

NAME	COMMENTS	METHOD OF COMMUNICATION
Jason Henrichs	I just wanted to send a message in support of the Third street bridge. I work in Pullman and live near the round-about so another direct way through Moscow for me to get home would be appreciate.	Email
Steve Leib	I applaud the addition of the third street bridge and the resulting third street corridor. It has been a long time coming and has been prevented by a small minority of people for way to long. Prejudice against East/West traffic will finally be gone! Unless the “traffic calming” measures are more sinister than the term sounds.	Email
Nancy Chaney	<p>Dear Chairman Calabretta and Commission Members:</p> <p>Thank you for your community service, and for considering public input on Third Street corridor safety, prior to making recommendations to the City Council. Consistent with Plan C generated by the MTC Subcommittee/Working Group, I support traffic-calming and other safety improvements along the Third Street corridor between Mountain View and Washington Street. In keeping with the Working Group’s stated priority of children’s safety, Plan C includes a bi-directional protected bike lane (conceived by UI Professor Mike Lowry) in addition to raised crosswalks, refuge medians, stop signs, continuous sidewalks, and buffers to protect bicyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users, and sensitive proximal activities. I also support restricting through truck traffic and preserving on-street parking to the extent practicable, for the convenience of nearby residents and visitors and for its traffic-calming effect.</p> <p>My preference remains that the City Council reverses the previous Council’s decision to install a multi-modal bridge over Paradise Creek on Third Street, and installs a much less expensive, far less disruptive bicycle-pedestrian ONLY crossing at that location instead. Corridor safety improvements should be implemented now, regardless of the Council’s decision about the bridge.</p> <p>The City’s process, pace, and rationale for installing a multi-modal bridge are flawed and not based on urgent need. I encourage you to recommend to the City Council that they take time to engage key stakeholders who may not have been represented in the Working Group. They include Moscow School District and Parent-Teacher organizations; people with disabilities;</p>	Email

boards of directors for Rendezvous in the Park, Renaissance Fair, and Hemp Fest; downtown businesses; Heart of the Arts and the Senior Center, among others. In addition to MTC, other citizen commissions (copied here) ought to be invited to weigh-in on aspects like social justice (Fair and Affordable Housing, Human Rights), green infrastructure and ecosystem function (Sustainable Environment), the urban forest (Tree), non-motorized connectivity (Pathways), performance arts and events in East City Park (Arts), architectural and cultural heritage (Historic Preservation), tourism and economic vitality (Farmers Market), and community gathering spaces (Parks & Recreation).

In addition to safety improvements articulated in Plan C, please recommend:

- Herringbone-type storm drains to lessen catch-hazards for cyclists' wheels
- Policies, equipment, staffing, and budget to reliably clear sidewalks and bike lanes of snow and debris because this is a main route for non-motorized users, including people with disabilities, (Extreme weather events could prevent that on infrequent occasions.)
- 'No through truck traffic' signage (Wayfinding software sometimes directs otherwise.)
- Pedestrian/bicyclist-oriented points of interest along the corridor, to encourage such uses (e.g. dog-friendly amenities, bike parking near bus stops, pedestrian-scale signs for historic interest, walking tours, tree identification, kiosk to post upcoming activities in the park)
- Green infrastructure so design elements of roadways, sidewalks, tree wells, vegetated buffers, rain gardens, etc. are consistent with the specialness of Paradise Creek and its ecosystem services
- Safe accommodation of traditional alleyway access onto Third (e.g. convex mirrors; resident- and Latah Sanitation truck actuated caution lights)
- Protection of property values and safety of adjacent residents by proactively addressing their concerns individually (e.g. planting trees, building fences or walls, or acquiring property as has happened on East D St, West A St, etc.)
- Buffering the southern edge of East City Park from lights, sounds, hazards of car and truck traffic, to protect ambiance and desirability of that public space
- Cohesive thematic street furnishings

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Spot-lit crosswalks and isolated (warm spectrum LED) illumination of key intersections, in addition to low-level walkway illumination, instead of lighting up the neighborhood like a raceway or strip mall</li> <li>• Means of evaluating safety intervention measures for effectiveness</li> <li>• Gateway treatments on medians at Jefferson and Hayes, to designate neighborhood entrances</li> <li>• Fixing misaligned southbound curb lines on Hayes for smoother, safer westbound turns onto Third, and modify curve on NW corner at the park</li> <li>• Four-way stop signs at <i>First</i> Street and Blaine, consistent with a systems approach to safety</li> <li>• Installing a bridge that would invite additional motorized traffic onto Third Street or failing to install bike-ped-ADA improvements along that corridor would: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Endanger non-motorized users</li> <li>• Diminish adjacent property values</li> <li>• Detract from the historic nature of the neighborhood</li> <li>• Injure Moscow’s reputation as a livable community</li> <li>• Lessen the attractiveness of East City Park as a venue for revenue-generating, community-building events</li> <li>• Impede mobility of people with disabilities</li> <li>• Hurt the ambiance and desirability of downtown, including Moscow Farmers Market</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>The City Council’s eventual decision regarding this matter will have long-lasting implications, and affect our community--culturally, aesthetically, functionally, and economically--for the foreseeable future.</p> <p>Thank you for your thoughtful consideration and recommendations.</p>	
Joanne Sutton	I strongly urge the council to cancel the auto bridge on third. There are so many other needs in the city streets, Harrison non pavement for one example, A street for another. The pedestrian-bike bridge is a better alternative for our dollars. The traffic calming needed will make the street difficult to use. Please leave it as it is.	Email

Joanne Sutton	<p>Please cancel plans for this bridge and build the long planned pedestrian bridge. This was decided with inadequate input and only benefits the new developments to the detriment of existing residents. Third street, with the expensive added safety features, will take needed parking spots and unreasonably slow traffic. There are streets partially unpaved such as E and Harrison and many in poor condition such as west A. Please use out taxes to fix these needed repairs.</p>	Email
Nancy Chaney	<p>Dear Councilors:</p> <p>Thank you for your commitment to public service, and for inviting this input about Third Street corridor safety. Please reverse the decision to install a multi-modal bridge over Paradise Creek on Third Street, and install a much less expensive, far less disruptive bicycle-pedestrian ONLY crossing at that location instead. Regardless of your decision about the bridge, proper, I encourage prompt implementation of safety improvements from Mountain View to Washington Street, consistent with Plan C generated by the MTC Subcommittee/Working Group.</p> <p>In keeping with the Working Group's stated priority of children's safety, Plan C includes a bi-directional protected bike lane, raised crosswalks, pedestrian refuge medians, stop signs, continuous sidewalks, and other protection for bicyclists, pedestrians, wheelchair users, and sensitive proximal activities. In addition, I support preserving on-street parking to the extent practicable, for the convenience of nearby residents and visitors and for its traffic-calming effect.</p> <p>Every budget cycle, the City asserts fiscal responsibly. That's why it was so surprising the City could shake its sofa cushions and discover an extra \$580,000 lying around in the General Fund for a motor vehicle bridge on Third Street, with no provision for safety improvements along the corridor. A previous Council opposed that idea for good reasons, unchanged since Resolution 2007-30. Some would have you believe that it is a fait accompli, but unless concrete has been poured, it is within your authority to reject that assumption, settle monetary commitments with consultants, and facilitate a better, safer, more fiscally responsible outcome.</p>	Email

The previous Council's motivation for proposing immediate installation of a multi-modal bridge is not based on urgent need. That amount of money could be more responsibly spent on other more pressing things like sidewalks, street maintenance/repair, the animal shelter, undeveloped parkland projects, the southeast Moscow industrial park, addressing food insecurity and indigent care, increasing matching funds to make grant proposals for safety improvements on North Mountain View to the Logos campus more competitive, making a more compelling case for the multi-million-dollar bond you're contemplating for 2018, and other priorities, including corridor safety improvements, whether the bridge accommodates motor vehicles or not.

Inviting additional motorized traffic along Third Street or not embracing recommended bike-ped-ADA improvements would:

- Endanger non-motorized users
- Diminish adjacent property values
- Detract from the historic nature of the neighborhood
- Injure Moscow's reputation as a livable community
- Lessen the attractiveness of East City Park as a venue for revenue-generating, community-building events
- Impede mobility of people with disabilities
- Hurt the ambiance and desirability of downtown, including Moscow Farmers Market

Complementary to Plan C, I'd like to see:

- Herringbone-type storm drains to lessen catch-hazards for cyclists' wheels
- Policies, equipment, staffing, and budget to reliably clear sidewalks and bike lanes of snow and debris because this is a main route for non-motorized users, including people with disabilities (Extreme weather events could prevent that on infrequent occasions.)
- 'No through truck traffic' signage (Wayfinding software sometimes directs otherwise.)
- Pedestrian/bicyclist-oriented points of interest along the corridor, to encourage such uses (e.g. dog-friendly amenities, benches, bike parking near bus stops, pedestrian-scale informational signs for historic interest, walking tours, tree identification, a kiosk for posting upcoming activities in the park)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Green infrastructure design elements of roadways, sidewalks, tree wells, vegetated buffers, rain gardens, etc., consistent with the specialness of Paradise Creek and its ecosystem services</li> <li>• Safe accommodation of traditional alleyway access onto Third (e.g. convex mirrors; resident- and Latah Sanitation truck actuated caution lights)</li> <li>• Protection of property values and safety of adjacent residents by proactively addressing their concerns individually (e.g. planting trees, building fences or walls, or acquiring property as has happened on East D St, West A St, etc.)</li> <li>• East City Park southern border buffers from lights, sounds, hazards of car and truck traffic, to protect ambiance and desirability of that public space</li> <li>• Cohesive thematic street furnishings</li> <li>• Spot-lit crosswalks and isolated (warm spectrum LED) illumination of key intersections, in addition to low-level walkway illumination, instead of lighting up the neighborhood like a raceway or strip mall</li> <li>• Means of evaluating safety intervention measures for effectiveness</li> <li>• Gateway treatments on medians at Jefferson and Hayes, to designate neighborhood entrances</li> <li>• Fixing misaligned southbound curb lines on Hayes for smoother, safer westbound turns onto Third, and modify curve on NW corner at the park</li> <li>• Four-way stop signs at First Street and Blaine, consistent with systems approach to safety</li> </ul> <p>The decisions you make in this situation will have long-lasting implications, and affect our community--culturally, aesthetically, functionally, and economically--for the foreseeable future. Please choose wisely.</p>	
Pat Rathmann	<p>As a fairly new Moscow resident, I'm curious what kind of uproar occurred years ago when this was first proposed. I understand it was placed on the list of future projects at that time. Wouldn't this have been the logical time for the anti's to have put a stop to this plan?</p> <p>If safeguards on speed limits and appropriate 4-way stop signs are put into place, I see no reason why this project should not move forward.</p>	Email

Colleen Christie	<p>I am in favor of the bridge. When I first came to Moscow seven and a half years ago as a UI student, I went down Third street. I found that the road did not continue to the other side of town. I was new in the area and did not know what other streets or where I could connect to the other side. I assumed that since it was one of the main streets in Moscow, it connected one side of town to the other. I agree traffic calming measure should be in place. A stop sign at Third and Hayes as well as a calming area similar to the area around Moscow Middle School on D Street. I like both Plan A and Plan B. I think I would prefer Plan B over A.</p>	Email
Dennis Becker	<p>I'm writing to provide comments on the 3rd Street corridor proposal.</p> <p>I support option 3 with full vehicle, bike and pedestrian access via a new bridge with traffic calming devises. My main concerns/interests are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lena Whitmore intersection at Blain. Traffic already backs up there quite a bit. A four-way stop might help with safety but could increase backups. A different parent drop off point might be necessary at the school.</li> <li>- bump outs are visually appealing and effective at slowing traffic. I would like to see more of these along that route into downtown.</li> <li>- crossing Mountain View on bike can be difficult. Will there be a four-way stop at 3rd and MV?</li> <li>- I strongly encourage public art and trees/vegetation along the route, particularly for those homes next to MV that will be most impacted. I haven't visited the site in awhile but is there also room for a small natural area at the creek?</li> <li>- are street lamps envisioned along 3rd? Winter/night time biking is a bit treacherous in places. I don't want a full light corridor with light pollution but some lighting would help, preferably using the classics historic looking lamps.</li> </ul> <p>Thanks for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Email

<p>Tom La Pointe</p>	<p>On this Christmas Eve morning, my fervent wish is that this city will wake up, realize that the Third Street bridge is a bad idea having little or no benefit to the people of Moscow, and stop the construction of this bridge.</p> <p>As a founding - and long term member - of Moscow's Transportation Commission, I spoke out against this bridge at every opportunity. I continue to do so now in the hope that the governance of the city will realize their error. The total costs of the bridge and its ancillary requirements of traffic calming, etc. now appears to be in excess of one million dollars. Funds have evidently been "found" to cover this amount but I cannot help but wonder about better uses for those funds: things like improved street maintenance and upkeep, snow removal and the like come to mind.</p> <p>Construction of this bridge will negatively impact and change the character of neighborhoods, parks and schools. Additional traffic on Third Street might benefit a select few by the flow of more vehicles, but at what cost? All because some few might be able to shave 10 seconds off of their already short commutes, and developers will be able to sell their lots/houses with 'improved connectivity' options. In the process increased vehicular traffic will endanger school children, reduce the peaceful nature of East City Park and surrounding neighborhoods, and add to the already congested traffic on Third Street between Jefferson and Washington Streets.</p> <p>Stop this bridge - your constituents will thank you.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Dean Stewart, Gretchen Stewart &amp; Amy Ball on behalf of Citizens for a Livable Community</p>	<p>Enclosed is a packet of twenty-one photocopied letters to the Editor of the MPDNews, six opinion/editorial columns, as well as a few news stories for each of you to read as part of your due diligence-whether you are an elected official, paid staff, or appointed person. We believe the views of the citizens of Moscow have been unnecessarily ignored or dismissed and not addressed. The enclosed copies are merely a small collection of these views. Please do read through the packet carefully and allow the voices of all citizens to be included in the planning of this project (and all future projects) that affect the whole of the city of Moscow. We oppose the planned construction of the planned motor vehicle bridge at 3rd Street and Paradise Creek. It is not necessary at this time and could be built later when</p>	<p>By hand (Packet)</p>



