



APPENDIX A:

Public Draft Corridor Study Comment/Response Matrix

Comments Received on the Public Draft Corridor Study

<u>COMMENT</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>SOURCE OF COMMENT</u>
Comment #1	04/12/10	Don Spivey Email (to Dan Norderud)
Comment #2	04/17/10	Don Spivey Email (to Dan Norderud)
Comment #3	04/19/10	Shelby Powell Email (to Necile Lorang - City of Whitefish)
Comment #4	04/19/10	No Name Via MDT Website (13:04:35)
Comment #5	04/19/10	No Name Via MDT Website (09:38:07)
Comment #6	04/20/10	Mary Jo Look Telephone Call (to Dan Norderud)
Comment #7	04/26/10	Jim Thompson Comment Form from Public Meeting
Comment #8	04/26/10	Jerry Luderman Comment Form from Public Meeting
Comment #9	04/26/10	Karl Borchers Comment Letter
Comment #10	04/26/10	Rebecca Norton Comment Form from Public Meeting
Comment #11	04/29/10	John Chaney Comment Letter to RPA (identical letter sent to Sheila Ludlow at MDT)
Comment #12	04/30/10	Jan Metzmaker Comment Form from Public Meeting
Comment #13	05/05/10	Konrad Binder via MDT Website (14:44:56)
Comment #14	05/13/10	Brian Schott via MDT Website (12:49:26)
Comment #15	05/13/10	Lyndsay Schott via MDT Website (21:27:59)
Comment #16	05/14/10	Mary Jo Look Comment Form from Public Meeting
Comment #17	05/14/10	Mary Jane Barrett Comment Form from Public Meeting

MDT appreciates your taking the time to comment on this study. If an improvement option is forwarded, your comments will be provided to the project team.



APPENDIX A: COMMENTS RECEIVED ON THE PUBLIC DRAFT CORRIDOR STUDY

#	COMMENT RECEIVED	RESPONSE
1	<p>04/12/10 Don Spivey Email (to Dan Norderud)</p> <p>Dan --</p> <p><u>Comment 1-A</u> I haven't been through the study in detail but a few things popped out that I'd like to be able to discuss in the CAC meeting. I note in your estimated construction cost summaries for the two preferred alternatives you have noted that they do not include costs for a bridge replacing the 3 culverts on the Spokane Whitefish River crossing. That would imply MDT has decided not to build the bridge.</p> <p><u>Comment 1-B</u> As you may recall I've discussed the role of that "bridge" in our Bike and Pedestrian Master Plan. We have at various times in the past discussed with MDT the desirability of hanging a pedestrian bridge under the then proposed bridge replacement as the means for us to transit from the East to the West side of the River where we have easements in place to continue our main stem bike path south along the river toward the playing fields near hwy 40. During those earlier conversations MDT seemed willing to seriously consider that option.</p> <p><u>Comment 1-C</u> What now? For safety reasons we need a way to make that east/west transition without climbing up to Spokane and making a grade level crossing at that point. As I have no idea what is actually planned at that river crossing I would request that you come to the CAC meeting with some response to that critical need.</p> <p><u>Comment 1-D</u> In both the preferred alternatives you are suggesting 3 lanes of traffic along Spokane. One from 2nd to 7th and one from 2nd to 13th. In the 3 lane sections as well as the 4lane section along Spokane, a separated, boulevarded bike/pedestrian path is desirable and I'm not sure I see that discussed.</p> <p><u>Comment 1-E</u> Widening Spokane in itself represents a challenge.</p>	<p><u>Response 1-A</u> The culverts beneath Spokane Avenue function acceptably from a hydraulic standpoint and have considerable remaining service life. There is also sufficient room to accommodate minor widening of Spokane Avenue at this crossing if needed. When the culverts require replacement, MDT will review the river crossing options (bridge or culvert) at that time.</p> <p><u>Response 1-B</u> Local preferences for replacing the culverts with a bridge and making desired trail connections have been noted in the discussion of future improvement options for Spokane Avenue and for pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The Corridor Study notes future improvement options should include elements that support the community's vision for its trail network where practicable.</p> <p><u>Response 1-C</u> This topic was discussed at the April 26, 2010 CAC meeting. Specific design details for corridor improvement projects, including pedestrian and bicyclist accommodations, would be worked out if improvement options are forwarded into project development.</p> <p><u>Response 1-D</u> Both improvement options allow for on street 5-foot bike lanes and a sidewalk.</p> <p><u>Response 1-E</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>

