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Section 1  Executive Summary
SECTION 1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The purpose of the Northwest Foothills Transportation Study Update is to revise the roadway network and improvement recommendations of the Northwest Foothills Transportation Study which was adopted in 2008 (2008 NWFTS). Since its adoption, the following changes have occurred in and around the City of Eagle to bring about the need for this update:

- Update to the COMPASS Communities in Motion Long Range Transportation Plan with a regional population forecast increase from 825,000 for 2030 to 1,022,000 for 2035 for Ada and Canyon Counties;
- Update of the Eagle Comprehensive Plan for the Eagle downtown area;
- ACHD Commission decision to not proceed with federal funding for the proposed Three Cities River Crossing roadway project, due to an estimated cost of over $80 million;
- The secondary crossing of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) property to serve the M3 Spring Valley development from Palmer Road was not approved by the BLM, making Linder Road the only access from northwest Eagle;
- A Community Infrastructure District formed for M3 Spring Valley by City of Eagle;
- Adoption of the State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan by the City of Eagle, City of Boise, and ACHD.

In addition to these regional actions, development plans in the foothills have changed for many of the tracts of privately-owned land. The City and ACHD also identified the need to tie the anticipated development to the regional horizon year of 2035. The 2008 NWFTS assumed all of the potential development in the foothills study area was fully completed (build-out), even though it could take well beyond on the 2035 horizon year to accomplish. The change in development plans and the horizon year for estimating potential development in the northwest foothills result in the anticipated housing dropping from 24,261 units to 13,889 units and the anticipated employment dropping from 10,822 jobs to 4,579 jobs for this update.

Figure 1 shows the updated roadway sizes and the anticipated type of control at key intersections. Following are the key recommendations as part of this update:

- **Eagle Road**: Between Plaza Drive and Willow Creek Road, three lanes are recommended which will be refined pending the outcome of the Eagle Road/State Street Concept Study. Between Chinden Boulevard and SH 44, six lanes plus a median are recommended in the long term, which is primarily due to regional growth and the removal of the Three Cities River Crossing.
- **SH 44**: Based on the State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan recommendations and funding considerations, SH 44 is recommended to be four lanes plus a median and high occupancy vehicle lanes (total of six lanes with a median) between Glenwood Street and Eagle Road and four lanes plus a median or a turn lane between Eagle Road and SH 16. If high occupancy vehicle lanes are not feasible, they would be installed as mixed-use lanes.
Right-of-way preservation for potential grade-separated intersections beyond 2035

Alignment to be Determined

Right-in or Right-in/Right-out

RECOMMENDED ROADWAY SIZES AND INTERSECTION CONTROL
• **SH 55**: Between Beacon Light Road and Avimor, four lanes plus a median is recommended with at-grade traffic signals at Beacon Light Road, Brookside and the two Avimor intersections. Grade separation may be required beyond 2035 or in response to specific development requirements. Therefore right-of-way preservation for grade separations is recommended.

• **Linder Road**: Between Chinden Boulevard and SH 44, seven lanes are recommended in the very long term with the potential for incremental widening to five lanes in the medium term. This is primarily due to regional growth and the removal of the Three Cities River Crossing. Between Beacon Light Road and the M3 Spring Valley development, five lanes could be needed with the removal of the Palmer Road connection. Therefore, construction to three lanes with corridor preservation, and potential construction, of five lanes north of Beacon Light Road is recommended beyond 2035.

• **Beacon Light Road**: Minimizing land use development and promoting the expansion of the state highway system should be pursued by the City and ACHD in order to reduce the potential need to widen Beacon Light Road to five lanes. Between SH 16 and Linder Road, expansion to five lanes should be planned within the horizon of this study. Between Linder Road and SH 55, right-of-way should be preserved in order to ensure widening remains a viable option if other land-use and transportation infrastructure options do not alleviate the projected traffic demand. A detailed set of prerequisite projects and triggers are identified which should be followed.

• **Willow Creek Road**: A bypass of Willow Creek Road from Eagle Road to the proposed east-west foothills collector continues to be recommended as part of this plan due to the design and constraint of Willow Creek Road. The alignment of the bypass road will be dependent on future property development and topography.

With this update, an implementation plan was developed. Following are the key findings of the implementation plan:

• Most of the short-term improvements on the existing transportation system are funded and planned for construction in the next five years.

• The two most significant short-term and medium-term improvements to existing roadways that remain unfunded are the widening of Chinden Boulevard (US 20/26) to four lanes plus center turn lane or median from Eagle Road to SH 16 and widening SH 44 to four lanes plus a center turn lane lanes between Linder Road and SH 16. The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) has indicated that both improvements will likely be funded in the next five to ten years.

• All of the long-term widening needed on ITD roadways are currently unfunded including:
  - SH 55 widening to four lanes plus a median north of Beacon Light Road
  - SH 16 widening to four lanes plus a median, SH 44 to M3 Spring Valley
  - SH 44 widening for HOV lanes, Glenwood to SH 55
  - Eagle Road widening to six lanes plus a median, Chinden Boulevard to SH 44

• Right-of-way preservation should be the focus for the following very long-term projects:
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- Beacon Light Road widening to five lanes (Linder Road to SH 55)
- Linder Road widening to seven lanes (Chinden Boulevard to SH 44)
- Linder Road widening to five lanes (Beacon Light Road to M3 Spring Valley)
- SH 16 grade separations at SH 44, Floating Feather, Beacon Light, and M3 Spring Valley
- SH 55 widening to six lanes with a median from SH 44 to Beacon Light Road
- Chinden Boulevard widening to six lanes with a median from Eagle Road to SH 16.

The roadway network and recommended projects should remain dynamic and responsive to development and changes to the adopted land-use and transportation plans. To accomplish this goal, a monitoring process should be agreed upon by the City and ACHD in an Inter-Governmental Agreement that identifies triggers for reviewing the improvements and how development within the surrounding area will be reviewed and coordinated with all parties. It is recommended that the land-use assumptions and recommendations used for this study be reviewed at least every five years and the study updated if significant changes to the future roadway network, land use assumptions, or adopted plans occur that could affect the need or appropriateness of the recommendations in this NWFTS update.
SECTION 2. INTRODUCTION

The Northwest Foothills Transportation Study (NWFTS) was developed to respond to the transportation infrastructure needs that are expected to occur due to development pressure in the northwest foothills. The general area envisioned for this future development is illustrated in Figure 2. Over 85 percent of this area is privately owned and has the potential for some type of development or intensification of land uses.

The purpose of this NWFTS update is to analyze future land-use and traffic projections which reflect changes that have occurred since the adoption of the Northwest Foothills Transportation Study in 2008 (2008 NWFTS) as well as the background changes due to the horizon year moving out from 2030 to 2035. The result of this study update is an updated roadway network. A key element of this update is additional information to aid in the implementation of the recommended roadway improvements. The 2008 NWFTS, with this update, will continue to function as a policy guide and corridor preservation mechanism for improving the transportation system as development occurs in the Northwest Foothills area.

Figure 2: Development Study Area
CHANGES SINCE THE LAST STUDY

The 2008 NWFTS was adopted with the understanding that amendments to the Study could be required if land-use projections or other factors significantly changed that could impact the recommendations. Since its adoption, the following changes have occurred in and around the City of Eagle:

- Update to the COMPASS Communities in Motion (CIM) Long Range Transportation Plan with a regional population forecast increase from 825,000 for 2030 to 1,022,000 for 2035 for Ada and Canyon Counties;
- Update of the Eagle Comprehensive Plan for the Eagle downtown area;
- ACHD Commission decision to not proceed with federal funding for the proposed Three Cities River Crossing roadway project, due to an estimated cost of over $80 million;
- The secondary crossing of Bureau of Land Management (BLM) property to serve the M3 Spring Valley development from Palmer Road was not approved by the BLM making Linder Road the only access from northwest Eagle;
- A Community Infrastructure District formed for M3 Spring Valley by City of Eagle;
- Adoption of the State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan by the City of Eagle, City of Boise, and ACHD; and,
- Significant changes in the types, intensity, and frequency of development proposals.
Section 3  Interagency and Public Involvement
Interagency coordination and public involvement occurred through meetings with the Project Management Team, Project Steering Committee, and Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee. In addition, a public open house was conducted to gain input on the preliminary recommendations. All information presented below was made available to the public through the project website located at www.achdidaho.org.

**PROJECT MANAGEMENT TEAM**

The role of the Project Management Team was to advise the consultant team on the technical elements of the project and make the final decisions regarding the overall project direction based on input from the consultant team, Project Steering Committee, and the public. Three meetings were held between June and October 2012.

The Project Steering Committee provided a balanced representation of interests as well as a communication link with elected officials, citizens, and groups in the community. Members included agency staff representatives, representatives of local business groups, elected officials, and advocates of key interests, including transportation, social, and civic groups. Responsibilities of Project Steering Committee members included representing their constituents’ perspectives during group deliberations, communicating project progress to them, and working to develop recommendations in the development of projects that are consensus based.

**DEVELOPER MEETINGS**

Key land-owners and developers were contacted at the initiation of the NWFTS update in order to identify potential changes to the plans for their property. Meetings were held with key land-owners and developers including Avimor, M3 Companies, and Rick Thomas. The purpose of these meetings and contacts was to introduce the project and identify the likely development that may occur by 2035.

**PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE**

One public open house was held from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. on October 11, 2012, to offer citizens the opportunity to review and comment on the preliminary plan updates. Approximately 60 people attended the public open house and 21 comment sheets were received at the open house. Summary information of the open house is included in the Appendix A.
ACHD developed mailers, as shown in Figure 3, placed sandwich signs throughout the study area, and placed advertisements in local papers. The mailers introduced the project, study area, and identified the date and location for the public open house.

ACHD also maintained a project website which provided background information about the project and information presented at the public open house.

Some of the general themes of the public comments included:

- Concerns about Beacon Light Road being planned for five lanes in the long term given the rural nature of the roadway and adjacent properties that exists today.
- Concerns about widening Linder Road.
- The need for more bicycle lanes throughout the area.
- Concerns about roundabouts as options to traffic signals.
- General changes to roadways in the area may be incompatible with rural atmosphere/quality of life in Eagle.
- The need to widen the State Highways.

INFORMATIONAL SESSIONS

Two informational presentations were held with the Eagle City Council and ACHD Commission during the project. These sessions were open to the public and provided the Eagle City Council and ACHD Commission with updates on the project, addressed any questions, and solicited input. The Eagle City Council, ACHD Commission, and Ada County Commission also held two joint meetings in March and June of 2013, to discuss the study. Additionally, a joint meeting of the same agencies was held on December 12, 2013 to address specific concerns related to Beacon Light Road.

