

Appendix 3

Comments and Responses to January 2006 Environmental Assessment

Comments and Responses to January 2006 Environmental Assessment

The Environmental Assessment was issued on January 27, 2006, for public review, in addition to the oral testimony taken on March 22, 2006, written comments were accepted between January 27 and April 22. Summaries of and responses to all comments are included below.

March 22, 2006, Public Hearing

The County held a public hearing on March 22, 2006, to inform the public of the Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Urban Connector proposal and to solicit public input on the Environmental Assessment that was prepared for the project and the alternatives under consideration.

The public hearing was held between 5:00 and 8:00 p.m. at East Valley Middle School, at 4920 North Progress Road, which is adjacent to the eastern limit of the proposed project. The public hearing was held in a format that allowed for one-on-one discussion to occur between the public and city staff in one room which contained printouts and displays of the different alternatives. In an adjoining room, a Hearing Examiner took oral public testimony recorded by a certified Court Reporter and accepted written comments.

The public hearing was conducted by Spokane Hearing Examiner, Mike Dempsey. Thirty-three members of the public or representatives of local businesses or organizations provided oral testimony. There were a range of comments including, comments in support and opposition to the project and many detailed questions on the purpose and need for the project as well as questions related to construction and design of the final roadway. In general, the oral comments received at the March 22 meeting touched on one or more the following concerns or issues:

- drainage concerns and stormwater runoff collection;
- impacts to wildlife from increase traffic (e.g., deer, elk, moose, bald eagles, turkey, peacocks and quail);
- impacts to property value and potential taking of land;
- noise impacts, control and potential mitigation measures;
- air quality impacts;
- amount of grade change (cut and fill amounts);
- impacts on water supply, including wells in the vicinity of the project;
- access to existing residences;

- concern about the type of access between the middle and high schools;
- type of roadway signage;
- range of alternatives considered;
- decision making process;
- concern about public outreach and noticing; and
- project timeline.

Comments and Responses

In this section, we present written comments (via letters, emails, and open house forms). in the order they were received. Comments have been copied in their entirety and demarcated according to the indexing system presented below. A total of 145 comment letters, forms, and e-mails were received containing a total of 557 comments.

Table 3-1. Comment Topics Received

Topic	Code(s)*	Number of Comments
Purpose and Need, Range of Alternatives, Alternative Modifications, Funding, Transportation, Traffic, Safety	03.0, 04.0, 05.1, 05.2, 55.0, 55.1, 55.2	174
Public Involvement	03.5	58
NEPA Process	05.5	35
General	05.0	33
Groundwater Resources and Quality	20.0, 20.1	45
Vegetation and Wildlife, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas, White-tailed deer, other wildlife	40.0, 40.1, 40.2, 40.5	50
Land Use and Displacement, Schools, Rural Residential, Agriculture, Just Compensation, Right-of-Way Acquisition, Environmental Justice	45.0, 45.1, 45.2, 45.4, 45.6, 45.8, 45.9, 50.0	52
Noise	65.0	31
Air Quality	60.0	10
Geology and Soils, Erosion, Floodplains, Wetlands	15.0, 15.1, 25.0, 30.0	10
Cultural, Historic	90.0, 90.1	11
Cumulative Impacts, Precedent Setting	05.3, 05.4	5
Visual Resources, Hazardous Materials	70.0, 80.0	5
Construction Impacts, Vegetation Maintenance	55.3, 40.7	7

Topic	Code(s)*	Number of Comments
Other (Non-substantive)	01.0, 01.1	31
Total		557

* Code(s) refer to the topic entry numbers designated during compilation of letters and comments in the Access database.

Index to Comments and Responses

Comment letters, comment forms, and e-mails were compiled and organized using a indexing and organization protocol established by the U.S. Forest Service for environmental impact documents. The steps included:

- sort form letters, e-mails, other letters, and open house comment forms;
- create identifier number for form letters, e-mails, other letters, and open house comment forms on PDF file;
- create mailing list/index to letters within Access database;
- create list of codes for comments (table 3-1);
- print working copies of letters;
- identify and code comments in letters on working copies;
- mark PDF versions with comment marks and comment numbers; and
- enter comment numbers and codes into an Access database.

Comment Letters and Responses

Table 3-2 presents a summary list of comments received from the comment letters, forms and e-mails. The table includes a code number by topic (see table 3-1 above for list of topics and corresponding codes numbers), an assigned comment number, the comment extracted from the letter, followed by the response to the comment. The letters have not been provided here because of the large number received. However, they are on file electronically and available in PDF format on the Spokane County website at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/engineer/>.

Public Hearing Comments and Responses

Table 3-3 presents excerpts from the March 22, 2006 public hearing. A total of 99 comments were presented at the hearing. The table includes a code number by topic (see Table 3-1 above), an assigned comment number, followed by the response to the comment. A paper copy of the public hearing transcript is available for public review at the Spokane County Public Works' office, and is also available in PDF format on the Spokane County website at <http://www.spokanecounty.org/engineer/>.

Table 3-2. Responses to Public Comments on the Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Urban Connector Environmental Assessment

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.5	2	1	<p>The EA Fails to Analyze and Assess a Range of Reasonable Alternatives.</p> <p>The National Environmental Policy Act ("NEPA") requires that agencies consider, evaluate and disclose to the public "alternatives" to the proposed action and "study, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action in any proposal which involves unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of resources." See 42 U.S.C §§ 4332(2)(C)(iii) & (E). Council on the Environmental Quality ("CEQ") regulations implementing NEPA require, among other things, that an Environmental Assessment ("EA") "rigorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives to the proposed action. See, 40 C.F.R. §1502.14 (emphasis supplied). Additionally, the evaluation of the alternatives must constitute a "substantial treatment," presenting the impacts of the alternatives in comparative form "sharply defining the issue and providing a clear basis for choice among options by the decision maker and public." (emphasis supplied).</p> <p>In this regard, the County, State and Federal agencies involved in this project have a duty to ensure that the range of alternatives considered does not foreclose prematurely any option that might protect, restore and enhance the environment, or define the purpose and need for the project so narrowly that it forecloses a reasonable consideration of alternatives. Recognizing that an agency can render alternatives "too remote, speculative, or impractical" by narrowly defining a project's purpose and need, the 10th Circuit recently rejected the Utah District Court's holding to the contrary in <i>Davis v. Mineta</i>, 302 F.3d 1104, 1119 (10th Cir.</p>	<p>The EA was prepared following the U. S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administrations Technical Advisory (T 6640.8A October 30, 1987) http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/legstregs/directives/techadvts/f664008a.htm and the Washington State Department of Transportation's Environmental Procedures Manual (M 31-11) http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/fasc/EngineeringPublications/Manuals/EPM/EPM.htm regarding alternatives and impact analysis of alternatives.</p> <p>Alternatives to the proposed action were evaluated and are described in greater detail in Chapter 3 of this Revised EA. The Transportation System Management and Transportation Demand Alternative (TSM/TDM) was described in Section 3.3 of the January 2006 EA and was dropped since it was determined to not be a viable alternative. Please refer to Chapter 3 for a summary of the two- and four-lane alternatives, and Appendix B <i>Roadway Geometry and Safety Discipline Report</i>, of the January 2006 EA for detailed engineering analysis of two and four-lane configurations.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>2002), overruling <i>Davis v. Slater</i>, 148 F.Supp.2d 1195, 1219 (D.Utah 2001). The 10th Circuit observed: "While it is true that defendants could reject alternatives that did not meet the purpose and need of the project, they could not define the project so narrowly that it foreclosed a reasonable consideration of alternatives." <i>Davis</i>, 302 F.3d at 1119 (quotations omitted)(emphasis supplied) quoting <i>Colo Env'tl. Coalition V. Dornbeck</i>, 185 F.3d 1162, 1174-75 (10th Cir 1999); see FSH chapter 20 §23.3 (recognizing duty to "ensure that the range of alternatives does not foreclose prematurely any option that might protect, restore, and enhance the environment.") The 10th Circuit Court of Appeals concluded:</p> <p>Alternatives were dismissed in conclusory and perfunctory manner that do not support a conclusion that it was unreasonable to consider them as viable alternatives to the EA. As a result, only two alternatives were studied in detail: the no build alternative, and the preferred alternative. FHWA acted arbitrarily and capriciously...</p>	
04.0	2	2	<p><i>Davis</i>, 302 F.3d at 1122.</p> <p>The EA for the Bigelow Gulch Project fails to consider any reasonable alternative to a 4-lane, high-speed thoroughfare. The proposed alternatives addressed in the EA are variations in the route of a 4-lane, high-speed road, or the existing road with no improvements. The most obvious indication that the EA fails to consider a range of reasonable alternatives is that only one action alternative -the proposed action - was fully considered. Although a "No Action" alternative was considered, the EA discloses that this alternative is wholly impractical, and is simply a "strawman" alternative. Significantly, there is no consideration of the feasibility of a 2-lane road that involves: (1) improvements to the grade of the road, as are included</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see chapter 3 and section 4.9 of this Revised EA and Appendix B to the January 2006 EA, <i>Roadway Geometry and Safety Discipline Report</i> which discuss the update process relating to the Travel Demand Forecasting Model and a two-lane roadway alternative. The traffic demand model was previously certified by Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) in accordance with approved guidelines for Federal Highway Administration certification. The projected traffic volumes from both the interim and previously certified traffic demand models illustrated that a two-lane roadway would not have the level of service to satisfy the purpose and need for the project as it relates to capacity, system linkage, safety and freight linkage.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>in all of the 4-lane alternatives; (2) eliminating key curves or turns in the present path of the road, as is included in all of the 4-lane; (3) providing for lane separation in critical areas (i.e., a turn lane), as is included in all of the 4-lane alternatives; (4) changing the speed limit; (5) widening the shoulders to allow for better movement of farm equipment and/or reduce the risk of head-on collisions; or any other improvements to the existing road.</p>	
55.1	2	3	<p>There is insufficient traffic volume data to justify why a 4-lane road is necessary in this rural community. The traffic volume projections appear to be based on a model that has not been accepted as valid. Even if accurate, the projections do not show the type of traffic volume increase that would require a 4-lane road. Notably, the projections show a lower traffic volume under the "No Action" alternative, suggesting that some of the traffic increase would be invited, not solved, by creating a 4-lane highway.</p>	<p>See response to comment No. 2-2 above.</p> <p>The traffic model projections were a collaborative effort between local jurisdictions, Washington State Department of Transportation and the Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC). SRTC endorsed the traffic projections in correspondence dated 4-12-05 to Spokane county. FHWA endorsed the collaborative effort for developing the traffic projections. Bigelow Gulch rebuilt to a 2-lane roadway with wider shoulders, smoother curves and flatter alignment would not meet acceptable level of service standards. See Chapter 3 and section 4.9 of this revised EA for additional information.</p>
04.0	2	4	<p>Many of the significant environmental impacts, affecting the existing stream, storm water, erosion, sensitive vegetation, etc., would be dramatically reduced by a safer, improved 2-lane road, and yet this alternative is not even considered. As one example, the preferred alternative crosses the stream or requires culverting and diversion of the stream in several locations, most of which could be avoided by a narrower roadway. In order to adequately assess alternatives, some alternative that involves modification of the existing 2-lane road must be considered.</p>	<p>See response to comment 2-2 above regarding the feasibility of a two-land roadway.</p> <p>The need for a full EIS will be determined by FHWA following review of this Revised EA.</p>
			<p>This should be done in a full Environmental Impact Study ("EIS").</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.4	2	5	<p>The EA Fails to Adequately Analyze and Assess Cumulative Impacts.</p> <p>The Council on Environmental Quality ("CEQ") regulations implementing NEPA require agencies to discuss the cumulative impacts of a project as part of the environmental analysis. A cumulative impact is defined as:</p> <p>The impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time.</p> <p>40 CFR § 1508.7</p> <p>Unfortunately, the Bigelow Gulch EA entirely fails to adequately analyze and assess cumulative impacts in several regards. The EA assumes, without proving, that a 4-lane, high-speed thoroughfare is necessary to move traffic through the Orchard Prairies community, without regard to the devastating effect on this unique community.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.17 of this Revised EA for the discussion of cumulative impacts of the project. Appendix A of the January 2006 EA also included additional information regarding Spokane County's ongoing comprehensive plan update and land use designations along the proposed alignment.</p> <p>Please see sections 4.16 (Socio-economics) regarding community character.</p>
55.2	2	6	<p>The character of the community is only given a passing glance. Orchard Prairie is a community with a long-standing identity, centering on Orchard Prairie School, the oldest continuously operating rural school in Washington. Children at this school live on both sides of Bigelow Gulch Road. Many of them help their parents' farm land on both sides of the road. The EA has no solution for how school children and community members will be able to safely cross the proposed 4-lane road. Though the project proposal includes some sidewalks, there is no proposed crossing. When asked at a public meeting how children could safely cross</p>	<p>Please see section 4.16 of this Revised EA for a discussion of the Orchard Prairie community.</p> <p>Crosswalks will be provided at all signalized intersections along the proposed alignment. The need for crosswalks at other locations will be evaluated during the design phase, during which time Spokane County will work with the community to evaluate crossing needs. As with any roadway, crossing of pedestrians will require care and caution and the use of the center median when crossing.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
No55.2 2	7		<p>Bigelow Gulch Road, Mr. Kelley was recorded on videotape as stating that they would have to look both ways and be very careful. This hardly an adequate solution! The safety of the children in this community is a significant concern that has not been that has not been adequately addressed.</p>	See response to comment 2-6 above.
20.1	2	8	<p>Nor has the serious disruption to cohesiveness of this historical community been addressed. This is a community with an active culture - on both sides of Bigelow Gulch. It boasts one of the oldest "homemakers' Clubs" in the state, as well as active scouting, 4-H and other groups. The proposed 4-lane road would balkanize the Orchard Prairie community into separate areas. Given the proposed limited access in some areas, as well as frontage roads, many people will find that visiting a next-door neighbor will require a car trip. The EA reveals that the concern for efficiently moving traffic through Orchard Prairie is driving the project design, without adequate regard for this unique community's way of life.</p>	<p>Please see sections 4.16 and 4.17 of this Revised EA regarding the community and cumulative effects. Please see section 4.2 of this Revised EA regarding groundwater and wells.</p>
20.1	2	8	<p>In addition to the effect on the character of the Orchard Prairie community, which the EA does not even recognize as a discrete community, the EA fails to consider the cumulative effects of all the environmental consequences stemming from the proposed road. Most homes in this area are on private wells, many hand-dug, shallow wells, which would be profoundly impacted by the cumulative effect of storm water, diversion of existing water flow, and run off pollution induced by increased traffic volumes under the 4-lane proposal. Not a single, individual well was studied for potential impact. Given that farming has been found to impact the water quality in certain wells in the area (e.g., nitrate levels), it is unreasonable to expect that the cumulative effect of surface pollution from anticipated storm water and erosion would not have similar impact.</p>	<p>Please see sections 4.16 and 4.17 of this Revised EA regarding the community and cumulative effects. Please see section 4.2 of this Revised EA regarding groundwater and wells.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>Yet, the EA simply concludes that impact will vary depending on traffic volume, which it admits will increase with a 4-lane road, (see chart on EA p. 4-48). At a minimum, the impact of a 2-lane alternative must be evaluated.</p>	
05.5	2	9	<p>Ultimately, the EA's failure to consider cumulative impacts is underscored by the general nature of the solution proposed when an individual impact is identified. When an impact, such as water quality, is noted, the EA proposed to minimize this impact by designing a road to minimize it. As noted in the report of water quality expert, Mr. Al Isaacson, which has been submitted as part of another comment, this is a principal flaw in the EA. Rather than assessing the cumulative impact on the environment, the EA seeks to "assure" citizens that the county will design the road that is best. Such assurance is not an adequate substitute for the "hard look" at environmental issues that is required under NEPA.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to comment 2-5.</p>
05.5	2	10	<p>A full Environmental Impact Study is Necessary. An EA is appropriate only in situations where it can be concluded, after taking a "hard look" at all environmental issues, that no significant impact will be created by a proposed project. See 40 C.F.R. §1502.14. This is not such a situation. The Bigelow Gulch project involves a dramatic change affecting the physical environment and community of Orchard Prairie. In this instance, a full EIS is needed. Several comments have been submitted addressing wildlife, water quality, community character, farming safety and other issues, all of which make clear that this project is not simply a "modification" to an existing roadway. Meaningful citizen input has been frustrated by the approach taken in the EA, which limits the alternatives realistically considered to variations on the</p>	<p>See response to comment 2-1 above.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			same 4-lane roadway, and fails to provide sufficient design information to allow meaningful inquiry into environmental impacts. It is not sufficient for the EA to propose "mitigation" of an impact through use of an as-yet-undisclosed road design. The actual design alternatives need to be disclosed, and an EIS conducted to take a "hard look" at each of these impacts, as well as the cumulative effect of individual impacts.	
05.5	2	11	Conducting an EIS at this juncture is preferable to protracted litigation on a citizen injunction to stop this project. Considering the work that has already been done, an EIS could build on the information already gathered, address the numerous, significant citizen comments, and consider the additional alternative of a narrower road, which would plainly avoid many of the impacts of the 4-lane alternatives, and has not been proved to be impractical.	Comment noted. See response to comment 2-1 above.
05.5	2	12	Further, conducting an EIS would allow the county an opportunity to reveal design solutions that the EA assures exist, and show precisely HOW any particular design will mitigate the identified impacts. Citizens deserve solid information, based on taking a hard look at environmental impacts, not blithe assertions that impacts will be mitigated under as-yet-undisclosed designs.	Comment noted. This Revised EA presents more project detail and mitigation.
03.5	3	1	I am writing you for reconsideration of my request for an additional 60-day extension of the EA comment period. Your letter to me said the period would be extended until April 28, and the additional 16 days is very helpful. However, this is hardly adequate when you consider the task the residence of Orchard Prairie and Pleasant Prairie communities have of reading through more than 800 pages of the EA document and numerous appendices.	Please see section 1.2 of this Revised EA regarding the comment period for the January 2006 EA.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			The County has had six years to complete the EA with many revisions and it seems only reasonable that the citizens who will be most affected by this roadway project are allowed ample time to read and make informed comments about it.	
03.5	3	2	You refer to only three times that requests have been made to review records, however in addition to these scheduled times, several citizens have, on our behalf, been in to request copies of documents. When the delay following a request to review records is followed by yet another delay in getting those copies, it is difficult to believe that the intent of chapter 42.17 RCW has been followed.	Comment noted.
01.1	3	3	I am requesting a response for reconsideration of the extension period by Monday, April 17, 2006.	Please see section 1.2 of this Revised EA regarding the comment period for the January 2006 EA.
01.1	3	4	Also, I would like a written confirmation of when we might receive the transcript of the testimony taken by the court recorder at the March 22, 2006 public meeting.	Comment noted. A copy of the transcript was provided.
03.5	4	1	We are writing to express our concern over the process that is taking place with regard to the Bigelow Gulch Road Improvement proposal, and to request information and an opportunity to meaningfully participate in this process. We write as a group of concerned citizens, including members of the newly formed Prairie Protection Association. To the extent this letter may reflect a somewhat limited knowledge of the proposed project, this is the direct result of the difficulties many have encountered in obtaining accurate information from the Spokane County website and various conversations with those involved in the project. We still have not been advised as to the specific path this proposed highway will take, in order to meaningfully assess its impact. Over the past several years, multiple plans for improving Bigelow	Please see Chapter 3 of this Revised EA regarding the analysis of roadway location. The final project design will reflect commitments resulting from the EA review and more site-specific analysis.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			Gulch have been discussed, without the public being advised that alternate plans are (apparently) no longer under consideration. Upon inquiry, various community members had been told that the exact plan has not yet been determined, or assured that all factors will be taken into consideration. This does not provide citizens with a meaningful opportunity to assess the potential effects of such a dramatic change to Bigelow Gulch.	
03.5	4	2	<p>We ask that you provide detailed information in response to the following general questions:</p> <p>Q1 What is the county's process for approval of this project, and what are the opportunities for public involvement?</p> <p>Q2 How was a notice provided of the proposed project, in particular of the comment period on the draft Environmental Assessment (EA)?</p> <p>Q3 Are alternative plans for improving Bigelow Gulch still on the table, and what are the details for any such plans?</p> <p>Q4 Does the inclusion of state and/or federal funding require citizens to contact any agencies other than the county in order to assure full public input?</p>	<p>Q1: The process for approval of the project is guided by the FHWA regulations and guidelines. This document includes: (1) revisions to the January 2006 EA to reflect changes in the proposed action, more detailed impact analysis and additional mitigation measures resulting from comments received on the January 2006 EA and at the public hearing; (2) any findings, agreements, or determination (e.g., wetlands, Section 106, Section 4 (f) required for the proposal, and (3) a copy of pertinent comments received on the EA and appropriate responses to the comments.</p> <p>There will be an additional 30-day review and comment period, a public open house and public hearing for this revised EA. FHWA will determine either a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) or a need for an EIS.</p> <p>Q2: Notice for the January 2006 EA and for this Revised EA was provided in public notices in the Spokane Spokesman-Review and on the Spokane County Public Works' website. Please see section 1.2 of this Revised EA.</p> <p>Q3: Please see Chapter 2 for modifications to the proposed project, and Chapter 3 for a discussion of the alternatives.</p> <p>Q4: The signature page of the January 2006 EA and of this Revised EA, identify the Federal Highway Administration and the Washington State Department of Transportation as the two other agencies involved in this</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	4	3	<p>Q Hold a full public hearing, with a "town-hall" type format, to take public comments on this proposal. The currently scheduled "open house" events, occurring today and tomorrow are insufficient to involve the public in this project. Citizens need to be allowed to hear their neighbors concerns and ask questions for the benefit of all.</p> <p>Q Extend the time period for commenting on the draft Environmental Assessment, by at least 60 days, in order to allow for meaningful citizen input. Several citizens have had difficulty in accessing this EA from the Spokane County website, and have only this week been able to obtain a copy. Further, we are uncertain why an EA, rather than a full Environmental Impact Study (EIS), was done, when several citizens had previously been informed that an EIS would take place. We have been advised that any and all objections to the draft EA must be raised and substantiated during the short comment period, including with expert opinion where necessary. There is simply insufficient time under the present process for meaningful comment or objection to the EA. We have serious concerns that significant impacts - on wildlife, water flow and wetlands, farming, the rural Orchard Prairie School, and other environmental and social issues - are not adequately addressed in the draft EA. Yet, without a reasonable extension of the comment period, such concerns cannot be meaningfully addressed.</p>	<p>Comment noted. A formal public hearing was held March 22, 2006. Please see the section 1.2 and the summary of the public hearing in this Appendix 3.</p> <p>Comment noted. Please see section 1.2 of this Revised EA for more information.</p>
90.0	5	1	<p>The Farmstead is not subject to 4(f) restriction.</p> <p>The public hearings and Environmental Assessment ("EA") relating to the Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Urban Connector ("Project" or "Row") set forth the alleged need to avoid the Karl Paulson Farmstead</p>	<p>Thank you for your April 12, 2006 letter commenting on the Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road Urban Connector and property located at the southwest corner of Bigelow Gulch Road and Jensen Road. Copies of e-mails from the Washington State Department of Transportation and the Washington State Office of Archaeology and Historic</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment	Response
		<p>("Farmstead") in order to satisfy the requirements of Department of Transportation Act of 1966 § 4(f) ("4(f)"). The language of 4(f) provides:</p> <p>The Secretary [of Transportation] may approve a transportation program or project...requiring the use of land of an historic site of national, State, or local significance (as determined by the federal, state, or local officials having jurisdiction over the...site) only if:</p> <p>(1) There is no prudent and feasible alternative to using the land...</p> <p>It is our position that the Farmstead has not yet been formally determined to be of national, State or local significance, and therefore is not subject to 4(f) consideration. The Jones & Stokes, 2005 Cultural Resource Assessment for the Bigelow Gulch/ Forker Road Urban Connector Project ("Cultural Assessment") asserts that the Farmstead is eligible for registry in the National Historic Register of Historic Places ("National Register"). It goes on to contend that both the Washington Office of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (OAH) and the Washington Department of Transportation concur with its findings.</p> <p>However, the letter to which the Cultural Assessment cites for this concurrence is not so clear. The letter, authored by Russell Holter of the OAH, actually states, "I concur that the current project as proposed will have 'NO ADVERSE EFFECT' on National Register eligible or listed historic and cultural resources." (OAH correspondence 2004).</p> <p>The 2004 OAH letter does not at any time state that the OAH has determined that the Farmstead is eligible for the National Register. Furthermore, there does not appear to be any other letters or correspondence from national, State, or local officials with jurisdiction, that determine that the Farmstead is of historical significance.</p>	<p>Preservation identifying eligible properties on this project are included at the start of sub-Appendix B <i>Consultation Letters of the Appendix E Cultural Resources Assessment of the January 2006 EA</i>. Through the body of the text, the Karl Paulson Farmstead is identified as one of the five eligible properties.</p> <p>The preferred alignment identified in the EA is the alternative that reduces the right-of-way width to 80 feet from 120 feet in the vicinity of the Paulson Farmstead to avoid the historically eligible site.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>An explicit determination is not provided in Chapter 5 of the EA, which analyzes 4(f) compliance, nor is such a determination provided in conjunction with the Cultural Assessment. (EA, Appendix E) Furthermore, our investigation has not revealed any such determination by an official with jurisdiction.</p> <p>Without a formal determination by an official with jurisdiction that the farmstead property is of national, State, or local significance, application of 4(f) to the Farmstead property is improper. The determination contained in the Cultural Assessment is insufficient to trigger formal designation.</p>	
45.9	5	2	<p>Relocation of the ROW to accommodate the Farmstead is imprudent and unnecessary.</p> <p>The EA explains that the Spokane County's preferred alignment of the project would involve narrowing the ROW in front of the Farmstead to 80 feet in order to satisfy 4(f). This narrowing would require a shifting of the centerline of the ROW to the South, removal of shoulders and medians, reduction of speed from 45 mph to 35 mph, and most significantly the relocation of the entrance to the Fire District 9 fire station ("Fire Station") from Bigelow Gulch Road to Jensen Road.</p> <p>This proposed relocation is estimated to cost as additional 1.3 million dollars. It is anticipated that the cost of this relocation will include building a new fire station with an entrance oriented to Jensen Road, along with construction of an intersection at Jensen Road with a controlled traffic signal to allow fire trucks to exit and access the station in an emergency.</p> <p>To say that it is imprudent to spend 1.3 million taxpayer dollars to avoid the Farmstead is a vast understatement. It has been unequivocally concluded that the expansion of the ROW 30 feet onto the Farmstead will have "NO ADVERSE EFFECT". Furthermore, the EA explicitly</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please note that, under a separate action, Fire District 9 is currently constructing a new fire station at Bigelow Gulch Road and Jensen Road, and not a part of the proposed Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road project.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>states, "None of [the impacts arising from expansion of the ROW onto the Farmstead] would be severe enough to substantially impair the site's historical function." EA, 5-8. Yet the EA proposes to avoid expansion of the ROW onto the Farmstead to avoid any impacts at the tune of 1.3 million dollars.</p>	
45.9	5	3	<p>Spokane County's position is not supported by the EA. Spokane County officials, at the Public Hearing held March 22, 2006, proposed their favored design for the ROW. This design involves shifting the centerline of the ROW south to avoid the Farmstead, while maintaining the 120-foot ROW. It is to this proposal that the Trust most strongly objects.</p>	<p>As a point of clarification, the County's proposed action at this location is a ROW width of 80 feet. The existing County-owned right-of-way is 60 feet so the impact to the Trust property is a 20-foot width of undeveloped property.</p>
			<p>The shifting of the 120-foot ROW to the south of the Farmstead will result in a taking of a 60-foot strip of the Trust property along its frontage, beyond the 30 feet already encompassed in the existing ROW. Though this alternative design is discussed in the EA, it is not discussed as a favored proposal.</p>	<p>The County is not proposing to shift the 120-foot wide ROW south of the farmstead without also narrowing the ROW to 80 feet.</p>
			<p>Inherent in this design is the need for the Fire Station to expand beyond the boundaries of the property it presently owns onto the Trust property. Consequently, the County's favored design will result in a double taking of the Trust property, once for the ROW, and again for the new Fire Station. This result is wholly unacceptable to the trust.</p>	<p>The Fire Station is currently under construction.</p>
			<p>Accordingly, the Trust requests that if it is found to be absolutely necessary to avoid the Farmstead property completely, that the ROW be narrowed as proposed in Alternative 1(b). Any other alternative would result in an excessive and disproportionate taking of the Trust property, and would be improper.</p>	
45.9	5	4	<p>The EA fails to consider the environmental aspects of the preferred alternatives.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Relocation of the fire station is no longer a necessary part of this project.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>It is peculiar that the EA anticipates having to at a minimum reorient the entrance to the fire station but takes no account of the environmental effects that will arise from such action. Shouldn't all of the impacts be considered at once? If all parties can agree that the shifting of the ROW south will require at least a remodeling of the impacted fire station, along with moderate updates to the Jensen Road intersection, shouldn't those environmental effects be included in the EA as well?</p>	
45.9	5	5	<p>Additionally, won't the reorientation of the centerline of the ROW require additional work with regard to the underground utilities? Won't this give rise to additional cost and environmental impacts? Shouldn't those also be considered in the EA prior to a determination being made?</p>	<p>Spokane county does not anticipate any additional work with regard to underground utilities in this area.</p>
90.1	5	6	<p>Accommodation of the Farmstead without a final determination as to its historical characteristics is improper.</p> <p>The Trust asserts that it is inequitable for the Farmstead to avoid being included in the expansion of the ROW based on its alleged eligibility for the National Register. There has been no formal action taken by an official with jurisdiction, or the owners of the property, to ensure that the Farmstead will retain its historically significant characteristics. Consequently, the allocation of a substantial benefit to the owners of the Farmstead is not hinged on any obligation to maintain that eligibility.</p> <p>Affording the owners of the Farmstead such a substantial benefit, at the cost of a new fire station, the Trust Property, and taxpayer money, without any assurance that the Farmstead historic characteristics will be maintained is inequitable and ill advised. The County should require that the owners seek formal registry of the Farmstead prior to committing to a design</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. See response to Letter 5, Comments 1,2, and 3 above.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			that avoids its inclusion in the ROW, in order to ensure that the expenditure involved in such avoidance is not made in vain.	
45.9	5	7	The right of way is measured from existing centerline to encompass the proposed 120 feet.	See response to Letter 5, Comments 1,2, and 3 above.
45.9	5	8	In the alternative, if the centerline must be shifted to avoid the Farmstead, the ROW should not exceed 80 feet.	See response to Letter 5, Comments 1,2, and 3 above.
01.1	5	9	Thank you for the opportunity to comment upon the substantial impacts of this project upon the Trust Property. We request the foregoing concerns be carefully considered so that improvements to the ROW are pursued in a manner that is equitable to the Western Living Trust.	Thank you for your comment.
45.0	6	1	Planned improvements are needed and very acceptable but would like to see surrounding zoning remain rural so as to not encourage commercial / residential development around the connector thus requiring many points of access to be developed. Stop lights every ¼ mile defeat the purpose of the high speed connector.	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to section 4.7 for additional information regarding land use.
03.5	9	1	As you know, a written request was made to your office for all records connected with the Bigelow Gulch Project on March 10, 2006. A letter acknowledging the request dated March 15, 2006 was sent to me by Marion Peterson from your office. At that time a date, Tuesday, March 21, 2006 from 11:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. was set for a review of the documents so we could select those we wanted copied. Upon reviewing the documents available on March 21, we found that e-mail documents were not made available and there were few items prior to 2000. We requested that Marion Peterson forward this additional request to you. On March 23, I called Ms. Peterson to inquire when we could expect the copies of the	See section 1.2 regarding the review period for the January 2006 EA.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>documents requested on March 21. She told me she would have them on Monday, March 27, as she did not work on Fridays. She said the e-mails were coming in, but two people were out of the office and had not had time to review their e-mails.</p>	
			<p>Ms. Peterson called me on Monday, March 27, to tell me the copied documents were ready for pick up – this was eleven business days after the initial request for records and four business days since the request to copy selected documents was made. I picked up the materials that day and set up a time with Ms. Peterson to review the additional documents we requested. We agreed that she would have a room scheduled and the documents for us on Thursday, March 30 at 1:15 for our review. For some reason the copying took place as we requested during the review of the documents. We now have less than two weeks before the end of the EA comment period and it appears that only afternoons are available for scheduling a conference room to review the documents.</p>	
			<p>At this point I am requesting another extension on the EA comment time as we will not have time to adequately review the copied documents and consult with experts in the areas we have concerns.</p>	
03.5	9	2	<p>My understanding of chapter 42.17 RCW is that public agencies are required to make available all public records for inspection and copying except in instances when they are exempt from disclosure under applicable laws and regulations. A response is to be sent within 5 business days confirming receipt of the request and when the documents will be available. Except for the initial acknowledgment of the records request to your office, there has been no further written correspondence explaining the delay in gathering records or when we might expect to have all of them for our review. Given the complications with regard to the availability of the</p>	<p>See response to Letter No. 9 comment No. 1 above.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
01.1	10	1	records, we request an additional sixty (60) day extension of the comment period. We respectfully request copies of all documents relating to the Bigelow Gulch Road Improvement Project that you are required to give the public under State and Federal law.	Comment noted. Information was provided.
30.0	14	1	When I looked at the environmental information on your website, I saw nothing that indicated a wetlands area that I know exists along Sullivan Rd. adjacent to the west border of the high school property. I am curious about whether year-round water flow has been addressed in the environmental impact information.	This wetland has been identified in and added to this Revised EA in section 4.4.
03.5	18	1	I am writing you concerning the Bigelow Gulch expansion. It seems the project is moving ahead with the already completed Argonne intersection. Where was the public meeting before this, for the local residence input and questions? The few demanded for public meetings that have come about, seem almost after the fact. The plans are called preliminary, but it sounds as if there are time frames for each one of the projects to start.	The construction of the Argonne intersection was completed in 2005 as a safety project to correct deficiencies at the intersection. Please see section 1.2 of this Revised EA regarding public involvement. The estimated time frames for each of the projects is presented in Chapter 2 of this Revised EA.
55.1	18	2	I understand the need to make this road safer. Many improvements could be made to the existing road such as widening, adding shoulders, turn lanes and smoothing out some curves. A four-lane highway is going to bring more traffic at higher speeds through this prairie, which makes me worry about pollution of the air, water, noise, and the coexistence of the wildlife in this area.	Please refer to Chapter 3 of this Revised EA for discussion of two-lane and four-lane configuration. Chapter 4 includes an analysis of impacts to air, water noise, and wildlife.
05.5	18	3	The Environmental Assessment was done per project. Bigelow is broken up into several separate projects. Is there going to be an assessment on the expansion as a whole? This to me would make more sense, as it would represent the environmental impact more accurately.	The EA did analyze the entire project (Havana Street to Wellesley Ave). The projects as presented in the public meetings, are identified more for the scheduling of construction rather than as separate analyses in the EA.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	18	4	The process by which this project has come about is confusing. How does it go from preliminary to concrete plans? And at what point do you let the public know that the plans are not preliminary any more?	Design of the project will begin following completion of the NEPA process. When final design is completed, following meetings with the public and negotiations with individual property owners, the project segment being designed will be advertised for bid. Once satisfactory bids are received, a bid award will be made and construction will begin.
45.0	18	5	Another thing that worries me very much is the chance of a zoning change once this project is finished. We don't need or want that to happen to this beautiful prairie. Could that be a possibility later on?	Please see sections 4.7 and 4.17 regarding land use, zoning, and cumulative impact. As a separate process, Spokane County is updating the comprehensive plan and the designation of future land uses for the entire County.
55.2	21	1	My family and I live at 6309 N. Lehman Rd. We are very concerned about the already dangerous intersection at Lehman and Bigelow Gulch. We are concerned that crossing, turning left north to west and left west to south, is going to be much more dangerous with heavy traffic on two opposing lanes instead of the existing one lane. We would ask you to have a stoplight here. It will also help to keep the traffic flow from regarding the road from Argonne to Forker a freeway instead of a 45 mph county road. Why should someone have to be critically injured or killed first to see the obvious danger? The crest of the hill west of the intersection obstructs vision of intersection activity until it is too late to stop. If traffic becomes heavier, which I expect it will, there will be an increased hazard of rear end collisions if there is an accident or a sudden stop that causes traffic to back up closer to the crest of the hill. If warning signs or lights before the hill indicate they are approaching a stop light, that will also cause unwary drivers to be on guard and to decelerate. Remember too, that that stretch of road is plagued with dense fog at certain times of the year. If a tall light were visible, a greater distance warning would be certain and	Thank you for commenting on the EA. Regarding Lehman traffic accessing Bigelow Gulch, Spokane County Public Works will measure the existing sight distance at the intersection and determine if mitigative measures are necessary. Regarding installation of a traffic signal system at the intersection of Bigelow Gulch/Lehman, the proposed project traffic volumes do not meet the requirements for a signal. Spokane County will continue to monitor traffic volumes to determine when the traffic volumes or safety necessitate a change. The proposed project would increase sight distance and improve safety by smoothing out the crest of the hills providing left hand turn lanes. Illumination at key intersection(s) will be investigated during the design of the project.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
01.0	22	1	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Environmental Assessment for the Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Urban Connector (Proponent – Spokane County, The Federal Highway Administration, and the Washington State Department of Transportation).	Thank you for commenting.
20.1	22	2	Any discharge of sediment-laden runoff or other pollutants to waters of the state is in violation of Chapter 90.48, Water Pollution Control, and WAC 173-201A, Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington, and is subject to enforcement action.	Comment noted. Please see sections 4.1 and 4.5 of this Revised EA regarding stormwater pollution prevention.
20.1	22	3	Proper disposal of construction debris must be on land in such a manner that debris cannot enter the natural storm water drainage system or cause water quality degradation of state waters.	Comment noted. See response to letter No. 22, comment No. 2.
15.1	22	4	Proper erosion and sediment control practices must be used on the construction site and adjacent areas to prevent upland sediments from entering the natural storm water drainage system. All areas disturbed or newly created by construction activities must be revegetated; use bioengineering techniques, use clean durable riprap, or some other equivalent type of protection against erosion when other measures are not practical.	Comment noted. See response to letter No. 22, comment No. 2.
20.1	22	5	Any work in or adjacent to waterways that will adversely affect water quality must receive specific prior authorization from the Department of Ecology pursuant to WAC 173-201A-110. A short-term water quality standards modification may be issued if the proponent agrees to a number of specific construction practices and techniques designed to minimize water quality	Comment noted. The County will submit permit applications (including a request for a short-term water quality modification) during the design phase.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.1	22	6	The applicant should consider alternatives to creosote treated wood or other chemically treated wood for in-water construction of wood structures. Over time, treated wood may contaminate nearby sediment and cause toxicity for aquatic organisms. Attached is a fact sheet with more information.	Comment noted. This recommendation will be considered during the project design phase.
20.0	22	7	All dry wells and other injection wells must be registered with the Underground Injection Control program (UIC) at Department of Ecology. Contact the UIC staff at UIC Program, Department of Ecology, P.O. Box 47600, Olympia WA 98504-7600 or (360) 407-6616 for registration forms and further information.	Comment noted. Spokane County will complete this requirement during the project design phase.
20.1	22	8	Dry Wells can not be used for disposal of storm water unless a treatment device for all known available and reasonable methods of prevention, control and treatment (AKART) is provided prior to injection and the discharge can meet the Ground Water Standards, Chapter 173-200 WAC. Examples of AKART are grassy swales, sand filters catch basins, and wet and dry ponds. A coalescing plate oil/water separator or equivalent treatment must be used in high traffic areas where gasoline or oil contamination or storm water is likely to be present. Disposal of antifreeze, oil and other pollutants into drywells is not allowed.	Comment noted. Please see Chapter 2 for additional information on stormwater management for the project. Spokane County will evaluate specific AKART applications during the project design phase.
15.0	22	9	Routine inspection and maintenance of all sediment and erosion control devices is recommended both during and after development of the site.	Comment noted. This recommendation will be part of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and plan of operation for the roadway.
20.1	22	10	During construction, all released oils, hydraulic fluids, fuels, other petroleum products, paints, solvents, and other deleterious materials must be contained and removed in a manner that will prevent their discharge to waters and soils of the state. The cleanup of spills	Comment noted. Please refer to sections 4.1 and 4.2 of this Revised EA regarding the Construction Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and the Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
80.0	22	11	Dumpsters and refuse collection containers must be leak free with close fitting covers. The drainage for refuse containers and dumpster areas adjacent to or over the water must be connected to the sanitary sewer or otherwise designed to prevent leachate from being discharged to surface waters.	Comment noted.
05.1	22	12	The proponent should consider use of recycled materials in asphalt for this project. Ground asphaltic roofing (from roofing projects) and crumb rubber (from waste tires) have proved to be effective feedstocks in roadway asphalt. Use of these materials would expand markets for these recycled products and reduce the use of natural resources needed for road construction.	Comment noted. Spokane County will evaluate the use of recycled materials during the project design phase.
55.1	23	1	There will be too much traffic on Thierman Rd. You will put a light at Bigelow & Thierman.	Regarding added traffic at the Bigelow Gulch/Thierman intersection, the traffic volumes will be monitored and reviewed to determine the need for a traffic light.
40.7	23	2	Right now! You need to fix your part of Thierman and Valley Springs it's terrible cut the bushes on the "S" ¼ miles of Thierman too many [illegible] no visibility. Your right of way has bushes you are liable for accidents and deaths. Stop arguing with the city urge them to fix the [illegible] Hill.	Comment noted. Your comment has been forwarded to our Maintenance Division for brush clearing/tree trimming. The City of Spokane and Spokane County have discussed the challenges presented by Valley Springs Road, and are awaiting the completion of the Northeast Transportation Study by the Spokane Regional Transportation Council to determine future actions.
55.1	23	3	You will be driving traffic up Thierman to Wellesey during construction and Valley Springs can't take it.	The Thierman/Wellesley/Valley Springs corridor would not be used as a construction detour during the construction of Bigelow Gulch.
01.1	24	1	Sir, thank you very much for returning my call this morning. My mom's address is 7810 E. Bigelow Gulch Road. She is in block 3009 from your book, Environmental Assessment for Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road Urban Connector. I would guess that her property	The picture was provided.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	28	1	would be the next one west of the picture shown in figure 27 of the same book. If I could get the picture of my mom's place I would appreciate it very much.	
			I am writing this because of the recent plan to widen Bigelow. I drive Bigelow every day, the problem is not the road it is the drivers on the road, to spend our money to appease poor driving is not right.	Thank you for your comment. Please refer to Chapter 2 for a discussion of need for a 4-lane roadway.
40.0	28	2	I would also like to say that more deer would be killed as a result of this freeway. I hope you will reconsider and stop the project.	Comment noted. Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA for a discussion of deer.
55.2	29	1	Hello, I would like to say a few words on how disappointed I am about the project that they want to do on Bigelow. All the money they want to spend just so people can get to work faster. You are going to take this road and make it into a freeway. No one seems to care about the animals that will be killed, fatalities for people, all the more car wrecks all, the more lives that will be taken, but they will get to work faster. Please think about this, not every one wants to go faster we want to enjoy life. I ask the people to rethink this.	Comment noted. Please see responses to 28-1 and 28-2 above.
03.5	30	1	Thank you for making time in your schedule to meet with residents of Orchard Prairie and Pleasant Prairie regarding the planned Bigelow Gulch Road Project. We found the more than two hour town hall meeting to be very informative. In fact, considerable information previously unavailable to residents was provided. We hope that you have a better understanding of our frustration with the current process and the flaws that accompany it.	Comment Noted.
03.5	30	2	We appreciate the opportunity to have Keith Martin, Ross Kelley and Steve Yach available also to help clarify questions and also hear what we feel are flaws in the Environmental Impact Assessment.	Comment Noted.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	30	3	<p>You said that you would seek an extension of the thirty (30) days for the comment period regarding the EIA. You also supported the opportunity for an additional public meeting to allow residents the opportunity to express their concerns and add pertinent facts to the record.</p> <p>I have learned from a telephone conversation with Ross Kelley that the extension of time has been granted to April 12. He also indicated that there would be a public hearing at East Valley Middle School at which time representatives of the Federal Government would hear testimony regarding the road project. Mr. Kelly said a letter would be coming to me as the representatives of the Prairie Protection Association outlines these items.</p> <p>We know a thirty-day extension is really not adequate for a thorough study by us of the environment impacted by this road project. We believe that unless an Environmental Impact Statement is prepared streams, wildlife, vegetation, and the quality of life in the historic communities will be irreparably changed for ever.</p>	<p>Please see section 1.2 of this Revised EA regarding the public comment period allowed for the January 2006 EA. Also, see response to comment No. 2-1 above.</p>
45.1	30	4	<p>Once this roadway is completed the next impact will be a change in the growth management plan to allow more homes per acre. This will impact the Orchard Prairie School (opened in 1894) with demands for education that cannot be provided in a school that has historically educated 60-70 students each year for over 100 years.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see sections 4.7, and 4.16 and 4.17 of this revised EA regarding growth and zoning.</p>
05.0	30	5	<p>We continue to ask that the original plan to make Bigelow safer with fewer curves, widened lanes (2) with a center turn lane and wide shoulders be reconsidered. Destroying historic communities to respond to a need that is not intended to be permanent seems short sighted when the North-South corridor is still planned.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please refer to Chapter 3 of this Revised EA for discussion of two-lane and four-lane configuration.</p>
05.5	30	6	<p>We urge you to insist that an EIS be completed before any work is begun on the Bigelow Gulch Project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to comment 4-2 above.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.3	31	1	I know that the Bigelow Gulch Road Project is an important couplet to enhance the traffic pattern for Spokane's future. In saying that; my concern is what happens to the businesses and the traffic flow during the construction. At times in business you must think out side the box. I would hope that the county would consider having the work crew work on this project on off peak hours between 8:00 p.m.– 6:00 a.m. In doing so the road would be open for the regular traffic during the day. The Argonne-Bigelow project last summer hurt many businesses during that project and that project was only 6 moths or so. If your job, 401k, house payments, line of credit payments or you BUSINESSES future relied on that project working smoothly, I'm sure that the Argonne-Bigelow project would have been differently. I hope that the county is listening to the business owners (we pay our property taxes, sales tax, road tax, and keep our employees off unemployment) concerns, but the county has not shown that they have in the past. This project will last 3 years. I'm sure that the end project will be great but meanwhile I have to pay my bills. If I'm still in business after the project is done I'm sure that I will prosper from it. I just hope that the business in this area can make it through this project!	Spokane County intends to keep the roadway open during construction. As with any construction project, traffic flow will be slowed.
01.0	32	1	It looks great! Especially the E & W ends.	Comment noted.
40.7	32	2	Please maintenance do something about the overhanging trees in the Gulch before they snap and someone gets killed!	Your request for maintenance has been submitted to County Maintenance.
55.0	33	1	I was very pleased to see that proposed tunnel to allow southbound traffic on Forker Road to merge with SE-bound traffic on Bigelow. Please keep the tunnel concept!	Thank you for your comment.
01.0	34	1	OK w/ me. Git 'er done.	Thank you for your comment.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	35	1	<p>Bigelow Gulch Road Improvement -</p> <p>The bottom line is the improvements are needed. Spokane has a history of listening to the "Not In My Backyard" folks, and the infrastructure suffers from lack of capacity. Now Spokane has an opportunity to do something about its infrastructure with defined goals and funding.</p> <p>Development is happening and will escalate in our area. Traffic is one of the inevitable results from development, and it is all of our responsibility, as members of this community, to ensure we plan adequately for the future of our community. Without infrastructure, our community will fail.</p>	<p>Comment Noted.</p>
55.1	35	2	<p>The only issue of real concern is the additional traffic to Sullivan Road. The County and the City of Spokane Valley need a plan for widening Sullivan; otherwise Sullivan will become the next Division. Sullivan Road will need widening from Sprague Avenue to Wellesley.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.9 Transportation of this Revised EA regarding the additional Sullivan/I-90 interchange analysis.</p>
55.0	36	1	<p>By way of this memo, I would like to present my support for the Bigelow Gulch road project for the sake of logic, safety and efficiency of travel for the citizens and businesses within Spokane County. For over 30 years I have used the Bigelow Gulch Road and have noticed the substantial increase in traffic. This increase in traffic is directly correlated to the increase in populations on the on the North side of Spokane and the Spokane Valley. It is only logical that traffic would parallel increases in populations since this route can save about 20-30 minutes of travel time via bypassing the city of Spokane.</p> <p>When observing the traffic patterns from a higher level, it is very clear that the logistics plans need to include by-pass routes around the city of Spokane. The Bigelow Project represents the first quarter of the loop that would encircle Spokane as is typical in most large</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>cities in the USA and the world. These city loops have several advantages:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Improve Air Quality/Reduce smog in downtown Spokane because the trucks traveling south to Spokane and east (e.g. via I-90) would not be traveling through downtown Spokane and stopping at the intersection where the acceleration creates additional exhaust. 2. Improve Safety/Reduce accidents associated with truck traffic on the arterials in Spokane. Vehicles are enticed to swerve around slower moving tractor-trailers to pass. 3. Improve travel time/improve efficiency for the freight and human traffic; thereby adding an incremental improvement to the economy. 	
01.0	36	2	Bigelow Gulch in its current state is not adequate to provide this service due to the curves and limited capacity with only two lanes. Therefore, I support this project to remove unnecessary curves, increase the number of lanes to five (with center turn lane) and connect the route from Francis to Sullivan Road.	Thank you for your comments.
55.1	36	3	The only caution is that the increase in traffic will exacerbate the bottleneck at Sullivan and I-90.	Comment noted. See response to comment 35-2 above.
55.1	37	1	Very glad to see the underpass southbound on Forker. More and more traffic each year. Very dangerous spot. Please don't drop this in the refining stage!	Thank you for your comments. Please see Chapter 2 for further description of the proposed underpass.
55.0	38	1	All looks good. And we really do need an underpass for Forker going onto Bigelow Gulch.	Thank you for your comment.
01.0	39	1	Thank you! It is nice to see an extremely needed project go through.	Thank you for your comment.
01.0	40	1	It looks like a good plan - and something sorely needs to be done, so go!	Thank you for your comment.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	41	1	I especially like the proposed alignment where existing Bigelow Gulch Road comes into Forker.	Thank you for your comment.
55.0	41	2	I favor your design of service roads to intersect the corridor (kept to a minimum).	Thank you for your comment.
01.0	42	1	Badly needed project. It will really help our east/west traffic.	Thank you for your comments.
01.0	43	1	Looks good to me.	Thank you for your comment.
01.0	44	1	Bigelow Project is wonderful!! Lets get Goin!!	Thank you for your comment.
55.2	44	2	Just want to know - (unrelated). Why don't we stripe lines with iridescent paint on our highways? Driving is a hazardous enough when there's something to follow. Spokane used to be really good about this. Sure helps to see if you're in the proper lane or not. It would be a good thing to concentrate on.	We intend to use a water-borne paint with a top layer of glass beads. We also intend to stripe as required depending on wear.
01.0	45	1	General comment - A well thought out and workable plan. Good job!!	Thank you for your comment.
55.0	45	2	Using mostly the existing route means less disturbance of new areas. Good.	Thank you for your comment.
55.1	45	3	Specific comments -The underpass design at the junction of Forker and Bigelow Gulch Road is very good (better than any solution I could imagine!). My congratulations to the person who originated this solution. Keeping all traffic flowing smoothly at this intersection is great; that you could devise a way to make it happen is good!	Thank you for your comments.
55.1	45	4	Suggestions 1. The intersection of Evergreen/Forker Roads with the Bigelow Gulch new road at Progress Road needs to be improved. A stop sign here means that people coming from Evergreen/Forker going north will have to wait for	Thank you for your comments. Please see the revised configuration for this intersection presented in Chapter 2 of this Revised EA.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			both lanes on new Bigelow Gulch Road to be clear before they proceed. Not Good. Long waiting times = impatience = trouble. Perhaps the same clever underpass solution you propose at Forker/Bigelow Gulch Road would work here for northbound traffic on Evergreen/Forker. Have a stop sign only for northbound people turning right toward Sullivan Road. They would be few and would only need an opening in the southbound traffic on the new Bigelow Gulch Road.	
55.2	45	5	2. You might want to use overpasses rather than underpasses for the people passages at the High School. The underpasses will be out-of-sight areas where students would not be readily observed. Underpasses would be convenient areas for drug deals, bullies beating up their victims, etc. Overpasses seem to work well on the freeway and the centennial trail for people passages over roadways.	Thank you for your comment. As part of the planning process with the school district, the alternative of constructing an overpass vs. an underpass will be further explored during design. Please see the mitigation measures in Chapter 5 of this Revised EA.
01.0	45	6	I just wanted to say I thought the presentation of this project was clear and well done. Having someone to direct us to the parts that pertained to our situation (where we live) was a welcome time saver. I also greatly appreciate knowledgeable representatives from your department at each station to explain what the diagrams meant. Very helpful.	Thank you for your comments.
55.2	46	1	I'm sure glad you (Spokane County) had the courage to take on a project that is so important to our safety. I hope you don't field too many rude complaints.	Thank you for your comments.
20.0	47	1	We have very valid concerns about the impact that this project will have on our property and house. The main concern is that the wetlands including a pond with fish, wildlife, our irrigation for our property and our drinking water well is right where the road is proposed to go.	Thank you for your comments. Please see the proposed revisions to the alignment for Project No. 5, and sections 4.2, 4.4 and 4.6 regarding groundwater, wetlands, and wildlife.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.2	47	2	We are not happy about this. There is a big chunk of our property that you will be building on which is on a hill and will put the main road right next to our house. I do not want my children next to a busy street.	Comment noted. Please see the proposed revisions to the alignment for Project No. 5.
60.0	47	3	The noise and air quality will be absolutely horrible.	Please see sections 4.10 and 4.11 of this Revised EA.
20.0	47	4	The stream that feeds the pond is year-round and we have water rights to it.	Comment Noted.
20.1	47	5	We are very concerned about the extra runoff contaminating our groundwater.	Sections 4.1, 4.2 and 4.5 discuss the measures to be taken to control runoff and mitigate impacts to groundwater.
40.0	47	6	You will also be taking out huge trees that line our property to diffuse the noise and this will expose us to the road.	Comment noted. Please see the proposed revisions to the alignment for Project No. 5.
01.1	47	7	We would like to be notified as soon as possible when the final planning of No. 5 project will be taking place. There are many factors that will have to be addressed before construction begins.	Comment noted. Notices of FHWA's decision on this Revised EA will be sent to all commenters of the January 2006 EA and this Revised EA.
15.0	48	1	Home located west uphill from current Forker Rd/Progress Road intersection. Future roadway shows cutting off NE portion of our land (this is a hill that is steep). Wondering how this going to be reinforced so hillside doesn't give way.	Please see section 4.1 Geology and Soils regarding proposed slope stabilization. During the design phase, detailed geotechnical studies of the alignment will define specific design for steep slopes.
65.0	48	2	Also the impact of all the noise going through this corridor as it already ricochets off hillside to homes above.	Comment noted. Please see section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding noise impacts.
05.0	49	1	Because of the new road construction it will devalue my home, degrade my view of Spokane Valley, increase my noise level, and be a threat to the wildlife. I would like the county to reimburse me for my depreciation of house value, build a berm with trees to compensate for ruining my view of the city.	Comments noted. The details of your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
01.0	50	1	I'm writing in support of the Bigelow Gulch project. The county engineers department has done a good job of compiling a design and educating the public of the project and its impact on the community.	Thank you for your comments.
55.3	50	2	<p>The purpose of this writing is also to discuss the impact this project will have for the business that I own and work full time at Francis and Havana, Bigelow Gulch Espresso, 4125 E Francis Spokane, WA 99217; Business 509-465-1112 or cell 509-216-4818.</p> <p>Havana to Argonne is scheduled to start this time next year and be completed November of 2008 or about 18 months. According to the engineering they will do everything to keep the road open to traffic but the Argonne project would indicate that this would be a tough requirement. The Engineers are planning for impact on other routes for the 14,000 vehicles a day that travel the Bigelow route.</p> <p>When the project starts next spring I will be starting my 6th year of ownership. A major congratulations! I have experienced 25% year on year growth up to last year when I experienced a 28% decrease from the prior year due to the Argonne construction. A set back for a business owner with a business that is my sole source of income, but I was able to survive through it and early business indicators for 2006 indicate that the business will sustain.</p> <p>The impact of the Havana to Argonne project is of major concern for a business that its sole survival is based on traffic. The business is a drive through only coffee business. No traffic, no business! I exhausted all efforts to find alternative sources of protection, Small Business Association, Business Interruption Insurance, Grants reimbursement from the state, county or city. Bottom line – there is no relief.</p>	<p>Traffic will be maintained on this route during construction and although it is anticipated that some commuters may choose alternative routes, a concerted effort will be made to minimize the impact to traffic. In addition, for the benefit of the business community, signing will be maintained to inform the motorists that local businesses will be open and if appropriate, directional indications to access the businesses when normal access points are disturbed.</p> <p>Specific aspects of access to your business will be addressed during project design.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.0	50	3	<p>The state laws strictly prohibit any relief for a business impacted by road construction. I wonder if these laws have taken into consideration a business that is drive through traffic dependent only for business. Bigelow Gulp is not a destination business; you do not look it up in the yellow pages, or call the business for hours of operations. I have regular customers and traffic impulse customers. My business is the only business that will be impacted by this project with the diversion of traffic. All other businesses are destination entities.</p>	See response to Letter 50, comment No. 2 above.
			<p>I'm anticipating nearly two years that my business and my income will be reduced by 50% or more. Told nothing available for assistance. I have been in business going on 5 years, paid off my initial debt to start the business and now my only options are either close the business, sell the business or take out additional loans to survive through the construction.</p> <p>Impact of these options:</p> <p>Close or sell the business - Not an option, as this is my sole source of income and my retirement. I have invested my life savings to build this business. I will be 46 when the project is completed. The business will be thriving again once the construction is completed and traffic will eventually increase to nearly 40,000 vehicles a day. The valuation of the business coming off a construction loss last year would bring a price well below what I have invested and below market value thus further affecting my retirement.</p> <p>Take out a loan - I will have spent 5 years getting the business debt paid off. The funds that were going towards paying off debt were to be invested towards my retirement. This investment would have started in January 2007. Two problems with taking out the loan. (1) No income to pay the monthly premium and (2) the loss of time to invest towards my retirement. I can ill afford to spend another 5 to 7 years paying off an</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>additional loan. That would place me at 51 in a physically demanding job.</p>	
			<p>I'm asking for your assistance regarding the following alternatives:</p>	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Spokane County or the contractor awarded the project subsidizes the loss of business during the construction term. Monthly average determined from last two years of business. I will keep the business open and work it as I do today. The difference between revenue generated and the predetermined monthly average will be paid by the county or the contractor with construction funds. 	
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Utilize the field behind Bigelow Gulp and adjacent to Country Homes Building Supply as the project HQ and field offices for the contractor and county employees. (This would need to be negotiated and approved by the property owners.) 	
			<p>I appreciate you attention to this matter and look forward to your reply. I'm available to meet and discuss further at your convenience.</p>	
45.0	51	1	<p>Under the Bigelow Gulch Road Project, the new south edge of the road will be close enough to Station 94 that our largest truck, when parked on the apron, will be up on the shoulder an into the south lane of traffic.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see response to comment 5-2 above. Upon approval of this project, Spokane County will negotiate with Fire District 9 regarding the ROW and other considerations associated with construction of the new fire station.</p>
			<p>Engineers turning analysis shows that in order to back apparatus into the bays, we will have to take up both eastbound lanes of traffic. Slope permit work for the road will require cuts be made clear back to the front of the apparatus bay. These factors make the fire station non-usable as it is currently configured. Additionally, the station will obscure clear view of the revised Bigelow Gulch/Jensen Road intersection as vehicle approach that intersection from the west.</p>	
			<p>Spokane County Fire District 9 commissioned a feasibility study by an architectural firm to evaluate</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>costs and benefits of remodeling the station or rebuilding another station on the same property. Remodeling requires moving apparatus bays to the south side of the station to move the building back from the south edge of Bigelow Gulch and allow access by emergency equipment onto Jensen Road. While this can be done, the feasibility study indicates a cost of 1.5 million dollars. Rebuilding involves building another facility farther to the south that would give adequate room from the south edge of Bigelow Gulch and put emergency equipment access onto Jensen. The cost returned by the feasibility study for rebuilding on the same property is \$1.3 million dollars. Furthermore, rebuilding will allow us to keep posted response crews on duty in the existing building while the new station is under construction, keeping service at this station location uninterrupted. Clearly rebuilding is the more cost efficient means of providing the same level of fire protection service to the taxpayer.</p>	
			<p>Spokane County Fire District 9 did not plan total station replacement this early in the lifecycle of this particular facility. Since it is the County's road improvement that makes the station unusable, our position is that the County needs to provide for replacement of the facility. Plans to rebuild include expansion. We believe Spokane County should provide funding for the same number of square feet that already exists at the current fire station. Any expanded square above and beyond the current station footprint will be paid for by Spokane County Fire District 9. This cost-share scenario will maintain the current level of fire protection services to the community.</p>	
55.0	51	2	<p>Under either scenario, the draft environmental assessment mandates changing fire apparatus access to Jensen Road. That necessitates that two things be accomplished:</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to comment 51-1 above.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.0	52	1	<p>1. Jensen Road must be widened to accommodate emergency apparatus turning onto the road.</p> <p>2. A traffic signal must be installed at the intersection of Bigelow Gulch and Jensen Road with signal pre-emption controls so responding emergency apparatus can stop traffic and allow safe entry onto the Bigelow Gulch Arterial, which is the travel route for large portion of our emergency response calls. The increased number of lanes and projected increases in traffic volume will necessitate a signal for emergency apparatus to enter Bigelow Gulch while responding to emergencies.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.10 of this Revised EA. The specific issues and requests regarding your property will be negotiated during project design.</p>
			<p>I own the small grey farm house located on the corner of Bigelow Gulch Road and Weile Avenue, at East 7009 Weile Avenue. The house belonged to my grandmother until it was passed on to me at her death by the members of our family. The house is over one hundred years old and has held four generations of our family. My mother was raised in the house, as were my daughters.</p>	
			<p>When I returned to Spokane in November of 1990 to take care of a grandmother with Alzheimer's, I brought 3 young daughters with me. In the years that we have lived in the house, we grew to love it, as we did my grandmother, she was a schoolteacher. Her home was our refuge, a sanctuary for each of us. It is simply our family house.</p>	
			<p>However, if the connector project proceeds as planned, resulting in the widening of Bigelow Gulch Road, taking the road directly in front of our home, rather than leaving it as it is now, there is no way anyone can continue to live safely in the house. A prevailing wind blows toward the house and currently removes toxic fumes, allowing us to live next to an already busy road.</p>	
			<p>Changing the direction of the road would destroy our</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			ability to withstand those same toxic fumes from the hundreds of extra cars going by each day (slated to increase to 63,000). Those same fumes would now be blown directly at our house from the same prevailing winds. Unless the County engineers can come up with a substantial windbreak, such as a rock fence, or an elongated and well placed berm, planted with mature evergreens, as well as add triple paned windows to the front and side of the house most impacted, a cooling system because we would no longer be able to open our doors and windows to receive fresh air, and finally, provide a changed front entrance toward the Northeast corner of the house, we will be unable to inhabit our family home.	
60.0	52	2	I have a history of asthma. I have had the condition under control for the past several years because I am scrupulous about living carefully. Yet, like so many others, I am medically uninsured. I feel strongly that the County's plans to widen this road and place it in front of my house would mean I would live a substandard existence, unable to breathe in my home, but unable to afford the cost of medication.	Comments noted.
45.0	52	3	Further, I am unable to purchase a new home. I am caught between the battle for expansion and those fighting to keep Orchard Prairie as it once was; those responsible for the zoning change, which went from Rural Settlement to Rural Agricultural in just the past few years. Presently I have very few options and little hope for saving my home from the damaging impacts of two dispassionate forces, between which I am caught.	Comments noted.
01.0	53	1	Roger and I attended the meeting about the proposed widening of Bigelow Gulch and like everyone else, we are upset and concerned.	Spokane County will work closely with residents during the design, right-of-way acquisition and construction of the project.
45.9	53	2	According to the county representative at the meeting, the current plan for the placement of the new road is	The structure across from this residence has historical significance but it is for the structure only and not the

