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MEETING OVERVIEW AND COMMENT SUMMARY

Meeting Overview

Date:    July 26, 2016, 5:30pm – 7:00pm
Location:  Black Hills State University, Box Elder, SD
Attendance: Approximately 50 people, plus consultants, Study Advisory Team members and
SDDOT representatives
Purpose: Provide overview of project and gather public input on critical issues and
alternatives
Meeting Graphics: Meeting handout and 14 display boards
Feedback: 16 comment sheets

Comments Summary

Comment Sheet Questions:

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor:

Commuter 5
Resident of study area 11
Through traveler 0

As shown, most respondents were residents of the study area.

In the study area, how would you rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Inadequate</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Acceptable</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Efficiency of traffic flow?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic safety?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Traffic safety was rated lower than operational efficiency of the corridor. Most indicated Inadequate to Fair safety levels. No excellent ratings given.
What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90?
   - Icy crosswind dangers
   - Icy conditions at Elk Vale and ramp of exit 63 in winter
   - I-90 closes at 61 in inclement weather as opposed to the base
   - Merging is difficult (5)
   - Right lane slower because of exiting at 63 (4)
   - Careless drivers

b. County Highway 1416
   - Slow moving
   - People get confused and stop where there’s no sign
   - Crossing over lanes (3)
   - Congestion at stop signs during peak hours (3)
   - Too much traffic, not enough signs for safety
   - Accidents at EB intersections/WB traffic congestion
   - At Radar Hill Road, might need a traffic light
   - Intersection of Radar Hill Road (2)
   - Speeding, turning
   - Radar Hill Road and S. Ellsworth dangerous intersections

c. Exit 63
   - Not two-way exit; inability to go east (5)
   - Base traffic backing up causing traffic
   - Too spread out – WB on ramp curve – numerous “drive offs”
   - People missing exit, slowing down and then traffic backs up
   - Single lane slows way down for left turns
   - The 4-way stop right before the ramp is a pain
   - Failure to yield right of way

d. Other
   - South gate experiences several “almost” accidents due to traffic set-up
   - Traffic using wrong ramp at Exit 67 – eliminate Exit 67B
   - Other ways in and out, but no one uses the Blvd.
   - Box Elder Road and 1416 confusion at intersections; yield signs, stop signs
   - 500 accidents in 5 years is a lot but what % is during winter?
   - Drivers speeding

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and I-90 corridor?
   - Open up bridge at Radar Hill site
   - Safety, displacement of people incapable of finding replacement housing. They will need options.
   - Efficient movement with least amount of stops/intersections
- Cost
- Constructability
- Safety and traffic flow on CH1416
- Traffic safety and efficiency of traffic flow – look at options near South gate/Commercial
- Safety of travelers – need better option for AFB traffic
- Future traffic flow needs and safety; Something needs to be done with 1416 also – maybe non divided?
- Use the most cost-efficient, safest, simplest change. Less confusion- option “Radar Hill Diamond” would be best for the amount of traffic and way less confusing
- Traffic flow and safety concerns. Too many accidents
- Winter traffic safety should be #1 consideration when selecting the future Exit 63. It rains, freezes, then snows so less complicated stops, no hard/sharp (for winter) turns/corners.
- Convenience and use for the majority of the users of the exit. Right now traffic on Radar Hill Road is getting heavier and that divided highway makes crossing to go to the exit for the interstate dangerous.
- Most of the areas of concern are due to how the drivers are driving – it’s not so much an engineering calamity, but improvements in your study area will help.

General Comments:
- Very good presentation. Need to break out accidents due to weather. Road on Elk Vale should be lowered to alleviate some accidents during bad weather.
- How will any future exits improve EAFB accessibility that was affected when the exit was removed years ago?
- Traffic lights for Exit 61 and Cheyenne Blvd. need to be timed better for traffic flow.
- Personnel and growth for Box Elder Community with EAFB.
- I don’t believe having the exit at Radar Hill Road/Gumbo is the answer. I think another area should be looked at closer. I appreciate the meetings with the public and the advertisement for the meetings.
- I would suggest the Radar Hill Road diamond as most preferred option. RWO acquisition could be joint between DOT and Ellsworth Authority (already acquiring property). This would also align I-90 travelers with route to regional airport. Either option at westgate would be too strung out and in curve of I-90.
- Something needs to be done soon. Box Elder is growing and nothing is done for traffic safety or law enforcement.
- I would love for the new exit to be located at Radar Hill Road. The bonus would be that people going to and from the airport would have a nice, close exit to the interstate. Please, strongly consider Radar Hill Road for the location of Exit 63.
- Have had a few serious accidents where Mall Driver intersects N. Elk Vale Road. Due to speeds and the rise in the hill from N Elk Vale traveling south toward Mall Drive very poor visibility (rise needs cut down – cannot see small vehicles – very dangerous) especially with the new soccer field traffic and traffic from the Seger Drive area.
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Sign-In Sheets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Brosz</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Jeff.brosz@state.sd.us">Jeff.brosz@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>Pierre, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gramm</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Steve.gramm@state.sd.us">Steve.gramm@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 E. Broadway Ave, Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Olson</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Karenolson@state.sd.us">Karenolson@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 E, Broadway Ave, Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Sprosty</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:EUGENE1966@YAHOO.COM">EUGENE1966@YAHOO.COM</a></td>
<td>606 WESTWIND DR, BOX ELDER, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glenn K Fast</td>
<td>Quality Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cant Meier</td>
<td>Home owner</td>
<td>C <a href="mailto:Meier@21c.com">Meier@21c.com</a></td>
<td>624 Box Elder Rd W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Mellen</td>
<td>REVFD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:THecket168@yahoo.com">THecket168@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Leilei Cardinal Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doug Curry &amp; I</td>
<td>Home owner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Dougcurry64@gmail.com">Dougcurry64@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>22726 TAWNEY CT, BZ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kauth</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valerie Recevs</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark Hastings</td>
<td>Rapid City</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marrick4278@ymail.com">marrick4278@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>4925 Ave A, RC, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darren Hastings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brenda Degen-Whiting</td>
<td>Rapid City</td>
<td><a href="mailto:degenranch@gmail.com">degenranch@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4000 cl, Elk Vale Rd, RC, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Miller</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:rmurphytime@yahoo.com">rmurphytime@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>Box Elder, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Schmahl</td>
<td>West River Electric</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Matt.Schmahl@westriver.coop">Matt.Schmahl@westriver.coop</a></td>
<td>3250 East Highway 49, RC, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Gillam</td>
<td>Rapid City</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jkgillam@elkwest.com">jkgillam@elkwest.com</a></td>
<td>1802 B, Onaha, St</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Eben</td>
<td>Ellsworth AFB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.eben@us.dofmil">robert.eben@us.dofmil</a></td>
<td>2125 South Dr, EAFB, SD, 57709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Miller</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eugene.brown@ymail.com">eugene.brown@ymail.com</a></td>
<td>57719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Carlson</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mcarlson@state.sd.us">mcarlson@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica &amp; Thomas Gluth</td>
<td>Box Elder/Ellsworth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tpgluth@hotmail.com">tpgluth@hotmail.com</a></td>
<td>231 Vine St, EAFB, SD, 57706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimber Daley</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kimber_daley@yahoo.com">Kimber_daley@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>4875 Bennett Rd, RC, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Frisbie</td>
<td>FHU</td>
<td><a href="mailto:todd.frisbie@fhuey.com">todd.frisbie@fhuey.com</a></td>
<td>2112 N. Corona</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sonia Downs</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sonia.downs@state.sd.us">Sonia.downs@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 S. Broadway Ave Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joanne Hight</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:joanne.hight@state.sd.us">joanne.hight@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 E. Broadway Rd Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Rempeich</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bradley.rempich@state.sd.us">bradley.rempich@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 S. Broadway Ave Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marc Heiscker</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:marc.heiscker@dot.gov">marc.heiscker@dot.gov</a></td>
<td>116 E. Dakota Ave Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Meier</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joef.meier@gmail.com">Joef.meier@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>106 S. Oak Rd Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexi Chmoodrad</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:lexi.chmoodrad@yuro.com">lexi.chmoodrad@yuro.com</a></td>
<td>106 S. Oak Rd Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cody L Wassen</td>
<td></td>
<td>CL Wassen 9467 Yankee Dr</td>
<td>106 Gumbo Dr Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileen Kiemigle</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:cklearek@gmail.com">cklearek@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>244 Mockingbird Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe Rappe</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Joe.rappe@state.sd.us">Joe.rappe@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>126 Johnson Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristie Maybury</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Kristie.maybury@rcmp.org">Kristie.maybury@rcmp.org</a></td>
<td>306 6th Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pat Medley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22437 Bennett Rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ella Smith</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ella.smith@state.sd.us">ella.smith@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>233 Mockingbird Dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shannon Tibbetts</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Coraunary.pattie9@gmail.com">Coraunary.pattie9@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>3190 Country Rd Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Wilson</td>
<td>Pennington Co. Hwy</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Tom.wilson@pennington.org">Tom.wilson@pennington.org</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherie Bost</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:ms.bost@yahoo.com">ms.bost@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>3276 Grand Ave Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morris Leone</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:morris.leone@state.sd.us">morris.leone@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>2800 N. S. Rd RCSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Todd Madison</td>
<td>Dita WitchofSO</td>
<td><a href="mailto:tmadson@ditawitchofso.com">tmadson@ditawitchofso.com</a></td>
<td>2187 Elk Lake Rd Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Reigerken</td>
<td>Meade Co Commission</td>
<td><a href="mailto:reidergerken@gmail.com">reidergerken@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>2237 W. Nike Rd. Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Zwietersdor</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmz055@gmail.com">cmz055@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>1148 Case Ct. Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carlton Peterson</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anpro@aol.com">anpro@aol.com</a></td>
<td>14860 morning view dr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Liverson</td>
<td>JSAF</td>
<td><a href="mailto:leonard.liverson@us.af.mil">leonard.liverson@us.af.mil</a></td>
<td>640 wolfwood dr. rcsd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jon Schmidt</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:jonathan.schmidt59@msn.com">jonathan.schmidt59@msn.com</a></td>
<td>620 2iebach st. rcsd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kathryn Caro</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td><a href="mailto:midnightkayak@yahoo.com">midnightkayak@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>215 wilder ct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Schanzenbach</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>janbmsse.msn.com</td>
<td>315 Ruhe Ln. box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kendra Hovingh</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td>hovingh@ramp midco.net</td>
<td>282 edelweiss ln. box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Moen</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>536 e hwy 1416 box Elder</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Open House PowerPoint Presentation
I-90 Corridor Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