	<p><u>Comment 1-F</u> We currently have a narrow bike lane on Baker from the Whitefish River Bridge all the way south to 19th St. The two preferred alternatives funnel more traffic along Baker for different distances but for the sections of Baker carrying that additional load, for safety reasons, we again need a separated bike/pedestrian path as well as a separated path on the rebuild of the Baker St Bridge.</p> <p><u>Comment 1-G</u> In the Contra Flow alternative the included section of 7th St. including the bridge needs a separated bike/pedestrian path. We have always had plans to provide such path on 7th St. from Geddes to Karrow and should this alternative be chosen we would undoubtedly plan to provide a path from Geddes east to the schools as that would become a major route for children getting to both the elementary and High school.</p> <p>I look forward to discussing all of these in the CAC meeting.</p> <p><u>Comment 1-H</u> As you know I've always been a supporter of a By-pass, or at least a truck route, either of which, in my opinion, would make these hwy solutions easier to accommodate.</p>	<p><u>Response 1-F</u> The Corridor Study presents improvement options that seek to perpetuate and/or enhance existing pedestrian and bicyclist facilities within the corridor. If an improvement option is forwarded to project development you concerns will be forwarded.</p> <p><u>Response 1-G</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 1-H</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>2</p>	<p>04/17/10 Don Spivey Email (to Dan Norderud)</p> <p>Dan--</p> <p>Here are some additional comments. (primarily focused on the Executive summary)</p> <p><u>Comment 2-A</u> Existing Transportation conditions-- No mention to Baker between 2nd and 6th, I would think it is nearing capacity as it, among other considerations, leads directly into the only practical way to get to the north side of town (the viaduct).</p> <p><u>Comment 2-B</u> Community characteristics the projection of 6900 additional housing units seems excessive</p> <p><u>Comment 2-C</u> Two preferred alternatives Both Baker and Spokane have long sections of 3 lane configurations and I wonder where you will get the space for those lanes plus separated bike paths and sidewalks on both Baker and Spokane. There is also the question of parking and on Spokane the "Trees". Additional right-of-</p>	<p><u>Response 2-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 2-B</u> This projection is from the growth assumptions generated for the Whitefish Growth Policy.</p> <p><u>Response 2-C</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>

<p>way will be hard to come by on both as well-for several reasons. With the increased traffic on Spokane and Baker, 5' bike lanes immediately adjacent to large truck traffic is not safe.</p> <p><u>Comment 2-D</u> The Spokane Ave. "Bridge" The study talks about installing this bridge sometime in the future (maybe) but well beyond the scope of this study. Certainly the contra option and probably the modified alternative will require work on the current river crossing to accommodate the additional lanes, bike paths and sidewalks. If no bridge then a path from North to South on the west side with a pedestrian/bike tunnel to avoid an unsafe grade level crossing (not interested in bringing trail users up to street level and then sending them south to 13th across US93 and back up to the south side of the river and down to the trail at that point)</p> <p><u>Comment 2-E</u> In 8.6.1 You use the term "grade-separated trail" Does that mean a hanging bike and pedestrian bridge under a new Spokane Ave, which is what we always wanted and have discussed with MDT?</p> <p><u>Comment 2-F</u> I've already commented on 5' bike lanes on busy US highways--particularly for novice riders and children.</p> <p><u>Comment 2-G</u> Truck turnings Truck turning lanes on 2nd at Baker and at Spokane (particularly at Baker). How are you going to achieve that without taking out Glacier Bank and potentially other businesses? Even today trucks pulling doubles have to take most of Spokane to safely execute a turn south at the Spokane/2nd St. intersection.</p> <p><u>Comment 2-H</u> Corridor Study and the City "Tiger" grant Seems like you've included the "equivalent" of the Tiger grant funds to rebuild 2nd from Spokane to Baker in you cost estimates. That section will be completed long before any of this study is undertaken. I wonder if somehow that should not be reflected and acknowledged in this document.</p> <p>That's enough from me.....Don Spivey</p>	<p><u>Response 2-D</u> This study does not go into specific design details for corridor improvement options, including pedestrian and bicyclist accommodations. These would be investigated if improvement options are forwarded into project development.</p> <p><u>Response 2-E</u> As stated the preference for the grade-separated pedestrian/bicyclist trail is the community's goal. This study does not include the replacement of the culverts with a bridge. A grade-separated trail would be investigated at the time the culvert replacement project is forwarded into project development.</p> <p><u>Response 2-F</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 2-G</u> Future improvement options, if advanced, would include modifications to curb radii to accommodate turns by large trucks. This may require minor amounts of additional right-of-way from the corners at the noted intersections.</p> <p><u>Response 2-H</u> The City's TIGER grant award is to fund some of the recommended improvement options. The TIGER grant funding is acknowledged in the study under the funding discussion.</p>
---	---

