will allow the Corps of Engineers to make a timely decision on the proposed projects.

If you should have any questions regarding this matter, please contact Mr. Jim Fellows at the Wall Wall District or Mr. John 01 son at our Boise Field Office at (509) 522-6724 or (208) 343-0671, respectively.
ATTACHMENT A

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \qquad \begin{array}{l}
\text { LISTED AND PROPOSED ENDANGERED AND THREATENED } \\
\text { SPECIES, AND CANDIDATE SPECIES THAT MAY OCCUR } \\
\text { WITHIN THE EAGLE ROAD AREA } \\
\text { IN ADA COUNTY, IDAHO } \\
\text { 1-4-87-SP-400 }
\end{array} \\
& \text { Listed Species } \\
& \text { Bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) } \\
& \text { Proposed Species } \\
& \text { None } \\
& \text { Candidate Species }
\end{aligned}
$$

Attachment
cc: $\begin{aligned} & \text { FWS, AFWE-SE, Portland } \\ & \text { IDFG, Hdqtrs, , Boise } \\ & \text { IDFG, Region 3, Boise }\end{aligned}$

United States Department of the Interior
FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
BOISE FIELD OFFICE
4696 Overland Road, Room 476
Boise, Idaho 83705

January 8, 1990

Pat Rogers-Rochna
District Three Environmental Planner
Transportation Department
P.O. Box 8028

Boise, Idaho 83707-2028

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Re: } & 1-4-90-S P-48 \\
& \text { Eagle Road - Fairview to Chinden } \\
& \text { (SE File: } 6003.0350 \text { ) } \\
& \text { (ES File: } 912.0400 \text { ) }
\end{aligned}
$$

Dear Ms. Rogers-Rochna:
We received your letter, dated December 7 , that requested a list of threatened and endangered species that may be present in the proposed Eagle Road Fairview to Chinden project in Ada County, Idaho. This letter updates the Service's species list response of October 1987 (\#1-4-87-SP-400).

According to our records, no listed or proposed threatened or endangered, or candidate species are found near the project. However, if work is not initiated on this proposal within six months, regulations require that the Transportation Department revalidate the species list every 180 days so you have the most current information. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,


Field Supervisor

```
cc: IDFG, Hdqtrs., Boise
    IDFG, Region 3, Boise
```

July 28, 1988

Dennis Clark, Environmental Planner
State of Idaho Transportation Department
P.O. Box 8028

Boise, Idaho 83707
RE: Project FG-3271 (37), Key 2793 Eagle Road - Fairview to Chinden

Dear Mr. Clark:
In regard to your letter of July 20,1988 . The tennis courts are used by the general public as well as by school organizations. We can relocate the courts, but we need to be reimbursed for this expense.

We also need an exit on Eagle Road in addition to our exit on McMillan Road. These exits are necessary to relieve traffic congestion, especially just before and after school.

We would hope that the area between the pavement and our property line would be left in a condition which provides for proper drainage and which will not create a maintenance problem.

Sincerely,


Nick Hallett
Superintendent of Schools

NH: os

# IDAHO STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY 

CECIL D. ANDRUS, Governor

Dr. David L. Crowder Director 210 Main St.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-3890

Archaeology
210 Main St.
Boise, Idaho 83702 208-334-3847

## Education

610 N. Julia Davis Dr.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-2120

Genealogical Library
610 N. Julia Davis Dr.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-2305

Historic Preservation 210 Main St.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-3847, 3861

Library and Archives 610 N. Julia Davis Dr.
Boise, Idaho 83702 208-334-3356

## Museum

610 N. Julia Davis Dr.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-2120

Old Idaho Penitentiary
2445 Old Penitentiary Rd.
Boise, Idaho 83712
208-334-2844

Oral History
210 Main St.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-3863

## Publications

610 N. Julia Davis Dr.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-3428

November 29, 1989
Ms. Pat Rogers-Rochna
State Highway Department P.O. Box 8028

Boise, Idaho 83707
Dear Pat:
After reviewing the sites in your project area $I$ believe that the following meet the criterion for the National Register:

Site \#14 -- SE corner of Ustick and Eagle Roads. It is over fifty years old and retains a high degree of its integrity. It is a fine intact example of an early twentieth century Craftsman style dwelling, as well as an early Ada County farmstead.

47
Site \#4te -- west side of Eagle Road. It appears to be over fifty years old and retains a high degree of its integrity. It is a good example of an early twentieth century farmstead, and an intact example of vernacular architecture.