BEACON LIGHT ROAD STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE

Based on the concerns about potential future widening of Beacon Light Road by citizens, the City of Eagle, and the Project Steering Committee, the ACHD Commission requested the formation of the Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee in order to review the corridor needs in greater detail. The Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee was chosen by the ACHD Commission in consultation with the City of Eagle. Members included representatives from the City of Eagle, City of Star (did not attend), Ada County, ITD, North Ada County Foothills Association, residents along the corridor, and ACHD. The task for the committee was to identify and make recommendation on a solution for accommodating the projected traffic demand on the Beacon Light Road corridor between SH 16 and SH 55. The Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee met on October 24, 2013 and November 13, 2013.

A Beacon Light Road specific mailer was sent to residents living along the corridor in October 2013 to inform them of the efforts being made to discuss the future of the corridor. All meetings were noticed in the mailer as well as via the project web site. All meetings were open for the public to attend and witness
the discussion. For more information on Beacon Light Road and the process used by the committee, see Section 6.
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SECTION 4. ROADWAY NETWORKS & LAND-USE PROJECTION

The roadway network and land-use estimates adopted as part of the 2008 Northwest Foothills Transportation Study (2008 NWFTS) were developed through an extensive process that included coordination with land owners and agencies responsible for planning, feasibility evaluation, and environmental evaluations. This update only addresses changes to the roadway network and land-uses that have occurred since the 2008 NWFTS due to new proposals by land-owners, ACHD, or ITD. In some instances, developers have curtailed development plans or forgone development plans altogether.

ROADWAY NETWORK

The roadway network developed in the 2008 NWFTS was based on a review of the land-use and topographical constraints that are present in the study area. Figure 4 shows the future roadway network recommended from the 2008 study.

Since the 2008 NWFTS, two changes in planned roadway connections have occurred. The first change is that the collector road connection from the M3 Companies Spring Valley development property to Palmer Road was not approved by the BLM. The second change is that M3 Companies has modified their development plan to include a southern collector road connection to SH 16, north of Beacon Light Road. These changes are also identified in Figure 4.
LAND-USE PROJECTIONS

The Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) prepares the regional population and employment forecasts for the urban area, which includes Ada County and Canyon County. The population and employment forecasts used for the 2008 NWFTS assumed a scenario in which much more significant development occurred within the study area than assumed in the COMPASS 2030 (horizon year in 2008) regional forecasts. The development estimates were based on a build-out of the proposed development areas in the northwest foothills. Build-out refers to completion of the total potential development of property within the study area, which is not expected to occur by the planning horizon year of 2035.

The advantage of using build-out forecasts for the development area is that on-site roadways can be built to their ultimate sizes and therefore be able to accommodate traffic growth beyond the adopted COMPASS Communities in Motion 2035 Regional Long-Range Transportation Plan (COMPASS Plan). The disadvantage of using build-out forecasts for the NWFTS developments is that the impact of development traffic on the 2035 background roadway network could be overestimated.

Since this update is focused primarily on the changes to the external roadway network serving the northwest foothills in 2035, it was determined that the most appropriate approach for this update was to base the growth estimates on how much development is expected to occur by 2035, rather than assuming a build-out. This approach is consistent with the regional planning and provides a way to align this study with the currently adopted COMPASS Plan and the ACHD 2012 Capital Improvement Plan.

Many changes to development plans for properties in the northwest foothills have occurred since 2008 that required a review of the land-use projections for key foothills developments. Meetings were held with key landowners to review their current plans and the anticipated timeframe they expect to reach their development targets for their properties. In addition, meetings with the City of Eagle and Ada County staff were held to discuss the current status of development approvals and land-use designations. The most significant changes relate to the development plans for the Connolly, Kastera, and Alpine Creek properties. Each has significantly decreased their planned development intensity or decided not to pursue development of a portion of their property. Table 1 shows the total projections that were assumed in the 2008 NWFTS and the updated projections assumed for this update.

Table 1: Comparison of Land Use for Foothills Development (2008 NWFTS vs. Update)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land-Use Element</th>
<th>2008 NWFTS (Build-out)</th>
<th>This Study Update (Year 2035)</th>
<th>Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homes</td>
<td>24,261</td>
<td>13,889</td>
<td>-10,372</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobs</td>
<td>10,822</td>
<td>4,579</td>
<td>-6,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 1, the housing and job estimates projected by 2035 in the study area for this update are significantly lower than in the 2008 NWFTS.
While the estimated development in the foothills assumed for this update has significantly decreased, regional growth has increased since the 2008 NWFTS. The 2008 NWFTS estimated a population of approximately 825,000 for the metropolitan area (Ada and Canyon Counties combined) for the 2030 horizon year. For 2035, the estimated population is 1,022,000. Therefore, while the expected growth in the foothills has been reduced, the forecasted traffic demands on the overall roadway system have increased due to the predicted increase in regional population between 2030 and 2035.

FUTURE TRAFFIC OPERATIONS

Future year traffic volume projections were developed by ACHD using the regional travel demand model with the population and employment forecasts for the northwest foothills study area updated to reflect the jobs and housing estimates described in the previous section. The traffic operations were analyzed in order to predict how the study area’s transportation system will operate in the year 2035. Table 2 provides a summary of the traffic operations analysis results for the key arterial roadways within the overall impact area studied in the 2008 NWFTS.

Based on the results shown in Table 2, the Project Management Team and Project Steering Committee were engaged to review the resulting roadway sizes and provide input on the options for accommodating the future transportation needs on each roadway based on the 2035 traffic projections. Two of the most significant increases in roadway sizes for ACHD roadways within the NWFTS study area were the need to increase Linder Road from five lanes to seven lanes between Chinden Boulevard and SH 44 and the need to increase Beacon Light Road to five lanes from two/three lanes between Linder Road and SH 55. The results for Linder Road and Beacon Light Road were consistent with the 2012 ACHD Capital Improvement Plan, which incorporated some of the major land-use transportation system changes since the 2008 NWFTS including the increased regional growth for 2035 and removal of the Three Cities River Crossing. If built as originally planned, the Three Cities River Crossing would have connected Cloverdale Road and Five Mile Road from Chinden Boulevard to the SH 44/SH 55 intersection, providing an additional crossing of the Boise River and thus reducing demand on other arterials that cross the Boise River such as Linder Road and Eagle Road.

Another factor in determining the updated roadway sizes was the adoption in 2012 of the State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan. The State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan included an extensive study of the State Street and SH 44 corridor between downtown Boise and SH 16. The outcome of that study was an improvement plan for SH 44 that included the addition of high-occupancy-vehicle (HOV) lanes between Glenwood Street and Eagle Road (for a total of six lanes plus a median) and widening to four lanes plus a median between Eagle Road and SH 16. This results in the same number of lanes east of Eagle Road, but a decrease from six lanes to four lanes plus a median between Eagle Road and SH 16 within the 2035 study horizon. Beyond 2035, widening of SH 44 between Eagle Road and SH 16 to add HOV lanes (six lanes total plus a median) is included in State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan.
## Table 2: Year 2035 Traffic Conditions and Recommended Roadway Configuration Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>Estimated 2035 PM Peak Directional Volume</th>
<th>Required Size</th>
<th>Recommended Configuration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinden Boulevard (US 20/26)</td>
<td>East of Eagle Road</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Rd - Linder Rd</td>
<td>2,640</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linder Rd – SH 16</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 44</td>
<td>East of SH 55</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median + HOV/AC (6 Lanes + Median) , Per TTOP</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH 55 – Eagle Rd</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Rd - Linder Rd</td>
<td>2,200</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median, Per TTOP³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linder Rd – SH 16</td>
<td>2,220</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Road</td>
<td>South of SH 44</td>
<td>2,300</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH 44 – State Street</td>
<td>1,780</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>Pending Eagle-State Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>State St – Floating Feather Rd</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>3 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floating Feather Rd – Beacon Light Rd</td>
<td>1,170</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>3 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beacon Light Rd - Willow Creek Rd</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>2 Lanes</td>
<td>3 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 55</td>
<td>SH 44–Beacon Light Rd</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beacon Light Rd – Brookside Ln</td>
<td>1,930</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Brookside Ln – Avimor Dr</td>
<td>1,530</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH 16</td>
<td>Chinden Blvd – SH 44</td>
<td>2,290</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median + GSI Traffic signals transitioning in the very long term to GSI’s at key intersections per the ITD SH 16 Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH 44 – Floating Feather Rd</td>
<td>2,100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floating Feather Rd – Beacon Light Rd</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beacon Light Rd – Aerie Wy</td>
<td>2,700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aerie Wy – Chaparral Rd</td>
<td>2,140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beacon Light Road</td>
<td>Linder Rd – SH 16</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH 55 – Linder Rd</td>
<td>1,430</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
<td>5 Lanes³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linder Road</td>
<td>Chinden Blvd – SH 44</td>
<td>2,820</td>
<td>7 Lanes</td>
<td>7 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH 44 – Floating Feather Rd</td>
<td>1,550</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floating Feather Rd – Beacon Light Rd</td>
<td>1,040</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beacon Light Rd – Aerie Wy</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
<td>5 Lanes³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floating Feather Road</td>
<td>SH 55 – Linder Rd</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>3 Lanes</td>
<td>3 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linder Rd – SH 16</td>
<td>530</td>
<td>2 Lanes</td>
<td>2 Lanes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:**

1. Roadway sizes based on maintaining LOS E which is the ACHD minimum threshold for Principal Arterials.
2. Medians indicate raise medians that may be used as a left-turn lane or two-way-left-turn lane in some sections or at intersections.
3. Beyond 2035 widening to include 5 Lanes with HOV lanes (7 lanes total) may occur per the State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan (TTOP).
4. Focus is on right-of-way preservation through 2035 until criteria for widening is met.

**Legend:**

- **AC** = Access Controlled
- **HOV** = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes
- **GSI** = Grade Separated Interchanges
Finally, the City of Eagle is currently working with ACHD to study Eagle Road from SH 44 through Downtown Eagle as part of a concept study for the Eagle Road/State Street intersection. That study has not been completed and will define the improvements in the vicinity of the Eagle Road/State Street intersection including circulation improvements to improve downtown connectivity.

Based on the evaluation and review process described above and input from the public, City of Eagle, and ACHD Commission, the 2035 roadway sizes and intersection control types were developed. Figure 5 shows the recommend roadway sizes and intersection control to meet the traffic demands generated by regional traffic growth and development in the northwest foothills. Also shown in Figure 5 are the sections of roadway that have changed since the 2008 NWFTS.