	<p>proper, sufficient and real needs have been shown. Furthermore, we believe that 3rd street traffic calming is needed now-whether or not a motor bridge at 3rd and Paradise Creek is ever built.</p> <p>Thank you for your diligent, thorough, and ethical attention to these concerns.</p>	
Terri Schmidt	<p>Hello City Representatives,</p> <p>I live on North Jefferson St. and I have to cross Third St. twice a day to get to work and back. I was recently waiting at the intersection of Jefferson and 3rd thinking about how busy that road is already and how hard it is to get across at times, especially if I have to make a left turn. We can no longer turn left on Main St. during busy hours, and traffic is often backed up turning left on Washington and 3rd. If this bridge is built there will be even more congestion for left turning traffic.</p> <p>Now the city is planning traffic calming options, which are important if the bridge is built. Some of these include lower speed limits and extra stop signs. If we add slowing measures, it will take just as long or longer to get to downtown or the mall from the east side of town than it does now. So what is going to be gained by building this bridge? If the idea was to have a quicker connection to the west side, the calming measures will cancel any gains made.</p> <p>One of the calming options is to remove more parking along third street. I understand the concerns of bicyclists, but having close parking for seniors and people with disabilities using the 1912 center is important. So I would be sorry to see any more parking eliminated.</p> <p>The costs of creating the bridge along with the cost of calming measures is high. I would prefer my tax dollars be spent on repairing roads, building the new police station, or various other more pressing needs. I don't like the idea of spending a likely three quarters of a million dollars or more on a project that will have little benefit and likely some frustrating results.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>	Email

Jeanne Clothiaux	<p>Dear City of Moscow,</p> <p>I am writing to express my opposition to the build-out of a bridge for motor vehicles on 3rd St. in response to a letter from the City of Moscow asking residents for input on the proposed plans for 3rd St., all of which include a motorized bridge.</p> <p>A motorized bridge and the resultant increase in traffic on 3rd St. would significantly change the character of the neighborhood and park. East City Park and the surrounding collection of homes, gardens, trees, and sidewalks, provide both the physical and emotional center for our community. We celebrate there. We grieve for those who have died. Our children swing and slide. Our elders sit on benches under trees and listen to raven song as their grandchildren collect pinecones. Visitors play guitars on blankets they carry in on their shoulders. A sad teenager pays attention, and her heart is lifted. I support improvements to 3rd St. I also support a biker/pedestrian bridge. But I think a motorized bridge would negatively impact the character and safety of the heart of our city. It cannot be overstated how unique and of what great value this park and neighborhood is to our town. Increased traffic, no matter what calming features may be placed to slow it down, does not count as an "improvement."</p> <p>I moved to Moscow in 1998 and owned and operated Red Door Restaurant downtown from 1998 until 2007. During that nine-year period, I came into contact with many locals as well as visitors from around the country and the world. There was near consensus in my conversations about what makes Moscow a great small city. Strong feeling of community, beauty, safety, and walkability always ranked high. These feelings are characterized best in our historic neighborhood, where the trees create a sense of awe, where car traffic is limited to residential traffic, where children race scooters down the sidewalks. East City Park offers a sense of refuge, peace, and quiet. That sense of sitting in a special place, a human-made haven in a hectic world, would be changed significantly by increased traffic on the south border.</p> <p>Why is the city not presenting an option for a non-motorized biker/pedestrian bridge? It offers as its rationale that a motorized bridge has been in the plans since 1994. Such a bridge would have degraded the experience of the neighborhood in 1994. Now that the neighborhood and East City Park have matured in its absence, it comes as an even greater</p>	Email

	<p>degradation. We have Highway 8 to carry traffic east. Perhaps you should consider improving the junction of Highway 8 at Mountain View Dr.</p>	
Sandy Vernon	<p>I would like to express my opinion. I am opposed to automobile traffic. Third street is so narrow and it's already dangerous with the speed people drive down the street. My daughter has to park on third and she has been almost hit multiple times and you want to increase traffic on a street that barely has room for two cars pass each other. Foot and bicycle traffic would have been adequate.</p> <p>To let automobile traffic from Mt View to Third Street I would recommend a four way stop at Hayes and Third. No one cares about the foot traffic at this corner. The stop sign is ran all the time and people do not respect the speed limits.</p> <p>There is more to this town then traffic flow. Safety must be our first priority to everyone.</p>	Email
Vince & Lynn Murray	<p>Members of Moscow City Council:</p> <p>As members of the City Council, we are writing you with the hope that you will revisit the Third Street bridge project. We believe that this project is ill advised and should be scrapped. Such a bridge will alter the character of Moscow in several adverse ways as it attempts to funnel traffic quickly through the heart of our town. Traffic will pass numerous public spaces such as schools, churches, parks, etc., all of which are meant to attract children, and thereby put pedestrians, especially children, in danger as drivers attempt to shave a few minutes off their evening commute (if, indeed, this path through town actually saves time at all, especially with "calming devices" that have been alluded to...and we're not exactly sure what that term means...does it mean the loss of old trees along the sides of the street? We certainly hope not!). Why would we want to funnel more automobile congestion into the heart of our town? We shouldn't sacrifice the wonderful character of Moscow simply to cater to the automobile. Other towns and cities have done this and have regretted doing so. Third Street should remain pedestrian and bicycle friendly. It should not become another fast lane for traffic.</p> <p>We believe the money dedicated to this project would be much better spent fixing the current problems with streets throughout town. Having lived in Moscow for over forty years, we can honestly say that the condition of our city streets has never before been so abysmal during our time here. It appears to us that our city government has been incredibly negligent</p>	Email

	<p>with street maintenance. A problem that has been simply an embarrassment and a nuisance in the past has now become dangerous as automobiles trying to avoid damaged streets enter the lanes of oncoming traffic, and bicyclists risk injury by simply trying to avoid dangerous potholes. Unfortunately, the maintenance has probably become much more expensive now that we have ignored the problem for so long, but it is far past time to do something. Please take the money that we would spend on a Third Street bridge and dedicate it to fixing the streets we already have.</p>	
Ed & Barb Townsend	<p>We are completely in favor of the third street bridge.</p> <p>We do have some concerns about the third street bike lane plans. Have any studies been done concerning how many bicyclists will be using these bike lanes? It seems like the number of people with cars are making huge concessions to the people with bicycles. In the winter will the use of bicycle lanes be diminished? Will this be worth it? Has any thought been given to moving the bicycle lanes to B Street from Adams to Mountain View which would be safer for the bicyclists and the cars as there is less traffic on B street?</p> <p>We would be losing lots of parking especially around the 1912 building and the High School. Where will we park for after school sporting events at the high school? Where are seniors going to park at the 1912 Building. The parking lot there is much too small. It seems to us that automobile traffic and parking should have the higher priority.</p>	Email
Colin Priebe	<p>Hello I am a regular bike commuter who bikes my son from Polk St to West Park elementary most days. Looking at your plans they all seem better than the previous and current roadways as far as safety for pedestrians and bikes. I do like <u>Plan C</u> the best however I have a few questions. A cyclist is traveling north on Jefferson and turning to go East on 3<sup>rd</sup> St. How will the entrance of the bike boulevard be marked to encourage proper use? Riding west on 3<sup>rd</sup> and turning south onto Jefferson (or any other street) what guarantees of protection to help will there be? Plan C</p> <p>I bike this route 1 – 3 times a day. I would love to talk to a planner about this. I would love to see a green bike route on the N/S streets near downtown to guide cyclists and to show the routes to drivers. Thinking about it really only Jefferson is the biggest issue I believe my neighbors and I on Polk can manage. It is just that busy intersection I worry about (see diagram on comment card). Again I would love to talk to someone involved in planning. Phone or Email work</p>	Comment Card

Colin Priebe	One more question. How will the city work with high schoolers getting out at the school using the right door. I understand that there will be a buffer, but if they don't look and start walking to the sidewalk there will be a collision.	Comment Card
Anne Adams	B is the best option – allows parking at East City Park which is very important during park events (there is already a parking shortage). Curb extensions are important. I like the curb extensions at Lincoln St as this is a heavily used crossing. Bike lane is far from ongoing traffic. A is OK. B is much better. C is a bad option. 2 way bike lane is dangerous at night when east going bikes are blinded by west going headlights. It further reduces event parking which is already not enough. I am a cyclist and the 2 way bike lane scares me. It is also more difficult to make left turns to the south on a bike.	Comment Card
Jerry Grzebielski	I feel it is time to open 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street to Mt. View. I have driven through town for 20 years doing a handyman/snow removal and lawn business. We need another street besides 6 <sup>th</sup> St to access Mt View. 6th Street is difficult to cross and about impossible to back out of a driveway. I do not see a need for a pedestrian or bicycle only bridge. We already have B street and 6 <sup>th</sup> to cross. By opening 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street we would have less traffic on Hayes, 6 <sup>th</sup> , D St, F St and 1 <sup>st</sup> Street going by the schools. I know as those are the routes I used going home to Concord. Thank You.	Comment Card
Anonymous	How will they collect my garbage? How will the snow be removed? Worry about fast downhill bikes just inches from uphill bikes (collisions) <u>Very Little Room</u> for error! Please think this through some more! Why the rush?	Comment Card
Harry Moore	Like plans A or B, not C. Keep parking on both sides of 3 <sup>rd</sup> St. Like curb extensions. We both bike 3 <sup>rd</sup> St – easiest hill to climb too!	Comment Card
Frank Bongiorno	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 4 way stop on Blaine &amp; Hayes</li> <li>2. Keep to 25 MPH</li> <li>3. Have Truck Route: Only local deliveries only <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. UPS</li> <li>b. Fed Ex</li> <li>c. Garbage Truck All OK.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>	Comment Card

<p>Bill Thomson</p>	<p>As a bicyclist, Plan C scares me. I would not feel safe riding up hill (east) with bikes coming down hill on my left and cars coming towards me on my right.</p> <p>I prefer Plan B. Will there be painted crosswalks at all street crossings? I hope so – in addition to the 3 raised crossings.</p>	<p>Comment Card</p>
<p>Leslie Rios</p>	<p>I am not in favor of a vehicle bridge on 3<sup>rd</sup> St. However, of these 3 plans, Plan C is the plan I could support; the separated 2-way bike lanes are the most appealing part of this plan.</p> <p>This vehicle bridge seems unnecessary at this time – there are streets in need of repair (ie. 8<sup>th</sup> St. between Logan and Lynn) and those should be a priority. Thank you!</p>	<p>Comment Card</p>
<p>Mary Read</p>	<p>I applaud the work of the subcommittee and the three concepts they developed. I cycle most days in good weather &amp; ride down Third regularly. The bike lanes in all three concepts are well thought out, although I favor one lane one each side for ease of merging with traffic when turning. It is also more logical to ride with traffic. Most importantly though I see no need to build the vehicle bridge at Mt. View. With all of the traffic slowing implementation I don't believe most drivers will choose the 3<sup>rd</sup> St. option. I recommend that the City Council review this budget item and use the \$500,000+ funds to repair many streets in Moscow that are eroding.</p>	<p>Comment Card</p>
<p>D. Nels Reese</p>	<p>I suggest that R/W or property line be shown. I.e. 80 R/W to Hayes, 60 R/W Hayes to Mtn. View</p>	<p>Comment Card</p>
<p>Victoria Seever</p>	<p>(I am a big believer in color coding or color for visual cues)  What would it take to not too expensively do:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) For the bike lane closest to street center, be color marked the whole length? Such as, scattered dots or some pattern in maybe red? To help visually cue everyone it's most at risk for bike &amp; car on-coming adjacent traffic (see diagram on comment card)</li> </ol> <p>*You could instead, every so often, put words on the street, like look right – look left-head's up.....something appropriate ...or icons</p>	<p>Comment Card</p>

	<p>2) If that's doable, then you could also similarly mark the Greenway with green. Overlap, then red trumps green.</p> <p>The taped display is great. You could use tape to make one "picture" of a bike so everyone gets that the carpet here is the dual bike lanes (see diagram on reverse of comment card).</p>	
Victoria Seever	<p>Food for Thought (thinking outside the box) (see diagram on Comment Card) – This bike lane has both oncoming traffic from cars &amp; bikes – FALLOUT:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Inexperienced bikers won't use it, especially kids, will go on the sidewalk</li> <li>2) Also is the bike lane where snow push may encroach in it</li> <li>3) Bikes = pedestrian/regs when using sidewalk</li> <li>4) Bikes = vehicle/regs when using street</li> <li>5) We design space for bikes in the street</li> <li>6) Is it feasible is some way to flip that angle &amp; design their space as pedestrians on parr with the walks instead?</li> <li>7) Yes, if: (see diagram on Comment Card) the bike lanes where level &amp; adjacent to the walks, = a lot more cement sidewalks but if bike lane raised up alongside the walks, then:</li> </ol> <p>Need</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Physically separated from cars all along because walks go the whole length</li> <li>2) No street bumpers &amp; candles needed</li> <li>3) Snow plows don't have the bike path obstacles (diagram above on Comment Card)</li> <li>4) There's some savings in cost for maintenance</li> <li>5) Costs more I assume to widen walks instead of using the street (plus you probably are building sidewalk over new asphalt (remove/replace)</li> <li>6) I would not take ROW (rt of way) unless there's plenty, like along 1912 &amp; East City Park, so could wave into land &amp; not affect street except to then have wider street where you can (see diagram on Comment Card)</li> <li>7) <u>Many bike users walk regardless, so why not put them on the same level?</u></li> </ol> <p>Maybe there's an idea in there that could lead to something - &amp; if not for 3<sup>rd</sup>, maybe the next project</p>	Comment Card
David Uberuaga	The cracks in the street from Cleveland to Roosevelt will need to be filled before heavy traffic starts	Comment Card