<p>3</p>	<p>04/19/10 Shelby Powell Email (to Necile Lorang – City of Whitefish)</p> <p><u>Comment 3-A</u> I read in the Daily Interlake today about the planned proposal for Baker Avenue to be widened as a thoroughfare for trucks. May I just say, "that's just crazy"! That does not solve the problem at all of trucks going through town. Why is this plan even being considered?</p> <p><u>Comment 3-B</u> The speed limit on Baker Avenue is 25 miles per hour, and with good reason. It's in the middle of town with a kiddie park, a bridge over the river, tennis courts and ducks crossing the street. It's a beautiful area with lots of pedestrians.</p> <p><u>Comment 3-C</u> Whatever happened to the Karrow idea of re-routing Highway 93? Maybe even consider re-routing trucks even further out from town than Karrow. There has to be a better solution. Ugh. Back to the drawing board is my suggestion.</p>	<p><u>Response 3-A</u> This comment was received after an article about the Draft Corridor Study with a misleading title --"State Wants Baker Avenue for Truck Route"—appeared in the April 19, 2010 edition of the <i>Daily Inter Lake</i>. Improving the US 93 corridor through Whitefish should include the actions needed to accommodate current and future demands of all facility users. The Contra-Flow and Modified Alternative C (Offset) configurations provide alternate ways that traffic could be routed through the downtown to help reduce truck volumes on 2nd Street and make truck movements less difficult.</p> <p>If Baker Avenue and new east-west connections at either 7th or 13th Street were made part of US 93, there would be an obligation to ensure that the facility could accommodate use by all types of vehicles that might travel this NHS route.</p> <p><u>Response 3-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 3-C</u> The Whitefish Transportation Plan examined a variety of western route alternates (bypasses) around the southwestern portion of the community but did not recommend the development of a western bypass route for US 93. Travel demand modeling for the bypass options illustrated that a bypass would not solve the future traffic issues along US 93 corridor.</p>
<p>4</p>	<p>A question, comment or request has been submitted via the "Contact Us" web page. Name: No name provided Submitted: 04/19/2010 13:04:35</p> <p>Comment or Question:</p> <p><u>Comment 4</u> Why are we even considering making Baker Avenue in Whitefish a thorough fare for trucks? The speed limit there is 25 miles per hour, and with good reason. It's in the middle of town with a kiddie park, a bridge over the river, tennis courts and ducks crossing the street. This doesn't solve any problems of getting trucks out of town at all. What an idiotic idea!</p>	<p><u>Response 4</u> This comment was received after an article about the Draft Corridor Study with a misleading title --"State Wants Baker Avenue for Truck Route"—appeared in the April 19, 2010 edition of the <i>Daily Inter Lake</i>.</p> <p>Improving the US 93 corridor through Whitefish should include the actions needed to accommodate current and</p>