Table 3 lists the roadway recommendations that have changed since the 2008 NWFTS, based on the recommended roadway network shown in Figure 5.

**Table 3: Future Year 2035 Roadway Segment Sizes Updated from the 2008 Study**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Roadway Agency</th>
<th>Segment</th>
<th>2008 Study Recommendation</th>
<th>This Study Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACHD</strong></td>
<td>Eagle Rd, Plaza Dr to State St</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
<td>3 Lanes/Pending Eagle-State Intersection Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Eagle Rd, Floating Feather Rd to Willow Creek Rd</td>
<td>2/3 Lanes</td>
<td>3 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Beacon Light Rd, Linder Rd to SH 55</td>
<td>2/3 Lanes</td>
<td>Preservation for 5 Lanes (See Section 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floating Feather Rd, Linder Rd to Eagle Rd</td>
<td>2 Lanes</td>
<td>3 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linder Rd, Chinden Blvd to SH 44</td>
<td>5 Lanes</td>
<td>7 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Linder Rd, Beacon Light Rd to Aerie Wy</td>
<td>2/3 Lanes</td>
<td>Preservation for 5 Lanes (See Section 5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equest Ln, SH 16 to Spring Valley</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>2 Lanes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ITD</strong></td>
<td>Eagle Road, SH 44 to Chinden Blvd</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH 55, Beacon Light to Avimor Dr</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median + Interchanges</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median (Preservation for Interchanges)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH 44, Glenwood Rd to Eagle Rd</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median + HOV (6 Lanes with Median total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SH 44, Eagle Rd to SH 16</td>
<td>6 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>4 Lanes + Median (6 + Median lanes potentially beyond 2035)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3, the most significant changes from the 2008 NWFTS recommendations are on the roadways crossing the Boise River and the key east-west arterials between SH 16 and SH 55. The expansion of Eagle Road (SH44 to Chinden Boulevard) and Linder Road is primarily due to overall growth by 2035 as compared to 2030, but is also because the Three Cities River Crossing is no longer included in the regional transportation network. The expansion of Beacon Light Road between Linder Road and SH 55 was similarly impacted by the increase in the horizon year to 2035, which pushed the traffic volume above the threshold for a three lane roadway. A more detailed discussion of key corridors and Beacon Light Road are included in Sections 5 and 6, respectively. Eagle Road from Plaza Drive to State Street is included in Table 3 although the recommendation in this update is similar to the recommendation from the 2008 NWFTS and will be refined as part of the Eagle Road/State Street Intersection Study. Eagle Road between Floating Feather Road and Willow Creek Road was changed to three lanes to accommodate the need for left-turn lanes and bicycle lanes. These corridors are discussed in greater detail in Section 5.
Right-of-way preservation for potential grade separated intersections beyond 2035
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Figure 5
DEVELOPMENT–DRIVEN IMPROVEMENTS

As part of the development of the updated roadway network shown in Figure 5, an evaluation was conducted to determine which improvements are due to the projected traffic growth from development in the northwest foothills. It should be recognized that most of the roadway improvements are the result of development growth, which includes local and regional development, in addition to the northwest foothills developments in which this study is focused. While the foothills developments affect most roadways in the study area, there are some roadways and improvements that are triggered by those developments alone. These “development-driven” needs are primarily required for specific developments and would not be needed if the foothills developments do not occur as assumed in this study. Figure 6 highlights the development-driven improvements.
Improvements triggered by Northwest Foothills Development

- Eagle Road, Beacon Light Rd – State St
  - 3 lanes (same as without NW Foothills)

- SH 55, Floating Feather – Beacon Light
  - Widen to 7 lanes

- SH 55, Shadow Valley Rd – Avimor
  - Widen to 4 lanes

- Dry Creek Ranch Roadways
  - Per plan 3 lanes minimum

- Avimor East Roadways
  - Per plan 3 lanes minimum

- Development Related Roadways
  - Internal roadway network to serve the Northwest Foothills

- State Highway 16 Interchanges at SH 44, State Street, Beacon Light Road, and Aerie Way
SECTION 5. KEY CORRIDORS

As part of this update, some key corridors were identified as having unique characteristics that require additional background and discussion. This section includes a more detailed discussion of these corridors. While Beacon Light Road is also a key corridor, it is discussed in Section 6.

EAGLE ROAD

SH 44 to Beacon Light Road

The traffic demand on Eagle Road north of SH 44 is identified to require five lanes from Plaza Drive to Beacon Light Road. There are two distinct areas within this section of Eagle Road. Figure 7 and Figure 8 show pictures for this section. The first is between Plaza Drive and State Street where the need for five lanes is consistent with the 2008 NWFTS and the 2012 ACHD Capital Improvement Plan. Significant concern over widening this section of Eagle Road was expressed by many stakeholders and the public. As a result of this concern, the City of Eagle and ACHD have initiated a study of the Eagle Road/State Street intersection to determine the ultimate configuration of this section of Eagle Road and the intersection at State Street because the intersection configuration affects the roadway sizes.

Figure 7: Eagle Road - North of Plaza Drive

Between State Street and Beacon Light Road, the additional growth in the NW foothills triggers the need for five lanes. Based on a review of the ability to widen this section of Eagle Road to five lanes, significant impacts were identified that may be too extensive to justify the widening, especially given the concerns expressed as part of the stakeholder and public involvement process. The impacts of widening range from businesses in downtown, Eagle Elementary School, residential homes, and creek and canal crossings. Due to the availability of other parallel roadways for north-south travel through Eagle, constraining Eagle Road north of State Street to three lanes is a viable option given the significant impacts and potential cost associated with widening to five lanes. Therefore, the existing three-lane facility is recommended to remain between State Street and Floating Feather and widening to three lanes between Floating Feather and Beacon Light Road to better accommodate pedestrians, bicycles, and turning vehicles.
Chinden Blvd (US 20/26) to SH 44

Eagle Road, south of SH 44 is owned and maintained by the ITD and designated SH 55. ITD currently does not have plans for widening beyond the current four lanes plus a turn lane (five lanes). Based on the projected 2035 traffic projections, a six-lane, access-controlled cross section with a median and center turn lane at intersections is needed to accommodate the projected travel demand at LOS “E” or better between Chinden Boulevard and SH 44. The 2008 NWFTS recommended maintaining the existing four lanes plus a center turn lane, however, with the increase in demand due to the 2035 horizon year, and the decision to not fund the Three Cities River Crossing, the projected volume in 2035 is approximately 23 percent greater than the 2030 projection in the 2008 NWFTS. While there is significant uncertainty in the likelihood of widening Eagle Road, it is recommended that ROW be preserved and widening be planned.

WILLOW CREEK ROAD

The existing Willow Creek Road, as shown in Figure 9, is constrained due to the topography and existing residential development. The steep topography limits the ability to function at more than local road speeds, and the direct lot access and proximity to homes limits the ability to accommodate high levels of traffic. For these reasons, a new alignment is required if a connection north of Eagle Road is to be made to the future arterial portion of Willow Creek as identified in the NWFTS roadway network. The most likely location for a new connection is across the vacant land to the east which can be characterized by large-parcel ownership (40+ acres). Topography will remain a factor in determining the alignment for a new connection as well as future land-use proposals by the property owners. Therefore, planning for the new connection to bypass the southern portion of Willow Creek should consider the following:

- Collaboration with the adjacent property owners to develop an alignment that minimizes negative property impacts and supports future land-use plans.
- Design of the roadway to minimize the grade and curvature in order to emphasize the route over the existing Willow Creek Road.
- Review the need to modify the south portion of Willow Creek Road to discourage through traffic.
SH 16

The section of SH 16 from SH 44 to Chaparral Road is two lanes with turn lanes at key intersections. The SH 16 Corridor Improvement Study Environmental Assessment completed by ITD in 2004 identified widening SH 16 to four lanes plus a center median, some frontage roads, and traffic signals at key intersections. ITD has also completed the environmental study for SH 16 between I-84 and SH 44 which plans for traffic signals at key intersections in the near-term with ultimate transition to grade separated interchanges. With the development of the Spring Valley development in the foothills, four lanes plus a median does not provide sufficient capacity with traffic signals at the key intersections. In order to provide sufficient capacity, two options are possible. The first option is to maintain SH as four lanes and install grade-separated interchanges. The second option is to widen SH 16 to six lanes plus a median and keep traffic signals at the key intersections. Grade separations are not currently planned by ITD north of SH 44, the ITD's vision for the SH 16 corridor is to ultimately create an expressway with grade-separations. Therefore, in order to maintain consistency with the ITD vision, the option of grade separations key intersections is recommended. In the very long term (likely beyond 2035), grade-separated interchanges are recommended at Chinden Boulevard, SH 44, Beacon Light Road, and Aerie Way. At that time Floating Feather Road is recommended as an overpass. Right-of-way should be preserved for the future grade separations. Interim traffic signals are recommended at Floating Feather Road, Beacon Light Road, Aerie Way and Chaparral Road.

Linder Lane was not envisioned in the roadway network to have full access to SH16, but has recently been proposed as an interim full-movement access to the M3 Spring Valley development. An interim signal may also be installed at the Equest Lane/Pollard Lane intersection, depending on the ultimate ITD permit conditions, but the signal will eventually be removed with the extension of Aerie Way to SH 16 and the widening of SH 16 to five lanes. At the time Aerie Way is extended or SH 16 is widened to four lanes plus a median, the signal would be removed and the intersection would be converted to right-in only or right-in, right-out only.

LINDER ROAD

There are two sections of Linder Road that received comments during the public involvement process. Based on the analysis (described below), preservation for seven lanes on Linder Road between Chinden Boulevard and SH 44 and five lanes on Linder Road north of SH 44 is recommended.

Chinden – SH 44

Linder Road is currently two lanes for most of the section between Chinden Boulevard and SH 44.
Figure 10 illustrates the existing configuration. Linder Road currently widens to five lanes at Chinden Boulevard and SH 44. The 2012 ACHD Capital Improvement Plan and this update identified the need for a seven-lane access-controlled cross section to accommodate the projected travel demand. This is greater than the five lanes recommended in the 2008 NWFTS. This difference is primarily due to an increase in demand resulting from additional regional growth forecasted for the 2035 horizon year, and the removal of the Three Cities River Crossing from the 2035 roadway network. The result of these differences is that the projected volume in 2035 is approximately 24 percent greater than the 2030 projection in the 2008 NWFTS. These thresholds do not account for the lack of signalized intersections between Chinden Boulevard and SH 44, which are the primary factor in determining the capacity. Therefore, the need for seven lanes is predominantly at the major intersections, which currently are Chinden Boulevard and SH 44. Intersection improvements identified for SH 44 and Chinden Boulevard will reduce the need for widening the roadway to seven lanes unless significant development occurs in this section. It is difficult, however, to forecast where and how development will occur along the corridor. Given this uncertainty, preservation for seven lanes is recommended. Interim widening to five lanes could be considered given the uncertainty of the need for widening between major intersections.

