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## Introduction

This Transportation Plan (Plan) has been developed for the Post Falls Highway District (PFHD or the District) in accordance to the general guidelines provided in the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council's (LHTAC) guidance document Manual on Transportation Plans.

## Purpose

The purpose of this Transportation Plan is to provide a guideline for the District when planning for current or future roadway maintenance or construction, while incorporating regional transportation planning efforts of neighboring jurisdictions and the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization (KMPO), the vetted goals of the District, while also incorporating the public feedback of its citizens.

While this plan has specific projects identified in the CIP, the District still has the flexibility to incorporate other projects based on need, priority, and the availability of funding opportunities.

The components of the PFHD Transportation Plan includes:

## Public Involvement

A Public Involvement Plan, which began with stakeholder questionnaires to gather input on issues of importance to our stakeholders. This was followed with the development of a Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) comprised of transportation leaders within our community, who provided insight and direction as to areas of concern and lessons learned from their experiences. To ensure the Public Involvement Plan was well represented, the District had two Public Open Houses to gather input from the public as to concerns and areas to be considered when planning improvements and to provide comments concerning the developed draft capital improvement plan.

## Land Use and Growth Impacts

An analysis of existing and proposed land use and growth impacts was performed to identify areas experiencing and expected to experience growth both residentially and commercially. By understanding these trends within the District, decisions can be made proactively, rather than reactively, to plan and prepare for the demands that growth brings to our roadway system.

## Existing Conditions and Future Plans

The Transportation Plan included a gathering and analysis of published Transportation Plans from jurisdictional neighbors, a review of the roadway network functional classification, an examination of existing safety concerns, and an inventory of the inter-modal transportation facilities in the District. The PFHD Road Network Map was updated based on the compilation of data gathered during the development of the Transportation Plan.

## Pavement Management, Bridge, \& Sign Inventory

A review of the current District's Pavement Management Plan in IWorq was performed with recommendations on a system of planning integral with the CIP plan. The review identified the successes of the current plan and how the IWorq program provided a metric by which to plan and develop the capital improvement plan. Through this effort, areas in which the use of the IWorq program could be utilized to benefit the District more fully were identified. The IWorq program includes an inventory of the District's roads, culverts, and signs.

## Capital Improvement Plan

A Capital Improvement Plan was developed through the analysis of all of the above, with emphasis on safety, areas of growth, coordination with improvements planned in neighboring jurisdictions, and input from the public open houses.

## Implementation Plan

An Implementation Plan was developed to provide a framework to assist the District in annual updating of the CIP, budgeting costs for maintenance and construction, and direction for funding opportunities.

## Transportation Plan Funding

The District received funding for this Transportation Plan through the Local Rural Highway Investment Program (LHRIP) administered through LHTAC. LHTAC supports Transportation Plans for Local Public Agencies as they provide an opportunity to effectively plan transportation infrastructure improvements with the collaboration of neighboring jurisdictions, the Technical Advisory Committee, the Public, and local transportation organizations such as the Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization.

## Post Falls Highway District Background

The Post Falls Highway District was formed in March of 1971, formerly called the Pleasant View Highway District. After the State of Idaho passed a law to consolidate numerous smaller roadway districts into four districts within Kootenai County, Post Falls Highway District, Lakes Highway District, East Side Highway District, and Worley Highway District formed the Associated Highway Districts of Kootenai County, to create a collaborative union for planning and funding a collective effort in maintaining and growing the local roadway system.

The PFHD maintains 191 miles of roads, with 555 culverts, 2 bridges and over 2,500 signs. The PFHD is led by three elected Commissioners, a Road Supervisor, Clerk, office staff, and a multitude of road crews.

There are 7 cities located within the PFHD that share the District's property tax base, with a 2010 US Census population of 54,224 . The current yearly budget falls just under $\$ 8$ million to maintain and build the roads within the PFHD roadways system. The jurisdiction of the Post Falls Highway District within the Associated Highway District is shown in Figure 1. The Post Falls Highway District Map is shown in Figure 2.

## ASSOCIATED HIGHWAY DISTRICTS BOUNDARIES KOOTENAI COUNTY, IDAHO



Figure 1 - Associated Highway Districts of Kootenai County


## Public Involvement

Public involvement was the first component tasked in developing the Transportation Plan. The Post Falls Highway District reached out to the public through multiple venues to gather input regarding the public's areas of concern, to share the Highway District's knowledge of concerns and needs, and to strengthen public support in the development of the Transportation Plan. The Post Falls Highway District Commissioners and Road Supervisor participated in all public involvement events, making themselves available for questions and providing answers specific to their district. The Public Involvement effort included Stakeholder Questionnaires, three Technical Advisory Committee meetings, and two Public Open Houses. The sequence of Public Involvement efforts is summarized below:

## Stakeholder Questionnaires

Stakeholder Questionnaires were sent out in March of 2017 to a list of key stakeholders identified by the Post Falls Highway District Commissioners and the Road Supervisor. Stakeholders were chosen based on their specific inter-jurisdictional relationships and knowledge of local transportation systems, challenges, and goals for the community. The Questionnaires were tailored to individual organizations to request feedback specific to their needs and knowledge. These stakeholder questionnaires were intended to provide a means of communicating stakeholder concerns early in the Transportation Plan development. The feedback was instrumental in planning the future discussions with the Technical Advisory Committee.

The Stakeholder Questionnaires were sent to the following stakeholders. The stakeholders who provided a response are marked with an $\left({ }^{*}\right)$, and are included in Appendix A.

* Jerry Keane - Superintendent of Post Falls School District
* Kimberly Hobson - Kootenai County Transit
* Joe Jovick - Kootenai County Sheriff's Office
* Warren Merritt - Kootenai County Fire and Rescue
* Brian Wallace - Coeur d'Alene School District
* Phillip Cummings - Coeur d'Alene Airport
* Chris Bosley - City of Coeur d'Alene

Alan Soderling - City of Hayden
Kevin Jump - City of Rathdrum
Bill Melvin - City of Post Falls
Bill Roberson - Idaho Transportation Department
Cathy Mayer - Kootenai Solid Waste
Glenn Miles - Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization
David Callahan - Kootenai County Community Development Darrell Rickard - Lakeland School District, MacLennan - North Idaho Centennial Trail Foundation.

For the most part, the responses indicated stakeholder concerns about congestion, safety, the addition of bicycle and pedestrian routes, and railroad crossing safety. The rating of the PFHD existing transportation system by the stakeholders was generally fair to good. The general consensus was that
the District's safety was fair to good, congestion was fair to good, truck traffic was fair, traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing/coordination) was fair to good, maintenance was fair to good, and bicycle and walkability was poor to fair. The issues identified as most important to address in the Transportation Plan were safety and maintenance. The concepts deemed most important for transportation planners to concentrate on were reducing fatalities and injuries, reducing congestion, and maintaining current infrastructure.

## Technical Advisory Meeting \#1

The first Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) Meeting was held on August 17, 2017 from 9:00 to 11:00am at the PFHD offices. The TAC participating members for Meeting \#1 were:

```
Terry Werner - PFHD Commissioner
Todd Tondee - PFHD Commissioner
Lynn Humphreys - PFHD Commissioner
Kelly Brownsberger - PFHD Road Supervisor
David Callahan - Director of Kootenai County Community Development
Chris Bosley - City of Coeur d'Alene
Alan Soderling - City of Hayden Engineer
Bill Melvin - City of Post Falls Engineer
Glenn Miles - Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization
Eric Shanley - Lakes Highway District Engineer
Steven Kjergaard - Coeur d'Alene Airport
Mike Fuller - Coeur d'Alene Pedestrian & Bicycle Advisory
Darius Ruen - PFHD Engineer
Stefani Mason - Ruen-Yeager Engineer
Laura Winter - Ruen-Yeager Engineer
```

The purpose of a Technical Advisory Committee is to assemble a team of leaders from the local transportation community who can provide insight and recommendations that stem from their unique experiences and expertise. There was a roundtable discussion concerning the four topics listed below. The discussion from the Technical Advisory Meeting \#1 laid the groundwork for the development of the Capital Improvement Plan and areas of emphasis within the Transportation Plan. The discussions for each topic is listed below and summarized in Appendix B.

## Areas of Safety Concerns

Highway 53 intersections
Railroad Crossings
Bus Stops
Riverview Drive - Bike Safety
Lancaster \& Huetter Intersection
Lancaster \& Meyer Intersection
Lancaster \& SH-41 Intersection
Huetter Bike Facility

Bike/ped on Seltice
Huetter Bypass
Pleasant View \& Prairie Intersection
Bike Connectivity throughout the District

## Areas with active or expected growth or change

Lancaster Road - $70+90$ lots (and could see another 100 lots)
Pleasant View Road \& Beck Road
Atlas Road/Huetter Road/Lancaster Road
Hanley Road/Poleline Avenue @ Huetter Road
Prairie Avenue / SH-41
SH-41 Corridor, especially Horsehaven Avenue

## PFHD Strengths and Areas for Improvement

Strengths
Participation in Regional Growth \& Collaboration Efforts
Active solving of Safety Concerns within the district
Areas for Improvement
Increase communication with residents
Send out mailers for areas with upcoming construction
KMPO has developed a website to update regional construction the District could link to
Media Outreach - Facebook, Twitter
Proposed Future Projects
Greensferry Bridge

## Public Open House \#1

The first Public Open House was held on September 26, 2017 from 4:00 to 7:00 pm at the Post Falls Highway District office. The purpose of the first Public Open House was to explain to the Public what a Transportation Plan is, provide information concerning the Districts current Capital Improvement Plan, present areas of safety concerns, and to provide a question/answer discussion of concerns and issues the public had with the District's roadway system.

The advertisement effort for the Open House included invitations to stakeholders, TAC members, and neighboring jurisdictions, flyers posted at local libraries, city halls, and grocery stores, public service announcements on several local radio stations, advertisement in the Coeur d'Alene Press, Craigslist announcement, and announcement at the KMPO meeting.


The event was well attended with over forty visitors. There were six exhibits, the first explaining "What is a Transportation Plan?", a PFHD Map with the current CIP improvements identified, a PFHD Map available for marking any hot spots or areas of concern, a PFHD Map identifying the top ten crash locations, a Kootenai County Map identifying Bike and Pedestrian facilities, and an interactive LHTAC Crash Map was on display for questions about specific areas. There were seven total PFHD representatives (two Commissioners, the Road Supervisor, and four Ruen-Yeager staff) present to answer questions and explain the exhibits.


Most of the visitors expressed an appreciation for the Highway District's dedication and hard work. There were many questions about the future prospects of rebuilding the Greensferry Bridge, with most in support and few opposed. There were many requesting improvements along Prairie Avenue.

A Public Open House Questionnaire was given to each attendee with encouragement to provide a response. Not all attendees responded, and several couples provided a joint response. A total of 24 written responses were gathered with the most consistent concerns being:

Maintaining infrastructure
Adding new roads or capacity to existing
Safety
Prairie Avenue improvements to intersections and capacity
Connectivity to I-90 and SH-53
Developing bike and pedestrian facilities
Increasing Transit Accessibility
Building the Greensferry Bridge
The feedback from the public at the Open House provided the public's unique viewpoint with concerns and questions sometimes not realized by the transportation community. Much of the proposed projects on the District's Capital Improvement Plan had the support of the Public. There was support and opposition to the increasing use of roundabouts. Multiple requests for improvements on Prairie Avenue were received. There was concern about the future Pleasant View and SH-53 interchange and the resulting traffic funneling after the closure of McGuire Road and Prairie Road at SH-53. The Public's desire for expanded bike and pedestrian facilities was clearly made in the written responses and verbal discussions. A Summary of the Public Open House \#1 Questionnaire responses is included in Appendix C, including the individual responses, and the Open House Flyer used for advertisement.

## Technical Advisory Meeting \#2

The second Technical Advisory Meeting was held on November 2, 2017 from 9:00 to 11:00am at the PFHD offices. The TAC participating members for Meeting \#2 were:

```
Terry Werner - PFHD Commissioner
Todd Tondee - PFHD Commissioner
Kelvin Brownsberger - PFHD Road Supervisor
Chris Bosley - City of Coeur d'Alene
Bill Melvin - City of Post Falls Engineer
Ali Marienau - Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization
Eric Shanley - Lakes Highway District Engineer
Darius Ruen - PFHD Engineer
```

The purpose of the second TAC meeting was to rank the proposed projects with a category matrix. The sum of the categories then ranked the importance of a project with a score between 0 and 100 , with 100 being the highest priority. These scores then established the sequence of project scheduling in the Five-Year CIP plan. This process provides a fully vetted CIP Plan, with systematic scheduling.

The projects were reviewed, and the ranking categories discussed. It was decided by the group that the projects in the CIP with previously secured funding and a definitive schedule would not be included in the priority ranking, since these projects already had an established schedule of design and construction. The group also concluded that the ranking categories should be revised to provide a more
accurate ranking. The categories were reviewed and discussed, with the outcome providing some categories removed and/or added, and ranking points were revised. The initial and final ranking categories with maximum points are listed below in descending order of importance:

## Initial Ranking Categories

20 - Safety
15 - Remaining Service Life
15 - Ties to Adjacent Projects
15 - Area Growth
10 - Project Cost
10 - Funding Source
05 - Public Support
05 - Right-of-Way Needs
05 - Utility Impacts
100 - Maximum Points

Final Ranking Categories
25 - Safety
15 - Transportation/Capacity
15 - Economic Vitality
15 - Remaining Service Life
10 - Public Support
10 - Ties to Adjacent Projects
05 - Project Cost
05 - Right-of-way Needs
100 - Maximum Points

The Initial and Final CIP Project Ranking Matrices are provided in Appendix D. A third TAC meeting to finalize the ranking of the projects was scheduled for after the Thanksgiving holidays.

## Technical Advisory Meeting \#3

The third Technical Advisory meeting was held on December 12, 2017 from 9:00 to 11:00 am at the PFHD offices. The TAC participating members for Meeting \#3 were:

```
Terry Werner - PFHD Commissioner
Todd Tondee - PFHD Commissioner
Chris Bosley - City of Coeur d'Alene
Bill Melvin - City of Post Falls Engineer
Ali Marienau - Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization
Eric Shanley - Lakes Highway District Engineer
Darius Ruen - PFHD Engineer
Laura Winter - Ruen-Yeager Engineer
```

The purpose of this meeting was for each TAC member to individually rank the proposed projects for the CIP plan based on the Final CIP Project Ranking Matrix modified in the second meeting. There was limited discussion concerning the projects, as the intent of this meeting was to secure independent scores for the projects from each TAC member. The individual ranking scores were then averaged to determine the
 priority ranking of the projects in the proposed Five-Year CIP plan.

The results of the project rankings were as follows:
74.2 Prairie Avenue - Five Lanes from Meyer to SH-41
63.9 Prairie Avenue \& Greensferry Road
63.8 Pleasant View and SH-53
57.0 Prairie Avenue - SH-41 to Greensferry
55.3 Greensferry Bridge
52.4 Hayden Avenue \& Meyer Road
46.4 Huetter Road Bikeway
44.7 Seltice Way - Seeley to Huetter
39.8 Seltice Way Connection to Centennial Trail
35.4 Riverview Drive - at Idaho Road
35.2 Riverview Drive - Curve Realignment
32.6 Riverview Drive Extension
28.4 Upriver Drive - Realignment at Jacobs Loop
21.9 Riverview Drive \& Harbor Drive

Road Improvement Intersection Improvement Intersection Improvement Road Improvement Bridges/Culverts Intersection Improvement Bike Ped Improvements Road Improvement Bike Ped Improvement Intersection Improvement Road Improvement Road Improvement Road Improvement Intersection Improvement

A full exhibit of the Final CIP Project Ranking Matrix with the averaged scores is included in Exhibit E.

## Public Open House \#2

The second Open House was held on January 9, 2017 from 4:00 to 7:00 pm at the Post Falls Highway District Office. The purpose of the second Open House was to present the ranking of projects in the Proposed CIP Plan and gather public input.

The advertisement effort was similar to the first Open House, including invitations to the Stakeholders, TAC members, and neighboring jurisdictions, flyers posted at local libraries, city halls, and grocery stores, public service announcements on several local radio stations, Craigslist announcement, and advertisement in the Coeur d'Alene Press.