		<p>future demands of all facility users. The Contra-Flow and Modified Alternative C (Offset) configurations provide alternate ways that traffic could be routed through the downtown to help reduce truck volumes on 2nd Street and make truck movements less difficult.</p> <p>If Baker Avenue and new east-west connections at either 7th or 13th Street were made part of US 93, there would be an obligation to ensure that the facility could accommodate use by all types of vehicles that might travel this NHS route.</p>
<p>5</p>	<p>A question, comment or request has been submitted via the "Contact Us" web page.</p> <p>Name: No name provided Submitted: 04/19/2010 09:38:07</p> <p>Comment or Question:</p> <p><u>Comment 5</u> I just read where Whitefish is looking to use Baker Ave to re-route truck traffic. My comment is, the bypass is being worked on through Kalispell so why not at least plan to continue this for routing around Whitefish? To me it seems crazy to go around Kalispell only to T back into highway 93 and route all that traffic through Whitefish. Ideally, the bypass should be routed down Farm To Market Road and connected back to Highway 93 where Farm to Market road ends now. If land acquisition is a problem, there should be plenty of other options for connecting to highway 93 at some point North of Whitefish.</p>	<p><u>Response 5</u> The Whitefish Transportation Plan examined a variety of western route alternates (bypasses) around the southwestern portion of the community but did not recommend the development of a western bypass route for US 93. Travel demand modeling for the bypass options illustrated that a bypass would not solve the future traffic issues along US 93 corridor.</p>
<p>6</p>	<p>04/20/10 Mary Jo Look Telephone Call (to Dan Norderud)</p> <p><u>Comment 6-A</u> Mary Jo Look called and commented that past input from the Citizens Working Group was being ignored in the Corridor Study.</p> <p><u>Comment 6-B</u> opposes the bridge at 7th Street for cost reasons and felt it was unnecessary.</p> <p><u>Comment 6-C</u> supports efforts to improve signals on 2nd Street and reiterated the need for turn lanes on 2nd Street at Baker Avenue and Spokane Avenue. She said the CWG opposed double lanes on Spokane or Baker Avenues.</p>	<p><u>Response 6-A</u> Past input from the Citizen's Working Group (CWG) established for MDT's design projects in Whitefish was reviewed during the development of the Corridor Study. This input is acknowledged in several parts of the study including information that defines issues and overall corridor needs.</p> <p><u>Comment 6-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 6-C</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>

	<p><u>Comment 6-D</u> advocates for a bypass and provided reasons why she favored the idea.</p>	<p><u>Response 6-D</u> The Whitefish Transportation Plan examined a variety of western route alternates (bypasses) around the southwestern portion of the community but did not recommend the development of a western bypass route for US 93. Travel demand modeling for the bypass options illustrated that a bypass would not solve the future traffic issues along US 93 corridor.</p>
<p>7</p>	<p>04/26/10 Jim Thompson Comment Form</p> <p><u>Comment 7-A</u> What about the people living on Baker and right of way acquisition. Can the expansion to 3 lanes be accommodated with the current road width of Baker?</p> <p><u>Comment 7-B</u> How will this impact Riverside Park? It seems a lot more traffic will go down Baker through Riverside Park where a lot of people walk.</p> <p><u>Comment 7-C</u> It seems like these studies were done only on traffic flow, not including the impact of the people living on Baker Avenue and Spokane Avenue. To me, it seems like the problem on Spokane/93 will be spread to Baker, not really solving a traffic pattern but creating 2 main roads in Whitefish with traffic problems. Of course I am biased, I do live on Baker Avenue.</p>	<p><u>Response 7-A</u> If an improvement option is forwarded into project development, the right-of-way needs would be determined.</p> <p><u>Response 7-B</u> If improvement options are forwarded in to project development the impacts would be investigated and if necessary mitigated through the environmental review and design process.</p> <p><u>Comment 7-C</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>8</p>	<p>04/26/10 Jerry Luderman Comment Form</p> <p><u>Comment 8-A</u> Long-time citizen recommends widening Spokane Ave. between 6th and 2nd St. as much as possible without impacting the trees. This could help to preserve on-street parking as the travel way is expanded to 3 lanes.</p> <p><u>Comment 8-B</u> Also suggest prohibiting left turns on 3rd, 4th, 5th and 6th Streets at Spokane intersections to prevent congestion due to vehicles waiting to make those sorts of turns.</p>	<p><u>Response 8-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 8-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>9</p>	<p>04/26/10 Karl Borchers Comment Letter</p> <p><u>Comment 9-A</u> Reconstructing US 93 using Baker Avenue and 13th</p>	<p><u>Comment 9-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>