Kathy Warren	Looks like the Plan C is the most favorable – <u>Safe</u> & continuation of our designated trail systems – also less expensive. Perhaps the \$ savings could be put toward more frequent snow removal & other maintenance measures?	Comment Card
Anonymous	Option C!	Comment Card
Russ Moore	I would propose a Plan D that provides two bicycle lanes in a standard location next to the right curb. If space allows, also include a traffic buffer. This would be implemented similarly to Option C without the two-way bicycle lanes.  Options A & B do not address the issue that “Sharrows” do not work on this corridor now, and will be worse when it becomes a minor arterial.	Comment Card
William Warfel	Build that Bridge! Why just build a bicycle access bridge when the town is empty during the best cycling months? We need a multi-modal bridge when town is busy the other 9 mo of the year. Thanks!	Comment Card
George Bridges	Plan C is the best.	Comment Card
Anonymous	I like Plan C!	Comment Card
Dody Dozier	There is a fundamental conflict here: is Thirst St. to be a traffic mover – a minor arterial – to help East-West motor traffic to get through town? If so, why are the plans so concerned with slowing traffic down? If Third is <u>not</u> going to move traffic efficiently, why is <u>so much money</u> to be spent on a bridge? Why not leave Third St. alone? And please <u>no parking along East City Park!</u> Little kids could run out between parked cars.	Comment Card
Thomas B. Newhof	There is <u>NO</u> need for a road here – A pedestrian and bike path would be nice. A road is WAY too expensive – this money could be better spent in numerous other ways. Change in traffic patterns would be hard on neighborhoods and 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street pavement.	Comment Card



Sophie Gilbert	Option C is by <u>far</u> the best option, and would not only keep pedestrians and bikers currently using the route safe, but would also give folks on the east side of Mtn. View new ped & bike access to downtown. Thanks for your hard work putting these options together!	Comment Card
Wendy McClure	<p>Please see attached sheet for comments. Thank You!</p> <p>Attachment reads:</p> <p><b>Third Street Corridor Improvements</b></p> <p>Overarching vision based on "always been an objective to build the Third St bridge" seems limited and needs to consider other important dimensions of the comprehensive plan like neighborhood quality. Core residential and downtown neighborhoods (and 2 historic districts) are compromised to accommodate east side growth and through westbound traffic.</p> <p>Used Sub-committee's "Identified areas of interest" as criteria to evaluate alternatives</p> <p><b>Safety:</b></p> <p><b>A, B, C</b> Good idea to reduce speed limit to 25mph. along entire corridor.</p> <p><b>A, B, C</b> Elevated crosswalks are a good idea as shown</p> <p><b>A, B, C</b> also need regular crosswalks to support pedestrian safety at intersections along corridor</p> <p><b>A and B</b> strongest support for pedestrians by having bulges and parked cars to slow traffic/width.</p> <p><b>C</b> has minimal consideration of pedestrians traveling N-S at many intersections along corridor</p>	Comment Card & Attachment

**C** At first glance a dedicated bike lane seems like a good idea but the one depicted would be quite intimidating. Uphill rider is sandwiched between downhill bicyclists and downhill vehicles in a relatively narrow lane on the wrong side of the road.

**Multi-modal access**

**A, B, C** Applaud effort shown in all 3 schemes to integrate multi-modal. A and B prioritize pedestrians.

**C** prioritizes vehicles with wide corridor and bikes with dedicated lanes though odd, unsafe config.

**Limiting Impacts**

**C.** Taking parking off street negatively impacts aligning property owners and pedestrians who are protected by parked cars. Reduces overall neighborhood parking capacity pushing overflow onto side streets to accommodate MHS students, park events etc.

**B.** Alternating parking as shown in "B" would be good for homeowners access but probably confusing for bike traffic. **A** is likely the best compromise for all users.

**ABC.** Encouraging bike use by east side residents may offset some anticipated vehicle traffic. Higher vehicle count will negatively impact historic core of town including downtown and traditional neighborhoods abutting Third for convenience of through traffic from east side residents. Will alleviate some current pressure from 5th, B and D. Long term solution for traffic with destinations farther west of downtown are needed that won't further impact historic neighborhoods.

**Speeds** Good idea to reduce speed limit at 25 along entire corridor. Traffic will likely go faster in **C** anyway with absence of on street parking and perceived wider corridor width.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your expedient work!

Stephanie Clarkson	<p>I like option C w/dedicated bike lanes because</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It provides predictability for where cyclists should ride.</li> <li>2) Therefore it is safer for vehicles, peds &amp; pedalers, we know where bikes should be</li> <li>3) It is the preferred method of installing bike lanes &amp; often most difficult. If it is an easy option for our city then we should take advantage of it &amp; become a model.</li> </ol>	Comment Card
Anonymous	Don't build it – the multimodal bridge. But if you have to Plan C for calming is best	Comment Card
Timothy Bartholomaus	<p>Great process – thanks for all the displays. I really like the raised crosswalks, 4-way stops, and lower speed limit. Great for pedestrians – maybe there's room for even more raised crosswalks/speed humps. My concern is in making the route as easy as possible for bikes. I prefer option C for the independent bike lanes and their protection from the traffic. These lanes are increasingly popular in other cities and I think they'll be a hit with families. I think the 3.5' wide bike lanes are plenty.</p>	Comment Card
Becky Garrison	<p>As a dietitian, I believe the research speaks for itself. Infrastructure for activity is always seen as a plus for the health of a community &amp; an opportunity for families to be active together. Thank you for your hard work on this project!</p>	Comment Card
Beth Bunzel	<p>DON'T DO THE CORRIDOR! PLEEAASE?  PARKING  Concern #1 High School &amp; 1912 bldg. Adequate Parking? Van Buren to Adams  Concern #2 Buffer zones between bike &amp; parking maybe inadequate. Non-contiguous at least in some plans anyway. Re-consider bike lanes – maybe not necessary. This comment written by an avid year round bicyclist.  Concern #3 COSTS!! RE-FIGURE VALUE OF CORRIDOR?</p>	Comment Card
Dean Stewart	<p>I believe that the city has not made a reasonable case for the vehicular bridge as of yet. Part of the dilemma is the lack of open, participatory meetings with the citizens. Besides, the money that has appeared is needed for significantly deteriorated sidewalks.  I do believe that traffic calming is a necessary project right away &amp; certainly before any kind of bridge is built, motor vehicular or pedestrian, bicycle, wheelchair</p>	Comment Card

Anonymous	I would love to see Plan C with a bike/pedestrian bridge over Paradise Creek	Comment Card
Anonymous	We should give Plan C a try.	Comment Card
T-Jay Clevenger	I own a local bicycle shop. I support Plan C for 2 way bike lanes going up 3 <sup>rd</sup> street. I understand a learning curve will be noticeable, but moving toward more riders, less cars means protecting traffic lanes for bikes. The C plan gets this done	Comment Card
Mark Solomon	Forget A, B & C – lipstick on a pig, with good intentions Linear park w/service-fire access from Van Buren to Hayes w/roundabout at Van Buren - No vehicle bridge!	Comment Card
David Phelan	-want Plan C -I am a bicyclist -I want the <u>pedestrian bridge only</u> - No Autos	Comment Card
David Nelson	My Preferences Are: 1) No Bridge for Vehicles 2) Plan C	Comment Card
Laurene Sorensen	I prefer C because it will have the best traffic calming effect and may incite more cycling by the public.	Comment Card
Elizabeth Day	I enjoy biking to & from the Mountain View houses from my house on East City Park! I am excited about the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street Bridge and re-planning project – but I would feel safest on a path that is divided from cars & traffic, especially on a bridge, where it can be icy in the winter.	Comment Card
Seth Dixon	Hi! I'm a longtime resident of Moscow and a member of an avid cycling family! We personally use 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street on our bikes nearly every day in the spring and fall. I am also an amateur road bike racer, so I was extremely excited to hear about a two-way bike lane on the 3 <sup>rd</sup> Street Bridge that is <u>separated from the road</u> ! Enough said – <u>please</u> choose Plan 3 😊	Comment Card

Chelsea Feeney	<p>YES TO PLAN C!</p> <p>My husband and I are bikers &amp; we use the trails &amp; greenways as much as possible! The better the connectivity the safer it will be to get across town!</p>	Comment Card
David Hall	<p>DO NOT BUILD MOTORIZED-ENABLED BRIDGE. DO NOT. NO. NO</p> <p>Al Poplawsky's (similar to Mark Solomon's) both are worth definite consideration</p>	Comment Card
Stephanie Miller	<p>I am an avid bicyclist and walker so I am very supportive of creating pedestrian &amp; bicycle friendly neighborhoods. As a community member who was <u>not</u> supportive of the Third Street Bridge, I am impressed with the committee work on the Third Street Corridor. I strongly support Plan "C" with the 2-way bike lane. Not only would I use it but I feel it would encourage students and other adults to do so as well</p>	Comment Card
William Warfel	<p>Hello!</p> <p>Thanks for putting this email together. I am all for the bridge and all for bike lanes!! I went to the first open house and liked all the projects presented. So long as the bridge gets built and bike lanes are added I will be a happy man.</p> <p>Thanks, City of Moscow!</p>	Email
Karin Clifford	<p>I don't think we need anything other than sharrows. Those of us who bike commute all over town in all sorts of traffic year-round will be just fine. We consider ourselves vehicles and we ride on the road, use hand signals, wear helmets, high-viz clothing and our bikes are equipped with lights and reflective material.</p> <p>Then you have the others...ninja cyclists who wear dark clothing with nothing reflective on their gear or bikes. And the kids and grownups who insist on biking on the sideways with no regard to pedestrians.</p> <p>We have many, many sections of road all over town that pass over Paradise Creek and the modification to the east end of Third Street with be the same. Will anyone think of themselves as crossing a bridge after the modification is done? I doubt it. Give the people who will be someday living in Harvest Hills easy access to Third Street – with a marked crosswalk – if you want to encourage biking and walking. These folks will have a straight line to Lena, the high school and downtown. My guess is most of the people who travel to the</p>	Email

	east end of town via Sixth Street will continue to do so out of habit. How about installing sharrows on Sixth between Mountain View and Blaine?	
Matthew Pollard	<p>Hello, these are my comments regarding the proposed 3rd street bridge and corridor.</p> <p>As most citizens of Moscow, I was dumbstruck that the third street bridge was stealthy added to the budget without the appropriate and or prior public discussion. Other than not needing a multimodal (or any) bridge, the eminent increased traffic on 3rd street poses a irresponsible and unnecessary risk to the students at both Moscow High School and Lena Whitmore Elementary school. And of course, we can't omit East City Park, the 1912 Center and The Methodist Church, and the houses along 3rd street, all whom will be adversely affected by the increased number of vehicles (noise, pollution, vibrations, light pollution, etc).</p> <p>Although a committee has proposed traffic-calming measures (curb extensions, lighting, etc), they did not provide adequate research that supports or (or refutes) the efficacy of these measures. For example, curb extensions similar to the ones on East D St near the middle school pose a *major and significant* safety hazard to cyclists, forcing them into vehicular traffic. I'm not sure if that was the intentions, however the truth is cyclists are recklessly forced into traffic with inadequate warnings. I don't want this to happen to 3rd street simply so East-West traffic can skewer town, versus taking the larger and properly engineered arterials (read: Troy Highway to Mtn View).</p> <p>I'm deeply saddened about the lack of foresight upon the proposal of the 3rd Street Bridge. It is clear to most that a busy 3rd street will disrupt our community, and directly impact the residents who are near this new arterial. And the proposed traffic mitigation efforts ("traffic calming measures") are not that, but rather bottle necks that jeopardize the safety of bicycle commuters.</p> <p>Finally, quick research (read: google) shows that the proposed budget is insufficient for the scope of this project. Prior to moving-forward with the project, what ever happened with finding adequate funding (a voter approved bond?) and adequate resident approval?</p>	Email

	<p>It's pretty clear that I, and many others, like our city's layout as it is, and changes like this don't reflect the core values of the city's mission and community-focus. I voted appropriately in the Fall and hope that the new city council will think deeply before making these irreversible and damaging changes to community. Smart growth means being smart, not just resurrecting a long-since buried fight with hopes of short memories.</p>	
<p>Al Poplawsky</p>	<p>First, thanks to the members of the Transportation Commission and Third Street subcommittee for taking the time to study the issue of East Third Street safety improvements and propose some alternatives.</p> <p>I bicycle commute from East to West Moscow on a daily basis throughout the year, dividing my route between Third and First Streets. When I traverse Third it is usually in the western direction, in the morning when the wind and hill allow me to ride the speed of traffic most of the way. Once I reach the hill, I pull out into the auto traffic lane and take the whole lane since I am riding the speed limit. This is safest for me since it provides the best visibility to car drivers. If I am at the wrong time and high school students are crossing the street (particularly at Adams), and cars are dropping students off and jamming everything up, I stay in the auto traffic lane and wait it out – I don't pull to the right of traffic and ride through since this would be very dangerous for me, pedestrians, and car drivers alike. However, I would like to point out that if a 2-way bike lane is installed on the north side of 3rd this will be the exact dangerous situation – students trying to cross at Adams, cars pulling in and out, and bicycles coming fast downhill independent of car traffic flow. Consequently, if this 2-way bike lane is installed, I would not use it in this direction since I would consider it very unsafe. I foresee several other problems with alternative C, the 2-way bike lane.</p> <p>2. The lane will be between the curb and parked cars in several sections. It appears that there will be only a one foot buffer zone between the parked car's opening (passenger) doors and the bike lane. Thus doors will be opening into the bike lane creating a very dangerous situation for bikers. Committee members did point out that the door opening people will be facing into the bike traffic coming uphill, so not as dangerous as 6th Street.</p> <p>3. Motorists coming south on cross streets such as Polk or others will come to a stop at Third, and look for traffic before pulling out. There will be a 2-way bike lane right there on either side of them very close, which they will have to try to, and remember to determine if there is</p>	<p>Email</p>

bike traffic coming at them – potentially fast- from either direction – as well as continuing to check for cars in the car lanes. When I am in this section of Third on my bike, I try to stay in the middle of the car lane if possible for maximum visibility. With the proposed 2-way bike lane, due to the proximity of the cyclist to the curb, trees and bushes in the beauty strip, and possibly parked cars also, it will be difficult for motorists on the cross streets to notice cyclists in the 2-way bike lane. Another dangerous situation.