Public Meeting #1
July 26, 2016
BHSU Rapid City Center
Introduction

• Welcome
• Housekeeping Items
• Methods of Commenting
  • Comment Card tonight
  • Comment Card later
  • Conversation with project representatives
  • Correspondence after the meeting
• Comments due by August 10
Project Contacts

SDDOT Project Manager: Steve Gramm, PE
Planning Engineer
Ph: (605)773-6641
steve.gramm@state.sd.us

FHU Project Managers:
Lyle DeVries
Todd Frisbie
Ph: (303)721-1440
lyle.devries@fhueng.com

Study Advisory Team Entities:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- City of Box Elder
- Rapid City Area MPO
- Ellsworth AFB
- Ellsworth Development Authority
- SDDOT Departmental/Local Staff
Project Background

• Recommended in BESTPlan as a more focused study of important corridor

• Positioned to:
  • Answer key questions in advance of I-90 rehab/reconstruction (8 yrs. out)
  • Address future of Exit 63

• Collaborative effort among several entities
Study Goals:
Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-90 corridor within the study area.

Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

Two primary areas of need will be investigated in this study.

1. I-90 Corridor Capacity
The need for I-90 and the surrounding roadway network to provide acceptable traffic operations and safety now and into the long range future.

Traffic counts, forecasts and analyses may support:
- The need for an additional travel lane along I 90 for all or part of the study corridor
- The need for particular regional roadway network improvements to accommodate vehicle-trips and support I-90
- The need for other multimodal mobility enhancements

2. Interchange Access
The current half movement interchange provides only for movements to and from the west, not in compliance with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy requiring that service interchanges provide for all movements. The study will investigate options to bring Exit 63 into compliance with FHWA policy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>I-90 Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td>Safe and effective transportation system</td>
<td>2004/2010 Decennial Interstate Corridor Study</td>
<td>Need for reconstruction/rehabilitation of pavement by 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement in Meade County, Pennington County and BEST Plan Transportation Plans</td>
<td>Preserve opportunity for future widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellsworth Development Authority</td>
<td>Maintain the operational mission of EAFB while accommodating surrounding growth and economic development and protecting public health and safety</td>
<td>2009 Moving Forward with Ellsworth Transportation Work Plan</td>
<td>Alternatives developed for Exit 63 interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellsworth Air Force Base</td>
<td>Continuing success of operational mission</td>
<td>2014 Ellsworth AFB Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Box Elder</td>
<td>Community vitality, sustainability, and financial health</td>
<td>2014 BEST Plan Zoning regulations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Improve mobility through national leadership, innovation and program delivery</td>
<td>Design and planning standards for Interstate facilities, procedural documents</td>
<td>1.90 access instrumental to commercial viability, meet compatibility with local development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid City Area MPO</td>
<td>Focus on effective regional transportation planning/federal funding coordination</td>
<td>2015 RapidTrip 2040 Regional Long Range Transportation Plan</td>
<td>1.90 planning process should follow regulatory guidance, set stage for needed approvals and environmental documentation Current Exit 63 not compliant with policy of all movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington County</td>
<td>Repair, maintain and reconstruct county roads</td>
<td>Pennington County Master Transportation Plan (CHAPS)</td>
<td>1.90 growth forecasts in regional model Planning oversight/approvals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

South Dakota Decennial Interstate Corridor Study

Rapid Trip 2040

BEST PLAN
Box Elder Strategic Transportation Plan

December 2014

Connecting Hills and Plains Study
We Are Here
Current Traffic Volumes and Levels of Service
2011-2015 Corridor Crash History

LEGEND
- Fatal Crashes
- Injury Crashes
- Property Damage Only Crashes
Future Growth and Roadway Network

Future I-90 Service Road Removal

HOUSING INCIDENTS

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Growth Factor</td>
<td>Growth Factor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid City Region</td>
<td>31,734</td>
<td>51,759</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Area</td>
<td>3,103</td>
<td>6,606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*As provided by the Rapid City Area MPO

LEGEND

- Proposed Roadway
- Highest Residential Growth Area
- Highest Employment Growth Area
- Highest Residential & Employment Growth Area
- I-90 Study Corridor
- Study Area Boundary
Prior Exit 63 Ideas

Radar Hill Road Diamond

West Gate Road Diamond

Modified County Hwy. 1416 Diamond

Other Ideas Welcome
DRAFT Solution Evaluation Criteria

- Traffic Flow
- Traffic Safety
- Construction Cost
- Environmental Impacts
- Right-of-Way Impacts
- Compatibility with EAFB/JLUS
- Compatibility with Development
- Constructability
I-90 Corridor Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