	<p>Street makes the most sense.</p> <p><u>Comment 9-B</u> It is really a “no brainer” to avoid building a bridge at the widest point on the Whitefish River at 7th Street at the most environmentally sensitive place at a cost of about \$9 million more than the alternate route would cost. The \$9 million saved could be used on one or two other road projects in the area. Thus these funds could be put to better use.</p> <p>Traffic has been going a few blocks either way for many years to cross the river with no particular problems. Why change this at such a high cost?</p> <p><u>Comment 9-C</u> I realize there are likely people in Whitefish who have an agenda to place a bridge at 7th Street. I would hope MDOT would see the bigger picture, avoid personal agendas, and environmental problems, and spend the highway funds in such a way as to construct the most miles of road for the money.</p>	<p><u>Comment 9-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 9-C</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>10</p>	<p>04/26/10 Rebecca Norton Comment Form</p> <p><u>Comment 10-A</u> I live near the WF River footbridge off of 6th so spend a lot of time in the Riverside Park & my office is only ½ mile away on Spokane between 4th and 5th Street so walk this corridor a lot. I’d rather not have the bridge off 7th unless you are using 7th to Karrow as a truck bypass to 93.</p> <p><u>Comment 10-B</u> But I also already see people not stopping for pedestrians – even with florescent signs and marked crossing lines. And there is a lot of bike/walking traffic & kids, kids, kids on Baker. I also wonder how very large trucks will be turning and where. Kids around this corridor frequently and very often acting impulsively.</p> <p><u>Comment 10-C</u> Also, I worry about dust/noise at my office and how much of the front of the property will be taken. Lots of parking on street already. Music school adds more kids, I like having a park for kids and families in the heart of town without excessive noise/traffic for the long run.</p> <p><u>Comment 10-D</u> Was hoping trucks would have an alternative route.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	<p><u>Response 10-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 10-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 10-C</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 10-D</u> The Whitefish Transportation Plan examined a variety of western route alternates (bypasses) around the southwestern portion of the community but did not recommend the development of a western bypass route for US 93. Travel demand modeling for the bypass options illustrated that a bypass would not solve the future traffic</p>