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>over the old right-of-way with all the additional width extending south requiring acquisition of at least half of our front yard. This plan seems unfair to us but the representative explained that the unoccupied, tumbledown house across the road from our house has possible historical significance and should be protected and also the power lines about a mile beyond us were an issue.</p> <p>We understand that when new roads are built; a few people have to give up a lot for the "greater good." Hopefully Spokane County will be willing to make this destruction of the property we have called home as bearable as possible.</p>	<p>entire site. Some shifting of the road alignment may be possible, and specific aspects of your property will be addressed during project design.</p>
65.0	53	3	<p>Bigelow Gulch Road as it is right now is noisy; the trees we planted years ago reduce the noise slightly. The new highway will have double the traffic. The new road will not only take out several of our trees but also make our yard so narrow that there would be not be space wide enough to plant enough trees to reduce the noise of the truck traffic. Your own report mentions that noise from truck traffic can actually be in the painful range.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding noise impacts. The specific issues and requests regarding your property will be negotiated during project design.</p>
55.2	53	4	<p>Bigelow Gulch Road is a dangerous highway and in spite of the 45 mph speed limit, some cars and trucks go by at 70mph or more. Granted the new highway will be safer than the existing highway but it will induce drivers to increase their speed. And, it won't change hazardous winter road conditions that are always an issue up here. The possibility of a vehicle, out of control, crashing into our unprotected house is very real.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The speed limit will remain at 45 mph and there will be appropriate placement of signs to inform the motorist of the legal speed limit. Winter maintenance will continue on this facility and the addition of a wide median, widened shoulders and recoverable side slopes will improve the safety of the roadway.</p>
55.2	53	5	<p>When the highway is widened, we will have no safe exit from our driveway, the existing turn-around area that allowed us to turn around and drive forward onto Bigelow Gulch Road; will be taken by the wider road. We will no longer be able to park our boat in the garage because we would have to pull out into the new four-</p>	<p>Comment noted. Specific aspects of your property will be addressed during project design.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	53	6	<p>lane highway to back it into the garage.</p> <p>We understand that the county will pay for any additional right of way needed for the new road. The land value of the right of way is the least of the loss incurred on our property value caused by the proximity of the road including reduction of parking and turn around space, the noise level, the visual destruction, the loss of trees.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Specific aspects of your property will be addressed during project design.</p>
60.0	53	7	<p>Air quality is already an issue here. Weather inversions cause traffic fumes to hang in this area. Imagine what the fumes will be like with double the current traffic.</p>	<p>Please see section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding air quality impacts of the proposed project.</p>
01.1	53	8	<p>We are hoping that between you and the county and us, we can come up with a plan that will repair the damage that this new road will do to our home.</p> <p>As soon as the county has a firm actual location of the new road, please contact us so we can begin to plan.</p> <p>We will appreciate suggestions or ideas you might have to alleviate the issues mentioned above.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Specific aspects of your property will be addressed during project design.</p>
90.1	54	1	<p>Have 2 historic rock pillars in driveway next to Bigelow. Built by CCC during the depression. EWU students did study/paper on them. Would like to have them moved when road gets widened.</p>	<p>The details of your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>
55.0	54	2	<p>Also, have easement for driveway east of current drive... Need paved center turn lane extended eastward, and approach put in on south side.</p>	<p>The details of your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>
20.0	55	1	<p>My property runs parallel to Bigelow Gulch Road on the south side. I have a well that supplies water to my residence and adjoining barn/workshop. The well was most likely hand-dug around 50 years ago. It's a shallow well, perhaps 50 feet deep at best. The well is within 40 feet of the road in its current location. Although I have no difficulty with the widening of the</p>	<p>Please see section 4.2 of this Revised EA regarding impacts to wells and water supply. The details of your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.1	55	2	<p>road, I believe the widening will first disrupt my availability to water.</p> <p>I am concerned about runoff from the road, which will increase with the anticipated increase in road traffic. With the increase in runoff I fear my well will be contaminated and I am not willing to risk the health and safety of my family and animals. This contamination will happen sooner or later. It would be best to prevent the difficulties that will accompany either the availability to water or contamination.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see response to comment 55-1 above.</p>
01.1	55	3	<p>I request, as the construction begins, my residence be placed on Pasadena water at no expense to me.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.2 of this Revised EA regarding water supply.</p>
90.1	56	1	<p>Concerned about rock pillars on the road at E 12426 E Bigelow Gulch Rd.</p>	<p>The details of your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>
40.0	56	2	<p>Concern for access to fields from Evergreen to Pines on the south side.</p>	<p>The details of your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>
55.0	56	3	<p>Concern for access to easement for 12424 E Bigelow Gulch.</p>	<p>The details of your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>
55.0	57	1	<p>I need a driveway relocation in regards to the road taking out my driveway entrance. Need to replace gate, well, and driveway exit on the old Gulch road. 02/25/06 Then everything is ok as planned.</p>	<p>The details of your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>
55.0	58	1	<p>I reside at 7502 E Bigelow Gulch Road and according to the drawings presented at your meeting of February 15 my access onto Bigelow Gulch Road will be modified by construction of an access road. My estimations are that I will now have to proceed west about ¼ mile to access the road and this change can create confusion and a possible reduction in my retirement income. I am a hay farmer and it is not unusual during hay season for 5 to 15 trucks per day to be hauling hay from my property. For many years my customers have used</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The details of access to your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	58	2	I totally support scheduled changes along my property as I, and my hay customers will now have a 5-lane roadway, which should greatly increase the ease on entering or exiting Bigelow Gulch Road. The addition of the center will allow turns onto, or from, my property without continuing the backlog of traffic that has occurred in the past when traffic was heavy in the opposite lane.	Comment Noted.
55.1	58	3	I farm on both the north and south sides of Bigelow Gulch and require a clearance of 16 feet to move my hay swather and other equipment between those fields, which are in production. If I will be allowed to use my existing driveway I can see immediate decrease in traffic backup as the proposed 8-foot shoulder will allow me to then use less than one full lane of the new roadway between my driveway and my exit point on what will remain of the current Bigelow Gulch Roadway towards Espe Road.	Thank you for your comments. The details of access to your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.
45.0	59	1	Where my house is I won't sell if road comes too close and takes my well. It and double garage has to be moved back. My house has a daylight basement.	Thank you for your comments. The details of access to your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.
55.0	61	1	I want a driveway access to the new road. The way it is I have to drive 2 ¼ miles and wind up 100 feet from my garage.	Thank you for your comments. The details of access to your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.
65.0	61	2	I would like a noise barrier as I'm on the 6% grade and will hear all of the truck noise.	Thank you for your comments. The details of access to your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.
20.0	62	1	My major concern is with my property at 4330 E Francis Whitey's Wrecking. Through all of the changes to Francis & Bigelow Gulch Rd the culvert that used to run under Havana to the east and under Bigelow to the	Thank you for your comments. Information regarding your current drainage issue has been forwarded to the Storm Water Utilities Division for further analysis and to the City of Spokane.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			north has been destroyed or blocked not allowing for natural drainage and the build up of the roads makes for a damming effect allowing all of the storm water from all of the surrounding area to collect in the northeast corner of my property creating about 1 to 1.5 acre lake in the winter and spring as heavy rains sometimes up to 2-3 feet of water. I would like this problem addressed during this project as I feel it is unfair or even illegal to have built this dam creating this problem.	
55.0	63	1	We own parcel # 46251.9023. When Bigelow Gulch Road was last upgraded our access was destroyed. We are considering building and will need our access restored.	Thank you for your comments. The parcel in question is located over one mile from Bigelow Gulch Road and is accessed by a private road. The details of access to your property will be evaluated during the design phase.
20.0	64	1	I would like to comment on phase 2 I think it is. We own property 6412, 5911 and 6013 Bigelow, the stream and pond are located in part on our property. In my opinion your plans seem to be the best possible way to protect the pond and stream. It is getting the road away from the majority of the stream. I would like to add that the stream has never run dry in the 10 years I have been here. In fact the stream never changes no matter if it is dry out or the snow is melting, it is always the same.	Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.5 of this Revised EA regarding stream conditions.
40.0	64	2	This doesn't make sense but it is the way it is. I have spent a lot of time cleaning up around the pond and stream and it has so much wildlife it is hard to believe. The pond has fish, turtles, fresh water snails, ducks, redwing blackbirds, cranes, hawks, a raccoon family, deer, porcupines, ground squirrels as well as others I may not have seen. Your records should be changed to reflect this as well as be a factor in determining the option on the dead end on the old Bigelow in front of 6013. Having the old part of the street not be a through road will help preserve this wildlife, also the access from just one direction is fine with us and that will affect 3 of our properties here. I like your plan and good luck,	Thank you for the information regarding wildlife use at your pond. Please see sections 4.4 and 4.6 for additional information regarding wetlands and wildlife resources.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			hope to see it work out.	
55.0	65	1	Are we putting up recessed pavement markers and if not why not?	The design of the roadway has not yet progressed to this detail, but recessed pavement markers are an appropriate marking device for this type of facility.
55.1	66	1	Please include a traffic light at the Jensen Road intersection in any design. Crossing this intersection from Jensen west bound onto Bigelow is very dangerous even with the current 35 mph speed limits as the line of sight is reduced to the east.	The 20-year traffic projections do not indicate that a traffic signal is warranted however the intersection will be monitored for future traffic control needs. The line of sight will be improved with the road reconstruction.
55.0	67	1	Concerned about cars being able to park in cul-de-sac by present drivers [illegible]. When Sullivan Rd going all the way up is too icy to travel. Currently 8-12 cars park along Sullivan by the middle school football field fence when it is too icy to get up.	Thank you for your comments. Maintenance of Sullivan Road as a private road is the responsibility of the owners of the road.
55.0	67	2	How will those who live just above middle school sports fields get out if cars of those who live further up the hill are filling the cul-de-sac parking spot? Will the cul-de-sac be large enough to accommodate those who need to use it for wintertime parking, as well as for getting out to Sullivan Rd? Seems to me that the cul-de-sac will be used for lots of parking during sporting events. Will we still be able to get in and out? It is sometimes difficult to do so already.	Please see response to comment 67-1.
55.0	68	1	Tunnels from high school to middle school (2 of them) need to be planned coming out of Driver's Ed driveway and road in front of high school. Parking for softball participants is currently along Sullivan (north of Wellesley). Where will they park when road is complete? 75 - 200 cars on sports activity night at high school and more on softball games and tournaments.	Thank you for your comments. The tunnel location and recreational aspects for replacement of the sports fields and recreation will be determined with the East Valley School District during the design phase. Please see section 4.13 of this Revised EA regarding parking for sports activities.
55.0	69	1	Concern over southbound Forker traffic access would be greatly improved by underpass to southbound Bigelow.	The underpass is now part of the proposed action. Please see Chapter 2 of this Revised EA for information on the underpass.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.0	69	2	2) Concern about stream and ponds now along Forker Rd. hill.	The impacts to the Forker Road stream have been addressed in sections 4.4 and 4.5 of this revised EA.
55.0	69	3	3) Concern about foot traffic between high school and middle school, need tunnel at convenient location. (Students are lazy; too much distance will cause problems).	See response to comment 68-1 above.
55.0	70	1	Pedestrian tunnels need to be discussed further with the school district.	Comment noted. Spokane County will negotiate with the school district as part of Section 4(f) mitigation regarding pedestrian movement between the schools.
55.0	71	1	We live north of Bigelow Gulch Rd off Forker. We turn north at Evergreen/Trent. Our question is how to best join South Forker with main Forker going north? I like the idea of an underpass to continue north on Forker Rd.	See response to comment 69-1 above.
45.9	72	1	I believe the "Right of Way" for this project should be limited to 100 feet vs. the proposed 120 feet in order to preserve, to the greatest extent possible, the historical rural flavor of the area this roadway will be impacting, and to save on construction dollars to the benefit of all taxpayers contributing to it.	Comment noted. Of the 120-foot right-of-way, approximately 76 feet would be roadway with the remaining 44 feet a vegetated clear zone for safety. Please see Chapter 2 of this Revised EA for additional information.
55.2	72	2	Since we know speed increases the incidence of traffic accidents and fatalities and doesn't significantly improve the travel elapsed times. I believe the speed limit on this roadway should be set at a moderate 50 mph or less.	Comment noted. The proposed speed limit for this facility will be a maximum of 45 mph, with portions posted at 35 mph.
55.2	73	1	I have a concern for getting out of Jacobs Rd. The speed limit now 35 and we have to blind corners. The cars speed both ways to about 50 mph and the road is curvy. With the widening of the road it eliminates the blind corners but I feel it will be hard to get out because traffic will be going 50-60 mph and I foresee a lot of traffic accidents.	See response to comment 72-2 above.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.2	73	2	The other concern I have is the safety of children who choose to walk to high school or middle school. There is no walkway from Bigelow to Progress then to the middle school. I can see kids trying to cross the 5-lane highway and getting hit by a car just to take a shorter way to school.	The proposed project will include sidewalks along both sides of the roadway from Progress south to Wellesley Ave. between the schools. Additionally, there will be a traffic signal with pedestrian control at Wellesley Ave. and a grade separated pedestrian crossing between the schools.
55.0	74	1	Much prefer a "thru road" instead of the cul-de-sac scenario.	A through-road at Old Bigelow Road is now proposed. Please refer to Chapter 2 of this Revised EA for information.
55.0	75	1	Project 5. Concerned about planned junction of new road with Forker north of Brevier. Expect high traffic will make turns here difficult - recommend traffic lights.	Please see response to comment 69-1.
55.2	75	2	Also concerned about nighttime markers/reflectors on Forker new road hill (Progress to Bigelow). Currently these are non-existent.	Traffic guidance markers will be installed along this roadway.
55.0	76	1	The exit by the school ball fields need to be fenced or blocked from entering the school area so the turnout does not turn into a parking lot.	Thank you for your comment. Fencing will be installed along the roadway between the schools. The details of access and egress from the schools will be planned with the East Valley School District during the design phase.
45.0	76	2	Also would like to know what will be done with the property that is being bought that is at 5225 Sullivan.	Purchase of property from the parcel with address 5225 N. Sullivan Road is not anticipated.
65.0	77	1	I don't understand how this is going to be less noisy for me, and why the earth berm is not going to be used between the school and the housing. Plus, I can see the cul-de-sac turning into a parking lot for sporting events with the tunnel so close to it, but noise is a big deal to me. You're moving a road 2000 ft away right now and it will be 150 feet from my home.	Please refer to the tables and figures in section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding noise impacts. Thank you for your comments. The details of access and egress from the schools and parking will be planned with the East Valley School District during the design phase.
55.0	78	1	In the area where no pavement is in the median there needs to be access to cross this area to travel both directions with equipment and trucks because a field is	Thank you for your comments. The details of access to your property will be discussed during right-of-way

