



Meeting Comments

SUBJECT: Parks Highway: Lucus to Big Lake Road MP 44-52
PROJECT NO.: Federal: NH-0A4-1(25); ACIM-0A4-1(26); TBD
 State: 52914; 52929; 54373
GROUP: 2012 Mat-Su Transportation Fair
DATE: August 9, 2012
TIME: 4:00 PM to 8:00 PM
LOCATION: Menard Sports Center
 Wasilla, Alaska
MEETING OUTREACH: See Outreach table below
MEETING ATTENDANCE: 402 individuals signed in at the meeting
STAFF PRESENT: *HDL:* Jeff Fuglestad, Trevor Strait, Danielle Fay
MEETING INFORMATION: Present the project to the public and discuss any comments/concerns that they have.

Attendees were greeted at the door and asked to sign in. They were then provided with a map showing the location of the various projects providing information at the event. Project team members met with and received comments from the public. These comments are provided below.

The comments in the following table reference project-developed parcel numbers.

Table 1. Property Owner/Business Comments

Parcel No.	Property Owner/Business Owner Comments
3006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What happens to Marigold ROW? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He subdivided ○ Vacate? • What will access be like from this property? • Johnson – Trucks & Pup <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ 105' ○ Double ○ Wants to see divided side street • Add signs to indicate dead end towards Fisher Fuels • Look at direct access onto Parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Not necessary if they have a driveway • Access to lot near Craig Taylor (drawn on strip plot)

Parcel No.	Property Owner/Business Owner Comments
3015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Connexes • Concerned about any ROW acquisition • This would impact his sign (has been there for many years) • He has connexes set up for storage all laid out already <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He has about \$4000/month w/minimal work required on his part <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Worried about losing income • He has plans for a second row of connexes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Set up two gates (1 either side of lot) to go down center of row. If ROW is purchased rows of connexes will have to be moved, therefore gates have to be moved • Did not allow surveyors on his lot. –Ms. Fay explained why the surveyors were there and why we need that data. • Thought the frontage road was fine just wanted it to be moved to not take away any of his property. • Ms. Fay explained that the ROW process looks at damages to the business as well as the land value • Looking to start up his refuge business again and will need space for trucks • Would like updates on ROW required as we progress
3015	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ROW requirement from property? • Sign • Conexes • Gate
3019	Concerned about what would happen to fence. Explained ROW acquisition process
3019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to follow up with them on their questions • They have a lot on Dandelion that use to access Marigold, but no longer does with the realignment. They wanted a driveway onto Marigold • Is the ROW at Marigold going to be vacated? If it is he feels it should go back to him as he originally subdivided this area • They have a parcel south of this parcel along this frontage road. There is currently no driveway shown. They would like a driveway to accommodate trucks. They have the parcel right behind this and plan to start up either a fueling or refuse business (cant remember which he said) on these lots • Parcel currently has frontage road on North side of highway that dead ends into their lot. Would like a way for trucks to get out if they accidently go down here. They would like a right-in-right-out driveway onto the highway • They thought we were taking ROW in this area, we are not, it is the existing DOT ROW • They felt the frontage road was too narrow – MR. Fuglestad explained that it just looks small in relation to the 4-lane divided highway • They own the lot directly across the highway. They are not happy to not be able to go straight across anymore, but understand why this is necessary