		issues along US 93 corridor.
11	<p>04/29/10 John Chaney Comment Letter to RPA (Sheila Ludlow from MDT received a similar letter from Mr. Chaney on 4-29-10)</p> <p>Dear Mr. Norderud:</p> <p>I would like to make the following comments on the Whitefish Urban Corridor Study of US 93:</p> <p><u>Comment 11-A</u> 1. A "spot" change should be made at the intersections of Spokane and Second and Baker and Second - A signal with left turn arrows. This is a change which could be made now that would provide immediate relief at these two intersections,</p> <p><u>Comment 11-B</u> 2. I feel that both Spokane Ave. and Baker Ave. should be kept two way. One way streets will negatively affect the impact of traffic flows on the community.</p> <p><u>Comment 11-C</u> 3. The bridge at 7th Street should be taken out of the plan for a number of reasons. First, the original plan was predicated on the City of Whitefish's plan to extend East 7th Street to intersect with Spokane. It is unlikely that the City of Whitefish will be willing at this time to spend the considerable funds needed to make this extension. Without this extension, the need for the bridge will be greatly lessened. Second, the significant cost of this bridge will likely delay the funding of the overall project. Third, the building of this bridge will have significant negative environmental consequences as it crosses both a river and wetlands. For these reasons, the alternative routes on 13th and 19th Streets are preferred over the bridge option. I feel that these routes provide sufficient conductivity between Baker and Spokane Avenues. These viewpoints are reflected at several planning levels. In the Whitefish Urban Corridor Study of US 93 by Robert Peccia & Associates, Inc (pp 5-11 to 5-12) it is stated that "Comments heard during the development of the U.S. Highway 93 Somers to Whitefish West FEIS and the City's Growth Policy suggest that not all community members support the concept of making this connection [the Seventh Street Bridge] because it would require a long and expensive bridge and cross the widest part of the Whitefish River's floodplain and associated wetlands. Securing necessary environmental permits for a new 7th Street bridge may also be difficult if other options resulting in less impact to the river and wetland areas are viable." In addition, both the Whitefish City Council and the Whitefish City-County Planning Board have agreed with the recommendation contained in the Whitefish</p>	<p><u>Response 11-A</u> The Corridor Study recommends improvement options to add appropriate left turn lanes and upgrading signals on 2nd Street.</p> <p><u>Response 11-B</u> Both the recommended improvement options provide for two-way on Spokane Avenue and Baker Avenue.</p> <p><u>Response 11-C</u> Your comments not supporting the 7th St bridge (Contra-flow configuration) are noted.</p>

	<p>Transportation Plan-2009 (pp 6-13 to 6-14) prepared by Robert Peccia & Associates where the 7th Bridge is placed in Implementation Category C (the lowest priority). In the Urban Corridor Study of US 93 (p ES-11) under the Contra-Flow Configuration, the 7th Bridge and 7th Street Connection are placed in Priority 4, the second lowest priority.</p> <p>In summary I feel that the construction of an approximately 575 foot bridge over the wetlands and Whitefish River at 7th Street would result in significant environmental damage. Thus I request that the decision makers reject the Contra-Flow Configuration and select the other configuration advanced to second level screening-the Modified Alternative C (Offset) Configuration.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of these ideas.</p>	
<p>12</p>	<p>04/30/10 Jan Metzmaker Comment Form</p> <p><u>Comment 12</u> I am VERY much opposed to routing ANY truck traffic down Baker Avenue in Whitefish. With the Wave, medical offices, kiddie park, Riverside Park and other businesses on Baker, additional truck traffic would be hazardous. Keep the traffic on Highway 93 and leave Baker as it is. Baker is also a bike route and relatively safe to travel.</p>	<p><u>Response 12</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>13</p>	<p>A question, comment or request has been submitted via the "Contact Us" web page.</p> <p>Name: Konrad Binder Submitted: 05/05/2010 14:44:56</p> <p>Comment or Question: I would like to provide some feedback on the Whitefish Corridor Study:</p> <p><u>Comment 13-A</u> As the town is so small, it seems to me that it makes sense to minimize the number of large roadways that go through the town, especially when one of the streets in consideration goes right through a town Park.</p> <p><u>Comment 13-B</u> As Spokane is the main corridor today, the obvious thing to do is to improve Spokane, but keep Baker Ave as is, or even make it less traffic friendly (i.e. add roundabouts or speed bumps) to divert traffic to Spokane, where it should be.</p>	<p><u>Response 13-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 13-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>

