

Valley County Transportation Plan, Valley County, Draft Master Transportation Plan Review Comments, February 2008

KEY NO. 09030	PROJECT NAME: Valley County Transportation Plan		COUNTY: Valley	PROJECT NO: STP – 0003(166)
REVIEWER: Mark Wasdahl		PROGRAM YEAR: 2005	DESIGN YEAR:	DATE OF REVIEW: 02/21/08
PAGE #	REVIEWER	COMMENT	RESPONSE AND MODIFICATIONS DONE IN DOCUMENT	
1	MW	With the 2006 data now available from the Idaho Department of Commerce and Labor, this number will need to be revised. The 2004 population was 7,935 and the 2006 population was 8,836. The population growth rate for the two-year period was 11.35 percent.	2006 population data is updated in the final report. Population growth rate from 2004 to 2006 is updated in the report and in Executive Summary	
1	MW	Local stakeholders perceive that population in Valley County will reach 25,950 by 2030.	Yes, Local stakeholders participated in the Growth Workshop held in April 2006.	
14	MW	The growth rate has changed with the 2006 Idaho Department of Commerce and Labor data. The latest data provided by economist John Church estimates Valley County population in 2030 at 19,719.	The scope of work of the project included a Delphi Process growth workshop to ascertain household and population projection. See Appendix C for the stakeholders list, growth workshop details and results. Idaho Department of Commerce and Labor did not provide projected population data on their website.	
19	MW	An illustration of this would be beneficial for the readers of this document. Bureau of Land Management has released a GIS ownership layer at the following URL: http://maps.insideidaho.org/webmapping/search/mssearchresults/searchresult.aspx?MetD= that can be used to illustrate this. It shows the great majority of privately owned land is adjacent to Idaho 55.	An ownership map is provided in the final report for illustration. See Appendix D.	
22	MW	I take this to be a one-year increase from 2005 but am not sure of it. Clarification is recommended for the time period discussed as well as a note that one-year data is not the basis for a long-term trend.	Clarification provided in the final report. See page 22	
24	MW	Dates of data collection? There is no identifiable method of organization for this table: Segment code neither ascends nor descends; Road Name is not in ascending or descending order alphabetically; Location is generally but not absolutely north to south; and ADT is not ascending or descending order.	Table is re-organized in street name alphabetical order. Traffic data was collected by Valley County staff during summer 2006.	
26-27	MW	Both sheets combine for 29 traffic counts yet Table 4 on page 24 shows only 19 traffic counts.	Table 4 shows traffic counts on key county roads. Traffic counts for other roads are provided in the map.	
28	MW	Tuesday appears to have a higher volume than Friday. Regardless, the variation between all weekdays is statistically insignificant. Conventional wisdom would look for a weekend peak on this gateway road to Tamarack Resort; the difference would appear to be construction workers not on-site on the weekend. In the absence of construction work (winter months), what is the actual traffic volume on this road?	No traffic counts are available for winter months. Variation between weekends and weekdays traffic is addressed in the final report.	

42-46	MW	Smiths Ferry Alternate Route is an active ITD project with key number 01004; an Environmental Impact Statement is currently being developed. McCall Alternate Route Study, key number 00688, selected the "No-Build" option in 2007 ending that project. There are no other ITD Valley County SH55 alternate route plans.	Added the text and updated the final report.
47	MW	(GARVEE)... should be changes to "The Emmett to Mesa connection has not been funded in the 2006 and 2007 legislative sessions.	Changed the text, as per comment, and updated the final report.
82	MW	There is no list of individual road segments and bridges to tally to this value. Is there any methodology to recommend conversion of a gravel road to a paved road based upon ADT counts? If there is, would that changes the cost quoted above.	There is no available methodology to recommend conversion of a gravel road to a paved road. Neither AASHTO nor ITD provided guidelines for conversion. Conversion of a gravel road to a paved road not only depends on ADT counts but also on various factors such as drainage characteristics, sub-grade properties, local weather conditions, maintenance costs, construction costs etc.
94	MW	Without the condition and drainage efficiency of culverts being recorded, maintenance and upgrade costs can not be accurately estimated. Recommendations to Valley County on page 98 did not include a complete culvert material condition survey to measure/ensure roadway drainage.	Recommendations to Valley County are provided to record culvert conditions periodically to determine maintenance costs and upgrade costs.