4. Every intersection with a 4-way stop will essentially have two intersections. One for the auto traffic and one for the 2-way bike lane superimposed. The traffic for each of these intersections will be moving independently of the other. Imagine for a moment, Hayes and Third at 8:10 in the morning with pedestrians crossing, school buses, car traffic, and bikes – independent of car traffic - in the 2-way bike lane all trying to negotiate this intersection. Again, a very confusing and unsafe situation.

For all of the above reasons I am afraid that if the city chooses this 2-way bike lane it will be taking a route which right now is not too bad, and in an attempt to make it better for cyclists it will actually be creating an unsafe situation in all of the ways described above, This will be analogous to the unsafe situations already created by the city with the 6th street bike lane which has car doors opening into it, and also Mountain View Road where a southbound bike lane abruptly ends at 6th street with no shoulder, and nowhere for the cyclist to go except into the narrow, heavily traveled at higher speeds, badly, badly, very badly potholed car lane

It would have made sense for either alternatives A or B (or D?) to have continuous one direction bike lanes on either side of Third Street for the whole distance. Time and time again this has been shown to be the best facility for cyclists. Unfortunately this was not proposed. The narrowest section in the middle has only sharrows markings in the car lanes and no bike lanes with these two alternatives. It seems that if there is room for one 8 foot wide, 2-way bike lane on one side of the street (Alt C), there should be room for two, four foot wide, one-way bike lanes, one on each side. If four feet is too narrow for bonified bike lanes, then consider “dashed” lines for these slightly narrower bike lanes in this section, legally allowing cars to use the space if not occupied by cyclists. I have no problem with this, it is still giving the cyclist some legitimate space.



	<p>I spoke with Mike Lowry about my concerns and he certainly seemed very knowledgeable about these matters and cited several studies regarding 2-way bike lanes, 1-way bike lanes, sharrows etc. He did seem to feel that the 2-way bike lane was the best solution for biking facilities on Third Street. If the studies do support this concept for this type of situation – complete with all these uncontrolled intersections – then perhaps the city should consider it. However, I still have concerns. By the way Mike did say that sharrows work only in low traffic situations, and that they were inappropriate for Third Street due to higher traffic levels. Thus, Alts. A and B which make liberal use of sharrows on this section of Third Street are probably not appropriate.</p> <p>Again, thanks to everyone working on this project and gathering and considering public input.</p>	
Isaac Pimentel	<p>As a high school student who bikes 3rd Street daily, Plan C would make me so much more comfortable. Traffic is bad around when school is starting, and buses park in the designated bike lane, forcing me into the street, which makes it so much scarier to bike</p>	Email
James Fazio	<p>My preference is to back up, let the people vote, and I'm certain that plans will be changed for the bridge to be bicycle and pedestrian ONLY. Opening up 3rd Street to through traffic is the dumbest thing I have seen in my 40+ years as a resident. It will forever change the heart of our pleasant little city, endanger students, and generally be an urban mess.</p> <p>If it does go through, I hope you are prepared to make the corner of 3rd and Hayes a 4-way stop (further annoying some residents) and installing a traffic light at the corner of S. Jefferson and 3rd.</p>	Email
Terri Schmidt	<p>Hello City Representatives,</p> <p>I live on North Jefferson St. and I have to cross Third St. twice a day to get to work and back. I was recently waiting at the intersection of Jefferson and 3rd thinking about how busy that road is already and how hard it is to get across at times, especially if I have to make a left turn. We can no longer turn left on Main St. during busy hours, and traffic is often backed up turning left on Washington and 3rd. If this bridge is built there will be even more congestion for left turning traffic.</p>	Email

	<p>Now the city is planning traffic calming options, which are important if the bridge is built. Some of these include lower speed limits and extra stop signs. If we add slowing measures, it will take just as long or longer to get to downtown or the mall from the east side of town than it does now. So what is going to be gained by building this bridge? If the idea was to have a quicker connection to the west side, the calming measures will cancel any gains made.</p> <p>One of the calming options is to remove more parking along third street. I understand the concerns of bicyclists, but having close parking for seniors and people with disabilities using the 1912 center is important. So I would be sorry to see any more parking eliminated.</p> <p>The costs of creating the bridge along with the cost of calming measures is high. I would prefer my tax dollars be spent on repairing roads, building the new police station, or various other more pressing needs. I don't like the idea of spending a likely three quarters of a million dollars or more on a project that will have little benefit and likely some frustrating results.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration,</p>	
Annette Bay Pimentel	I'm in favor of Plan C. I would like Moscow to be more bike-able.	Email
David Pimentel	<p>Please find attached my comments to the Transportation Commission on the Third Street Corridor. For the reasons articulated therein, I strongly support the adoption of Plan C.</p> <p>I am a resident of Moscow, very interested in transportation issues in general and in “bike-friendly” initiatives in particular. Moscow already has a reputation for being pedestrian friendly, particularly the Main Street area. But despite the fact that Idaho has the most progressive bicycle law in the country, Moscow as yet falls short of being a truly bicycle-friendly town. Now is a chance to improve that, by adopting Plan C for the Third Street Corridor.</p> <p>The Transportation Commission should make bicycle-friendliness a priority for a number of reasons. First, greater bicycle use means less automobile use. That benefits everyone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fewer cars means the streets are quieter, and less congested.</li> </ul>	Email

- It means less traffic, so it is easier for drivers to get from point A to point B.
- It means less wear and tear on the roads, and therefore less spent on maintenance and repair.
- It means there is less need for parking, so that public space can be utilized for purposes that improve the quality of life, and that parking is that much easier to find.
- It means that fossil fuels are conserved, and air quality is enhanced.
- It means that those who are financially underprivileged are empowered – if they can navigate Moscow safely and easily without a car, they can liberate a large portion of their household budget and repurpose it to other priorities.
- It means that young people (who cannot drive, or otherwise don't have access to a car) are empowered, as they are not dependent on parents and other adults in their lives to shuttle them around to their various activities.
- It also means, of course, that parents are liberated, as their kids can get themselves to and from school, sports, and other activities.
- Finally, it means greater safety for pedestrians and cyclists alike. Not only are there fewer cars to hit them, there is compelling empirical evidence that the more bicycles you put in circulation,

<sup>1</sup> My newest publication, [Cycling, Safety, and Victim-Blaming: Toward a Coherent Public Policy for Bicycling in 21st Century America](#), 85 TENN. L. REV. \_\_\_\_ (2018), will come out in the Tennessee Law Review later this year. An unpublished draft is available at the link provided.

<sup>1</sup> My oldest daughter was part of a bicycle advocacy group in San Francisco, where adoption of the “Idaho laws” was a key part of their platform. See also Kurt Holzer, *Living with Stop as Yield for Cyclists*, BIKE LAW IDAHO BLOG (Jan. 27, 2016) <https://www.bikelaw.com/2016/01/living-with-stop-as-yield-for-cyclists/>; Ken McLeod, *Bicycle Laws in the United States—Past, Present, Future*, 42 FORDHAM URB. L.J. 869, 903 (2015).

- the safer they all are. The well-documented “safety in numbers” effect, suggests that when there are more cyclists, drivers expect them, and watch for them, and take extra care.

One of the great fallacies about investments in bicycle-friendly infrastructure is the idea that this benefits a comparatively small group people who bicycle, and does so at the expense of the rest of the community, and at the expense of car-drivers in particular. The opposite is actually true. Every person you put on a bicycle takes one car off the roads, and everyone

benefits from that. So a decision to invest in bicycle-friendly infrastructure does not pit one group against another, it benefits everyone, even those who never mount a bike.

The Third Street Corridor improvements project presents an ideal opportunity to enhance bicycle use and safety in Moscow. This corridor will connect much of Moscow's housing with Main Street (including the Farmer's Market), with East City Park (the site of many community events), with the High School and the 1912 Center, with the Library, and with the playfields on Mountain View. And it goes without saying that many people do not feel safe bicycling on Third Street at present. The traffic moves too fast, and the shoulder has parked cars on it, which pose the dual threat of forcing the rider out into traffic and exposing the cyclist to the risk of being "doored" if the driver of a vehicle parked there throws open a car door into the path of a cyclist.

My children bicycle daily to the Middle School and to the High School, and complain about the dangers that make the ride uncomfortable or scary. Even the new bike lane in front of the High School offers little protection during the most congested times of day, as school buses (so my son reports) block that lane, forcing the cyclists either out in the street where they can be hit, or onto the sidewalks where they put pedestrians at risk. Many of the kids who do cycle Third Street to school (or to other destinations) stick to the sidewalk in an effort to stay safe. And it is likely that many parents refuse to allow their children to bicycle that stretch at all, because of the perceived danger: "Let me drive you. It will be safer."

Plan C is by far the most meaningful improvement (arguably the only meaningful improvement) of this unfortunate situation. A dedicated, separated, two-way bicycle lane will protect cyclists from cars, both moving and parked. The obviousness of the separated lane, and the channeling of cyclists into

<sup>1</sup> In Australia, they found that because of this "safety in numbers" effect, mandatory helmet laws resulted in *greater* risks to cyclists. The burdens associated with complying with the helmet law meant that fewer people bicycled, decreasing bicycle use overall, especially among children, and the bicycle accident rate significantly increased. *History of Helmet Law in Australia*, CYCLISTS' RIGHTS ACTION GROUP <http://crag.asn.au/history-of-helmet-law-in-australia/#12>; Peter Ubel, *Warning: Bicycle Helmets Could Be Hazardous For Your Health*, FORBES (Feb. 27, 2017) <https://www.forbes.com/sites/peterubel/2017/02/27/warning-bicycle-helmets-could-be-hazardous-for-your-health/2/#9fd84117e2f6>.

<sup>1</sup> In a startlingly ill-advised move, the State of Oregon started taxing bicycle sales last year, based on the idea that the bicycle friendly infrastructure that Oregon was building should be paid for by those who benefit from it, and that bicycles should pay their “fair share” for maintenance of the roads they share with cars. Bob Adelman, *Oregon Passes Resentment Tax: \$15 Per Bicycle*, THE NEW AMERICAN (July 18, 2017) <https://www.thenewamerican.com/usnews/politics/item/26499-oregon-passes-resentment-tax-15-per-bicycle>. But bicycles inflict negligible (if any) wear and tear on roads (cars are an order of magnitude worse than bikes, and trucks are an order of magnitude worse than cars). Besides, increased cycling benefits everyone, so everyone should be happy to share in the expense of public projects that encourage more people to bicycle. Moreover, taxing cyclists only discourages cycling, diminishing all the benefits identified above, including cyclist safety.

<sup>1</sup> The risk of being “doored,” of course, only forces the cyclists to ride farther out, into the traffic lanes.

predictable places will enhance driver awareness—they’ll see cyclists crossing there, they’ll expect cyclists to be crossing there—and the risk of accidents will dramatically decline. Parents will feel secure, allowing their children, even young children, to cycle that stretch, on a path where no car can ever go.

I am, perhaps, more confident of this predicted impact than most, having spent four years, with teenage and preteen children, living in the Netherlands. There, this type of bicycle lane (the type proposed in “Plan C”—entirely separated from the traffic) is ubiquitous. It was a liberating experience for the whole family, and we bicycled everywhere, the children often unaccompanied by adults because, after all, it was so safe! In fact, bicycling in Holland is sufficiently risk-free that they see no cause for bicycle helmets. For them, it would be like donning a helmet when you go for a walk or decide to climb some stairs—of course you could fall, but the risks are so slight that wearing a helmet seems like a ridiculous precaution. And the bicycle accident data there strongly backs that up.

Our family continues to ride – every week to church, I to work, the kids to Scouts and piano lessons – etc. Third Street figures prominently in the routes we most often follow. In our case, Plan C is not likely to make us cycle more than we already do. But we will feel safer, happier, and more secure cycling in such an environment. And if there is any significant uptick in bicycle use in Moscow as a result, it promises great benefit to the community: to everyone, not just to those who choose to ride. It will help with parking issues during the Ren Fair and other large events at East City Park. It will help with parking issues at the Farmer’s Market and with Main Street in general.