Parcel No.	Property Owner/Business Owner Comments
3020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mark-ups transferred from the strip plot at the transportation fair 8/9/12 • Move a little more north • Will have trucks using driveway (doubles) tankers
3021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concise with large truck access • Mr. Fuglestad requested e-mail with truck sizes so we can evaluate
3026	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mother-in-law of attendee ○ Told Mr. Fuglestad that proposed access should be okay
3035	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendee told Mr. Fuglestad about concerns with access ○ Has a circular driveway • Add driveway? Or joint use?
3037	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This parcel is a kennel business with a couple of rental shacks. Kennel building next to Parks has fence, well, & septic that will be impacted according to owner. • Residence/house in back of lot should not be impacted & house has its own well & septic system • Mr. Fuglestad directed owner to discuss acquisition options with DOT ROW personnel. • Owner understands that kennel business may need to be relocated as an option if required. • Design → Can we maintain minimum setback to kennel building?
3044	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • They had their lot surveyed and about 1 acre of what they thought they owned is actually DOT ROW • Their well is in the DOT ROW and they aren't sure what to do • Ms. Fay was unsure of options available, one ROW agent suggested looking into an encroachment permit. • Property owners and Ms. Fay agreed this would not really be an option because their well is basically in the centerline of the roadway • Ms. Fay will contact Lynda, the DOT ROW agent for this project, tomorrow to have her call them about ideas as to what to do
3044	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Michelle • Needs to contact ROW agent about moving well? • Where is well? • Encroachment permit? * Call Lynda/Al with DOT&PF Right of Way Section
3050	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner has no problems with total take
3061	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owners (couple) had concerns with impacts to “fancy” fence (upside down trees) along Potter. Also septic may be impacted. Can we minimize impacts?
3079	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3081 & 3079 • Pick-up & semi-truck, too fast to stop at Pittman and Vine
3079, 3081	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Has trucks running in and out that are 48-52' long • Doesn't want us to take ROW from him • The current ROW shown is too close to his building and will take away all of his

Parcel No.	Property Owner/Business Owner Comments
	parking <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • He owns two lots next to each other • He would like the frontage road to be steepened up to miss the corner of his land we need • Ms. Fay explained how this may be difficult to do because of design constraints • He would like the frontage road move closer to the highway • Ms. Fay said it will be something we look at as what we have shown is preliminary, but there are issues that may prevent us from moving closer to the highway including drainage and utilities
3081	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Parking • 48-52' trailer
3081	Mark-ups transferred from the strip plot at the transportation fair 8/9/12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Set back and parking
3093	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drive through food shack. Owners (couple) had concerns with drive through access • Owners also had some landscaping that may be impacted (blue spruce trees) • Design → Can we revise to have no impacts?
3097	Mark-ups transferred from the strip plot at the transportation fair 8/9/12 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fishers • RV park • Frontier Rd • Fiber Optic Shed
3099	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fuglestad discussed access issues with owner. Owner has concerns with large truck access by frontage road on highway. Mr. Fuglestad said we would look at providing RT in/RT out access to Parks
3108	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Red mark-ups illustrate the line work shown on the strip plot for the transportation fair 8/9/12 • Black mark-ups are what was drawn on the strip plot at the meeting
3127	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Owner has access concerns. Mr. Fuglestad did not realize this lot has access to Dandelion circle. Had told owner that we would look at providing access off of Marigold

Other general comments from attendees:

- Some people concerned that DOT would just take their land. Ms. Fay explained ROW acquisition process
- Several people frustrated that this project isn't coming sooner. Ms. Fay explained why the ROW process takes the time it does which is why our schedule is the way it is
- Several people happy to have all of the projects in one place. They felt they are getting their questions answered