Open House Portion
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Open House Exhibits
Welcome

Please provide your views and ideas through discussions with study team members, and written comment sheets, and keep up to date with the project through: www.i90corridor61to67.com
The planning area for this project includes multiple entities, each with important input on the future of I-90 and its interchanges. Documented information about the goals and I-90 perspectives held by each agency is provided below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Entity</th>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Documents</th>
<th>I-90 Input</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td>Safe and effective transportation system</td>
<td>2000/2010 Decennial Interstate Corridor Study</td>
<td>Need for reconstruction/rehabilitation of pavement by 2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Involvement in Meade County, Pennington County and BESTPlan Transportation Plans</td>
<td>Preserve opportunity for future widening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alternatives developed for Exit 63 interchange</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellsworth Development Authority</td>
<td>Maintain the operational mission of EAFB while accommodating surrounding growth and economic development and protecting public health and safety</td>
<td>2009 Moving Forward with Ellsworth Transportation Work Plan</td>
<td>Prior documents support full interchange at West Gate Road as replacement for Exit 63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Continuing success of operational mission</td>
<td>2016 Ellsworth AFB Joint Land Use Study (JLUS)</td>
<td>Interchanges should be located outside of protected zones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellsworth Air Force Base</td>
<td>Community vitality, sustainability, and financial health</td>
<td>2014 BESTPlan</td>
<td>I-90 access instrumental to commercial viability, seek compatibility with local development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td>Zoning regulations</td>
<td>I-90 planning process should follow regulatory guidance, set stage for needed approvals and environmental document(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Design and planning standards for Interstate facilities, procedural documents</td>
<td>Current Exit 63 not compliant with policy of all movements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td>Improve mobility through national leadership, innovation and program delivery</td>
<td>2015 RapidTrip 2040, Regional Long Range Transportation Plan</td>
<td>I-90 Growth forecasts in regional model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rapid City Area MPO</td>
<td>Focus on effective regional transportation planning/federal funding coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td>Planning oversight/approvals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennington County</td>
<td>Repair, maintain and reconstruct county roads</td>
<td>Pennington County Master Transportation Plan (CHAPS)</td>
<td>I-90 bisects county and connects to county roads, including County Highway 1416</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Schedule/Work Plan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study Advisory Team Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continues for 6 Months After Project End</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Public Involvement**

- Website

**Needs and Solutions Analyses**

- Baseline Conditions
  - Project Initiation
  - Data Collection:
    - Traffic counts
    - Mapping
    - Travel Patterns
    - Infrastructure Conditions

- Needs Assessment
  - Existing Traffic and Safety
  - Future Growth Impacts
  - Regional Road Connections
  - Intelligent Transportation Systems Assessment

- Solutions
  - Identify Solutions
  - Evaluation and Screening
  - Select Build Scenarios

- Project Recommendations
  - Conceptual Design
  - Package Corridor-wide Improvements
  - Recommendations
  - Report

**Environmental**

- Environmental Resource Scan
- Agency Outreach

- Purpose and Need Development

- Environmental Impacts

- Environmental Documentation

**Available for NEPA Process**

**Legend**

- Public Meeting
- Rapid City Area MPO Meeting (open to the public)
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**Study Goals:**
Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-90 corridor within the study area

Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

Two primary areas of need will be investigated in this study.

1. **I-90 Corridor Capacity**
The need for I-90 and the surrounding roadway network to provide acceptable traffic operations and safety now and into the long range future.

Traffic counts, forecasts and analyses may support:
- The need for an additional travel lane along I-90 for all or part of the study corridor
- The need for particular regional roadway network improvements to accommodate vehicle-trips and support I-90
- The need for other multimodal mobility enhancements

2. **Interchange Access**
The current half movement interchange provides only for movements to and from the west, not in compliance with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy requiring that service interchanges provide for all movements. The study will investigate options to bring Exit 63 into compliance with FHWA policy.
Safety History
Reported Crashes (2011-2015)

Crash Types

- **I-90 Segment 1**
  - 13 Wild animal
  - 2 Overturn
  - 14 Other fixed object
  - 23 Guardrail
  - 1 Other

- **1416 West Gate Rd.**
  - 7 Angle
  - 5 Rear-end
  - 3 Fixed object
  - 1 Sideswipe
  - 1 Wild animal

- **1416 Radar Hill Rd.**
  - 34 Angle
  - 9 Rear-end
  - 5 Fixed object
  - 2 Overturn
  - 2 Wild animal
  - 2 Other

- **1416 Commercial Gate Dr.**
  - 13 Angle
  - 6 Rear-end
  - 2 Fixed object
  - 1 Overturn
  - 1 Sideswipe
  - 1 Head-on

- **I-90 Segment 2**
  - 7 Wild animal
  - 3 Overturn
  - 4 Other fixed object
  - 1 Pedestrian
  - 13 Guardrail

- **1416 Ellsworth Rd.**
  - 7 Angle
  - 5 Rear-end
  - 3 Fixed object
  - 1 Sideswipe
  - 1 Wild animal

- **Exit 63 WB On-Ramp**
  - 2 Wild animal
  - 1 Overturn
  - 3 Other fixed object
  - 17 Guardrail

- **Exit 67 Corridor Study**
  - 1416 Ellsworth Rd.
  - 13 Angle
  - 6 Rear-end
  - 2 Fixed object
  - 1 Overturn
  - 1 Sideswipe
  - 1 Head-on

- **I-90/Liberty Blvd. Interchange**
  - 7 Wild animal
  - 4 Overturn
  - 4 Other fixed object
  - 1 Sideswipe
  - 1 Domestic animal
  - 3 Guardrail
  - 1 Other

Crash Severity

**LEGEND**

- Red = Fatal Crashes
- Yellow = Injury Crashes
- Green = Property Damage Only Crashes
Existing Traffic Conditions

LEGEND

X/X = AM/PM Peak Hour Signalized Intersection Level of Service
x/x = AM/PM Peak Hour Unsignalized Movement Level of Service
= AM/PM Freeway Level of Service
= AM/PM Merge/Diverge Level of Service
= Daily Traffic Volumes (Weekday)
= Stop Sign
= Traffic Signal
= Intersection Approach Lanes

13,350

7,950

8,500

7,650

7,600

32,650

-6,200

-29,800
# Level of Service Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Service</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Free flow with low volumes and high speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Reasonably free flow, but speeds beginning to be restricted by traffic conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>In stable flow zone, but most drivers are restricted in the freedom to select their own speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>Approaching unstable flow; drivers have little freedom to select their own speeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>Unstable flow; may be short stoppages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>Unacceptable congestion; stop-and-go; forced flow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

About 70% of Exit 63 traffic travels to/from Ellsworth AFB.

About 57% of Ellsworth AFB traffic uses Exit 63.