	<p>Hard core cyclists may resist the dedicated lanes, but that is not the constituency we need to be serving here. It's not about taking care of the special interest of lycra-clad road warriors. They (we – for I am one of them) can ride Sixth Street or A Street, if they/we don't like a dedicated two-way bike lane on Third. What the Transportation Commission needs to think about is how we serve the community as a whole, easing transportation issues all across the board, and traffic congestion on Third Street in particular. We do that by encouraging more people to leave their cars at home and get on a bike. And making Third Street a safe and pleasant bicycle route – by adopting Plan C – is a straightforward way to do precisely that.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> Death rates for Dutch cyclists declined from a high of 425 deaths in 1965, before the big push for these bike lanes, to 138 in 2009. See Cycling deaths in selected countries, citing statistics from IRTAD (the OECD's International Road Traffic and Accident Database), <a href="http://www.cyclehelmets.org/1258.html">http://www.cyclehelmets.org/1258.html</a>. This 68% decrease occurred even as total bicycle use has steadily risen in that country to become the highest in the world. Renate van der Zee, <i>How Amsterdam became the bicycle capital of the world</i>, THE GUARDIAN (May 5, 2015) <a href="https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/may/05/amsterdam-bicycle-capital-world-transport-cycling-kindermoord">https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2015/may/05/amsterdam-bicycle-capital-world-transport-cycling-kindermoord</a>; Stuart Kenny, <i>Which Country Cycles More Than Any Other in the World? Here's the Top 10</i>, MPORA (Dec. 7. 2015) <a href="https://mpora.com/road-cycling/which-country-cycles-more-than-any-other-in-the-world-heres-the-top-10">https://mpora.com/road-cycling/which-country-cycles-more-than-any-other-in-the-world-heres-the-top-10</a>.</p> <p><sup>1</sup> As you know, the sufficiency of Main Street parking has been raised as a serious concern associated with the expansion of New St. Andrew's College there.</p>	
Cathy Willmes	<p>I am a long time resident who has read and followed city news and the Third Street project. I believe strongly that a public works project of this magnitude and expense to the city taxpayers (to say nothing of the residents most affected) should be put before the voters. The money for this issue could be spent in a number of constructive ways. (street repair) Find out what the residents of Moscow really think and open this idea up for a vote!</p>	Email
Anonymous	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I don't feel it would be safe for me to ride my bike on the opposite side of the road than the existing car traffic.</li> <li>2) I don't understand how I am going to transition to the opposite side of the road at either termmus (or from any point in the middle)</li> <li>3) I don't believe that the city will be able to keep up with the snow maintenance. Already existing bike lanes are used by motorists in the winter because we are currently not clearing snow from curb to curb.</li> </ol>	Comment Card

Nils Peterson	Was a roundabout @ 3 <sup>rd</sup> & Mountain View considered as an alternative intersection. Lanes would need realignment but the land to east is only platted, not developed (see diagram on comment card)	Comment Card
Nils Peterson	At 3 <sup>rd</sup> & Washington Intersection, what is the proposal for the traffic signal to protect west bound bikes from vehicles turning right 3 <sup>rd</sup> to Washington North?	Comment Card
Nils Peterson	There are many tree planting locations along the route that are missing street trees. Trees provide both traffic calming & more pleasant experience for bike/walk. Tree Commission should be consulted & tree planting funded in each plan.	Comment Card
Hugh Mclsaac	Development on the outskirts of town will require changes in route options for commuters as traffic levels rise. However, guiding this extra traffic along 3 <sup>rd</sup> St. seems a poor choice given that this would create high volume on an already moderately busy street that passes two schools and a city park in addition to residential neighborhoods where the higher traffic will degrade the quality of life for all living and using these areas. The schools especially will be at higher risk given that children regularly walk and cross these streets. In addition, because of the speed reductions in school zones commuter efficiency gains may be minimal for new comers if high volumes cause backups over a few blocks; and commuter efficiency of current residents will decline. Streets several blocks further north would seem better options. However, of the options currently under consideration, option C seems the least harmful.	Comment Card
Susan Roberts	<p>After a brief look at the cached material online, I could not revisit the site. My computer alerted that the site was infected with malware.</p> <p>I supported the pedestrian and bikeway bridge on Third Street years ago, and was deeply disapp-ointed that the city would not complement the amount local citizens raised. Now that a vehicular bridge is "in the budget," we can only mitigate traffic safety problems.</p> <p>The "bulbout" extension shown in your presentation is on my corner. I can state that it creates a blind corner due to parked cars at Lena Whitmore. The intersection is not wide enough for both a turning and an oncoming car. Snow removal and street cleaning equipment do not reach the inner curb. Curb extensions that are not bulb-outs would be preferable.</p> <p>Adding broad bikeways as in option C would give pedestrians some protection, slow traffic, and give bikers a designated lane, buffered from cars.</p> <p>Four-way stops at Blaine and Third, and at Hayes and Third have been needed for many years.</p>	Email

Patricia Gardner	I would like to express my support for Plan C for Moscow's proposed Third Street bridge. It is important that we make Moscow a bicycle friendly city for the safety of children, cyclists and drivers. Thank you,	Email
Vikky Ross	As a 5th generation born resident of Moscow, I am happy to see that the much needed connection offered by the 3rd Street bridge will finally come to fruition. With the hard work of City officials and City residents, a way to build the bridge at the same time, providing safety for pedestrians and bicyclists, has been achieved. That is one thing that I am the most proudest of living in this wonderful community, the ability of compromise and common sense! Again, thank you for finding solutions and the hard work in order to build the bridge.	Email
Phil Riersgard	I want to give my opinion regarding the proposed Third street bridge. There are two points (among the many that you've no doubt heard) that make the car bridge an illogical choice.  1. Encouraging NON-motorized commuting and other traffic in Moscow has been a stated priority the city. That is an important policy for Moscow to pursue. It is impossible to build more roads to solve the over-population of cars. If more cars are accommodated, more cars will simply fill the newly available space. More people on bikes and on foot addresses the problem of a growing population (or even a static population) in a sustainable and healthy way. A car bridge violates this policy. It's a bad idea.  2. It has been pointed out that more traffic on Third Street endangers two school zones. The solution that I have read that the city proposes is to install restrictions at some or all of the corners to slow or discourage traffic. This is a backwards way to approach the problem. It boils down to this: spend resources to build a new bridge and then spend more resources to undo the results of the new bridge; two wrongs don't make a right. A car bridge violates logic and common sense. It's a bad idea.  A bicycle and pedestrian bridge is a better plan.	Email



Maureen Laflin	I fully support plan c. We need safe bike lanes on 3rd street. Although I can no longer biker, I used to frequently bike to UI from fort russel area and my kids biked a lot. Moscow needs plan c.	Email
Monique Lillard	<p>Please consider how detrimental traffic noise is to musical performances in East City Park. Those performances, especially at Ren Fair and Rendez-vous in the Park, bring revenue to the entire city. If the park experience is made less pleasant - unsafe conditions, exhaust fumes, or noise - it will hurt the entire town.</p> <p>Consider writing into the plan that traffic will be re-routed to Sixth Street during Ren Fair and during Rendez-vous performances.</p> <p>Frankly, the entire bridge project should be reconsidered. The point was to allow a straight, swift shot to homes on the east side of town. But the "traffic slowing" mechanisms will make the progress across town on Third slower than taking Sixth or the Troy Hwy currently is now. So we are spending money to increase and speed up traffic on Third then spending money to decrease and slow down traffic on Third. That's dumb and wasteful. Under Robert's Rules of Order, someone who voted in favor of the Third Street Bridge could move to reconsider the question, or anyone on the council could move to rescind or annul the motion. AND THEY SHOULD.</p>	Email
Courtney Conway	<p>I live and own a home on north Mountain View Rd., and I <u>strongly oppose a car-capable third street bridge</u>. A bike/pedestrian bridge is a good idea, but not a car bridge. I commute from my home on N. Mountain View to the UI area every day and, hence, I regularly drive the corridor that would be affected by the proposed bridge. But, I am strongly against it for <u>several reasons</u>:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) There are currently several routes to get from Mountain View to downtown, and the traffic is distributed evenly among those routes such that traffic is not a problem and people can take the route that works best for them (i.e., there is no current traffic problem that warrants an expensive bridge – don't fix a problem that doesn't exist).</li> <li>2) I drive by MHS every day on my way to work. The traffic and congestion there is already hectic between 745-815am with walkers, bikers, cars, people dropping off. Adding the bridge will make this hectic scene in the morning even worse. I know of several people</li> </ol>	Email (sent twice)

	<p>who have been in accidents there during that bottleneck time. The bridge will make the difficult congestion worse for our high schoolers in Moscow, and will potentially discourage biking (and thereby increase traffic).</p> <p>3) MHS has an open-campus and students walk downtown for the lunch hour. Again, more traffic on east third street will make it less safe for our MHS students.</p> <p>4) The 3rd street corridor is by far the best bicycle route from the east side of Moscow to downtown and UI. The other routes are very steep and narrow, and not safe for cars and bikes together. Especially on winter days, the other routes are just not safe. The added traffic on east 3rd street would cause worse safety for bikers and drivers on the other routes.</p> <p>5) East City Park is one of the beautiful hallmarks of Moscow, a place that the whole community uses and cherishes. It is a place that I take people who are considering a move to Moscow, and they are always impressed. It is a great park. Added traffic along east 3rd street would diminish the tranquility of one of our town's gems (East City Park).</p> <p>6) The allure of Moscow is the small-town feel, and the 'connection' between UI, downtown, and the historic area of Fort Russell. It is why many people who work in Pullman often chose to live in Moscow (but rarely vice versa). That will change if we put more traffic on the corridors that give Moscow that tranquil feel. We will become more like Pullman.</p> <p>7) Consider what cities often do – they build highways/thoroughfares that circle around the city to divert traffic from traveling through the heart of the city. A car-capable 3rd Street bridge would achieve just the opposite – it would invite more cars through the heart of our town. It is not currently a hassle to navigate from east Moscow (e.g. Mountain View) to downtown. Drivers quickly learn the routes required and our lives are not affected.</p> <p>PLEASE, reconsider and don't build a bridge for cars that connects 3rd street with Mountain View. The negatives greatly outweigh the positives.</p>	
Mary Ann Kellogg	<p>My one concern has been about flooding. By building the bridge over Paradise Creek, the area around that construction will probably be deepened. It is my concern that in doing so, this will enable more volume of water to flow through at that point moving towards a portion of Paradise Creek that is not as deep, thus allowing the potential for more flooding than usually occurs. It also has the potential to affect housing on both sides of the creek, rather than just the one side closest to Roosevelt Street.</p> <p>So, if the Third Street corridor is accomplished, is it possible to deepen that portion of Paradise Creek further down that usually has a tendency to flood over its banks?</p>	Email

	Thank you for allowing comments to be made.	
Jeff Hicke	<p>I am a resident of Moscow who lives near Third Street and regularly uses Third Street for transportation. I do not support the construction of a bridge for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) I commute by bicycle along Third Street east of downtown, and walk regularly along this section as well. I am very concerned that constructing a bridge on Third Street over Paradise Creek will substantially increase traffic from downtown to Mountain View Road, creating more hazardous conditions for walkers and bikers.</li> <li>2) I am a parent of students who previously attended Lena Whitmore School, and I am concerned with the decrease in safety from the increase in traffic at the nearby intersections.</li> <li>3) Cross-town routes currently exist, and commute times from downtown to Mountain View Road are minimal now.</li> <li>4) The money funding this construction is better spent on other infrastructure, including traffic infrastructure.</li> </ol> <p>I appreciate that there are discussions about how to limit traffic speed. However, these actions are not enough.</p> <p>Thus, I do not think the decrease in safety cost outweighs any justification of making cross-town commuting easier. I strongly encourage the Transportation Commission and the City Council to reverse this decision to build the bridge.</p>	Email
Helen Stroebel	<p>I prefer the bicycle friendly Plan C. Even though I live east of Mountain View and travel the D and 6th street corridors frequently to downtown, I choose bike and pedestrian friendly corridor past City Park and schools for third street over convenience to drivers. It makes it more enticing to ride bike from the east side to downtown and save a car trip.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	Email

<p>Niels Damman</p>	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to submit comments in regards to 3rd street accessibility. Unfortunately, I was not aware of the meeting and did not see the three designs up for proposal. Therefore, my comments may or may not be completely in line with the proposals as they stand. I apologize for that in advance.</p> <p>We (my wife and I) advocate for a separated bike lane on third street for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having grown up in the Netherlands, bicycling is my preferred method of transportation. However, the bicycle culture in the US has not caught on quite as intensively as it has in the NL, and as such, motorized vehicle drivers do not always (or often) give bicyclists the rights to the road bicyclists are granted by law. It frequently happens that cars overtake my daughter and I while bicycling through Moscow's streets (streets with sharrows and without), even though there is a (double) solid line painted on the street. As a matter of fact, my wife does not feel safe enough to bike on the road (alone or with the kids) due to vehicular traffic. A separated bicycle lane on 3rd street would alleviate that concern in that area.</li> <li>• Our family recently moved back to Moscow, ID, after having been gone from the Palouse for four years. Especially compared to Miami, we are happy to be back, as we consider Moscow to be a perfect place to raise our kids. Our daughter currently goes to Lena Whitmore, and our son will join her next year. Both our kids really enjoy being able to walk or bike to school as well as downtown , and we plan to continue doing so through their middle and high school years.</li> <li>• We appreciate that the City of Moscow already proposed a separated bicycle lane as one of the options. Pursuing this option would emphasize that Moscow continues to encourage alternative transportation methods. Moscow already has a few separated bike lanes or paths, and adding one on a major thoroughfare encourages people to consider this as a viable alternative.</li> <li>• I believe a separate bicycle lane on third street, specifically, will encourage more of Moscow's high school students to bike to school, which has a number of associated benefits in itself (reducing vehicular traffic during peak times; offsetting parking issues around the high school; physical health benefits for students; and a higher level of concentration in the classroom [<a href="http://sciencenordic.com/children-who-walk-school-concentrate-better">http://sciencenordic.com/children-who-walk-school-concentrate-better</a>]).</li> </ul>	<p>Email</p>
---------------------	--	--------------