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			large various crops are grown.	negotiations in the design phase.
55.0	78	2	Access to keep from contaminating the other crops is need. Also access off roadway is needed, wide area to accommodate long semis and wide equipment.	See response to comment 78-1 above.
55.2	79	1	Keep speed at 45 mph.	Comment noted. The proposed speed limit will vary from 35 mph to 45 mph.
65.0	79	2	Noise barrier like trees and brush.	Please refer to response to comment 77-1 above, and to section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding the effectiveness of vegetation as a noise barrier.
55.0	81	1	The cul-de-sac or turn around west of the EVHS football field should be angled to the NW to allow homeowners who live up the hill to gain adequate speed to get up during winter.	Comment noted. The connection to the existing residential area will be based on design standards and discussions with property owners during the design phase.
20.0	81	2	Question about water runoff near the "cul-de-sac" on the NW corner of EVHS property.	Comment noted. Please see response to comment 14-1 and Chapter 2 of this Revised EA regarding the stormwater management program.
55.0	81	3	Why do you need to turn equipment around in the "cul-de-sac" or turnaround?	County maintenance equipment needs to be able to turn around to do snow plowing and emergency vehicles also need the ability to turn around if the need arises.
55.0	81	4	A better plan would be to have our access for all property owners (15 families) angled off near the EVHS alternative building to allow us to obtain adequate speed to get up our steep hill.	Please see response to comment 81-1 above.
55.2	81	5	Also cars would possibly stack up on our entrance into Sullivan from our homes and if the hill is icy cars could slide into each other.	Please see response to comment 81-1 above.
55.2	81	6	Speed limit on the section between the EVHS and middle school should be 30 at max or maybe 25.	Comment noted. The speed limit at this time is anticipated to be 35 mph in this area.
55.3	82	1	What detour routes are planned?	A construction traffic management plan (including designation of alternative routes) will be prepared for the

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.1	82	2	Will speed limits be adjusted to reflect the higher volume of traffic in detour areas?	project, but at this time Spokane County anticipates that traffic will be maintained through the construction area. Please see response to comment 82-1 above.
01.1	82	3	What is the length of time estimated for project # 4?	We are estimating that construction would take approximately one year to complete that phase of the project.
55.3	83	1	I believe that the county should chip/seal Doak Road as part of the Bigelow Reconstruction Project because Doak will be used as an alternative route during the construction phase and the current condition will not handle the additional use.	Please see response to comment 82-1 above.
60.0	83	2	Also, the dust generated by this use would unbearable.	Comment noted. Control of dust during construction will be required.
55.1	84	1	I read the comment in Saturday's Spokesman-Review "Letters" from Mr. John Hanna. I've lived in Northwood for 12 ½ years and I also have a concern regarding entering Bigelow Gulch Rd off Jensen Rd heading west. It is very difficult to see traffic coming from the east (right) heading west on Bigelow. Traffic crests the hill and they are at the intersection before you realize it. I would suggest a traffic light with sensors in the pavement at the intersection of Jensen and Bigelow Gulch. The traffic on both sides of these roads is only going to increase as development of the Northwood area continues. We need to plan ahead for this projected increase in traffic, with the issue of safety for all drivers being paramount.	Thank you for your comments. Measurement of sight distance indicates that this location meets the minimum requirement for a speed limit of 35 MPH. This speed limit was recently revised (2005) to 35 MPH for the intersection of Argonne/Bigelow Gulch. Under the proposed project, the sight distance will be further increased with the adjustment of the vertical alignment. Analysis of the existing intersection and the proposed project determined that a stoplight is not currently warranted at the intersection. Spokane County will monitor traffic volumes, when the traffic volumes necessitate a change, the traffic control at the intersection will be reviewed. An emergency signal will be installed at the intersection by the fire district as part of the ongoing reconstruction of the fire station. The proposed emergency signal will be designated to accommodate conversion to a full signal system in the

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.2	85	1	Instead of an underpass for between the schools I would like to see an overpass as they did on the freeway out at Liberty Lake. My concern is that the fall and winter months it gets dark so early that many after school activities will still be on going when it is dark outside. For me it's a safety issue. I wouldn't want my child going in an underpass lit up or not after dark.	Comment noted. Please see response to comment 45-5 above.
01.0	85	2	I like everything else about all the phases of the project. You folks do a great job. Thanks!	Thank you for your comments.
70.0	86	1	Highways can be things of beauty. This one will go through a beautiful area that should not be diminished by an ugly highway. Please use good taste, good landscape design and plenty of trees to make sure visual quality is maintained and noise minimized.	Thank you for your comment. Please see section 4.12 of this Revised EA regarding visual impacts. Visual design will be defined during the design phase.
05.1	86	2	Include a generous Bike lane in both directions.	Dedicated bicycle lanes (4-foot wide) are part of the proposed urban roadway to be constructed between Forker Road and Wellesley Road (0.8 miles). The rural portion of the road from Havana Street to Forker Road (7.4 miles) will include 8-foot wide paved shoulders on both sides of the roadway suitable for bicycle use. The paved shoulder will provide greater safety for bicycle riders than the existing roadway.
45.8	86	3	Respect the property values and rights of those whose property will be impacted. Pay full market prices for rights of way and land.	Comment noted. The right of way process must comply with State and Federal regulations. The process will include preparation of a right of way plan, preparation of appraisal worksheets, and review of the appraisals by an independent review appraiser. Acquisitions will include fee simple, permanent utility easements and temporary construction easements. Appraisals of property to be acquired will be conducted by a certified appraiser.
55.1	86	4	Sullivan Bridge: This highway will dump a lot more	Please see response to comment 35-2.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	87	1	<p>After attending the public hearing at East Valley Middle - Would be concerned w/ present location of pedestrian tunnel not easily accessible to students walking between middle and high school.</p> <p>traffic onto the Sullivan Bridge over the Spokane River. The bridge is already severely congested during rush hours. This subject came up at a public meeting about the Bigelow Gulch Project several years ago. What plans do you have to deal with this problem?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 45-5.</p>
55.2	87	2	<p>Would like to see safety and security of tunnel explored and explained.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 45-5.</p>
55.0	87	3	<p>Would like to see cost of walking bridge vs. tunnel as it relates to long-term security, safety, etc.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 45-5.</p>
55.0	88	1	<p>1. The speed limit should 50 mph.</p>	<p>The proposed speed limit will vary from 35mph to 45 mph. Spokane County does not propose to increase the speed limits.</p>
55.0	88	2	<p>2. You should consider acceleration lanes at all major intersections, such as Palmer etc.</p>	<p>The traffic model indicates that two through traffic lanes will be sufficient for the projected traffic.</p>
55.0	88	3	<p>3. Use the recessed reflectors throughout they really help at night.</p> <p>4. Please re-topcoat Palmer at the same time.</p> <p>5. Palmer Rd. intersection is really bad right now, I hope that you will consider the above aforementioned items; I would like to see the intersection flattened so it does not bank anymore and Palmer could use a new coat of pavement as well.</p>	<p>The use of recessed reflectors will be considered during the design phase, and the Palmer Road intersection will be reconstructed to meet current design standards. Your recommendation for new pavement has been provided to the Pavement Management Section of Spokane County Public Works.</p>
55.0	88	4	<p>6. Paint, paint, paint, please make sure it is well lit and well painted along with good signage and turn lanes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
40.0	89	1	<p>My first concern with this project is for the wildlife that inhabits this area. What studies have been done in regards to the impact on the environment? (I tried to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA regarding vegetation and wildlife. The feasibility and benefit of constructing a wildlife underpass</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			download the file, but was unsuccessful). I understand that monies are available to construct either overpasses or underpasses to allow the animals to safely cross the highway. This needs to be fully explored.	will be analyzed with WDFW biologists. Information regarding wildlife overpasses/underpasses is located at the following website: http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/wildlifecrossings/
55.0	89	2	For our own concerns, we would like to see an exit at both the east & west Bigelow connections (by Palmer on the west end and the Grange at the east end). This would allow us access to our home on Orchard Prairie Road.	Comment noted. The proposed project now proposes exits at both ends of the Bigelow bypassed loop. Please see Chapter 2 and Figure 2-1 for additional information.
40.0	89	3	We fully support the upgrade, but not at the expense of the deer and elk and other critters that call this area home as well.	See response for comment 89-1 above.
65.0	90	1	EA document p1-7: 20 homes will be subjected to traffic noise exceeding WSDOT noise abatement criteria. There is no mitigation proposed to address noise.	Comment noted. Please see response to comment 77-1 above, and to section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding the noise analysis and mitigation measures.
60.0	90	2	EA document p1-7: there will be a decrease in CO emissions when the project is completed due to improved traffic flow. Question: if the traffic flow nearly doubles, 18,000 to 30,000 +, how can the CO emissions decrease?	Comment noted. Modeling of future traffic volumes and speeds indicated a decrease in carbon monoxide emissions due to the improved traffic flow and decrease in traffic delays along the corridor.
20.0	91	1	I question the impact on the little stream which runs from this valley. The enhanced burden on wildlife and people crossing, increased noise.	Comment noted Please see sections 4.5 and 4.6 of this Revised EA for additional analysis of streams and wildlife. Additionally, Chapter 2 explains changes in the project made to further reduce impacts to streams and wildlife. As with any roadway, crossing of pedestrians will require care and caution and the use of the center median when crossing. Please see section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding the noise analysis and mitigation measures.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.2	91	2	1) It appears that the speeds will be greatly increased. 45 mph should be the max.	Comment notes Please see response to comments 88-1 above.
55.0	91	3	2) Why won't a 2-lane road with safe shoulders and turn lanes work?	Please see response to comments 2-2 and 2-3.
05.0	91	4	3) The concept that this is the long-term solution to the postponement of the N/S freeway is new news to me that I cannot support.	Comment noted. Please see Chapter 2 and section 4.9 of this Revised EA. The proposed project is not a substitute for the North-South freeway but will facilitate vehicle and truck trips until such time as the NSC is connected to I-90.
05.1	92	1	Make a wider 2-lane with turn lanes. Why bring more trucks and traffic through one of the few nice rural areas left in Spokane.	Please see response to comments 2-2 and 2-3.
40.0	92	2	What will happen to the elk and deer that roam this area?	See response for comment 89-1.
65.0	92	3	What about the increased noise and pollution. 2 lanes already make plenty of noise.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comments 77-1, 90-1 and 90-2 above.
20.0	93	1	I question the impact on the little stream which runs from the valley; the enhanced burden on wildlife and people crossing, increased noise	See previous response to comments 77-1 and 89-1.
65.0	94	1	We overlook the corner of Bigelow & Forker and are concerned with increased traffic noise and removal of foliage in the area. Will this decrease property value?	Comment noted. Please see section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding noise, and section 4.12 regarding visual quality.
40.0	94	2	What about wildlife crossing in the area?	See previous response to comment 89-1 above. As previously mentioned, the wider cleared right-of-way and longer sight distance on the proposed roadway would offer drivers more time to react to and avoid collisions with wildlife.
40.0	95	1	The wildlife crossing on Bigelow there is right now 2 miles and then on Espe Road another mile, will that be	Comment noted. Please see section 4.6 of this Revised

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			addressed?	EA regarding wildlife.
01.0	96	1	Boxes Checked: Noise Visual Quality	Please see section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding noise and section 4.12 regarding visual quality.
40.0	97	1	Elk currently cross Bigelow Gulch Road. Is the proposed project going to take this into account?	See previous response to comment 89-1.
55.0	98	1	I do not like the idea of a frontage road on the south side of Bigelow. No need -people have access on Bigelow everywhere else.	Comment noted. Frontage roads are no longer presented as a part of the proposed action.
55.2	98	2	Bradley Road is steep in the winter, how are we going to get out if you dead-end it?	Please see response to comment 81-1.
40.0	98	3	How about the deer and elk that roam this area?	See previous response to comment 89-1.
20.0	98	4	You will be upsetting the creek down by Palmer Rd. And where's the environmental impact about that?	Please refer to section 4.5 of this Revised EA regarding the creek at Palmer Road and the proposed use of the old roadway.
65.0	98	5	And what about the noise that will come from this?	Please see response to comment 90-1.
20.0	99	1	Concerned about the stream along south side of Argonne.	Please see section 4.5 of this Revised EA regarding streams.
40.0	99	2	Vegetation (old willow trees).	Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA regarding vegetation.
40.2	99	3	Wildlife (elk & whitetail deer).	See previous response to comment 89-1.
45.2	100	1	I have many concerns about this proposal. Way of life here is rural not city. Increased traffic to existing residents is intrusion. This is not an urban developed area, but farms and mountains. Bisecting a school district and the rural nature of East Valley SD is appalling.	Comment noted. Please refer to section 4.16 Socio-economics and Chapter 5 of this Revised EA.
05.1	100	2	I propose that the existing Argonne Rd. is a better north	The North Spokane Corridor is a separate project being

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.0	100	3	The ultimate extreme impact change to the environment in the proposed area is losing a very needed agricultural and aesthetic area. I understand the need to fix parts of Bigelow Gulch Rd., but the Forker to Sullivan section is ludicrous and will forever degrade the area!!	constructed by WSDOT. Bigelow Gulch nor Argonne Road are intended to replace the need for the NSC. Comment noted.
45.0	100	4	I find that we are turning into "concrete" jungle with very little pristine land left for wildlife, rural lifestyles, etc. What we are doing "In the name of progress" is forever changing the ecology and compromises the land. I have lived in the valley for 27 years and have watched as building after building has been erected with at least 1/3 standing empty. Once something is built, there is no going back to the quality or restoration of the land.	Thank you for your comments.
05.1	100	5	I drove up through the area in question and the open fields the forests will be compromised. Please find a new path (Argonne). It would make more sense as a north south to go from Mt Day Spokane Rd down Argonne all the way to the new improved interstate! Why waste more taxpayers' money.	The regional traffic model for community circulation demonstrated that each of the facilities serve a regional need and work in unison with each other.
55.2	101	1	This project will cause my access to garage and other access to back property to be to steep for safety reasons. Every time I talk to county I get a different story. By now they should have a positive plan, which they don't. Lies-lies-lies!!!	Spokane County will make sure that driveway access to the roadway meets safety codes. The details of access to your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.
05.0	102	1	Bigelow Gulch is the place where I was raised and currently still reside. I am concerned that the proposed construction on the Gulch will adversely affect my life, my families' lives and my neighbors' lives.	Thank you for your comments.
55.2	102	2	As an agricultural community, many people who live here also work on the land. They travel the Gulch with farm equipment on a regular basis. The speed on the	Comment noted. Please see comment 58-3. The proposed two lanes and the 8-foot wide shoulders on each side of the roadway would allow vehicles to pass

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.2	102	3	<p>road now is too fast to safely move equipment along the farm equipment more readily than under the existing roadway.</p> <p>Now the speed limit will be even higher. Since we are a close-knit community and regularly communicate with each other. The proposed construction will create a barrier between neighbors adversely affect the quality of life in our community.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 53-4.</p>
65.0	102	4	<p>The construction on Bigelow Gulch will have a severe impact on the life of my family. As the road will be very close to my house, the road noise will prevent me from enjoying the out of doors and will even make it hard to hear in my living room and sleep in my bedroom. It will destroy the quality of life I enjoy currently here on the Gulch.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see response to comment 77-1.</p>
55.2	102	5	<p>The height of the road will impact my life, as it will be a hazard to exit my garage and drive up the proposed incline and to access the road. The incline will also create a drainage problem and my basement will flood.</p>	<p>The details of access and stormwater control for your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.</p>
45.0	102	6	<p>The widening and raising of the road in front of my house will lower the properties value along with my neighbors' property value. Many of us have lived here for many years and have worked long and hard to create good homes and properties for our retirement. This will be impossible with the "new" Bigelow Gulch Road that resembles a freeway as opposed to a road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Property owners will be justly compensated for land value and other considerations when right of way is acquired.</p>
05.0	103	1	<p>As a resident on Bigelow Gulch Road for the last twenty-five years, I am concerned that the construction that is to be conducted on the road will adversely affect my life and my community here in Bigelow Gulch. We have primarily been an agricultural community. As neighbors, we regularly communicate with each other and many farm the land around our area. The proposed construction on Bigelow Gulch will adversely affect the quality of life in our community and will be a safety</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.0	103	2	The new construction as currently proposed will have a severe impact on the life of our family. The road will be very close to our house. We spend a lot of time outside enjoying the spring, summer and fall weather and the noise from the road will be distressful and destroy the quality of life we enjoy here in the Gulch.	Thank you for your comments.
55.2	103	3	More disturbing is the impact of the raising of the road. We will not be able to safely exit our garage and enter the traffic on the road with the incline so severe. The incline will also create a drainage problem and flooding of our basement is likely to occur.	Spokane County will make sure that driveway access to the roadway meets safety codes. The details of access and stormwater control for your property will be discussed during right-of-way negotiations in the design phase.
45.0	103	4	This so called improvement will be a disaster to our community and lower the price of our property. The residents of this area have been here many years and have spent their lifetimes creating quality homes and properties. A better location for a road to help people move from the north side to the valley would be along Peone Road that has farmland on both sides, with plenty of room to grow. Twenty-five years ago this was a quiet road until developers, Vandavert, Douglas and the other builders, built up the north side and along Argonne Road. I'm sure they wouldn't let the county build a freeway in front of their homes.	Thank you for your comments.
05.0	103	5	I talked to representatives of the road department five times. Each time I talked to them I got a different answer to the question of, what was the county planning for construction on the road. I cannot trust these people.	Thank you for your comment.
45.8	103	6	This is not just a road they intend to put in but a freeway. I have been looking at prices of houses comparable to mine in the last three years. Similar acreage and house construction are running around \$300,000. The county will try to low-ball me on the	Thank you for your comment. Spokane County is required to follow strict Federal, State, and County guidelines and procedures for the assessing the value of property needed for the project and compensating the property owner accordingly. This process will include the

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
65.0	104	1	<p>value of my house and probably offer only about \$200,000 that is a difference of 100,000. I will have to carry a mortgage again, as my house and property is presently paid for. I have serious back and neck problems and may have to take a medical retirement and won't have the income to pay a mortgage.</p> <p>At present levels, the noise at my parents' home at 7611 E Bigelow is intrusive, not only during the day but all hours of the night as well. The windows rattle at times with the heavy truck traffic. A doubling of the traffic flow as estimated would make a bad situation much worse.</p>	<p>use of an appraiser to establish property value, followed by an independent review appraiser to review the appraisals. The reviewer will either agree or recommend a revised amount. Based on the reviewer's recommendation, the County will approve the amount of just compensation to the property owner.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 77-1.</p>
65.0	104	2	<p>Please enter the following into the record objecting to the Environmental Assessment and demanding an Environmental Impact Study for the Bigelow Gulch Expansion Project.</p> <p>Noise:</p> <p>From the time cars crest the hills at Jensen Road from the east and the hill west of my family's residence at 7611 E. Bigelow Gulch Road, the noise has penetrated the house - winter and summer. Add the ricochet effect off buildings particularly metal-sided ones, and the invasive noise tends to put one "on edge". The farms workshop faces the highway about 25 ft from the edge of the road. That 25 ft comprises my workspace when I'm working on large equipment such as combines, balers, swathers etc. When the shop was built in the late 1940's the traffic only amounted to neighbors going by so it was a convenient location, it no longer is. It is in fact quite dicey to positioning equipment either to park outside or to make the approach to the interior, often involving the use of both current lanes of traffic. Assuming the raising of the present road grade, approaches to the three roll up doors would likely be untenable. To speak of the noise level at the residence</p>	<p>See previous response to comment 77-1.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			as invasive, puts the shop and outside workspace as nearly intolerable. Normal speech either outside the shop or inside with a door open isn't possible. I often wear ear protection just to tolerate being in the workspace. This is all at present traffic flow. I can't imagine either working in the shop or being able to sleep in the house should the traffic double as estimated.	
45.0	104	3	<p>Interference with farming enterprise:</p> <p>Another concern has to do with our choose and cut Christmas Tree operation, the planting for which began in 2002. The Christmas Tree Farm/Pumpkin-Corn Patch is a destination for families seeking the rural experience. Remediation of the current noise problem as it is now is requested, and an abatement plan for future increased noise is demanded. For my family and me, in addition to noise containment, a safe, pleasant access to the farm is essential to our success. Our enterprise, the time, expense and future income should not have to be sacrificed on the alter of moving cars.</p>	Thank you for your comment.
40.0	104	4	<p>Concern for other living things:</p> <p>Wildlife in the area is also a concern. During all the years while I was growing up, not one of my pets lived out their natural lives. Every dog and every cat ended their often-short lives as a "furry spot" on the highway. The same fate has befallen many of the wild animals in our community. If for no other reason then the safety of motorists, the safe crossing of the Gulch by wild animals must be addressed effectively. One of the reasons people live here is the variety of wildlife, including white tail deer, elk, moose, coyotes, porcupines, turkey, quail, pheasant, hawks, owls, killdeer and a long list of songbirds.</p>	See previous response to comment 89-1.
05.0	104	5	Community character:	Thank you for your comments. Please see previous