About 7% of Rapid City Regional Airport (RCRA) traffic uses Exit 61.
**Mainline I-90 Conditions**

**Bridge Locations**
1. Elk Vale Road over I-90
2. I-90 & Service Road over Box Elder Creek
3. County Highway 1416 WB over I-90
4. West Gate Road over I-90
5. I-90 over Commercial Gate Road
6. I-90 over Abandoned RR Tracks
7. I-90 over Ellsworth Road
8. Liberty Boulevard over I-90

**I-90 Characteristics:**
- Approximate Right-of-Way Through Corridor
- 4 Travel Lanes (2-WB, 2-EB)
- Separated by 50' Depressed Median

**Current and Forecast I-90 Weekday Traffic (Preliminary)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location along I-90 (by Exit)</th>
<th>2013 Observed</th>
<th>2035 Forecast</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West of 63</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 63</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 to 67</td>
<td>13,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of 67</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant Grade Differential**
- 300'

**High Vertical Clearance**

**Variable Message Sign**
- High Vertical Clearance

**Rapid City**

**Box Elder**

**I-90 over Box Elder Creek**

**Ellsworth AFB**

**Parallel Service Roads**
Prior Exit 63 Ideas

Radar Hill Road Diamond

West Gate Road Diamond

Modified County Hwy. 1416 Diamond

Other Ideas Welcome
Environmental Justice Data

Minority Persons

Low Income Persons
Alternative Evaluation Criteria

- Traffic Flow
- Traffic Safety
- Construction Cost
- Environmental Impacts
- Right-of-Way Impacts
- Compatibility with Ellsworth Air Force Base/ Joint Land Use Study
- Compatibility with Development
- Constructability
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Public Meeting Summary

Meeting Handout
Schedule/Work Plan

**Next Steps**

- Complete Analyses of Existing Conditions
- Refine Future Traffic Forecasts
- Develop I-90 Corridor and Exit 63 Alternatives

For more information, please contact:

Steve Gramm, PE - Planning Engineer  
South Dakota Department of Transportation  
(605)773-6641  
steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Lyle DeVries - Consultant  
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
303.721.1440  
lyle.devries@fhueng.com

Or visit the website:

www.i90corridor61to67.com

Thank you for your interest in the

Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

This handout includes some of the displays from the July 26, 2016 Open House.

All displays may be viewed at www.i90corridor61to67.com

We look forward to your involvement in this project!
Study Area & Project Goals & Needs

Study Goals:
Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-90 corridor within the study area

Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

Two primary areas of need will be investigated in this study.

1. I-90 Corridor Capacity
The need for I-90 and the surrounding roadway network to provide acceptable traffic operations and safety now and into the long range future.

Traffic counts, forecasts and analyses may support:
- The need for an additional travel lane along I-90 for all or part of the study corridor
- The need for particular regional roadway network improvements to accommodate vehicle-trips and support I-90
- The need for other multimodal mobility enhancements

2. Interchange Access
The current half movement interchange provides only for movements to and from the west, not in compliance with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy requiring that service interchanges provide for all movements. The study will investigate options to bring Exit 63 into compliance with FHWA policy.

Mainline I-90 Conditions

Prior Exit 63 Ideas
Interstate 90 Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study
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Public Meeting Summary

Comment Sheets
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90 Icy Crosswind dangers
b. County Highway 1416 Slow moving/cross traffic
c. Exit 63 None
d. Other?

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor:

Gen up bridge at Black Hill site.

GENERAL COMMENTS:
Very good presentation. Need to break out accidents due to weather. Road on E side should be lowered to elevate some accidents during bad weather.

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
e-mail: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440 fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
e-mail: lyle.devries@fhuenq.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90 Ice on exit ramp of exit 63 in winter
b. County Highway 1416

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

safety, displacement of people incapable of finding replacement housing - they will need options

GENERAL COMMENTS:

How will any future exits improve accessiblility that was affected when the exit was removed years ago?

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
e-mail: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
e-mail: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

- a. Commuter
- b. Resident of study area
- c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow? 1 2 3 4 5
   - Efficiency of traffic flow?

2. Traffic safety? 1 2 3 4 5
   - Traffic safety?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>poor</th>
<th>inadequate</th>
<th>fair</th>
<th>acceptable</th>
<th>excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

- a. I-90
- b. County Highway 1416
- c. Exit 63
- d. Other?

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

- Efficient movement with least amount of stops/intersections
- Cost
- Constructability

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Traffic lights for exit 61 and Cheyenne blvd need to be timed better for traffic flow

Project Contacts:

SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
e-mail: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:

Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
e-mail: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  

b. Resident of study area  

c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  
   1  
   2  
   3  
   4  
   5

2. Traffic safety?  
   1  
   2  
   3  
   4  
   5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90  
   none

b. County Highway 1416  
   Mayor congestion on most intersections at High volume times

c. Exit 63  
   Inability to head onto I-90 East

d. Other?  
   5. Gate North turnoff at 1416 East has a lot of near misses due to single way stop on 1416 west

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Allocation of Best Traffic from 1416 & Together, possibly look at 5 Gate/Commercial gate – I-90 interchange.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Thank you for involving the Community and those affected by Study Area.

__________________________________________________

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
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Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90
b. County Highway 1416
   Intersection of Red Hill Road
   ______________________________________________________________________

c. Exit 63
   ____________________________________________
d. Other
   ____________________________________________

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Safety and traffic flow on CH 1416

GENERAL COMMENTS:

________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhuencia.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90
b. County Highway 1416
c. Exit 63
d. Other?

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
e-mail: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
e-mail: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90  THE ON RAMP AT 63 AT TRAFFIC MERGE
b. County Highway 1416  SPEEDING, TURNING, CROSS OVER

c. Exit 63  NO EAST BOUND ON RAMP
d. Other?

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

PROJECT 67 PLANNING DID NOT CONSIDER BOX ELDER SAFETY FOR POLICE & FIRE DEPARTMENT TO ALL AREAS OF BOX ELDER

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@flueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
   2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

poor  inadequate  fair  acceptable  excellent

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90  ok
b. County Highway 1416  Rader Rd Exchage - Dangerous Stillwater - Dangerous
   c. Exit 63  ok
   d. Other

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Personal Growth for Box Elder Community

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
e-mail: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhuong.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90  yield/merging is difficult at high peak hours
b. County Highway 1416  congestion at intersections during peak hours
c. Exit 63  inability to access I-90 east
d. Other?  State experiences several “all most” accidents due to traffic setup.

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Traffic safety & efficiency of traffic flow - look at options near State Commercial

GENERAL COMMENTS:
I don't believe having the exit at Radar Hill rd/1416 is the answer. I think another area should be looked at closer. I appreciate the meetings with the public & the advertisement for the meetings

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440 fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90  merging off of 63 & 61
b. County Highway 1416  worst place for wrecks
    s. Exit 63  back up trauma causing
    d. Other?  wrecks at radar hill also

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Safety of travelers - need better option for AFB traffic

GENERAL COMMENTS:


Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
e-mail: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter    b. Resident of study area    c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow? 1 2 3 4 5
2. Traffic safety? 1 2 3 4 5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90 Sometimes congestion westbound at Exit 63 on-ramp
b. County Highway 1416 Accidents at EB intersections - WB traffic congestion
c. Exit 63 Too spread out - WB on ramp curve - numerous drive off
   traffic

d. Other? Traffic using incorrect ramp at Exit 67 - Eliminate Exit 67-B

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Future traffic flow needs and safety

Something needs done with I-90 also - maybe non divided??

GENERAL COMMENTS:

I would suggest the Radar Hill Road Diamond as most preferred option.
ROW Acquisition could be joint between DOT and Ellsworth Authority (Already Acquiring)
This also would align I-90 travelers with route to Regional Airport

* Either option at west gate would be too string out and in curve of I-90

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440 fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow? 1 2 3 4 5
2. Traffic safety? 1 2 3 4 5

poor inadequate fair acceptable excellent

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90 merging with traffic - People coming off ramp too slow
b. County Highway 1416 - Too much traffic - Not enough signs for safety
c. Exit 63 - People missing it, then slowdown and traffic backs up fast
d. Other? Other ways inside and out but no one uses the new Blvd.