Beacon Light – Aerie Way

The extension of Linder Road, shown in Figure 11, from its current terminus at Homer Road into the M3 Spring Valley development was recommended in the 2008 NWFTS to be three lanes between Linder Road and Homer Road and two lanes north into the Spring Valley development. With the removal of the parallel connection to Palmer Road and the 2035 demographic revisions, the 2035 traffic projections show the need for a five-lane (four travel lanes with turn lanes at intersections) roadway section. Because a majority of the proposed alignment traverses BLM property and the Spring Valley Development without any major signalized intersections, there will be minimal impedance from side-street traffic. The lack of major intersections results in the available capacity for traffic on Linder Road being higher than the standard thresholds used for the analysis in this study. Based on a more detailed analysis, the section of Linder Road between Beacon Light Road and the M3 Spring Valley development will function acceptably as a three-lane roadway assuming no significant intersections. Therefore, right-of-way for five lanes should be preserved, but may not be needed in this section if no significant intersections are created.
SH 55 between Beacon Light Road and Avimor was recommended in the 2008 NWFTS to have four lanes with a median, along with grade separated intersections at Brookside Lane, Avimor Drive, and the future northern access to Avimor. Currently, SH 55 has two lanes with turn lanes at key intersections and driveways as illustrated in Figure 12. The need for grade separated intersections was due to the large amount of development proposed for the Dry Creek Ranch planned community and build-out of the Avimor planned community. Neither of these developments is expected to be fully built-out by 2035, resulting in less traffic demand on SH 55. With the lower traffic demand, grade separations are not required through 2035 although ITD may require grade separations at an earlier date based on permitting requirements for specific developments. Beyond 2035, build-out of Avimor, Dry Creek Ranch, and other properties to the west, SH 55 may still require grade separations. Future community planning should include the potential need for grade separations, and right-of-way should be preserved at the intersection locations.
SECTION 6. BEACON LIGHT ROAD CORRIDOR

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Beacon Light Corridor is projected to require widening from two lanes to five lanes near the end of the 2035 planning horizon. While ACHD has been preserving right-of-way for five lanes for a number of years, the need to widen Beacon Light Road between Linder Road and SH 55 was only recently identified as part of this study and the 2012 ACHD Capital Improvement Plan.

Significant opposition to future widening by the property owners along the corridor and the City of Eagle led to formation of a stakeholder committee to review options for accommodating future projected traffic demand on Beacon Light Road between SH 16 and SH 55. Three options were identified that would limit Beacon Light Road widening to three lanes in 2035 which include:

- **Reduce Land Use Growth and Widen SH 44**: The City and County would stop allowing development beyond what is entitled and ITD would widen SH 44 to six lanes with a median between Eagle Road and SH 16.
- **Shift Traffic Demand to Another New ACHD Road**: Construct a new east-west roadway north of Beacon Light Road.
- **Shift Traffic Demand to State Highways**: Fully build out the State highway system including the following:
  - Construction of the Central Valley Expressway (SH 16 to I-84)
  - SH 44 widening to six lanes plus a median
  - US 20/26 widening to six lanes plus a median

Based on these options, the preferred approach of the Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee was to shift the traffic demands to the State highway system if it is possible for ITD to fund the expansions. Because ITD has indicated funding is unlikely for buildout of their system, a potential for Beacon Light Road requiring expansion still exits under that option. *Therefore, the strategy for Beacon Light Road should be as follows:*

- **Continue to preserve right-of-way for five lanes (96 feet) when the City or Eagle and Ada County approve development**:
  - If properties do not develop or redevelop, additional right-of-way will not be preserved.
  - If right-of-way is ultimately not used for widening, pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facilities could be installed in the additional space.
- **Encourage ITD to invest in expansion of the State highway system per the Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee recommendation. This State highway expansion may defer, or potentially eliminate, the future need for widening Beacon Light Road, but cannot be assumed due to funding constraints.*
- Widen Beacon Light Road only after other prerequisite projects have been completed and additional triggers are met.
- Identify near-term maintenance projects that could add bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the existing right-of-way along Beacon Light Road.

BEACON LIGHT ROAD CORRIDOR INTRODUCTION

The most controversial finding of the future 2035 traffic evaluation is the recommendation to preserve right-of-way to widen Beacon Light Road in the future to five lanes between Linder Road and SH 55 when warranted by traffic volumes. Figure 13 shows the study section of Beacon Light Road.

![Figure 13: Beacon Light Road Study Section (aerial source: Google Earth)](image)

The need for a future widening of Beacon Light Road was consistent with the findings of the 2012 ACHD Capital Improvement Plan. At the October 11, 2012 public open house, approximately 70% of the 21 commenters stated they were not in favor of future widening of Beacon Light Road to five lanes. Following the public open house, additional comments were received against the widening, and the City of Eagle responded to ACHD with a request to limit Beacon Light Road to three lanes. In November 2012, the Project Steering Committee provided a recommendation to the project team to limit Beacon Light Road to three lanes between Linder Road and SH 55, but continue to preserve right-of-way for five lanes when properties develop as ACHD has already been doing. The preservation will reduce future impact in the form of cost increases to tax payers and damages to properties in the event widening is shown to be needed by actual traffic volumes at some point in the future.

The public, Project Steering Committee, and City of Eagle stated the following key reasons to not widen Beacon Light Road to five lanes.

- Maintain the rural character.
- Promote the use of the State highway system for non-local trips.
- Discourage future residential and commercial development not consistent with the rural lifestyle.
- Safety concerns with a five-lane roadway.
- Livability for residents adjacent to Beacon Light Road.
Based on the concerns by citizens, the City of Eagle, and Project Steering Committee, the ACHD Commission requested the formation of a stakeholder committee in order to review the corridor needs in greater detail and provide a recommendation for transportation improvements that accommodate the projected traffic on the Beacon Light Road corridor. The following section describes the results of the detailed evaluation of Beacon Light Road, the recommendation by the stakeholder committee, and the recommended implementation strategy.

STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE PROCESS

The Beacon Light Stakeholder Committee was chosen by the ACHD Commission, in consultation with the City of Eagle. The committee included representatives from the City of Eagle, City of Star, Ada County, ITD, North Ada County Foothills Association, residents along the corridor and ACHD. The task for committee was to identify a solution to accommodating the projected traffic demand on the Beacon Light Road corridor between SH 16 and SH 55 that can be supported by all the stakeholders represented on the committee. Figure 14 shows the process for developing a recommendation for the Beacon Light Road Corridor.

**Figure 14: Beacon Light Road Study Process**

The Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee met on October 24, 2013 and November 13, 2013. At both meetings, committee members reviewed technical information provided by ACHD at the request of the committee members and held discussions regarding the corridor. All meetings were open for the public attend. Approximately 10 to 15 members of the public attended the first meeting and approximately 25 members of the public attended the second meeting. Public comments were allowed based on the amount of time available before the end of the meeting.
At the second meeting, the Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee voted on a recommendation which was presented to the ACHD Commission, Eagle City Council, and County Commissioners at a joint meeting on December 12, 2013.

**BEACON LIGHT ROAD BACKGROUND**

**Corridor Context**

Beacon Light Road is currently a two-lane roadway that is generally rural in nature. Figure 15 shows a picture of Beacon Light Road that illustrates the rural nature of the corridor.

While Beacon Light Road is primarily rural, it serves many functions ranging from local access to properties along the corridor between SH 16 and SH 55 to regional trips associated with origins and destinations outside the corridor from places like Canyon County, Star and Emmett. Being the only east-west arterial roadway that connects into Canyon County besides SH 44, many of the existing trips on Beacon Light Road are not generated by the homes and farms adjacent to the corridor.

**Land Use and Traffic Projections**

In 2008, the NWFTS identified the need to widen Beacon Light Road to five lanes between Linder Road and SH 16 based on future year 2030 traffic projections. The 2030 traffic projections included many assumptions that have since changed as part of the development of the more recent 2035 traffic projections utilized for this study. The most significant change is the regional population estimate has increased from 825,000 by 2030 to 1,022,000 by 2035. While the difference between the 2030 and 2035 projections is an increase of approximately 23 percent, it represents an increase of over 70 percent over the current 2013 regional population. This increase creates a significant amount of new trips that will need to be served by the transportation system. The city growth projections and additional trip estimates are illustrated in Figure 16.
The City of Eagle is projected to grow significantly by 2035 with much of this growth anticipated to occur on the Beacon Light Road. The population in the area between Floating Feather Road and Homer Road is projected to increase by approximately 250 percent and the NWFTS estimates an additional 13,889 households in the foothills may be developed by 2035. These increases are illustrated in Figure 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>2013 Population</th>
<th>2013 Estimated Trips</th>
<th>2035 Population</th>
<th>2035 Estimated Trips</th>
<th>Trips Added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eagle</td>
<td>21,350</td>
<td>~53,000</td>
<td>54,179</td>
<td>~153,000</td>
<td>+100,000 Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Star</td>
<td>6,480</td>
<td>~16,000</td>
<td>20,825</td>
<td>~60,000</td>
<td>+44,000 Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>81,380</td>
<td>~202,000</td>
<td>172,576</td>
<td>~480,000</td>
<td>+278,000 Trips</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>209,700</td>
<td>~520,000</td>
<td>343,712</td>
<td>~929,000</td>
<td>+409,000 Trips</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16: Estimated City-Based Trip Increases by 2035**

Another important change since the 2008 NWFTS is the adoption of the State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan by the City of Eagle, City of Boise, and ACHD. ITD also continued work on the SH 44 Corridor Study. The State Street Transit and Traffic Operational Plan, as well as SH 44 Corridor Study by ITD, recommended SH 44 have four lanes plus a median west of Eagle Road within the 2035 time horizon. Therefore, the potential option for six lanes as recommended in the 2008 NWFTS was not included in those more recent studies. Maintaining the four lanes plus a median on SH 44 puts additional pressure on Beacon Light Road between SH 16 and SH 55.
The combination of these changes result in the 2035 traffic forecasts for Beacon Light Road being higher than in the 2008 NWFTS and identifying the potential for future widening to five lanes be extended east from Linder Road and SH 55. Figure 18 shows the projected 2035 p.m. peak hour, peak direction traffic demand on Beacon Light Road. As shown in Figure 18, the 2035 projected volume is expected to growth to approximately 1,500 vehicles per hour in the peak direction during the weekday p.m. peak hour. This is approximately 600 vehicles per hour greater than the capacity of a three-lane roadway. Based on this, the stakeholder committee identified and reviewed options for accommodating the traffic demand.