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>Most people in the historic community of Orchard Prairie realize that some expansion of Bigelow Gulch Road is inevitable. The proposals of five or six years ago calling for three lanes was infinitely more palatable than the present proposed five lanes with frontage roads, and would be an easier sell to me and my neighbors. Mere monetary compensation for land taken is not sufficient for our community to be host of such an expanded roadway. It is only right that great care be taken to minimize the loss of the quality of our surroundings. It should not simply be an issue of getting motorists from point A to point B as fast as possible. My family owns land on the south side of the road, half way between the residence at 7611 and the east end of Weile Ave. on which proposed expansion would stand. There is a correlation between how agreeable we will be to that transference of our land to the county and how our community and its member are treated.</p>	
05.5	105	1	<p>An Environmental Assessment for a project of this magnitude is ridiculous! This should have an Environmental Impact Study and a complete one.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 2-1.</p>
03.5	105	2	<p>At the Feb. 15th meeting we find that the period for public comment on the project began on Jan 27th, 20 days before anyone was made aware of it. The small notice in the legal section of newspaper is a poor excuse for not letting the people whose lives will be impacted know about it. I found one person who actually saw the notice and he was unable to access it on the web or at the library. The period for public comment is to end March 12. Almost half the comment time was over before any significant number of the people involved were notified. Extend the comment time another 20 to be fair.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see section 1.2 of this Revised EA regarding extension of the comment period.</p>
40.0	106	1	<p>I am very concerned about the impact of the planned Bigelow Gulch "freeway" on many aspects of our</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 89-1 above.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			community. Wildlife - herd of 30+ elk that regularly cross Bigelow - large numbers of deer that move through the area, creating hazardous driving conditions. -Occasional moose that travel through creek and others. -Coyotes, raccoons, pets, turkeys, fish in	
55.2	106	2	Safety - It is very difficult now to cross Bigelow at Jensen Rd. A 5-lane "freeway" will be nearly impossible.	Comment noted. Please see response to comment 84-1 regarding Jensen Road.
65.0	106	3	Noise - The noise from a road of the planned magnitude will be overpowering. I have no knowledge of any planned barriers.	Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 77-1.
05.0	106	4	Please reconsider building this "freeway" and go back to the original road improvement plan of straightening the curves and providing two lanes with turn lanes at intersection.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to Comment 2-2 above regarding roadway lanes.
40.0	107	1	Palmer Rd. - Wildlife preserve for herd of elk.	Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 89-1 above.
05.0	107	2	6 years ago we were told at a similar meeting - 1) B.G would be a 3-lane road. 2) Nothing would happen for 10 yrs. 3) Nothing would start before public input including B.G and Argonne. 4) Construction would begin on the west end near Freya. All these commitments have been violated.	Thank you for your comments.
45.0	108	1	We now enjoy clean air, a quiet and peaceful atmosphere, wildlife and the fact that our grandchildren can play safely here. That will all disappear with the new roadway. We will see our home resale value be wiped out. We have invested in this property with 3 cherry trees, an apricot, pear, plum and walnut tree that are 10 years old along with 5 evergreen trees, a birch,	Thank you for your comments.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.1	109	1	<p>I am greatly concerned about the problems such as extensive and significant change in the nature of the Bigelow Gulch Road would have on our ground water and well. The runoff of hazardous waste pollutants and toxins such as oils, antifreeze and lubricants, which would increase proportionately from the increase in traffic, could easily contaminate our well and ground water. That in turn, could have severe negative impact on the health of all residents in this area. A representative from Pasadena Water has said they are not equipped to supply water even if needed due to this road project.</p> <p>I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.2 of this Revised EA regarding groundwater, water quality and wells.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>
05.0	110	1	<p>I strongly object to a project presented as a widening and straightening of a two-lane country road arbitrarily moved and transformed into a huge divided four-lane North/South Freeway route around Spokane.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to Comment 2-2 above regarding roadway lanes.</p>
05.5	110	2	<p>Due to the magnitude and scope of this proposal, I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>
65.0	111	1	<p>I am gravely concerned about the impact of the noise this project would bring to this area. The traffic noise caused by the new proposed configuration of the Bigelow Gulch "upgrade" would be unhealthy and deafening. The incessant noise of constant traffic such a highway would invite, including commercial vehicles with Jake breaks would ruin the quality of our quiet rural neighborhood.</p> <p>I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 77-1 above regarding noise. Regarding the use of Jake Brakes, please see public hearing Letter 163 Comment 71 for discussion.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.0	112	1	<p>I am concerned that this new expanded project will endanger the streams in this area. My areas of concern are the native fish in the streams, the drainage of the areas and the pollutants that will find its way into these.</p> <p>I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see sections 4.5 and 4.6 of this Revised EA regarding fish and streams.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>
60.0	113	1	<p>I am seriously concerned about the air quality impact a huge, divided four-lane highway would have on our neighborhood. The hazardous waste in fumes and exhaust of the increased traffic such a project would invite will seriously endanger the health of the residents in our neighborhood.</p> <p>I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.</p>	<p>Please see section 4.10 of this Revised EA regarding air quality.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>
55.2	114	1	<p>I am concerned about the safety of our children crossing such an expansive width of highway, as proposed for Bigelow Gulch Road. Students live on both sides of Bigelow Gulch that attend Orchard Prairie School. It is not safe for grade-schoolers to cross a huge four-lane highway.</p> <p>I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see the response to comment 91-1 regarding pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>
40.0	115	1	<p>I am concerned about the lack of consideration of the urban elk herd, deer and other species that travel the Bigelow Gulch, Orchard Prairie and Peone Prairie to and from the Beacon Hill areas. The "upgrade" of Bigelow Gulch Road as proposed would greatly impact their habitat. It would cause more animal deaths and vehicular accidents on the road.</p> <p>I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.</p>	<p>See previous response to comment 89-1.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>
40.0	116	1	<p>I am concerned about the lack of consideration of the urban elk herd, deer and other species that travel the</p>	<p>See previous response to comment 89-1.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			Bigelow Gulch, Orchard Prairie and Peone Prairie to and from the Beacon Hill areas. The "upgrade" of Bigelow Gulch Road as proposed would greatly impact their habitat. It would cause more animal deaths and vehicular accidents on the road. I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.	an EIS.
20.0	117	1	I am concerned that this new expanded project will endanger the streams in this area. My areas of concern are the native fish in the streams, the drainage of the areas and the pollutants that will find its way into these. I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 112-1. Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.
55.2	118	1	I am concerned about the safety of our children crossing such an expansive width of highway, as proposed for Bigelow Gulch Road. Students live on both sides of Bigelow Gulch that attend Orchard Prairie School. It is not safe for grade-schoolers to cross a huge four-lane highway. I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.	Thank you for your comments. Please see the response to comment 91-1 regarding pedestrian safety. Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.
60.0	119	1	I am seriously concerned about the air quality impact a huge, divided four-lane highway would have on our neighborhood. The hazardous waste in fumes and exhaust of the increased traffic such a project would invite will seriously endanger the health of the residents in our neighborhood. I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.	Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.10 of this Revised EA regarding air quality. Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.
65.0	120	1	I am gravely concerned about the impact of the noise this project would bring to this area. The traffic noise caused by the new proposed configuration of the Bigelow Gulch "upgrade" would be unhealthy and	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 111-1 above. Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			deafening. The incessant noise of constant traffic such a highway would invite, including commercial vehicles with Jake brakes would ruin the quality of our quiet rural neighborhood. I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.	
05.0	121	1	I strongly object to a project presented as a widening and straightening of a two-lane country road arbitrarily moved and transformed into a huge divided four-lane North/South Freeway route around Spokane.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to Comment 2-2 above regarding roadway lanes.
05.5	121	2	Due to the magnitude and scope of this proposal, I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.	Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.
20.1	122	1	I am greatly concerned about the problems such as extensive and significant change in the nature of the Bigelow Gulch Road would have on our ground water and well. The runoff of hazardous waste pollutants and toxins such as oils, antifreeze and lubricants, which would increase proportionately from the increase in traffic, could easily contaminate our well and ground water. That in turn, could have severe negative impact on the health of all residents in this area. A representative from Pasadena Water has said they are not equipped to supply water even if needed due to this road project. I formally request a full Environmental Impact Study to address these issues.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 109- 1 above.
05.5	123	1	A project of this size and scope requires a full Environmental Impact Statement. A simple assessment will not suffice.	Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.
05.5	124	1	The Spokane County Engineering Department stealthily changing the Bigelow Gulch Road Project that, for years, has been characterized as a three-lane fix to	Thank you for your comment. Please see response to Comment 2-2 above regarding roadway lanes.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.0	124	2	address safety issues into a five-lane freeway-like bypass with frontage road cries out for a thorough and complete Environmental Impact Study.	Thank you for your comments.
03.5	125	1	Using Bigelow Gulch Road as a short-term solution to move traffic from the north to Interstate 90 and back is inappropriate and unwise.	Thank you for your comments. The comment period was extended.
03.5	126	1	Allow us more time to consult with environmental experts. That's all we ask!	Thank you for your comments. The comment period was extended.
			The EA overlooks several significant environmental and social impacts. How can people challenge the EA without hiring environmental experts? We need more than 45 days!! Please respond by 2/17/06 or there will be no time to act.	Thank you for your comments. The comment period was extended.
45.0	127	1	We would like to voice our opposition to the Bigelow Gulch Road Expansion Project. We feel the road is being made to big and don't want the zoning changes that will go along with it.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 6-1 regarding zoning.
05.0	127	2	We are concerned about air, noise, and visual quality being destroyed. Also the other concerns marked above. [groundwater, wells in the area, vegetation and wildlife, land use and displacement, environmental justice, transportation, and historic resources.]	Thank you for your comments. Please see the corresponding sections of this Revised EA for additional information.
65.0	128	1	This letter is in regard to the Bigelow Gulch Road Expansion Project. I would like to voice OPPOSITION to the project as proposed. We moved into our house in November of 2005, and we knew a project was in the works to widen the road, but we feel it is being made much bigger than necessary. A four-lane road with a center turn lane and access roads on both sides will take up too much of residents' property. It will also allow for a volume of traffic that would cause many issues for residents, especially the noise factor. It has	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 2-2 regarding roadway design and number of lanes. Also, please see response to comment 77-1 regarding noise.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			not been considered that many noise barriers will be removed during the construction of such a huge road. If the noise levels were tested after completion, they will be outside acceptable limits for the way the area is zoned now.	
03.5	128	2	I feel the county is going ahead with the project without adequate time for the residents to have input. No one that lives out here was given any information about how big the project would be until it was almost too late to gather information and make an informed decision.	Thank you for your comment. The comment period for review of the January 2006 EA was extended to April 28, 2006.
40.0	128	3	At this time, we still don't have exact details of what is being done. There also will be a definite impact on wildlife. We have deer in our yard and crossing Bigelow Gulch for most of the year. There are elk in the area also. These will cause danger to traffic on such a big road. Fish are also present that will be affected by the moving of so much ground.	Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 89-1 regarding wildlife, and response to comment 112-1 above regarding fish.
20.0	128	4	The moving of earth is also a concern for the wells in the area. There is no other water source here except wells, and there is no option to bring other water here, as the resources are limited.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 109-1.
45.0	128	5	I am very concerned about the zoning changes that will probably go along with this project. I don't want commercial businesses to be allowed on the property between our house and Bigelow Gulch Road. This would have a significant impact on our way of life here. We moved into this area because of the view and the peace and quiet, and that will definitely change.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 6-1.
05.0	128	6	In summary, I am OPPOSED to the Bigelow Gulch Road Expansion for the following reasons: 1. The width of the road as proposed would infringe on people's property too much, which will mean the cost of the project will be higher because of the property that will need to be purchased. As a taxpayer I object to	Comments noted and addressed in previous responses above.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			this.	
			2. The size of the project will have environmental impacts that have not been thoroughly studied. An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) needs to be done before the project goes any further. Wildlife needs to be considered.	
			3. The noise levels will be unacceptable for our community.	
			4. The impact that such a large project will have on our way of life is unacceptable. The road can be made safer without having such a negative impact on the residents here.	
			5. Zoning changes that will undoubtedly accompany this project are also unacceptable. Please listen to the concerns of the citizens of the community!!	
65.0	129	1	This letter is in regard to the Bigelow Gulch Road Expansion Project. I would like to voice OPPOSITION to the project as proposed. We moved into our house in November of 2005, and we knew a project was in the works to widen the road, but we feel it is being made much bigger than necessary. A four-lane road with a center turn lane and access roads on both sides will take up too much of residents' property. It will also allow for a volume of traffic that would cause many issues for residents, especially the noise factor. It has not been considered that many noise barriers will be removed during the construction of such a huge road. If the noise levels were tested after completion, they will be outside acceptable limits for the way the area is zoned now.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 2-2 regarding roadway design and number of lanes. Also, please see response to comment 77-1 regarding noise.
03.5	129	2	I feel the county is going ahead with the project without adequate time for the residents to have input. No one that lives out here was given any information about how big the project would be until it was almost too late to	Thank you for your comment. The comment period was extended to April 28, 2006.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
40.0	129	3	At this time, we still don't have exact details of what is being done. There also will be a definite impact on wildlife. We have deer in our yard and crossing Bigelow Gulch for most of the year. There are elk in the area also. These will cause danger to traffic on such a big road. Fish are also present that will be affected by the moving of so much ground.	Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 89-1 regarding wildlife, and response to comment 112-1 above regarding fish.
20.0	129	4	The moving of earth is also a concern for the wells in the area. There is no other water source here except wells, and there is no option to bring other water here, as the resources are limited.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 109-1 above regarding water quality and wells.
45.0	129	5	I am very concerned about the zoning changes that will probably go along with this project. I don't want commercial businesses to be allowed on the property between our house and Bigelow Gulch Road. This would have a significant impact on our way of life here. We moved into this area because of the view and the peace and quiet, and that will definitely change.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 6-1 above.
05.0	129	6	In summary, I am OPPOSED to the Bigelow Gulch Road Expansion for the following reasons: 1. The width of the road as proposed would infringe on people's property too much, which will mean the cost of the project will be higher because of the property that will need to be purchased. As a taxpayer I object to this. 2. The size of the project will have environmental impacts that have not been thoroughly studied. An Environmental Impact Study (EIS) needs to be done before the project goes any further. Wildlife needs to be considered. 3. The noise levels will be unacceptable for our community.	Comments noted and addressed in previous responses above.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>4. The impact that such a large project will have on our way of life is unacceptable. The road can be made safer without having such a negative impact on the residents here.</p> <p>5. Zoning changes that will undoubtedly accompany this project are also unacceptable. Please listen to the concerns of the citizens of the community!!</p>	
03.5	130	1	<p>We are writing in response to the meeting held February 2 at the Central Grange regarding the upgrading of Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road. As residents in the Orchard Prairie community with property adjacent to Bigelow Gulch, we were very disappointed with the meeting for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The delay - we have been trying to get a meeting with the County Engineers for almost a year through the office of County Commissioners. After initially being told that there would be a meeting in June, it was put off a number of times until finally this meeting was called. 2. The format - we feel that the meeting would have been much more effective if it had been formal presentation by the engineers at a set time with a question and answer period from the concerned citizens. We found it nearly impossible to get to talk to any of the representatives from the County and they must have had to repeat the same information over and over as questions were asked. 3. Lack of information - there was no new information given that we could determine. We already knew about the three options - no further discussion was apparent. 4. Resident response - there was no real opportunity for residents to voice an opinion because of the crowd and unstructured nature of the meeting. (We can only hope that the written responses will be diligently read and considered.) 	<p>Thank you for your comments. In response to your concerns, the comment period for this project was extended to April 28, 2006, additional meetings sponsored by the Prairie Protection Association were attended by Spokane County representatives, and a public hearing was held on March 22, 2006. In these forums additional information was provided and citizens had the opportunity to voice their opinions.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
04.0	130	2	<p>Alternatives - no consideration of alternative solutions to the transportation problem were allowed. We would like to see the possibility of an Argonne/Stoneman Road beltway considered. It seems that it would cost a fraction of the expense of the Bigelow Gulch proposal, could be done sooner, would mean less disruption of people's homes and property, and with the existing Bigelow Gulch, would provide two routes to funnel traffic from the north side of Spokane to the Valley which would help solve the problem much sooner. The proposed Bigelow Gulch project would funnel more traffic into Francis Ave., which is already severely congested. The Argonne/Stoneman Rd. route will likely have to be done sooner or later anyway.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Chapter 3 of this Revised EA presents the alternative alignments evaluated and screened during the project planning phase.</p> <p>The "Connecting Our Community" study that was performed in 1990's surveyed the public and looked at several alternatives including the route referenced in this comment. The study indicated that the regional travel patterns showed an increase of traffic would use Bigelow Gulch Road and there may also be a future need for another corridor further north but a northern route would not supplant the need for improvements to Bigelow Gulch.</p>
55.0	130	3	<p>Bigelow Gulch improvements - rather than widening Bigelow Gulch to 4 lanes, we would like to see left-turn lanes added and a ban on large truck-trailer rigs that cause traffic to pile up behind them. These changes could be made much earlier than the proposed three years for the widening of the Gulch. Having lived near Bigelow Gulch since 1952, we have seen each new "improvement" add an increase in traffic and the number of accidents and fatalities.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Bigelow Gulch Road is currently a major arterial in Spokane County and is an important freight route. It is not reasonable to restrict heavy vehicles without providing another route for their use. Spokane County has more than doubled in population since 1952 which has caused the increase in traffic. The safe operation upon this route is the primary factor of the proposed project.</p>
45.0	130	4	<p>Future zoning - we in the community have been fighting to preserve the rural lifestyle of this area. We have managed to stave off efforts to change the zoning to allow non-rural development. What will the presence of a four-lane truck route through the heart of our community do to our rural quality of life?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 6-1 above regarding zoning.</p>
45.2	130	5	<p>Individual rights - Here is just one example of the impact on individuals that such a project would have. A young couple recently purchased the old farmhouse near the corner of Jensen and Bigelow Gulch with the intent of restoring it to its turn-of-the-century beauty. They have been working hard at it. This road project would take</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.0	131	1	<p>Very concerned with how the improved originally proposed 2-lane roadway with turning lanes has turned into this 4-lane major highway. North - South temporary cure?</p> <p>forty feet from the north side of the Gulch (because of the fire station's site close to the south side). The road wouldn't pass through their living room but would come darn close to it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 2-2 above regarding roadway lanes.</p> <p>Chapter 3 of this Revised EA presents the history of the alternatives analyzed AND THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE North Spokane Corridor.</p>
05.5	131	2	<p>Why wasn't a full EIS done, we have been told only an EA was done.</p>	<p>Please see response to comments 2-1 above regarding EIS.</p>
40.0	131	3	<p>Wildlife concerns, there is a herd of elk that use this corridor. What happens to them?</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 89-1 above regarding wildlife.</p>
45.0	131	4	<p>Concern for rezoning - now rural 10 acres, what happens when a full-blown 4-lane highway blows through our rural home?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 6-1 above regarding zoning.</p>
05.5	132	1	<p>As a resident of Orchard Prairie, a rural community that will be impacted by the Bigelow Road Project I have the following questions. I also have offered some suggestions. I trust your office will follow procedures for such comments and get back to me in a timely manner.</p> <p>The NEPA process, as I understand it is to allow the average person to determine the damage from a proposed activity by an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Study. In addition this process is to show or describe all of the impacts and the proposed mitigation measures that lessen the impact on the environment. With that in mind I find it hard to understand how the EA determines any impact to the environment when the project design is not complete? From what I gathered from county officials at the open houses is the roadway design for Bigelow is not complete?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) provides guidance for project design and environmental analysis. The "design phase" of a transportation project begins with the allocation of funds and ends with the approval of project design and environmental documents. The design of a project is an evolutionary process, with the environmental analysis done in tandem with engineering, and changes in the project made in response to environmental conditions and issues. The environmental impacts of the project are determined based on the engineering information (e.g., roadway location, length and width, traffic volumes and speed, etc.) and baseline environmental information (e.g., vegetation, wildlife, wetland and stream locations, etc.). Mitigation is developed to avoid or lessen impact (e.g., use of retaining walls to reduce the amount of wetland filled by the road). "Final" design begins once environmental</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.5	132	2	What is the mitigation process when a design is not complete?	<p>documentation is complete (i.e., completion of the FONSI for the EA or a Record of Decision for an EIS). Final mitigation for a project is typically not completed until the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates phase which follows the design phase.</p> <p>Mitigation measures (i.e., environmental commitments) have been identified as part of this EA based on the currently level of project design. These are commitments by Spokane County to implement these measures as a part of later design and during construction, and include procedures and regulations that apply to the environmental resources. Mitigation measures defined during preparation of the EA, are implemented as part of final design, and as a part of environmental permitting (i.e., requirements or conditions defined by regulatory agencies as a part of permit approval).</p>
20.0	132	3	Where in the EA does it address the issue of stream alignment and storm water drainage?	<p>Section 4.5 of this Revised EA presents an analysis of streams and the stormwater management program. Figures showing the locations of detention ponds are presented in Chapter 2.</p>
04.0	132	4	NEPA requires alternatives to be addressed and compared against each other. It seems the other alternatives are all the same design with the only change being in the location? Why are there no other design alternatives?	<p>Chapter 3 of this Revised EA presents a history and discussion of project alternatives.</p>
03.5	132	6	I object in the manner in which the residents of this community have been notified of this project. We have asked on numerous occasions, requested that the county hold a town hall style meeting versus the open house format. The town hall style would allow for people to ask specific questions one at a time for all attending to hear and for all to hear the answers to. I have overheard a resident at the last three open houses ask questions that I felt were very pertinent and should	<p>Thank you for your comments. See response to comment 130-1 above.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			have been heard by all in attendance.	
03.5	132	7	How will the county handle the Public Comment forms it has received on this project?	Spokane County has compiled, catalogued, and responded to the comments received during the public comment period. Electronic copies have been made of the comment letters, and comments have been entered into an Microsoft Access database. Public comments have been reviewed by FHWA and WSDOT to formulate the final decision regarding the NEPA process.
03.5	132	8	There was public testimony given at the March 22, 2006 open house. What is the procedure for this? Will we be notified of the results of recorded comments?	The comments provided during the open house are also part of the record of public comment and are summarized in this appendix. Copies of the hearing transcript are available upon request.
03.5	132	9	The county engineers and planning department has had 10+ years to prepare for this project where as we the residents who pay into the county's tax coffers have not. We are expected to review, interpret and comment on stacks of comments and forms that we know nothing about. We are expected to know how to ask the right questions in a manner to obtain the critical files held by the county. If we don't then our requests are delayed. We are not trained as attorneys or engineers. We are normal people requesting fair treatment and to be part of the process.	Thank you for your comments.
05.0	132	10	In summary I believe the proposed 4+-lane highway will extract a terrible toll on the livability and sustainability if routed through the heart of a rural Spokane County community.	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 100-1 above.
05.5	132	11	I am requesting an EIS be done before this project goes any further.	Please see response to comments 2-1 above regarding EIS.
05.0	135	1	I reside in the Bigelow Gulch area, and am growing increasingly concerned over the proposed road improvement plans for Bigelow Gulch Road. This project, which began as a relatively minor county road	Thank you for your comments.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
40.0	135	2	improvement, has now morphed into a huge freeway corridor plan with little thought or care for the impact on the environment or the residents of the area. More specific concerns are as follows.	
			What sort of environmental damage would result? This is a rural area, with wetland; vegetation and wildlife that would most certainly suffer significant harm under this new plan.	Thank you for your comments. Please refer to sections 4.4 and 4.6 of this Revised EA.
05.5	135	3	I question the integrity of the impact study previously done, as it does not take into consideration the extreme changes to the initial plan.	Comment noted. The project as proposed in the EA was developed and modified over time. The impact analysis in the EA evaluates the project as currently proposed.
03.5	135	4	Area residents have tried to access records showing both an updated, more appropriate study, and the actual revised plans themselves, but to no avail.	Spokane County provided project information requested during the comment period. Please let us know if you have additional requests for information.
55.0	135	5	Quality of life issues. The increase in traffic, and the resultant noise and pollution would most certainly have a negative effect on the area. There are safety considerations as well - the original plan was meant to address these, but the new plan only exacerbates the problems residents currently experience.	Thank you for your comments.
45.0	135	6	Zoning. Already, there have been applications made to install typically 'freeway' type businesses in what is currently an area zoned rural. (Gas stations, etc).	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 6-1 above.
45.1	135	7	Economic impact. Schools will have to adjust transport schedules and routes, resulting in increased transportation costs.	Thank you for your comment. With the exception of modified access at Old Bigelow Gulch Road, Forker Road, and Progress Road, access to Bigelow Road with the project would remain unchanged. Consultation with the School Districts has taken place and they have not indicated any change in service.
45.0	135	8	Residents will eventually have to pay for the various types of improvements that are associated with zone changes, such as sewer, etc. Land/home values will	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 6-1 regarding zoning.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.0	135	9	certainly drop - who wants to live next to a freeway? The entire make-up of this community is threatened with the proposed corridor project. Rural areas like Bigelow Gulch are vanishing, and cannot be replaced. It is a unique area, rich in history and scenic beauty, and it would be a shame to see it destroyed when there are other sensible, viable options for a project such as this.	Thank you for your comments.
55.2	136	1	The following people would like to thank you and give their support for a well-designed plan to improve this major source of commerce and extremely dangerous road. The following people travel this way daily and only represent a small fraction of the people in huge support of this project. How could anyone in their right mind think we shouldn't address this huge safety issue? Every day thousands and thousands of vehicles including large trucks need to access this major traffic corridor for the local deliveries that are vital to our economy. In the winter the winding icy roads and huge yearly increase in traffic show just how dangerous this corridor is.	Thank you for your comments.
40.0	136	2	Wildlife would be safer with straighter roads for visibility and less shaded roads allowing for better and faster stopping in bad conditions.	Thank you for your comments.
55.2	137	1	The need for this highway is to prevent accidents and improve safety and convenience. People need to slow down, and with the widening of the highway it will only increase traffic and speed. This will only make things worse, not better.	Thank you for your comments.
45.8	137	2	Property values will decline for those of us who reside off Bigelow Gulch, so will compensate me? I plan on having my property appraised now, and when this project is complete, so have your checkbooks ready!	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 86-3 above regarding appraisal process.
65.0	138	1	The use of exhaust brakes should be prohibited.	Thank you for your comments.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	139	1	You can't get this project done too soon. I drive that route several times a week, and see more and more traffic and more close calls all the time.	There are state and local regulations on truck brakes that have greatly reduced noise impacts associated with their use. Thank you for your comment.
40.0	140	1	I am very concerned about further upset of the elk migration.	Thank you for your comment. See response for comment 89-1 above.
20.0	140	2	I don't believe that the stream running beside the current Bigelow Gulch Road should be labeled as dry. Because it is not!	Comment noted. Please see section 4-5 regarding additional information on streams.
20.0	140	3	I'm concerned that the new road will cause water problems, via new floodplains created and diversion of the existing stream.	Thank you for your comment. Section 4.3 of this Revised EA provides additional floodplain information. A detailed stormwater management program will be a part of the project.
01.0	141	1	This is a greatly needed project to be completed as soon as possible. The general plan appears to be well thought out.	Thank you for your comment.
55.0	141	2	The only suggestion would be to add an underpass at Evergreen - Forker - Progress intersection to gain access for old Progress and north bound to new Forker.	Thank you for your comments.
55.0	142	1	East Valley School District wants to discuss the pedestrian crossing alternatives and of course play field, fencing, parking issues. This comment form is being submitted so the desire to talk about an overpass vs. tunnel is recorded.	Thank you for your comments. Spokane County will be working closely with the School District regarding these aspects. Please see response to comment 45-5 above.
05.0	143	1	After 29 years on Wellesley (just west of Sullivan) this road is finally being taken seriously. (We've heard about it since the day we moved in, in 1978.)	Thank you for your comment.
55.1	143	2	My concern is why this area is the end of the project - the traffic on Wellesley and Progress gets worse every	Comment noted. The intersection of Wellesley and Progress was analyzed in Section 4.9 of this Revised

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.1	143	3	Going to Barker doesn't help the amount of traffic on Wellesley and Sullivan for Industrial Park and Valley Mall etc. "Walmart".	Comment noted.
55.2	144	1	I have lived at 5424 N Progress Road, the second house north of the East Valley Middle School since 1963 and am concerned about the impact this "Urban Connector" will have on our quality of life and pedestrian and animal safety here in Trentwood. I know you have noticed that the north/south traffic from Sullivan to Forker Road is already a hazard to our children walking to school as cars pass on the shoulders of Progress in a rush to get to work each day. And every winter many deer and moose are killed on Progress trying to reach the ponds in the field on the west side of Progress. (See attached photos of neighborhood animals).	Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comments 73-2 and 91-1 regarding pedestrian safety. Please see response to comment 89-1 regarding elk and deer crossing.
	144	2	I know you have noticed the ugly board fence residents erected along the west side of Progress in an attempt to block the traffic noise out of their homes as its volume increases with each passing year, (and incidentally), we were informed by the county that Progress was scheduled for future improvement to handle local traffic in the early 1960's when we first purchased this property. So after construction of the East Valley Middle School in the 1970's, we have waited many years for the county to improve Progress and make the road situation "right" for the school children and other pedestrians here in Trentwood. However, now it has become apparent that this road is not for local traffic anymore, but in fact has been commandeered to be an "Urban Connector" designed to haul freight from Canada to Interstate 90, potentially destroying the quality of the life and safety of everyone	Thank you for your comments. Please see Chapter 2 of this Revised EA for proposed cul-de-sac design at Progress Road. Progress Road south of the new road alignment will become a local access and school traffic only road. As a result, traffic volumes will be dramatically less for this roadway and the safety for the middle school will be enhanced.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>in the East Valley School District.</p> <p>Protests have been lodged with the East Valley School Board for agreeing to this road, although I know that when they did so years ago, it was not presented to them as a freight-hauling road. They believed the road improvement was as it was first conceived, to relieve local traffic congestion and benefit student safety by removing traffic from Progress Road in Front of the East Valley Middle School.</p>	
55.2	144	3	<p>I also protest the County's efforts to pacify EVSD by building a tunnel under the highway as a means for students to cross safely during school hours. A tunnel with gates that school personnel must be paid to lock and unlock each day of the life of the road to allow daytime pedestrian traffic and prevent night crime? As a taxpayer in the East Valley School District, as a parent of an East Valley student and as a neighbor who will need to cross this road myself during all hours and days of the week. I object! A school district assigned the task by the County of controlling who and when community members and students can cross a road safely? Even one dead pedestrian, man, woman, or child will cost the County and School District millions of dollars in lawsuits and deservedly so!</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see response to comment 45-5.</p>
55.2	144	4	<p>At the school Board meeting on March 14, 2006 I asked the School Board members to work with the other neighbors in developing a plan to mitigate the highways impact on our neighborhood, a plan which makes it safe for all of us all the time. And I believe you road planners are obligated to co-operate in this effort by not bestowing road improvements and accommodations on a few hand picked property owners while ignoring the needs of the rest.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As previously mentioned, Spokane County will work with the school district to finalize the roadway crossing issue. Please see response to comment 45-5.</p>
55.0	144	5	<p>I have heard the argument that nothing will change (safety wise) as a result of this highway, but that is not</p>	<p>The new traffic signal will accommodate the orderly movement of vehicles and pedestrians at the</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			accurate. Right now pedestrians who want to cross Sullivan do so about 200 feet north of Wellesley. That is because the traffic is so heavy at that four way stop that you take your life in your hands to walk across Sullivan there. However, the fact that there is no traffic light on that corner works in favor of automobiles turning right onto Sullivan. In the morning with 80% of cars turning south off Wellesley onto Sullivan, and the rest heading east and west on Wellesley, traffic flows freely. Think about that. After the road is built, and a stop light is installed at Sullivan and Wellesley; every morning, rush hour traffic including school busses from EVHS, EVMS and Trentwood Elementary, the several dozen students who walk or bike to school, the several hundred students who drive their cars (about 3,000 in all), are going to have to stop and take turns at Sullivan and Wellesley. The traffic jam will be terrible, at least a mile long like it is on Sullivan starting at Indiana and going north to Marietta each afternoon. Cars will be turning left and right onto Wellesley off from Sullivan to escape the traffic jam on Sullivan and racing past EVHS, EVMS, Trentwood Elementary and Skyview Elementary to get to Trent Road and other routes south on residential streets. Trent at Progress already has a high number of wrecks each year from cars coming off the Sullivan overpass onto Trent and cars speeding in from Idaho on Trent colliding with cars coming out of Progress onto Trent. (The Idaho cars and trucks do not slow down until they hit the stop light at Trent and Evergreen.)	intersection. Traffic modeling illustrates that the signal will accommodate the efficient movement of traffic. The intersection is modeled to operate at Level of Service (LOS) C. This project should reduce traffic going to Trent & Progress Road and should move the traffic to Sullivan Road. This movement of traffic should reduce the probability of collisions at Trent & Progress Road.
05.1	144	6	So how can this Urban Connector be made neighborhood friendly for us here in Trentwood? I have thought about it a lot and one of my suggestions is that there should not be a stop light at the junction of the	The new traffic signal will accommodate the orderly movement of vehicles and pedestrians at the intersection. Traffic modeling illustrates that the signal will accommodate the efficient movement of traffic. The

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>Urban Connector and Wellesley causing a stop and start one mile traffic jam in the school zone at rush hour each day.</p> <p>There is already a stop light a few hundred feet south on Sullivan at Trent which can serve that purpose and as I pointed out earlier, part of the cars headed south on Sullivan want to exit onto Trent anyway. So have Wellesley go under Sullivan, pedestrian sidewalk and all, eliminating the traffic congestion and the need to build a bridge over the road for pedestrian traffic, like Liberty Lake built for the Centennial Trail, (another solution which would allow us to cross this road anytime for neighborhood pedestrian travel and to access our own portion of the Centennial Trail Off Wellesley and Trent).</p>	<p>intersection is modeled to operate at Level of Service (LOS) C.</p> <p>A grade separation at Wellesley would require Sullivan Road to be raised causing substantial impacts to the school and surrounding neighborhood.</p>
55.0	144	7	<p>And that brings me to the issue of the sidewalk the County proposes to build along this 0.8 mile section of highway north of Wellesley.</p> <p>No one uses the sidewalks south of Wellesley on Sullivan because of the heavy traffic, so whom are the road planners building the sidewalks for? Future business developers?</p> <p>The sidewalks do not reflect the needs of this neighborhood. We are largely zoned Rural Conservation. If it is proposed that the zoning be changed to a use requiring sidewalks, I want to be notified immediately. And in the mean time, the construction of this road should reflect the needs of the existing neighborhood. We need sound control walls and cyclone fences to keep children, deer moose and dogs off the road. Even just a three foot high concrete sectional wall like what is already on Sullivan starting at Trent would be good on both sides of the Urban Connector backed up by six-foot cyclone fences to keep the animals and kids from jay walking along this 0.8 mile stretch through Trentwood. We also need the local</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The sidewalks will be adjacent to the middle and high schools for use by pedestrians.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			streams, pond and wetland preserved east of this highway so the local wildlife have a safe place to drink water.	
05.0	144	8	In closing I would like to reiterate that this is a family neighborhood, and a schoolyard. It is a terrible blow to the quality of our lives that Progress is being morphed into a freight hauling "Urban Connector" plowing through our pastures, baseball fields, and schoolyards. Planners, you need to step up to the plate and make this a road that we and our children and our animals can live with not die on.	Comments noted.
05.0	145	1	1) Traffic will increase and also speed of cars/trucks (increased noise, road kill (wildlife)). Rural life will be destroyed as such.	Thank you for your comments. As previously mentioned, the speed limit will be set at 45 mph for the roadway, with 35 mph zones at Jensen Road and at the east end of the project. Please see comment 77-1 regarding noise and comment 89-1 regarding wildlife.
55.2	145	2	2) Accidents presently caused are by "idiots" who drive faster that what the road conditions exist. Whether it's a 2-lane or a 4-lane the drivers will be the same. Added to this problem of big trucks (who do not abide by all laws) compounds the problem.	Comments noted.
70.0	145	3	3) My parents settled in this area because of environment and aesthetics of the area. My children plan to build in this area also!	Thank you for your comments.
40.0	145	4	The past few years - elk/turkey, trout in the creek have come into our area! How long will they stay after the improvements have been made causing increased traffic flow and noise?	See response to comment 89-1 above regarding wildlife.
05.1	146	1	I have submitted comments before, but I only have more concerns as time goes on. It seems to me that when all things are considered that - except for the money required - it would be overall a better plan and program to extend Bigelow straight east and make Flora interchange.	To extend the roadway to the east would not be feasible due to steep terrain, extensive costs, sensitive wildlife corridors and seasonal streams through a totally undeveloped area that would not terminate in an I 90 interchange. The existing traffic demand along the