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Use the most cost efficient, safest, simplest change. Less confusion - Option: Radar Hill Diamond would be best for the amount of traffic and way less confusing.

GENERAL COMMENTS:
Something needs to happen soon, Box Elder is growing and nothing is done for traffic safety or laws enforcement.

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsberg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
e-mail: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Efficiency of traffic flow?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Traffic safety?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90 merging into traffic is real tricky most of the time.

b. County Highway 1416 certain times of day the stop signs take a long time to get through.

c. Exit 63 coming off interstate is fine.

d. Other? Box Elder Rd and 1416 confusion at intersections: yield signs, stop signs.

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Traffic flow and safety concerns. Too many accidents.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
e-mail: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

- a. Commuter
- b. Resident of study area
- c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow? 1 2 3 4 5
2. Traffic safety? 1 2 3 4 5

poor inadequately fair acceptable excellent

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

- a. I-90 exit 61-63 right lane drastically slower, lane of people exiting at 63
- b. County Highway 1416 people get confused and stop where there’s no sign
- c. Exit 63 single lane slows way down for left turns
- d. Other? 500 accidents in 5 yrs is a lot but what % is during winter?

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Winter Traffic safety should be #1 consideration when selecting the future for exit 63...it rains, freezes, then snows...so less complicated steps, no hard sharp (for winter) turns/corners.

GENERAL COMMENTS:


Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440 fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

a. Commuter  b. Resident of study area  c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  1  2  3  4  5
2. Traffic safety?  1  2  3  4  5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

a. I-90  __________

b. County Highway 1416  __________

c. Exit 63 The 4-way stop right before the ramp is a pain.

d. Other? It is very inconvenient when coming home from the east not to be able to exit off of exit 63 to go home.

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Convenience & use for the majority of the users of this exit.
Right now, traffic on Radar Hill Rd is getting heavier and that divided highway makes crossing to go to the exit for the interstate dangerous.

GENERAL COMMENTS:
I would LOVE for the new exit to be located at Radar Hill Rd.
The bonus would be that people going to and from the airport would have a nice, close exit to the interstate.
Please, strongly consider Radar Hill Rd. for the location of Exit 63.

Project Contacts:
SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641  
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:
Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440  fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Please characterize your use of the I-90 Corridor (circle your answer):

- a. Commuter
- b. Resident of study area
- c. Through traveler

In the Study Area, how would you rate:

1. Efficiency of traffic flow?  
   - 1  
   - 2  
   - 3  
   - 4  
   - 5

2. Traffic safety?  
   - 1  
   - 2  
   - 3  
   - 4  
   - 5

What traffic problems and/or safety concerns do you experience when traveling at or along:

- a. I-90 - Have traveling through from Exit 52 - 61 find DOT speeds (Many near misses)
- b. County Highway 1416 - Cross scenic lanes (Driver not clearing lane before pulling out (Speedy)
- c. Exit 63 - Speeds 63 to 1416 (Failure to yield law)
- d. Other? Exit 61 - Traffic on speed (Speeding) Exit 59 CB Traffic trying to exit 68 USB

What criteria would you use to select the best option for the future of Exit 63 and the I-90 Corridor?

Most of the areas of concern are due to how the drivers are driving, it's not as much an engineering concern or (speed, maintenance, attitudes, poor driving skills, etc.) are causing problems. But improvements on your study areas will help.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Have had a few serious accidents where Mill De Intervisal W on side hill.

Due to speed at the exit on the hill from N 1st Ave to 13th Street towards Mill De.

Very poor visibility (Rise under cut down can cause small vehicle - very dangerous)

Especially off the new service field traffic & traffic from the depot area.

Project Contacts:

SDDOT Project Manager
Steve Gramm, PE
ph: (605) 773-6641
email: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

please email, mail or fax completed comments to:

Lyle DeVries, PE, PTOE
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
ph: (303) 721-1440 fax: (303) 721-0832
6300 South Syracuse Way, Suite 600
Centennial, CO 80111
email: lyle.devries@fhhueng.com
Interstate 90 Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

July 2016
Public Meeting Summary

Letters/E-Mail Correspondence
Received email:

Mr. DeVries,

Thank you for the informative presentation on the I-90 corridor study. I appreciate you and the SDDOT involving the public in this process. I have attached a few comments which I thought about after attending the open house. Thank you for your consideration of my comments and concerns.

Robert Miller
320 Ruhe Lane
Box Elder, SD 57719
605-431-5113

Attached comments:

Comments to I-90 Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study Open House presentation:

The Safety History slide shows a large number of crashes along 1416, will this study give this area any attention with regard to safety?

There is also a high concentration of reported crashes just east of exit 61. I believe the cause of many of these crashes is the convergence of traffic with the through traffic (eastbound). Much of the through traffic is headed for exit 63, so they move to the left lane to allow traffic to merge from the exit 61 on ramp and then have trouble getting back over to the right lane prior to exit 63. This is compounded by traffic slowing to less than the speed limit well before exit 63. From my observations, many of these slower drivers are destined for a left turn at West Gate Road.

The Existing Traffic Conditions slide depicts intersections 8 and 10 incorrectly. At intersection 8, the northbound to westbound traffic is not required to stop. Also, the southbound to westbound traffic is required to yield, although this rarely happens. At intersection 10, the westbound traffic is not required to stop.

The Existing Traffic Conditions do not indicate the “frontage road” on the north side of 1416 or the railroad on the south side of 1416. I believe both of these contribute to traffic conditions along this corridor.

The Corridor Travel Patterns slide shows 70% of the traffic using exit 63 going to and from Ellsworth AFB. If exit 67 was constructed to replace the exit at Ellsworth Road (66?) why are travelers to the base not encouraged to use exit 67? Maybe this would reduce the number of reported crashes on 1416. Maybe there would not be a need for six lanes (including frontage road) of traffic on 1416 if the traffic volumes were reduced. Maybe a two or three lane road would be sufficient to serve the local traffic in this area. Maybe the remaining ROW could be sold or returned to adjacent landowners for redevelopment.
The Prior Exit 63 Ideas slide shows three options of which two would require significant acquisitions and relocations. The Modified County Hwy 1416 Diamond seems like a reasonable option, but why not connect 1416 to Seger Drive or Mall Drive to the west? This would provide an additional avenue for local traffic between Box Elder and Rapid City without entering and exiting I-90.

The Environmental Justice Data slide depicts a large area near the west end of the study area as “minority” and “low income.” Most of this area is undeveloped farm land or flood plain. How does it get this designation? Also it appears that Ellsworth AFB is designated “minority” and “low income” as well?
August 5, 2016

Re: Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study – East Mall Drive extension

Steve Gramm  SD DOT
Lyle DeVries Felsburg Holt & Ullevig

Gentlemen,

I am writing this as a property owner within the defined study area. I am the owner of Ditch Witch of South Dakota at 2108 Elk Vale Rd. After attending the public meeting on July 26th I would like to share a concern that will affect my business significantly. The extension of East Mall Drive from Elk Vale Rd is a project that will change traffic flow both in and out of my property and also within the property lines of Ditch Witch and my neighbors.

I have had a couple of meetings with Stacy Bartlett and Michael Carlson of the SD DOT on this topic also. I do not have property that is directly part of the right of way acquisition process however I have a unique situation that will leave me tremendously affected. Ditch Witch, Excel Trucking, and Quality Transportation all share a common driveway and access point from Elk Vale Road and also share a common central area within all of our property lines giving all of us effective operating square footage for our customers far greater than our own property lines. I and my neighbors all have the need for space to handle semi-truck traffic for our customers. With the elimination of the Excel Building and the Quality Transportation building and the right of way property for the new road I will lose my access point and the shared square footage needed to be a viable location for and underground construction equipment business and its related customer traffic needs. This situation is difficult to see on paper but standing on site seeing the dynamics brings this to light.