**Figure 18: Future Traffic Projections on Beacon Light Road**

Based on the input from the stakeholder committee and additional analysis by ACHD, six potential options were identified to manage the traffic demand on Beacon Light Road. These include:

- **Option 1 (Preservation for Five Lanes Based on Analysis):** Preservation of right-of-way for a future widening of Beacon Light Road to five lanes. Widening would occur when volumes warrant.
- **Option 2 (Reduce Land-Use Growth):** City and County would stop allowing development beyond what is entitled.
- **Option 3 (Shift More Traffic Demand to SH 44):** Widen SH 44 to six lanes between Eagle Road and SH 16. Six lanes plus a median are assumed between Glenwood Street and Eagle Road. ACHD has a plan for six lanes plus a median (7 lanes) on State Street east of Glenwood Street.
- **Option 4 (Options 2 and 3 Combined):** Combination of Option 2 and Option 3. The City and County would stop allowing development beyond what is entitled and ITD would widen SH 44 to six lanes with a median between Eagle Road and SH 16.

- **Option 5 (Shift Traffic Demand to Other ACHD Roads):** Construct a new east-west roadway north of Beacon Light Road.

- **Option 6 (Shift Traffic Demand to State Highways):** Fully build out the State highway system including the following:
  - Construction of the Central Valley Expressway (SH 16 extended to I-84).
  - SH 44 widening to six lanes plus a median.
  - US 20/26 widening to six lanes plus a median.

Figure 19 shows the projected traffic resulting from the six options and the approximate capacity of a three-lane roadway. These six options were evaluated for accommodating the traffic demand on Beacon Light Road.

![2035 Traffic Demand for Improvement Options](image)

**Figure 19: Options Studied for Accommodating Traffic Demand on Beacon Light Road**

As shown in Figure 19, three of the options reduce the future traffic demand on Beacon Light Road below the threshold for three lanes. These are Options 4, 5, and 6. While Options 2 and 3 reduced the traffic demand on Beacon Light Road, they do not provide a significant enough reduction in travel demand by themselves to be below the threshold for three lanes on Beacon Light Road. Together, as Option 4, they do...
have the ability to reduce the projected traffic demand below the three-lane threshold on Beacon Light Road.

In addition to identifying which options will feasibly accommodate the 2035 traffic demand and keep Beacon Light Road at three lanes, the following key findings were identified:

- Reducing future development approvals by the City of Eagle will only extend the timeframe before widening would be necessary. This is due to the regional growth that is still expected to occur and already approved developments such as the ME Spring Valley development.
- Expansion of the State highway system significantly alleviates traffic demand on Beacon Light Road and other ACHD arterials although such expansion is not planned by ITD.
- A new east-west arterial could split the east-west traffic demand resulting in two three-lane arterials.

Each of the three options that maintain Beacon Light Road at three lanes were evaluated in greater detail and compared to Option 1 which accommodates the projected demand by the widening of Beacon Light Road to five lanes. Table 4 shows the results of the comparison including the pros and cons of each option.

**Table 4: Comparison of Options that Accommodate Beacon Light Road Future Traffic Demand**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beacon Light Road Option</th>
<th>Estimated Cost ($2013)</th>
<th>Pros and Cons of Each Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 1:</strong> Preserve ROW and Potentially Construct 5 Lanes on Beacon Light Road</td>
<td>$35 Million</td>
<td>Pros:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Lowest cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Less right-of-way needed (approximately 67 percent of the right-of-way area is owned by ACHD including the existing road and dedicated right-of-way from developments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts to properties along Beacon Light Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impact to the rural environment of Beacon Light Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 4:</strong> Land-use Reduction and SH 44 Widening</td>
<td>$120 Million</td>
<td>Pros:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Less traffic demand in general due to reduced growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited ITD Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potentially difficult for the City and County to implement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Potential negatively impacts to economic development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 5:</strong> Parallel East-West Roadway</td>
<td>$80-100 Million</td>
<td>Pros:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Improved roadway connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Requires a relatively straight east-west alignment south of the Spring Valley Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Impacts along new alignment (likely Homer Road given topography and BLM land)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Higher cost for ACHD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option 6:</strong> State Highway System Buildout</td>
<td>$1 Billion</td>
<td>Pros:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Positive impacts to other ACHD roads in addition to Beacon Light Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cons:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Limited ITD funding and prioritization against other statewide projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Extensive impacts to other corridors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Most expensive option</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4, Option 1 (preserving right-of-way and ultimate construction of five lanes) is the alternative that is the least expensive. Option 4 (land use reduction and widening SH 44) or Option 5 (construction of a new east-west roadway) create similar capacity options for east-west traffic but are three to four times as expensive. In addition, widening other roadways or construction of a new road impacts other Ada County citizens.

Option 6 (building out the key ITD corridors serving the Eagle area) is by far the most expensive and results in impacts to existing properties along the State highway corridors. As identified by members of the Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee, Option 6 also has regional implications and would have a significant effect on roadways in Eagle and Meridian. Therefore, the benefits of Option 6 extend well beyond Beacon Light Road and are not directly comparable to the other options. While there are significant benefits to Option 6, ITD has many highway needs throughout the State, so the ability to focus so many improvements in Ada County must be considered.

A significant issue with Option 6, and Option 4 to a lesser extent, is the lack of funding by ITD for major State highway projects. ITD has funding challenges looking into the future and has stated many times during this study that additional widening of the State highway system in the Eagle area beyond its current widening of SH 44 to four lanes is not anticipated. In addition, even with funding increases for State highways, these highway improvements will need to be prioritized with other projects throughout the State.

Funding for the improvement is critical to ensuring the study recommendations are implementable. If the recommendations of this study rely on buildout of the State highway system and that does not occur, then the recommendations would result in an inadequate transportation system. This would be very difficult and costly to modify in the future. Therefore, the lack of ability to implement Option 6, and potentially Option 4, makes these options less realistic within the planning horizon of this study. Relying on these projects to reduce traffic demand on Beacon Light Road and not continuing to preserve right-of-way could result in still needing to pursue other options in the future, at a higher cost and having greater impacts.

**STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE EVALUATION**

Each Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee member was asked to rank the options for accommodating the future traffic growth anticipated on Beacon Light Road. Table 5 summarizes the number of first place votes each option received from the committee members:

**Table 5: Stakeholder Committee Ranking of Options**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Beacon Light Road Option</th>
<th>First Place Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Option 1: Preserve ROW to Construct 5 Lanes on Beacon Light Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 4: Land-use Reduction and SH 44 Widening</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 5: Parallel East-West Roadway</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Option 6: State Highway System Buildout</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 5, Option 6 (buildout of the State highway system) received the most votes from the stakeholder committee. Option 5 (creating a parallel east-east roadway) received the second highest number of votes.

STUDY RECOMMENDATION

Four key factors were considered in developing the recommendation for Beacon Light Road.

- Factor #1 - The first key factor is that there is not support for five lanes by the property owners living along the Beacon Light Road corridor or the leaders within Eagle. These groups represent people that live and travel to the corridor daily and will live with the future results of transportation investments in the area.
- Factor #2 - The second key factor is ensuring public funds are spent wisely and citizens throughout Ada County are not required to pay more in the future because of the planning decisions made today.
- Factor #3 - The third key factor is the need to reduce future impacts associated with widening or other mitigations that become needed in the future.
- Factor #4 - The final key factor is that ACHD does not want to invest in widening Beacon Light Road to five lanes unless it is absolutely necessary in the future.

Based on these factors, the recommendation for Beacon Light Road corridor is as follows:

- Continue to preserve right-of-way for five lanes (96 feet) when the City or Eagle and Ada County approve development:
  - If properties do not develop or redevelop, additional right-of-way will not be preserved.
  - If right-of-way is ultimately not used for widening, pedestrian, bicycle, or equestrian facilities could be installed in the additional space.
- Encourage ITD to invest in expansion of the State highway system per the Beacon Light Road Stakeholder Committee recommendation. This State highway expansion may defer, or potentially eliminate, the future need for widening Beacon Light Road, but cannot be assumed due to funding constraints.
- Widen Beacon Light Road only after other prerequisite projects have been completed and additional triggers are met.
- Identify near-term maintenance projects that could add bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the existing right-of-way along Beacon Light Road.

Implementation Prerequisites and Triggers

Based on the stakeholder and public input process, the following implementation strategy was developed to ensure widening of Beacon Light Road would be the last option for accommodating east-west traffic.
demand. Therefore, prior to widening being considered, a number of prerequisite projects have been identified which are shown in Figure 20 and listed below in implementation order from A to E:

A. Signalization of the SH 16/Beacon Light Road intersection.
B. Signalization and adding turn lanes to the Linder Road/Beacon Light Road and Linder Road/Floating Feather Road intersections.
C. Widening of Linder Road to five lanes between Beacon Light Road and SH 44.
D. Widening Beacon Light Road to five lanes between Linder Road and SH 16.
E. Signalization and adding turn lanes to the Beacon Light Road/SH 55 intersection and the Eagle Road/Beacon Light Road intersection.

These projects will provide additional capacity at the key pinch points on Beacon Light Road. Making these improvements, when needed, prolongs the ability of Beacon Light Road to remain as two lanes with additional turn lanes at the intersections. Once the prerequisite projects have been completed, a unique set of “triggers” will need to be met in order for the ACHD Commission to consider widening Beacon Light Road to five lanes:

- Floating Feather Road reaches LOS E (approximately 880 directional peak hour vehicles) and;
- Beacon Light Road reaches LOS E (approximately 880 directional peak hour vehicles) and;
- Beacon Light Road is prioritized high enough by ACHD for inclusion in the Integrated Five-Year Work Program.

**SUMMARY**

The widening of Beacon Light Road presents a dilemma between 1) serving the existing properties along the corridor with a three-lane roadway and 2) planning for the potential future development growth anticipated in the surrounding communities and in the foothills north of Eagle, which are projected to require a five-lane roadway. The lack of funding for expansion of the State highway system further complicates this transportation issue.