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.2	147	1	<p>Rd. the connector road by this project. As it funnels that traffic from the Valley, Liberty Lake and North Idaho areas. I believe that all areas of concern marked above would be benefited by such a plan.</p> <p>Checked items: [General, geology and soils, groundwater, floodplain, wetland, streams, vegetation and wildlife, environmental justice,, air quality, noise, parks and recreation, and hazardous materials.]</p>	<p>Sullivan Road Corridor would not be accommodated by a Flora connection and Flora Road does not meet spacing requirements for an I 90 interchange.</p>
01.0	147	2	<p>As a School Board member our biggest concern is safe access to the schools crossing the road. I feel that we need 2 ways to access between the schools 1- underpass wide enough for machinery and 1- pedestrian overpass. This would better meet our needs.</p> <p>Thank you for allowing us to be part of this process in planning.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. See response to comment 45-5 above.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>
55.2	148	1	<p>Our major concern as a school district is the safer access for our students between buildings and along Wellesley.</p> <p>Changing the traffic speed to 35mph. Providing a tunnel for movement of equipment between properties (EVMS & EVHS).</p> <p>Providing a pedestrian overpass for foot traffic between the 2 properties - if feasible.</p>	<p>Comment noted. See response to comment 45-5 above.</p>
20.0	149	1	<p>My concern is the shallow well at the corner of Palmer and Bigelow Gulch in my neighbor's yard that we share - what the county will do in case the water is affected by change or construction.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see response to comment 109-1 regarding wells and groundwater.</p>
55.2	150	1	<p>I understand that the Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road project does not include plans for a stoplight at the Bigelow Gulch/Jensen Road intersection. I think this is</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 84-1 regarding Jensen Road.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>shortsighted and does not address the difficulty one has today when entering Bigelow Gulch road from Jensen, going west.</p> <p>It is a dangerous undertaking now. It will only be more dangerous after the road expansion.</p>	
55.0	150	2	<p>Apparently there is a plan for a stoplight for emergency vehicles. If this is for the fire station on the corner, why not put in a stoplight at the intersection and have the fire vehicles exit the fire station onto Jensen and enter Bigelow Gulch with the stoplight under the control of the fire department.</p> <p>Please re-consider a stoplight or some other traffic control means at the Jensen Road Intersection.</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 84-1 regarding Jensen Road. An emergency signal is proposed to be installed at the intersection of Jensen/Bigelow Gulch. The proposed emergency signal will be designed to accommodate conversion to a full traffic signal system in the future if a change is necessary by traffic volumes or safety.</p>
05.0	151	1	<p>I find that the County has done a great job of assessing the environmental impacts on Bigelow Gulch. The process and document were well thought out.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
55.2	151	2	<p>The "greater good" of the people outweighs the desire of the immediate neighborhood. The Prairie will survive the construction of the wider roadway. Surely, no one wants more deaths from collisions on this road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
01.1	152	1	<p>The Westin Living Trust ("Trust") would like to request notice of the decision regarding the Environmental Assessment of the Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Urban Connector. The trust has submitted a substantive comment in regard to the Environmental Assessment and would like notice of the decision forwarded to:</p> <p>Elizabeth A. Mosey Winston & Cashatt 601 W. Riverside, Suite 1900 Spokane, WA 99201</p>	<p>You will be sent notice of the decision.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	153	1	<p>Your public meeting process is flawed at best, and dishonest at worst. Your public meetings pretended to seek public input, but were, in fact, a sham.</p> <p>Your team had already made its decision about this project, and held these meetings as political theater.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see section 1.2 regarding public input.</p>
03.5	153	2	<p>Mr. Ross Kelley sees the good people of Orchard Prairie as merely unreasonable rustics who are an obstacle to his grand plan. "They won't listen to reason," he explains in his March 3rd email to Matt Ewers. He continues, "They don't seem to understand that the food they eat, the clothes they wear, the house they live (sic), the SUV's (sic) they drive, etc. and etc., totally depend upon transportation... They have no sympathy for those that have lost loved ones in fatal crashes or suffered injuries from crashes on the narrow road."</p> <p>(One should note that the food we eat is grown on farms, including those farms that Mr. Kelley's project will diminish and destroy. Mr. Kelley might be interested to know that some of us still grieve the loss of our family members to traffic accidents. His comment about our lack of sympathy is unconscionable.)</p> <p>In an email of February 17, 2006 to County Commissioners, he boasts of having the wisdom to arrange for an armed security detail from the County Sheriff's Department. He said they "really helped out a lot when a couple of vocal Orchard Prairie opponents of the project became very loud and disruptive."</p> <p>In fact, Ross Kelley misused these deputies by treating them as his personal security force to control people who were trying to learn the truth about his plans. It was quite disturbing to witness.</p> <p>Yet another outrage is that in the February 17th email to Commissioners, he said of meeting with the people of Orchard Prairie, "I know this won't resolve anything</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			because they are so violently opposed to the project and have taken on a very selfish, non-compromising attitude..." Saying that we are violent is a slanderous lie, told in writing, to the most powerful leaders of our County.	
03.5	153	3	Ross Kelley insulted and demeaned honest citizens trying to understand this project. "We could paint the road a different color," and "there are a lot of ridiculous questions," are just two of his insulting responses to serious questions. These responses were recorded.	Comments noted.
03.5	153	4	Your team members coordinate their efforts to thwart the attempts of my neighbors and me to understand this massive project, and offer a serious response.	Comments noted.
03.5	153	5	Your meetings created a "hostile environment" in which armed sheriff's deputies, other county employees, and you Mr. Hemmings, repeatedly misquoted the law and demanded that we not record your words, though it was our right. This intimidation has had a chilling effect on citizen participation and opportunities to understand the scope and impact of this project.	Comments noted.
03.5	153	6	The process of getting information from the county engineers has been like pulling teeth. The preliminary designs for the section of the road that runs in front of our home was not available online until many days after I made the request at the February 16th "Public Meeting." Why wasn't it online from the very beginning of the comment period? Is this evidence of incompetence or corruption? These are serious charges. As proof of my assertions, I offer the enclosed DVDs and transcripts of portions of two of your "public meetings." I believe that the way you chose to conduct your "public meetings" violated my neighbors' and my civil rights and interfered with the public process required under SEPA	Comments noted. Please see section 1.2 regarding public input.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.5	153	7	<p>Mr. Hemmings, I demand that you at long last do the right thing and join a growing list of people that believe this massive project of yours should be given the full Environmental Impact Study that it deserves.</p> <p>You county guys know that you're building a partial alternative to the North-South Freeway under the guise of a county road safety improvement. Admit it.</p> <p>Such a massive project should be fully and completely examined. Despite the size of your EA, it is deeply flawed and should not be the basis for the approval of this project.</p>	<p>The project does not provide an alternate to the North Spokane Corridor (NSC) rather Bigelow Gulch Road does connect through Francis Ave to a major interchange on the NSC.</p>
05.0	153	8	<p>The 125-year-old Orchard Prairie Community is worthy of recognition and protection.</p> <p>The Bigelow Gulch Road Expansion, as it seems to be planned, will have a devastating impact on the quality of life in our community.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.16 regarding the social impacts to Orchard Prairie.</p>
03.5	153	9	<p>Our community has had no significant input in the design process of the Bigelow Gulch Road Expansion.</p> <p>Our requests for information have been ignored and the county sponsored meetings have not truly sought our input.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
55.0	153	10	<p>We the residents would prefer that Bigelow Gulch have modest improvements and a lowered speed limit.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see Chapter 3 regarding the analysis of alternatives, including the two-lane alternative.</p>
03.5	153	11	<p>We've recently been told that no engineering for the balance of the road is finished; yet the Argonne intersection was broadened. This seems like a flawed</p>	<p>The final design of the project will be completed when the required NEPA and SEPA processes are complete.</p> <p>The Argonne/Bigelow Gulch Intersection was designed</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
90.1	153	12	<p>process and further decisions should be tabled for more citizen input.</p> <p>The Community of Orchard Prairie has been a distinct community since 1879. Since it's beginning, the social life of it's residents has been centered largely around Orchard Prairie School.</p> <p>In 1979, a hundred year celebration brought residents, past and present back to memorialize their shared love of this beautiful place. The all day festivities began with a pancake feed, followed by a parade, a historical pageant, music, dance and of course more food. Since the centennial, 2 more successful school/community reunions have been held.</p> <p>One of the other strong unifying forces is the Orchard Prairie Homemakers Club, now in its 78th year. 'Club' as it is commonly called, has its roots in the Cooperative Extension Service Department Service of the Department of Agriculture.</p> <p>These extension clubs were formed to reach out to farm wives, giving them information to better their homes, families and communities. Club is now mainly a community service group, with emphasis on assisting the school, and community emergency.</p> <p>Orchard Prairie School is a unique small district, serving about 60 students from grades K-7. It still employs the multi grade approach, though with more teachers than a hundred years ago. Students have a high tech education in a distinctly rural atmosphere. A few years ago, the original Orchard Prairie 2 room school was reinvented to serve again, and stands as a proud symbol of the communities' heritage.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see section 4.16 regarding the social aspects of Orchard Prairie.</p>
03.5	153	13	<p>We, the citizens of the Orchard Prairie Community, believe that we have been badly served by a road design and building process that has intentionally kept us ill informed about a major highway that Spokane</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	153	14	<p>County Engineer Ross Kelley and his team are determined to build through our community under the guise of safety improvements to a county road.</p> <p>Approximately seven years ago, we were presented with a number of proposed designs showing a widening of Bigelow Gulch Road from its present winding two-lane design to a straighter two-lane road with a center turn lane and generous shoulders.</p> <p>At that time, many of us were concerned that a widened road would negatively impact the quality of life in our rural community, but for safety's sake, many could see the necessity of some road improvement. We could see that widened shoulders would make it possible for Sheriff's Deputies to pull over speeders to enforce the posted speed limit.</p> <p>We were assured that we would be invited to have meaningful input into the subtleties of the road widening design process.</p> <p>In the intervening years, many Orchard Prairie residents have attempted to get information about the plans to change the road, through phone calls and visits to the County Engineers. To a man, we were told that no information was available.</p> <p>The next thing we knew, a multi-million dollar reconstruction of the intersection of Argonne and Bigelow was executed without a single public meeting about its obvious implications. We were blindsided by a secretive process, which seemed designed to neutralize our concerns.</p> <p>Still, when troubled landowners tried to learn what was in store from the County Engineers, they were told that despite the work at Argonne, nothing else was designed and there was no information available. But again, we were assured that there would be plenty of opportunity for community input.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see Chapter 3 of this Revised EA regarding the history of the alternatives analyzed.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			CURRENT DEVELOPMENTS:	
			<p>Finally, The Orchard Prairie Homemakers Club reached out to the County were told that County Engineer, Ross Kelley and Paul Jensen of County Planning would come to a special meeting of 100 neighbors at The Central Grange Hall. Mr. Kelley came, Mr. Jensen did not.</p>	
			<p>At that meeting, for the very first time Mr. Kelley showed us a new proposal for what can accurately be described as a freeway. Two two-lane roads will be separated by a median, with extra wide shoulders and intermittent two-lane frontage roads on either side. In many places that's a total of 9 paved lanes.</p>	
			<p>About two weeks after the February 1 meeting, we learned that we were already into a critical 45-day comment period of an Environmental Assessment.</p>	
			<p>Alarmed, the citizens of Orchard Prairie met to try to understand what was happening. Plans were made to attend an advertised public meeting at the Grange on February 15. There, though the residents had requested a town hall style meeting, we were given an 'Open House' where County Engineers were stationed at multiple easels around the room where individuals asked questions and offered comments that were lost in a sea of confusion. Videotape of the proceedings, and of the subsequent Open House/Public Meeting the following night at East Valley Middle School, documents the feigned interest in seeking citizen in-put. The tapes reveal contempt for concerned citizens demonstrated by county employees and especially Mr. William Hemmings, who obviously feels he owes no one answers at these critically important, legally required, public meetings.</p>	
			<p>We have subsequently learned that Mr. Ross Kelley has understood for years that the cost of acquiring the land to complete the North-South Freeway is prohibitive. He has boasted that for one-tenth the cost, he can</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>accomplish a traffic corridor through Bigelow Gulch that will alleviate the need for the 1-90 to Francis portion of the North-South Freeway for 20 years. He intends to build a NAFTA transportation corridor through our community and doesn't want to say it.</p> <p>This huge highway, that is more like a Super Highway than a county road, will have a devastating impact on our community, our environment, and it's wildlife.</p>	
03.5	153	15	<p>We are insulted by the way the County Engineer and his staff have treated us. They have proven to be insensitive to our concerns. Thus we are demanding:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mr. Ross Kelley and his County Engineering Department be candid about their true plans for the Super Highway. 2. The Engineering Department follow not just the letter of the law where public involvement is concerned, but follow the spirit of the law. We want real Public Meetings, not Open Houses. 3. A full Environmental Impact Study for this hugely expanded project, not just the truncated Environmental Assessment that helps keep this project roaring forward under the radar. 4. An apology from certain county employees for their disrespect for the concerns of the citizens of the Orchard Prairie and Pleasant Prairie Communities. 	<p>Comments noted.</p>
55.2	154	1	<p>The EA fails to adequately address safety.</p> <p>While the county's stated goal for the project is improved safety, it does not appear to take pedestrian safety into account. The proposed plan includes sidewalks, but no pedestrian crossings are indicated. And when asked about safety for schoolchildren crossing the road, county employee Ross Kelley is on tape replying, "They'll look both ways and cross very safely. Every intersection is a place to do it". One need</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see previous response to comment 2-6 regarding pedestrian safety.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.0	154	2	<p>not point out the inadequacy - nor the apparent indifference - of this answer.</p> <p>The EA fails to address cumulative impacts.</p> <p>As noted in comments submitted by others, the Council of Environmental Quality regulations require agencies to discuss cumulative impacts, defined in part as that "which results from incremental impacts of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions."</p> <p>According to Section 1-1 of the EA, "The properties bordering the arterial are predominately farms and large residential lots." And on page 2-4, the county asserts its stated goal of "maintaining rural character." Further, comprehensive plan policies require "preservation of communities and neighborhoods" and "adequate consideration of cultural...issues," and the DOT Act of 1966 states, "(S)pecial effort should be made to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside.</p> <p>Yet the county's project clears the way for zoning changes that would irretrievably alter the character of the neighborhood (notwithstanding page 4-31's attempts to abdicate responsibility: "Although the proposed project would facilitate a higher volume of traffic, zoning designations [as determined by Spokane County] ultimately dictate the rate of growth in the project vicinity.").</p> <p>Later, the EA again denies any culpability for future zoning changes ("Spokane County has designated this area as a rural residential zone and development is constrained by the County's policies. There is however, a potential for increased industrial and commercial development focused West [sic] of the Havana and Bigelow Gulch intersection...and East [sic] of the North Spokane Corridor and Francis interchange." But then it goes onto acknowledge that the EA's own traffic</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see Section 2.18 of this Revised EA regarding cumulative impacts.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>projections assume "future development adjacent to and within the corridor (page 4-89)."</p> <p>Is the county not proposing a solution to a problem it is in fact, creating? Moreover, according to the county's projections, average annual daily traffic figures are considerably lower under the "no action" alternative (pages 3-10 and 4-48). Again, is the county not proposing a solution to a problem its action will create?</p>	
20.1	154	3	<p>The EA fails to adequately address water issues.</p> <p>When considering the impact on groundwater, the county asserts, "the amount of pollutant loading generated by road runoff would depend on several factors, including...traffic volume." And yet it seeks to increase traffic volume (see chart, page 4-48).</p> <p>Throughout the EA, the county asserts that appropriate design will mitigate all detrimental effects, yet provides no specifics as to what that design will entail. Are citizens simply to accept the county at its word?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 109-1 and section 4.2 of this Revised EA regarding groundwater.</p>
20.0	154	4	<p>The EA doesn't specifically address the effect of the project on neighborhood wells, residents' sole source of water, nor does it refer to a long-established pond on the south side of Bigelow between Palmer and Wiele Roads.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see responses to comment 109-1 regarding wells and water supply.</p>
30.0	154	5	<p>The project also calls for the partial or complete fill-in of 0.62 acres of wetland - while calling these effects "temporary impacts" (page 4-88) - without describing how such a loss would be made to conform to the county's "no net loss" regulations.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.4 of this Revised EA regarding impacts to wetlands and proposed mitigation measures.</p>
20.0	154	6	<p>Page 1-4 raises the possibility realigning stream channels, but does not explore the ramifications of such actions.</p>	<p>Please see section 4.5 of this Revised EA regarding stream channel realignment. The stream realignment design will follow the WDFW Stream Habitat Restoration Guidelines (Saldi-Caromile et al 2004) and Integrated Streambank Protection Guidelines (WDFW et al 2003).</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.0	154	7	According to the EA, the area's streambeds were dry during the county's survey, though no mention was made when the survey was performed nor of any efforts made to assess them during other times of year.	Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.5 for additional information regarding stream characteristics.
40.0	154	8	The EA fails to state adequately address wildlife issues. Although bald eagles remain on the federal threatened species list, the EA does not address bald eagle habitat. Residents have photographic evidence of the presence of bald eagles.	Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA regarding wildlife, including bald eagles.
40.5	154	9	In addition, the EA claims there are no fish in affected streams, while some residents maintain that historically, there have been. And again, there is no discussion of the impact on wildlife from the stream channel realignment.	Please see section 4.5 of this Revised EA regarding fish habitat.
40.1	154	10	Although much of the project area meets the definition of a Fish and Wildlife Conservation Area (Spokane County Code Chapter 11.20) due to its designation as white-tailed deer winter habitat, the EA dismisses wildlife concerns with a pledge to install deer signs, a patently ridiculous solution for a roadway of this size.	Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA regarding wildlife, including deer habitat.
04.0	154	11	The EA fails to adequately consider alternative solutions. The EA's concerns about moving freight seem to center around the industrial and commercial facilities at the west end of the project. However, it fails to explain why the planned north-south corridor, which terminates almost adjacent to those businesses, is not a sufficient solution. Why spend the considerable funds this project requires to provide what is, at best an interim route.	The movement of freight is a regional transportation need. Freight haulers currently utilize this Bigelow Gulch Rd. to move freight both east and west. Completion of the NSC south of Francis Avenue to connect to Interstate 90 will likely not occur until 2025, so it is reasonable to expect all types of vehicles to utilize Bigelow Gulch Road.
55.1	154	12	Throughout the EA, the county asserts that, were no action taken, traffic along Bigelow Gulch would increase overtime. Is it not possible that the north-south corridor would indeed ease traffic on Bigelow Gulch, and those	The NSC will ease traffic on Bigelow Gulch when it is fully constructed. The NSC is not expected to be completed with a connection to Interstate 90 until around 2025. Much of the Bigelow Gulch roadway has

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			drivers leery of the road's inherent challenges would seek an alternate route? No study appears to have considered that possibility, nor the benefits of strategies designed to reduce future traffic volumes, such as an adjusted speed limit. The county's "speed study" merely catalogues rate of travel during various times of the day. A more useful speed study would consider how much safer the road would be for vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycle users with a lowered speed limit, and how many fewer head-on collisions would result.	remained unchanged for many years, but with increasing traffic. Drivers have not historically sought alternate routes and it is believed this will not change until the NSC is completed. Laws, such as speed limits, cannot be effectively enforced without the consent and voluntary compliance of the public majority. The speed study reinforces that the majority of drivers are complying with the posted speed limit on Bigelow Gulch. Lowering the speed limit on Bigelow Gulch may actually increase collisions. It is not high speed alone that relate to crash risk; it is the variation of speed within the traffic stream. Large variations in speed within the traffic stream create more conflicts and passing maneuvers.
50.0	154	13	The EA fails to adequately consider the impact on area residents. First, the county has chosen the only alternative shown to potentially disproportionately effect minority and low-income populations (page 3-9).	Thank you for your comment. Please see section 4.8 of this Revised EA regarding Environmental Justice.
65.0	154	14	As the county is apparently unable to find a workable solution, the EA simply accepts the effect of traffic noise exceeding FHWA's noise abatement criteria for residents of no fewer than 20 homes (pages 1-7 and 4-58).	Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 77- 1 and section 4.11 of this Revised EA.
60.0	154	15	The project site currently includes EPA Maintenance Areas for CO and PM10. While acknowledging - though minimizing - the deleterious effect of construction on air quality, the EA claims (pages 2-6 and 4-57) the project would actually improve air quality in the long term. However, the county provides no data in support of this claim and indeed failed to perform LOS (level of service) modeling to confirm its assumptions about at least one intersection. Nowhere does the EA address how increased traffic may offset the "benefits" gained through amplified traffic flow.	Thank you for your comments. Results of hot spot modeling conducted at the Sullivan Road and Wellesley Avenue intersection (future LOS C with the project) indicated that CO concentrations would be well below NAAQS limits. Modeling for all intersections was not conducted since all segments of the proposed project would operate at LOS C or better. The modeled CO concentrations for Year 2025 (with project) would be slightly higher than current (2006) conditions and Year 2025 No Action, all modeled concentrations would be well below the NAAQS limits.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	154	16	<p>The EA adopts arbitrary standards.</p> <p>The EA applies LOS standards for this project even though it falls outside urban growth boundaries. If LOS standards are indeed to be used, how can the county justify the entire project when only one intersection (Wellesley and Sullivan) fails to meet LOS standards under the "no action" alternative?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Chapter 2 of this Revised EA presents the purpose and need for the project. Bigelow Gulch Road currently operates at LOS E in both directions. In year 2025, all segments of the proposed road would operate at LOS A, B, or C in both directions.</p>
55.0	154	17	<p>The EA fails to address a major portion of the proposed construction.</p> <p>Nowhere does the EA address "frontage roads" or their impact, despite their conspicuous presence in plans presented in county "open house" meetings.</p>	<p>Frontage roads are no longer a part of the proposed project.</p>
03.5	154	18	<p>The EA and the attendant process for citizens input fails to regard resident concerns.</p> <p>This entire process has revealed a shocking lack of respect for the citizens who pay the "public servants" undertaking this project. That disrespect is clearly evident in videotape of county open houses, in which county employees walked out on citizens' seeking information and, in one case, referred to citizens' "ridiculous questions." In another instance, a citizen visiting the courthouse overheard county staff mocking those who had attended an open house the evening before.</p> <p>Records requested from the county have not been provided in a timely manner. For instance, records requested on March 10 were not supplied until March 21, and then only in part. Other comments detail additional requests and delivery dates.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Any disrespect to citizens or staff is deeply regretted.</p> <p>The records request was quite broad and covered a decade of information thus the gathering of the information required substantial work and time. The records were supplied in segments to expedite the availability of the requested information.</p>
05.5	155	1	<p>The Prairie Protection Association is requesting the attached documents/comments be entered as part of the public comment record regarding the Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road Urban Connector project. They are enclosed in the order in which the subjects are</p>	<p>Comment noted. All written comments and the verbal testimony at the public hearing are part of the public comment record.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			addressed in the document. This endeavor was undertaken because, from our perspective the Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road Project has been segmented into 6 'improvement' projects in a vacuum, instead of placing it cohesively in the context of the entire transportation system proposed for Spokane/Spokane County. This seems to have allowed planning to proceed with an already determined goal in mind, a process that sought the preponderance of evidence to support the goal, and with the public as an afterthought. Without an Environmental Impact Statement for the Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road Project, the full traffic, growth, and socio-economic impacts of the Project on the much larger geographic area, of which it is only a part, have not been adequately addressed. This is a disservice to the entire Spokane area community and its future.	an EIS.
03.5	155	2	We wish we could have been included in the process much earlier so we could have worked cooperatively with the Engineering Division to achieve an improved, safer county road.	Comment noted.
01.1	155	3	We are requesting a copy of the summary of responses to all the EA comments as well as a copy of the revisions or changes to the EA that is sent to the Steve Saxton, Area Engineer for the Federal Highway Administration.	Comment noted. You have been included on the list to receive the final document.
05.5	155	4	This Project Requires the Completion of an Environmental Impact Statement. NEPA requires federal agencies to prepare an environmental impact statement (EIS) for all "major federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment." 42 U.S.C. § 4332(2)(C). An EIS serves two purposes: (1) to provide decision makers	Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.5	155	5	<p>with enough information to aid in the substantive decision whether to proceed with a project in light of its environmental consequences; and (2) to provide the public with information and an opportunity to participate in gathering information. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.1; see also California v. Block, 690 F.2d 753, 761 (9th Cir. 1982).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The factors you have identified were considered and evaluated in FHWA's final decision. Please refer to the Introduction and Chapter 4 of this Revised EA.</p>
			<p>To determine whether the project will have a significant impact, the agency must consider the context and intensity of its actions. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.27. CEQ regulations further require agencies to consider the following elements when evaluating the severity of project's impacts:</p>	
			<p>The degree to which the proposed actions affect public health or safety. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. ...</p>	
			<p>The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial. ...</p>	
			<p>The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. ...</p>	
			<p>The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about future consideration. ... Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action "temporary" or by breaking it down into small components parts. ...</p>	
			<p>The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. ...</p> <p>Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. 40 C.F.R § 15008.27 (b).</p> <p>Review of this project indicates that it is a significant federal action deserving of a thorough environmental impact statement.</p>	
05.5	155	6	<p>An EA is appropriate only in situation where it can be concluded, after taking a "hard look" at all environmental issues, that no significant impact will be created by a proposed project. See 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14. This is not such a situation. The Bigelow Gulch project involves a dramatic change affecting the physical environment and community of Orchard Prairie. In this instance, a full EIS is needed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>
05.5	155	7	<p>Several comments have been submitted addressing wildlife, water quality, community character, farming, safety and other issues, all of which make clear that this project is not simply a "modification" to an existing roadway. Meaningful citizen input has been frustrated by the approach taken in the EA, which limits the alternatives realistically considered to variations on the same 4-lane roadway, and fails to provide sufficient design information to allow meaningful inquiry into the environmental impacts. It is not sufficient for the EA to propose "mitigation" of an impact through use of an as-yet-undisclosed road design. The actual design alternatives need to be disclosed, and an EIS conducted to take a "hard look" at each of these impacts, as well as the cumulative effects of individual impacts.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This Revised EA includes additional and more specific information regarding impacts and mitigation measures.</p> <p>Cumulative impacts are presented in section 4.17 of this Revised EA.</p>
05.5	155	8	<p>Conducting an EIS at this juncture is preferable to protracted litigation on a citizen injunction to stop this project. Considering the work that has already been</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 2-1 above regarding an EIS.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.2	155	9	<p>done. An EIS could build on the information already gathered, address the numerous, significant citizen comments, and consider the additional alternative of a narrower road, which would plainly avoid many of the impacts of the 4-lane alternatives, and has not been proved to be impractical. Further, conducting an EIS would allow the county an opportunity to reveal the design solutions that the EA assures exist, and show precisely HOW any particular design will mitigate the identified impacts. Citizens deserve solid information, based on taking a hard look at environmental impacts, not blithe assertions that impacts will be mitigated under as-yet undisclosed designs.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please refer to section 4.9 of this Revised EA regarding safety and sections 4.9 and 4.13 regarding bicycle use.</p> <p>Please see comment 58-2 regarding farm equipment.</p> <p>Please see response to comment 77-1 regarding noise.</p>
			<p>The Project affects public health and safety</p> <p>EA - 2.2.6 Comprehensive Plan Policies: There is no mention of pedestrian safety along Bigelow Gulch between Havana and Forker.</p> <p>EA - 4.7.3.3 Operations Impacts - Land Use: The 8-foot wide shoulders will be used by: drivers experiencing problems merging on to the road or encountering other emergencies; local farmers moving equipment; pedestrians and bicyclists.</p> <p>EA - 4.13.3 Spokane County's Regional Bike Plan: the shoulder areas would provide adequate room for cyclists, making this a Class III bikeway.</p> <p>EA - There is no solution for how school children and community members will be able to safely cross the proposed 4-lane road.</p> <p>EA - page 1-7: Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts: Twenty homes will be subjected to traffic noise exceeding WSDOT noise abatement criteria and no mitigation is proposed due to the fact that measures recommended by WSDOT were not acoustically feasible and economically reasonable.</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
90.0	155	10	<p>The Project impacts an area with unique characteristics. Thank you for your comments. Please refer to section 4.16 of this Revised EA regarding social impacts.</p> <p>Union Cemetery established in 1884 still in use.</p> <p>Orchard Prairie School (oldest continuously operating rural school in Washington) established in 1894 and supported by an active parent-teacher organization.</p> <p>Community has active culture on both sides of Bigelow Gulch. It has one of the oldest "Homemakers Clubs" in the state, active scouting and 4-H groups.</p> <p>Centennial celebrated in 1979 with two successful school/community reunions since.</p> <p>A video was made to commemorate the historical heritage of this unique community.</p>	
45.0	155	11	<p>Residents will find visiting a next-door neighbor will require a car trip given the limited access proposed in some areas along Bigelow Gulch - this would segregate the Orchard Prairie community into separate areas.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
30.0	155	12	<p>EA page 1-4: Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts: Wetlands: 0.62 acres of wetland within four wetlands would be partially completely filled; mitigation measures are not specific for this.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.4 of this Revised EA regarding wetland impacts and mitigation measures.</p>
20.0	155	13	<p>Streams: 8 streams are partially or completely within connector alignment; details for mitigation are not given. See Hydrologist's report - Attachment If</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Comment noted Please see sections 4.5 and 4.6 of this Revised EA for additional analysis of streams. Additionally, Chapter 2 explains changes in the project made to further reduce impacts to streams and wildlife.</p>
20.0	155	14	<p>The Effects to the Environment are Uncertain and Risky EA page 1-3, 1-4: Table 1-1 Summary of Impacts: Groundwater Resources and Floodplains: A flood occurred around 1950 in Bigelow Gulch that took out two bridges, 1 house and caused extensive erosion - no mitigation is planned for increased storm water runoff to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Chapter 2 of this Revised EA provides additional information regarding stormwater management for the project. Additional information is also provided in sections 4.3 Floodplains and 4.5 Streams.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.3	155	15	<p>increase in impermeable surface.</p> <p>The project establishes a precedent for future action in the region</p> <p>NSF Final EIS, Appendix C: page C-4: Argonne Road ... "The route would cross large acreage tracts and prime farmland to an interchange with Market Street. While this route would impact the smallest number of businesses and residences, it would also have the greatest potential for inducing growth in the rural agricultural northeast of Spokane." The exact same situation will occur in the Orchard Prairie and Pleasant Prairie area as a result of completion of the Bigelow Gulch project.</p> <p>EA - 4.7.3.3: Operations Impacts - Land Use: Although the proposed project would facilitate a higher volume of traffic, zoning designations (as determined by Spokane County) Ultimately dictate the rate of growth in the project vicinity. Residential growth would likely remain where it is currently located UNLESS zoning changes are approved. The commercial industrial area on the western edge of the proposed project would likely experience growth with the improved project corridor which will provide access to the east.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see responses to comments 2-2 and 154-2 regarding future land uses and zoning.</p>
05.4	155	16	<p>The Project has significant cumulative impacts.</p> <p>The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA require agencies to discuss the cumulative impacts of a projects as part of the environmental analysis. A cumulative impact is defined as: "The impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.17 of this Revised EA regarding cumulative impacts.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
90.1	155	17	<p>The Project will adversely affect sites eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and may result in the destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources.</p> <p>EA - Table 1-1 page 1-8 Cultural and Historic Resources: There are five structures eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places for which OAHF and WSDOT have determined No Adverse Effect of the proposed action to the resources: The homestead property of Charlie Bigelow, pioneer and early homesteader for whom the road is named was determined non-significant. The proposed highway would cut deep into this hillside.</p> <p>The plan leaves no room for returning any number of other historic homes to their original "historic condition" such as the plan for the Shannon homestead at 7611 E. Bigelow. Also the proximity of the proposed highway to the Ole Hansen homestead at 10806 E Bigelow Gulch Road adds to the concerns about preservation of historic homes.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. As mentioned, the proposed project would have no effect to structures or properties eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.</p>
40.0	155	18	<p>The Project will affect endangered/threatened species and their habitat.</p> <p>EA - 4.6.2.1 Existing Vegetation and Wildlife (State and Federal Listings)</p> <p>A Biological Assessment (Appendix A) was prepared for the Bigelow Gulch Connector Project - information from the WNHP and the PHS programs indicates no records of threatened or endangered animal species in the project area. (Moody, Wa-DNR letter February 2000).</p> <p>Bald Eagles are present within (video records) the project area.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 154-8 regarding bald eagles, and response to comment 112-1 regarding fish.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>Presence of fish in the ponds and streams is not known - no studies were done to determine this.</p> <p>A colony of Columbia ground squirrels was severely impacted with most of the burrows covered by landfill and pavement when the Argonne/ Bigelow intersection was completed in 2005.</p>	
40.0	155	19	<p>The Project threatens a violation of other laws and legal requirements.</p> <p>EA - chapter 4, section 6: the county failed to follow WAC 197-11-055(2)(c) and WAC 197-11-030(2) (b) and (g) by failing to consider all affects increased traffic will have on yellow-billed cuckoos and whitetail deer grazing. What affect will the increased noise have on the bird and grazing areas?</p>	<p>Please refer to the January 2006 EA section 1.7.2 of Appendix A Biological Assessment, for an analysis of effect on yellow-billed cuckoo. The BA states that the project "may affect, but not likely to adversely affect" the species.</p> <p>Section 4.6 of this Revised EA includes an analysis of impacts to white-tailed deer.</p>
40.0	155	20	<p>The lead agency failed to follow WAC 197-11-03(2) (c). No clear concise evidence was produced within the EA to prove the claim of no significant impact to the wildlife in the project area.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The January 2006 EA recognized that there would be impacts to wildlife resources from construction and operation of the project. In addition, please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA for additional information regarding wildlife resources.</p>
55.0	155	21	<p>EA - chapter 4, section 10: the county failed to cover WAC 197-11-055 (2)(c), WAC 197-11-030(2) (b) and (g) and WAC 197-11-030(2)(c) because the document does not indicate which traffic model was used. How many more heavy freight vehicles will be traveling through the area? What effect will this have on air quality and noise levels?</p>	<p>Please refer to page 1 of Appendix B – Roadway Geometry and Safety Discipline Report of the January 2006 EA for a description of the traffic model used in the transportation analysis.</p> <p>Appendix B assumed 9% to 10% of the traffic volume as trucks. The number of freight vehicles actually using the roadway will be dependent of the economic climate and driver choice.</p> <p>Please see sections 4.10 and 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding air quality and noise.</p>
90.0	155	22	<p>EA - chapter 4, section 14 is incomplete. The county did not look for evidence of pre-settlement. So clearly the county failed to follow WAC 197-11-055(2) (c).</p>	<p>As described in Appendix E of the January 2006 EA, a component of the cultural resources report was a review of known archaeological resources within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). This report was an addendum to</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
04.0	155	23	<p>The Environmental Assessment fails to Consider and Evaluated a Wide Range of Alternatives.</p> <p>NEPA requires agencies to "[s]tudy, develop, and describe appropriate alternatives to recommended courses of action," 42 U.S.C. § 4332(e), to "[u]se the NEPA process to identify and assess the reasonable alternatives to proposed actions that will avoid or minimize adverse effects of these actions upon the quality of the human environment," 40 C.F.R. § 1500.2(e), and to "[r]igorously explore and objectively evaluate all reasonable alternatives." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a). This development and assessment of alternatives has been described as "the heart of the environmental impact statement." 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14.</p> <p>NEPA requires that the Forest Service consider all reasonable alternatives. 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(a). Accordingly, agencies must look at every reasonable alternative, with the range dictated by the "nature and scope of the proposed action," <i>California v. Block</i>, 690 F.2d 753, 761 (9th Cir. 1982), and sufficient to permit reasoned choice and informed decision-making. <i>Save Lake Washington v. Frank</i>, 641 F.2d 1330, 1334 (9th Cir. 1981). An agency may not define the objectives of its action in terms so unreasonably narrow that only one</p>	<p>the "Cultural Resources Assessment of Spokane County's Proposed Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Realignment Project (Axon et al. 2001) prepared by Archaeological and Historical Services of Eastern Washington University. As stated on page 13 of Appendix C, "The AHS initial report (Axon et al. 2001) contained a detailed description of the project area's ethnographic resources, Spokane County's and the project area's historical evolution, and potential areas of archaeological concern. During archival review, Jones & Stokes identified additional survey and reports and archaeological sites applicable to the project area.</p>
			<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see Chapter 3 of this Revised EA regarding the alternatives evaluated, and Appendix B "Roadway Geometry and Safety Discipline Report" of the January 2006 EA, regarding the analysis of two-lane, three-lane, and four-lane alternatives.</p>	<p>The lower traffic volumes projected for the No Action alternative were the result of traffic demand modeling based on roadway characteristics, i.e. volume to capacity, run speed, safety, etc. This corridor is one element of a regional transportation system and it is reasonable to assume that the traveling public will choose routes that are safe and efficient to travel. Traffic modeling is an iteration of projecting traffic along each route in a system to balance the projected travel demand with consideration of the characteristics of each individual route.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>alternative would accomplish the goals of the agency action. City of Carmel_by_the_Sea v. United States Dept. of Transp., 123 F.3d 1142, 1155 (9th Cir. 1997). Under this scenario, the existence of a viable but unexamined alternative "renders an environmental impact statement inadequate." Citizens for a Better Henderson v. Hodel, 768 F.2d 1051, 1057 (9th Cir. 1985).</p>	
			<p>An agency must not reject an alternative because it is not within its sole legal authority, 40 C.F.R. § 1502.14(c), and must provide an explanation of why an alternative is infeasible and, therefore, eliminated from consideration. Id. at § 1504.14(a). Courts have stated that an agency may not eliminate an otherwise reasonable alternative solely because it presents only a partial solution to the stated purpose and need for the project. NRDC v. Morton, 458 F.2d 827, 836 (D.C Cir. 1972). Thus, it is unreasonable "to disregard alternatives merely because they do not offer a complete solution to the problem." Id. at 836.</p>	
			<p>The proposed alternatives addressed in the EA para. 3.4 are variations in the route of a 4-lane, high-speed road or the existing road with no improvements. The most obvious indications that the EA fails to consider a range of reasonable alternatives is that only one action alternative - the proposed action- was fully considered. Although a "No Action" alternative was considered, the EA discloses that this alternative is wholly impractical, and is simply a "strawman" alternative. Significantly, there is no consideration of the feasibility of a 2-lane road that involves: (1) improvements to the grade of the road, as are included in all the 4-lane alternatives; (2) eliminating key curves or turns in the present path of the road, as is included in all of the 4-lane alternatives; (3) providing for lane separation in critical areas (i.e. a turn lane), is included in all the 4-lane alternatives; (4) changing the speed limit; (5) widening the shoulders to</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>allow for better movement of farm equipment and to reduce the risk head on collisions as well as allow for safe traffic law enforcement; or any other improvements to the existing road.</p> <p>Notably, the projections show a lower traffic volume under the "No Action" alternative, suggesting that some of the traffic increase would be invited, not solved, by creating a 4-lane highway.</p>	
05.5	155	24	<p>The Environmental Assessment fails to take a "hard Look" at Environmental, Social and Economic Impacts. NEPA is a procedural statute that requires agencies to demonstrate that "a reasonably thorough discussion on the significant aspects of the probable environmental consequences" of a project has been undertaken. <i>Swanson v. Forest Service</i>, 87 F.3d 339, 343 (9th Cir. 1987). NEPA requires public discourse "to insure the agency has fully contemplated the environmental effects of its action and to insure the public has sufficient information to challenge the agency." <i>Idaho Sporting Congress v. Thomas</i>, 137 F.3d 1146, 1151 (9th Cir. 1998); see also <i>Inland Empire Pub. Lands v. Forest Service</i>, 88 F.3d 754, 758 (9th Cir. 1996). Under this standard, an agency is required to take a "hard look" at the environmental consequences of proposed actions. <i>Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.</i>, 137 F.3d 1372, 1476 (9th Cir. 1998).</p> <p>The Second Circuit Court of Appeals explained that agencies must: (1) ensure that an EIS adequately compiles relevant information; (2) analyze the information reasonably; (3) not ignore pertinent data; and (4) make public disclosures. See <i>Sierra Club v. Army Corps</i>, 701 F.2d 1011 (2nd Cir. 1983).</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment does not contain the requisite hard look. To the contrary, it appears that the lead agency did not compile data in good faith, did not</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see sections 4.16 and 4.17 of this Revised EA regarding socio-economic and cumulative impacts.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			analyze the data collected in a rational or reasonable manner, ignored relevant information and failed to update existing environmental conditions, and has not made adequate public disclosures. In short, the lead agency failed to take a hard look at the environmental impacts of this project with respect to: Streams and wetlands, wildlife, historical and socio-economic impacts.	
30.0	155	25	The largest wetland that will be impacted by the Urban Connector is not mentioned in the Environmental Assessment. It is a large pond, just south of the current Bigelow Gulch Road, known locally as Sullivan's Pond. The springs that feed it are an important source of water for Creek #1. Construction above the pond can impact the ground water tables that feed the springs. Runoff during construction and from the completed road surfaces can affect the quality of the water entering and leaving the pond. The construction and road placement will also have a detrimental effect on the pond at Bigelow and Palmer.	Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.4 of this revised EA regarding additional wetlands analysis.
30.0	155	26	All of the wetlands along the project provide aquifer recharge to the Spokane-Rathdrum Aquifer. The EA does not give enough study to the probable negative impacts to these sensitive wetlands.	Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.2 of this Revised EA regarding the Spokane-Rathdrum Aquifer, and section 4.4 regarding wetlands.
40.5	155	27	Stream #1 has been home to rainbow and brook trout. Adjacent ponds were stocked with fish and escapement from these ponds at times also stocked the creek with fish. The Washington State Game Department should electroshock the creek to verify the presence of fish. The road construction would have a negative impact on fish populations. A determination of the presence of fish would have an impact on how construction proceeds, as it is adjacent to and crosses the creek.	Comment noted. The Revised EA has assumed the presence of fish in the creek. Please see response to comment 154-6 regarding procedure for designing any realignment or streambank modification to streams to be impacted by the project.
40.2	155	28	The Assessment, fails to address the impact on the many animals and birds. It does mention the large	Thank you for your comments. Please see comment 89-1 above, and Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			population of whitetail deer. But in Chapter 4 section 6 the county has failed to follow WAC 197-11-055(2) (C) and WAC 197-11-030(2) (b) and (g) by failing to consider all effects increased traffic will have on the grazing of Whitetail deer. Placing deer crossing signs is not sufficient to mitigate the impact on the year around populations of deer, and risk death to both the deer and motorists.	additional information regarding wildlife.
40.5	155	29	The area between Havana and Forker is now home to a large herd of elk that regularly cross Bigelow Gulch Road. Collision with an elk can cause even more serious consequences. Nothing is mentioned in the Assessment concerning protecting the elk herd or mitigating the risk to motorists.	Comment noted. Please see comment 89-1 above, and Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for additional information regarding wildlife.
40.5	155	30	Some important species are not listed at all in the Assessment. Eagles have been increasingly using the area in the last few years. There has been a return of hawks and owls. These raptors are very important to area farmers in keeping rodent populations in check. Pheasant, quail and turkeys are present. Yellow-billed cuckoos are mentioned in the EA but many of the songbirds, house finches, towhees, crossbills, bluebirds, grosbeaks, varied thrushes, goldfinches, downy woodpeckers, flickers are not included in the EA. Very importantly, meadowlarks are returning after a long absence from the area.	Thank you for your comments. Please see comment 89-1 above, and Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for additional information regarding wildlife.
40.0	155	31	The Assessment mentions wildlife but provides nothing for their protection. The statement "no significant impact" is applied to all the species even though a road of this magnitude will have a tremendous impact on the wildlife of the area. Also the lead agency failed to follow WAC 197-11-030(2)(c). No clear concise evidence was produced within the document to prove the claim of no significant impact to the wildlife in the project area.	Thank you for your comments. Please see comment 89-1 above, and Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for additional information regarding wildlife.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
90.1	155	32	<p>Historical and Socio-Economic Impacts</p> <p>The Environmental Assessment fails to examine the impacts on the historical community of Orchard Prairie, and the impacts on its unique school.</p>	<p>Please see section 4.16 regarding Socio-economic impacts. Regarding cultural resources, please note that the "Cultural Resources Assessment of Spokane County's Proposed Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Realignment Project (Axon et al. 2001) prepared by Archaeological and Historical Services of Eastern Washington University contained a detailed description of the project area's ethnographic resources, Spokane County's and the project area's historical evolution. The Orchard Prairie School is located outside of the "Area of Potential Effect (APE)" that was defined for the project. When the project is constructed, the Orchard Prairie School would be located even further from the new roadway than it is from the existing Bigelow Gulch Road.</p>
45.4	155	33	<p>The Environmental Assessment fails to address the impacts on farming along the area it proposes to divide. The highway will create a significant challenge to moving equipment from field to field. It creates a danger to farmers and to motorists by the sudden necessary obstruction caused by farming equipment. These dangers and challenges may reduce farming activity, thus have significant economic and social impacts.</p> <p>There appears to be no in depth economic impact analysis of this project.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see comment 58-2 regarding farm equipment.</p> <p>An economic analysis was not defined in scoping of environmental study elements because of the rural nature and the lack of businesses within the project area. The right-of-way acquisition process will address the specific property values for property to be purchased by Spokane County. Please see response to comment 102-6 regarding property values.</p>
05.4	155	34	<p>The Environmental Assessment fails to assess the Cumulative Effects of Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions.</p> <p>NEPA requires agencies to address a project's direct impacts, indirect impacts, and cumulative effects. <i>Kleppe v. Sierra Club</i>, 427 U.S. 390 (1976); <i>Thomas v. Peterson</i>, 753 F.2d 754, 758-59 (9th Cir. 1985); <i>Save the Yaak v. Block</i>, 840 F.2d 712, 714 (9th Cir. 1988); <i>Neighbors of Cuddy Mountain v. United States Forest Serv.</i>, 137 F.3d 1372, 1378-79 (9th Cir. 1998).</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see response to comment 2-5 and section 4.17 of this Revised EA regarding cumulative effects.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	155	35	<p>This analysis needs to include: (1) the effects of past connected and cumulative actions; (2) the effects of present connected and cumulative actions; and (3) the effects of reasonably foreseeable future connected and cumulative actions. 40 C.F.R. § 1508.7.</p> <p>There are no specific calculations, based on current data, for total expected traffic and environmental impacts for:</p> <p>The north/south corridor from Freya to Francis, From Freya to Francis,</p> <p>And from Wellesley to I-90 interchange at Sullivan Road</p> <p>There is no thorough analysis of the long-term projected impacts of the Bigelow Gulch/Forker Road on the I-90 interchange. There is no mention of additional local, state and federal funding that may be required.</p> <p>The Northeast Transportation Study is considering the designation of Francis Avenue from Division to Market as an extension of SR 291. It follows logically that this extension would continue to Freya upon the completion of the NCS Nickel Fund Project.</p> <p>The Bigelow Gulch project as currently designed approaches the standard for a rural connector, however it approaches the design standard for a state highway. This project is intended to be completed in the year 2010.</p> <p>The Sullivan Road urban connector from Wellesley to the I-90 interchange appears to meet the design standards for a state highway. The tentative capital program for road projects for the city of Spokane Valley includes widening of Sullivan Road from Wellesley to Euclid and the widening of the west bridge over the Spokane River to be completed by the year 2012.</p> <p>These factors indicate that SR 291 will be extended from Division Street to the Sullivan Road interchange at</p>	<p>Comment noted. An analysis of Wellesley to the I-90 interchange has been conducted and included in section 4.9 of this Revised EA.</p> <p>The City of Spokane Valley has included two Sullivan Road Projects in its Six Year Construction Plan to address congestion concerns.</p> <p>The Washington State Transportation Improvement Board has route jurisdictional authority. The owner of a roadway, the WSDOT or the legislature may petition to transfer a roadway to a state highway. There are no plans to transfer Bigelow Gulch to the State highway system.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	155	36	<p>I-90 without any consideration of the cumulative impact on the environment.</p> <p>There is no indication that the SRTC has modeled for the projected increased traffic volumes that should be expected when the NSC Nickel-Funded project is opened for traffic 2011. There appears to be no projected increase in heavy vehicle traffic between Canada, the northern urban area of Spokane/Spokane County and the East Valley industrial/commercial area points east. By 2025 the increased heavy vehicle traffic will turn Bigelow Gulch into a two-lane high-speed highway with outside lanes becoming heavy vehicle crawl lanes (This scenario is comparable to the original design discussed and reasonably accepted by the community in 2000 as a two-lane highway with climbing lanes and provisions for left turns).</p>	<p>The scenario of the NSC being opened from Francis to SR395/SR2 (nickel package) has not been modeled for traffic volumes in 2011. However, Spokane County believes the currently planned multi-lane Bigelow Gulch facility will handle the traffic volumes for this scenario. It is estimated that freight movement will increase on Bigelow Gulch; however, this increase is believed to increase with passenger vehicles, so the percentage may remain near current levels. A multi-lane facility does provide for climbing lanes and crawl lanes to accommodate heavy vehicles.</p> <p>Please see Chapter 3 of this Revised EA regarding the history of the project and alternatives.</p>
03.5	155	37	<p>The Lead Agency failed to ensure that the Public Process provided adequate and accurate information to the public.</p> <p>As articulated by the Supreme Court, NEPA requires "that the agency, in reaching its decision, will have available, and will carefully consider, detailed information concerning significant environmental impacts; it also guarantees that the relevant information will be made available" to the public. <i>Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council</i>, 490 U.S. 332, 349 (1989).</p> <p>NEPA further requires federal agencies to:</p> <p>[A]ssess and consider comments both individually and collectively, and shall respond by one or more of the means listed below, stating its response in the final statement. Possible responses are to: (1) Modify alternatives including the proposed action. (2) Develop and evaluate alternatives not previously given serious consideration by the agency. (3) Supplement, improve,</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 1.2 of the Revised EA regarding public involvement.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			or modify its analyses. (4) Make factual corrections. (5) Explain why the comments do not warrant further agency response, citing the sources, authorities, or reasons which support the agency's position and, if appropriate, indicate those circumstances which would trigger agency reappraisal or further response. 40 C.F.R § 1503.4.	
03.5	155	38	EA - 1.4 How has the public been involved in the scoping? Spokane County hosted an open house at the Central Grange on Bigelow Gulch Road on February 2, 2000 to provide citizens the opportunity to obtain information and to discuss the proposed project with project officials and consultants. Meeting attendees were also asked to complete and submit comment sheets to inform the County about their specific concerns and questions. More than 50 citizens submitted comments. The residents were invited to a town hall type meeting hosted by the Orchard Prairie Homemakers at the Central Grange regarding an update on the road project. This was on February 1, 2006; there had been no communication from the County for six years! At this meeting the residents learned of the magnitude of the planned roadway for the first time. The County invited the community to an "open house" at the Central Grange on February 15, 2006 with a second meeting at East Valley Middle School on February 16, 2006. At these meetings the public learned that the EA comment period was open (had been since January 27,2006), which was 16-17 days into the 45-day period. We were told it had been published in the legal notices section of the paper on January 27. There was no effort by the county to notify people beyond the legal notice and it was not mentioned at the February 1 meeting.	Comment noted. Please see section 1.2 regarding public involvement The opportunity for public involvement has been continual since 2000 including information booths at community and the interstate fairs, published in the Spokane County Road Construction Program each year, civic group meetings, news paper articles, etc. In addition to notice in the legal section of the local news paper, notice of availability of the EA and notice of open houses and public meetings were published as paid advertisement in the local news papers, on radio stations, on television and posted on numerous 4ft. x 8 ft. signs along the entire corridor. Direct mailings were also sent to all businesses and residents along the corridor.
03.5	155	39	On February 17 a letter was sent and signed by 42	Extension of time was granted twice during the comment