As of this writing I am not standing in the way of the East Mall Drive extension project however I will need the state and the City of Box Elder to work with me to keep me viable moving forward. I will need East Mall Drive access across property that I do not currently own and any thought of Elk Vale Road access will not handle the semi-truck needs and any access point driveway will be very close to the future controlled intersection making it very unsafe. Realistically I will need to acquire the remaining Excel property to have enough yard square footage to handle the truck turn around needs of my business.
I look forward to discussions to work through options to coordinate and balance future road expansion and development with my need to be left with a viable site to continue to do business moving forward.

Regards,

[Signature]

Todd Madson
President
Ditch Witch of South Dakota
DWSD Properties LLC.
Advertisements / Communication

The following display advertisement publicizing the meeting was published on July 10, 2016 and July 13, 2016 in the Rapid City Journal and on July 6, 2016 and July 13, 2016 in the Native Sun News.
Date: July 26, 2016
Time: 6:00 p.m. to 7:30 p.m.
Place: Black Hills State University Rapid City, Main Atrium
4300 Cheyenne Boulevard Rapid City, SD 57709

The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) in cooperation with the City of Box Elder, the Rapid City Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), will hold an open house style public meeting for the Interstate 90 (I-90) Exit 61 (Elk Vale Road) to 67 (Liberty Boulevard) Corridor Study. The study is being done to identify the recommended future configuration for mainline I-90 and the Exit 63 interchange. The purpose of this public meeting is to gather information on community needs and desires for the corridor as input into the study document that is being prepared. The open house will be informal, with one-on-one discussion available with SDDOT, FHWA, Rapid City Area MPO, City of Box Elder and consultant staff.

Between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m., public agency and consultant staff will be available with displays to discuss issues, answer your questions, and take your ideas and opinions regarding the study corridor. During this time, you will also have the opportunity to provide written comments. A short presentation will be given at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Notice is further given to individuals with disabilities that this public meeting is being held in a physically accessible place. Any individuals with disabilities who will require a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting should submit a request to the department’s ADA Coordinator at 605-773-3540 or 1-800-877-1113 (Telecommunication Relay Services for the Deaf). Please request the accommodations no later than 2 business days prior to the meeting in order to ensure accommodations are available.

All persons interested in the corridor study are invited to attend this open house meeting to share their views and concerns any time between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. Those who cannot make the meeting are invited to visit the webpage: http://www.i90corridor61to67.com

For further information regarding the study, please contact Steve Gramm at (605) 773-6641 or by email at steve.gramm@state.sd.us
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MEETING OVERVIEW AND COMMENT SUMMARY

Meeting Overview

Date: March 6, 2017, 6:30pm – 8:00pm
Location: Black Hills State University, Box Elder, SD
Attendance: Approximately 30 people, plus consultants, Study Advisory Team members and SDDOT representatives
Purpose: Provide overview of project and gather public input on critical issues and alternatives
Meeting Graphics: Meeting handout, Power Point presentation and 22 display boards
Feedback: 6 comment sheets

Comments Summary

Comment Sheet Questions:

What Exit 63 alternatives or corridor improvements that you like have not been considered by the project team?

- I am in favor of Alternative 4 as it maintains a connection to I-90 from 1416, but may reduce or at least slow traffic headed eastbound on 1416. It also has little impact on currently developed properties.
- Alternative #4 is best
- Alt #4 best

Do you agree that the Exit 63 alternatives selected by the project team are all appropriate for further consideration?

Yes 3  No 1

- Closing of Exit 63. I feel it is not a good idea. Hundreds of people live on the north side of I-90 just in Thunder Bird alone. There is no other way out except over country roads. This is not a good road to have hundreds of people on daily.
If no, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why:

- (in favor of Alternative 4) however, any alternative with direct access to 1416, similar to current situation, will not resolve traffic issues/safety concerns on Highway 1416.

What Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology solutions appeal to you for this corridor?

- Advanced travel information further down the road

General Comments:

- I think the public should be informed of other projects/improvements (planned or in the works) for areas west of Exit 63 and along Highway 1416. This may help gain community support.
- Very glad the meetings are taking place
- Need to maintain access to I-90 for businesses located at Highway 1416 and Westgate Road. If Exit 63 closed, it would add a significant amount of additional travel for these businesses.
- Recent revisions to the flood plain have added flood insurance costs to property owners along Highway 1416.
- North Service Road from Westgate Road to Bennett Avenue should not be closed. It provides an alternate route to I-90 when I-90 is closed.
- Revise Alternative 4 to tie into North Service Road instead of simply closing the service road.
- Do not eliminate Exit 63 interchange.
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Sign-In Sheets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gramm</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.gramm@state.sd.us">steve.gramm@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 E Broadway, Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Brosz</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jeff.brosz@state.sd.us">jeff.brosz@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy Hix</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:chief1h@rap.micd.com">chief1h@rap.micd.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerald &amp; Jane Maine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>607 W Sunnydale Rd, Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Larkin</td>
<td>MVP Town</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmeier@61-67corridor.com">cmeier@61-67corridor.com</a></td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curt Meier</td>
<td>Home Owner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:cmeier@61-67corridor.com">cmeier@61-67corridor.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kirk VanRoekel</td>
<td>FHWA</td>
<td><a href="mailto:kirk.vanroekel@dot.gov">kirk.vanroekel@dot.gov</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Meier</td>
<td>Land Owner</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jmeier@61-67corridor.com">jmeier@61-67corridor.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sam Lockhart</td>
<td>West River Electric</td>
<td><a href="mailto:sam.lockhart@westriver.com">sam.lockhart@westriver.com</a></td>
<td>3850 E Hwy 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doyle Estes</td>
<td>SELF</td>
<td>doyle.esteslaw@klingmeyer</td>
<td>Box 334, RC 50, 57705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unga Fry</td>
<td>Ellsworth</td>
<td><a href="mailto:anga.fry.456@ellsworth.bank">anga.fry.456@ellsworth.bank</a></td>
<td>Ellsworth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Carlson</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:mika.carlson@state.sd.us">mika.carlson@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon Mike Whiting</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:degenranch@gmail.com">degenranch@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>4000 N Elk Vale Rd, RC 50, 01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ky Harrington</td>
<td>RCMP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Estman</td>
<td>BOX ELD</td>
<td><a href="mailto:karen.olson@state.sd.us">karen.olson@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 E Broadway Ave, Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen Olson</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:jambm5@msn.com">jambm5@msn.com</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Schanzenbach</td>
<td>Self</td>
<td></td>
<td>315 Ruehe Ln, Box Elder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brad Remnick</td>
<td>SDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:bradley.rennick@state.sd.us">bradley.rennick@state.sd.us</a> PIERRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Wolf</td>
<td>SDOT</td>
<td>Wolfman 19627 @ yahoo.com Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jennifer Layton</td>
<td>citizen</td>
<td><a href="mailto:twenty6522@aol.com">twenty6522@aol.com</a> 1204 Copperfield Dr</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Layton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norris Leone</td>
<td>SDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:norris.leone@state.sd.us">norris.leone@state.sd.us</a> 2300 S. Ogden Rapid C.t.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill Gibling</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bill@gmail.com">bill@gmail.com</a> 300 S. Beadle St. R.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary McErlie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheryl Peterson</td>
<td>self</td>
<td><a href="mailto:chrpeterson@att.net">chrpeterson@att.net</a> 236 E Hy 1116</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tommy Wilsey</td>
<td>Penn Co. Turf <a href="mailto:tom.wilsey@penconc.org">tom.wilsey@penconc.org</a></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kaufman</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emily Olson</td>
<td>KNBN</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Olson@newscenter1.com">Olson@newscenter1.com</a> 2429 S Plaza Dr.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Miller</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Miller</td>
<td>Box Elder Res. <a href="mailto:rmilrtine@yahoo.com">rmilrtine@yahoo.com</a> 320 Pine Lane Box Elder, SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stephen Sennan</td>
<td>SDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Sennan@state.sd.us">Sennan@state.sd.us</a> 5606 51 st US R.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Kiehnert</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:George_K44@Hotmail.com">George_K44@Hotmail.com</a> 4420 Bozman 82703</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rex Frank</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George Estman</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td><a href="mailto:pitaboo@outlook.com">pitaboo@outlook.com</a> 522 Shattuck</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheikh Brandt</td>
<td>Box Elder/Prairieview Estates <a href="mailto:mccolest@yahoo.com">mccolest@yahoo.com</a> 3276 Milestone Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Harper</td>
<td></td>
<td>218 Douglas Rd Box Elder 80570</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Open House PowerPoint Presentation
I-90 Corridor Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