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Lastly, adding a separated bicycle lane on third street will reduce the remaining lane width of the vehicular lanes. Narrower lanes have been proven to have a calming effect on vehicular traffic, (<a href="https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/narrow_residential_streets_daisa.pdf">https://nacto.org/docs/usdg/narrow_residential_streets_daisa.pdf</a>), which is one of the main concerns for this project as we understand it.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for your attention. Please contact me if you have any questions, comments or concerns on this matter.</p>	
<p>Dianne Daley Laursen</p>	<p>I am writing in support of the 3rd Street Bridge.</p> <p>However, I think the priority is a 4 way stop or round about at 6th and Mountain View. Traffic from Highway 8 turns on Mountain View on then onto the Sixth headed downtown and to the University. The reasons I support the bridge are the same reasons I want traffic control at 6th and Mountain View. This is a dangerous intersection for kid, pedestrians, and bicyclists. Traffic at this intersection often does not yield right of way and when cars headed N on Mtn View are stopped to turn west onto 6th, cars will pass the car, thus minimizing traffic openings. In the morning around 8 and in the afternoon when children are going to and from school this is especially noticeable. A pedestrian bridge on 3rd street will not alleviate this as this does not serve the neighborhoods where kids are headed to and from school. At this intersection. Additionally, many folks turn right from 6th onto Mtn View headed north and cut through Pickard's parking lot, as it can be impossible to get across 6th.</p> <p>A 3rd Street bridge would split this traffic.</p> <p>I do strongly that since traffic east of Mountain View is coming from residential areas, and these areas are growing, that traffic could be dissapted across streets to keep residual streets safer.</p>	<p>Email</p>
<p>Mac Cantrell</p>	<p>Dear City of Moscow 3rd Street Planning Folks,</p> <p>This is a short note to let you know that I greatly prefer plan C for modifications to 3rd Street in conjunction with the construction of the 3rd Street bridge. I believe plan C will have the greatest benefit for our entire community. It will reduce traffic congestion because of the addition of the bridge. It will provide the greatest safety for bicyclists and encourage more use of bicycles in the town.</p>	<p>Email</p>

	<p>The positive ramifications of this kind of change will be felt throughout the community, economically, environmentally, and in terms of improved health for the people in our town.</p> <p>If you would like further comments, please let me know. Thanks for the work you're all doing!</p>	
David Hall	<p>Building the motor-vehicle bridge at Third Street and Mountain View is crazy. The cost for the bridge: half a million dollars. Partially mitigating the harm it will impose: a quarter million dollars. The time poured into planning and design. The disruption of property owners along Third Street from Jefferson to Mountain View during construction and into the future.</p> <p>A motor-vehicle bridge that most do not want and that we don't need will lead to increased traffic on Third Street, which may be partially mitigated by traffic calming (much of which amounts to making the driving experience more dangerous in the hope that drivers will be encouraged to slow down or find an alternate route). Traffic-calming measures include shifting the road surface up and down, shifting traffic lanes left and right, and traffic circles.</p> <p>Forecast traffic volumes in year 2035 at Third &amp; Garfield are 1,300 with a bike/pedestrian bridge, 3,500 with a motor bridge, and 2,800 with a motor bridge and calming measures. At Third and Mountain View the numbers are 50 and 2,300 and 1,800. At D and Garfield 6,200 and 5,600 and 5,950.</p> <p>Who loses? Those who live, bike, or walk along East Third Street. All Moscow citizens who want money spent more wisely – we need an alternative water supply and we need to maintain existing infrastructure. And we still could use a new stage at East City Park.</p> <p>Proposed additional lighting also could be troublesome; the recent switch to LED street lights in town got a lot of push-back.</p>	Email

	<p>If you won't listen to me, listen to Michael Kyte, a local expert in the field (professor emeritus in civil engineering and former director of the <i>National Institute for Advanced Transportation Technology</i> at the University of Idaho), as he wrote in the Moscow-Pullman Daily News (<i>His View: If the Third Street bridge must be constructed</i>, by Michael Kyte, Jan 8, 2018):</p> <p>It has been clear since the public hearing on the Moscow city budget Aug. 7 that the city intends to build a bridge on Third Street. ... I am opposed to the Third Street Bridge. I don't think it will provide any significant reduction in travel time for motorists traveling from the east side of town to the University of Idaho, Moscow's downtown or to Pullman. The increase in roadway capacity is minimal, particularly for the relatively low volume of traffic that we experience daily in Moscow. Any perceived benefit for some Moscow residents won't make up for the negative impacts that will be experienced by residents of Third Street in the section between Hayes Street and Mountain View Road. These residents made their housing location decisions based on the character of Third Street as a local, not a through, street.</p> <p>I don't believe the bridge should be constructed. And I don't agree with the speed at which the city is moving on this project.</p> <p><a href="http://dnews.com/opinion/his-view-if-the-third-street-bridge-must-be-constructed/article_28d07b42-37c1-5066-8dd0-ceef982c9ecd.html">http://dnews.com/opinion/his-view-if-the-third-street-bridge-must-be-constructed/article_28d07b42-37c1-5066-8dd0-ceef982c9ecd.html</a></p> <p>A motorized=traffic bridge at Third Street is not a “done deal.” Please follow the <b>2007 Pedestrian Bridge Resolution</b>, which endorses construction of a pedestrian/ bicycle bridge over Paradise Creek.</p>	
Becky Chastain	<p>I vote for #3  However I want to say I wish you would put the sixth street round about in first.  Thanks for your hard work.</p>	Email
Diane Prorak	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the 3rd Street plan. I am a bicycle commuter who lives on the NE side of Moscow and I frequently commute to the UI. I have used Third Street to commute for many years. I appreciate the effort to incorporate bicycle and pedestrian needs and safety into the development plan and I have appreciated the bike lanes and removal of parking recently made on Third. I do not agree with the proposal to put an</p>	Email

auto bridge to extend Third Street, but, if we are going to do that, I do see a strong need to ensure bicyclists and pedestrians are safe with increased traffic. I do question the apparent contradiction of connecting the road and increasing traffic, and then slowing down the traffic with traffic calming. Is this really going to help move traffic?

That said, I attended both public sessions and looked at the plans proposed. Some comments include some ideas from conversations I had at those public sessions.

Here are my comments:

Two Way Bike lanes:

I strongly oppose the separated 2-way bike lanes. First, they will be hard to access for bicyclists. For example, right now, coming home, I come past the Post Office and turn right from Jefferson to go up Third. That intersection is very busy, with traffic from MHS, the city hall/library area, the shopping center, etc. Pedestrians are common. Trying to get across Third to the bike lane will be inconvenient to hazardous. I probably will just use the street. And going west, I will have to stop and use the pedestrian crossing instead of turning left in the vehicle lane like I do now.

Cleaning the bike lanes will be very problematic. With the barriers, they will have to be cleaned separately. Throughout the year, the regular bike lanes get filled with debris of all kinds. It's not just an issue of snow, but leaves, rocks, branches, etc. I would imagine it would not be cost effective to clean the lanes very often and they may become dangerous due to slippery leaves, branches and rocks that accumulate.

Another problem with the 2-way lanes is that they confuse drivers and teach bicyclists bad habits – riding against traffic. We see that on 6th Street where people ride the wrong way in the single bike lane. At intersections, without separate traffic signals, pedestrians and car drivers will have to watch for bikes in an unexpected place in the traffic flow. Yes, people will learn over time, but I can see lots of continuing confusion at intersections like Hayes and Third, where there is a lot of auto, pedestrian and bike traffic. I believe these 2-way lanes can work in very populous urban centers, with extensive bike lanes and special traffic signals for the lanes, but I do not feel they are appropriate for Third Street, especially since they are likely to be the only example of this in Moscow.

The 2-way lanes are likely to feel very narrow and constricting when the bicycle traffic includes trailers and very fast-moving cyclists. Add debris to avoid to that mix and you may see collisions. While the lanes may seem attractive to novices at first, I predict they will not



be as popular after novices see some of the disadvantages. And novices using Third Street will only have that piece of street to ride on. If they are going to actually bicycle commute, they still need to learn to deal with riding on roads with traffic other places. While a few people use sidewalks to ride, most would best learn to ride safely on roads if they use marked bike lanes in the direction of traffic and get the feel of riding with traffic. I really hope the city does not choose the 2-way bike lanes. I suspect a lot of intermediate riders like myself will not use them for the reasons above and Third Street will be more confusing than ever.

#### Sharrows

I have been using the “sharrows” marked on Third and I don’t really feel they work well. I still need to take most of the lane and cars have to go way around me. This might work in current traffic, but not with traffic increases. Drivers in Moscow are generally polite, but I have had some get frustrated with me. I understand the Mike Lowry feels sharrows are not appropriate for the situation. Plan A and B rely heavily on sharrows. With the parking included in those plans, the increased traffic and mixed bike facilities, I think the sharrows will work even less well than they do now. I think we need consistency, like bikes lanes on each side of the road the whole route. The consistency means all users know what to expect for the whole route. In the narrow places, Les MacDonald suggested “advisory bike lanes” (dashed lines) and I think that would be much safer and more consistent than alternating lanes and sharrows.

#### Parking

The one thing I do like about Plan C is that it removes the most parking. I feel that if the city government and some citizens want Third Street to go through to Mountain View, and still be safe, then parking is the price that has to be paid. Right now, I frequently have to go out around parked cars on Third Street and slow down traffic by using the lane. I have heard the argument the parked cars slows down traffic, but Third Street is already narrow in many places and residential. If all (yes, all) parking were removed, I believe we could have bike lanes or advisory bike lanes the whole route. That would be consistent and would give bikes some territory. It would help people get used to riding on roads as well and encourage cycling throughout the city.

	<p>Curb extensions: I agree that these are good for traffic calming and pedestrians. My concern is that in some places, due to sharrows and parking spaces, bicyclists may have to merge out into traffic just before the intersection. I am wondering if plastic posts or some other traffic feature could allow bikes to fit through without having to go over a curb, but provide safety for pedestrians.</p> <p>Traffic speed I do strongly support the proposal to have a 25 mph speed limit. I think it should be that way right now.</p> <p>Plan D So overall, I would prefer that there was another plan that used ideas from the other 3 plans. If we could use the parking proposal of Plan C but incorporate the one-way bike lanes of the other plans, along with more bike lanes or advisory bike lanes instead of sharrows, I think we could have a street that would work to provide bicyclists with a sensible traffic pattern and some safety. It would be more consistent for both car drivers and pedestrians as well. If more parking can be removed for Plan C, why not for another plan? And if there is room for 2-way bike lanes much of the way, why not enough room for bike lanes on each side that go along with traffic?</p> <p>Again, thank you for seeking the public input on this plan.</p>	
Brooke Lowry	<p>Thank you for taking public comment about this important decision of what will happen on 3rd street to accommodate cyclists.</p> <p>As a mother of three, daily bike rider and former Safe Routes to School Coordinator, I fully support a separated bike lane on the north side of 3rd street.</p> <p>A separated bike lane on 3rd will put Moscow on the map as an actual bike friendly city. Separated bike lanes help cyclists of all ability levels feel safer, and therefore I believe ridership will go up. This means less cars on Main St., healthier commuters as well as many more families being able to safely and comfortably access destinations along the corridor such as The Farmer's Market, the Library, Schools, Free Lunch, the UI, Main Street and local businesses.</p>	Email

	<p>A separated bike lane makes a statement that bikes belong, separated bike lanes give bikes a place to be so there are less potential conflict points with cars and pedestrians (as opposed to biking on the roads or sidewalks).</p> <p>I have ridden on separated bike paths all over North America and Europe and as a mother of 3, I felt much much more safe than when riding on the roads or sidewalks with them. I also feel strongly that separated bike lanes gives comfort and encouragement to cautious cyclists to ride more.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and efforts in this matter! Your work is very much appreciated!</p>	
Russ Moore	<p>My input and recommendations follow (also attached as Word docx):</p> <p>Proposal for improvement of existing traffic calming measures for 3rd St. Corridor</p> <p>A few concerns about the current options for traffic calming (Options A, B, and C).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Sharrows (utilized throughout the route from Polk to Blaine for both options A and B) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This type of bicycle compatible roadway is more appropriate for lower traffic volumes such as used on Spotswood or S. First.</li> <li>b. Currently, automobiles do not respect the bicycle space and attempt to overtake the bicycle in unsafe manners.</li> <li>c. When traffic volumes increase, the unsafe situations are going to increase</li> <li>d. Dedicated or advisory bicycle lanes are needed to establish a standard bicycle lane that makes it clear to motorists that they need to yield to bicycle traffic</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Curb extensions <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Provide a narrowing of the lane that provides for consistent lane width for the bicycle (when cars are parked between the extensions), and may keep bicycles in a predictable location in the lane, but many cyclists will weave in and out of empty parking spots to avoid traffic, increasing the likelihood of collisions.</li> <li>b. Requires the use of Sharrows.</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Two-way bicycle lane with a contra-flow lane</li> </ol>	Email