The event was again well attended with over 40 visitors. There were two exhibits, the first displaying the Scored Final CIP Project Ranking Matrix and the second identifying the locations of these projects on a Post Falls Highway District map.

There were six total PFHD representatives (two Commissioners, the Road Supervisor, and three RuenYeager staff) present to answer questions and explain the exhibits.

A Public Open House Questionnaire was given to each attendee with encouragement to take the time to provide a response. Not all attendees responded, with many couples, providing a joint response. A total of twenty-four written responses were gathered with the most consistent comments being:

Greensferry Bridge with nine comments directly in favor and two opposed Appreciation for the good job PFHD does
Comments that the rankings seemed to appear in a reasonable order
Happy to see Bike/Ped projects on the forecast

A Summary of the Public Open House \#2 Questionnaire responses is included in Appendix F, including the individual responses, the front-page article from the Coeur d'Alene Press, and the Open House Flyer used for advertisement.


## Public Input Analysis

Through the public outreach process, comments were received from the public that merited further analysis. The development of the PFHD Transportation Plan considers the needs of the community a critical component in developing a plan that addresses the needs and concerns of all users.

The input from the public was included in the analysis prepared for the existing conditions in terms of AADT, crash data, growth factors, land use changes, and other analysis performed in developing the Transportation Plan and the CIP Plan.

## Land Use \& Growth Impacts

An important component of the development of the Transportation Plan is to look at existing and future land use to predict where growth may impact traffic volumes. This effort helps roadway improvements to occur before or as growth is happening, rather than after congestion has already taken affect.

The local municipalities adjacent to Post Falls Highway District have jurisdiction over their land use zoning. The Post Falls Highway District does not have land use authority over its jurisdiction. Kootenai County has the land use zoning and comprehensive planning authority of the rural areas outside of the municipal jurisdictions, which includes the Post Falls Highway District jurisdiction. Changes to land use and zoning can create impacts to the demand on the PFHD roadway system. These zoning and land use impacts were considered for the development of this Transportation Plan. A map of the current zoning from Kootenai County is shown in Figure 3.

There is varied zoning in the District. With the District's unique location, bordered by Washington State to the west, Rathdrum to the north, and Post Falls, Hayden and Coeur d'Alene along the perimeters, the expectation of future growth is quite certain.

## Existing Land Use

The District currently has much of its jurisdiction across the Rathdrum Prairie classified as Agriculture, Light Industrial, or Mining. The District north of SH-53 is primarily Rural, Ag-Suburban, and Upper Watershed to Hauser Lake. The District's jurisdiction south of I-90 is primarily Rural and Ag-Suburban.

A general description for the primary zoning designations within the District are as follows:
Agriculture - The Agricultural zone is a zoning district in which the land has been found to be suitable for uses related to farming, agriculture, forestry, silviculture, aquaculture, and other similar uses. The minimum lot size for parcels in the Agriculture zone is five (5.00) acres.

Light Industrial - The Light Industrial zone is a zoning district in which the land has been found to be suitable for manufacturing and processing of a non-nuisance character. The purpose of the Light Industrial zone is to encourage the development of manufacturing and wholesale businesses that are clean, quiet, and free of noise, odor, dust, and smoke.

Mining - The Mining zone is a zoning district in which the land has been found to be suitable for excavation and processing materials secured from the earth.

Rural - The Rural zone is a zoning district in which the land has been found to be suitable for rural residential uses and uses related to agricultural pursuits, including farming and forestry. The minimum lot size for parcels in the Rural zone is five (5.00) acres.

Ag-Suburban - The Agricultural Suburban zone is a zoning district in which the land has been found to be suitable for residential and small-scale agricultural uses. The minimum lot size for parcels located in the Ag -Suburban zone is two $(2.00)$ acres.

Upper Watershed - The Upper Watershed zone north of Hauser Lake has a minimum lot size of five (5.00) acres per parcel.


## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT 2018 Transportation Plan Kootenai County Zoning Map



Kootenai County Zoning
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## Development Activities

While the Rathdrum Prairie is expected to experience continued development, all of the neighboring municipalities are experiencing growth as well, with traffic impacts currently being felt in the District. The Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization (KMPO) has developed an annual growth rate projection for all of Kootenai County and lists the projected annual growth rate for Post Falls Highway District at $0.217 \%$. The KMPO has also produced a Population Density Map to identify the density in Kootenai County as of 2016 (see KMPO population data in Appendix G). Though this may seem low, the projections for the surrounding municipalities indicate significantly higher growth, as listed below. Growth experienced in these neighboring jurisdictions are felt in the PFHD as motorists utilize the District's roadway system.

Post Falls Highway District - 0.21\% annual growth rate
City of Post Falls - 4.801\% annual growth rate
City of Rathdrum - 3.549\% annual growth rate
City of Hayden - 3.796\% annual growth rate
City of Coeur d'Alene - 2.499\% annual growth rate

There were several development activities identified with a potential to impact the District's roadway system.

Lancaster Road west of US-95 - Hayden North Village is a new development with nearly 300 residential high-density units and homes.

Pleasant View Road and Beck Road - Mining and Light Industrial growth.
Prairie Avenue and SH-41 - Residential growth impacts are expected to be evident at this major intersection located within the state system.

Hanley Road at Huetter - Future expansion of the residential area will extend Hanley Road to intersect with Huetter Road at Poleline Avenue.

SH-41 Corridor - Residential growth along the expanse of the SH-41 corridor, especially along Horsehaven Avenue.


Hayden North Village on Lancaster Road

## Projected Land Use

As growth occurs in the District, it is anticipated that growth will align with the Kootenai County Land Use Map as seen in Figure 4. The map presents a significant portion of the Rathdrum Prairie as incorporated either into the City of Post Falls, Rathdrum, Hayden, or City of Coeur d'Alene. The remainder of the Rathdrum Prairie is depicted as transitional, which is a category designation to reserve land for future annexation into incorporated areas. The District areas just south of the Spokane River are identified as suburban, which is in line with current conditions.

## Population Demographics

The current population data from the 2010 US Census is shown below with a twenty-year growth factor. The table shows the 2010 census population and the 1990 to 2010 population annual growth trend in Kootenai County unincorporated areas and urban areas.

Population Trend in Kootenai County


Though the growth trends for the unincorporated areas in the District are not as high as the urban areas, those urban areas utilize the District's roadway system and are increasing the volume of traffic that must be addressed by the District. The KMPO annual growth projections indicate the PFHD's jurisdictional population will increase to 11,082 by the year 2020, and to 11,448 by year 2035. In addition, the same projections indicate Kootenai County's population to increase to 178,280 by the year 2020, and to 273,566 by year 2035. Another factor to consider is these growth projections are based on 1990 to 2010 census data, and do not take in to account the current growth expansion Kootenai County is experiencing now. At the start of 2018, the City of Post Falls was planning for an annual 5\% increase in population growth for the coming years.

## Age and Income Demographics

The Census data from 1990 to 2010 provided the historic and current age demographics for Kootenai County. The data shows the median age for Kootenai County residents has risen from a median age of 35 in 1990, to 36.1 in 2000, and 38.5 in 2010, compared to the State of Idaho at 31.5, 33.2 and 34.6 for the same respective years.

The Census and the US Department of Health and Human Services data estimated the median household income in Kootenai County at $\$ 49,151$ in 2010, compared to the State of Idaho median household income at $\$ 47,015$. This same data provided an estimate of $12.8 \%$ of persons living below poverty in Kootenai County, compared to $15.1 \%$ of persons living below poverty in the State of Idaho.

## Summary of Population and Traffic Forecasts

While the future population growth of the District is estimated to increase at an annual rate of 0.217\%, the KMPO projected the annual growth rate of Kootenai County between now and 2035 will average $2.4 \%$, and the urban areas within Kootenai County will grow at an annual growth rate of $3.253 \%$, or higher based on current growth trends. These growth percentages help forecast traffic volumes and determine design life of transportation infrastructure improvements. When looking at these percentages and converting them to population numbers, the annual growth trend indicates that the District will add 604 to their population, the urban areas surrounding the District will add 132,408 population, and Kootenai County will add 135,072 to its population by the year 2035.


Figure 4 - Kootenai County Comp Plan Designation in PFHD

## Existing Conditions and Future Plans

In the development of the PFHD Transportation Plan, existing published transportation plans from neighboring jurisdictions were gathered and reviewed. By taking into consideration the transportation infrastructure improvements of neighboring jurisdictions, the PFHD Capital Improvement Plan was designed to coincide and link with outside projects when possible and feasible. Regional Plans collected in this effort include:

Kootenai County Comprehensive Plan<br>Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization<br>Transportation Plan<br>SH-41 Corridor Master Plan<br>Huetter Corridor Study<br>City of Hayden Transportation Strategic Plan Update<br>Lakes Highway District Transportation Plan<br>City of Coeur d'Alene Comprehensive Plan<br>City of Post Falls Transportation Plan<br>Worley Highway District Transportation Plan

The PFHD is a member of the Kootenai County Area Transportation Team (KCATT) which meets monthly at ITD with other local highway districts and municipalities to discuss and coordinate local projects. The PFHD will continue to coordinate and follow the improvements being made by ITD and other neighboring jurisdictions.

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) has two significant improvements that could impact the PFHD roadway system, and spur improvements within the Highway District. The first ITD project is the improvements planned for $\mathrm{SH}-41$. This is a state highway, with intersecting streets from Prairie Avenue to Lancaster Road belonging to PFHD. The improvements include widening the highway to a four-lane highway, installing intersection improvements, improving stormwater facilities and adding a separated bicycle and pedestrian path. The PFHD will continue to monitor these improvements closely and will plan for improvements as necessary to their adjoining streets.

The second ITD project is the planned improvements to SH-53 from the Washington State line to west of Rathdrum. This development is in the preliminary phase and is anticipated to provide a center turn lane and right turn bays, as well as illumination at intersections. Though SH-53 is a State Highway, many of the intersections are PFHD local roads. The PFHD will continue coordination with the Idaho Transportation Department to plan for improvements within the PFHD that adjoin SH-53.

## Roadway Network Functional Classifications Review

The District, KMPO, in coordination with the Kootenai County Area Transportation Team (KCATT) members, collaboratively updated the Urban and Rural Federal Functional Classification Maps for Kootenai County. The most current update was performed in 2013, with recommended changes
approved by the KMPO Board in December of 2013, and approval by Federal Highways Administration (FHWA) in 2014 (see Appendix H).

During the course of the Transportation Plan development, the functional classifications in the PFHD jurisdiction were reviewed to determine if any road classifications could have changed. After thorough review, it was determined no changes have occurred since FHWA approval in 2014. There was one minor correction that should be brought to the KMPO's attention, the Huetter Bypass Corridor has a line type indicating it is an existing Other Principal Arterial, when it is should be marked as a future Other Principal Arterial. The KMPO Rural and Urban Federal Functional Classification Maps are attached in Appendix H. A PFHD jurisdictional map with the ITD Roadway Classifications is shown on the next page.

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT 2018 Transportation Plan ITD Functional Classification Map



Figure 5 - Post Falls Highway District Functional Classification Map

The FHWA defines each functional classification for both rural and urban, with the Associated Highway Districts guidelines for each functional classification as follows:

| Urban <br> Federal Functional Classification | FHWA Definition |
| :---: | :---: |
| Urban Other Principal Arterial | Serve major activity centers, highest traffic volume corridors and longest trip demands <br> Carry high proportion of total urban travel on minimum of mileage <br> Interconnect and provide continuity for major rural corridors to accommodate trips entering and leaving urban area and movements through the urban area <br> Serve demand for intra-area travel between the central business district and outlying residential areas |
| Urban Minor Arterial | Interconnect and augment the higher-level arterials <br> Serve trips of moderate length at a somewhat lower level of travel mobility than Principal Arterials <br> Distribute traffic to smaller geographic areas than those served by higher-level arterials <br> Provide more land access than Principal Arterials without penetrating identifiable neighborhoods <br> Provide urban connections for Rural Collectors |
| Urban Major Collector | Serve both land access and traffic circulation in higher density residential, and commercial/industrial areas <br> Penetrate residential neighborhoods, often for significant distances <br> Distribute and channel trips between Local Roads and Arterials, usually over a distance of greater than three-quarters of a mile <br> Operating characteristics include higher speeds and more signalized intersections |
| Urban Minor Collector | Serve both land access and traffic circulation in lower density residential and commercial/industrial areas <br> Penetrate residential neighborhoods, often only for a short distance <br> Distribute and channel trips between Local Roads and Arterials, usually over a distance of less than three-quarters of a mile <br> Operating characteristics include lower speeds and fewer signalized intersections |

\(\left.$$
\begin{array}{|l|l|}\hline \text { Rural } \\
\text { Federal Functional Classification } & \text { FHWA Definition } \\
\hline \text { Rural Other Principal Arterial } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Serve corridor movements having trip length and travel density } \\
\text { characteristics indicative of substantial statewide or interstate } \\
\text { travel } \\
\text { Connect all or nearly all Urbanized Areas and a large majority of } \\
\text { Urban Clusters with 25,000 and over population }\end{array} \\
\hline \text { Rural Minor Arterial } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Provide an integrated network of continuous routes without } \\
\text { stub connections (dead ends) }\end{array} \\
\hline \text { Rural Minor Collector } & \begin{array}{l}\text { Link cities and larger towns (and other major destinations such } \\
\text { as resorts capable of attracting travel over long distances) and } \\
\text { form an integrated network providing interstate and inter- } \\
\text { county service }\end{array}
$$ <br>
Rural Major Collector <br>
Be spaced at intervals, consistent with population density, so <br>
that all developed areas within the State are within a <br>

reasonable distance of an Arterial roadway\end{array}\right\}\)| Provide service to corridors with trip lengths and travel density |
| :--- |
| greater than those served by Rural Collectors and Local Roads |
| and with relatively high travel speeds and minimum interference |
| to through movements |

## Traffic Safety Concerns

A review of the LHTAC Local Road Crash Data Map identified key crash locations, or hot spots. Also taken into consideration was public comments concerning areas with safety concerns to the public. The area with the most focus was Prairie Avenue. Of the top ten crash locations in PFHD, seven of them are intersections along Prairie Avenue. The LHTAC Local Road Crash Data Map is shown below with Prairie Avenue highlighted in yellow.


Prairie Avenue Crash Locations - LHTAC Interactive Crash Map
Of the seven Prairie Avenue intersections, three experienced recent intersections improvement completed by PFHD. The Huetter Road and Meyer Road intersections recently were converted from two-way stop to signalized intersections. The McGuire Road intersection was converted from a two-way stop to a roundabout. Two of the intersections will soon be converted to roundabouts, with the PrairieChase Roundabout construction in 2018 and Prairie-Pleasant View roundabout in design and scheduled for construction in 2020. The remaining two intersection hotspots on Prairie Avenue at both Idaho Road and Greensferry Road are currently two way stops and are in the CIP for conversion to a signalized intersection. Greensferry Road intersection is currently in preliminary design, and Idaho Road was listed as an approved project for LHSIP funding in 2021.

The other three projects in the top ten crash locations are Huetter Road at Seltice Way, Wellesley Road at Seltice Way, and Pleasant View Road at Seltice Way. The Huetter Road and Seltice Way Intersection was recently converted from a two way stop to a signalized intersection in late 2016. Twenty-three of the twenty-four accidents listed on the LHTAC crash map for this intersection occurred prior to the signalization upgrade. As future crash data is populated into the LHTAC crash map, it will be evident whether greater intersection safety has been achieved. The Wellesley Avenue and Seltice Way intersection logged 15 accidents between 2011 and 2014. There have been no accidents at this intersection since October of 2014 when safety improvements to this intersection were made by the District and Spokane County. The Pleasant View and Seltice Way signalized intersection has logged twenty-three accidents between 2011 and 2016. PFHD will look at any safety improvements that may be warranted at this intersection.

## Inter-Mode Transportation Facilities Inventory

Through coordination with KMPO and the Kootenai County Transit, a review was performed of the intermodal facilities within the PFHD. These include:

## Transit

Kootenai County Transit operates three bus routes in the Kootenai County Metropolitan Area. Currently, the "B-Route" is the only route which operates within the PFHD jurisdiction (see Figure 6-Kootenai County Transit "B-Route"). The "B-Route" traverses into PFHD along Seltice Way with one stop within the District at Huetter Road. The Kootenai County Transit B-Route map can be found online at www.kcgov.us/departments/transit/transitpdfs/BRoute2.pdf.

