

To: Steve Gramm, Study Team members	
From: Rick Laughlin	Project: I-190/Silver St. Phase 2
CC: file	
Date: 9/30/2011	Job No:

RE: Public Meeting, September 14, 2011

A total of 38 people signed the attendance roster for the second public meeting in Phase 2 of the I-190/Silver St. study, held on September 14, 2011. Of the 38, 9 represented SDDOT, 2 represented the City of Rapid City, 2 represented the Rapid City Council, 1 represented FHWA, 2 represented HDR, and 22 either represented themselves or listed no affiliation. Other staff were also present, but not reflected in the attendance roster. The sign-in sheets are attached.

Seven comment cards were received at the public meeting. The information from the comment cards is summarized below:

- Tom Baumgartner, 229 Alta Vista – “I like the 2a with the West Boulevard connection.”
- D.L. Brown, Faith, SD – “2a with the red option appears to be the best option. 1a would be second choice. Do not like #1 as it has too many problems that do not solve the traffic from Central High & option 3a impacts too large an area, not standard.”
- Ritchie Nordstrom, 401 East Meade St. – “Like 2a – smallest footprint. Drainage, sidewalks and grade. Stormwater runoff, sidewalk installation and how flat the construction completion will be for winter sand/salt. What about plantings? Overhead utilities being placed underground.”
- Clifford Larive, 737 Highway 81 – “Alt 1a is the best approach – all others take up too much space and are of no value to the community. Under no circumstances do we need to better other streets and make easier access for future builders. They can make their own expenses, let’s stick strictly to the I-190 interchange.”
- Rex Perestine, 1505 Custer St. – “I like the 2a with West Blvd. connection – least disturbing and closest to the same connection.”
- Chuck Rausch, 602 Dilger Ave. – “At the present time (9/14/11), I prefer option 2a.”
- Jeanette McGough Thorstenson, 610 Fairlawn Dr. – “Why are you taking all property to the west instead of the land by the high school.”

One comment was also received via email on 9/28/11 from Jean Jackson, 1028 Philadelphia St. She writes:

“My comments and concerns are coming from the point of view of a home owner on Philadelphia St.

First of all, all the alternatives seem to have my house cornered in with three streets surrounding it. By this statement I mean that as one of the three remaining houses left on the block my house will be next to the off ramp or the closest to the ramp.

The plans I've seen are from the top so it leaves a lot to the imagination. Are there any plans I could see that show this project from the ground so I could get a better idea of what the bridge options are? How much room will each actually take up? What and how big will the bridge be? At what height will the new Philadelphia St.-North street be behind my house? How close will it be to my house? How close will the ramp be to my house?

Alternative 1: I don't like this one. It leaves only one way in and out of the neighborhood to get to work, school, shopping etc. That's by traveling around the golf course to Omaha St. and choosing the direction from there.

Alternative 1a: Is a little more favorable because it has more options of getting over to the east side of I-90 for Central High or Civic Center and traveling through the north part of town rather than taking Omaha etc. it also gives me the option of going south via the off ramp by my house. Although a couple of minus' is there are no quick access to Silver St. and West Blvd. N. area, one would have to travel in a loop of sorts to get to it.

Alternative 2a: Is a little more favorable because it gives better access to Silver St. and for travel to any direction of town but I'm still not sure if I like the plan of something that big by my house. A concern for this option is that the busy intersection is the foot traffic that crosses under the bridge for students or people walking to Central, Civic Center, Rapid Ride stop, or kids going to The Club for Boys etc.

Alternative 3a: I don't like this option at all.

More pros and cons:

I'm not completely opposed to the Van Buren St. connection in option 1a unless it's for future residential development along the hill side which I'm assuming is the real reason for it. I like the West Blvd N connection in alternative 2a, but the placement of the recreation trail doesn't make sense. Does it just stop there at Philadelphia St. or is supposed to go through to the bike path? I think it should follow the West Blvd. connector to Philadelphia St.

I didn't see a plan of what the area around my house would look like. Will it have landscape or will it be a concrete retaining wall? Will it be part bridge on the side of my house? Will it be a hill? Will it turn into an alley or alcove of sorts for high school students or others to hang out in. If concrete wall will graffiti end up on it? What plans are there for drainage and rain/snow runoff? I'll probably have more questions the more I think about this.

I've lived in this neighborhood for 30 years and I love it because it's always been a quiet out of the way street and neighborhood. Now with this plan it will all be gone because of the increased level of traffic and noise that comes with it. I also have to wonder what this new situation will do to my property value? In the future I wonder if I wanted to sell could I get a buyer to live next door to an off ramp??

Any answers to these questions would be greatly appreciated."