There are several scenarios that could occur that would result in a delay of the widening of Beacon Light Road. These scenarios include:
- Development growth does not occur as planned along the corridor.
- The State establishes a funding option to further expand the highway system.
- Changes in market demand for residential housing in northwest Ada County and northeast Canyon County.
- Changes in travel patterns and habits, including shifts to alternative transportation.

If these scenarios occur, widening may not be needed within the future planning horizon. Because there is no way to predict the likelihood of these occurring, the recommended path forward is to continue to preserve 96 feet of right-of-way on Beacon Light Road but collaborate between the City of Eagle, ACHD, and ITD. Utilizing the recommended prerequisites and triggers will extend the timeframe before widening should be needed and provide the opportunity to affect future development growth and improvement to the State highway system.
Section 7  Implementation Strategy
SECTION 7. IMPLEMENTATION STRATEGY

This section describes the phased implementation strategy for achieving the long-term transportation vision for the Northwest Foothills Transportation Study (NWFTS). The purpose of the implementation strategy is to provide guidance on the implementation of improvements as traffic demand changes and new development occurs in the study area. Implementation of the recommendations of this update will be through the ACHD Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), ACHD Five Year Work Plan (FYWP), the ITD Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP) and development application and review processes.

IMPLEMENTATION PLAN PROCESS

The two primary aspects of the implementation plan for the NWFTS are the estimated timeframe of when each improvement is needed and a threshold “trigger” that can be monitored to identify when the need for an improvement may be approaching. The timeframe for each improvement was determined by reviewing four primary considerations. The first consideration was the timing of the improvement based on the projected growth in traffic. The second is how the improvement corresponds to other improvements planned in the area or on connecting roadways. The third is the importance of the improvement to support ongoing growth. The final consideration is whether the improvement can be funded and constructed within the proposed timeframe accounting for other improvements that also must be completed.

The timing for each proposed improvement was separated into four categories:

- **Short Term**: Improvements that are planned to be constructed by ACHD, ITD or developers in the next 5 years.
- **Medium Term**: Improvements that are planned or estimated to be needed within the next 10 years, or are identified as part of the middle phases of developments.
- **Long Term**: Improvements that are planned or estimated to be needed within the next 10-20 years, or are identified as part of the later phases of the developments.
- **Very Long Term**: Improvements that are planned or estimated to be needed near, or potentially beyond, the end of the 2035 study horizon.

In addition to these timeframes, some roadways are in areas that may not develop at all by 2035 and are needed solely to support a specific property or development. These roadways were left out of the implementation plan because they are solely to access certain development areas and are not needed for any other reason.

The trigger for most improvements to existing roadways is based on the weekday peak hour directional traffic volumes. Traffic volumes are monitored by ACHD through traffic studies, traffic counts, and the periodic update of their CIP, and by ITD through permanent traffic counter stations and traffic studies.

While development in the growth creates the need for the recommended transportation projects, some projects are specifically identified as being required due to the developments in the foothills. In instances
where new roadways are solely associated with new development, they were identified as “development-driven.” In instances that improvements to existing roadways are significantly accelerated (moved up in time) by NWFTS developments, the improvement was identified as “development-accelerated.” In instances where developments in the northwest foothills add traffic demand, but are not the primary contributor to the need for an improvement, then the project is considered to not be development-driven or development-accelerated. Not being development-driven or accelerated only indicates that the improvement would still be needed within the same general timeframe to serve local and regional growth even if the foothills developments did not occur.

For development-driven and development-accelerated improvements, an estimate of development units is provided based on the traffic analysis conducted for this study and traffic information provided in the studies for specific developments. The development unit trigger is only intended to be a guide and the final unit threshold will be determined as part of the development approval process through the City, ACHD, and ITD.

Finally, potential funding sources were identified for each improvement. For the purpose of this study, the financing options were limited to the following:

- **ACHD CIP**: Applicable for improvements to ACHD arterials that are listed on the CIP. Note that the CIP does not guarantee funding but provides a funding mechanism.
- **ACHD Unfunded**: Applicable for improvements to ACHD arterials that are not included in the CIP but are shown to be needed.
- **Extraordinary Impact Fee (EIF)**: Potentially applicable for construction on the arterial roadway system if ACHD were to work with developments in a particular area to establish an EIF.
- **Community Infrastructure District (CID)**: Potentially applicable funding source for development-driven/accelerated improvements that qualify and that enter an agreement with the City and roadway agency.
- **ITD Funded**: Improvements on the state highway system that are included in the ITD Five-Year Idaho Transportation Investment Program (ITIP)
- **ITD Unfunded**: Improvements on the state highway system that are not fully funded at this time but are shown to be needed.
- **Private**: Applicable to improvements that are development-driven or development-accelerated.

Following is a summary of the general findings and recommendations of the implementation plan:

- Most of the short-term improvements on the existing transportation system are funded and planned for construction in the next five years.
- The two most significant improvements short-term and medium-term improvements to existing roadways that remain unfunded are the widening of Chinden Boulevard (US 20/26) to four lanes plus a median or center turn lane from Eagle Road to SH 16 and widening SH 44 to four lanes plus a median or center turn lane between Linder Road and SH 16. ITD has indicated that both improvements will likely be funded in the next five to ten years.
• All of the long-term widening needed on ITD roadways are currently unfunded including:
  o SH 55 widening to four lanes plus a median north of Beacon Light Road
  o SH 16 widening to four lanes plus a median, SH 44 to M3 Spring Valley
  o SH 44 widening for HOV lanes (six lanes plus a median), Glenwood to SH 55
  o Eagle Road widening to six lanes plus a median, Chinden Boulevard to SH 44

• Significant improvements are needed in the very-long-term, which include the grade separations on SH 16, widening SH 55 to six lanes plus a median between SH 44 and Beacon Light Road, and widening Chinden Boulevard to six lanes plus a median between Eagle Road and SH 16.

• Right-of-way preservation should be the focus for the following very long-term projects:
  o Beacon Light Road widening to five lanes (Linder Road to SH 55)
  o Linder Road widening to seven lanes (Chinden Boulevard to SH 44)
  o Linder Road widening to five lanes (Beacon Light Road to M3 Spring Valley)
  o SH 16 grade separations at SH 44, Floating Feather, Beacon Light, and M3 Spring Valley
  o SH 55 widening to six lanes plus a median from SH 44 to Beacon Light Road
  o Chinden Boulevard widening to six lanes plus a median from Eagle Road to SH 16.

Table 6, Table 7, Table 8, and Table 9 summarize the recommended improvements for all roadways and intersections included in the Northwest Foothills Transportation Study Update. The tables are separated into the four general timeframes. The table also includes the “triggers” and possible funding source for the improvements. Furthermore, the improvements are numbered (Short-Term (S), Medium-Term (M), Long-Term (L), and Very Long-Term (VL)) and organized into three categories which include development-driven, State highway system improvements, and ACHD Improvements. The improvement projects are also shown in Figure 21, Figure 22, Figure 23, and Figure 24, respectively.

In some instances, roadways or intersections may require a different level of improvement for two different time horizons. In these instances, the improvements could be phased over the two time horizons or the longer-term improvement could be constructed upfront. For roadway sections with more than one improvement option, both levels of improvement are listed in Table 9 under the earliest timeframe.

**BEACON LIGHT ROAD**

As discussed in Section 6, a detailed set of implementation recommendations was developed. This included the following implementation triggers:

• Completion of all prerequisite projects including the following:
  o Signalization of the SH 16/ Beacon Light Road intersection.
  o Signalization and adding turn lanes to the Linder Road/Beacon Light Road and Linder Road/Floating Feather Road intersections.
  o Widening of Linder Road to five lanes between Beacon Light Road and SH 44.
  o Signalization and adding turn lanes to the Beacon Light Road/SH 55 intersection and the Eagle Road/Beacon Light Road intersection.
- Floating Feather Road reaches LOS E (approximately 880 directional peak hour vehicles) and;
- Beacon Light Road reaches LOS (approximately 880 directional peak hour vehicles) and;
- Beacon Light Road is prioritized high enough by ACHD for inclusion in the Integrated Five-Year Work Program.

Due the extensive amount of triggers that would need to occur for widening of Beacon Light Road to five lanes, the widening of the Beacon Light Road sections between Linder Road projects in the Very Long-Term are shown in Table 9 as being focused on right-of-way preservation. If all the triggers are not met, widening would not occur and any additional right-of-way beyond what is required for three lanes could be utilized for additional pedestrian, bicycle and streetscape elements.
### Table 6: Implementation Strategy: Short-Term Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location/Segment</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</th>
<th>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Trigger and Estimated Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S-1</td>
<td>Linder Road, Homer Rd. - Spring Valley Rd.</td>
<td>New Road 2/3 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 TIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>M3 Spring Valley development (&gt;1,000 units) or as required by ACHD</td>
<td>Equest Lane is under application for 200-300 units. A signal without SH16 widening could serve about 1,000 homes assuming ITD and ACHD allow that level of traffic on Equest Lane. Beyond that, it is assumed Linder will be required.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-1</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 Master TIS showed 2 lanes lasting to 7153 units but also included a 2-lane Palmer connection.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Review need at 5,000 units for M3. May not need widening if intersections are operating acceptably</td>
<td>Analysis shows Linder Road needs 5 lanes in 2031 which assuming a straight line of 5,700 units would be around 4,600 units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-2</td>
<td>Aerie Way, Linder Rd. - East and West</td>
<td>New Road 3 Lanes</td>
<td>Part of M3 development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Per M3 development plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-2</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>Part of M3 development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Per M3 development plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-3</td>
<td>M3 Equest Access</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>Part of Phase 1 of M3</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID</td>
<td>Per M3 development plan and ITD permit requirements. Access will transition to right-in or right-in, right-out only at the time Aerie Way is extended, SH 44 is widened, or intersection reaches capacity.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-4</td>
<td>Avimor East Road, SH 55- Avimor East Rd.</td>
<td>New Road</td>
<td>Part of Avimor development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID</td>
<td>Per Avimor development plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-5</td>
<td>State Highway 44, Linder Rd. - Ballantyne Ln.</td>
<td>Widen 4 Lanes + Turn Lane</td>
<td>ITD ITIP/ACHD CIP – Under construction to be completed in December 2013.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ITD Funded</td>
<td>Existing deficiency. Includes Linder Road intersection.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-6</td>
<td>State Highway 44, SH 16- Linder Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 4 Lanes + Turn Lane</td>
<td>ITD ITIP – ROW preservation scheduled for next 5 years. State Street TTOP. ITD is working to get funding.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ITD Funded</td>
<td>Existing deficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-7</td>
<td>State Highway 16, Chinden Blvd. - State St.</td>
<td>New Road (4 lanes + Median)</td>
<td>Planned extension by ITD. Currently Under Construction</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ITD Funded</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S-8</td>
<td>Eagle Road, SH 44-State St.</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>ACHD CIP – Scheduled for widening to 5-lanes in 2017-2021.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACHD CIP</td>
<td>Existing deficiency being studied as part of the Eagle Road/State Street Intersection Concept Study.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- ITD = Idaho Transportation Department
- TIS = Traffic Impact Study
- ITIP = Idaho Transportation Investment Program
- CID = Community Infrastructure District
- M3 = M3 Companies Spring Valley Development
- AC = Access Controlled
- HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes
- GSI = Grade Separated Interchanges
- CIP = ACHD Capital Improvement Plan
- ROW = Right-of-Way
- ACHD CIP = Existing deficiency being studied as part of the Eagle Road/State Street Intersection Concept Study.
## Table 7: Implementation Strategy: Medium-Term Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location/Segment</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</th>
<th>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Trigger and Estimated Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M-1</td>
<td>Aerie Way, SH 16-Linder Rd.</td>
<td>New Road 3 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 TIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID/EIF</td>
<td>Per M3 Spring Valley development</td>
<td>Assuming 2030 and 5,700 units of M3 at 2035, approximately 4,400 units would be completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 TIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID/EIF</td>
<td>Per M3 TIS, Review at approx. 4,000 units, 2030-2035</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Development Driven Improvements – Constructed as Development Triggers Result in Need**