- a. A good concept, but would require a full 5' to 6' wide bike lane for each direction (3.5' is too narrow to be inviting to most riders and would defeat the overall benefits of the separated section).
- b. Motorists (specifically non-residents, which number plenty in this university town) are very unfamiliar with this transportation scheme. Too many cross-streets exist along this corridor to make this a safe solution
- c. Transitioning this bicycle flow onto east-bound and north-bound bikes at Washington and also east-bound bikes at Mountain View has not (to my knowledge) been fully addressed, and will likely complicate efforts by frequent bicycle commuters/users in getting to and from downtown.
- d. Separated section with barriers, posts or curbs might require purchase of specialized equipment for debris and snow removal

Recommendations:

1. Provide a fourth option which utilizes an "advisory bike lane". This option would provide for the best compromise allowing for multi-mode transportation along the entire route. This option would provide normal 6' wide bike lanes on each side of the roadway where space allows (ideally from Washington to Polk and also from Blaine to Mountain View) and also include additional barriers or separation from motor vehicle traffic where possible (in heavy traffic zones around the schools and near downtown). In the section between Polk and Blaine, 6' wide advisory lanes would be installed. Dashed line lane separation along with possibly lane painting (diagonally striped green zone, etc.) would alert drivers to a right-of-way for bicyclists (but not exclude vehicles when extra clearance is required when not bikes are present). Extensive signage should be installed to alert/educate motorists to the proper usage of the advisory lane. See the references for more details and examples.
2. Investigate options to promote increased bicycle usage for high school students. Increase sheltered parking for bicycles and provide for better, safer access to the installed bike lanes that are on either side of the street (this could include bike crossing lanes that are adjacent to the pedestrian crossing that allow for easy merging into and out of bike lanes – green boxes, etc.)
3. Investigate cost of inclusion of in-pavement pedestrian crossing lights. With fast bicycle and vehicular traffic down 3rd street (west-bound), more visible signaling at the high-school crosswalk should be used. They improve the visibility especially during daylight hours.

	<p>These have been in use for many years, and the cost might not be prohibitive. If so, they should be installed at Cleveland as well.</p> <p>References:  <a href="http://www.thewashcycle.com/2015/06/alexandria-installs-regions-first-advisory-bike-lanes.html">http://www.thewashcycle.com/2015/06/alexandria-installs-regions-first-advisory-bike-lanes.html</a> <a href="https://usa.streetsblog.org/2014/09/25/portland-experiments-with-advisory-bike-lanes/http://www.xwalk.com/pages/crosswalk-lighting.htm">https://usa.streetsblog.org/2014/09/25/portland-experiments-with-advisory-bike-lanes/http://www.xwalk.com/pages/crosswalk-lighting.htm</a></p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	
Nora Locken	<p>Thank you for your dedicated work to making the Third Street corridor safe for all users after the bridge at Mountain View is installed. Cars are often the basis upon which changes are initiated -- i.e. in this case a vehicular bridge was deemed necessary and will soon be built. However, I am highly concerned about our most vulnerable users, those who walk and bike.</p> <p>In this case, it is especially important to protect the many children who walk to school along Third Street or crossing Third Street to attend Lena Whitmore. At the public meeting January 11th, I was able to view the drawing of the three possible alternatives. It was difficult to say which was 'best', as I felt there were merits to all three. I hope that City staff can sincerely recommend the project that to their knowledge will be afford pedestrians and cyclists safe travel along Third Street. The bulb outs, raised cross walks and bike facilities are necessary and I hope the City Council approves a Third Street corridor plan that provides traffic calming measures to deal with the increased vehicle use and speed on this road</p>	Email
Gretchen Stewart	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cheers for whoever contributed to and/or actually converted the Transportation Commission Subcommittee's ideas for proposed Plans A, B, and C into large, beautiful, clear, and helpful visual aids for all of us to see and understand.</li> <li>2. I think Plan C is the best of the three current proposals, but I also think it would be fine for the subcommittee and the public to continue to refine Plan C if the public comments and input, more research and study, or future discussions reveal additional needs or new ideas.</li> <li>3. The Third Street Corridor needs the Plan C enhancements NOW-in 2018-no matter which kind of bridge over Paradise Creek is built (or when it may be built).</li> </ol>	Email

	<p>4. No one needs a bridge for motorized vehicles at Third and Paradise Creek at this time (and maybe no one will ever need a bridge for motorized vehicles in that spot)! A convincing case has not yet been made for the need to build a bridge to channel motorized vehicles between Mountain View and east Third Street and points west. There are already many ways to accomplish this.</p> <p>5. Low impact users (persons of all ages, walking or biking, singly or in groups, and persons needing to use various mobility aids) need a neighborhood bridge for their needs and purposes, certainly including these, at a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. safety: crossing Paradise Creek on a safe pedestrian bridge rather than using a steep ravine;</li> <li>b. exercise and fresh air for better health and wellbeing;</li> <li>c. social interaction and neighborliness for increased sense of community;</li> <li>d. less dependence on motorized vehicles, thus reducing carbon and noise pollutants and resulting in quieter, more peaceful neighborhoods with better air quality locally and beyond;</li> <li>e. errands and shopping in our pleasant, walkable, bikeable town;</li> <li>f. travel to and from K-12 schools, university classes, churches, workplaces, and community and cultural events;</li> <li>g. enjoyable activities with family and friends; babies riding in strollers pushed by parents or other caregivers, preschoolers walking alongside; children walking or riding bikes to go play and interact at school playgrounds, East City Park, and friends' houses and yards.</li> </ul> <p>6. Moscow needs an ordinance that results in signage that says "No thru trucks," "local delivery trucks only," and/or "Truck Route" pointing to US 95 North and South and also to Hwy 8 East, beginning at Third Street and Jackson.</p> <p>7. Our center city park, East City Park, deserves a 20 mph zone ("20 is plenty") along the entire south and east sides; the Third Street Corridor will have a 25 mph posted speed limit everywhere else except for the 15 mph school zones. These different speed zones will need to be monitored and enforced consistently and often at first, a little less over time. People will learn. Look at Colfax as an example.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments. And, thank you Transportation Commission members for your hard work.</p>	
Linda Pall	Dear Mr. Chairman and Members of the Commission,	Email

I m attaching a letter I have prepared and sent to the Mayor and Council that includes a letter to the Editor I have submitted as well. I want to extend this information to you for your consideration.

Further, I attach to this e-mail a copy of the December 2007 Resolution, passed by a 5-1 vote that included both Bill Lambert and me voting in favor as council members then. The endorsement of the pedestrian bridge and the opposition to the motor vehicle bridge were highly supported then and in the past election, I can tell you that this was a solid message that came through among winners and losers during this past election.

I hope that you will at the very least ask that the current proposal be put on hold so that the appropriate, community-wide, broad based discussion about the future of Third Street and the bridge and its status on the city's transportation classification be systematically considered. This might well be a matter of broader concern for the Transportation Commission. If the Commission's work on the City's Transportation Plan is considered, there are several AREAS THAT NEED UPDATING. THIS WOULD BE AN EXCELLENT OPPORTUNITY TO WIDEN YOUR CONSIDERATION AND ASK THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL FOR DIRECTION THAT WOULD RETOOL THE CITY'S general citizen involvement programs and could involve the Community Development Department as well. I have sent this to Gary Riedner for his review as well.

In any case, I hope that you will take this seriously and take the time to do the consultation with the entire community, not with the style of some past civic planning efforts which focused on uninvited monologues that citizens were pummeled with that told citizens about the already determined project decisions, stale coffee and dim light with the entire speech of the staff person read from a power point presentation of boring world class proportions. What will provide an open, inviting and productive atmosphere for effective citizen participation will require some creative effort outside our current resources. The city has numerous contacts it can pursue, including those of Everyday Democracy, and Project for Public Spaces and similar firms that provide such services.

Thank you all for your volunteer services and your willingness to open the process to the effective subcommittee that produced the Traffic Calming proposals. I am aware of

considerable concern among bicycle enthusiasts about the proposals that need to be addressed.

Attachment Reads:

Dear Mr. Mayor and Members of the City Council of Moscow:

The following letter to the editor has been sent reflecting my continuing objections and a resolution to this problem for City government to consider.

I am so very concerned that the Council may be pressing forward now, not only on an inadvisable bridge project, but on a project that will place any option for passage of a bond issue this spring for needed City projects in danger of defeat.

First, neither project has had adequate planning and community consultation and involvement. Second, without the community being actively and personally invited into a process that gives information about city needs and asks for any additional projects, the future of the bond issue is in grave doubt.

I would like to help all of you in this process. I have some thoughts I want to share with you.

Other cities across the country dedicate dollars for a community process before any public plans and processes go forward. Project for Public Spaces, a well-known and respected group that advocates for creative urban solutions, has offered a series of priorities for community engagement which would be illustrative for Moscow.

I am sharing them here, hoping that you all will find them helpful. The purpose of these priorities is to help citizens and public officials define and resolve problems, rather than fiddling with the details of solutions, already decided for them.

1. Start early, never stop.

Be accountable throughout the process so that all of the players feel that they can present new information that will be seriously considered as a project is conceived, produced and goes forward. This protects all of the participants from "being locked on a runaway train, watching helplessly" as changing circumstances pass them by.



I believe this describes well where the City is today with the Third Street Bridge project as it is proposed.

2. Go where (or when) the people are.

People with the most to lose are the hardest to reach in planning. Those who are the usual participants in planning are those with more time, money and knowledge of civic procedures; they are easier to reach with traditional procedures. Cities should find more ways, places and times to participate. Consider 'pop-up' opportunities, events in every day places (grocery stores, schools, churches) including a status quo option as well as, in Moscow's case, a bridge.

3. No such thing as a Free Lunch.

Cities have to put a budget to these activities for expenditures like free child care for participants at planning sessions, food and beverages at the sessions, and opportunities for residents for work gathering data or other tasks the City might require.

4. Collect data through citizen science.

Create a shared sense of reality. Get as much information about how people use the street and how traffic behavior goes on in the area. In 2007, Michael Kyte help me and others to generate the information that showed the City Engineering Department's argument for increasing travel time with the bridge to Mountainview Road. We showed that the increase was approximately 30 seconds, hardly significant and requiring the large public expenditure. Citizen science supports the notion of collecting what can be observed and noting it for calculation purposes...date for information like crosswalk use, stops at stop signs (full stop? California stop? Ignoring it?), walking (what routes do people take? Age choice?), parking and cycle usage (how much parking use and where? Any conflict with cyclists? Timing of parking usage?), speed limits (how many drivers? Speed issues?), ETC.

5. Take Action Together!

This priority considers the prospect of the City implementing, perhaps even with the participation of the citizens, a lighter, cheaper project together. This citizen outreach should be an energizing campaign that builds a community's capacity and desire for change.

The City has the opportunity to reinvent its public participation processes for planning here with this bridge project and the bond issue that is on the horizon! The exclusive, rigid, dysfunctional community processes that have prevented Moscow from becoming the

forward-looking community it deserves to be to welcome a vibrant future for all of us. A city of affordability, sustainability, and accessibility, and help create the kind of community we all want Moscow to be as we welcome the future and our potential.

I hope that this may give you all some ideas for considering how planning might go forward for both of these ideas so the bridge and the bond would benefit...the bridge to be put on the shelf for the current time and the bond issue to be given the community involvement as described above that is necessary if it is to be successful this spring!

BELOW, please find the Letter to the editor which I also am sending to each of you hoping that you all will give the community the chance to put a temporary pedestrian bridge here and if, in the future, a real justification and improvement requires a motor vehicle bridge against current engineering best practices at Third and Paradise Creek.

The Third Street Bridge continues its questionable life, despite its lack of demonstrated need or benefit. Overwhelming failure of the City to involve important stakeholders in planning the need, funding and purpose of this doubtful, costly project contribute to the negative influence on any city-sponsored bond issue to come before the public.

Consider this:

The bridge, plus the essential traffic calming if the bridge is built, bears a price tag of more than \$1.1 million (plus 1% for the public art program). Other street projects are critical to the city and its residents, the people who will foot the bill and use the streets.

The traffic calming proposals are very positive changes to the Third Street corridor and deserve the thanks of the community for the effort of all who participated in this process. The fundamental flaw in this process is that traffic calming is planned for installation AFTER the bridge and its negative effects have already ruined life along Third Street. Concerns for future budgets will eclipse this part of the project.

The bridge ruins options for children who want to walk to Lena Whitmore.

The property values along East Third where the homes formerly on what amounted to a cul de sac have now been ruined.

Here is an alternative the Council could use to preserve options for the future if, after appropriate planning and community consultation, a motor vehicle bridge is found to be essential, it could be constructed.

Right now, give the community the opportunity to construct a pedestrian/cyclist/handicapped access bridge at the community's expense through a renewed contribution campaign across the creek, preserving the lovely willows.

Focus on the projects the city needs and wants. Save the time and effort for a planning process for the City Bond proposed for the spring.