Sincerely,


State Architectural Historian
EE: 1p
cc


# IDAHO STATE HISTORICAL SOCIETY 

CECIL D. ANDRUS, Governor

Dr. David L. Crowder Director 210 Main St. Boise, Idaho 83702 208-334-3890

Archaeology
210 Main St.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-3847

Education 610 N. Julia Davis Dr. Boise, Idaho 83702 208-334-2120

Genealogical Library 610 N. Julia Davis Dr. Boise, Idaho 83702 208-334-2305

Historic Preservation 210 Main St. Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-3847, 3861

Library and Archives 610 N. Julia Davis Dr. Boise, Idaho 83702 208-334-3356

## Museum

610 N. Julia Davis Dr.
Boise, Idaho 83702 208-334-2120

Old Idaho Penitentiary 2445 Old Penitentiary Rd. Boise, Idaho 83712 208-334-2844

## Oral History

210 Main St.
Boise, Idaho 83702
208-334-3863

Publications " 610 N. Julia Davis Dr. Boise, Idaho 83702 208-334-3428
R. T. Gwin, P.E.

Assistant District Engineer
District 3, Transportation Dept.
P.O.Box 8028

Boise, Idaho 83707-2028
Re: Project F-FR-3271(37), Key 2793
Eagle Road: Fairview Avenue - Chinden Blvd. Section 106 Determination

Dear Mr. Gwin:
Thank you for submitting to us your documentation for the Section 106 Determination for the Eagle Road: Fairview Avenue - Chinden Blvd. project. We have reviewed this document and have the following comments.

In our opinion, both the Hamming Property, at 5635 Eagle Road, and the Yost Farmstead, at the intersection of Eagle and Ustick roads, are eligible for the National Register of Historic places. We also agree with your assessment that the project will have no effect upon the Hamming Farmstead. Upon careful consideration, we would disagree with your conclusion of a no adverse effect regarding the Yost Farmstead. Instead, we believe this project, despite the proposed physical encroachment upon the property, will have no effect upon the qualities that make the site eligible for the National Register.

Please give us a call if we can clarify or explain these comments to you further.


RECEIVED
MAY 251990


Subject: Use of Temnis Courts
To Whan It May Concern

1. To accumodate the large number of participating students which runs over 30 students per grade. The sixth grade this year had over
students out for temnis. More courts are needed when this happens.
2. P.E. classes have over 40 students and more than six courts would 9th grade sturients from Centemial use the courts after 4:00 p.m. 9th grade student
for practice and matches.
. A tennis team is organized so that 12 matches must be played to detennine a team winner. The mone courts available expedites the com-
pletion of play. Scmetimes it gets dark before all matches are comple 5. The public uses the counts at night and on weekends. All counts are occupied most of the time during the temnis months by the public. summer recreation programs schedul
temnis teams also use the courts.
concerned coaches and Teachers,


Offl 6 I 930
त + : ! :

SUPEANTENDENT OF SCHOOLS


 and parents from the Lowell Scott area. It also contains information about
the use of the temnis courts. Those tennis courts are heavily used during good the use of the tennis courta. Those tennis courts are heavily used during good

There are two real concerns that we feel need to be addressed at some time in There are far future. The first concern is with the need to have at least six the near future. The first concern is with the need to have at least six
tennis courts and that those courts must be in close proxinity to each other.
if widening of Eagle Road causes the loss of one or two tennis courts, where If widening of Eagle Road causes the loss of one or two tennis courts, where
do we locate the replacements? it sems to us that all six courts will need to be relocated, if so who pays for the relocation of all six? As you can see
there is not roon for more courts between the present courts and the track. there is not room for more courts between the pressent courts and the track.
On the other side is mhere we bring in our buses for pick up and delivery of On the other side is where we bring in our buses for pick up and delivery of
students.

The second concern has to do with the fact that the piresent school site barely
meets the state requirements for the size of a site for a middle school. If meets the state requirements for the size of a site for a middle school. If wite, the full lenght of the school site, then we will not meet state requirements for the size of the school site. At the present time there is
land available along the east side for the school property that could possibly be purchased to replace the land lost due to widening the road. I am sure
that in the near future that land will be daveloped and no longer available.
 site will be needed for widening of Eagle Road and purchase that amount of
land to the east of Lowell Scott before it is too late to get that land? If land east of Lowell Scott could be purchased, then the tennis courts could be
relocated to the east of the school.

If you have question, comments for answers to any of my questions, please call

[^3] courts in that area of the district.

## J. R. Dick, District Enginear Transportation Department P. O, Box 8028 Boise, Idaho 83707 Dear Mr. Dick, Dr. Hallett asked me to gather some information and respond to your letter dated November 14, 1990. <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Enclosed you will find a copy of a letter of concern from coaches, teachers and parents from the Lowell Scott area. it also contains information about <br> J. R. Dick, District Enginear Transportation Department P.O. Box 8028 Boise, Idaho 83707 Dear Mr. Dick, Dr. Hallett asked me to gather some information and respond to your letter Dated Novenber 14, 1990 .

 If you have question, coments for answers to any of my questions, please callme at $880-6701$.
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