**State Highway Improvements – Constructed by ITD Based on Regional and State Priorities**

| M-2 | Chinden Boulevard, SH 16-Linder Rd. | Widen 4 Lanes + Median/ Turn Lane | ITD STIP – ROW preservation scheduled for next 5 years | No | ITD | Existing deficiency. Also see VL-21 for ultimate 7-Lane widening. |
| M-3 | Chinden Boulevard, Linder Rd-Eagle Rd. | Widen 4 Lanes + Median/ Turn Lane | ITD STIP – ROW preservation scheduled for next 5 years | No | ITD | Existing deficiency. Also see VL-21 for ultimate 7-Lane widening. |

**ACHD Improvements – To be Constructed When Identified Need Has Been Met**

| M-4 | Linder Road, Chinden Blvd.-SH 44 – 5 lanes | Widen 5 Lanes OR Widen 7 Lanes | ACHD CIP – Scheduled for widening to 7 lanes in 2017-2021. Widen to 5 lanes may not be done if widening to 7 lanes from the existing 2/3 lanes occurs. | No | ACHD CIP | Widen to 5 Lanes: PH Dir Vol => 880, 2015-2020  Widen to 7 Lanes: PH Dir Vol => 1,780, 2030-2035 |
| M-5 | Linder Road, SH 44-Floating Feather Rd. | Widen 5 Lanes | ACHD CIP – Scheduled for widening to 5 lanes in 2017-2021. M3 TIS | No | ACHD CIP | PH Dir Vol => 690, 2020-2025 or significant progress of the M3 Spring Valley Development (>3,000 units). Assuming 2025 and 5,700 units of M3 at 2035, approximately 3,100 units is assumed be completed and in the projection for Linder Road |
| M-6 | Linder Road, Floating Feather Rd.-Beacon Light Rd. | Widen 5 Lanes | ACHD CIP – Scheduled for widening to 5 lanes in 2017-2021 | No | ACHD CIP | PH Dir Vol => 690, 2020-2025 or significant progress of the M3 Spring Valley Development (>3,000 units). Assuming 2025 and 5,700 units of M3 at 2035, approximately 3,100 units would be completed. |
| M-7 | Beacon Light Road | Pedestrian/Bicycle | Identified need | No | ACHD | No trigger | As maintenance/development occurs, widen shoulders and connect existing sidewalk sections. |

**Legend:**

ITD = Idaho Transportation Department  
TIS = Traffic Impact Study  
ITIP – Idaho Transportation Investment Program  
CID = Community Infrastructure District  
M3 = M3 Companies Spring Valley Development  
AC = Access Controlled  
HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes  
GSI = Grade Separated Interchanges  
CIP = ACHD Capital Improvement Plan  
ROW = Right-of-Way
# Table 8: Implementation Strategy: Long-Term Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location/Segment</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</th>
<th>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Trigger and Estimated Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-1</td>
<td>Aerie Way, Spring Valley East to Willow Creek</td>
<td>New Road 3 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 TIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>As needed Per M3 development phases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-4</td>
<td>Widen to 5 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 TIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>As needed Per M3 development phases, Estimated 2030-2035 (approx. 5,000 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-2</td>
<td>Willow Creek to Brookside Connection, Aerie Way - Brookside</td>
<td>New Road 3 Lanes</td>
<td>Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>As required for developments or emergency access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-3</td>
<td>Brookside Lane, SH 55-Spring Creek Ln</td>
<td>Widen 3 Lanes</td>
<td>Dry Creek Ranch TIS and related supplements. Phase 2 (Approx. 1,500 units)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Development of Dry Creek Ranch (Ph2)/other property per ACHD/ITD requirements. Approx. 1,500 units.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-5</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Per future development requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-4</td>
<td>Brookside Lane. Mt. Shadow Ln.-SH 55</td>
<td>Widen 3 Lanes</td>
<td>Dry Creek Ranch TIS and related supplements. Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Development of Dry Creek Ranch (Ph2)/other property per ACHD/ITD requirements. Approx. 1,500 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-6</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Per future development requirements of developments on west side of SH 55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-5</td>
<td>Avimor West Road, SH 55-SH 55</td>
<td>New Road 2/3 Lanes</td>
<td>Part of Avimor development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Development of Avimor on the west side of SH 55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-6</td>
<td>Avimor East Road. Avimor Dr to North Access</td>
<td>New Road 3 Lanes</td>
<td>Part of Avimor development</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Development of Avimor north to toward the north access to SH 55.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-7</td>
<td>Aerie Way, Willow Creek Rd – Avimor West Rd.</td>
<td>New Road 2 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 TIS, Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>As required by development of adjacent property (Connolly)/Harmon), ACHD development requirements or emergency access.</td>
<td>This is not required for traffic capacity. It is needed to serve adjacent properties and for emergency access and connectivity. As needed Per M3 development phases. Estimated to be needed in 2031, at which time approximately 4,500 units of M3 would be completed and are assumed in the traffic projections for Linder Road. Estimated to be needed in 2023, at which time approximately 5,200 units of M3 would be completed and are assumed in the traffic projections for Linder Road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-8</td>
<td>Linder Road, Beacon Light Rd.-Homer Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 3 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 TIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /ACHD</td>
<td>Approx. 4,000 units of the M3 Spring Valley development or as required by ACHD</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-7</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>M3 TIS</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>Approx. 5,000 units of the M3 Spring Valley development or as required by ACHD</td>
<td>Estimated to be needed in 2033, at which time approximately 5,200 units of M3 would be completed and are assumed in the traffic projections for Linder Road. Estimated to be needed in 2022, approximately 2,300 units of M3 would be completed and are assumed in the traffic projections for SH 16.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-9</td>
<td>State Highway 16, Beacon Light Rd.-Aerie Way</td>
<td>Widen 4 Lanes + Median/Turn Lane</td>
<td>M3 TIS, ITD SH 16 Corridor Plan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded/Private/CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 920, 2017-2022. Or per ITD requirements for development of M3 Spring Valley 2017-2022. Monitor once M3 Spring Valley constructs connection to SH 16 and completes approximately 2,500 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-10</td>
<td>State Highway 55, Brookside Ln.-Avimor Dr. West Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 4 Lanes + Median/</td>
<td>Avimor TIS, Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded/Private/CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 920, 2025 or significant progress of the Avimor Development (&gt;2500 units).</td>
<td>As needed Per M3 development phases. Estimated to be needed in 2027. Approximately 2,500 are assumed in Avimor. Note that this is average traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Location/Segment</td>
<td>Project</td>
<td>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</td>
<td>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</td>
<td>Potential Funding Source</td>
<td>Trigger and Estimated Timeframe</td>
<td>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-11</td>
<td>Eagle-Willow Creek Connector</td>
<td>New Road 2 Lanes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID /EIF</td>
<td>As required by development of adjacent property (Connolly/Harmon), connection of Aerie Way from Spring Valley to Willow Creek Rd, ACHD development requirements or emergency access.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-12</td>
<td>State Highway 16, SH 44 - Beacon Light Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>M3 TIS, ITD SH 16 Corridor Plan</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded/Private/CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 920, 2017-2022. Or per ITD requirements for development of M3 Spring Valley 2017-2022. Monitor once M3 Spring Valley constructs connection to SH 16 and completes approximately 2,500 units</td>
<td>Estimated to be needed in 2022, at which time approximately 2,300 units of M3 would be completed and are assumed in the traffic projection for SH 16.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-13</td>
<td>Eagle Road, Chinden Blvd.-SH 44</td>
<td>Widen 6 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded</td>
<td>Existing deficiency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-15</td>
<td>State Highway 55, Beacon Light Rd.-Brookside Ln</td>
<td>Widen 4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>Aivinor and Dry Creek Ranch TIA Phase 2 (Approx. 1,500 units), Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded/Private/CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 920, 2025, or significant progress of the Dry Creek Ranch or Aivinor Developments (&gt;3,000 units total).</td>
<td>Estimated to be needed in 2025. Assumes approximately 2,100 units of Aivinor and 1,000 of Dry Creek would be completed by 2025. Note that this is average traffic so congestion on summer Friday evenings would occur.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**ACHD Improvements – To be Constructed When Identified Need Has Been Met**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location/Segment</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</th>
<th>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Trigger and Estimated Timeframe</th>
<th>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L-16</td>
<td>Beacon Light Road/Linder Rd Intersection</td>
<td>Improve Intersection</td>
<td>ACHD CIP – Scheduled for widening to 5 lanes in 2022-2026. Near-term ROW preservation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACHD CIP</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 690, 2022-2027 or intersection meets signal warrants.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-17</td>
<td>Beacon Light Road, SH 16- Linder Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>ACHD CIP – Scheduled for widening to 5 lanes in 2022-2026. Near-term ROW preservation.</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACHD CIP</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 690, 2022-2027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L-19</td>
<td>Beacon Light Widening at SH 55</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes at Intersection</td>
<td>ACHD CIP – Scheduled for widening to 5 lanes in 2022-2026</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACHD CIP</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 690, 2022-2027</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**