- Commenter wanted grade separated crossing for railroad at Pittman
 - Ms. Fay explained this was not in the project scope or budget. It will be a complex issue to deal with if it is addresses in the future
 - Commenter explained that it is a long wait for the gravel trains, and if you get stuck on one side that is where you are. There is only one other way to get out and it is something like 10 miles. She has seen that Seldon is planned to go through and she really likes that idea and thinks it will help. She also stated that it is a problem with the train and where the troopers' office is located. They can be stuck waiting for a train when they are trying to respond to a call
- Commenter concerned about the Machen area. Ms. Fay explained we will work with the church and businesses
- Commenter like Museum Drive and Machen road connections—hopes they get done soon.
- One commenter expressed the following:
 - Upset that there are not frontage roads the whole length of the project. Says that was the original plan
 - Wanted to know about “problem” at restaurant. Ms. Fay stated that we work with every property owner and address their access needs as best we can
 - He felt the frontage road type access we have shown would be good for the restaurant
 - Wanted the project to be moving faster
 - Stated this is a Band-Aid, they need a Wasilla bypass
 - Stated that ROW agents are not very good with public, speaking from past experience
- The team explained the project to a handful of people who seemed interested but had no comments on design.
- One commenter was in support of the project, recognizes the fatalities from left turns, hopes the addition of traffic signals will slow down speedy drivers (to the correct speed limit)
- One commenter liked the project but was not so happy about the additional traffic lights, seemed to be a little happier when informed that the lights are to be synchronized.
- Residents who use Museum Access Road frequently are not happy about moving the road closer to Vine. Think it is dangerous merging onto Parks and moving the road closer to Vine will only make it more difficult to jump in and accelerate to the speed limit because of oncoming traffic. They think moving the road away from the curve/uphill that the current road merges onto is helpful but overall, is not worth it when considering the traffic on the highway.

In addition to the comments noted above, written comment were received. The three written comments received at the Transportation Fair are transcribed below:

- I am really in favor of the four-lane divided highway concept with dedicated turn lanes. I think these improvements will greatly improve the safety of the Parks Highway, helping to prevent vehicle accidents such as head-on crashes, rear-end crashes, and crashes due to improper passing. Thank you for your time and effort on this project.
- Our business will be affected by the four lane divided. We would only benefit from a five-lane hwy. Please, please look at what this highway design will do to our business. The highway design will destroy our business.

Table 2. 2012 Mat-Su Transportation Fair Outreach

Date	Outreach Method
	City of Houston Facebook page notice
	Online calendars: City of Wasilla, City of Houston, Mat-Su Borough, <i>Frontiersman</i> , <i>Anchorage Daily News</i>
	Mat-Su Transportation Fair logo showing dates on the following Mat-Su area project web sites: Fairview Loop Rehabilitation Glenn Highway MP 34-42 Museum Drive Extension Machen Road Extension South Mack (Clapp Road) Extension Trunk Road: Parks Hwy to Palmer-Fishhook Road
07/30/2012 – 08/03/2012	Radio advertising on KBYR, KMBQ, and BOB FM 3 times per day on each station
06/15/2012	<i>Make a Scene</i> display advertising
07/15/2012	<i>Make a Scene</i> display advertising
07/23/2012	Postcard Mailer to Parks Highway MP 44-52 mailing list (2792 total)
07/23/2012	Postcard Mailer to Glenn Highway MP 34-42 mailing list (3057 total)
07/23/2012	Notice sent to constituents by Senator Charlie Huggins
07/24/2012	Letters from DOT&PF Project Manager to affected property owners for the Glenn Highway 34-42 and Parks Highway 44-52 (Phase 3) projects
07/25/2012	MSB Transportation Advisory Board, reminder provided by Brad Sworts to advisory board members
07/25/2012	Postcard Mailer to Fairview Loop Reconstruction mailing list (5036 total)
07/25/2012	Postcard Mailer to Lucus Road Reconstruction mailing list (260 total)
07/27/2012	Postcard Mailer to Trunk Road mailing list (5677 total) Poster display at City of Palmer's <i>Friday Fling</i>
07/29/2012	<i>Frontiersman</i> meeting notices
08/01/2012	<i>Anchorage Daily News</i> Display Advertising, Mat-Su Edition
08/03/2012	Poster display at City of Palmer's <i>Friday Fling</i>
08/05/2012	<i>Frontiersman</i> meeting notices
08/06/2012	Email notice via Constant Contact to the following project lists:
08/07/2012	<i>Frontiersman</i> meeting notices

Date	Outreach Method
08/08/2012	<i>Anchorage Daily News</i> Display Advertising, Mat-Su Edition

Documents on file:

Postcard Mailer

Mailing List

Comment Sheets received at the meeting

Meeting Graphics