	<p><u>Comment 13-C</u> From a high level I see how it looks like a good idea to have Baker take some of the flow, however as there is the Kiddie Park that Baker cuts right through today, any increase in lanes or any additional traffic there is a very bad idea. Studies show that increased lanes on a roadway add to increased speeds of vehicles (regardless of posted limits). If anything were to happen to increase traffic through a park area, a pedestrian bridge or tunnel should be added to the plan. I dont recall seeing any of that addressed in this doc. Let's not lose a kid or have a number of horrible accidents before the idea to put in a solution is addressed.</p> <p>It would appear to me that the plan was designed more for traffic flow patterns, without taking these community elements into account. This plan does not account for the livable access of the area, with people, kids, bikes and community overlooked.</p> <p><u>Comment 13-D</u> This area is already a high pedestrian area (with the Post Office and Park), and bikes (with Bike lanes on Baker today). We should be building a plan to increase foot and bike usage, not more lanes for logging truck through the heart of our town and Parks. We must remember that it is very hard to go back, once we add lanes and pavement, they will be there forever. Let's keep the flow on Spokane, where it belongs. Two dangerous and busy streets are not better than one.</p> <p><u>Comment 13 -E</u> And adding a bridge across the river on 7th? Waste of money, ugly and bad for the environment. Nothing good about that option.</p>	<p><u>Response 13-C</u> Pedestrian safety and crossing provisions on Baker Avenue would be examined if improvement options are advanced into project development.</p> <p><u>Response 13-D</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 13-E</u> This study does not make a decision on which configuration to use. Your comment is noted.</p>
<p>14</p>	<p>A question, comment or request has been submitted via the "Contact Us" web page.</p> <p>Name: Brian Schott Submitted: 05/13/2010 12:49:26</p> <p>Comment or Question: The corridor study in Whitefish should be re-thought.</p> <p><u>Comment 14-A</u> When Baker Avenue was recommended to be upgraded to 3 lanes and have truck traffic on it, there was no Whitefish WAVE and many other businesses in this zone where there is a lot of pedestrian and bike traffic.</p> <p><u>Comment 14-B</u></p>	<p><u>Response 14-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 14-B</u></p>

	<p>Trucks should be kept to Spokane. Improve that street and keep the trucks on the highway please rather than ruining a nice street through the heart of town.</p> <p><u>Comment 14-C</u> Baker Avenue has 2 parks that it dissects -- a Kiddie Park on one side and the tennis courts and bike/pedestrian paths on the other by the river.</p> <p><u>Comment 14-D</u> By widening Baker and putting trucks onto it, it will ruin a nice part of our town and increase chances for car/bike/ped collisions. Already cars do not yield to the crosswalk after the bridge.</p> <p><u>Comment 14-F</u> The studies being done have not anticipated a change of consciousness where people need to be encouraged to get their cars off the road and walk or bike for short trips in town.</p> <p><u>Comment 13-G</u> We should not always be building for more traffic, but looking at ways to keep things moving slowly and safely through town. Increasing speeds on Baker is not the right solution.</p> <p><u>Comment 13-H</u> Spokane is the right place for trucks.</p> <p><u>Comment 13-I</u> Also, the idea of a big bridge across the Whitefish River is environmentally questionable and too expensive.</p> <p>Thanks for your time.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 14-C</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 14-D</u> Pedestrian safety and crossing provisions on Baker Avenue would be examined if improvement options are advanced into project development.</p> <p><u>Comment 14-F</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 13-G</u> The study did not recommend increasing speeds on Baker. This study does not go into specific design details for corridor improvement options, including pedestrian and bicyclist accommodations. These would be investigated if improvement options are forwarded into project development.</p> <p><u>Response 13-H</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 13-I</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>
<p>15</p>	<p>A question, comment or request has been submitted via the "Contact Us" web page.</p> <p>Name: Lyndsay Schott Submitted: 05/13/2010 21:27:59</p> <p>Comment or Question:</p> <p><u>Comment 15-A</u> I think it's in the best interest of Whitefish to keep all of the traffic on Spokane Ave rather than to expand Baker Avenue and make that a truck route.</p> <p><u>Comment 15-B</u> Seems like pushing traffic to Baker, not only separates the West side of Whitefish from the town center, but is</p>	<p><u>Response 15-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 15-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p>