Also attached:

RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
CITY OF MOSCOW, IDAHO  
2007- \_\_\_\_

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MOSCOW, IDAHO, RECOGNIZING THE NEED AND APPROPRIATENESS OF CONSTRUCTION OF A PEDESTRIAN BRIDGE ON THIRD STREET OVER PARADISE CREEK, THE PROTECTION OF THIRD STREET AS A NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR THAT HELPS PRESERVE THE NEIGHBORHOOD VALUES AND CULTURAL AND EDUCATIONAL CENTERS OF THE COMMUNITY, AND THE SAFETY CONCERNS FOR PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE AND DISABLED ACCESS TO THE CORE OF THE COMMUNITY, AND PROPOSING CERTAIN ACTIONS FOR BY THE CITY AND PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Moscow, Idaho, recognizes that Third Street has been an image of the town we value, with its tree canopy, historic landmark buildings, East City Park and historic residential architecture adjacent to the Fort Russell Neighborhood National Register Historic District; and

WHEREAS in 2005 the City Council authorized the building of a pedestrian bridge across Paradise Creek at Third Street and removed Third Street from designation as an arterial for city planning purposes; and

WHEREAS, Third Street is the best access point for central east/west travel of pedestrians, bicycles and wheelchairs in central Moscow and the construction of an 8-10 foot wide bridge, limited to that traffic will maximize the access across the creek to Mountianview Road; and

WHEREAS context sensitive street design, an engineering approach which generates street designs that meet neighborhood needs as well as community wide needs with the interests of all users and neighborhood conservation in mind, including multiple users beyond cars and trucks, preservation and expansion of street trees, provision of safe and protected sidewalks, and a goal of calm, safe streets; and

WHEREAS inviting more motorized traffic onto Third Street by increasing its traffic burden to that of an arterial would involve unmitigatable trade-offs such as destruction of street trees, removal of parking and increasing speed and volume adjacent to an elementary school; and

WHEREAS preserving Third Street as a neighborhood collector encourages walkability for children going to Lena Whitmore School, complements the Safe Routes to Schools grants the City has received, reduces the need for elimination of parking in residential areas and close to community facilities such as East City Park, and reduces conflicts for older and disabled residents using Third Street; and

WHEREAS adjacent neighbors and citizens from all over Moscow have expressed their support for a pedestrian bridge at this site supporting the Council's commitment to the pedestrian bridge for a neighborhood collector on Third Street rather than a vehicular bridge/arterial in 2005; and

WHEREAS citizens have come forward to assist in the financing of the pedestrian bridge and have sought the direct cooperation of the City of Moscow in this project, to preserve the safety, relative quiet, non-motorized options, parking and historic character and sense of Place Third Street contributes to the entire City;

NOW, THEREFORE, THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF MOSCOW, IDAHO, HEREBY RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:

	<p>1. The City of Moscow endorses the construction of a pedestrian/bicycle/disabled access bridge on Third Street over Paradise Creek at the eastern terminus of the street west of Mountainview Road, with adjacent landscaping and accommodating the Paradise Path and amenities to the extent possible within the City's right of way at the intersection of the Creek and Third Street,</p> <p>2. Third Street shall remain classified as a neighborhood collector to preserve and enhance the central historic neighborhood of Moscow and conserve the safety and accessibility of schools, East City Park and other public facilities and services located adjacent to Third Street.</p> <p>3. The City shall aid in the development of this project through authorizing expenditures for a soil study and other activities from time to time that will facilitate the project, including but not limited to engineering administration, evaluation and approval and grant development for the project and receiving donations, grants and other funds earmarked for the Third Street Pedestrian Bridge and Pocket Park.</p> <p>4. This resolution will be in full force and effect immediately upon its passage and approval by the City Council.</p> <p>Dated this third day of December, 2007.</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Nancy Chaney, Mayor</p> <p>Attest:</p> <p>_____</p> <p>Stephanie Kalasz, City Clerk</p>	
Tyler Kee	<p>My name is Tyler Kee and I am a Moscow resident. We have lived on the corner of A and Monroe just north of East City Park. As I learn more about the third street improvements, I am concerned traffic load on A street will increase even more.</p> <p>We have a daughter in third grade attending Russell elementary and a son in kindergarten at West Park. We walk our kids to Russell in the morning (son rides bus from Russell to West</p>	Email

	<p>Park) and are already concerned about the speed of vehicles driving without restriction down A street.</p> <p>Any impediment to traffic flow on Third street will invariably increase the volume of unrestricted traffic on A street. especially traffic from northeast of town.</p> <p>As a citizen, parent, and community member, I urge you to address any potential increase in A street traffic during Third street improvements. I envision 1-2 four-way stops between Hayes and Van Buren serving as effective deterrents.</p> <p>I am happy to discuss this issue further, feel free to contact me by email, phone, or schedule a time to meet in person.</p> <p>I appreciate your consideration and look forward to making our community an even better place to work, live, and play!</p>	
Tyler Kee	<p>In regards to the three options for third street improvements, I strongly advocate for option C, a dedicated bike lane.</p> <p>I am an avid cyclist with two young up-and-coming avid cyclists. Trying to ride from A and Third to West Park with a kindergartner in tow can prove to be a daunting and downright dangerous challenge. If the city provided better safeguards for cyclists, I would ride my child to school far more often.</p> <p>Cycling improves citizens and communities. Anything that encourages cycling will make Moscow a better place to work, live, and play.</p>	
Judy Sobeloff	<p>Dear Members of the City Council, the Third Street Transportation Committee, and the Mayor:</p> <p>Thank you for your work on behalf of the people of Moscow and your dedication to doing what will serve our community best. I am writing to express concerns about the safety and wisdom of the Third Street Bridge project. I still hold out hope for this being a pedestrian/bicyclist bridge rather than a motorized bridge; I hope that if it must be a</p>	Email

	<p>motorized bridge, despite the many reasons against that plan, that all necessary traffic calming measures will be put in place beforehand.</p> <p>I think our top priority should be keeping our community a wonderful and safe place to live. The decision to build a motorized bridge seems to have been pushed through without public comment, without concern for costs, and in opposition to what will serve our community best. I think that a bridge for motorized traffic on Third Street may make life in Moscow faster down that corridor, but I don't think that the few minutes people gain will make life better. I think the increase in motorized traffic will diminish the feeling of liveability in our downtown, particularly by transforming the stretch of Third Street around the high school and the 1912 Center, and may lead to safety issues due to the proximity of schools.</p> <p>If the motorized bridge does go through, despite the very real concerns of many residents, I hope that you will do the utmost to put the necessary traffic calming measures in place. I hope that students and pedestrians and bicyclists and, yes, drivers will all still be able to travel safely on this street, as well as the residents of Third Street and the surrounding neighborhoods. Thank you for your consideration.</p>	
Joann Muneta	<p>The Plan C is best. A &amp; B depends on curb-outs &amp; they are not effective in traffic calming – as experienced at 1<sup>st</sup> &amp; Blaine. But care must be taken that the crosswalks &amp; medians are wide enough &amp; visible enough to be effective – good example 6<sup>th</sup> St on campus</p>	Comment Card
David Allen	<p>Plan C is the safest and the most forward-looking for traffic and growth. Also, I think the safety of the Third Street corridor is extremely important. These safety/calming measures must be <u>completed</u> by the time the Third St. Bridge is functional.</p>	Comment Card
D. Nels Reese	<p>Dear City Council and Staff, As we approach a new year with high hopes and enthusiasm, I believe we should take a new and fresh look at Third Street. As the city moves forward with plans for a new connecting bridge, the opportunity arises to create a pedestrian and bicycle friendly street that will be unique to Moscow and to the region. Imagine bicyclists enjoying the safe ride from Mountain View to Main Street. I am delighted that the city took time with a select committee to review opportunities for</p>	Letter/Comment

	<p>Third Street. There are several options that have been on show to the public at City Hall. After careful study, I would suggest that the "C Option", which is dedicated to bicycle traffic offers the most unique possibilities for Third Street. However, I believe that with a more creative charge the redevelopment of Third Street could be even more profound.</p> <p>Remember that The Fort Russell Neighborhood Historic District has now been expanded and runs for seven blocks from Jefferson to Hayes Street. In essence, that is from City Hall to East City Park. Two sites that are much used and much loved by all. Those seven blocks also represent the longest stretch of historic blocks in the city. The Downtown Historic District is just five blocks long. The Downtown District does include six stand-alone buildings on Main Street that are on the National Register, while Third Street comes in second with four stand-alone National Register buildings. Those are City Hall(1910), the First Methodist Church(1904), the 1912 Center(1912) and the Mason Cornwall House(1889).</p> <p>We have made great strides in turning Main Street and its historic properties into a very pleasing and useful area that respects pedestrians and accepts cars. There is no doubt in my mind that we could do the same thing on Third Street. Imagine along with the pleasing and relatively flat bicycle lane, there might be a row of flowering trees along East City Park. As sidewalks need to be repaired we could enlarge the walks into six feet wide walks rather than the very tight four feet. There could be special lights and signage that would assist citizens in understanding where the historic district begins and ends.</p> <p>My point is that this, the Third Street opportunity is quite special and should not be squandered. Please assist me in encouraging the restructured City Council and the very able staff to reach the very best possible choice in this matter.</p>	
Cathy & Jack Porter	<p>Dear Mayor, Council, Transportation Commission, and other sub-group members,</p> <p>We strongly favor "Plan C" as developed by the task force. Separated bike lanes with a physical barrier would be a huge improvement over bicyclists having to "share the road" with cars and trucks on this narrow street. Plans "A" and "B" would be better than nothing, but the key advantage of "Plan C" is the physical protective barrier. Just painting lines on the pavement cannot make us feel secure when riding within a few feet of multi-ton vehicles whose drivers are frequently inattentive, distracted, impatient, and unaccustomed to thinking of bikes as vehicles.</p>	Email



	<p>As a recent column in the Daily News pointed out, this is not just about bicycles. Every downtown worker/shopper/visitor who rides a bike means fewer cars competing for parking spaces, wearing out the pavement, and adding to traffic congestion. Protected bike lanes would also help get bicyclists off the sidewalks, where they compete with pedestrians and wheelchair users.</p> <p>We understand the protective barriers would be relatively inexpensive to acquire and install, and relatively easy to relocate or remove if necessary. The city should give "Plan C" a try and see how well it works once the public gains familiarity with it. If it turns out less successfully than we expect, the other options would still be available.</p>	
Jim Frenzel	I know I missed the Sunday deadline, but as a dedicated cycle commuter - in all kinds of weather - I am strongly in favor of any plans that improve the safety of bicycling up and down Third Street and from the description in the paper I believe Plan C would be my first choice.	Email
Jennifer Boie	As longtime residents of Moscow, our family would like a separated bike lane on 3rd street to help more families and people of all ages feel safe on 3rd street on their bikes.	Email
Steve Schulte Streets Supervisor City of Moscow	<p>As requested, my Staff and I have conducted a maintenance review of the proposals generated by the Transportation Commission Task Force, and have prepared comments based on said review. We appreciate the opportunity to contribute our perspective to this important process, as the lifecycle costs of any facility are drastically influenced by the long-term operation and maintenance investments.</p> <p>Plans A and B are similar from a maintenance perspective in that they create some challenges, and additional input of labor. The increase is most acutely experienced in the increase in pavement markings, especially with this being a higher-traffic, high-visibility area. We are a small crew, and pride ourselves on working effectively and efficiently, but we are truly close to saturation with our current available labor hours, and already commit 15-20% of our available construction season labor hours to traffic markings.</p> <p>The bulb-outs in these two options present some challenges for plowing, and sweeping, as anything that disrupts straight-line operations has a negative impact on efficiency. Other</p>	Memo

minor considerations are the continued maintenance of flashing signals, and the impact of median islands on our ability to berm and remove snow from Washington to Van Buren. Plan C presents some unique maintenance challenges in addition to the items covered in the previous paragraphs. The following are the specific items to Plan C generated in the review process:

1. Placement of garbage and recycling bins for collection could prove challenging.
2. The narrow bike lane, and physical buffer, would present challenges for sweeping. This would likely require special equipment, and additional man hours to maintain at an acceptable level of cleanliness. Sweeping is, and will increasingly be, a critical component in maintaining storm water quality.
3. Snow removal in the cycle track lane will be difficult and the Street Dept. does not have equipment capable of performing this task. Snow storage is also limited. Also, we will be unable to run a snow gate equipped plow along the North curb-line, which will impact the historic level of service.
4. Snow removal for the vehicle lanes is a concern throughout the entirety of the corridor. The following is a rundown based on section width:
  - a. Main to Washington- Snow on the north sidewalk and cycle track is isolated from the roadway and the furniture zone lacks the storage room for a normal winter. I am not sure how we would remove it without requiring a considerable change to our snow removal program.
  - b. Washington to Jefferson- This block may have enough room in the middle for a snow berm but it will be snug.
  - c. Jefferson to Adams- This block has 42' of plow-able width and 24' of driving lane. Our snow berm is generally about 6' wide leaving 9' of drive lane per side.
  - d. Adams to Polk - 22' of driving lane does not leave room for snow berm in the middle as we have historically done. One idea was to push all of the snow to the south side and try to put it on the green strip. This would be challenging and there are multiple driveways.
  - e. Polk to Hayes – All snow would need to be plowed to the south side green strip but there is also the issue of driveways/alleys that would be blocked.
  - f. Hayes to Grant- Maintenance along this stretch is highly challenging. There is not enough room to store the snow and keep two lanes of traffic open due to the bikes on one side and a sidewalk on the other. This narrow section also limits the potential of building a

center berm as there still wouldn't be enough room for vehicles. We will continue to look for potential alternatives for this section.

g. Grant to Mountain View- This last section may have enough room for snow storage along both sides however the south side parking may be too dense to allow for much room. Please let me know if you have any additional questions or would like any clarifications.