Public Meeting #2
March 6, 2017
BHSU Rapid City Center
Introduction

• Welcome
• Housekeeping Items
• Methods of Commenting
  • Comment Card tonight
  • Comment Card later
  • Conversations with project representatives
  • Correspondence after the meeting
• Comments due by March 24
Project Contacts

SDDOT Project Manager: Steve Gramm, PE
Planning Engineer
Ph: (605)773-6641
steve.gramm@state.sd.us

FHU Project Contacts:
Lyle DeVries
Todd Frisbie
Ph: (303)721-1440
lyle.devries@fhueng.com

Study Advisory Team Entities:

- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- City of Box Elder
- Rapid City Area MPO
- Ellsworth AFB
- Ellsworth Development Authority
- SDDOT Departmental/Local Staff
Project Background

• Recommended in BESTPlan as a more focused study of important corridor

• Positioned to:
  • Answer key questions in advance of I-90 rehab/reconstruction (8 yrs. out)
  • Address future of Exit 63

• Collaborative effort among several entities
Study Goals:
Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-90 corridor within the study area.

Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

Two primary areas of need will be investigated in this study.

1. I-90 Corridor Capacity
The need for I-90 and the surrounding roadway network to provide acceptable traffic operations and safety now and into the long range future.

Traffic counts, forecasts and analyses may support:
- The need for an additional travel lane along I-90 for all or part of the study corridor
- The need for particular regional roadway network improvements to accommodate vehicle-trips and support I-90
- The need for other multimodal mobility enhancements

2. Interchange Access
The current half movement interchange provides only for movements to and from the west, not in compliance with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy requiring that service interchanges provide for all movements. The study will investigate options to bring Exit 63 into compliance with FHWA policy.
Project Update

• Public Meeting last July attended by 50 people, input included:
  • Safety concerns, particularly weather-related and Highway 1416 intersections
  • Try to minimize vulnerability to poor winter road conditions, when 27% of crashes occur
  • Some favor for interchange at Radar Hill Road vs other options

• Team meetings to discuss key components
  • Alternatives workshop to brainstorm options at Exit 63
  • ITS Stakeholder meeting to discuss technology solutions

• Work has focused on:
  • Exit 63 drawings
  • Analysis of traffic forecasts
Current Traffic Volumes and Levels of Service
Daily Traffic Forecasts
2045 Level of Service-No Action
Impact of External Roadway Connections
Intelligent Transportation Systems

Current ITS Devices

Legend
- Study Area
- Road Closed Finsher
- Traffic Signal
- Variable Message Sign
- Manual Road Closure Gate
- Automatic Traffic Recorder
- Interstate
- Rivers/Streams
- Roads
- Lakes
- Railroad
- Parks
# Intelligent Transportation Systems

## Potential I-90 Corridor ITS Solutions and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS Solution</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Goal/Potential Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Roadway condition warning/anti-icing for existing WB Exit 63 on-ramp to I-90</td>
<td>Uses sensors and signs and/or sprayers to reduce crash risk</td>
<td>Improve safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Intersection conflict warning for County Highway 1416 intersections</td>
<td>Uses detection and flashers to alert drivers approaching conflicting traffic</td>
<td>Improve safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Remotely operated “intelligent” gates</td>
<td>Allows current manual closure gates to be operated remotely</td>
<td>Improve safety and staff efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Additional vehicle detection and surveillance on I-90</td>
<td>Allows data collection and monitoring of “trouble” spots, reducing response time and improving awareness</td>
<td>Improve mobility and efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Fiber optic “trunk” along I-90 to connect devices to unify communications</td>
<td>Enables reliable communications and full-motion video. Places all devices on one high performance network</td>
<td>Improve mobility and efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Control software to unify DMS, CCTV, detection and other operations</td>
<td>Enables monitoring, data collection and control from a single interface. Reduces training time and IT workload</td>
<td>Improve efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Variable speed limit signs (VSL)</td>
<td>Uses active signs to display speed limits that vary based on conditions</td>
<td>Improves safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exit 63 Alternatives

• Goal of alternatives is to provide full movements at Exit 63, not necessarily at the current interchange location

• 12 alternatives have been developed, including the no action and removal of Exit 63

• Conceptual designs address basic layout and key design implications of options, including grades, property impacts and control of access

• Locations of alternatives fall into two categories: west (near current Exit 63) and east (vicinity of Radar Hill Road)

• Further analyses to be performed for alternatives carried forward
Alternative 1: Interchange at West Gate

- North Service Road must be closed due to control of access.
- Railroad crossing required.
- Box Elder Rd must be closed due to control of access.

Carry Forward: YES
- Fewer Property Impacts
- Simplicity of Configuration

Note: Parcel impact defined as a loss of existing access or land needed for new infrastructure.
Alternative 2: Interchange at West Gate with direct access to EB Cty Hwy 1416

- Carry Forward: **YES**
  - Facilitates Movements to EAFB
  - Simplicity of Configuration
  - Uses Existing Infrastructure
Alternative 3: Interchange at West Gate with existing west ramps and new east ramps

- Carry Forward: **YES**
  - Facilitates Movements to EAFB
  - Uses Existing Infrastructure
  - Maintains N. Service Road Access
  - Provides Desired Ramp Spacing
Alternative 4: Interchange at County Highway 1416

- Carry Forward: **YES**
  - Fewer Property Impacts
  - Simplicity of Configuration
  - Provides Desired Ramp Spacing
  - Minimal Impact to Existing Property Access
  - Maintains N. Service Road Access
Alternative 5: Interchange at Radar Hill Road

- ![Map of Radar Hill Road interchange]
Alternative 6: Interchange at Radar Hill Road with braided ramps to Commercial Drive
Alternative 7: Split Interchange with Radar Hill Road and Commercial Drive

- Carry Forward: NO
  - Property Impacts
  - Environmental Impacts
  - Access Impacts
  - Does not Meet Desired Intersection for Intersection Ramp Spacing
Alternative 8: Split Interchange with Radar Hill Road and Commercial Drive - Exclusive EAFB ramps