	<p>going to be bad for the community.</p> <p><u>Comment 15-C</u> Adding traffic to the already busy Baker will lessen the quality of our "pedestrian/bike friendly" community. Baker has a lot of foot traffic, whether it's bikers at the bike path crossing, folks going to the post office or banks, or parents taking their children to the Kiddie Park.</p> <p><u>Comment 15-D</u> I think there needs to be a study about the non-automobile traffic that uses Baker or crosses Baker. If that were taken into account, I don't think you would be considering Baker as an option for an Urban Corridor.</p>	<p><u>Response 15-C</u> Pedestrian safety and crossing provisions on Baker Avenue would be examined if improvement options are advanced into project development.</p> <p><u>Response 15-D</u> If an improvement option is forwarded into project development the Community of Whitefish would need to provide non-motorized vehicle data.</p>
<p>16</p>	<p>05/14/10 Mary Jo Look Comment Form</p> <p><u>Comment 16-A</u> The US 93 Project has been studied since the EIS came out in 1994. During these 16 years Whitefish has had considerable growth.</p> <p>A Citizen Working Group of 14 people who lived in Whitefish started working with WGM on this EIS plan in 2005 until 2007, and it was determined that this plan was "outdated", as even, at that time, Spokane and Baker Avenue were crowded, and it was determined that 2nd St. between Baker and Spokane needed to remain 2 lane road through town as there are businesses on both sides of the street that need the parking. This also applies to Baker and Spokane Ave.</p> <p>There really is no other alternative – through the business core.</p> <p><u>Comment 16-B</u> The idea of building a 7th St. Bridge from Spokane to Baker would also require widening the existing Baker St. Bridge. This all is far too expensive to justify what it would accomplish.</p> <p><u>Comment 16-C</u> Traffic on Baker is near maximum now, and if it were considered to be part of US 93, it would require at least 6 traffic signals (at 3rd, 4th, 5th, 7th, 13th, 17th or 18th (whichever is the road to the new Fire-Police Station). It has pedestrian traffic as there are "2 Churches", a "kiddie park" – tennis courts, 2 Banks, City Post Office, residential homes, and businesses, and needs on the street parking. The intersection at 2nd and Baker is too narrow for the Logging and long Semi-trucks to negotiate the turn. Safety, also, would be a big issue.</p>	<p><u>Response 16-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 16-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 16-C</u> The recommended configurations that have been examined in detail do not require traffic signals at all of the locations you identify.</p> <p>Future improvements options at 2nd and Baker recommend modifications to accommodate truck turning movements.</p>

	<p><u>Comment 16-D</u> As I see it – as a temporary alternate, but the beginning of a permanent alternate road, and with the least amount of property disruption or impact on businesses and neighborhoods, would be to: Starting from the US 93-Highway 40 Intersection, south of Whitefish, build a 2 lane road going West until it reaches the Power Lines or Blanchard Lake Road, which turns into Karrow Ave-then meeting US 93N West of Whitefish, with a traffic signal with a left turn lane and left run signal.</p> <p>It is not the best- as a permanent bypass should go west of Grouse Mountain. This road is almost necessary as 2nd Street from Spokane to Baker is to be rebuilt soon and US 93 must remain open.</p> <p>Do hope this may be a consideration. It appears workable and, maybe, the least expensive.</p>	<p><u>Response 16-D</u> The Whitefish Transportation Plan examined a variety of western route alternates (bypasses) around the southwestern portion of the community but did not recommend the development of a western bypass route for US 93. Travel demand modeling for the bypass options illustrated that a bypass would not solve the future traffic issues along US 93 corridor.</p>
<p>17</p>	<p>05/14/10 Mary Jane Barrett Comment Form</p> <p><u>Comment 17-A</u> 1) You will destroy (2) Parks and river. We have a village atmosphere on Baker with high pedestrian, bike, water recreation, tennis courts. The use will be destroyed along with the visual & noise. A travesty after all the work on Baker. A health club – (2) physician’s clinics – will impact emergency access onto Baker- parking destroyed- (2) churches. <u>Businesses</u> will go <u>out</u> of business.</p> <p><u>Comment 17-B</u> 2) Put more stop signs & widen highway already in use.</p> <p><u>Comment 17-C</u> A <u>very bad</u> idea to make Baker a truck Route.</p>	<p><u>Response 17-A</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 17-B</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p><u>Response 17-C</u> Please review the responses provided in response 2-A.</p>