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			residents to the Project Engineers and WSDOT Engineer voicing their concerns and requesting a 60-day extension on the comment period. The people also requested additional "town hall" type meetings so everyone could hear all the questions and answers at the meeting. A letter from Mr. William Hemmings Program Development Engineer dated February 22, 2006 was received saying the request for the extension had been sent to Ross Kelley, County Engineer. Commissioner Todd Mielke was invited to meet with the Bigelow, Pleasant Prairie communities at the Orchard Prairie School on February 27 to hear the concerns about the proposed road project. Commissioner Mielke brought three engineers with him to the meeting which was attended by about 50 residents. At that time the Prairie Protection Association asked for an extension of 30 days to review records and make informed comments. The request was granted and confirmed in a letter from Mr. Kelley on March 7, which stated a 30-day extension would be granted to March 12, 2006. A Public Hearing was scheduled for March 22. The request for a "town hall" type meeting was ignored.	period and an additional Open House and Public Meeting was held.
03.5	155	40	<p>On March 10, a records request was given to William Hemmings. The two women who handed him the request were told someone on staff would copy the records. They then sat and waited in the lobby at the Engineering office for two hours only to learn that the person who copied the records was not at work that day so nothing could be done until Monday, March 13.</p> <p>A notice was sent on March 15 acknowledging the receipt of the records request and setting up a time to review the records on March 21, 11:00 - 4:30. The documents were not copied and made available until March 27. Records were again reviewed on March 30. E-mails were not available until April 4 and were reviewed then and again on April 11. Each time the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Mr. Hemmings told the two ladies that he would give the request to the person who handles this work. He was not told that they intended to wait for the copies. Since the woman who does this work was gone that day and it normally takes many days to research and gather these records, Spokane County regrets any misunderstanding about the requested records and subsequent 2-hour wait. Spokane County provided the requested records in accordance with the rules and regulations that govern such requests.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	155	41	<p>On April 3 a request was sent to Ross Kelley for an additional 60-day extension due to the delay in getting records which handicapped the citizens' efforts to study and make informed comments for the record. This request was denied on April 7 but an additional 16 days was granted to April 28, 2006 for comments. In a final request to Mr. Kelley dated April 12, to reconsider his decision because of County's delays in providing the records. On the same date it was also requested that a written memo be sent advising when the transcript of the comments taken by the court recorder on March 22 would be available. No memo was provided and the actual records which had been requested on both April 10 and 11 finally arrived on April 25 three days before the close of the comment period. The transcript clearly shows that the County Hearing Examiner allowed Mr. Kelley to interject comments and argue with many of those submitting testimony.</p>	<p>On April 14, 2006, Ross Kelley, received a certified letter requesting reconsideration of a previous request for a second extension of the comment period for the Environmental Assessment of the Bigelow Gulch-Forker Road project. An additional extension of time was granted to April 28, 2006. The length of the comment period with the second extension to April 28, 2006, brought the total time for comments to more than 3 months.</p>
03.5	155	42	<p>First amendment rights were denied on February 16, 2006 when citizens attempted to video and voice record the Open House meeting to learn how the same questions were being answered differently by various county officials. Sheriff's deputies were asked by county officials to intervene on their behalf to deny the videotaping. Numerous county personnel, who were being paid to participate in the Open House meeting, held up their hands to block the cameras and refused to give their names and positions as county employees. The Program Development Engineer, Bill Hemmings, refused to talk with citizens while being taped even after a lawyer stepped forward and verified that the law does allow such recording at a public meeting.</p> <p>Mr. Hemmings subsequently left the meeting to avoid further questioning and recording. He was not present</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.5	155	43	<p>The Environmental Assessment relied upon Outdated and Incomplete Information.</p> <p>NEPA was enacted to ensure that federal agencies do not act on incomplete information, only to regret its decision after it is too late to correct. Marsh v. ONRC, 490 U.S. 360, 371 (1989). To comply with NEPA, an agency has a "continuing duty to gather and consider new information in assessing the environmental impacts of its actions." Coeur d'Alene Lake v. Kiebert, 790 F. Supp. 998 (D. Idaho 1992). In Chapter 4 section 10 again the county failed in cover WAC 197-11-055(2)(c), WAC 197-11-030(2)(b) and (g), and WAC 197-11-030(2)(c).</p> <p>The document does not disclose what model was used and did not provide the results. Information was not provided in a clear, concise manner indicating the increase in vehicular traffic traveling through the area and the effect on the air quality.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please refer to the traffic model information in Appendix B of the January 2006 EA, and air quality modeling information in Appendix C (pages 2 through 4) of the same document.</p>
90.0	155	44	<p>Chapter 4 section 14 is incomplete. The county did not look for evidence of pre-settlement. So clearly the county failed to follow WAC 197-11-055(2)(c).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 155-22 regarding pre-settlement.</p>
55.0	155	45	<p>Proposed frontage roads along Bigelow Gulch Rd. were not addressed in the Environmental Assessment. Arrangements for mail delivery were not addressed for residents along the frontage roads.</p>	<p>Frontage roads are no longer a part of the proposed project. The determination of a cluster of boxes or individual driveway box location would be a policy decision of the US Postal Service.</p>
65.0	155	46	<p>Examination of the current design indicates that there are least seven homes in addition to the twenty existing homes identified in the EA that will be above the impact criteria for noise levels after project completion. There is NO mitigation planned to solve this.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see response to comment 77-1 above, and section 4.11 of this Revised EA for additional noise information and impacts. The noise modeling was rerun to include a larger number of residences.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.5	155	47	<p>The Environmental Assessment contains Inadequate Mitigation Measures and Fails to Adequately assess the Effectiveness of Proposed Measures.</p> <p>NEPA requires that an EIS present a "reasonably complete discussion of possible mitigation measures." <i>Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council</i>, 490 U.S. 332, 351 (1989). The Ninth Circuit has concluded that "[w]ithout analytical data to support the proposed mitigation measures, we are not persuaded that they amount to anything more than a 'mere listing' of good management practices." <i>Idaho Sporting Congress</i>, 137 F.3d at 1151.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Mitigation measures have been presented in each section of Chapter 4 and in Appendix 2 – Mitigation Commitments of this Revised EA.</p>
20.1	155	48	<p>EA-Table 1-1, page 1-3: STORMWATER: Increased stormwater runoff due to increase in impermeable surface, resulting in greater concentrations of pollutants reaching local surface and groundwater. No additional mitigation is proposed in the EA - only noted that guidelines for stormwater management, WSDOT manual will be followed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 22-2 and comment 132-3 regarding stormwater and analysis in Sections 4.2 and 4.5 of this Revised EA.</p>
30.0	155	49	<p>EA-page 1-4: WETLANDS: Approximately 0.62 acres of wetland within four wetlands would be partially or completely filled. The mitigation relies on guidelines for stormwater management with WSDOT Highway Runoff Manual. The mitigation is to limit surface water discharges to wetlands per regulations. No explanation or detail of this is plan.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 154-5 regarding wetland mitigation.</p>
20.0	155	50	<p>EA-page 1-4: STREAMS: Eight streams are partially or completely within connector Alignment ...stream channels may need to be realigned to accommodate increased roadway width. Mitigation measures call for preparation of a long-term stormwater management plan; no details are given.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see response to comment 112-1 and comment 154-6 regarding stream mitigation.</p>
40.0	155	51	<p>EA-page 1-5: VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE: Potential impact to Water Howellia from filling or partially filling</p>	<p>Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA for additional information regarding water Howellia.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	155	52	<p>wetlands. Mitigation measures are to conduct preconstruction surveys to determine presence of Water Howellia. There is no data to confirm this has been done.</p> <p>EA-page 1-6: TRANSPORTATION: No mention of how traffic can merge with highway from the frontage roads, especially if a left turn across two lanes and a center turn lane is necessary. Plans call for a traffic signal at Jensen and Bigelow to be activated by the fire department with possibility of this becoming a regular intersection signal.</p>	<p>The frontage roads are no longer a part of the proposed project. The emergency - vehicle traffic control signal will conform to the MUTCD.</p>
60.0	155	53	<p>EA-page 1-7: AIR QUALITY: Decreased carbon monoxide emissions in corridor ...due to improved traffic flow. With traffic projects predicted to increase will the CO emissions truly be improved?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 154-15 regarding air quality.</p>
65.0	155	54	<p>EA-page 1-7: NOISE: Twenty homes would be subjected to traffic noise exceeding WSDOT noise abatement criteria in 2025. No mitigation is proposed due to none of the WSDOT's recommended noise mitigation measures were found to be both acoustically feasible and economically reasonable.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 77-1 regarding noise.</p>
70.0	155	55	<p>EA-page 1-7: VISUAL RESOURCES: loss of vegetative screening. Mitigation measures call for retaining as much roadside vegetation as possible ...replacing or creating new vegetative screening where "determined by the County Engineer to be necessary." No plan to ask for citizen input on this.</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
90.1	155	56	<p>EA-page 1-8: CULTURAL AND HISTORIC RESOURCES: Five structures eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places ...OAHF and WSDOT have determined No Adverse Effect ...The mitigation measures are none. The planned roadway cuts through the historic Charlie Bigelow acreage with no detail of how close this will come to the structures</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 155-17 regarding historic structures.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.0	155	57	<p>since no design is complete. The Ole Hansen homestead on E. Bigelow will also be impacted by the new roadway's proximity.</p> <p>The Bigelow Gulch EA entirely fails to adequately analyze and assess direct and indirect impacts on the Orchard Prairie community. The EA assumes, without proving, that a 4-lane, high-speed thoroughfare is necessary to move traffic through the Orchard Prairie community, without regard to the devastating effect on this unique community.</p> <p>The character of the community is only given a passing glance. Orchard Prairie is a community with a long-standing identity, centering on Orchard Prairie School, the oldest continuously operating rural school in Washington.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see section 4.16 of this Revised EA regarding Orchard Prairie.</p>
55.2	155	58	<p>Children at this school live on both sides of Bigelow Gulch Road. Many of them help their parents' farm land on both sides of the road. The EA does not address how school children and community members will be able to safely cross the proposed 4-lane road. When asked at a public meeting how children could safely cross Bigelow Gulch Road, Mr. Kelley was recorded on videotape as stating that they would have to look both ways and be very careful. This is hardly an adequate solution! The safety of the children in this community is a significant concern.</p>	<p>Please see previous response to comment 2-6.</p>
45.9	155	59	<p>Serious disruption to the cohesiveness of this historical community has not been addressed. This is a community with an active culture - on both sides of Bigelow Gulch. It boasts one of the oldest "Homemakers' Clubs" in the state, as well as active scouting, 4-H and other groups. The proposed 4-lane road would segregate the Orchard Prairie community into separate areas. Given the proposed limited access in some areas, as well as frontage roads, many people</p>	<p>Please see response to comment 2- 6 above.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.1	155	60	<p>will find that visiting a next-door neighbor will now require a car trip. The EA reveals that the concern for efficiently moving traffic through Orchard Prairie is driving the project design.</p> <p>The EA fails to consider the cumulative effects of all of the environmental consequences on this discrete community stemming from the proposed road. Most homes in this area are on private wells, many hand-dug, shallow wells, that would be profoundly impacted by the cumulative effect of stormwater, diversion of existing water flow, and run-off pollution induced by increased traffic volumes under the 4-lane proposal. Not a single, individual well was studied for potential impact. Given that farming has been found to impact the water quality in certain wells in this area (e.g., nitrate levels), it is unreasonable to expect that the cumulative effect of surface pollution from anticipated stormwater and erosion would not have similar impact. Yet, the EA simply concludes that impact will vary depending on traffic volume, which it admits will increase with a 4-lane road, (see chart on EA p. 4-48). At a minimum, the impact of a 2-lane alternative must be evaluated.</p>	<p>Please see response comment 109-1 regarding groundwater and wells.</p>
05.4	155	61	<p>Ultimately, the EA's failure to consider cumulative impacts is underscored by the general nature of the solution proposed when an individual impact is identified. When an impact, such as water quality, is noted, the EA proposed to minimize this impact by designing a road to minimize it. As noted in the report of water quality expert, Mr. Al Isaacson, which has been submitted as part of another comment, this is a principal flaw in the EA. Rather than assessing the cumulative impact on the environment, the EA seeks to "assure" citizens that the county will design the road that is best. Such assurance is not an adequate substitute for the "hard look" at environmental issues that is required under NEPA.</p>	<p>Please see section 4.17 of this Revised EA regarding cumulative impacts.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.0	155	62	The EA fails to address the impact of inviting urban sprawl ("Build it and they will come."). This proposed highway intersects prime farmlands, with exceptionally deep topsoil. Every day in America, thousands of acres of valuable farmlands are lost to 'development', with little consideration to the future need for agriculture to provide for populations to come. New technologies necessary to provide alternative renewable fuels will depend upon the availability of agricultural lands.	Thank you for your comments. Please see section 4.7 of this Revised EA regarding impacts to farmland.
70.0	155	63	The EA fails to address the impacts to the economy by contributing to the process of degrading the aesthetics of Spokane County. The positive image helps to attract businesses to the area which sustain the economy and provide living wage jobs to its citizens. The City of Spokane and Spokane County both depend on the continuation of a beautiful, natural environment which creates and sustains the image of a near nature lifestyle. ("Near Nature, Near Perfect.") Instead, the project seeks to further the mistake made by the 1960's 'upgrade' of Bigelow Gulch Road. Poor engineering created a road poorly designed for safety. A higher capacity road attracts more motorists to an area of the county that is not suitable to more traffic. Rather than truly mitigating for safety concerns, the project makes a county road into a state highway. It brings increased noise that for some will make their homes intolerable. New safety concerns are created for those who live along the road, and have no choice but to deal with the consequences of an overly aggressive design.	Thank you for your comments. An economic analysis was not defined in scoping of environmental study elements because of the rural nature and the lack of businesses within the project area. As previously mentioned, Bigelow Gulch Road has had very few changes over the years other than resurfacing. What was considered an acceptable road years ago is no longer considered acceptable. The proposed project is to address the safety and capacity issues caused by the growing community's travel demands and the resultant public's choice to utilize this route for their commuting needs.
05.5	155	64	As required by NEPA (40 CFR & 1502.17), there is no list of preparers and their qualifications in the Environmental Assessment document.	Comment noted. The list has been provided in the Revised EA.
03.5	155	65	If a truly open, transparent process for planning for current and future transportation needs had been in	Comment noted.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			place for the Bigelow Gulch Project during the last five years, the public could have become a planning partner and a positive advocate for the efforts of the Spokane County Engineering Division.	
05.0	155	66	The Noise Discipline Report has errors, omissions and contradictions with other information in the Environmental Assessment and information provided by County Staff at the open house hearings, that it should be done over and be subject to the requirements of an Environmental Impact Statement so that we may be more certain that its assumptions, projections, studies and evaluations are accurate.	Comment noted. The noise analysis has been recalculated and the results presented in section 4.11 in this Revised EA.
55.1	155	67	The traffic volumes used in this report are 3% medium trucks and 2% heavy trucks, however in section B of the Road Geometry Report, the truck traffic was projected to be 9% to 10%. This is 80% to 100% discrepancy in truck volume should be properly studied and accurately and consistently reflected in any environmental documents.	Comment noted. The noise analysis has been recalculated using the truck volume assumptions for the model.
65.0	155	68	The study indicates that a total of 49 homes were identified within 500 feet of the project, not all residences were identified in this study and the entire inventory should be reviewed and presented accurately. There are at least three residences within 250 feet of the roadway between H-24 and H-25 that are not addressed in this study (at least one within 100 feet). Other residences may also have been omitted. The report indicates that 20 of these residences will be demolished, and therefore no noise study was required. Some residents were told at the open house meetings by County Engineering Staff that their houses would not be demolished (H-28 in particular) although they were listed to be demolished in the study. Any house that potentially will not be demolished that is identified in the study to be removed should be included in a complete	Please see section 4.11 of this Revised EA for revised noise analysis. The number of occupied structures to be demolished is seven. Please see section 4.11 for map and revised table of this revised EA.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.2	155	69	Cost estimates of this project provided by the County Engineering Department listed only funds for two or three relocations, not the 20 in the noise report. What is the projected costs of this demolition and relocation above and beyond the county estimate of \$10,000 per acre for right of way acquisition and are these costs reflected in the current cost estimate of the project?	The costs are currently being revised and updated by the County.
65.0	155	70	The noise modeling used made no actual measurements as far as can be determined although reference is made in the study to two sets of receivers being placed and listed in table 5-3, there is no table 5-3 in the document. The terrain is varied along the route and flat terrain straight-line roadway model in no way accurately reflects the actual current situation and the full magnitude of additional noise impacts of the proposal. There are many existing berms, cuts, hedgerows, barrier trees and shrubs, and other noise mitigation elements in place that will be removed and significantly altered with construction. Proposed cuts and fills will also affect existing conditions. Current actual conditions should be measured to determine the current baseline so the actual effect of the new construction can be known to help determine what mitigating measures may be appropriate.	Thank you for your comment. Your observation is correct that our modeling used a simplified “worst case” geometry assuming no vegetation or topographical barriers between the roadway and the houses. The calculated noise levels therefore represent a “worst case” estimate of noise levels at the receivers. In reality if there are topographic barriers between the roadway and houses, then the noise impacts would be less than indicated in the tables of modeled noise presented in section 4.11 of this Revised EA.
65.0	155	71	The study concluded that no noise mitigation was required because it was too expensive or that the modified changes in noise were not significant, or existing modeled noise was already too great, or that any wall, hedgerow or barrier trees and shrubs would not be effective because of the need for the driveway access. This extremely broad-brush approach for an 8 mile corridor with varying terrain, setbacks and unique situations, is used to justify absolutely no mitigation commitments whatsoever by the County, State or	Comment noted. Please see response to comment 77-1 regarding noise mitigation.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	155	72	<p>Federal agencies that may fund this proposed project. This noise study should be done gathering actual noise data at the sites and any modeling used should take into account the changes contemplated in this project.</p> <p>There should be discussions with residents of the area of alternative approaches to noise mitigation, which include for example; financial participation by homeowners with other allowable funds for noise mitigation could create an effective solution to some noise situations. The possibility of placing power and phone lines underground to allow for planting of trees along the roadway to provide noise abatement and a visual barrier. In this document there is no commitments to any visual or aesthetic mitigation.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see response to comment 77-1 regarding noise mitigation.</p>
03.5	155	73	<p>The Environmental Procedures Manual for the WSDOT section 410.06 calls for early public involvement and mutual continued feedback and ideally a Public Involvement Plan that includes early and open communication with the public and especially those affected by the plan. It appears that the only Public Involvement Plan for this project was to hold no meetings nor solicit any input from those living in the area from the meeting that discussed a possibly three or maybe a four lane upgrade in 2001 until the required last minute notification after the EA was completed. This approach has created an adversarial climate and mistrust as well as denying local residents and the general public input at a time that it could be considered and incorporated in the document.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. See response to comment 105-2.</p>
55.1	155	74	<p>TimeMark Incorporated did a traffic study for the County at the end of March 2005. From the 22nd thru the 28th of March 2005, the busiest seven days of the study, had an average daily total (ADT) of 10,930 on Bigelow Gulch west of Argonne and an ADT of 6,378 on Bigelow Gulch east of Argonne. The graphs in section B-1 of</p>	<p>Please refer to Appendix B of the January 2006 EA. The graphs shown in Appendix B have projected traffic of approximately 14,000 ADT west of Argonne and 12,500 East of Argonne. Table B-5 shows the increase is 14% east of Argonne and 68% west of Argonne. (note: TimeMark incorporated is the company that supplies</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.0	155	75	GeoEngineers recommended that any wells or springs located within 1000 feet of major roads or cuts be tested. I see no commitment in this EA for such a program. Any wells, springs or water tables that could be affected by the road expansion project should be inventoried as a matter of prudent and just public policy. The County and other funding agencies should have a fair and clearly stated policy for remediation for any water supply damaged or rendered useles.	Comment noted. Please see section 4.2 regarding recommended pre- and post-construction inventory and proposed mitigation measures.
05.5	155	76	We feel that the lack of any reasonable opportunities for the public to participate and give meaningful input for a project of this magnitude plus the inaccuracies, omissions, and a complete lack of any commitment to mitigating actions call for a reevaluation of this project and a full Environmental Impact Statement be prepared. The WSDOT manual suggests that the maximum length of an EA be 15 pages, this EA is about 200 pages plus an appendix probably near five or six hundred pages.	Comment noted.
05.0	157	1	I read the article in the Spokane Valley News Herald, Bigelow Gulch Improvement Opponents Express Views, dated March 3, 2006. The design of this passage from Francis to Sullivan needs to remain a four-lane road and it does not need to be delayed. This passage will reduce traffic congestion and accidents and improve public safety, economic development and air quality in Spokane. This is a no-brainer. If you need any assistance from me to enlighten these people with negative attitudes, please let me know. There are many businesses that I have talked to about	Comment Noted.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	157	2	The only caveat is the amount of congestion that this project will generate at the Sullivan and I-90 intersection. I really wish your design would have taken the road to Barker and I-90.	The City of Spokane Valley has included two Sullivan Road Projects in its Six Year Construction Plan to address congestion concerns.
01.0	158	1	Great job to all.	Comment noted.
03.5	159	1	Please notify of all meetings. We have requested and have been assured that a public meeting would be held at the Foothills Community Center.	Please see section 1.2 of this Revised EA for information on the public involvement.
55.0	160	1	Would the new corridor create a new bus route for STA and reduce congestion for future usage? Would bus stops and pickup areas be considered?	At this point in time there is no plan to service this area.
05.0	161	1	Although we don't live in the Orchard Prairie/Pleasant Prairie area, it was one of the first places my husband and I saw when considering moving to Spokane. The beauty of that rural area was a deciding factor in our decision to live here. Please don't destroy one of the last remaining rural places in this area.	Comment Noted.
05.0	162	1	Absolute power corrupts absolutely. Shame on the county agencies responsible for trying to push through their Bigelow Gulch agenda without concern for the wishes of the residents of Spokane County. The video of your public meeting spoke volumes and we are lucky to have seen your representatives in action. Shame on you and thanks to the Protect the Prairie Organization for bringing this to our attention.	Comments noted.