- ITD = Idaho Transportation Department
- TIS = Traffic Impact Study
- ITIP = Idaho Transportation Investment Program
- CID = Community Infrastructure District
- M3 = M3 Companies Spring Valley Development
- AC = Access Controlled
- HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes
- GSI = Grade Separated Interchanges
- CIP = ACHD Capital Improvement Plan
- ROW = Right-of-Way
## Table 9: Implementation Strategy: Very-Long-Term Improvements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location/Segment</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</th>
<th>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Prerequisite/Trigger</th>
<th>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VL-8</td>
<td>State Highway 55, Floating Feather Rd.-Beacon Light Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 6 Lanes + Median/ Turn Lane</td>
<td>Idaho 55 Traffic Impact Study of Northwest Foothills Developments</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded/Private/CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 1,960 or approximately 5,000 units total between Avimor, Dry Creek and Connolly developments.</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately near 2035 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-9</td>
<td>State Highway 55, Avimor Dr. to North Avimor Access.</td>
<td>Widen 4 Lanes</td>
<td>Avimor TIS supplemental documents</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded/Private/CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 920 or significant progress of the Avimor Development (&gt;3,500 units total).</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2020-2025 timeframe Needed near end of Avimor Development 2035 projection of 3,700 units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-10</td>
<td>State Highway 16/SH 44</td>
<td>Grade Separate/ ROW Preservation</td>
<td>Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ITD/Private /CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 1,770, M3 Spring Valley Development (&gt;5,000 units)</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2020-2035 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-11</td>
<td>State Highway 16/Beacon Light Road Interchange and Floating Feather Overpass</td>
<td>Grade Separate/ ROW Preservation</td>
<td>M3 TIS Phase 5 (Approx. 12,000 units), Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ITD/Private /CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 1,770</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2030 timeframe Approximately 4,900 units of M3 would be completed and are assumed in the traffic projections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-12</td>
<td>State Highway 16/Aerie Way</td>
<td>Grade Separate/ ROW Preservation</td>
<td>M3 TIS Phase 4 (Approx. 6,000 units, Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Private/CID</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 1,770</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2030 timeframe Approximately 4,900 units of M3 would be completed and are assumed in the traffic projections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-13</td>
<td>State Highway 16/Chaparral</td>
<td>Signal</td>
<td>Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>ITD/Private /CID</td>
<td>When needed based on warrants. Not associated with a specific amount of development by M3 Spring Valley Development north of the M3 Spring Valley development. It could be needed sooner.</td>
<td>The need for this signal is general development north of the M3 Spring Valley development. It could be needed sooner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### State Highway Improvements – Constructed by ITD Based On Regional and State Priorities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location/Segment</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</th>
<th>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Prerequisite/Trigger</th>
<th>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VL-14</td>
<td>State Highway 44, Eagle Rd.- SH 55</td>
<td>Add HOV Lanes (6 Lanes + Median)</td>
<td>State Street TTOP – Long-term widening</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 1,780</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2025-2030 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-15</td>
<td>State Highway 55, SH 44- Floating Feather Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 6 Lanes + Median + HCI at SH 55</td>
<td>Idaho 55 Traffic Impact Study of Northwest Foothills Developments</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 1,960</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2030-2035 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-16</td>
<td>State Highway 16, Aerie Way-Chaparral Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 4 Lanes + Median</td>
<td>Northwest Foothills Developments Joint Transportation Study, Tier 2 – Alternatives Analysis</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 920,</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2020 timeframe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-17</td>
<td>Chinden Boulevard, SH 16- Eagle Rd</td>
<td>Widen 6 Lanes + Median/ ROW Preservation</td>
<td>ITDI TIP – ROW preservation scheduled for next 5 years</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ITD Unfunded</td>
<td>PH Dir Vole =&gt;1,960</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2025-2035 timeframe. See M-1 and M-2 for near-term widening to 5 lanes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACHD Improvements – To be Constructed When Identified Need Has Been Met
## Section 7. Implementation Strategy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location/Segment</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</th>
<th>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Prerequisite/Trigger</th>
<th>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VL-18</td>
<td>Eagle Road, Floating Feather Rd. - Beacon Light Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 3 Lanes</td>
<td>Identified need for pedestrian and bicycle facilities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>ACHD Refunded</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-19</td>
<td>Eagle Road, Beacon Light Rd. - Vali-Hi Rd.</td>
<td>Widen 3 Lanes</td>
<td>Identified need for pedestrian and bicycle facilities</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Accelerated</td>
<td>ACHD/ Private/CID/EIF</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-20</td>
<td>Floating Feather, Eagle Rd to SH 16</td>
<td>Widen 3 Lanes</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACHD Unfunded</td>
<td>PH Dir Vol =&gt; 690</td>
<td>Anticipated need to be met approximately in 2030-2035 timeframe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ACHD Improvements – Right of Way Preservation Only Until All Prerequisites Have Been Met

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Location/Segment</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Other Plan Reference (Non-NWFTS)</th>
<th>NWFTS Dev. Driven?</th>
<th>Potential Funding Source</th>
<th>Prerequisite/Trigger</th>
<th>Estimated Timeframe and Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>VL-21</td>
<td>Beacon Light Road, Linder to Eagle (Segment)</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>ACHD CIP – Need for widening to 5 lanes in anticipated in 2022-2026. Near-term ROW preservation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACHD CIP</td>
<td>Triggers for widening include completion of all of the following:</td>
<td>Estimated to be needed in 2026-2035. See L-4 for widening from SH16 to Linder Rd and L-5 for Eagle Rd intersection improvements.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VL-21</td>
<td>Beacon Light Road, Eagle to SH 55 (Segment)</td>
<td>Widen 5 Lanes</td>
<td>ACHD CIP – Need for widening to 5 lanes anticipated in 2027-2031. Near-term ROW preservation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>ACHD CIP</td>
<td>Triggers for widening include completion of all of the following:</td>
<td>Estimated to be needed in 2026-2035. See L-5 and L-19 for Eagle Rd and SH 55 intersection improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend:**
- ITD = Idaho Transportation Department
- TIS = Traffic Impact Study
- ITIP = Idaho Transportation Investment Program
- CID = Community Infrastructure District
- M3 = M3 Companies Spring Valley Development
- AC = Access Controlled
- HOV = High Occupancy Vehicle Lanes
- GSI = Grade Separated Interchanges
- CIP = ACHD Capital Improvement Plan
- ROW = Right-of-Way
SHORT TERM IMPROVEMENTS (0-5 YRS)
Figure 22

MEDIUM TERM IMPROVEMENTS (5-10 YRS)
Figure 23

LONG-TERM IMPROVEMENTS (10-20 YRS)
Signal

3 Lanes
4 Lanes + Median/ Turn Lane
5 Lanes
4 Lanes + HOV + Median
6 Lanes + Median/ 7 Lanes

Overpass

Grade-Separated Interchange

High-Capacity Intersection

ROW Preservation Focus. See Section 5.

ROW Preservation Focus
See Table 9 for Pre-Requisites and Triggers for Potential Widening

Very Long-Term Improvements (20+ Yrs)
IMPLEMENTATION PLAN ELEMENTS

A key aspect of the implementation strategy is a process to ensure project development occurs for the study area when needed. This includes coordinating with private developers, review and updating of the Capital Improvements Plan / Integrated Five-Year Work Plan, identifying funding sources, and monitoring for future updates to the NWFTS.

Land Use Development Actions

Land-use was a key issue discussed by the City and ACHD during the development of this study and particularly with respect to the Beacon Light Road corridor. Private development will be the key driver for the roadway network north of Beacon Light Road as well as a contributor to improvements throughout the study area. Approval of new development creates additional trips on the roadway system and will impact the estimated timing for improvements. The land-use review process is important in order to ensure the roadway system improvements happen concurrently with the development that triggers the improvements. The land-use process also provides the opportunity to target growth to areas where costly roadway infrastructure may not be required. This will reduce impacts on existing property owners, support the existing character of the community, and reduces the financial impact to ACHD of having to design, construct, and maintain new roadway infrastructure.

Both ACHD and the City of Eagle coordinate regularly on the review of land-use applications. As development occurs in the northwest foothills, ACHD and the City of Eagle will coordinate in reviewing these applications and the necessary transportation infrastructure to support each application. The implementation strategy provides a framework for new development and land-use applications to understand the transportation needs and improvements in the study area. Based on this framework, a more detailed strategy will be developed for each application and validated with the traffic impact study that is required as part of applications.

CID Funding

Since adoption of the 2008 NWFTS, Community Infrastructure District (CID) funding has been approved by the City of Eagle for the M3 Spring Valley development. CID funding can be used for any roadway improvement project that is required for development, whether it is within the development or off-site on the existing transportation system. Based on input from the Project Steering Committee and the City of Eagle, the most likely roadway improvements for CID funding will be the public roadways within the northwest foothills that will serve the developments and improvements to the primary transportation corridors that directly serve the developments. Some of the existing primary transportation corridors serving the NWFTS developments include:

- Linder Road – Beacon Light to Aerie Way
- SH 16 – SH 44 to Chaparral Road
Another aspect of CID funding is that it is best suited to fund improvements after some development is already completed. The primary transportation corridors listed above generally need improvement in the medium and long-term and therefore could be good candidates for CID funding.

**Corridor Preservation**

The most uncertain part of any implementation plan focused on future needs is the timing of projects. This is because development and background growth can be difficult to predict. For this reason, corridor preservation is the most important aspect of the implementation strategy. As land-use applications are made, ACHD and the City should ensure that adequate right-of-way is preserved so that future improvements can be made, even if they are far into the future. Without preservation, some improvements may not be possible which can have a ripple effect throughout the entire plan as projects on other roadways may need to be expanded or changed.

**Monitoring Process**

The purpose of this study is to ensure that adequate safety and capacity is provided for highway users throughout the year 2035 horizon. While general monitoring thresholds are included within this update to assist agencies in reviewing the need and timing of phased implementation, the study and roadway network plan should remain dynamic and responsive to development and changes to the adopted land-use and transportation plans. To accomplish this goal, a monitoring process should be agreed upon by the City and ACHD in an Inter-Governmental Agreement that identifies triggers for reviewing the corridor plan and how development within the surrounding area will be reviewed and coordinated with all parties. It is recommended that the land-use assumptions and recommendations of this study be reviewed at least every five years and the study updated if significant changes have occurred.
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