



Meeting Notes

SUBJECT: Parks Highway: Lucas to Big Lake Road MP 44-52

PROJECT NO.: ADOT&PF IM-04-1(23)/57178
B&A 3926.04

GROUP: Public

DATE: July 23, 2009

TIME: 4 p.m. to 8 p.m.

LOCATION: Curtis D. Menard Memorial Sports Facility

MEETING OUTREACH: See table below

MEETING ATTENDANCE: 146 individuals signed in

MEETING MATERIALS: Aerial photo, informational posters, comment sheets

STAFF PRESENT: ADOT&PF: Gerry Welsh, P.E., Project Manager; Carol Roadifer, EIT; Doug Morton; Brian Elliott; Angela Hunt, Environmental Impact Analyst; Alvin Talbert, LSIT; Al Burton; Allen Kemplen, AICP; Kim Stricklan, P.E.; Scott Thomas, P.E.; Burrell Nickeson

Brooks & Associates: Anne Brooks, P.E.; Rose Cox

MEETING INFORMATION:

The open house was held in conjunction with three other projects — the related Parks Highway Connector projects (Machen Road Extension and Museum Drive Extension) and South Mack Drive Extension.

Attendees were greeted at the door, asked to sign in and directed to the three meeting rooms containing information about each project. Project team members were on hand to answer questions and solicit input from attendees. People who visited the Parks Highway MP 44-52 room were invited to view aerial photos of the project on display and give written comment, and offered the Federal Highway Administration brochure *Safe Access is Good for Business*. A computer station was set up so people could view the annotated video *Safe Access is Good for Business* throughout the meeting.

The following comments were transcribed from comment sheets received at the meeting.

- *Love the idea of a divided highway.*
- *Need a traffic signal at Big Lake Road intersection with Parks Highway.*
- *Coordinate traffic lights between Pittman Road, Vine, Church and Lucas.*

- *The section of Big Lake Road and Parks Highway (approximately 82.5) is in dire need of a traffic signal now. This section of highway is particularly dangerous in the later afternoon/early evening due to the number of vehicles slowing to turn onto Big Lake Road while other north-bound vehicles are attempting to go around at highway speed and continue on up the Parks Highway, and vehicles in the left-turn lane at Big Lake Road risk making their turn in between cars. The possibility that this intersection may not get a traffic signal until 2020 is unacceptable — even worse would be for a four-lane divided highway to go in here in 2013 or so and this intersection not get a traffic signal for another seven years. It is an absolute necessity that a traffic signal, with left turn lanes/signals for Parks and Big Lake be installed at the same time that the highway is expanded.*
- *Thanks so much for providing this opportunity to learn about proposed changes and the opportunity to comment. Good job!*
- *As you change the Parks, consider the businesses that are well-established along the way and give them access from both directions so as not to damage their traffic flow.*
- *For safety reasons, the upgrade should be a five-lane road with center turning lanes and a 45 mph speed limit. The four-lane highway split with a median will be a disaster in this corridor because: higher speeds with the proposed freeway will be unsafe due to constant conflicts with children and ATVs, pets and moose; existing businesses will suffer due to limited access to their location; higher speeds on this type of road will be changed by DOT from 55 mph to 65 mph because the traffic will be traveling at those speeds; stopping and accelerating at designated intersections will be difficult and dangerous because of high speed in summer, and high speed combined with ice and snow in winter. Future plans for DOT should encourage a bypass around Wasilla as well as a bridge from Anchorage to Point McKenzie via Willow, as planned. DOT should look into highway safety studies in northern states that deal with ice and snow. A freeway and high speeds are not an upgrade for safety in a populated environment. And finally, most responses have been in favor of the five-lane approach. Moving traffic faster should not be the State Department of Transportation's only approach to an "upgrade" in a high-population area.*
- *Please see ROW relinquish #R-35-1-006-1. Property owner Barb Potter is concerned regarding right of way close to her house and limited access. She recommends shifting the highway north. She has a need to move her home, and project impacts could allow her to make improvements. Potential acquisition.*
- *I, Mike Calovich at 8431 W. Parks, milepost 50, totally support the new road being designed and built. Right now it is so hard to get on the highway at 4:30; a few lights are sorely needed. I need an access to my business that's easy for customers. Will I be compensated for loss of business while the road is being constructed?*
- *At milepost 52 where the project ends and tapers off, the access to local, on-highway businesses is severely restricted. Little Gorilla will have no southbound access, Black Cat*

will have no northbound access, TNT will have no southbound access. Customers will have no way in from those directions, and no direct access to exit in the opposite direction. Also, there really should be a signal at the Big Lake Road cutoff.

- *How about going to five-lane at the end of the project (Big Lake Road) instead of median tapering out?*
- *I like the four-lane divided. Probably need a signal at Stanley Road, maybe one at Big Lake Road. Hurry up and build it! Five-lane is a very bad idea.*
- *From Lucas to railroad trestle — five-lane with left and right access. W. Sems Street — correctly align physical road with legal easement.*
- *Good job including frontage roads — need more of them all along the road. Where are the cloverleaf and non-traffic light intersections? A limited access highway should be safe to access without stopping traffic. Why is South Mack Drive off of the Parks Highway the same name, South Mack Drive, off of Knik Goose Bay? How will rescue personnel know which is which?*
- *Regarding the state proposed project Parks-Lucas to Big Lake, four-lane with frontage looks good. How long will the project take to complete through finishing bike trails? The sooner the better, as the traffic patterns are dangerous presently. The city mayor's request for a five-lane through Houston is ridiculous and dangerous.*

Meeting outreach:

Date	Outreach method	Description
7/06/09	Postcard mailer to residents and property owners, community councils; MSB elected officials, boards and commissions; City of Wasilla elected officials, boards and commissions; City of Houston elected officials, boards and commissions; area state legislators.	Invitation to 7/23/09 public meeting
7/7/09, 7/14/09, 7/21/09	Display ad, <i>Frontiersman</i>	Announce public meeting
7/8/09	Meadow Lakes Community Council	Introduce the project and invite council members to the 7/23/09 open house
7/08/09	Postcard distributed to Mat-Su Community Transit (MASCOT)	Announce public meeting
7/08/09	Request to Meadow Lakes Community Council	Coordinate notice of public meeting on council Web site (www.meadowlakeschatter.com)

Date	Outreach method	Description
7/9/09	Online notices posted on City of Wasilla, Mat-Su Borough and ADOT&PF sites	Announce public open house
7/09/09	Press release e-mailed to the <i>Frontiersman</i> , <i>Anchorage Daily News</i> , and radio stations KMBQ, KASH, KGOT, KSKA	Advertise public meeting
7/17/09	Press release e-mailed to environmental agency personnel; flyers for all four projects sent by postal mail.	Invitation to public meeting

Related documents on file:

- Sign-in sheets
- Handouts (blank comment sheet)
- Comment sheets received at meeting
- Meeting graphics
- Mailing list
- Postcard