Table 3-3. Responses to Public Hearing Comments on the Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Urban Connector Environmental Assessment

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
01.0	163	1	<p>MIKE DEMPSEY: All right. We will now go on the record. My name is Mike Dempsey. I am the Spokane County Hearing Examiner. I'm an attorney. What I do for a living is, I'm a county employee who hears land use cases primarily for Spokane County. And I've been asked tonight to basically sit here and accept testimony on the Environmental Assessment and evaluation for the Bigelow Gulch Road/Forker Road Urban Connector project that Spokane County is involved in. I think the federal government will actually make the final environmental determination on this.</p> <p>And so, we're going to take testimony. I don't really have any information regarding the project. My sole purpose is to kind of just take testimony in an orderly fashion. Record it. We have a court reporter here who will be able to record this and make a transcript. And then we're also recording this on a compact disk.</p> <p>So I'll just go ahead and take people in whatever order they want to come up, and they can tell us what they want about the environmental impacts of the project. So someone gets to be first. If you could just us give us your name and your mailing address, that would be great.</p>	<p>Hearing Examiner introduction.</p>
20.0	163	2	<p>BUCK KOERPER: Okay. My name is Buck Koerper. K-o-e-r-p-e-r. My address is 11606 North Roundup, Mead.</p> <p>And my concern with it is, I own Whitey's wrecking right at that corner of Havana and Bigelow Gulch. And throughout the years--we've had that property for fifty</p>	<p>See Section 4.5 of the revised EA for discussion of drainage.</p> <p>Roadway surface water will be collected and treated with this project and adequate drainage features and cross culverts will be deployed to equalize natural drainage. Water draining from private property is beyond the scope of this project, but this specific issue will be forwarded to the Storm Water</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.6	163	3	<p>years--and throughout widening Francis, and keep changing Francis and Bigelow Gulch, they've taken and created a dike, a big dam around the corner of my property. So all the runoff from the railroad tracks and all in that area all soaks down to the corner of my yard, and every year in the spring and in the wintertime, we'll have like a two to three-foot deep lake on about an acre and a half to two acres of my property. And I wonder what, if they do these projects and make it even bigger, where is all that water--why--how am I going to be responsible for all the storm water runoff in that area when I'm getting it from everywhere, and it has no place to go? And they've created the dam and made basically, you know, an acre and a half to two acres of my land useless during the spring runoff.</p> <p>MIKE DEMPSEY: All right. Thank you, sir.</p> <p>BUCK KOERPER: You're welcome. There used to be a culvert underneath Francis that ran when they built it up there first. Well then, in the process of widening it, they crushed that culvert. They let Tom bury, backfill his corner of the thing so now there's nowhere for the water to go except for in my property.</p>	<p>Utilities Division for further analysis.</p>
45.6	163	3	<p>VIOLA ORRINO: I want to know specifically, are they taking our home? Because everybody is buying everything. We have been looking, looking, looking, and there is nothing. Absolutely nothing. We can't go buy anything. And we can't wait until the last minute or everything will be gone. We've been driving around for all</p>	<p>This house is very close to the existing road and the preferred alignment thus the house may be a future acquisition.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.0	163	4	<p>last week, trying to find some little place that we could, you know-</p> <p>Could possibly move to with the things we have; unless we go to the thousands and thousands of dollars, and we cant afford that. So I want a yes or no answer if that's going to be taken because I cant wait until the last minute and have no place to move. I'm sure you can understand.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
05.0	163	4	<p>DONNA MAHAN: I am Donna Mahan. 14201 East Bigelow Gulch. I really feel like this road project needs to go ahead. If we settle for two lanes and a turn lane, we'd be penny-wise and pound-foolish because in another year, two years, probably just a year, the traffic would really be far more than the road can handle. So I say while we're doing it, let's go ahead and do it right and put the four lanes in. I happened to hear over the radio or the TV the other day that Bigelow and Forker are one of the top ten accident sites in the county, in the whole area, and so we need to get that straightened out. We need to go ahead with this project. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Spokane County is required to follow strict Federal, State, and County guidelines and procedures for the assessing the value of property needed for the project and compensating the property owner accordingly. This process will include the use of an appraiser to establish property value, followed by an independent review appraiser to review the appraisals. The reviewer will either agree or recommend a revised amount. Based on the reviewer's recommendation, the County will approve the amount of just compensation to the property owner.</p>
65.0	163	5	<p>KELLEY CLOTHIER: My name is Kelly Clothier. I represent my family. We have a limited partnership, the Clothier Family Limited Partnership that oversees my father's, my parents' estate. And so we have land on both sides of the Bigelow Gulch Road. What I wish to see for this project is, since we're our community is bearing the brunt of, or a host to a very large roadway. I think that we should have--get a little extra consideration because of the impact. We can't really just be compensated the amount for the land taken. We really need to have our community given a little special treatment to minimize the impact of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Spokane County is required to follow strict Federal, State, and County guidelines and procedures for the assessing the value of property needed for the project and compensating the property owner accordingly. This process will include the use of an appraiser to establish property value, followed by an independent review appraiser to review the appraisals. The reviewer will either agree or recommend a revised amount. Based on the reviewer's recommendation, the County will approve the amount of just compensation to the property owner.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>this roadway. And the essential things for me that need to happen are some control for the extra noise. I understand there's some projected 30,000 cars a day once the North/South Freeway gets into the picture, and right now, my family's home is really not very inhabitable because of the noise, and to double, more than double the traffic, I just can't imagine getting a good night's sleep there.</p> <p>So, for me and for the other members of the community that live right adjacent to the road, I think there should be consideration for the noise control in the guise of plantings or berms, whatever is necessary to make those residences still habitable and a place to live, you know. A lot of people have lived there their whole life and this is being, you know, they didn't choose to have this road put in here and so there should be consideration for those people.</p> <p>And I have not as yet seen very much to address the noise control. It's just kind of an aside at the meetings.</p>	
40.5	163	6	<p>There's sort of faint lip service given to the noise control. The issue that is of concern to me and to a lot of the members of the community is that we had a lot of wildlife. I guess they call it the "urban elk herd" that seem to be pretty savvy about getting across a two-lane highway, but four lanes with a turn lane, they might not be so lucky to cross that without not only endangering them but endangering people that are driving. I don't see that being addressed adequately.</p>	<p>See Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for discussion of impacts to wildlife, including elk.</p>
45.2	163	7	<p>I have a neighbor, Ruth Montany, who has lived there</p>	<p>Right of way acquisition negotiations will progress after the environmental review is complete and prior to any construction.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.0	163	8	<p>ANN WINKLER: My name is Ann Winkler. I am a traffic engineer, but I am not representing anyone tonight. I'm just here because I think the Bigelow Gulch Project is an essential connector between linking the Valley with the north side. I think we've got two communities right now that are-it's really hard to get between. And I think that the existing traffic volumes on Bigelow Gulch show that there's a need for more connection between those two communities and the widening of the road and increased capacity will help tie our community together. I think that this is a really important project for the Greater Spokane area. I think it's as important as the North Spokane Freeway. I think it's going to do as much or more good for the local area, and I would really like to see it move forward. So, I am fully in support of the project.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
55.2	163	9	<p>STEVE SMART: My name is Steve Smart, and I'm on Argonne. I'd really like to see the project go forward in a very safe manner. I think having the traffic allowed to go through there into four lanes is a good way to go. I do think that there should be mitigation for the houses along there. I do see earth and berms in places with</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
40.0	163	10	<p>vegetation to buffer those people that are really affected, and I'd be one, as a taxpayer, to agree with actually moving some of those people either further back in their places or to another location. I see every year a lot of wrecks on that road. A number of people have been killed on that road. I think there's a real safety issue there. There's a lot of commerce that goes through there. There's a lot of big trucks. It is a main corridor between north Spokane and the Valley.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>
05.0	163	11	<p>I am a little bothered, too. I went to one of the local meetings. And I was bothered by the integrity of some of the people on some of the things that they said they were going to bring up that I don't think showed an honest, forthright way of doing conversations with your guys. I was pretty appalled after listening for about 45 minutes of all the things that they're going to say that weren't appropriate and so I left that meeting. I was hoping that we were going to find out some good ideas, like buffering the road, and how we could do that to protect it, but it was more of how to totally stop the road. I don't</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	163	12	<p>think that's a realistic thing. I think way too many people have been hurt in accidents to stop this project. And I just want to say, I'm for it.</p>	<p>This project will not change the plans for the North Spokane Corridor. The two projects serve separate and distinct needs.</p>
03.5	163	12	<p>MARIE NESBITT: My name is Marie Nesbitt. I live on North Scott Road which is about three quarters of a mile northeast of Bigelow Gulch Road and Argonne. I have just a couple of questions that I'd like--there's discrepancy and lots of public talk and so on and so forth about this urban connection, that Bigelow Gulch is being designated as an urban connector. I would like to know if this is going to be in lieu of, totally in place of, the North/South Freeway that we've been anticipating and planning, hoping for, for many years? Is this urban connector going to be instead of?</p>	<p>Spokane County has purchased some land along the proposed alignment.</p>
55.0	163		<p>So can you tell me if any land as been purchased?</p>	<p>A description of the proposed project is presented in Chapter 2 of this Revised EA. The frontage roads are no longer a part of the proposed project.</p>
55.0	163		<p>...according to the projections and what we see on the website, and what they're showing us for pictures and things and that, this is going to be a four-lane highway with a division in the middle of it and limited access and frontage roads; is that correct?</p>	
55.2	163	13	<p>ELISE GUMM: I understand they're going to have to build an underground or over bypass on the road between the middle school and the high school, and that will be locked down on off hours. That, to me, is a very high safety impact for children to have locks.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. As part of the planning process with the school district, the decision regarding access and locks during off hours will be made during the design phase. Please see the in Chapter 5 of this Revised EA.</p>
55.0	163	14	<p>ELISE GUMM: So you cannot still come down</p>	<p>There will be access to Progress.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
45.0	163	15	<p>....why do we have to go over that far and cut through and make a new road? It just seems like such a waste of dollars to me. Isn't there some other routing that can be done besides this? Some other options besides cutting through all these people's land and everything?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see Chapter 3 of this Revised EA for the analysis of project alternatives.</p>
45.0	163	15	<p>TERRY MONTANYE: It's Terry M-o-n-t-a-n-y-e. Yeah, my mom and I were just next door. We moved up here in 1962. She's at 7810 East Bigelow Gulch Road, and it's about, oh, I don't know, less than a quarter of a mile, her place is less than a quarter of a mile west of the Paulson place which is a place that has historical value. It talks in the plan about bumping the highway, the words say a bit south, possibly narrowing it to avoid getting on that property. Now, we just talked to a nice guy next door there, and my mom's place is on the map. So I looked at the highway, and I see where it shows it's probably going to go. There are a lot of people that are obviously opposed to this project. I'm opposed to it myself. But we hear scare tactics--I don't know if they're scare tactics, but pretty strong language about the fact that the highway is actually going to come right up to her front door which is a long ways from what that picture says. So this is what I want to know, is that picture pretty accurate or can this highway, by the time it gets to her place, deviate a lot where she's going to be taken by surprise? She has to have some sort of comfort level here, even at this stage, so she's not constantly concerned about</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Figure 2-1 (Chapter 2) of this revised EA presents an aerial view of the project area with the roadway alignment as proposed. That figure presents, as accurately as possible at this time, the proposed location of the roadway. Some adjustments to the alignment may occur during the final design phase based on the more detailed engineering.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.1	163	16	<p>whether the highway is going to be there or whether it's going to be here. I would like somebody to tell me and tell my mom, who is sitting here. My mom and dad put an awful lot of time and years into that piece of property, and everyone has. What's the answer? Is it going to be a long ways south? Is it going to stay approximately where it is? Or what's it going to be? Picture 3?</p> <p>But what I'm getting at is, right now, at this point when I look at the picture, it seems pretty clear, and I understand that maybe it will jog a little bit this direction or that, but then there are people that say this thing is going to come right through your front door, so that picture is not telling the truth. So the question is, is that just something that's been drawn and you're just laying it out there, or are you guys going to honestly try to put that road right where that picture shows?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see section 2.2.2 in Chapter 2 Project Description, and section 4.9 Transportation, for discussion of traffic safety.</p> <p>The posted speed limit will be 35 to 45 mph, depending on location.</p>

Letter Code	Number	Comment	Response
		<p>safety is really being a factor in there. If people would just slow down, there wouldn't be an issue with this. People's property, you know, isn't the equity in my home going to go down now that there's a freeway running 850 feet from my property line? Because that's approximately how far I am back off of Bigelow Gulch is about 850 feet. You know, what are the people going to do with that? If my property is assessed a certain amount now and this construction starts going through and there's a million cars going up and down the highway all day; how am I going to deal with that? What are my options? Do I have any options?</p>	
		<p>TERRY MONTANYE: It's not a freeway in the proper term or a legal term, whatever, but it's going to turn into--you have two lanes running east and west. It's going to be a well-traveled highway. It's not an interstate, I understand that. Also, I'm going to say that my property line is 850 feet from Bigelow Gulch. My house, the property line is a pie shape. It could probably be more like 200 feet away from it. The animals that we have around, now that we're going to have--you may not think that it's more traffic. But people are going to know that it's there, that it's supposedly safer and quicker is the key. People are going to use that highway and there's going to be a lot of speeding on that highway. They speed on it right now. It's crazy. It's just going to get worse. So, anyhow, you're saying that you don't find that property values go down when you put a highway, road, whatever you want to call it through there, typically that</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.0	163	17	<p>that's not the case?</p> <p>So people are trying to get out of the city and live in the country in a nice area, then you have a million people going up and down a stretch of highway, that's not like it used to be.</p> <p>...there's an existing road that's smaller and that less vehicles travel. And some people choose not to travel it because they feel that it is more dangerous to travel, but now that it's going to be safer, we're going to get an influx of people that are going to be traveling it, speeders, they'll be more accidents. You know, I-90 the other day had, I don't know how many people involved in a multi, multi-collision because they drive too fast.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please discuss this issue, which is separate from the Environmental Assessment, with the Spokane County Engineer.</p>
03.0	163	18	<p>GERRY M. OLSON: Yeah, I'm sorry. It's Gerry M. Olson.</p> <p>You're going to spend 40 million dollars on a road that a lot of these people don't seem to want. I've got a road that you had blocked with concrete barricades for four years, and I can't even ride my horse on my property. Can't we take like a thousand of this and put a new culvert in my road before you create new ones that you're probably not going to maintain anyway?</p>	<p>Comment noted. The estimated cost of the project is \$52.6 million. Please see section 2.2 Purpose and Need, of this Revised EA for a discussion of the need for the project.</p> <p>Please see response to 163-17 above.</p>
45.0	163	19	<p>For five years my road is not a priority. It's been blocked for five years.... How long does it take to clean out a culvert and a ditch?</p> <p>GERRY M. OLSON: Okay. Let me go back to the gentleman's last question. How do the property values go</p>	<p>Please see section 2.2 Purpose and Need, of this Revised EA for a discussion of the need for the project.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.2	163	20	<p>up in this area when you've got a zillion cars going by and these people just want some quiet and peace and nature in their backyard? Where's the value to them?</p> <p>Is the only value measurement you're taking is a monetary one and not piece and enjoyment for the people around here? Is it just monetary to you guys? Is that your big priority?</p>	<p>Please see section 4.16 Socioeconomics and Chapter 5, 4(f) Evaluation for a discussion of the roadway and adjacent schools.</p>
20.0	163	21	<p>GERRY M. OLSON: And the road's going right by this grade school? And that's going to be safe for those grades?</p> <p>It's not safe for the kids to have a whole bunch of cars going by them all the time.</p> <p>GERRY M. OLSON: My problem, on my road is drainage. What have you done to accommodate proper drainage on this \$40 million project you're going to embark on? Are you going to have adequate culverts to drain the water for this project? And that's important to have good culverts and a good ditch system then?</p> <p>For the safety of the roads? But you look at my road as a different thing? As far as the ditches go, are you sure you're going to have enough drainage? And they're not going to be small, where they'll hold back all the water and artificially expand the flood plain so that the water is held back long enough, so that pretty soon these guys don't own their land anymore because it's got surface water on it? And now they don't own it, it's the county or the state or the government that owns the surface water once they divert it onto their property. How is that going to affect these folks?</p>	<p>Please see response to 163-17 above.</p> <p>The project will include drainage for the proposed roadway. Please see section 2.3.4 Design and Construction, and sections 4.3 Floodplains, and 4.5 Streams for a discussion on drainage and flooding.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Response
		<p>Proper drainage is really important. Drainage is really important. I know that for a fact. So there's no water that's going to be built up on either side of the road then? They don't have to worry about losing their land because of water settling all over it?</p>	
		<p>GERRY M. OLSON: And let's say this road gets put in. Let's say it goes through, in spite of what maybe a lot of people think, it goes through. And let's say years down the road, one of these people, they have a problem with one of the culverts or one of the ditches on this road, are you going to maintain it for them? Because that's what you're paid to do, right....?</p>	
40.0	163	22	<p>WAYNE MOREHEAD: My name is Wayne Morehead, by the way. My thing is, and I've bothered ...about.... is the wildlife. From the environmental things I've read, there's very little about the fish in the creek on the other side down towards Havana. The elk in the area, deer, access for them. My question is, what are you going to do for these things? What kind of protection is there? I clean up three to five deer a year in my pasture that I have to bury. Can I bill the county if that increases to twenty or thirty a year, because it will?</p> <p>These are my questions and the things that I want looked into. I think your person that looked into this originally maybe did not do the best job in the world, because the creek don't go dry. There's fish in it, whether they're native or not, I can't tell you. I know they've been there some years, but that don't mean they're native. They have been the elk, the moose. And it's going to kill people. It will kill the people. I'm not against you improving things. But let's do it right.</p>
55.2	163	23	<p>SPEAKER: Oh, I'm sorry. Evelyn McCarty. We live at 5315 North Sullivan which is just directly north of this building. My question is, number one, how are the children, I know underneath they're going to build tunnels, right now, they're talking about it, to get the children</p> <p>Thank you for your comment. As part of the planning process with the school district, an alternative of constructing an overpass vs. an underpass will be further explored during design. The issues you mention will be addressed as part of the design phase of the project. Please see the mitigation measures in Chapter 5 of this Revised EA.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	163	24	<p>from the middle school to the high school to use the tennis courts, to use the track? It's not only after school, it's during P.E. times, too, for their safety.</p> <p>EVELYN MCCARTY: Another one, do you realize that those tunnels will flood when we have a regular winter which there is a low--we have springs, which maybe some of you don't know. There's lots of springs around here and those tunnels will flood, I'll guarantee that.</p>	<p>See response to comment 163-23 above.</p>
55.0	163	25	<p>EVELYN MCCARTY: Okay. Another one is, are you going to fence the road? And is there going to be a five-lane road, a turn lane? Or is it all the way through?</p> <p>Has there been an alternative thought at all? Like going straight across, up above and coming down at Flora? It's steep there. You've all got graders and dirt throwers and whatever to level that out. Is there a possibility of leveling that out? Or is so steep to come down at Flora or Barker and miss the school children all together....?</p> <p>Why is it necessary to connect to Sullivan Road?</p> <p>Now, have you driven on that road now with the traffic the way it is now? "...it stacks up no matter what time of day it is? It'll just be worse.</p>	<p>Fencing will be provided along each side of the road between the schools. The roadway will be five-lanes. Please see Chapter 5 for further discussion. Alternatives routes were analyzed in Chapters 3 and Chapter 5 of the Revised EA. The proposed route would provide the necessary connection to Sullivan Road and will remove the current traffic from the front of the middle school.</p> <p>The need to connect to Sullivan Road is based on the traffic analysis and the necessary access to the Sullivan Road Interchange.</p> <p>This Revised EA includes an analysis of Sullivan Road and interchange. Please refer to section 4.9 Transportation, of the Revised EA.</p>
03.5	163	26	<p>RON HARDING: Ron Harding. Our comments and concerns, do they have any bearing on the outcome of this?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The January 2006 EA has been revised and addresses issues presented in testimony and by written comment. All sections of the Revised EA include additional background information and impact analyses. The public will have the opportunity to review and comment on this Revised EA during the public comment period and at another public hearing.</p>
55.2	163	27	<p>RON HARDING: But there's no chance it's not coming to fruition; correct? This is going to happen?</p> <p>So the concern is, is getting more people quick--getting more people to and from where they need to go, commuters from north Deer Park area, whatever, out to Liberty Lake or vice versa, Coeur d'Alene, to get a larger volume of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Federal Highway Administration will make a determination following public comment on the Revised EA.</p> <p>Please see section 2.2 in Chapter 2 Project Description for a description of the purpose and need for the project.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.2	163	28	<p>people in a quicker manner to and from their destination? "...it's not going to be safe.</p> <p>You guys keep saying it's going to be safe, but there's going to be higher volumes of traffic and the speeds are going to be increased, that's what's going to happen.</p> <p>UNKNOWN SPEAKER: Are safety concerns environmental concerns, is that going to be addressed later?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Safety is social concern and has been discussed in Chapter 2 and section 4.9 of this Revised EA.</p>
45.0	163	29	<p>ROGER GIDDINGS: My name is Roger Giddings. I live at 11812 East Bigelow. The question that I have is, is there a regulation on, I know from looking at the alignment in the other room that the proposed highway is going to go from the north pavement line south, from that pavement line south, which puts it pretty close to my front door. Is there a regulation on how close you can be to our house with the noise concerns and the safety concerns of something sliding off the road? If you increase truck traffic, we're not very far from something coming through our living room. We've had several wrecks in that area and that puts us so close to the road. So, my question is, is there a regulation on how close you can be to my house on a four-lane highway?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The width of the roadway and right of way are based on prescribed engineering standards and guidelines. A clear zone will be established on each side of the roadway. Spokane County will be working with all adjacent landowners regarding the exact location of the right of way on properties.</p>
65.0	163	30	<p>ROGER GIDDINGS: Also we've got, I think from the information I've got, we've got like 9,000 cars a day, cars and trucks a day, and they expect it to be 19,000 a day. So the noise issue, because it's going to increase truck traffic which it's designed to do quite a bit. So it's going to be a noise issue.</p>	<p>See Section 4.11 of this Revised EA for discussions of noise related to the project.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	163	31	NEW SPEAKER: These series of meetings, well still have until April 12 to turn in comments?	Comments were received through April 28, 2006.
40.0	163	32	BEVERLY CABBAGE: My name is Beverly Cabbage. I live at 5309 North Sullivan Road which is just across the ball field from here. We have a multitude of concerns about the road going through. One is about the wildlife itself. Yeah, turkeys are expendable, peacocks are expendable, deer are expendable, I guess if you look at it that way: but there's also lots of other wildlife that just this morning, 40 turkeys were in our yard and driveway, 27 peacocks, 4 deer were there. There's trails for them. They were in the field just the other day. There was a cougar that brought a deer down in our backyard about two and a half, no, about five weeks ago. And we're assuming it was a cougar that brought it down, the deer in the pasture across the road about three or four days later. And so, there's moose there. Actually, the moose do the pruning on our pear trees. They're there often enough to take care of that. We have a great concern about--there's much wildlife that's there.	Thank you for your comments. See Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for discussion of wildlife.
55.2	163	33	We have a great concern about the kids also. I'm not sold on the way the kids have to go back and forth between the two school.	Please see section 4.16 Socioeconomics and Chapter 5, 4(f) Evaluation for a discussion of the roadway and adjacent schools.
05.1	163	34	The reason to me, looking at it, is that Sullivan is the road of choice because that's the most expeditious route from the Valley to the north side right now. I don't know why it wouldn't be just as expeditious for those in Liberty Lake or east of us in north Idaho to go up Flora Road, if there was another option, bypassing the schools	Please see response to comment 163 -25 above.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.0	163	35	<p>And, yes, those of us who have lived here for a long time, this area out here is a flood plain. And, what I remember, it is wet there and there's water all the time. So, we don't know if that means that you'll have to raise the road up above that which--how do you then protect those us who live right over there from the noise pollution, just the plain pollution of the exhaust when those trucks, and that letter is changing everyday, it says that's it's going to be the truck or the freight route? I can't remember if that's the phrase that was used, but freight truck route which means there will be much harmonic noise and pollution to control that we are very concerned about, the people who are living there.</p>	<p>and everything. That's not been answered. It just seems that would be a safer route without introducing more cars on Sullivan Road, which we don't need. It may be a five-lane road that your planning, but Sullivan Road is already so backed up. It can take you a half hour to go from our house here to the mall down there any time, almost every afternoon. We allow a half hour to go there, just those three miles. So, it's a great concern that we have. I'm not sure how that would be more expeditious or safer for the children as well. It seems like taking Bigelow Gulch over the top and down Flora would be more efficient to get things done. So that's a great concern we have as we think about those things.</p>
40.0	163	36	<p>And we are concerned about, how do you keep the wildlife, which there is so much here, how do you keep that off the road? How do you keep not just the wildlife safe, but how do you keep the drivers safe because there is much. The other day, the show in the pasture, we assume it was a</p>	<p>Section 4.3 of the Revised Environmental Assessment discusses the designation, permitting and mitigation associated with floodplains.</p> <p>Trucks are currently using and will continue to use the route. Please see section 2.2 of the Revised EA regarding freight transport.</p> <p>Thank you for your comment. Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA for a discussion of wildlife. It will not be possible to keep wildlife off the roadway. The project will offer greater sight distance for drivers to see wildlife in the roadway or adjacent clear zone.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>cougar again, there were bald eagles circling, there were ravens, there was all kinds of wildlife. And that would not be that far removed from it. I don't know. It's just a concern that we have. These are just some concerns that I would like to voice. There's probably other things that I can't think of right now, but that's some of the things we've been talking about. It just seems like maybe there would be a more efficient and expeditious route than Sullivan Road.</p>	
55.0	163	37	<p>DALE LaBROESE: My name is Dale LaBroese. I live at 5310 North Sullivan, directly across from the previous lady that was here. And I sure want to pretty much ditto everything that she commented on. I have a piece of property that adjoins the play fields. We're really concerned about the kids. And pretty much everybody has covered most of my concerns.</p> <p>I'm still--there's one small junction where you turn onto Sullivan down passed the school. It looks like a relatively large spring and any time of year, there's water running there. I don't exactly know how that is being addressed, what that entails, and where that water will now run? In addition to that, every spring season, baseball in particular, there's hundreds of cars parked at an angle to us, all the East Valley girls baseball games. You know, there's very little parking as it is now, and the football games for East Valley High School and Junior High, I'm particularly concerned about the parking availability. Where is that going to be? It may have been covered, but I haven't heard that addressed yet.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 163 -23. Please see section 4.13 of this Revised EA regarding parking for sports activities.</p> <p>A schematic of parking will be developed with the East Valley School District during the design phase of the project. We recommend that you request information regarding parking from the school district and Spokane County during that time.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.1	163	38	<p>"...we can't make space. There's only so much space there and if we're going to eliminate a ball field or two, and we're going to make four lanes and a center lane out of it, is all of that going to be fenced so that children can access, I guess, it must be, is that true?</p> <p>"...At what point will we see some type of--do we have any input into what type of schematic is actually picked out for parking and how it's going to be handled?</p> <p>DALE LABROESE: Many times you've said that you've chosen Flora are that people very much want the feeder to Sullivan. And I guess I'm wondering who all of these people are that want that feeder?</p> <p>"... At one point, we were told that this entire planning and the development of the road system was to be ready for the growth of our community over the next twenty years. And many people have commented about going to Flora, Barker, etc. It seems like if we already have kind of a traffic snarl during certain times on Sullivan that if we were really planning for the next twenty years, we might go a little further east and try and distribute some of that traffic. I know you're responsible, I don't know, but people would go farther east and still turn back and come through Sullivan, I'm guessing. I guess I'm covering what's already been covered.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Use of Flora is based on the results of traffic analyses conducted by Spokane County Public Works.</p> <p>An analysis of alternatives was conducted for the project and is presented in Chapter 3 of this Revised EA.</p>
05.5	163	39	<p>MARILYN HIGHBERG: I'm Marilyn Highberg. I live on Orchard Prairie on East Summit Road. And I know Mr. Kelly fairly well. My question is around the decision to do an environmental assessment rather than an EIS. As you know, I made a request, as part of the Prairie Protection Association, for all the records that we're allowed to look at and have as part of public documents. We made that request on the tenth of March. Our first opportunity to</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see section 1.4 of this Revised EA regarding EAs and EISs. The need for a full EIS will be determined by FHWA following review of this Revised EA.</p> <p>As previously mentioned, this Revised EA has included an expanded analysis based on public comment on the January 2006 EA.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>look at some of those was yesterday. And what I was curious about, as I looked back in those records, and they don't go back very far, it looks like there was a decision made in about 99 or 2000 to do an EA rather than EIS. And as we look six years later, at the magnitude of this project, was that a wise decision to do an EA? And an EIS probably is going to give us more information about the part I'm hearing, about wetlands and wildlife and traffic. That's my question.</p> <p>"... I don't agree with the depth of your study at this point.</p>	
05.5	163	40	<p>My next question then is, this comment period was extended to April 12, and that's not very far away now, I still don't have access to all the documents that I need to make comments prior to April 12. So I'm hoping that there's some way we can fix that. The period closes. And then who makes the decision as to whether or not the comments that were received here or other written comments, do indeed need further looking and should be looked at further than an EA?</p> <p>"...the county engineers will look at them (comments) first and say that we've adequately covered it and then you sign off, and you send it to the State. Is that the way it works? And is there an appeal process and at what point...</p>	<p>Comment noted. The comments received and responses to those comments are presented in Tables 3-2 and 3-3 of this appendix.</p> <p>The comments were reviewed and responded to jointly by Spokane County and their consultant, with review and comment by WSDOT and FHWA.</p> <p>Appeal can occur following FHWA's decision or through a court process.</p>
03.5	163	41	<p>I live at 11615 North Guinevere Drive, Spokane, 99218. My family owns property that butts (sic) against Jensen Road and Bigelow Gulch Road. The fire station on the corner there of Jensen and Bigelow Gulch Road, the property was</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Notice of Open house was mailed to each property owner along Bigelow Gulch Road. Please be sure to provide your name and mailing address for the record.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
40.0	163	42	<p>purchased from my father who is now deceased. My concerns about this project are varied. My biggest concern is that for something of this magnitude, the process effectively, whether it was on purpose or not, eliminated my family's input. I have received no mailings on this. I have received no information. I do pay taxes on that land. There's a 17.9-acre parcel there. I do get the tax statements, but I did not get any information about any of this. Had it not been for someone that I know informing me even of this meeting, I would have not known it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. See Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for an expanded discussion of wildlife.</p> <p>Noise is discussed in Section 4.11 of this Revised EA.</p>
03.5	163	43	<p>I don't live on the Bigelow Gulch Road but our family has owned that property since approximately 1962. We grew up in this area. We enjoy the animals. And like some of the people have said before, there are deer, there are elk, there are eagles, there are waterfowl that come through the Gulch, there's a huge herd of elk that on any given day, I've seen 25 to 30 of them. And if they've going to be traveling around this area, what part of the EA has dealt with that? This part of the country is a beautiful part of the country, a lot of people move here because of the environment, because of the animals, because of nature and city being close together and somehow seeming to be in harmony. I'm just very concerned about that aspect of it, about the animals. And also the noise factor has not really been adequately addressed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Notice of Open house was mailed to each property owner along Bigelow Gulch Road.</p> <p>As you know, the fire station has proceeded separately with improvements to the fire station. During the design phase, Spokane County will coordinate with property owners regarding project right of way.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	163	44	<p>I would really appreciate knowing why, as individual private person's, we would have to do it if we wanted to develop lands. We would have to actually have an Environmental Impact Statement done but the county can get away with the lesser, the less complete. I'm not trying to minimize it, but it's a lesser type of environmental study. And I find that very unusual and very disconcerting. A private developer would have to go the full nine yards. The county should, ought to go with the full nine yards, too, for the Environmental Impact study. That's all I have to say. Thank you.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to 163-39 above regarding an EIS.</p>
55.0	163	45	<p>NEW SPEAKER: I just have a quick question. I was just wondering when you're going to know for sure exactly where the road is going to go? It's real difficult for those of us who have houses right on the road to make any plans until the county planning can tell us what's happening there. Do you know when that's going to happen?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please response to comment 163-15 above regarding location of the proposed roadway.</p> <p>The project schedule will be determined by the time needed to complete NEPA approval and project design. Please refer to section 2.3.4 Design and Construction in Chapter 2 of this Revised EA for an estimated schedule of construction once the project has been approved.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.1	163	46	<p>JEANETTE BODEN: Hi, my name is Jeanette Boden, and I live at North 5018 Evergreen Road. I'm not directly impacted by this other than I've lived here for 27 years. My children all went to East Valley School District and graduated from here. I see that the Section 6 part of this is my main concern. In the design, it splits the school district in half because of the road coming done between East Valley Middle School and East Valley High School. I'd like to see it moved to the east, as the gentleman, two gentlemen--two people ago, was talking about. Why not bring it down Barker Road which is already built to four lanes? You're building a road where there's been none existing right now. You're also coming down through an area, coming down off of Forker Road, cutting off a piece of property there where there are homes along that area, especially on the east side of Forker. And you are talking about an environmental impact and the ground erosion in there, which is already a flood plain area. Anybody who lives below that area pays a higher amount for their home-owners insurance for flood insurance because of that. That will definitely impact what conditions will happen there. It could turn that whole part of the Valley in there into just flood ranges there because there's nothing to prevent--the erosion that would happen because of the road being built. There isn't a road there now.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see Chapter 3 of this Revised EA for the analysis of project alternatives.</p>
05.1	163	47	<p>My other suggestion is, they keep talking about all this traffic and this bottleneck at Progress and Forker. Why not put a traffic light in there. It would</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. A traffic signal alone at the intersection of Forker and Progress Roads does not address the remaining safety issues along the corridor.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
40.0	163	48	<p>save you thousands of dollars and then you wouldn't have all those, you know, the problems with the accidents there.</p> <p>Now, I understand the idea that it has to be with straightening out parts of Bigelow Gulch and even widening it, but making it a freeway is just like beyond belief to me. I've always known that to be just be rural. There's deer, there's elk, there's quail, there's pheasant, there's everything up along that area. Any drive that you take along there, you're going to see something.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The proposed project does not construct a freeway but rather the proposal is to add another lane in each direction and a left turn lane where needed and where a left turn lane is not necessary, to maintain the separation of the traffic to minimize head-on collisions.</p> <p>See Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for an expanded discussion of wildlife.</p>
55.2	163	49	<p>The school district, I'm sure, is working with you, as I've heard from many people; but, are they looking into what that will also do with putting a tunnel between two schools and an increase in drug activity and all kinds of different things that will happen with students that have another area to hide out in? You know, how that's going to cost more for us as taxpayers because of hiring people to manage the tunnel during school hours and after school hours. There's going to have to be something set up to protect kids or anybody using it at all. I would think, anyway. If I had children, I'd want some kind of provision that something was going to happen that way.</p> <p>So those are kind of my issues and where I stand on this, that way. I think you need to find an alternative to splitting up the school district. I think that's my biggest concern right now, are the school children. It's never happened here before that we've ever had to even contemplate something splitting up the whole school district like that and the kids do use both schools interactively.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see response to comment 163-23 above regarding the tunnel.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	163	50	JOHN HANNA : My name is John Hanna. Two questions. One is, tell me what the signage is going to look like on 1-90, right around the Sullivan area. Tell me what the signage is going to look like on the North/South freeway right around Francis..."	Thank you for your comment. The details for signage at the Sullivan Road/1-90 interchange and at the North/South freeway will be defined during the design phase by the Eastern Region office of WSDOT working with Spokane County Public Works.
55.2	163	51	JOHN HANNA: And tell me about plans for any traffic signals at Jensen Road. JOHN HANNA: My concern is the residents of those houses there. It's dangerous now. It's going to be much, much, much more dangerous in the future especially if you have double capacity on those roads. And I would really like to see a lot of careful thought and planning and letting the county pay for that instead of trying to find some poor developer that wants to add three lots and try to have him come up with the money. It needs to be done when you do this road, not down the line.	Thank you for your comment. The 20-year traffic projections do not indicate that a traffic signal is warranted however the intersection will be monitored for future traffic control needs. The line of sight will be improved with the road reconstruction.
55.2	163	52	NEW SPEAKER: I live across the street on Wellesley, right over there. And for those people who say this is going to be a freeway, I'm sorry. Forker, Progress, and Wellesley are already a freeway. I cannot get out of my driveway. BRENDA WAGGONER: I'm sorry. My name is Brenda Waggoner. I can't get out of my driveway. This is a four-way stop. This is a four-way stop. I mean, some days I feel like I just need to throw something to get somebody to stop so I can get out of my driveway. When the ball fields are being played, not only do I have traffic going	Thank you for your comments. Spokane County will coordinate with the School District during the design phase to address the needs of the District for movement and safety of students. Please refer to response to comment 163-23 regarding the tunnel. The proposed project would reduce traffic on portions of Wellesley Avenue.

