

U.S. 12

The City of Lewiston's Public Works Department has reviewed the proposed Baker Truck Request for the new 129,000-pound trucks. Based on the proposed route, it appears East Main Street will be the only street utilized that is within the City of Lewiston's jurisdiction. Based on this information, we have the following two points of concern. Please see the attached map for reference.

1. Truck trailer off tracking from U.S. 12 onto East Main and from East Main onto U.S. 12
2. The load carrying capacity of the bridge at Lindsay Creek. I believe this is ITD bridge number 21291.

We would appreciate any help ITD could provide in evaluating these two items.



Highway 12 runs through the Lochsa River corridor, a place that is one of Idaho's true natural gems. Highway 12 is a modest highway serving recreationists and a thriving tourist industry (fishermen, hunters, campers, boaters, hikers, bikers, etc.). It is a highway that runs through an area designated as a Wild and Scenic River corridor, a Northwest Passage Scenic Byway, a TransAmerica Bicycle Route, and the historic route of the Lewis and Clark Trail, all amid the natural wonder of some of Idaho's best wildlife habitat. It is an area totally unsuitable for use as an industrial transportation corridor for giant trucks carrying oversized and overweight equipment. The shipment of such large equipment should be restricted to our Interstate Highway system, a system built in places more conducive to industry uses, a system built to accommodate larger loads than our two

lane highways such as Highway 12. Highway 12 was not designed for "super-sized" loads and should not be used for such vehicles.

Idaho Forest Group is Idaho's largest lumber manufacturer. We support safety, efficiency and cost consciousness in the transport of our lumber, logs and residuals.

We fully support ITD's process of identifying and adding new routes and understand any additional routes must be designated as structurally appropriate by ITD. The two routes currently under consideration have been judged to meet the necessary standards to be classified as a red or blue route. With that knowledge, IFG asks you to support the requested routes on sections of U.S. 95 and U.S. 12.

As one of the applicants, Baker Trucking, mentions, allowing 129,000 lbs trucks on the routes is good for Idaho business. Transporting products with 129,000 lbs trucks allows Idaho's businesses to carry goods more efficiently, reduce the number of truck trips and increase our connectivity with many of our neighboring states. This must all be done safely as well. We know not every route is the right fit for 129,000 lbs trucks, but we feel confident adding sections of U.S. 95 and U.S. 12 will help us move Idaho forward.

Clearwater Paper continues to support increasing truck weight limits on identified sections of highways in Idaho. We believe that allowing 129,000-pound trucks on approved roads is good for Idaho's economy and just makes good sense when a road has met the standard. We fully support ITD's process of identifying and adding new routes and understand any additional routes must be designated as structurally appropriate by ITD.

Transporting products with 129,000-pound trucks allows Idaho's businesses to carry goods more efficiently, reduce the number of truck trips and increase our connectivity with many of our neighboring states. The two routes currently under consideration have been judged to meet the necessary standards to be classified as a red or blue route. With that knowledge, Clearwater Paper supports the requested routes on sections of U.S. 95 and U.S. 12.

We, as members of the Right Truck for Idaho Coalition, are writing to you as a group of Idaho businesses, large and small, who represent industries from across our great state. Our products include sugar beets, potatoes, dairy, wheat, grain, sand and gravel, groceries, phosphate, and more. We are writing in the hopes that you will support increasing truck weight limits on sections of U.S. 95 and U.S. 12.

In 2013, our coalition urged lawmakers to increase truck weight limits on the 35 routes studied in the 10-year pilot project and establish a process for adding new routes if they meet the necessary engineering and safety standards. The extensive study conducted by the Idaho Transportation Department confirms that 129,000 lbs trucks are the right trucks for certain roads in Idaho. However, we recognize that not every road is appropriate for 129,000 lbs trucks and that is why the process for adding new routes is so important.

We fully support ITD's process of identifying and adding new routes and understand any additional routes must be designated as structurally appropriate by ITD. The two routes currently under consideration have been judged to meet the necessary standards to be classified as a red or blue route. With that knowledge, the Right Truck for Idaho Coalition asks you to support the requested routes on sections of U.S. 95 and U.S. 12.

As one of the applicants, Baker Trucking, mentions, allowing 129,000 lbs trucks on the routes is good for Idaho business. Transporting products with 129,000 lbs trucks allows Idaho's businesses to carry goods more

efficiently, reduce the number of truck trips and increase our connectivity with many of our neighboring states. We know not every route is the right fit for 129,000 lbs trucks, but we feel confident adding sections of U.S. 95 and U.S. 12 will help us move Idaho forward.

Verbal Testimony

Idaho Forest Group is the largest lumber producer in Idaho and we support safety, efficiency and cost consciousness in the transport of our lumber, logs and residual products.

We were involved with the original legislation and we followed the rule-making process and we fully support ITD's process for identifying and adding new routes and understand any additional routes must be designated as structurally appropriate by the ITD.

The two routes under consideration have been judged to meet the necessary standards to be classified and with that knowledge, IFG asks that you support the requested routes of sections of U.S. 95 and U.S. 12.

As the applicant, Baker Trucking, mentioned, 129,000-pound trucks on the right route is good for Idaho businesses and we think it's good for IFG as well as other companies and we think it's the more effective and efficient way to carry products, reduce the number of trips that can be done safely and efficiently.

We know that not every route in the state fits the criteria but we're confident that these two do and think that this will move us forward in implementing the law and the rules.

Verbal Testimony

My testimony on it is from a trucking standpoint. I see no issues at all. I feel it's a safe deal. Yes, there's increased weight but we also got more axles on the ground for more braking power.

The way - that configuration was designed to disperse the weight more out, more equal, be less ground pressure than what we're doing as we speak so - you know, you can go back to when we went from 80,000 pounds to 105,000 pounds. We're basically doing the same thing in a nutshell. More axles, more braking, more distributing it out.

I've been in the trucking business 30-plus years and I don't see any safety issues with this deal at all. If I didn't feel comfortable, I wouldn't have pursued it so - and we're also going to get more lumber moved per load. It should be less trips.

We don't know exactly what that number's going to be yet until the ball gets rolling but I think you'll see less movement of trucks than you're seeing now.

Verbal Testimony

Unfortunately, we have the last leg of this whole route, you know, from city limits to Mill Road (in Nez Perce County) and we have a road that is in " Mill Road being in pretty tough shape.

A lot of rutting and deterioration on that road that has been on-going for years. And I don't at all want to hold this project up but I'm wanting to see if we can come to some common ground at least to make sure that these heavy loads are not going to have any more of an impact to our road as far as rutting and deterioration of that road.

And, you know, I spoke to the commissioners about this issue several times and they really have not taken a position on it. I think they're kind of waiting to see what my position's going to be on it and, again, I'm not for it or against it one way or the other.