During the development of the Transportation Plan, PFHD coordinated with Kootenai County Transit to explore ways to assist with transit facilities. Kootenai County Transit expressed the desire for stakeholder involvement during the design process of road improvements, to expand or improve their transit stops. Further discussion concerning design of transit stops, roundabout pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and providing for snow storage during design indicated a need to include Kootenai County Transit in future preliminary design planning.

## Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

The Bicycle and Pedestrian community was contacted during the development of the Transportation Plan. The Technical Advisory Committee included Mike Fuller, a member of the Coeur d'Alene Ped \& Bike Advisory Committee. Through the Stakeholder Questionnaires and the Public Open Houses, comments were solicited and received concerning the addition of bike and pedestrian facilities.

The Kootenai Metropolitan Planning Organization inventoried and created a map of "Non-Motorized Pathways - Rural, Kootenai County". The map was first published in the 2010 KMPO "Kootenai County Metropolitan Transportation Plan". In 2017, the map was updated and provided to PFHD for use in developing their Transportation Plan. The map shows the existing and future shared roadways in PFHD along Prairie Avenue, Riverview Drive, McGuire Road, and in proximity to the City of Hauser (see Figure 7 - Non-Motorized Pathways - Rural Kootenai County). The PFHD jurisdiction does include bike and pedestrian facilities wherever feasible and utilized. There are bike lanes and sidewalks along the improved sections of Prairie Avenue, and sections of Seltice Way. The original KMPO "Non-Motorized Pathways - Rural Kootenai County" can be found online at www.kmpo.net. The updated map shown as Figure 7 has not been published yet.

Based on the response from the community, the PFHD added two projects to the Capital Improvement Plan. One of the two projects is the Huetter Road Bikeway, which is a proposed bike path connecting the Prairie Path to the Prairie Avenue bike lanes along the east side of Huetter Road. The second project is the Seltice Way Connection to the Centennial Trail at Huetter Road.


Figure 6 - Kootenai County Transit "B-Route" Map
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## Airport Facilities

The Coeur d'Alene Airport (COE) borders the PFHD jurisdiction along Huetter Road to the east. The airport provides primarily freight and private transport. The airport is administered by an Airport Board appointed by the Kootenai County Commissioners. As the airport expands its operations to include commercial flights, increased traffic volumes could occur in the PFHD roadway system.

The PFHD continues to coordinate with the Coeur d'Alene Airport concerning their Master Plan and any impacts the airports growth could have on the PFHD roadway system. The Director of the Coeur d'Alene Airport was included on the Technical Advisory Committee to provide feedback specific to the airport concerning the PFHD Capital Improvement Plan development.

## Freight \& Truck

The PFHD jurisdiction contains agriculture, mining, and light industrial zones which generate truck traffic. In addition, I-90 and SH-53 both transect the PFHD jurisdiction, typically routing trucks along Pleasant View Road. Many of the roads in the District have weight limits posted starting in midwinter restricting trucks with heavy loads from utilizing these roads. Load limits are usually lifted in the spring, with timing depending on the weather and road conditions. The PFHD does have allweather roads that are not subject to load limits in the winter. These include Pleasant View Road and Prairie Avenue, which both experience truck traffic.

Rail
There are Union Pacific Railroad (UPRR) lines and Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad (BNSF) lines that cross the PFHD jurisdiction. These rail lines typically transport goods.

There are four main track BNSF crossings and seven BNSF Spur crossings. Of the four main track crossings, Greensferry Road was improved to a grade separated crossing, and Pleasant View, McGuire Road, and Prairie Avenue have flashing lights and gates. Pleasant View Road is anticipated to be improved to a grade separated crossing in the near future. When the Pleasant View grade separated improvement is constructed, the intent is to close the railroad crossings at Prairie Avenue and McGuire Road.

There are ten main track UPRR crossings and two UPRR Spur crossings. Most of the main track crossings have flashing lights and gates. There are two UPRR Spur crossings on Prairie Avenue and Meyer Road. Both crossings are planned to be decommissioned in the near future.

The following table lists all the crossings within the PFHD jurisdiction, the crossing treatments, and any planned improvements.

## Post Falls Highway District Railroad Crossings

| Intersecting Road | Railroad | Existing Infrastructure | Planned <br> Improvements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Prairie Avenue | BNSF | Flashing Lights \& Gates | To be closed when Pleasant View Grade Seperation is Constructed |
| Pleasant View Road | BNSF | Flashing Lights \& Gates | Grade Seperated to be Constructed |
| McGuire Road | BNSF | Flashing Lights \& Gates | To be closed when Pleasant View Grade Seperation is Constructed |
| Greensferry Road | BNSF | Grade Separated Crossing |  |
| Prairie Avenue | BNSF Spur | Railroad Crossing Sign |  |
| Pleasant View Road | BNSF Spur | Flashing Lights \& Gates |  |
| N. Corbin Road | BNSF Spur | Railroad Crossing Sign |  |
| W. Grange Avenue | BNSF Spur | Railroad Crossing Sign \& Stop Sign |  |
| McGuire Road | BNSF Spur | Flashing Lights \& Gates |  |
| Seeley Street | BNSF Spur | Railroad Crossing Sign |  |
| Huetter Road | BNSF Spur | Railroad Crossing Sign |  |
| Beck Road | UPRR | Flashing Lights \& Gates |  |
| Pleasant View Road | UPRR | Flashing Lights \& Gates |  |
| N. Corbin Road | UPRR | Railroad Crossing Sign \& Stop Sign |  |
| Prairie Avenue | UPRR | Flashing Lights \& Gates |  |
| Idaho Road | UPRR | Railroad Crossing \& Stop Sign |  |
| Greensferry Road | UPRR | Flashing Lights \& \& Gates |  |
| Hayden Avenue | UPRR | Flashing Lights \& Gates |  |
| Wyoming Avenue | UPRR | Railroad Crossing Signs \& Yield Signs |  |
| Meyer Road | UPRR | Flashing Lights \& Gates |  |
| Huetter Road | UPRR | Railroad Crossing \& Flashing Stop Sign |  |
| Prairie Avenue | UPRR Spur | Railroad Crossing Sign | Crossing to be Decommissioned |
| Meyer Road | UPRR Spur | Railroad Crossing Sign | Crossing to be Decommissioned |

## PFHD Map

The PFHD Map was reviewed and updated with current improvements, city boundaries, and annexations. A copy of the PFHD Map is included in Appendix J.

## Pavement, Bridge, \& Sign Management Strategies

The PFHD utilizes the IWORQ program as part of its pavement management system. The IWORQ program is a global information system (GIS) format map and data system that identifies the roadways, culverts, and signs within the Highway District jurisdiction. Though the Highway District has been entering road, culvert, and sign data, it can utilize the management component of the program even further to assist in developing the Capital Improvement Plan.

The goal of utilizing the IWORQ program is to have available a program that can identify remaining service life and pavement condition information that would be instrumental in programming roadway improvements that meet the goals of the Highway District and the budgets available. The Highway District currently has a regular scheduled program of road maintenance such as crack sealing, chip seals, overlays, and inlays that is scheduled by visual assessment and knowledge of historic road maintenance cycles. The IWORQ program can assist in developing a District-wide scheduling program for anticipating yearly work, whether it is road maintenance, culvert cleaning, or sign inspections, that can meet the growing needs of an expanding Highway District.

The objective of creating and maintaining a reliable Pavement Management System, is to input roadway conditions through regular scheduled pavement condition inspections. It is recommended that roads within the Highway District be inspected at least every three years for pavement conditions to look for signs of wear, fatigue, longitudinal or transverse cracking, patching, and raveling. It is also important to maintain accurate records of roadway improvements. Any improvements should be immediately entered to the program. Annual reports can be run through the program, such as Remaining Service Life, Treatment History, Rating History, with customizable inputs, to develop a yearly review. The IWORQ program can provide systematic recommendations of roads to consider programming into the Capital Improvement Plan based on the data collected and input to the program. The IWORQ program would supplement the knowledge of the Road Supervisor for roads requiring maintenance or full construction. An example of road data sheet with pavement assessment is shown below:

Pavement Information


View Map

Current Rating Information

| Date | 3/2/2015 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FATIGUE | 8:HIGH SEVERITY-MED EXTENT | $\checkmark$ |
| LONGITUDINAL | 2:LOW SEVERIT Y-MED EXTENT | $\checkmark$ |
| PATCHING | 0:NONE | $\checkmark$ |
| TRANSVERSE | 4:MED SEVERITY-LOWEXTENT | $\checkmark$ |
| EDGE | 2:LOW SEVERITY-MED EXTENT | $\checkmark$ |
| BLOCK | 0:NONE | $\checkmark$ |

Pavement Condition
Date 3/2/2015
RSL 2
Recommended Treatment THICK OVERLAY

Treatment History

Uploaded Files
Date

Figure 8 - IWORQ Pavement Management Data Sheet

The culvert component of the IWORQ program lists the culverts within the Highway District. There are 555 culverts throughout the jurisdiction. The size, material, and conditions of the culverts can be input, with latitude and longitude, and any photos or comments concerning inspection conditions. The IWORQ program will allow a culvert maintenance program to be scheduled to ensure inspections and maintenance are performed on all the culverts in a systemic fashion. The program can break up the request input fields by numerous components, to narrow down a maintenance program specific for the Highway District. A Culvert input page from the IWORQ program is shown below:


Figure 9 - IWORQ Culvert Management Data Sheet

The sign component of the IWORQ program lists the road signs installed within the Highway District. The signs retroreflectivity should be inspected on a regular basis, in order to replace signs reaching minimum retroreflectivity. There are several methods for inspection, with LHTAC recently providing to local jurisdictions retroreflectivity comparison panels to aid in visual inspections. By consistent inspection and replacement, the Highway District can manage their sign inventory through the IWORQ program. An example of the sign data input page from the IWORQ program is shown below:


Figure 10 - IWORQ Sign Management Data Sheet

## Capital Improvement Plan

The PFHD has an existing Capital Improvement Plan that incorporates road improvement projects, intersection improvements, capacity improvements, safety improvements, and maintenance projects.

The Capital Improvement Plan developed through this Transportation Plan was planned, modified, and vetted through a series of technical and community input. It began with the Stakeholder Interviews and proceeded with Technical Advisory Committee discussion concerning areas of concern. Input was gathered from the public at the Open House events and considered when developing the Capital Improvement Plan project list. The Technical Advisory Committee developed and refined the project evaluation criteria, and independently ranked the projects within the Capital Improvement Plan Project Ranking Matrix. The Matrix and Draft Capital Improvement Plan was presented to the public at the second Open House. Comments were gathered concerning the ranking and proposed project scheduling.

## Summary of CIP Goals \& Objectives

The Capital Improvement Plan provides a five-year forecast of upcoming needs to budget for and pursue potential funding sources. The goals of the Capital Improvement Plan were developed to include the following objectives:

```
Safety Improvements
Transportation Needs and Capacity
Economic Vitality
Maintenance Improvements
Public Support
Ties to adjacent projects
Project Costs
Right-of-Way Needs
```

In addition, long range planning for projects of greater effort, significance, and funding, such as the potential reconstruction of the Greensferry Bridge, can be tracked and even broken into phases on the five-year Capital Improvement Plan to ensure budget and progress are accounted for.

## Recommended CIP Projects

The projects recommended in the 2018-2022 Capital Improvement Plan is shown below in Figure 11 Post Falls Highway District Capital Improvements Plan (CIP). The plan identifies the project with a short description, the anticipated year of construction, the type of Capital Improvement (road improvement, intersection improvement, bridge/culvert, safety improvement, bike/pedestrian improvement, or maintenance - bituminous surface treatment), CIP Value, Potential Funding Source, Approved Funding Source, and design year. Below find Figure 12 - PFHD Project Map identifying CIP project locations.

| POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN 2018-2022 (Draft) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anticipated Year of Construction | Project | Type of Capital Improvement | CIP Value | Potential Funding Source | Approved Funding Source | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Design } \\ & \text { Year } \end{aligned}$ |
| 2018 | Prairie Avenue \& Chase Road (roundabout) | Intersection Improvements | \$1,000,000 |  | Strategic Initiative Grant | 2017 |
| 2018 | Huetter Road <br> (Mullan to Prairie, widen shoulders \& structural overlay) | Road Improvements | \$400,000 |  | DA, HB312, PFHD | 2017 |
| 2018 | Hauser Lake Road (replace culvert west of Ragged Ridge Road) | Bridges/Culverts | \$30,000 |  | PFHD | 2017 |
| 2018 | Winch Avenue - Church to N. Chase (ADT - 84 Length - 3464') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$40,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2018 | Schilling Loop - Eastside, Riverview to Coyote (ADT - 195, Length - 2709') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$32,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2019 | Riverview Drive (guardrail installation) | Safety Improvements | \$450,000 |  | LHSIP | 2017 |
| 2019 | Riverview Drive at Skalen Creek (widening and guardrails) | Safety Improvements | \$1,000,000 |  | STP Rural | 2017 |
| 2019 | Hauser Lake Road Culvert sizing/elevate roadway) | Road Improvements | \$150,000 |  | HB312-PFHD | 2018 |
| 2019 | Prairie Avenue <br> (SH-41 to Greensferry, CRABS \& overlay) | Road Improvements | \$400,000 | HB312- PFHD | PFHD | 2019 |
| 2019 | Wyoming Avenue <br> (Meyer Rd to Huetter rebuild to gravel standards) | Road Improvements | \$100,000 | PFHD |  | 2017 |
| 2019 | Schilling Loop - Coyote to Comet (ADT - 189 Length - 4179) | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$50,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2020 | Spoakne St Bridge Rehab | Bridges/Culverts | \$590,000 |  | STP Bridge | 2017 |
| 2020 | Pleasant View \& Prairie Avenue (roundabout) | Intersection Improvements | \$1,200,000 | LHSIP | LHSIP | 2018 |
| 2020 | Prairie Avenue \& Greensferry Road (signalization) | Intersection Improvements | \$600,000 |  | HE312, PFHD | 2019 |
| 2020 | Seltice Way <br> (Seeley St to Huetter Overlay) | Road Improvements | \$450,000 | HB312, PFHD |  | 2020 |
| 2020 | S. Stateline Rd-End of oil to bottom of hill (ADT-158 Length $4280^{\prime}$ ) | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$50,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2021 | Prairie Avenue \& Idaho Street | Intersection Improvements | \$990,000 |  | LHSIP | 2020 |
| 2021 | Riverview Drive (Curve Realignment at St. Dominics) | Road Improvements | \$500,000 |  | DA - PFHD | 2021 |
| 2021 | Riverview Drive <br> (safety improvements) | Safety Improvements | \$450,000 | HB312, PFHD |  | 2017 |
| 2021 | Millsap Loop - Holland Rd to the elk pens (ADT - 104 Length - 3400') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$40,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2022 | Beck Road, Seltice Way to Prairie Avenue (widen shoulders \& structural overlay) | Road Improvements | \$2,500,000 |  | STP Rural | 2017 |
| 2022 | Millsap Loop <br> (Big Rock Road rebuild to intersection \& hill) | Road Improvements | \$50,000 |  | PFHD | 2021 |
| 2022 | Millsap Loop - Elk pens to Deer Ridge (ADT-104 Length - 5787') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$68,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2023 | Hayden Avenue \& Meyer Road (intersection improvements) | Intersection Improvements | \$1,200,000 | STP, PFHD |  | 2019 |
|  | Prairie Avenue <br> (Five Lanes from Meyer to $\mathrm{SH}-41$ ) | Road Improvements | \$4,200,000 | STP/HB312, PFHD |  |  |
|  | Riverview Drive Extension (Foothills to Fairmont Loop) | Road Improvements | NR | Development, STP, HB312, PFHD |  |  |
|  | Upriver Drive <br> (Realignment at Jacobs Loop) | Road Improvements | \$75,000 | PFHD |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\partial} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{4} \end{aligned}$ | Riverview Drive (intersection improvements at Idaho Road) | Intersection Improvements | \$500,000 | PFHD |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\omega} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{5} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Pleasant View \& SH-53 (grade seperated intersection) | Intersection Improvements | \$2,000,000 | Tiger Grant |  |  |
|  | Riverview Drive \& Harbor Drive (intersection improvements) | Intersection Improvements | \$150,000 | PFHD |  |  |
|  | Huetter Road Bikeway <br> (connect the Prairie Path to the Prairie Avenue bike lanes) | Bike/Pedestrian | \$200,000 | Children Pedestrian Satety-TAP Grant |  |  |
|  | Seltice Way Connection to the Centennial Trail (connect the Seltice Shared Use Path to the Centennial Trail) | Bike/Pedestrian | \$50,000 | Children Pedestrian Safety-TAP Grant |  |  |
|  | Greensferry Bridge | Bridges/Culverts | \$16,000,000 |  |  |  |
|  | tal CIP Infrastructure Improvements |  | 35,515,000 |  |  |  |



Figure 12 - Post Falls Highway District CIP Projects Map

## Grant \& Funding Sources

## Implementation Action List

Successful implementation of this Transportation Plan will require the Capital Improvement Plan to be updated on an annual basis. Potential projects should be re-prioritized with the ranking categories in the CIP Projects Ranking Matrix. Post Falls Highway District should seek funding opportunities yearly to advance projects that meet criteria within grant and funding opportunities. The PFHD should consider the following recommendations in continuing implementation:

## Annual Review of Upcoming Grant and Funding Opportunities

The District should review upcoming projects in their CIP to determine the criteria of annual funding opportunities and which projects best fit the requirements. Crash data, estimated costs, right-ofway needs, and capacity criteria should all be reviewed as potential key data that may qualify a project for funding wins. Local agencies provide annual workshops to educate applicants in developing competitive submittals to various funding opportunities. Attendance at these training opportunities are highly suggested in they will typically share key components to successful submittal packages.

