

Please do not permit these loads through downtown Boise. Downtown we are trying as a community to improve the pedestrian and cycling experience and this would go against everything that the City, CCDC and others are working for.

---

Evidently, the trucking company Arlo G. Lott Trucking has requested permission from ITD to operate oversized 115-foot, 2-trailer roads over urban streets here in Boise (and on other Treasure Valley Roads). Isn't this outside current regulations? If so, where is the PUBLIC need in doing this? Do we really need such a large vehicle on Boise streets? Is this company going to reimburse Ada County Highway District for the increased wear this vehicle is going to cause on OUR roads? I am totally opposed to granting the request of this company, and I hope so is ITD.

---

Topic. Overweight loads through town. Do not even waste time (money) on this. No. We have weight limits and loads that are smaller can use the interstate. Arlo Trucking Optimal profit on each load is not the public good. Let them use the interstates and break down loads to deliver in town. Our building and distribution industry can pay for it out of their bottom line. If it is that big of a deal, let them pass along the cost to all of us in the valley through higher prices. Free market. We have load limits for a reason. Stop the nonsense now.

---

Regarding the request from Arlo G. Lott Trucking to increase the weight limit allowed, the City questions if approval would be wise at this point on a corridor where capacity is already an issue. In addition, we are interested in knowing how enforcement of any new standards will be addressed and what steps will be taken to ensure that these large, heavier trucks stay on the requested highways. The maintenance and impact due to weight increase on the roadways should be further evaluated. Finally, the Community Planning

Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) is undergoing a freight study in the region. Until this study is complete, and capacity improvements are added to the corridor, we would be opposed to the requested weight increase.

---

I would like to express Boise Elevated's concern regarding the potential impact of this application on downtown Boise, specifically the Front and Myrtle corridor (US 20/26). Our group and others in the business community have a growing concern about the current barrier impact of this one-way couplet to north-south connectivity along the entire length from the Connector to Broadway. There is a growing perception that conditions are unsafe, or at a minimum discouraging, for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the 5-lane roadways in the face of high traffic volumes and high vehicle speed.

There is tremendous and welcome private investment (after a severe recession) that is taking place or has been announced in the corridor, including JUMP, the Simplot World Headquarters, City Center Plaza, Boise Centre expansion, 4 hotels, condominiums and apartments. When one considers the expected significant increase in pedestrians in the corridor from added workers and visitors, the addition of over 1,700 trips by very large trucks on Front and Myrtle would not be a positive and would further aggravate this barrier condition.

We would strongly recommend that ITD push the pause button regarding this application to allow a more complete assessment of the potential impacts of this application. The assessment should include factors that go beyond the traditional transportation analysis that has been undertaken. Additionally, we would strongly recommend that ITD consider SH 55 (Eagle Rod.) as an alternative access to the Interstate rather than US 20/26 through downtown Boise.

Thank you for your consideration. We are always available for a further conversation and would be happy to assist ITD with a broader assessment.

---

Benewah County is strongly opposed to the applications for 129,000-pound truck routes on U.S. 12; Idaho 13; Idaho 162; Idaho 16; and U.S. 20-26. A large number of Idaho roads are in poor to mediocre condition and do not possess the proper widths, passing lanes, turnouts and safety ramps necessary for trucks carrying 129,000 pound loads. Adding to that, inclement weather and winding roadways create unsafe conditions for everyone. Longer, heavier trucks will lead to more congestion on our highways and put increased stress on our roads and bridges and it is unfair to hold taxpayers responsible for paying for infrastructure damage caused by the heavier trucks.

---

I personally see no problem with allowing the larger loads on our highways. We need to start giving business in this state a break on shipping costs, which are extremely high the way it stands. I'm all for it. At least let's give it a shot for a while and see what happens.

---

I think it's ludicrous to allow this. My reason being is that's why we put the bypass in in the first place. I hate to see all of this. I think there needs to be more thorough consideration of what it's doing to our area.

---

I think it's absolutely outrageous and is going to cause a lot of traffic problems - tremendous delays and a lot of frustration. I'm sure there's some other route they've been using. Why can't they continue with that?

---

As a private citizen, I'm very concerned. I'm very concerned about the increased load on our infrastructure. I'm very concerned about the traffic challenges that we already have right now.

I'm very concerned about the safety issues involved with the - enforcement safety and how we're going to assure that if the ITD Board approves this, then how are we going to hold the right people accountable not if but when there's an issue that occurs.

I truly understand the tremendous opportunities that our infrastructure gives us and that it really is about commerce, moving things. But I think that in today's environment with the growth that we're seeing in Ada County projected to be a million by - in about 20 years if I'm not mistaken through COMPASS, this is probably something we do not want to see or I would not want to see.

I think there are other avenues and I think that the highway system has been built to support these bigger loads. The local roads - I put local in quotes because they are ITD roads - have probably not been designed to the maximum extent to ensure safe, effective operations.

And like I said, today we're already seeing the tremendous struggles just to get home and get back out to work on a day-to-day basis. I think that any other addition of heavy, heavy vehicles is unwarranted.

---

We are in full support of the 129 as we have been in the other requests that we've submitted. We can't see that there is a downside to it whatsoever.

I was just sharing with one of your members here just recently in the number of trips that we are bringing out of the north Idaho area, Lewiston primarily and Grangeville. We're at about 300 loads a month coming in currently, which is going to up the percentages that we gave in the beginning. By going to 129,000, that will reduce those trips almost a third of what we've had.

So having said that, you know, I still stand for the point that in our calculations and all of our analysis, our maxi trucks or the trucks

carrying the 129,000 and even the 106, we have a much better safety rating on those than we do our 80,000-pound trucks. We can't see a downside to it.

I'd just as soon have a little less traffic running up and down 95. It's somewhat of a risk as it is let alone, you know, bringing down 129,000. I do feel the 129's a little safer. You're running 10 axles. You've got double the brakes of what you do on 80,000 and our own drivers as they -as they maneuver their trucks with 106, they like that better than 80 just coming off the grades. Like White Bird, it's safer. 129 will even be that much better. You're adding the axles. So from a safety standpoint, we like that.

As something to help us compete in the state of Idaho, I think it's imperative that we do this. We do the same thing in Utah. We do the same thing in Nevada. I looked at the numbers and it will just make Idaho more competitive and to be that much more competitive than, say, other states that are not going to allow this. I think it's wonderful.