Letter Code	Number	Comment	Response
		<p>straight across my street coming from east to west, but I've got people now coming from the north, directly up. I've had the power pole hit in front of my house. The transformer has been taken out. The dog has been hit. The kids have almost been hit going across the street. The apartments that are right here, people will drive through that land because they don't want to have to deal with going to the four-way stop. We've had kids almost hit that are walking or riding their bike being hit by people who live in those apartment buildings coming through the fields, going over the humps and coming through my driveway to go out on Wellesley.</p>	
		<p>I've lived here 29 years and this road has been promised for 29 years. Yes, I have concerns about it coming between the schools. I don't like the idea of a tunnel, and I understand that the reason you're doing this is because of the handicap issue, because you have to do that. I see no problem with going up and over the top.</p>	
		<p>Why cant it be a grade like what they've got down at Gonzaga that goes up and over the top of the Centennial Trail? It can just be a longer one that deals with the school. And then put coverage over it so the kids cant throw things over the bridge, or somebody cant jump, or something like that. But I don't like an idea of a tunnel, because for me, you put kids in a tunnel and if there's nobody coming, some bully can do something to somebody and you wouldn't even know it. There's no visual. At least on an overpass there's visual. But I'm ready for something different. I mean, it's been--the dust, the traffic, I'm just concerned about the kids. This is a play area for kids. In all the years</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.1	163	53	<p>I've lived here, there's been kids that have been hit right here on the corner of Progress and Wellesley because people are driving. They're not paying attention to the fact that these kids are there. I've got bus traffic in the morning. I've got high school traffic. I've got traffic that goes to the mall, traffic that goes to Industrial Park.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
55.1	163	53	<p>To me, if you want to take this and take it down to Barker, it's not going to help. People who go to Industrial Park are still going to come through this way. You've got the big trucks that come on this road because again, they know this is the shortcut from this side of the city to the north side. It's not going to stop the big trucks that want to just go from Industrial Park to the north side. They're not going to go out of their way to go to Barker to get a road that's going to take them that way. They're still going to come this way.</p>	<p>So to me, to go out to Barker, yeah, it helps for some people, but it's not going to help with the traffic situation. And Industrial Park just keeps getting busier and busier. And after living on this road for 29 years, I can tell you that the traffic is getting worse every year. I don't want this to be Phase 6. I'm ready for it to be Phase 1. And I guess it's just because I live right there. I know it impacts a lot of other people and there's not many of us that live on that road. And so it impacts a lot of people who live in other areas; but truly, this is already a freeway. I'd rather give people four or five lanes than giving them two, and they're trying to use it as a freeway. People pass, in front of my house, as if there's a passing lane there. Kids who go to the school,</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>people who go there, the traffic in front of my house, the speed sometimes has got to probably be 50 miles an hour, if not more. There's motorcycles that you can hear them hit there, and they're probably doing 70 by the time they get to Progress.</p> <p>And my neighbor at one time, he got so tired of it. He was standing in the front yard, this wasn't recently but years ago. He was so angry, and traffic wasn't what it is now. His daughter's doll was sitting in the driveway. He picked up the doll and threw it out into the street because the cars were coming by so fast. And when the guy stopped, he got out, and he was shaking; but the guy told him, that could have been my kid, and you would have never seen him before you hit him.</p> <p>But I'm ready for something new.</p>	
55.0	163	54	<p>SCOTT CRAWFORD: My name is Scott Crawford. I live on Thierman Road. My concern lies with what's happening on the more westerly part of this project. In talking to your engineer, I was kind of surprised at his--let's see, how do I put it? He didn't seem to be putting a lot of emphasis as to what's happening as Thierman intersects with the new Bigelow Gulch. And my concern is, I'm aware of the Valley Springs Project. I know you can't stop progress, nobody really thinks they can. It's going to come out, and it's going to join with Thierman and then Valley Springs. And if I lived in Northwood, and I'm in the two-thirds west part of Northwood, instead of going back to Argonne, heck, I'm going to go straight down Columbia. I'm going to come to Thierman, I'm going to go north on Thierman. And according</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The intersection of Thierman Road and Bigelow Gulch Road would be reconstructed as part of the project. The specific design details will be developed as part of the construction plans.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	163	55	<p>to the way you guys have it set up right now, I'm going to come to a "T" with no left-hand turn lane which means if I actually am coming from the other direction, I'd like to turn right. Guess what? I'm going to be backed up, car after car after car. Because when you think about the natural flow of traffic, if I'm coming from this side, and I'm going up this hill, obviously, I'm not going to be wanting to head back east if I'm headed west. So, I'd like to hear if there's going to be some attention paid to this Thierman, this Thierman, Bigelow Gulch "T". Because right now, it looks like you guys aren't counting on anywhere from 600 to 1500 more cars that this Valley Springs connection is going to grab.</p>	
55.0	163	55	<p>I'm also concerned as you guys go through your construction. How are you going to keep people from utilizing the Valley Springs Road down to Wellesley? Anybody that has driven that road, knows that it's a borderline road with the traffic that it gets right now. Between that very sharp S-curve and the S-curve--the tight curve that goes around the water tower. I can't tell you how many people I've talked to that simply refuse to use that road. They live in the area. It would save them time. It would be a great choice to get them where they want to go if they're heading to the southern part of the city, but they refuse to use it. They go up and they use Bigelow. Well, guess what? You get Bigelow all screwed up, that road is going to become a conduit. Everybody trying to get away from Bigelow Gulch is going to use that road.</p> <p>Fourth of July last year, I got in a head-on</p>	<p>Valley Springs Road is not planned to be a detour for Bigelow Gulch Road. There is currently planning efforts underway (separate from the Bigelow Gulch Corridor Project) that are looking at Valley Springs Road for future improvements. These planning efforts are driven by proposed land developments in the neighborhood.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
25.0	163	56	<p>accident on that road with some kid who was driving too fast, and we had nowhere to go. The road, it was on the S-curve. You've got about 25-feet of view as you round that curve and unfortunately, that's the exact instant he was heading in our direction. I broke my arm, broke my sister's arm and totaled her van. It's a very under improved road for the area. The fact that Valley Springs is going to be joining in with Columbia and then you throw that on top of the fact that you're going to be doing this thing with Bigelow, I'm not liking what I see as far as safety of traffic around that area. I think it needs to be really looked at more carefully. And I would like to hear from you guys by the time this is all done, and you've done your studies that you're paying very close attention to the joining of Columbia into Valley Springs into Thierman, and how that all is going to affect the traffic out there. Because it doesn't sound to me like right now that's being looked at very carefully at all. That would be my hope.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Hydraulics and flood zone analysis are part of the design efforts that will be considered when designing this road project. This topic is discussed in Section 4.3 of the Revised EA as a 500-year flood zone.</p>
			<p>GENE LORENSON: I'm Gene E. Lorensen. I live on Jensen Road, just north of Bigelow Gulch. In all of the things that have been going on concerning the road, I know that there's no mention of the flood that occurred right about 1950, I believe. We had a flood occur that took out two bridges and washed a whole house down the creek for as far as a city block.</p>	
			<p>This was the little creek that goes through Bigelow Gulch. And, obviously, this is not a usual occurrence, but it did happen. There was a humongous thunderstorm, water built up, took out bridges, took out a house and so on. I just want that particular thing put in the record. And for any highway</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
40.5	163	57	<p>improvements and things like that, they should consider that, the possibility of that flood is always there.</p> <p>GENE LORENSON: Another thing that's not in the Environmental Assessment thing is the fact that we do now have bald eagles adjacent to Bigelow Gulch. There have been a least three of them in the field right at the beginning of the project near Havana. They're regularly seen on Pleasant Prairie. And when the people who came to do the assessment, perhaps they weren't around then, but they are there now. And we do see them. Okay, I just wanted to get those two items in the record.</p>	<p>Comment noted. Please see section 4.6 of the Revised EA for a discussion of Bald Eagles and their habitat.</p>
40.0	163	58	<p>PAULA MILLER: My name is Paula Miller. I live on 8413 North Palmer Road. I don't know very much about your environmental study because I just learned about your project on Sunday. I want to know what you studied about our wildlife, the elk, the deer, the birds, the turkeys, the quail. We live on a, we live on a road that's really, I mean, we have so many wildlife. It's just, it's like--I just want to know what your study has been on, you know, environmentally. What is this going to do to the impact of our elk herd, our deer, I mean, our turkeys and our quail? Have you done any study?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA for discussion of wildlife.</p>
65.0	163	59	<p>PAULA MILLER: Noise factor. What is this going to do? How is this going to impact on the noise? I mean, you're increasing from a two lane to, I think, it's a four or five? (Four with a turn lane). "...And this is going to impact our traffic flow immensely. I mean...."</p>	<p>Noise is discussed in section 4.11 of the Revised EA.</p>
03.5	163	60	<p>PAULA MILLER: Do you have anything else I can read on what you've done. I don't have a computer.</p>	<p>I Thank you for your comments. Paper copies of the Revised EA will be provided for review at the Spokane Public Library and the Argonne Public Library, as well as at the Spokane County Public Works office.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>I have been asking. Nobody seems to know about our elk. I mean, we have..." They don't live here. They just collared another cow this year, and they're going to calve because they hang out in our yard, and we know this.</p>	<p>Please see section 4.6 of this Revised EA for a discussion of the elk herd. Additional information regarding the herd was derived from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.</p>
			<p>Is there anyway that I can get information, since I don't have a computer. And I know that you put your comments and your agendas and everything, put them in the newspaper. A lot of us don't get the newspaper. A lot of us work, you know, we don't read newspapers, we don't all we see is this billboard on the side of the road as you're driving, and you're trying to read what it says, you know, "public meeting." And I'll say, somebody catch the rest of it when we come down the road. Just tell me what it says. I mean, I didn't even know until my neighbor called and told us. That's why I'm here, to try and figure out more what I need to learn....</p> <p>"...I just want more study on our elk, deer and everything else.</p>	<p>A notice of availability of the Revised EA will be sent to all who commented on the January 2006 EA either in writing or during testimony at the public hearing.</p>
55.0	163	61	<p>ED FREDERICK: " East 7411 Bigelow Gulch. You have a proposed frontage road. Proposed, I'm assuming. I understand there's not a definite plan at this point? I mean, your Project 3 is where I'm referring to.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The frontage roads are no longer a part of the proposed project. During the design phase, Spokane County will coordinate with property owners regarding the right of way on their property.</p>
			<p>Well, I guess I like the idea because in this case, it would put the highway further away from my house. I know that doesn't make everybody happy, but I know you're going to go through with this one way or the other. Just one concern I have on a piece of parcel. You show the culvert as turning around in the middle of one of my parcels and the access road is on the far side of it. There's a gate there existing. I just wanted to make sure that the culvert or turnaround, I would</p>	<p>Names and addresses of property owners and those commenting on the January 2006 EA have been compiled.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment	Response
65.0	163	62 Do you need parcel numbers or addresses? ED FREDERICK: I have a question then on noise. I mean, obviously, I'm as close as anybody on that highway, probably closer than most. And noise has always been a problem. I would definitely like anything you could do as far as a noise barrier. I know you're proposing some kind of noise wall down in this area someplace for houses that are close. Would that be anything that could be looked at?	Thank you for your comments. During the design phase, Spokane County will coordinate with property owners regarding specific aspects of their property.
45.0	163	63 ED FREDERICK: I mean, we can't even hardly get the paper any more because you can't get across the highway. That brings up another point. How is the mail route going to change? Newspaper delivery? I mean, are we going to be able to put those right at the house? Are we going to have a central mailbox? Any plans been devised on that?	Thank you for your comments. During the design phase, Spokane County will coordinate with the U.S. Postal Service and property owners regarding mailbox locations.
55.0	163	64 ED FREDERICK: On the end of that cul-de-sac, I know you're--you just brought me a picture to look at. I'm assuming if you plan on building on people's property, you will be contacting them. Do you know what the highway width is going to be? Is there--do you have the access road and directly beside that the highway or shoulder? The one road says 22 feet, as far as from the one road to the freeway, it's going to be four lanes. He wasn't sure on how far apart that was going to be from the front of the road.	Comment noted. As previously mentioned, the frontage roads are no longer a part of the proposed project. The right of way width will be 120 feet, with a combined pavement and median width of 76 feet for the "Rural" portion of the project. The pavement and median width (curb-to-curb) will be 72 feet for the "Urban" portion of the project. The "Urban" portion will also include 6-foot wide sidewalks on each side of the road (please see Figures 2-2 and 2-3 of this Revised EA for a diagram of the roadways). Please refer to Figure 2-1 for the roadway alignment.
60.0	163	65 KATHY STIERWALT: My name is Kathy Stierwalt. I live at 7204 East Bigelow Gulch Road. My concerns on this	Comments noted. Please see section 4.10 of the Revised EA for a discussion of air quality. As previously mentioned, the frontage roads are no longer a part

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
65.0	163	66	<p>project are environmental concerns. Because of the increased traffic, I would be concerned about the air quality. One statement I read said that because the traffic will be moving more continuously on the new proposed road and not having to slow down for people turning or to make those curves down in the Gulch, that the air quality would actually be improved because there would be less build up of the emissions from traffic having to sit and idle like it does at stop lights or whatever. So I can understand that.</p> <p>But my concern is that if you use these frontage roads for people to access the highway, and you don't put a stop light on it, then that will keep the traffic flowing freely on the highway. But then I don't understand what the purpose of the frontage road is if there's no stop light for people to access the highway from their driveways. Why not just access it from your driveway? Why do you need a frontage road? To me, the only purpose a frontage road would have is if there's a stop light there, so you can safely access the highway from the frontage road by stopping the traffic on the highway. And then, if you do put the stop light in, you're reversing the effects of the air quality because traffic is going to be stopped and idling at those intersections. So, air quality is a concern of mine.</p>	<p>of the proposed project.</p>
65.0	163	66	<p>Noise is a concern of mine. And our house is a quarter mile away from the existing highway right now. But the new highway proposed is going to be closer to our house and those frontage roads are going to be closer even to our house. And I don't see any way that a noise</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please refer to the tables and figures in section 4.11 of this Revised EA regarding noise impacts.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.0	163	67	<p>barrier, whether it be a berm or trees, I mean you'd have to construct that along the entire length of this new proposed highway which is what, six, eight miles, for it to truly be effective for all the people that live along there. So, I don't think there's anyway to control the noise, unless there's something in the plans that I haven't read.</p> <p>So noise issues are definitely a concern because, according to the proposals, the traffic is going to double by the year 2020. So there's going to be a lot more noise. The houses that are along Bigelow Gulch now, especially from the west side, west of Argonne, they're already fairly close to the road and a lot of them are going to be even closer with the new road proposed. So, noise is going to be an absolute definite issue. And I don't think it's been addressed, or I haven't seen any studies that can really show us what the noise will be when the traffic doubles. I don't think it will be in acceptable levels for a residential area.</p> <p>Other environmental concerns, along the west end of the project from Havana say out to Weile where there's going to be massive amounts of earth moving taking place to fill in the Gulch and raise the road and however all that works, there would be concerns of water supply out there. There's a lot of people that have wells there. Will that be affected by the movement of that much earth? Will the water supplies be affected? Will your wells still be good? Has any of that been addressed?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please see sections 4.2 and 4.5 of the Revised EA regarding water supply and quality.</p>
40.0	163	68	<p>I definitely have concerns about the wildlife, as</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Please refer to section 4.6 of this Revise EA for additional information on wildlife.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.0	163	69	<p>well, that people previous to me have stated. There's deer and elk in the area; and right now, deer are being killed quite frequently on Bigelow Gulch with the traffic as it is now. So, if you're going to increase the traffic by that much, and I think it's pretty much impossible to keep the deer off the road, so you're going to have that many more incidents of animals being hit on the road. And, obviously, they're traffic hazards. Any time an animal is hit, usually there's a potential accident occurring between two vehicles or the one vehicle leaving the road. So animals on the road would definitely be a concern. I think that's all I have.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments.</p>
			<p>LES STONE: I appreciate the fact that a number of the people in the area where the road is going to be built have legitimate objections to the construction and to the fact that there's extra traffic. However, one of the things that's really clear is we are not going to stop the increase of the number of people in the area, the increase in the amount of traffic that's in the area. And that really isn't possible. We keep encouraging more development. We keep inviting people to come and make a more vibrant community. And we have to provide the infrastructure to do that.</p> <p>So I think the question is, where are you going to put the traffic? You're not going to eliminate it. And I have not heard anybody that's opposed to the project come up with a better alternative. And there's a fair amount, you know, not in my backyard, which is certainly understandable but not really practical. To take a route that's already there, it's basically through a rural area</p>	

Letter Code	Number	Comment	Response
		<p>that is not heavily populated, relative to other options, seems like a very good idea to me. The other alternate is to run them through the City of Spokane which is already heavily congested, particularly at change of shifts and at rush hour. Their new freeway isn't going to be built for another 20 years and the traffic isn't going to sit and wait for 20 years.</p>	
		<p>I want to assure people, I have had an opportunity to work with the county engineers on the MacMahan Road Project where they demonstrated a level of excellence that I have not seen in public officials in about 30 years of running projects involving dealing with public entities anywhere before. Their ability to listen and to take suggestions, not just sit and wait for people to quit talking, is just impressive. And I think Spokane County ought to be really pleased to be served by that kind of quality operation.</p>	
		<p>Some of the work that they have done on this project, particularly the interchange where Forker comes into the new road with an overpass and smooth blending of traffic, is something that those of us that live in the area, when we heard about the project, couldn't imagine it could be that good. I mean, we thought of ways to do it. And we were sure that we would at least have a traffic light or a long stop at a stop light to get into the traffic stream, and because of your creativity, you came up with a better solution which looks like it'll work really well. So, I would congratulate you for that. Well done.</p>	
		<p>And I think that the project looks like it will really smooth out the flow of traffic that has to come from the north to the east end of the Valley, and you need to</p>	

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
20.0	163	70	<p>do something. I can't imagine how you can come up with an alternate solution. I certainly haven't heard any proposals, other than we don't like what's there. And I can understand that, but that's how our system works. So thank you for your good efforts. I appreciate that. Anything I can do to help or to encourage you to continue on, so be it.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The issue of groundwater quality and quantity is addressed in section 4.2 Groundwater, of this Revised EA. Spokane County will follow a pre- and post-construction survey and mitigation protocol of wells located within 1,000 feet of the proposed right of way.</p>
65.0	163	71	<p>AL DURAZO: My name is Alfonso Durazo. I live at north 7016 Palmer Road. My concern is, basically, I understand what's going to go on. I can accept that. It's probably at the corner of Palmer and Bigelow Gulch. I guess the road is going to be elevated another ten feet or so. It so happens that I've got easement rights into my neighbor's property that there's a shallow well there, approximately really close to that intersection. What kind of affect is it going to have when the construction starts to happen and the runoff from the road down into his property--which, I believe, the county is going to try to buy part of his property, and I think he's willing to sell--and so, that's basically my only question, me and the other property owner next to him. Because I believe the road is going to have to be elevated. And you're going to have to elevate Palmer Road also. Does that make sense, what I'm saying? So basically, that's my question. I would just like to have that addressed.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Section 4.11 of this revised EA provides the noise analysis and identifies potential mitigation measures. During the design phase, Spokane County will work with the affected property owners to identify potential measures to reduce noise.</p>
65.0	163	71	<p>JIM STRANDY: I'm Jim Strandy. I live on 6017 East Lyons Lane and have for the last 23 years, which is just above the canyon or south of the canyon as the first Weile Road comes down to Bigelow Gulch, where you're going to have the first exchange. As I understand, you're going to raise that grade by 20 or 30 feet so you match the hillside going east. Correct?</p>	<p>Section 46.37.390 of the Spokane County Code Title 46 Motor Vehicles, states that "Every motor vehicle shall at all times be equipped with a muffler in good working order and in constant operation to prevent excessive or unusual</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.0	163	72	<p>So we're on the West Weile, up above West Weile. My question is, what sort of noise abatement are you going to have? We've been here for 23 years, so we're use to having some quietness. We can still hear Bigelow Gulch. We can't see it. Although we'll probably see it in the new alignment. But my main concern is, what type of noise abatement is the county going to plan on doing there to keep the noise down to as much of a minimum as possible?</p> <p>On the south side, it's all open country. It's open pasture land, so you're going to have to have something there to abate that noise as it roars up that canyon. I think it's going to get worse. What about prohibiting Jake brakes? So why can't the county put some type of noise abatement of no Jake brakes in that area? It's a rural area, so why are they having a freeway going through there without some type of ordinance that would keep that down. Shouldn't they put signs up saying "No Jake brakes allowed"?</p>	<p>noise, and no person shall use a muffler cutout, bypass, or similar device upon a motor vehicle on a highway." There is no Spokane County ordinance that specifies Jake brakes. Chapter 173-62 WAC Motor Vehicle Noise Performance Standards, establishes requirements for noise from motor vehicles operating on public highways. WAC 173-62-030 states "No person shall operate any motor vehicle or any combination of such vehicles upon any public highway under any conditions of grade, load, acceleration or deceleration in such a manner as to exceed the maximum permissible sound levels for the category of vehicle in Table 1 (In-use Motor Vehicle Noise Performance Standards), as measured at a distance of 50 feet (15.2 meters) from the center of the lane of travel within the speed limits specified..." The maximum allowable sound level (dBA) for a motor vehicle over 10,000 pounds GWR is 86 dBA. There is no mention of Jake brakes.</p>
55.0	163	73	<p>JIM STRANDY: What's the posted speed limit going to be on his highway?</p> <p>NEW SPEAKER: A couple of years ago, they talked about increasing the speed on Sullivan from 35 to 40. And I didn't know whatever happened to that?</p>	<p>The posted speed limit will be 45 mph, with some areas at 35 mph (intersection of Argonne/Bigelow Road, for a short section west of Jensen Road, and in the urban area near Havana, and between the middle and high school at the far eastern end of the project.</p> <p>Sullivan Road is within the City of Spokane Valley. The speed limit is 35 mph.</p>
03.5	163	74	<p>BONNIE MAGER: Okay. Okay. And I'm representing the Neighborhood Alliance of Spokane County. And mainly, I just want to testify about the process. I don't feel that these open-house processes really give folks what they need. I think they're a fine beginning so they can see what's going on, but I think that a presentation with actual questions and answers that could be heard by everyone instead of, well, this one was much better than the one at Bigelow Gulch, but the noise level was so high</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Revised EA will have an additional public open house and a public hearing during the 30-day review period.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>there, you could hardly hear.</p> <p>And it takes so much time for a person to talk to individual people at stations that many people just get disoriented and go away. And I think it's matched more to diffuse public process than it is to actually give the folks in the neighborhood the opportunity to actually hear what's planned for them, what their process is, what their appeal process is, and to let them ask questions in a dignified manner where everyone can hear what the answers are all in one place. That's basically all I have to say.</p>	
03.5	163	75	<p>TOM HENNES: My name is Tom Hennes. I live just north of Bigelow Gulch Road, about a quarter mile, half mile. I'd like to thank you for making this opportunity available to the citizens that are affected by this project, because I think there's been a pretty sorry lack of this kind of opportunity since this project was accepted and designed, and it is pretty much a done deal. I believe that I'd like to wholeheartedly endorse what the--the last testimony, about the hearing process. I think--I went to a meeting six years ago in the Central Grange with the same, basically, group of engineers minus the ones that have retired or been hired. We talked about this project as pretty much simply safety improvements on Bigelow Gulch Road.</p> <p>And I think since that time, this whole project has moved into an extension of the North/South Freeway without any kind of opportunity for input or dialogue about what kind of impact that's going to have on Orchard Prairie and the East Valley area. You talk to the state engineers, and they say, "Well, that's a county issue." You talk to the county engineers, and they say, "Oh, that's a State issue." And there's nobody that's looking at this whole thing as a unified project and looking at the impacts that it's going to have on the people affected.</p> <p>And I think that's a sorry lack of planning and a sorry lack of process that values the input of the people that live in this area. It's outrageous as a matter of</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This proposed project is an arterial improvement. This arterial does cross the North Spokane Corridor at an interchange but is not the extension of that facility. The North Spokane Corridor is still planned to continue south through the City of Spokane to intersect Interstate 90.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>fact. This is in fact an extension of the North/South Freeway. Nobody will admit it at the engineering level or at the political level. I don't know why? Because they probably would have such an outrage that people would start to be politically active about it.</p>	
55.0	163	76	<p>The fact of the matter is that when Bigelow Gulch opens and the freeway opens north of Francis, the traffic count on the Market-Green Corridor is going to drop dramatically which means the opportunity to get funding for the completion of that is going to go away for years and years and years. So why won't we talk about the fact that this is a de facto freeway. They designed it to look very similar to 395. It's 120 feet wide with 4 lanes and a center lane and shoulders wide enough for an escape, with vast right of ways and disturbances in the environment to take out, you know, grade issues. Nobody will talk about it like that, but that's what it is. It's the 200--or 2,000 pound elephant that's standing in the room that nobody seems to want to acknowledge. I think that kind of project needs a higher level of scrutiny than just the quote simple safety improvements' jobs that the engineering people told us about at that meeting in the Central Grange six years ago. And I think we've been misled. And I think it's disingenuous of the county engineers or the county policy people not to have addressed this issue sooner.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. All discussions regarding Bigelow Gulch Road improvements including the "Connecting Our Community" study in the 1990's and the early meetings at the Grange identified Bigelow Gulch Road improvements as a four-lane facility. The center turn lanes and shoulders for disabled vehicles are safety amenities for a facility with the expected volume of traffic that is projected. The 120 feet of right of way includes purchasing clear zone for errant vehicles.</p>
45.0	163	77	<p>Orchard Prairie is one of the oldest inhabited areas of Spokane county. Father Desmet formed a mission on Orchard Prairie on Palmer Road, back when the fir traders were here. This is an old historical area. We have one of the last school district, independent school</p>	<p>Comments noted. Sections 4.7, 4.16, and 4.17 of the Revised EA address impacts to the community.</p>

Letter Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			<p>district, in the State of Washington that's functioning and growing because of the community support. There's a strong community on Orchard Prairie. And this project is going to divide it in half and make it impossible, virtually impossible, for people on one half of Orchard Prairie to get to the other half without a lot of inconvenience and noise and disruption. I think that's bad. I think the planners need to look at more people issues and balance that with the issue of moving traffic.</p>	
45.0	163	78	<p>The issue of property values. I think Ross' answer to the earlier question about property values going up, I don't know where he got his statistics, but I'll bet you that if you lived on Fourth Avenue, down in the Valley between downtown and Havana and you didn't realize what happened to that area when they built a freeway through it, you're just not in the real world. That area has been a slum for 30 years now. So property values can't be going up in that area and they couldn't have been going up when the freeway was built. And that's what going to happen to those folks from East Valley that are going to have this freeway cutting their school in half and their neighborhood. You don't think that's going to impact your property values? Of course it is. And I think they're being disingenuous in that area, too.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
65.0	163	79	<p>So, I'm concerned. I'm concerned that the noise is going to, you know, from the trucks and extra traffic is unacceptable. It's already a factor in the quality of life on Orchard Prairie. There's often days, and I think they</p>	Please see the noise analysis in section 4.11 of the Revised EA. As indicated in Table 4.11-3, the year 2025 noise impacts with the proposed project and no action would be similar.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
40.0	163	80	<p>said it in one of their other meetings, where the decibel level from the traffic is higher than legally accepted. And it's going to get worse. And it's going to grow. So I'm concerned about that.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
05.5	163	82	<p>You know, the elk herd is not a seasonal elk herd. I think Ross was alluding to the fact that they only come down out of Mount Spokane in the wintertime. Well, that's not a fact. I have elk on my property almost twelve months out of the year. And they've been seen up there. The school kids have a project to monitor their activity on the Prairie. And they're up there twelve months out of the year at one time or another. The wildlife up there and the quality of life and the noise pollution and the exhaust pollution from making this into a major freeway extension, which is what it is and which we ought to call it like it is, is definitely going to impact negatively the people that live there and the people in Spokane County that value that kind of environment.</p>	Please see Section 1.4 of this Revised EA regarding the NEPA regulations.
05.5	163	82	<p>I think the project is overkill. This is not the little safety improvements project that they talked about six years ago when this was first announced to us and which we were asked to testify about. We, all of a sudden, come to meetings in January up on Orchard Prairie and find out that this is an extension of the freeway. I think the noise, the pollution, the other environmental impacts are unsatisfactory and are not being mitigated satisfactorily. I read most of the Environmental Impact Statement online, and I think they should go with a more comprehensive statement. I don't believe that the advice</p>	Please see Section 1.4 of this Revised EA regarding the NEPA regulations.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
03.5	163	83	<p>they got from federal government or the state is adequate to address the issues that are emerging here as significant for the people involved.</p> <p>I have learned one thing. If putting one over on the people is an incremental process, I think we're being had. And I think that the county policy makers need to clean up their act about these meeting formats where they divide and conquer the people that have input. They put you in a room full of spinners, and they get you, they corner you, and they answer your question, and nobody else can hear what they tell you. And the next guy comes along, and we don't know what they're being said. There's been very little opportunity for a group meeting where there can be open dialogue, where everybody can hear what everybody else has to say about it. And I think this is not only a problem with this project, but it's a problem with the way the county treats its people. They're not really interested in hearing what you have to say. They're interested in spinning this project.</p> <p>And I know that's kind of a harsh thing to say, but I really, I can only, I can only draw that conclusion after seeing how they handled it. They really--they make up their mind that they want to build this project and then the subject becomes, how do we get it done, not, do we want to ask the people what they want. And I think that's a big mistake and I think that the political people, the policy makers at the political level need to start addressing this because we've got people on Five Mile Prairie, on Gleneden or Glenrose, I'm sorry, on Wildrose Prairie. We've got people all over the suburbs of Spokane now having issues</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see Section 1.3 of the Revised EA regarding the public process.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
04.0	163	84	<p>with the way these kind of issues are handled. And I think they better address that because these people are all going to get together and they're going to want political solutions if they can't get a bureaucratic solution.</p>	
04.0	163	84	<p>GENE LORENSON: I live on Jensen Road, just north of Bigelow Gulch. I testified earlier on a couple of issues, but since there's no one waiting, I thought maybe I'd try a couple of other things, too.</p> <p>In the assessment statement, it talks about several alternative plans, so to speak. And a couple of them went south of Bigelow Gulch, up over the hill and on, and stuff like that, and they were really not viable at all. And the only one is, I think number one which is the plan that is shown next door. And so you had alternatives. But the alternatives dealt only with the route that the highway would take. It did not speak at all to road planning and engineering on the route itself. It only gives the one projected in there, which is basically a five-lane road. It does not look at any other alternatives of putting a road through that route.</p>	<p>Please see Chapter 3 of the Revised EA for a discussion of alternatives.</p>
04.0	163	85	<p>Most people realize that there has to be some sort of improvement, just because of some of the traffic volume and things like that. But a five-lane road all the way through there, we think, is really too much. And the projected traffic numbers for up to 20 years, which is only I think 3,000 more vehicles or something like that, does not warrant this much of an improvement, if you can call it an improvement. That traffic could be handled with a smaller road. It's going to have to be multi-lanes, with</p>	<p>Comments noted. Please see Chapter 3 of the Revised EA for a discussion of alternatives, including the engineering analysis. Additional information is provided in Appendix B of the January 2006 EA.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
			two good wide ones, with a turning or passing lane in between would probably handle the traffic. The point is that other than the route of the road, the assessment offers no other alternatives, just the one or nothing at all which no one, of course, realizes it would be the acceptable.	
03.5	163	86	As far as input in this meeting, we appreciate you folks coming so that we can do that here. And, there will be a lot more input, written, coming in, too. One thing that makes it difficult to comment is the fact that the engineering on the different sections is not done. How can you make an intelligent comment on a section of the road when it hasn't even been designed yet? And yet, they want us to accept an assessment and just have that said and done when we haven't even looked at the designs yet, and they're not available because they haven't been done. I find it really difficult to say, well, now, how can I comment on where the creek will be crossed by the road and stuff like that when they don't know quite yet. And yet, they want to put this whole thing to bed.	Comments noted. The design has progressed to the level sufficient to assess the environmental impacts. Completion of design will occur following completion of the NEPA process.
05.5	163	87	In most of these projects, it will say that an Environmental Assessment will be done to determine whether an Environmental Impact Study would be required. In this, that is not mentioned. It is not there. Now, whether that could be done, if there's enough testimony, I don't know. But the word that we're getting from the Spokane County people is that, oh, no, we don't need it. We don't even have to do an assessment, is the word that we got. We also got the word that we don't even have to have a public meeting. In other words, we can do anything we please.	The FHWA will determine if an EIS is warranted.

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
40.0	163	88	<p>And unfortunately, that's what we've got here, too, on this assessment process. They can get a thousand comments, but who decides the validity of the comments? The people who are doing the road. Whether our comments will be considered seriously or not, who knows.</p> <p>Anyway, that's some of the frustrations that we're looking at now. Like I say, most of us are not opposed to the road. We're certainly opposed to the way this has been done. Thank you very much.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The use of vegetation will be discussed with property owners when negotiations for right-of-way commences.</p>
40.0	163	88	<p>WILLIAM SHANNON: My name is Bill Shannon. I live at 5616 North Progress, just up the road here. I've lived here most of my life. I'm pretty familiar with the stories of the traffic when it was like one or two cars going down the road here. I grew up along the Gulch. I do know that it's been a real good route for most people to travel. I don't really look forward to the extra noise or the pollution that's going to come from that. But I think if you are working on, I heard this gentleman say earlier that they were looking at vegetation. I think that could be helpful for both pollution and noise filtration as well as even animal control.</p> <p>In the past years, I have seen as many as 40 deer come off this mountain and get on to this flat down here. Right now, we've got about 12 to 16 deer up at my place, which is like 300 yards north of that green water tank up there. And that is something you should give some consideration to. The hazards--] don't care too much for the pesky deer. They're all the time getting in my garden. So it's more of a safety thing for people, more than anything else.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The use of vegetation will be discussed with property owners when negotiations for right-of-way commences.</p>
55.1	163	89	<p>As far as Bigelow Gulch dividing those people up there, in that particular area up there, it's already</p>	<p>Comment noted</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
55.1	163	90	<p>One other concern I kind of looked at, too. The say this is coming across as being a freeway. They got major problems on Sullivan here because it's already pretty congested at rush hour, as you know, backed up to, oh, a half a mile on some occasions. But if you add more traffic than that, they're going to have to deal with that eventually, too. I think it's all, you know, I'm all for cost prevention. I'm glad that you said they weren't going to put any cement walls in. I'd rather see vegetation or berms, something more natural. But I really would like to emphasize the research done on vegetation.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The use of vegetation will be discussed with property owners when negotiations for right-of-way commences.</p>
40.7	163	91	<p>There is maybe, perhaps, one other concern there, too, is the noxious weeds that might get involved there. I don't know what you have to do there, but that might be the kind of vegetation, how you can maintain that and keep the noxious weeds down as well.</p>	<p>County has current regulations for identifying and controlling noxious weeds. These same regulations would apply to this project.</p>
05.0	163	92	<p>I know the thing is going to be coming through. It's inevitable. I'd just like to see what they can do as far as keeping the noise and air pollution down as much as possible and keeping the safety factor.</p>	<p>Please see Sections 4.10 and 4.11 for discussions of air quality and noise.</p>
40.0	163	93	<p>CHARLOTTE MANGAN: Okay. I was reminded by what this gentleman said about the deer corridor, which does in fact exist near Forker. And I have a concern about safety for all animals, two legged and four legged, and how that would be addressed.</p>	<p>Please see Section 4.6 of this Revised EA for discussion of wildlife.</p>
05.2	163	94	<p>I also would like to have some presentation to what the estimate of cost of this particular proposed road, and I say that in quotes. According to the</p>	<p>This 8.2-mile project is estimated to cost about \$52.6 million to complete.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment	Response
55.0	163	<p>I'd also like to know what role the State Department of Highways actually play in this whole process. I'm curious about the speed limit. Human nature is that if you put the speed at 35, people will drive at 40 or 45. And that, of course, leads to the question of safety and traffic enforcement. And I'm wondering how much more that will cost us in supplying deputies; if it's going to be State, County handling that.</p>	<p>The Washington State Department of Transportation is a reviewing agency of this project. The speed limit of this route will be 45 mph in the rural sections and 35 mph on the east end and also along the segment at Argonne Road. This facility is a County Road and will be enforced by the County Sheriff. No additional deputies would be anticipated due to this project.</p>
55.0	163	<p>I also have a question about assessment when we've been told that engineering has not been completed, that the design is not completed. And on that same--in that same venue. I found talking to people out here, that the issue of the stream and channels have not really been addressed. One person said that there were possibilities, but if they hadn't been okayed by someone. And he didn't seem to know whom. Another person said, no, we haven't even talked to anyone about that. We have to wait until we go further. There's obviously alternatives in dealing with the stream issues. And I have a concern that these alternatives are not being explored. The other aspect of lack of exploration is, as it appears at this point, all the alternatives involve four lanes. I find that most interesting since, as I said, I lived at the other end of Bigelow Gulch when the last hearing occurred 5-and-a-half, six-years ago, whenever it was. And I spoke with a gentleman at that time who was representing this same department. And I was told that the</p>	<p>The streams are discussed in Section 4.5 of the EA. Regulations regarding streams are governed by the Washington State Dept. of Ecology and the Dept. of Fish and Wildlife. Please see chapter 3 of this Revised EA regarding the discussion of alternatives and number of lanes.</p>

Letter Code	Number	Comment	Response
03.5	163	<p>97</p> <p>The other point that I'd like to make is about the development of Argonne and Bigelow Gulch. And while it certainly does assist in movement of traffic, I have talked to people who live within 50 yards and were never notified. My understanding is that taking on such a project does require some sort of a public hearing, and to their knowledge as well as to the rest of us who have looked at this, there never was one. We were told recently that that's because it was just upgrading an intersection. However, again, we were--five or six years ago at that previous meeting or it was an open house, it certainly was not a public hearing that--In fact I was told personally, nothing would happen for at least ten years. It would start in the town end near Freya or Havana and that nothing would occur prior, no development, no modification would occur prior to having a public hearing, which of course didn't occur.</p>	<p>plan was for a three-lane road. And I was concerned because having come from California, I saw three lane roads. He then explained to me that it wasn't in the traditional three lanes, but it was two lanes with an island turn to make the third or center lane. I've since been told by Mr. Ross Kelley that there was never such a plan. However, now living in a new neighborhood, I have found approximately 20 people who were told exactly the same thing, that is was to be a two-lane road with a turn lane to make the third lane. And so that concerns me that somewhere along the line that alternative was thrown out or erased and is now no longer being looked at as a possibility, and I think it should be.</p> <p>The intersection project was identified as a safety project and was constructed after discussions with WSDOT and FHWA on how it relates to this proposed project. The safety project was included in the County Six Year Construction Program and Hearings were held for this process.</p>

Code	Letter Number	Comment Number	Comment	Response
05.5	163	98	<p>Another area I have a great concern is that at that time at least, when an Environmental Assessment was done, the purpose of that was to hold a public hearing to look at concerns and determine the need for an Environment Impact Statement, that also has not happened. And yet, in the meeting with federal, state, and county folks, it's obvious that their Environmental Assessment did not provide information such as the streams and certainly they're totally unaware of the wildlife and actually said things like the imaginary elk herd. And as this gentleman says, if you have them nibbling on things on your property, you know it's not in your mind.</p>	<p>There will be an additional 30-day review and comment period, a public open house and public hearing for this revised EA. FHWA will determine either a finding of no significant impact (FONS) or a need for an EIS. Please see Section 4.6 of the Revised EA for discussion of wildlife.</p>
04.0	163	99	<p>I would say that I couldn't agree more with the development of the road, if it continues to be a road and not take the place of the North/South Freeway, which we were told would not be completed for another 15 to 20 years. And that was said in a public meeting. And so, for all intents and purposes, this will be the North/South Freeway until it continues from Market down to 1-90. As I said, I do believe the road needs to be improved, and I don't think there's anyone I've spoken to in either of the neighborhoods who doesn't agree with that. However, it's one thing to go for a two-lane road with islands and a nice wide shoulder, to a four-lane road which, from what I understand some places will even have frontage roads. I think that's a big jump. And it's kind of skipping over alternatives that I'd like to see considered.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment.</p>