## T-2 Road Maintenance Training

Maintaining staff that are current in their road maintenance and road safety training will typically yield a higher score on funding applications. LHTAC has a Training and Technical Assistance (T2) program available to Highway Districts for training their staff.

## Coordination with Neighboring Jurisdictions and KMPO

Active participation in the KMPO organization and neighboring jurisdictions, provides opportunities to advance projects based on needs of the community and coordination with adjacent projects. KMPO has knowledge and access to project funding opportunities sometimes unique to their organization. Active membership in a multi-jurisdictional transportation group produces higher scores on funding opportunities, as well as project support from the local community. It is recommended PFHD continue their involvement in the Transportation Community and KMPO membership.
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## Appendix A

Stakeholder Questionnaires


## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT STAKEHOLDER QUESTIONNAIRE SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

| Stakeholders Contacted | Response <br> Received | Primary Concerns |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Kootenai County Sherriff's Department | x | Congestion, Railroad Crossing Safety |
| N. Idaho Centennial Trail Foundation |  |  |
| Kootenai County Airport Manager | X | Congestion, Truck traffic, Airport access |
| Coeur d' Alene School District | x | Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes |
| Post Falls School District |  | Bicycle and Pedestrian Routes, Communication with <br> School District during inclement weather |
| Lakeland School District |  |  |
| Kootenai County Community Development |  |  |
| KMPO |  | x |
| Kootenai Solid Waste | x | Maintenance, Congestion, and Railroad Crossing Safety |
| ITD |  | More transit facilities |
| Kootenai County Fire \& Rescue |  |  |
| Kootenai County Transit |  | Xafety, Bicycle \& Pedestrian Facilities, developing <br> Complete Streets Concept |
| City of Post Falls |  |  |
| City of Rathdrum |  |  |
| City of Hayden |  |  |
| City of Coeur d'Alene |  |  |

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717

## Stakeholder Questionnaire

| Stakeholder Name: | CHRIS BOSLEY |  |  | Date: | 3/22/2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization / Position: | City of Coeur d'alene / City Engineer |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: (208)769-2216 | Fax: | (208)769-284 | Email: | cbos | CDAID.ORG |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination) Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $y$ | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | New roads or added capacity on roads |
| Improved safety |  |
|  | Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing |
|  | Improved road signage |
|  | Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities |
|  | Truck routing \& access |

3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improv ing roadway reliability
Improv ing the trucking netw ork
Protecting / enhancing the env ironment
4. What types of transportation improvements do you see as being most beneficial to the region's quality of life?

IMPLEMENTING A COMPLETE STREETS APPROACH TO ALL TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENTS. FILLING IN GAPS IN THE PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE NETWORK. IMPLEMENTING ROUNDABOUTS TO REDUCE CRASH SEVERITY AND REDUCE DELAY DURING OFF-PEAK HOURS.
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

## Providing bicycle connectivity to the Centennial Trail (through Post Falls) and the $\mathrm{SH}-41$ trail (present and future).

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

Prairie Ave appears to have a disproportionately high number of Type A injury and fatality crashes.

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community or organization?

THE POTENTIAL TRAFFIC IMPACT OF CONNECTING POLELINE AVE WITH HANLEY AVE. THE NEED TO CREATE A COMPLETE STREETS CORRIDOR WITH SELTICE WAY ONCE THE COEUR D'ALENE PORTION IS COMPLETED.
8. What other issues / factors do we need to take into consideration in the Transportation Plan?

IMPROVEMENT OR ELIMINATION OF AT-GRADE RAILROAD CROSSINGS.
9.

Do you have any ideas for goals \& objectives for the Transportation Plan?
INCREASED CONNECTIVITY FOR PEDESTRIAN AND BICYCLE TRAVEL.
10. What are your impressions of the bicycle \& pedestrian facilities within the PFHD jurisdiction?

MORE ON-STREET BIKE LANES, SHARED-USE PATHS, AND SIDEWALKS ARE NEEDED AND WOULD GREATLY IMPROVE CONNECTIVITY, ALLOWING THE COMMUNITY TO SHIFT MODE SHARE TOWARD NON-MOTORIZED TRANSPORTATION AND IMPROVING LIVABILITY FOR THE COMMUNITY.
11. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?
BIcycle facilities should be focused around providing connections to the Centennial Trail and future SH-4I Trail (the backbone of the system). Shared use paths and bike lanes should also PROVIDE ACCESS TO SCHOOLS AND PARKS. SIDEWALKS SHOULD BE INSTALLED WHERE GAFS IN THE EXISTING SIDEWALK SYSTEM EXIST.
12. Should shoulders on the roadw ays be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\checkmark$ No $\square$
13. What areas within the PFHD jurisdiction do you think are most likely to develop in the next 20 years?

THE AREA BETWEEN POST FALLS AND COEUR D'ALENE
14. Do you believe that new development and / or redev elopment activities will generate significant traffic congestion and parking problems within the PFHD jurisdiction? If so, where do you think these problem areas will be and what do you believe are potential solutions?

No

Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

## Stakeholder Questionnaire

| Stakeholder Name: | PHILLIP CUMMINGS |  |  | Date: | 4-10-17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization / Position: | COEUR D'ALENE AIRPORT \ OPERATION MGR. |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: 208-446-1860 | Fax | 208-446-1867 | Email: | PCUMM | cgor 15 |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ | Safety / Accidents

Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination) Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improv ing roadway reliability
Improv ing the trucking netw ork
Protecting / enhancing the env ironment
4. What types of transportation improvements do you see as being most beneficial to the region's quality of life?

```
CAPACITY AND TRUCKING NETWORK, THE INCREASE IN ALL TRAFFIC ON THE CURRENT
SYSTEM WHEN TAKING INTO VIEW THE PLANNED DEVELOPMENT UNDER WAY COMMERCIAL
ACCESS HAS NO CHOICE BUT TO MIX WITH LOCAL (RESIDENTIAL) TRAFFIC.
```

5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improv ements? Please be specific.

> pleasant view and highway 41 feed main north south, Hayden ave from McGuire rd. to atlas rd. and Lancaster from 41 to Huetter rd., I believe need some trucking consideration.
6.

Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
Pleasant view at prairie and hwy 53. Lancaster at hwy 41.
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community or organization?

EAST WEST ACCESS TO AIRPORT AND COMMERCIAL \INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT.
8.

What other issues / factors do we need to take into consideration in the Transportation Plan?
REGIONAL GROWTH COMMERCIAL\INDUSTRIAL AND RESIDENTIAL, THE HIGHWAY
DISTRICTS AND AIRPORT NEED TO PLAN TOGETHER FOR A MOBILE FUTURE
TRANSPORTING MORE PEOPLE AND GOODS WITH BETTER ACCESS.
9. Do you have any ideas for goals \& objectives for the Transportation Plan?

WE HOPE TO UNDERSTAND THE NORTH, SOUTH AND EAST, WEST FUTURE ACCESS PLANS FOR THE AIRPORT.
10.

What route improvements would be of greatest value to your organization?
HAYDEN AVE. EAST TO ATLAS RD. AND LANCASTER EAST TO HUETTER RD.

## Stakeholder Questionnaire

| Stakeholder Name: | Brian Wallace |  |  | Date: | 4/7/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization / Position: | CDA SCHOOL DISTRICT \#27I |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: 208-664-8241 | Fax: | 208-664-1748 | Email: | ALLACE | Schools.org |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good |
| :--- |
| Fair |
| Poor |
| $\checkmark$  <br> $\checkmark$  <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ <br> $\checkmark$  <br>   <br>  $\checkmark$ |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $\checkmark$ | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure New roads or added capacity on roads |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
| $\checkmark$ | Improved safety |
|  | Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing |
|  | Improved road signage |
| $\checkmark$ | Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities |
|  | Truck routing \& access |

3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improv ing the trucking netw ork
Protecting / enhancing the env ironment
4. What types of transportation improvements do you see as being most beneficial to the region's quality of life?

SAFE WALKING AND BIKE ROUTES, WELL MAINTAINED ROADS, TRAFFIC CONGESTION KEPT TO A MINIMUM.
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

Trees and shrubs at intersections can cause difficulty seeing.

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community or organization?

FROM A SCHOOL DISTRICT PERSPECTIVE, IT IS VERY IMPORTANT TO HAVE SAFE WALKING/BIKING ROUTES TO SCHOOLS AND SAFE TRAFFIC ZONES AROUND SCHOOLS
8.

What other issues / factors do we need to take into consideration in the Transportation Plan?

9.

Do you have any ideas for goals \& objectives for the Transportation Plan?

10. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction is difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
11. Do you think better road signage is needed? If so, where?
$\square$
12. What route improvements would be of greatest value to your organization?

13. What are your impressions of the bicycle \& pedestrian facilities within the PFHD jurisdiction?
$\square$
14. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

FAMILIES NEED SAFE OPTIONS AND CONNECTIVITY FOR THEIR CHILDREN TO GET TO AND FROM THEIR NEIGHBORHOOD SCHOOLS AND PARKS.
15. Should shoulders on the roadw ays be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?


## Stakeholder Questionnaire

| Stakeholder Name: | Warren Merritt |  |  | Date: | 3-21-17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization / Position: | KOOTENAI COUNTY FIRE \& RESCUE |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: 208-777-8500 | Fax: | 208-777-1569 | Email: | RENM@ | ENAIFIRE. |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good |
| :--- |
| Fair |
| Poor |
| $\checkmark$  <br> $\checkmark$  <br> $\checkmark$  <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ <br> $\checkmark$  <br> $\checkmark$  <br>   <br>   | Safety / Accidents

Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $\checkmark$ | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | New roads or added capacity on roads |
| $\checkmark$ | Improved safety |
|  | Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing |
|  | Improved road signage |
|  | Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities |
| $\checkmark$ | Truck routing \& access |

3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improv ing roadway reliability
Improv ing the trucking netw ork
Protecting / enhancing the env ironment
4. What types of transportation improvements do you see as being most beneficial to the region's quality of life?

AT BUSY INTERSECTIONS HAVING ADEQUATE SIGNALING AND PEDESTRIAN ACCOMMODATIONS AVAILABLE
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

Cougar Gulch area, Maintenance of Seltice Way,
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

Railroad Crossings; realize that the PFHD can't always fix these but more signals if there is an opportunity to impact the same is important.
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community or organization?

MAINTENANCE OF ROADS DO TO OUR HEAVY FIRE APPARATUS

What other issues / factors do we need to take into consideration in the Transportation Plan?
I. APPROPRIATE CURBING IN THE CONGESTED AREAS WHERE PEDESTRIANS ARE
2. SIGNALIZATION BASED ON NEED
9.

Do you have any ideas for goals \& objectives for the Transportation Plan?
I. OVERLAY PROGRAM ON ROADS WITH HIGH VOLUMES
2. CHIP SEAL ON LESS TRAVELED STREETS
10. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction is difficult to access? Please be specific.
I. NEED TO BE CAREFUL ALONG SELTICE WAY BETWEEN CEDAR AND ATLAS
11. Do you think better road signage is needed? If so, where?

PROBABLY OK
12. What route improvements would be of greatest value to your organization?

SELTICE WA, PRAIRIE AVE, PLEASANTVIEW (RAILROAD TRACKS)
13. What are your impressions of the bicycle \& pedestrian facilities within the PFHD jurisdiction?

I DON'T RIDE A BIKE AND THERE ARE AREAS WHERE BIKES DON'T BELONG - LACK OF A SHOULDER; RIVERVIEW BEING ONE OF THEM.
14. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

## ON STREETS THAT WOULD ACCESS THE CENTENNIAL TRAIL SYSTEM

SAY YES BUT ADD; NOT EVERY ROAD NEEDS BICYCLE ACCOMMODATION
15. Should shoulders on the roadw ays be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?


POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717

## Stakeholder Questionnaire

| Stakeholder Name: | JoE Jovick |  |  | Date: | 03/27/17 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization / Position: | KOOTENAI COUNTY Sheriff 's Office, Patrol Lieutenant |  |  |  |  |
| Phone: 208-446-2245 | Fax: | 208-446-1307 | Email: | JJo | kcgov.us |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>   <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ <br>  $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  |  | Safety / Accidents Peak hour traffic congestion

Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $\checkmark$ | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation inf |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ | New roads or added capacity on roads |
|  | Improved safety |
| $\checkmark$ | Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing |
|  | Improved road signage |
|  | Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities |
|  | Truck routing \& access |

3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improv ing the trucking netw ork
Protecting / enhancing the env ironment
4. What types of transportation improvements do you see as being most beneficial to the region's quality of life?

> Improvements at railroad crossing, to include a bypass near Hwy 53 and Stateline, much like the one near greensferry and Hwy 53 . Widening of Prairie Avenue from meyer Road to State line and development of frontage roadways along Highway $4 l$.
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improv ements? Please be specific.

## Prairie Avenue between Meyer Road and Highway 41, with improvements at the Hwy 41 and Prairie Avenue interchange.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

Although I believe most of Lancaster Road between Greensfery and Huetter Road is now in the City of Rathdrum, with 2 schools now on Lancaster and multiple housing developments occurring, this area is becoming a high traffic area and improvements are going to be needed. Meyer Road needs improved access at Highway 53 and possible improved traffic control devices to Hayden Avenue.

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community or organization?

Numerous crashes along Hayden, Meyer, Huetter and greensferry Roads. Also traffic hazards along beck road during events at State Line Raceway. Roadway needs to be widened and a better shoulder or walking path needs to be established for pedestrian traffic in the area.
8. What other issues / factors do we need to take into consideration in the Transportation Plan?

CONTINUED SPRAWL ACROSS THE PRAIRIE, WHICH WILL MAKE IT HARDER TO OBTAIN THE LANDS NEEDED TO CREATE IMPROVEMENTS, BY WIDENING OF ROADWAYS OR BUILDING OF TURN LANES OR TRAFFIC CIRCLES.
9. Do you have any ideas for goals \& objectives for the Transportation Plan?

WITH INCREASED TRAIN TAFFIC ON BOTH BNSF AND UNION PACFIC RAIL LINES, UNDERPASSES OR BRIDGES TO ASSIST WITH TRAFFIC FLOW IS NEEDED.
10. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction is difficult to access? Please be specific.

AT TIMES, TRAFFIC BECOMES SEVERELY BACKED UP AT PRAIRIE AVENUE AND HWY 53, ALONG WITH HEAVY TRAFFIC ALONG PRAIRIE AVENUE BETWEEN MEYER AND BECK, WHICH FOR THE MOST PART IS ALL STILL ONLY 2 LANES.
11. Do you think better road signage is needed? If so, where?

N/A
12. What route improvements would be of greatest value to your organization?

It was great seeing lights put in at Huetter and Seltice way and the improvements that have been made along Praire to Meyer Road, but with continue growth in the greater RATHDRUM AREA, CONTINUED IMPROVEMENTS, TO INCLUDE RAILROAD UNDER/OVER PASSES ARE NEEDED.
13. What are your impressions of the bicycle \& pedestrian facilities within the PFHD jurisdiction?

N/A
14. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

ALONG ABANDON RAILWAYS OR OTHER TRAIL SYSTEMS. I UNDERSTAND THERE SEEMS TO BE A BIG PUSH FOR "SHARING THE ROADWAYS" BUT LAW OF THE LUG NUTS SAYS THOSE WITH THE MOST LUG NUTS WINS, WHICH MEANS BICYCLISTS ALWAYS LOOSE IN VEHICLE VS. BICYCLIST CRASHES AND I BELIEVE IT SAFER FOR THEM TO be riding in cities or on trails, and not along rural roads with higher speeds.
15. Should shoulders on the roadw ays be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?


## Stakeholder Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good |
| :--- |
| Fair |
| Poor |
| $\checkmark$ |
| $\checkmark$ |
|  |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system I can't answer this as I would really like to expand transit in
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $y \checkmark$ | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | New roads or added capacity on roads |
|  | Improved safety |
|  | Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing |
|  | Improved road signage |
|  | Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities |
|  | Truck routing \& access |

3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improv ing roadway reliability
Improv ing the trucking netw ork
Protecting / enhancing the env ironment
4. What types of transportation improvements do you see as being most beneficial to the region's quality of life?

MORE INVESTMENT INTO PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION IN THE AREA
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community or organization?
8. What other issues / factors do we need to take into consideration in the Transportation Plan?
9. Do you have any ideas for goals \& objectives for the Transportation Plan?

10. Do you think better road signage is needed? If so, where?

11. What route improvements would be of greatest value to your organization?
12. What are your impressions of the bicycle \& pedestrian facilities within the PFHD jurisdiction?

13. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

14. Should shoulders on the roadw ays be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?


## Stakeholder Questionnaire

| Stakeholder Name: | POST FALLS SCHOOL DISTRICT |  |  | Date: APRIL 7, 2017 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Organization / Position: | SUPERINTENDENT |  |  |  |
| Phone: 773-1658 | Fax: | 773-3218 | Email: | JKEANE@SD273.com |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $y \checkmark$ | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure |
| :---: | :--- |
|  | New roads or added capacity on roads |
|  | Improved safety |
|  | Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing |
|  | Improved road signage |
|  | Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities |
|  | Truck routing \& access |

3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improv ing roadway reliability
Improv ing the trucking netw ork
Protecting / enhancing the env ironment
4. What types of transportation improvements do you see as being most beneficial to the region's quality of life?

ADDITIONAL BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ROUTES
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

It would be helpful that the hired officials would provide the district with more information regarding the timing and issues they are facing when their is inclement weather.
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community or organization?

OVERALL WE DO NOT HAVE CONCERNS. HOWEVER SEE ABOVE. THE COMMUNICATION WITH US IS VERY RESTRICTED.
8.

What other issues / factors do we need to take into consideration in the Transportation Plan?

Do you have any ideas for goals \& objectives for the Transportation Plan?
$\square$
10. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction is difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
11. Do you think better road signage is needed? If so, where?

SIGNAGE IS GOOD.
12. What route improvements would be of greatest value to your organization?

13. What are your impressions of the bicycle \& pedestrian facilities within the PFHD jurisdiction?

THEY ARE LIMITED.
14. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

CLOSE TO VARIOUS CONCENTRATION OF HOMES.
15. Should shoulders on the roadw ays be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?


## Appendix B

## Technical Advisory Committee Meeting \#1

| POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING \#1 SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION <br> August 17, 2017 |
| :---: |
| Safety Concerns |
| Highway 53 intersections <br> Railroad Crossings <br> Bus Stops <br> Riverview Drive - Bike Safety <br> Lancaster \& Huetter Intersection <br> Lancaster \& Meyer Intersection <br> Lancaster \& SH-41 Intersection <br> Huetter Bike Facility <br> Bike/ped on Seltice <br> Huetter Bypass <br> Pleasant View \& Prairie Intersection <br> Bike Connectivity throughout the District |
| Areas with Active or Expected Growth or Change |
| Lancaster - $70+90$ lots (could see another 100) <br> Pleasant View Road \& Beck Road <br> Atlas/Huetter/Lancaster <br> Hanley/Poleline @ Huetter <br> Prairie Avenue / SH-41 <br> SH-41 Corridor, especially Horsehaven |
| Strengths \& Areas for Improvement |
| Strengths <br> - Participation in Regional Growth \& Collaboration Efforts <br> -Active solving of Safety Concerns within the district <br> Areas for Improvement <br> Increase communication with residents <br> Send out mailers for areas with upcoming construction <br> KMPO has developed a website to update regional construction the District could link to <br> Media Outreach - Facebook, Twitter |
| Proposed Future Projects |
| Greensferry Bridge |

## Appendix C

## Open House \#1



## Post Falls Highway District

## Transportation Plan Open House

Post Falls Highway District is seeking public input on their Transportation Plan.

Please join us

Tuesday, September 26, 2017 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm

Post Falls Highway District Office 5629 E. Seltice Way


## Post Falls Highway District Summary of Public Open House \#1 Questionnaire

9/26/2017

1. How would y

| Good | Fair | Poor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | 10 | 1 | Safety / Accidents <br> Peak hour traffic congestion <br> Maintenance <br> Bicycle system <br> Walkability / Pedestrian systems <br> Truck traffic <br> Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal <br> timing / coordination) <br> Transit system |
| 5 | 12 | 5 |  |
| 12 | 8 | 2 |  |
| 2 | 11 | 9 |  |
| 3 | 9 | 11 |  |
| 7 | 13 | 2 |  |
| 9 | 10 | 2 |  |
| 3 | 5 | 8 |  |

2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| 17 | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure <br> 14 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 13 |  |
| 12 | Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing <br> Improved road signage |
| 1 | Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities <br> Truck routing \& access |
| 8 |  |

3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| 13 | Reducing fatalities / injuries |
| :--- | :--- |
| 8 | Maintaining current infrastructure <br> Reducing congestion |
| 11 | Improving roadway reliability |
| 9 | Improving the trucking network |
| 1 | Protecting / enhancing the environment |
| 2 |  |

One citizen wrote in support for multi-modal facilities

## 4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for

 bicyclists?| 17 | Nos | 2 | Yes, only if bicyclists are <br> required to use shoulders |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be <br> 5. specific.

- Beck Road is really narrow and you cannot pull off on the side of the road
- The higher traffic/main roads need more access to Hwy 53 from Hayden Ave
- Put in bridges either over or under railroad intersections
- Pleasant View
- Highway 41 \& Prairie, Mullan, \& Seltice
- $4^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Seltice - needs a light or roundabout
- Prairie Ave widening between Greensferry \& Meyer
- Intersection Improvements along Prairie
- Greensferry River Bridge
- Hwy 41 - Post Falls \& Rathdrum
- Gunning in Rathdrum needs turn lane to Gunning, too many accidents happen there
- Get traffic off of Prairie, crash \#'s are just a direct result of volume
- Signal timing, often it feels like the system is set up to stop people, rather than keep them moving. Very noticeable in situations of low traffic volumes.
- Hwy 41 - 4 lanes to Rathdrum
- Signal at Lancaster/Hwy 41
- Pleasant View \& 53; Prairie \& Pleasant View; surface condition between Chase \& Idaho on Prairie
- Spokane St and Prairie
- Improve Beck Road with heavy truck traffic in mind
- Traffic lights on Greensferry, Chase, Pleasant View, and no roundabouts
- Hwy 53 from State Line to McGuire, including Hauser junction area and Hauser Lake Rd, Beck/Prairie, Pleasant View
- We need an exit ramp to Huetter Road
- The infrastructure for the continued growth of the city
- Schilling Loop - needs paved, several areas along creek are deteriorating and dangerous, Centennial grading necessary with increased traffic. This is a growth area
- Poleline between Seltice \& Hayden
- Prairie between Seltice \& Hayden
- Railroad Crossings
- Intersections where truck traffic and passenger traffic meet
- Pleasant View/53
- Highway 41 \& Prairie, Mullan, \& Seltice
- $4^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Seltice - needs a light or roundabout
- Prairie Avenue
- Pleasant View - Poleline = stop light = not roundabout
- Chase = Prairie = stop light not roundabout
- The potential closure of the $\mathrm{SH}-53 /$ Prairie \& SH-53/McGuire RR crossings is a bad idea. The volume of funneling this would create is dramatic. Create an underpass at McGuire as well as extending Hayden to 53 \& add an additional underpass.
Create more flow to routes besides Prairie.
- Even though not identified as a Top 10 Crash Location, SH-53 and Pleasant View is a nightmare. I avoid it
- Prairie Avenue
- Prairie \& Pleasant View
- Hauser Lake Road pedestrians / speed
- Pleasant View at Prairie and at Hwy 53
- Prairie Ave use traffic signal
- Hwy 53 from State Line to McGuire, including Hauser junction area and Hauser Lake Rd, Beck/Prairie, Pleasant View, Lancaster \& 41
- Prairie Ave
- Corner of Schilling Loop ( $w$ ) and W Riverview - incoming traffic from Riverview will generally cut short and it would be good to have some form of channeling to keep traffic in lane

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

- Proper \& regular maintenance
- Designs need to address motorist/pedestrian safety \& reducing accidents
- Transit
- Bike/Ped
- Maintenance
- Traffic congestion at the intersections of Hwy41 \& Prairie, Mullan, \& Seltice, and $4^{\text {th }}$ Ave/Seltice
- Growing Congestion at major intersections reducing safety and impacting system efficiency
- Lack of sufficient shoulders for bikes and safe vehicle recovery of errant vehicles
- Need access roads to take away from congestion on Hwy 41 from Post Falls to Rathdrum
- As populations increase, traffic congestion increases with it. There needs to be some focus towards the development and increased opportunity for alternate means of travel. Encourage people to walk \& bike \& provide the infrastructure for that support.
- Would like the Greensferry Bridge! Need to create an alternative south of river other than Spokane St.
- Timing of lights
- Adequate budgeting for growing construction cost
- Encourage roundabouts at arterial intersections
- Add multi-modal facilities on arterials and collectors
- Prepare for future growth - streets and bike paths
- Turning onto Hwy 53 from Hauser Lake Road
- Providing "connectivity" in the I-90 corridor, i.e. access over/under I-90 in key locations, for example Treaty Rock, Seltice Crossing, @ Hwy 41, Spokane St
- Safety \& Growth
- Continued grading and proper snow removal
- Lack of promotion to grow \& use pedestrian/cyclist "trails" and/or shoulders connecting vital locations

8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

- South side of Spokane River to Greensferry area on north side of Spokane River
- The Riverview/South River area, with limited ways to cross the river
- Prairie/SH-41
- Prairie/Idaho
- Prairie/Spokane
- SH-41 \& $16^{\text {th }}$ needs a light for traffic - not a roundabout
- South of the river. The bridge project at Greensferry \& Pleasant View would result in great strides for emergency response as well as funneled traffic issues at Spokane St.
- Access more choices south of Spokane River, Greensferry Bridge, someday Pleasant View Bridge
- South Greensferry
- Properties south of Spokane river have limited access. Adding Greensferry Bridge would improve safety and reduce congestion on Spokane St
- Bridge at Pleasant View may be worth considering in long term plan
- None - just plan for future growth
- Hwy 41 between Mullan and Seltice is congested
- Rathdrum trying to cross back and forth over the tracks


## 9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD

 jurisdiction where would you place them?- Along the main/higher traffic roadways
- Prairie, Hayden, Huetter, Riverview, \& include bike/ped with Pleasant View/53 Crossing
- Prairie Avenue
- Seltice Way
- SH-41, Prairie Ave, Poleline Avenue, Greensferry, Riverview Drive
- Automobile traffic is more important and safety standards. A lot of people are not walking or riding bikes in the winter months
- Along identified commuter routes connecting neighborhoods to communities/transit facilities
- Along Hwy 41, along Seltice Way
- Prairie
- Prairie
- Collectors and up
- Near all schools
- Better connectivity around I-90 - local paths along rail easements
- More city cycling \& walking between parks. Don't need as many facilities for st mile cyclists, kids \& strollers
- Hard to cross Seltice in the Chase-Idaho section
- Seltice, broken sidewalks
- I wouldn't. This is creating a very dangerous situation.

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717

## Public Involvement Questionnaire

| Name: Sub Nonini Email: nonini.bobe gmail. Com |
| :--- |
| Address: 5875 W. Harber Drive, Cda., ID 83814 |
| Phone Number:208-6 $59.4643^{\text {Check box if you would like a response to your comments }} \square$ |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?


Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| 1 |
| :---: |
| 2 |
| 3 |
|  |
|  |
|  | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure

New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| $y$ | Reducing fatalities / injuries <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Maintaining current infrastructure <br> Reducing congestion <br> Improving roadway reliability <br> Improving the trucking network <br> Protecting / enhancing the environment |
| :---: | :--- |

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

## 5629 EAST SELTICE WAY

POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.
$\square$
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
proper of regular maintenance
8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
from Ser th side of Spokane River to Greenferry area on north side of spokane River
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire


1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| X |  |  | Safety / Accidents |
|  | X |  | Peak hour traffic congestion |
|  | ¢ |  | Maintenance |
|  | $\gamma$ |  | Bicycle system |
|  | $x$ |  | Walkability / Pedestrian systems |
|  | $\times$ |  | Truck traffic |
|  |  |  | Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination) |
|  |  | K | Transit system |

2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| 1 |
| :--- |
| 3 |
| 2 |
| 2 |
|  |
|  | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure

New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| 3 | Reducing fatalities / injuries |
| :---: | :--- |
| 1 | Maintaining current infrastructure |
| 2 | Reducing congestion |
|  | Improving roadway reliability |
|  | Improving the trucking network <br> Protecting / enhancing the environment |

Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Beck Red really narrow road } \\
& \text { anat pull oFF in the side of the road }
\end{aligned}
$$

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
$\square$
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire


1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

Good Fair \begin{tabular}{l}
Poor <br>

| $X$ |  |  |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $X$ |  |
| $X$ |  |  |
|  | $X$ |  |
|  |  | $X$ |
|  | $\searrow$ |  |
|  | $X$ |  |
|  |  | $X$ |

\end{tabular}

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

|  |  |  | Reducing fatalities / injuries |
| :---: | :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  | Maintaining current infrastructure |  |  |
|  | Reducing congestion |  |  |
|  | Improving roadway reliability |  |  |
|  | Improving the trucking network |  |  |
| Protecting / enhancing the environment |  |  |  |

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.
$\square$
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854

## Public Involvement Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\sim$ |  |
|  | $\nu$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  | $\sim$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\sim$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

|  |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
| 2 |
| 2 |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

|  |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

# POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT 

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?
$\square$
Yes No
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

```
ThEE HKCNETZ TRAFFKC/MANN ROADS
```



```
PUT in BRRIDGES ETHER OVEX ON UNDER
EALLROATS interned IONS.
```

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
DESIGN NEED TO ADDRESS MOTURIST/PED.
SAEETY स REDGCINC AECIDENTS
8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?
Alone to MAIN WlGAER TIRAFFIN
RoAn uses.

Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire


1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | - |  |
| < |  |  |
| < |  |  |
|  | \% |  |
|  | / |  |
| - |  |  |
| - |  |  |
|  | / |  | Safety / Accidents

Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY

## POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854

4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?


POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT<br>5629 EAST SELTICE WAY<br>POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854<br>208-765-3717

## Public Involvement Questionnaire

| Name: Diane Fountain in $\quad$ Email: |
| :--- |
| Address: 4218 N . Ceres St $\quad \mathrm{Cd} \mathrm{A}$ |
| Phone Number:208 $-651-4723$ Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$ |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?


Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion - Prairie Ave
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (ie. traffic signal timing / coordination) except on Hwy 41
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $x$ |
| :--- |
| $x$ |
| $x$ |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| $y$ | Reducing fatalities / injuries <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> Maintaining current infrastructure <br> Improving roadway reliability <br> Improving the trucking network <br> Protecting / enhancing the environment |
| :--- | :--- |

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes


No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

The above intersections
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

Traffic congestion@ the intersections in $=5$.
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?
Prairie Ave
Seltice way

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717

## Public Involvement Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?


Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (ie. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

|  |
| :--- |
|  |
| $\square$ |
|  |
|  | Reducing fatalities / injuries

Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists? Yes
 No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific. * Praise Ave widening between Greensferry and Meyer

* Intersection safety improvements abms Praivie Ane * Greensferm River bridge

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
Prairie Ave
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
prairie/SH4 Prairie / Idaho Praive/spokane
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { SH41, Prairie Ave, Pole line Ave,, Greensfersy, } \\
& \text { Riverview Dr. }
\end{aligned}
$$

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854

Public Involvement Questionnaire

| Name: Scott ; Pam Borek | Email: P-borek Qyahor.com |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Address: P. 0.1166 | Pest FAlls. Fd AH C |
| Phone Number: 2087730337 | Check box if you would like a response to your comments |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?


Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (ie. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $X$ |
| :---: |
| $X$ |
|  |
| $Y$ |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| $X$ |
| :---: |
|  |
| $X$ |
|  |
|  |

Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?
$\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

Pleasant View-lolELine = Stop Light = Not round about Chase = Primally $=$ stop Light Not round about
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

Needs Access Roads to tako away from congestion on Hwy 4/ from PF to hathidrum
8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Automobile traffic is more } 1 \text { mpoichant and lina Bit } \\
& \text { E Standards Aloft of people me e not walking? Ricing } \\
& \text { In the winter months }
\end{aligned}
$$

Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717

## Public Involvement Questionnaire

| Name: $S_{G T}$. WARD $C_{\text {RAW FORD, KCSO Email: werawford @ KCgov.us }}$ |
| :--- |
| Address: KCSO |
| Phone Number: 208.446 .1300 Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$ |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?
Good Fair $\quad$ Poor 1

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| 2 |
| :---: |
| 3 |
| 1 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| 1 | Reducing fatalities / injuries |
| :---: | :---: |
| 2 | Maintaining current infrastructure |
|  | Reducing congestion |
|  | Improving roadway reliability |
|  | Improving the trucking network |
| 3 | Protecting / enhancing the environment |

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Get traffic off Bracric. } \\
& \text { Crash \#s ane just a direct result of } \\
& \text { volume. }
\end{aligned}
$$

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

this would create is dramatic. Create an underpass
at mibuime as well as extending Hayden to 53
sid an additional underpass. Create hove flow 10 roves besides
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

As populations merease traffic congestion mareases with it There needs to be some four towards the development and increased opportunity for alternate means of travel Encourage people to walk s bike \& provide the in frastuctepe
for that support.
8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717

## Public Involvement Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | X |  |
|  |  | $X$ |
|  | $x$ |  |
|  |  | $x$ |
|  |  | $x$ |
| $x$ |  |  |
|  | $\times$ |  |
|  |  | $\times$ |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment
Multi Modal Grcilities
Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?
Yes $\square$ No $\square$ a least
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

- would like the Greensferry Bridge! need to create an alternative solnth of river other than Spokane St.
- Timing of lights

8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.


More choices south of Sportulae River Greensfery Bridge, Someday Pleasmantuian?
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { along identified commuter routes connecting } \\
& \text { neighborhoods to communities'/transit Facitice. }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Public Involvement Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?


Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (ie. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $x$ |
| ---: |
|  |
|  |
| $x$ |
| $X$ |
|  |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT 5629 EAST SELTICE WAY POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Hwy } 41 \text { 4 Lanes to Rathdrum } \\
& \text { Signal (1) Lancaster/ Hwy } 41
\end{aligned}
$$

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
$\square$
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?


POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire


1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

Good Fair \begin{tabular}{l}
Foor <br>
\hline \multicolumn{1}{l}{ Poor } <br>

| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\ddots$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

\end{tabular}

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Pleasant view \& } 53 \text {; Drains Pig } \\
& \text { surface condition btw Chase d dato } \\
& \text { on practice }
\end{aligned}
$$

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

Prairie a pleasant view
Hauser lake Rd pedestrians/speed
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
S.Greensferry
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?
Prairie

Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire


1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?


Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT <br> 5629 EAST SELTICE WAY <br> POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854 <br> 208-765-3717

4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

- Encourage Rowed abouts at Arterial
intersections
- Added multimasehl facillores on Antarials

8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - Prairie } \\
& \text { - Cdlectorg and up. }
\end{aligned}
$$

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire


1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| 2 |
| ---: |
| 3 |
| 3 |
| 1 |
|  |
|  |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| 1 | Reducing fatalities / injuries |
| :---: | :---: |
|  | Maintaining current infrastructure |
|  | Reducing congestion |
| 2 | Improving roadway reliability |
|  | Improving the trucking network |
|  | Protecting / enhancing the environment |

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?
near all sahoolz

Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854

## Public Involvement Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\sqrt{ }$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| 2 |
| :---: |
| 3 |
| 1 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| $X$ |
| :---: |
|  |

Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.
$\square$
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
$\square$
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717

## Public Involvement Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or dded capacity on roads Improved safety - praime \& pleasant View corridor Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

|  |
| :--- |
|  |
| $X$ |
|  |
|  |

Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$ Maybe. Doesn't "make Sense" everywhere.
Develop a bike "plan" to designate strategic widening
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

Hwy 53 from state tine past mcguire.
Including the Hawser junction area and these intersections

- H.boke Rood, Bect/Parinie, Pleasantuiew

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
see above. What is ITD's position?

$$
A_{\text {so }} \text { I Imasser and Ally } 41
$$

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

Turning onto Hwy 53 from Nasser hake Rood.

- Provesting "Connectivity" in the I-90 corridor. i.e. access overfunder I-90 in key locations. For example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { - Treaty Rock Crossing - Spokane st. } \\
& \text { - Settee }
\end{aligned}
$$

8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

- Hwy 4 1 between mullion and settice is congested.
- Pathdrum

2 drying to cross back and forth over the tracks.
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?


Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717


1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

Good Fair $\quad$ Poor ( |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system


Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (ie. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system ( $\because$ unknjets make it effeicof, lofoduc:"
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

|  |
| :--- |
|  |
| 3 |
|  |
| 2 |
| 2 |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
1 ponduddesig to Accmatate muses, biceplar, petectiva-z
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment
Publictrasemtatin-
Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulderf on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
$\square$
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?
$\square$

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT<br>5629 EAST SELTICE WAY<br>POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854<br>208-765-3717

Public Involvement Questionnaire

| Name: $\sqrt{T H N A}$ S R | FLOREmars |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Address: 620 N. COLES | $\angle 007$ | $83854$ |
| Phone Number: $\qquad$ |  |  |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | $\checkmark$ |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3-issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| $\checkmark$ |
| ---: |
| $\checkmark$ |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  | Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure

New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

|  | Reducing fatalities / injuries <br> Maintaining current infrastructure <br> Reducing congestion <br> Improving roadway reliability <br> Improving the trucking network <br> Protecting / enhancing the environment |
| :---: | :---: |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
$\square$
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717

## Public Involvement Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good | Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
|  | $\checkmark$ |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| $\checkmark$ |  |  |

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

|  |
| :--- |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
provie Ave
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

$$
N / A
$$

9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?
heltiee, bioken sidewalks.

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire


1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good Fair | Poor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |



Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

|  | $R$ |
| :---: | :--- |
| 2 | R |
| 1 |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.
$\square$
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
$\square$
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854

## Public Involvement Questionnaire

| Name: MARHOFKE, JAMES Email: JEMARHOFKEOHOTMPIL.COM |
| :--- |
| Address: $2337 \mathrm{~N} . H O W E L C R D$. |
| Phone Number $208-773.8877$ Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$ |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?


Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (i.e. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.
$\square$
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
$\square$
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854

## Public Involvement Questionnaire



1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

Good Fair \begin{tabular}{l}
Poor <br>

| $X$ |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $X$ |  |  |
|  | $X$ |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | $X$ |
|  | $X$ |  |
|  | $X$ |  |
|  |  |  |

\end{tabular}

Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (ie. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

| 1 |
| :--- |
| 2 |
| 3 |
|  |
|  |
|  |
|  |

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads lasauming Post Tall e untunes major perth.
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on? (o mk /w), won doter

|  |
| :---: |
|  |
|  |
| $\chi$ |
|  |
|  | Reducing fatalities / injuries roterg)

Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.

9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?


POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire

| Name: Daniel Carmichael Email: e8tydnde gmail.com |
| :--- |
| Address: 7313 E. Z nd Ave Spokane valley, wA \&9212 |
| Phone Number: 509.607 .78 oft Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$ |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?


Safety / Accidents
Peak hour traffic congestion
Maintenance
Bicycle system
Walkability / Pedestrian systems
Truck traffic
Traffic operations (ie. traffic signal timing / coordination)
Transit system
2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?


Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?

| $\square$ | Reducing fatalities / injuries |
| ---: | :--- |
| $y$ | Maintaining current infrastructure |
|  | Reducing congestion |
|  | Improving roadway reliability |
|  | Improving the trucking network <br> Protecting / enhancing the environment |

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT 5629 EAST SELTICE WAY POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?
Yes
$\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.
$\square$
6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.
$\square$
7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?

Lack of promotion to grow \& use pedostriaw/cyclisf "trails" and for shoulders connecting vital locations.
8. What portions) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?

POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT
5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854
208-765-3717
Public Involvement Questionnaire

| Name: ED ADAMCHAK JR | Email: adamchak C noadnump |
| :---: | :---: |
| Address: 719 S GREENSFERRY ROA1) P, F |  |
| Phone Number: 204-425-0428 Che | would like a response to your comments $\square$ |

1. How would you rate the existing transportation system within the PFHD jurisdiction?

| Good |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Fair |  | Poor |
|  $X$   <br> Safety / Accidents    <br> Peak hour traffic congestion    <br> Maintenance    |  |  |

2. Which 3 issues are most important to address in the Transportation Plan?

Maintenance / Repair of existing transportation infrastructure
New roads or added capacity on roads
Improved safety
Improved road operations \& traffic signal timing
Improved road signage
Additional bicycle \& pedestrian Facilities
Truck routing \& access
3. Which concept is most important for transportation planners to focus on?


Reducing fatalities / injuries
Maintaining current infrastructure
Reducing congestion
Improving roadway reliability
Improving the trucking network
Protecting / enhancing the environment

## POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT

5629 EAST SELTICE WAY
POST FALLS, IDAHO 83854 208-765-3717
4. Should shoulders on the roadways be widened to provide a travel lane for bicyclists?

Yes $\square$ No $\square$
5. Are there particular areas that need transportation improvements? Please be specific.

6. Are there particular areas that generate safety concerns? Please be specific.

7. What transportation issues concern you with respect to your community?
$\square$
8. What portion(s) within the PFHD jurisdiction do you find difficult to access? Please be specific.
$\square$
9. If you could put more cycling \& pedestrian facilities anywhere within the PFHD jurisdiction where would you place them?
$\square$
Post Falls Highway District Transportation Plan

## Appendix D

## Technical Advisory Meeting \#2

| Post Falls Highway District CIP Plan 2018 | -2023 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | al CIP Pr | Ranking Matrix |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mporanact eankno |  |  | $\frac{1}{\text { Sater ream }}$ | anwng |  |  | Remamma | ${ }_{2}{ }^{2}$ |  |  | $\frac{3}{\text { Toadacen }}$ | reoter |  | $\frac{4}{\text { ana arow }}$ |  |  | $\stackrel{5}{\text { probecramo }}$ |  |  | ${ }_{\text {funoms }}{ }^{6}$ | nes |  | 7 |  | $\stackrel{8}{\text { Rowneti }}$ |  |  |  | 9 |  | FINAL SCORE |  |
|  |  |  | Hent |  |  | EsT. uf | 117020 | 67010 | ${ }^{0} 05$ | ves | no | Somemar | ньн | моо. | urue | (c) |  |  | ${ }^{\text {funose }}$ | \|over |  | ${ }^{\text {spoeken }}$ | unspoken | NoNE | 1 Parct | $\triangle 1$ Paccel | NoNE | ${ }_{\substack{\text { moo } \\(12)}}^{\substack{\text { a }}}$ |  | known | max 10 |  |
|  |  | 20 | 10 | 5 | $\frac{1}{5}$ |  | 5 | 10 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 10 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 10 | 5 | 2 | 10 | $\bigcirc$ |  | 5 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 0 | 5 | 3 | $\bigcirc$ | 0 |  |  |
| max. Ponsis/ Carigoar |  |  | 20 |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 10 |  |  | 10 |  |  | 5 |  | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |  | 100 |  |
| Proikctis | Cost, Mu |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| BECK RD. KN 19288 <br> Road Rehab, Widen Shoulders <br> In Design <br> In Design | s 250 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 5 0.50 |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | ? |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s 0.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 | нвв31/PFНD |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s 0.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { LHSIP } \\ \text { DESIGN } 2017 \\ \text { CONST } 2018 \end{gathered}$ |  | 0 |  |  | 0 | 5 |  |  |  | 5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\pm \begin{gathered}\text { Rvervew orve } \\ \text { sfenen ceekw widering }\end{gathered}$ | s 100 |  |  |  |  | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 3 |  |  | 3 |  |  | 6 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s 0.50 |  |  |  |  | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  |  | 3 |  | ? |  |  |  | 8 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (ex | n® |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0 |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s 0.05 |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ? |  | ? |  |  | ? |  |  |  | 10 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| HUETTER ROAD <br> Mullan to Prairie widen shoulders \& structural overlay <br> all turn lanes at Mullan, Greta, Poleline \& Big Sky | s 0.40 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | PfHD | ? |  | ? |  |  | $?$ |  |  |  | 4 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s 120 |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ? |  |  |  | 0 |  |  |  | 0 | 10 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S 420 |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | ? |  |  |  |  | 0 |  | 13 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { PRAIRIE \& CHASE RD } \\ & \text { Roundabout } \end{aligned}$ | s 0.50 |  |  |  |  | NA |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | const 2018 | 5 |  | 5 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 15 | stratecic wranuvs |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s 0.30 |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | рस+ | 5 |  | 5 |  |  | 5 |  |  |  | 25 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | s 120 |  |  |  |  | 10 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | ? |  |  | ? |  |  |  | 15 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | s 120 |  |  |  |  | 8 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { LHSIP } \\ \text { DESIGN } 2018 \\ \text { CONST } 2019 \end{gathered}$ | 5 |  | ? |  |  | ? |  |  |  | 13 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | S 200 |  |  |  |  | NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | ? |  |  | ? |  |  |  | 5 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ELTICE WAY <br> Seeley St to Huetter Overlay | s 0.45 |  |  |  |  | 6 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 5 |  |  | ? |  |  |  | 16 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |





## Appendix E

## Technical Advisory Meeting \#3

|  |  |  | $\cdots$ |  |  | $\pm$ | ＂$=$ |  | \％ |  |  | \％ |  |  |  | ＂ |  |  | \％ |  | － |  |  | － |  | mamem |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| mexmeme | mmam | \％emme |  | ${ }^{\text {cam }}$ 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mmammame | mo | momam | mommm | －${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| memamemem | mo | ${ }^{\text {mor mom }}$ | mamam | －${ }^{\circ}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| memamamam | ＂mo | mem mat | ＂manamo | －0 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| memamamas | mo | 0 mmam |  | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | smanama | mamam |  | 40 | $\cdots$ | $\because$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | － | $\cdots$ | ＊ | ＊ | $\bigcirc$ | $\because$ | ${ }^{-}$ | $\square$ | $\bigcirc$ | ， | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 2 | $\bigcirc$ |  | － | \％ | ${ }^{2}$ |
|  | m | m | mamamex | 0 | $\cdots$ | 吅 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ＊ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | ＂ | ${ }_{0} 0$ noo | － | 5 | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | ＂ | ＂ | ${ }^{26}$ | ＊ |  | $\cdots$ | ． | \％ |
|  | mammo | mom | maxum |  | $\ldots$ | ${ }^{2}$ | $\cdots$ | 0 | ${ }^{28}$ | \％ | $\because$ | $\cdots$ |  | ${ }_{0} \mathrm{moc}$ | －0 | oo s | $\bigcirc$ | s | u | ${ }^{\circ}$ | ． | $\bigcirc$ |  | －${ }^{\circ}$ | \％ | $\cdots$ |
|  | man | ${ }_{\text {man }}$ | mmamem |  | ${ }_{00} 26$ | ${ }_{20}{ }^{\circ}$ | ${ }^{4}$ | － | ＂ | 18 | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{\circ} \times$ |  | ${ }_{0}{ }^{\circ}$ | － | ¢ | \％ | $\bigcirc$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{23}$ | \％ |  | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{2}$ |
|  |  | mamam | mammaxememem |  | － 2 | $2{ }^{26}$ | ${ }^{26} 20$ | 10 | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | － | ${ }^{2}$ |  | \％ 4 | － | 0 | ${ }^{2}$ | ＂ | $\cdots$ | $\infty$ | ${ }^{26}$ | $\bigcirc$ |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ | \％ | ${ }^{n 6}$ |
|  |  | manam | \％mam |  | $\cdots$ | ．． 4 | 4.10 | u | － | ${ }^{2}$ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{4}$ ． |  | $\cdots$ | \％ | － | ＊ |  | a 18 | 2 | ${ }^{1}$ | \％ |  |  | 0 | ${ }^{34}$ |
| mamamumam | ＂ | mom mom | nesarmasmam | ${ }^{120}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| mameme | smancemmes | mat |  | － 20 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | umsmmo | ${ }^{\text {mam }}$ | －mamamem | ${ }^{20}$ | ${ }_{20}$ | ＊ | － 2 | ${ }^{2}$ | $\cdots$ | 10 | ${ }^{2}$ | ＊ |  | «＊ | ® | $\cdots$ | \％ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{\prime}$ u | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  | ＊ | \％ | $\cdots$ |
|  | wem |  | nearmasas | ${ }^{20}$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{25}$ | ${ }^{3}$ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{.}$ | $\because$ | \％ |  | ${ }^{-}$ | ® | H | － | － | ${ }^{3}$ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{28}$ | os |  | － | $\cdots$ | ＊ |
|  | mmmomb | ${ }^{\text {an }}$ | mamamamos | ${ }^{10}$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | 220 | 20 | $\cdots$ | － | － | $\cdots$ |  | $\cdots$ | ® | 20 | － | － | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ | $\bigcirc$ | ® |  | ${ }^{\circ}$ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{24}$ |
|  |  | manmam | mamam | $\triangle$ | \％\％ | ¢ 2 | 8 | ${ }^{*}$ | $\cdots$ | ${ }^{-}$ | \％ | － |  | \％ | － | \％so | o |  | ${ }^{\circ}{ }^{3}$ | $\because$ | ${ }^{-1}$ | $\cdots$ |  |  | \％ | ${ }^{*}$ |
|  |  | manmm | mammamumame | ，as |  | ＊ | $\because$ | 。 | $\cdots$ | － | － | \％${ }^{\circ}$ |  | $\because$ | ® | © © | 。 |  | ＊ | ${ }^{\circ}$ | － | ® |  |  | 。 | ${ }^{4}$ |


|  |  |  |  | Mmoorack caunce |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Emenmmgesencuif |  |  | ${ }_{\text {puactusmoer }}$ |  |  | \＃ssonomeer mouc |  |  | Peoteramowr |  |  | \％$\frac{8}{\text { noweter }}$ |  |  | Final score <br> max 100 <br> 100 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  | Caram |  |  |  |  |  | ankepo |  |  | ${ }_{\text {mox }}^{\text {mox }}$ | 117200 | 6r0， | ${ }^{\text {pros }}$ |  | Some | uspoek | vs | no | ${ }^{\text {sommenat }}$ |  |  | ¢ | now | ${ }^{\text {Premala }}$ | 1 Pemeal |  |
|  |  |  |  | 5 | 5 |  |  |  |  | 5 | ${ }^{15}$ | ， |  | 5 | ${ }^{10}$ | ${ }^{15}$ | 10 | ， | 。 | 10 | $\bigcirc$ | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 5 | ${ }^{3}$ | 。 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 |  |  | 15 |  |  | 10 |  |  | 10 |  |  | 5 |  |  | 5 |  |  |
|  | funomg staus | fuvolvg source | YRSCHEULED |  |  | provers | cos， |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{n}{z}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Approved } \\ \text { fuNova } \end{gathered}$ | LHSIP | 2017－2018 |  |  |  | 5 0.45 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\text { dut }}{\substack{2}}$ | Approved funoing | STP RURaL | 2017－2019 |  |  | RIVERVIEW DRIVE <br> Skalen Creek widening | \＄ 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{n}{\underline{\Sigma}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { APpRoved } \\ & \text { funvong } \end{aligned}$ | PFHD | 2021－2022 | MILLSAP LOOP Big Rock Road rebuild intersection and hill | \＄ 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 耑 |  | HB312，pFHD | 2017－2021 | RIVERVIEW DRIVE | \＄$\quad 0.45$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 岩 | APproved funoing | PFHD | 2017－2018 |  | \＄ 0.03 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| U | Approved funolng | STP BRIIGE | 2020 |  | s 0.59 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 会 |  |  | Preliminary | Grenensfrery brioge | \＄12．5－516．0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{2.8}$ | ${ }^{3.1}$ | 11.7 | 2.2 | ${ }^{5.6}$ | ${ }^{2.4}$ | ${ }^{5.8}$ | 5.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | ${ }^{1.1}$ | 0.0 | 4.4 | ${ }^{3.6}$ | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 0.0 | ${ }^{1.1}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 0.8 | ${ }^{1.1}$ | 2.2 | 0.0 | 55.3 |
|  |  | CHILDREN PEDESTRIAN SAFETY－TAP GRANT | Preliminary |  | \＄ 0.20 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 1.9 | ${ }^{8.7}$ | 0.0 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }^{0.6}$ | 5.9 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 2.2 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 6.7 | 1.7 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | ${ }^{3.3}$ | 1.7 | 0.0 | ${ }^{3.9}$ | ${ }^{1.1}$ | 0.0 | ${ }^{46.4}$ |
| $\frac{\ddot{山}}{\stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\infty}}$ |  | CHILDREN PEDESTRIAN SAFETY－TAP GRANT | Preluminary | SELTICE WAY CONNECTION TO CENTENNIAL TRAIL | \＄ 0.05 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 7.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | ${ }^{5.3}$ | 0.0 | 1.2 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 6.7 | 2.2 | ${ }^{0.0}$ | 6.7 | 2.2 | 0.0 | 0.6 | ${ }^{3.1}$ | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 39.8 |
|  | Approved funoing | PFHD | 2018 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\underset{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}{\substack{\text { ¢ }}}$ | Approved funolng | PFHD | 2018 | SCHILLING LP－Eastside，Riverview to Coyote Coyote $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| بِّ | APpRoved funoing | PFHD | 2019 | SCHILLING LP－Coyote to Comet ADT－ 189 Length－ 4179 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{c}{工} \\ & \tilde{n} \\ & \end{aligned}$ | Approvep funolng | PFHD | 2020 | of to bottom of <br> hill <br> ADT－ 158 Length－ 4280 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{2}{\Sigma}$ | Approved funoing | PFHD | ${ }^{2021}$ | MILLSAP LP－Holland Rd to the elk pens ADT－ 104 Length－ 3400 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\stackrel{5}{0}$ | Approved funolng | PFHD | 2022 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { MILLSAP LP - Elk pens to Deer Ridge } \\ & \text { ADT - } 104 \text { Length }-5787 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Appendix F

## Open House \#2



## Post Falls Highway District

## Transportation Plan

 Open HousePost Falls Highway District is seeking public input on their

Draft Capital Improvement Plan.

Post Falls Highway District Office

$$
\begin{gathered}
5629 \text { E. Seltice Way } \\
\text { Post Falls, Idaho } 83854 \\
208-765-3717
\end{gathered}
$$




Please join us<br>Tuesday, January 9, 2018 4:00 pm to 7:00 pm

pmo

## POST FALLS CONSIDERS BRINGING BRIDGE BACK

January 06, 2018 at 5:00 am /


LOREN BENOIT/Press A high-profile project the Post Falls Highway District is embarking on is a single-lane roundabout at the intersection of Pleasantview Road and Prairie Avenue, a spot notorious for serious accidents and fatalities in recent years. At one point, there were 14 accidents at the intersection in 10 months.

## Staff Writer

POST FALLS - Fifty years after the Greensferry bridge over the Spokane River at Post Falls closed, building another structure at the same location is being explored.
"(The Post Falls Highway District) is in the very preliminary stages of looking at the possibility of building a bridge at Greensferry," said Kelly Brownsberger, the district's road supervisor. "The district engineer is evaluating the site to make sure a bridge will fit in the existing right of way."

The Post Falls Highway District will host a public input open house for its draft project plan on Tuesday from 4 to 7 p.m. to accept comments on future roadways and improvements in the district. The open house is at the district office at 5629 E. Seltice Way.

The bridge is among 26 projects listed on the district's draft project list that will be open for public comments during an open house on Tuesday from 4 to 7 p.m. at the district office at 5629 E . Seltice Way.

The cost for the bridge is estimated at $\$ 8.5$ million, but a construction date has not been determined as the district is only exploring the possibility at this point.
"One of the biggest hurdles we're facing is funding," Brownsberger said. "Currently there is no federal or state grants available to build a new bridge. We are looking into the possibility of passing a bond for construction, but everything is very preliminary right now."

The old bridge was closed in September 1967 because it was in poor condition. It was dismantled in 1971.

Proponents of building another bridge there say it would improve mobility in that area as the only way to access south side of the river from Post Falls is the Spokane Street bridge. The Greensferry bridge would also improve emergency response and delivery of goods and services.

If the bridge were to become reality, motorists could travel from the south side of the river to the Rathdrum Prairie in a straight shot with the Greensferry overpass that was constructed over Intestate 90 two years ago.

A high-profile project the district is embarking on is a single-lane roundabout at the intersection of Pleasantview Road and Prairie Avenue, a spot notorious for serious accidents and fatalities in recent years.

At one point, there were 14 accidents at the intersection in 10 months.
"Design of the roundabout is just getting started with construction scheduled in 2020," Brownsberger said, adding that the cost is estimated at $\$ 1.2$ million.

Right of way will be purchased as part of the project, Brownsberger said.
"The district did an evaluation of possible improvements at the intersection, including a traffic signal," Brownsberger said. "We went with a roundabout because of the proven reduction in crashes that a roundabout provides. A traffic signal does not prevent the high-speed angle crashes that have been happening in the intersection.
"Also, with all the overhead clutter from all the power lines along with rail crossings in the area, it would be very easy to miss a traffic signal."

The roundabout will be designed to accommodate large trucks, Brownsberger said.
"There is currently a lot of truck traffic on Pleasantview from Highway 53 to Interstate 90 and the district commissioners have insisted that the roundabout be designed to handle large trucks," he said.

The highway district earlier made a series of improvements at the intersection to reduce accidents, including adding rumble strips, flashing lights, additional signage, larger-than-normal stop signs and surface leveling.

Another roundabout on Prairie Avenue - at Chase Road - was slated for construction last year but was bumped when the bids were twice the engineer's estimate. Brownsberger said the district has applied for state funding for the $\$ 1$ million project and, if approved, it is expected to be built starting late spring.
"This will have a major impact on traffic because the intersection will be closed during construction," he said. "We are going to keep the closure as short as possible, but it could be closed for up to 60 days."

Another project planned for this year is a $\$ 400,000$ widening and overlay of Huetter Road from Prairie to Mullan Avenue.
"This will cause some short-term traffic delays," Brownsberger said.

At the open house, residents will be able to review all of the projects and comment on how they're rated by the district.

# Post Falls Highway District 

Open House
January 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet (Summary of Responses)

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

- There was a total of 9 comments that were directly in favor of the Greensferry Bridge, $\mathbf{2}$ that were opposed, and one that didn't care as long as his taxes did not go up.
- 1 Comment in favor of the Pleasant View / Prairie Roundabout
- 2 comments on bike/pedestrian access
- 1 comment on congestion on SH-41
- Feedback, for the most part, was positive and in favor of the projects listed on the CIP.


## 2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?

- Pleasantview Bridge over Spokane River
- Pleasantview Road multi-use pathways/HWY 53 multi-use pathways
- Accelerate the vertical curve problem at Riverview \& Idaho
- Roundabouts at Pleasantview \& Prairie and Poleline \& Cecil
- At grade ramps at Greensferry and I-90

3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?

- Suggest increasing the rating W. Riverview \& Idaho intersection below the proposed roundabouts
- How does PFHD prioritize funding for different improvement categories
- Greensferry Bridge should be \#1
- The ratings appear to be correct / looks great

4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?

- Private funds for Greensferry Bridge available if at grade on/off ramps at Greensferry are made possible.
- Why should Post Falls be the only one to fund, many would use the Greensferry Bridge
- Grants, other?
- Bridge funding should be top priority


# Post Falls Highway District 

Open House
January 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet (Summary of Responses)
5. Do you have any other comments?

- Coordinate Hwy 53 / Huetter Bypass / Pleasant View / Beck Rd
- Explore options to use Beck Rd / Pleasant View \& route to Lancaster to relieve Hwy 95 \& Hwy 41 traffic
- Explore alternatives to relieve congestion on SH-41.
- Prefer stop lights/signs to roundabout (more cost effective).
- Concerns with roundabout at Prairie and Pleasant View for large trucks
- Need additional I-90 access between SH 41 and US 95
- Concerns with future traffic flow due to continued development and railroad traffic.
- Don't work on roads twice
- Post Falls does an excellent job - thank you!
- Thank you
- Good to see bike/ped projects
- Seem to be on top of your district \& do a good job
- Fix the signals to keep traffic flowing smoothly
- Concerns about fire access south of the river if Spokane Street bridge were unusable.
- Would like to see Greensferry Bridge as soon as possible

Post Falls Highway District
Open House
January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet

| Name: |  | Email: | IHKIDAHD®, HOTMOAS. Lam |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Address: | $3125, R$ | $R_{\infty}$ | $\text { PDas Faxls, } I_{D}$ |
| Phone Number | $8 \text { T T 5 - } 1894$ | eck box if | would like a response to your comments |

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?

3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?

4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?

## Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.

Post Falls Highway District<br>5629 E. Seltice Way<br>Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet

| Name: Bryan D. Myers | Email: Brand. Myers Camail. com |
| :--- | :--- |
| Address: 11610 N SUNRISE CT, RATHDRum ID |  |
| Phone Number: $2084469988 \quad$ Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$ |  |

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
Integrate bike Ped Facilities where possible is secure Row For Future Multi use piths ! sidewalks as our community grows and becomes more URBAN. Focus on intersections and intessatimg a/ Adjacent municipal Ructions
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Plesunt view Bridge Q spokane River } \\
& \text { Pleasant view Rand MultiusePatthways } \\
& \text { Hwy } 53 \text { Multiuse Path }
\end{aligned}
$$

3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
Erphas's on PED/ BIKE FACICITIES OUERACL
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Coordination of Hwy } 53 \text { /HaTtER ByPASS/PLESANTVIEW/BECK ROAD } \\
& \text { EXPLORE OPTIONS TO USE BECK ROAD/ PLESANTVIEW ROUTE TO } \\
& \text { LANCASTER TO RELIEVE HWY } 95 \text { HWY } 41 \text { TRAFFIC }
\end{aligned}
$$

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854


Post Falls Highway District
Open House
January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet


1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?
Dour touch or needs Twice

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet

Name: Dave Fair Email: Ofairepostfalkichathoigh

Address: 3875 N. Chase RED 8 R 83854

Phone Number: $208-773-7445$ Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { The b:ke / Ped Issues must be adelressean } \\
& \text { sidewalks to cownect to city infrastructure-ADA }
\end{aligned}
$$

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?

## Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.

Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?

No
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP? No
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?

NO
5. Do you have any other comments?

Post Falls riahuay Dept does an excellent Tob.
 a you.

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
No
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
No
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP? No.
5. Do you have any other comments?


Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854


Post Falls Highway District
Open House
January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet

austere 15854 N Middle Fork Rd, Hawser id
Phone Number: $208-777-1532$ Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

Projects seem concentrated in 2018-2020; not much beyond 2020
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP? Loots he a good spread of potions
5. Do you have any other comments?
5. Good to see bike/ped prose of s!

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District


# Post Falls Highway District <br> Open House <br> January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$ <br> Capital Improvement Plan Projects <br> Comment Sheet 



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

of He Grensformy Bridge across the Spoken River
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?


4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?

## Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.

Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District
Open House
January 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet


1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet

Name:
Email:
Address:
PO BOX 2065 - DA 10.83816
Phone Number:
Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered? No
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?


Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
It's exciting to see what is being Considered.
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?


Post Falls Highway District

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
```
I Think we Need The greensfevry BRidse.
This will greatly impuove Response. Time Frr Fire & medicit/
This alsu will reduce Tratfic on spokawe STreet,
```

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered? No
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP? F would like the bridge to atheast Trying and get The Funding As soon as possible,
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?


Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854


Post Falls Highway District
Open House
January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet


1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP? X doit care what improverments you do as Long as you "Doff" raise my taxes (fixed income here)
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?


Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way Post Falls, Idaho 83854



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP? $\qquad$
Address:

Phone Number:
Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP? Why should PF, be the only one tifiund. Those who live across should help porgy for bridge
5. Do you have any other comments (Safety issue)

Roundabout in prainri \& Pleatent vices, 18 Wheelers can not orlop quickly. When a car trio to Race them vito a roundabon. Cinviofer 18 Lotulevó-liguied loads. Wouldistease sesurnit bus belle

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District 5629 E. Seltice Way Post Falls, Idaho 83854
Why cunturgeta ueporves hims complice to traffic on


Post Falls Highway District
Open House
January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet

Name:


Address:
1620 W FQRDIAAM 57
Phone Number:
Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$

$$
708450.8001
$$

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?

3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

LIKE THE PROTECTS. FUNDING LOOKS LIKE THE BIGEST ISSUE.
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered? ROUND-A-bOUT AT POLELINE \& CECIL 3
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
LOOKS GREAT.
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP? GRAN辛S, OTHER?
5. Do you have any other comments?

NONE

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854


Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
```
T APPESRS TWE PRODEETS USVE BEEEN PLACED IN
PINOEL, PRLORITY
```

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Baser on woxt l couns SEE, SL THE HAB } \\
& \text { REOCNMRNE PROBZEM AREAS ARE BEINK ADDRESSED }
\end{aligned}
$$

3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { IT APPENS BASED or WISTORKA COSUES } \\
& \text { THE RATINWS ARE COROT. }
\end{aligned}
$$

4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?
```
TTLE on<4 TWNG GokLD BE TRNNKMN vE ENETLARE
TR\triangleFFR FLSUS ISBLCES BAEED ON CONTLNCND BENELOPMENT
AND RAKLRADD TRAFKLC.
```

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854


Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet

Name: L

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
 ass Acton en porsiskle:
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?

3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?

4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?

5. Do you have any other comments?



Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January 9 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?


Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

Post Falls Highway District<br>Open House<br>January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$<br>Capital Improvement Plan Projects<br>Comment Sheet



1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?

2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
Not sure
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?

4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?

NO
5. Do you have any other comments?

Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854


Post Falls Highway District
Open House
January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects
Comment Sheet


1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP? benefit, Already a bridges
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?
5. Do you have any other comments?


Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018.
Post Falls Highway District
5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854

From: Kelly Brownsberger [mailto:kelly@postfallshd.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 7:45 AM
To: Laura Winter [lwinter@ruenyeager.com](mailto:lwinter@ruenyeager.com)
Subject: FW: New Form Entry: Contact Form

Good morning,
Would you add this to the comments received.
Thanks,
Kelly

From: Mary Spray [mailto:mary@postfallshd.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 5:58 AM
To: 'Kelly Brownsberger' [kelly@PostFallsHD.com](mailto:kelly@PostFallsHD.com); 'Shirley Walson' [shirley@postfallshd.com](mailto:shirley@postfallshd.com)
Subject: FW: New Form Entry: Contact Form

From: vicki@positivelypr.com [mailto:no-reply@editmysite.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 3:13 PM
To: info@postfallshd.com
Subject: New Form Entry: Contact Form

You've just received a new submission to your Contact Form
Submitted Information:

Name
Jim and Vicki Larson

Email
vicki@positivelypr.com

## Comment

We are unable to attend the open house tonight, Jan.9, 2018, but we completely and vigorously oppose the rebuilding of the Greens Ferry bridge. We live on W. George Lane and the bridge would come right by our house. We are 5 minutes from the $S$ pokane $S$ treet bridge, and to spend $\$ 8.5$ million+ to save 5 minutes is absolutely ludicrous. It would also completely change the character and safety of our neighborhood, and make our property undesirable. Please take this into consideration, as we can hardly even believe this is being contemplated! Sincerely, Jim and Vicki

Larson

# Post Falls Highway District (PFHD) - Capital Improvement Plan Projects Comments 

## Submitted by:

Name: Joe \& Corina Brown
Address: 7710 E Marine Dr., Post Falls, ID 83854
Email: joeabrown@gmail.com
Phone: (208) 996-0188

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP? The GREENSFERRY BRIDGE project is unnecessary and will have significant negative safety impacts to the community along Greensferry Road. Further, it is disappointing to see so few projects focused on safety improvements, economic improvements and biking/pedestrian improvements. We would have hoped the focus of the PFHD would be to improve the safety and vitality of our community, but that clearly does not seem to be the case with an organization willing to spend millions on an unnecessary bridge project.
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?

Nearly every intersection on Hwy 41 and Hwy 53 can use significant improvement. These highways have become so congested, it has pushed traffic onto secondary roads that cannot support the load such as Huetter, Meyer, Greensferry and idaho. Where these roads intersect with Hayden and Prairie respectively, significant safety improvements must be made. The area is growing quickly, and if PFHD does not make significant safety improvements at these key intersections now, safety and economic development in our community will suffer. Please, focus your capital budget in those areas.
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?

The ratings are arbitrary. At the open house we asked how the matrix was developed. It was not developed following state or federal guidelines, good engineering practice, or stakeholder engagement standards. So, we ask, how was it developed? As stated previously, The GREENSFERRY BRIDGE Project is a waste of our tax payer money, so we fail to see how the economic vitality rating is so high. The negative safety issues introduced by increasing traffic on Greensferry Road south of Seltice Way far outweighs any safety improvements afforded by increased access south of the river. Focus on the Spokane Street Bridge and making needed improvements to existing infrastructure.
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?

The GREENSFERRY BRIDGE is not needed and a waste of our money. Whether this is funding that comes from local taxes, federal taxes or fees, funding the GREENSFERRY BRIDGE Project is a waste. Please do not waste any of our money on something so frivolous that negatively impacts so many and benefits very few.

## 5. Do you have any other comments?

Instead of adding more infrastructure (e.g. GREENSFERY BRIDGE Project Proposal), focus on and fix what we already have. Focus on improving the safety and economic vitality of our communities. We suggest rather than getting very narrow feedback from only a few individuals involved in roads projects, as was described by the engineer at the Open. House, that the PFHD involve the community in comprehensive planning. Developing a long term plan for our community with projects we need would be beneficial. We ask that you keep us apprised of the GREENSFERRY BRIDGE Project, and ask that PFHD stop wasting our money on a bad project.

Post Falls Highway District
Open House
January $9^{\text {th }}, 2018$
Capital Improvement Plan Projects Comment Sheet
Name: JIMROLETTO Email: jimeenricoconsulfing.com

Adders: 8965 N FINUCANEDR
Phone Number:
Check box if you would like a response to your comments $\square$

1. Do you have any comments concerning the projects listed on the CIP?
2. Are there any projects NOT listed on the CIP that you would like to be considered?
Yes, af grade on ramps ba fo East o West
3. Do you have any comments concerning the rating of the projects on the CIP?

Greenfery
4. Do you have any comments concerning the funding of the projects on the CIP?

The bridge project over thespolkane vier funding could be available through private
5. Do you have any other comments? funds if condition are Ne 大
a private company is very welling fo discuss
a loan for constructing the bribe on Green fere Please return Public Comments by January 16, 2018. the spoke wo th es aid.
if of quale
Post Falls Highway District 5629 E. Seltice Way
Post Falls, Idaho 83854 on vamps fran 1.90 on Greenery void is possible

From: Kelly Brownsberger [mailto:kelly@postfallshd.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 7:45 AM
To: Laura Winter [lwinter@ruenyeager.com](mailto:lwinter@ruenyeager.com)
Subject: FW: New Form Entry: Contact Form

Good morning,
Would you add this to the comments received.
Thanks,
Kelly

From: Mary Spray [mailto:mary@postfallshd.com]
Sent: Wednesday, January 10, 2018 5:58 AM
To: 'Kelly Brownsberger' [kelly@PostFallsHD.com](mailto:kelly@PostFallsHD.com); 'Shirley Walson' [shirley@postfallshd.com](mailto:shirley@postfallshd.com)
Subject: FW: New Form Entry: Contact Form

From: vicki@positivelypr.com [mailto:no-reply@editmysite.com]
Sent: Tuesday, January 09, 2018 3:13 PM
To: info@postfallshd.com
Subject: New Form Entry: Contact Form

You've just received a new submis sion to your Contact Form.
Submitted Information:
Name
Jim and Vicki Larson

Email
vicki@positivelypr.com

## Comment

We are unable to attend the open house tonight, Jan.9, 2018, but we completely and vigorously oppose the rebuilding of the Greens Ferry bridge. We live on W. George Lane and the bridge would come right by our house. We are 5 minutes from the Spokane Street bridge, and to spend $\$ 8.5$ million+ to save 5 minutes is absolutely ludicrous. It would also completely change the character and safety of our neighborhood, and make our property undesirable. Please take this into consideration, as we can hardly even believe this is being contemplated! Sincerely, Jim and Vicki

## Appendix G

Population Data

*Data based onf best available information
*Data for illustrative purposes only
Population Density by Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) - 2016



## Appendix H

Urban \& Rural Federal Functional Classifications


## 2025

URBAN

## FEDERAL

FUNCTIONAL

## CLASSIFICATION

KMPO Board Approved
December 12, 2013
FHWA Approval
Signature \& Date
R. Scott Frey November 17, 2014 LEGEND

## Classification

- Interstate
-Other Freeways or Expressways
-Other Principal Arterials
- Minor Arterial
- Major Collector
- Minor Collector
- Minor Collector
Future Interstate

Future Other Freeway/Expressway

- Future Other Principal Arteria
- Future Minor Arterial

Future Major Collector
Future Minor Collector
Jurisdictions \& Other Features
CDA; Post Falls; Rathdrum

- Hayden
- Other Jurisdictions
- Water Features

Urbanized Area ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}$


素 ootrnai , MPO

KOOTENAA METROPOLITAN PLANNING ORGANIZATION
250 Northwest BIv, SUute 209, Coeurud dAlene, Idaho 83814



## Appendix I

Inter-Model Maps




## Appendix J

## Post Falls Highway District Map



## Appendix K

Capital Improvement Plan and CIP Project Map

| POST FALLS HIGHWAY DISTRICT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS PLAN$\begin{gathered} \text { 2018-2022 } \\ \text { (Draft) } \end{gathered}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Anticipated Year of Construction | Project | Type of Capital Improvement | CIP Value | Potential Funding Source | Approved Funding Source | Design Year |
| 2018 | Prairie Avenue \& Chase Road (roundabout) | Intersection Improvements | \$1,000,000 |  | Strategic Initiative Grant | 2017 |
| 2018 | Huetter Road <br> (Mullan to Prairie, widen shoulders \& structural overlay) | Road Improvements | \$400,000 |  | DA, HB312, PFHD | 2017 |
| 2018 | Hauser Lake Road <br> (replace culvert west of Ragged Ridge Road) | Bridges/Culverts | \$30,000 |  | PFHD | 2017 |
| 2018 | Winch Avenue - Church to N. Chase (ADT - 84 Length - 3464') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$40,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2018 | Schilling Loop - Eastside, Riverview to Coyote (ADT - 195, Length - 2709') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$32,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2019 | Riverview Drive (guardrail installation) | Safety Improvements | \$450,000 |  | LHSIP | 2017 |
| 2019 | Riverview Drive at Skalen Creek (widening and guardrails) | Safety Improvements | \$1,000,000 |  | STP Rural | 2017 |
| 2019 | Hauser Lake Road Culvert sizing/elevate roadway) | Road Improvements | \$150,000 |  | HB312 - PFHD | 2018 |
| 2019 | Prairie Avenue <br> (SH-41 to Greensferry, CRABS \& overlay) | Road Improvements | \$400,000 | HB312-PFHD | PFHD | 2019 |
| 2019 | Wyoming Avenue <br> (Meyer Rd to Huetter rebuild to gravel standards) | Road Improvements | \$100,000 | PFHD |  | 2017 |
| 2019 | Schilling Loop - Coyote to Comet (ADT - 189 Length - 4179) | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$50,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2020 | Spoakne St Bridge Rehab | Bridges/Culverts | \$590,000 |  | STP Bridge | 2017 |
| 2020 | Pleasant View \& Prairie Avenue (roundabout) | Intersection Improvements | \$1,200,000 | LHSIP | LHSIP | 2018 |
| 2020 | Prairie Avenue \& Greensferry Road (signalization) | Intersection Improvements | \$600,000 |  | HB312, PFHD | 2019 |
| 2020 | Seltice Way <br> (Seeley St to Huetter Overlay) | Road Improvements | \$450,000 | HB312, PFHD |  | 2020 |
| 2020 | S. Stateline Rd - End of oil to bottom of hill (ADT-158 Length 4280') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$50,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2021 | Prairie Avenue \& Idaho Street | Intersection Improvements | \$990,000 |  | LHSIP | 2020 |
| 2021 | Riverview Drive (Curve Realignment at St. Dominics) | Road Improvements | \$500,000 |  | DA - PFHD | 2021 |
| 2021 | Riverview Drive (safety improvements) | Safety Improvements | \$450,000 | HB312, PFHD |  | 2017 |
| 2021 | Millsap Loop - Holland Rd to the elk pens (ADT - 104 Length - 3400') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$40,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2022 | Beck Road, Seltice Way to Prairie Avenue (widen shoulders \& structural overlay) | Road Improvements | \$2,500,000 |  | STP Rural | 2017 |
| 2022 | Millsap Loop <br> (Big Rock Road rebuild to intersection \& hill) | Road Improvements | \$50,000 |  | PFHD | 2021 |
| 2022 | Millsap Loop - Elk pens to Deer Ridge (ADT - 104 Length - 5787') | Bituminous Surface Treatment | \$68,000 |  | PFHD | - |
| 2023 | Hayden Avenue \& Meyer Road (intersection improvements) | Intersection Improvements | \$1,200,000 | STP, PFHD |  | 2019 |
|  | Prairie Avenue <br> (Five Lanes from Meyer to SH -41) | Road Improvements | \$4,200,000 | STP/HB312, PFHD |  |  |
|  | Riverview Drive Extension (Foothills to Fairmont Loop) | Road Improvements | NR | Development, STP, HB312, PFHD |  |  |
|  | Upriver Drive (Realignment at Jacobs Loop) | Road Improvements | \$75,000 | PFHD |  |  |
|  | Riverview Drive (intersection improvements at Idaho Road) | Intersection Improvements | \$500,000 | PFHD |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\otimes}{\approx} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{z} \\ & \stackrel{y}{c} \end{aligned}$ | Pleasant View \& SH-53 <br> (grade seperated intersection) | Intersection Improvements | \$2,000,000 | Tiger Grant |  |  |
|  | Riverview Drive \& Harbor Drive (intersection improvements) | Intersection Improvements | \$150,000 | PFHD |  |  |
|  | Huetter Road Bikeway (connect the Prairie Path to the Prairie Avenue bike lanes) | Bike/Pedestrian | \$200,000 | Children Pedestrian Safety-TAP Grant |  |  |
|  | Seltice Way Connection to the Centennial Trail (connect the Seltice Shared Use Path to the Centennial Trail) | Bike/Pedestrian | \$50,000 | Children Pedestrian Safety-TAP Grant |  |  |
|  | Greensferry Bridge | Bridges/Culverts | \$16,000,000 |  |  |  |
| Total CIP Infrastructure Improvements |  |  | $\$ 35,515,000$ |  |  |  |




## Post Falls Highway District

Transportation Plan