- Carry Forward: NO
  - Property Impacts
  - Environmental Impacts
  - Access Impacts
  - Does Not Meet Desired Intersection Ramp Spacing
  - Interchange Complexity
Alternative 9: Interchange at Bennett Road

- Carry Forward: NO
  - Does Not Facilitate Movement to EAFB
  - Does Not Accommodate Existing Transportation Planning
  - Property Impacts
  - Proximity to Exit 61
  - Lack of Connectivity to Existing Transportation Network
Alternative 10: Split Diamond Interchange
At Commercial Drive

- Carry Forward: **NO**
  - Interchange Complexity
  - Property Impacts
  - Environmental Impacts
  - Access Impacts
Alternative 11: Remove Exit 63 Interchange

- Carry Forward: YES
  - No Property Impacts
  - Low Construction Cost
  - Maintains N. Service Road Access

map with marked areas:
- Future closure of North Service Rd per NOX Elder Long-Range Planning
- Railroad crossing required
- Note: Parcel impact defined as a loss of existing access or land needed for new infrastructure
# Feasibility Screening Matrix

- **Best accommodates current Long-Range planning efforts**
- **Has the fewest impacts to property**
- **Alternatives at Westgate are most compatible with EAFB and Box Elder Land Planning**
- **Best utilizes existing infrastructure**

## Feasibility Screening Matrix Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Score</th>
<th>Score Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Most accommodates current Long-Range planning efforts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Has the fewest impacts to property</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Alternatives at Westgate are most compatible with EAFB and Box Elder Land Planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Best utilizes existing infrastructure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Legend
- Red: Least meets criterion
- Green: Best meets criterion

**Point Value**
- 0: Least meets criterion
- 1: Meets criterion
- 2: Satisfies criterion
- 3: Meets criterion
- 4: Best meets criterion

**Alternatives have most impacts on low income and minority populations**

**Alternatives at Radar Hill Road have highest construction costs**
Please provide your views and ideas through discussions with study team members, and written comment sheets, and keep up to date with the project through:  www.i90corridor61to67.com
**Study Goals:**
Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-90 corridor within the study area

Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

Two primary areas of need will be investigated in this study.

1. **I-90 Corridor Capacity**
The need for I-90 and the surrounding roadway network to provide acceptable traffic operations and safety now and into the long range future.

   Traffic counts, forecasts and analyses may support:
   - The need for an additional travel lane along I-90 for all or part of the study corridor
   - The need for particular regional roadway network improvements to accommodate vehicle-trips and support I-90
   - The need for other multimodal mobility enhancements

2. **Interchange Access**
The current half movement interchange provides only for movements to and from the west, not in compliance with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy requiring that service interchanges provide for all movements. The study will investigate options to bring Exit 63 into compliance with FHWA policy.
Existing Traffic Conditions

LEGEND

- AM/PM Peak Hour Signalized Intersection Level of Service
- AM/PM Peak Hour Unsignalized Movement Level of Service
- AM/PM Freeway Level of Service
- AM/PM Merge/Diverge Level of Service
- Daily Traffic Volumes (Weekday)
- Stop Sign
- Traffic Signal
- Intersection Approach Lanes

Traffic Volumes:

- West Gate Rd.: 7,650
- N. Elk Vale Rd.: 7,600
- S. Elk Vale Rd.: 32,650
- Mall Dr.: 6,200
- Bluebird Dr.: 13,350
- County Highway 1416: 8,500
- Liberty Blvd.: 29,800
- S. Ellsworth Rd.: 15,900
- Commercial Gate Dr.: 7,950
- Radnor Hill Rd.: 7,650
- N. Ellsworth Rd.: 6,200
- I-90 Service Rd.: 30,000
- I-90 Exit 61-67 Corridor Study: 32,650

Traffic Conditions:

- Stop Signs
- Traffic Signals
- Intersection Approach Lanes
Traffic Forecasts with I-90 Column Plot vs Capacity

LEGEND

* = Current (2012-2016) Daily Traffic (vehicles per day)
X,XXX = Year 2045 Forecast Daily Traffic (vehicles per day)
2045 Projected Traffic Conditions - No Action

LEGEND
- X/X = AM/PM Peak Hour Signalized Intersection Level of Service
- x/x = AM/PM Peak Hour Unsignalized Movement Level of Service
- = AM/PM Freeway Level of Service
- = AM/PM Merge/Diverge Level of Service
- = Stop Sign
- = Traffic Signal
- = Yield Sign
- = Intersection Approach Lanes

I-90 Exit 61-67 Corridor Study 16-034 03/06/17
Solutions Process

1. Identify Solutions
2. Initial Investigations
3. Feasibility Screening
4. Recommended Improvement

- External Scenarios
- i.T.S. Assessment
- Needs Assessment
- Solutions Workshop
- Previous Ideas

- Account for in Evaluation of Solutions
- Comprehensive List of Corridor Solutions
- Non-Feasible Projects

- Conceptual Design Options
  - I-90 Mainline
  - Exit 63 Reconstruction
  - I.T.S. Components
  - Other Projects

- Feasible Scenarios
  - Scenario A
  - Scenario B
  - Scenario C

- Ensure that Project Goal(s) are met in Recommended Scenarios

Actions:
1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 6. 7.
2045 External Scenario Traffic Volumes

LEGEND

SCENARIO
0 Base Model
1 Cheyenne Blvd Connection: Elk Vale to Radar Hill
2 Cheyenne Blvd Connection: Elk Vale to Liberty Blvd
3 Cheyenne Blvd Connection: Elk Vale to Liberty Blvd & Westgate Extension from County Hwy 1416 To Cheyenne Blvd.
4 Mall Dr Extension to Westgate
5 Change County Hwy 1416 to 3-Lanes
6 Cimarron St Extension: From Country Rd to Ellsworth Rd
7 Remove Exit 63
8 Add EB On-Ramp and WB Off-Ramp

XX.X = Daily Traffic Volume (in thousands)
I-90 Exit 63

Alternative 1 - Interchange at West Gate

Carry Forward: YES
- Fewer Property Impacts
- Simplicity of Configuration

I-90 Exit 61-67 Corridor Study

03/06/17
I-90 Exit 63

Alternative 2 - Interchange at West Gate Rd. with Direct Access to Eastbound 1416

- Carry Forward: YES
- Facilitates Movements to EAFB
- Simplicity of Configuration
- Uses Existing Infrastructure

Map details:
- North Service Road must be closed due to control of access.
- Box Elder Rd must be closed due to control of access.
- Railroad crossing required.
- Use existing eastbound off-ramp.
- New interchange would require closure of access.
- West Gate Rd provided to Box Elder Rd.

Legend:
- Parcel impact removal
- Property line access to be closed
- Wall

Note: Parcel impact defined as a loss of existing access or land needed for new infrastructure.
Alternative 3 - Interchange at West Gate Rd. with Existing West Ramps and New East Ramps

- **Carry Forward**: YES
- Facilitates Movements to EAFB
- Uses Existing Infrastructure
- Maintains N. Service Road Access
- Provides Desired Ramp Spacing
Alternative 4 - Diamond Interchange at Highway 1416

- Carry Forward: **YES**
  - Fewer Property Impacts
  - Simplicity of Configuration
  - Provides Desired Ramp Spacing
  - Minimal Impact to Existing Property Access
  - Maintains N. Service Road Access
I-90 Exit 65
Alternative 5 - Interchange at Radar Hill Rd.

Carry Forward: NO
- Property Impacts
- Environmental Impacts
- Access Impacts

NOTE: PARCEL IMPACT DEFINED AS A LOSS OF EXISTING ACCESS OR LAND NEEDED FOR NEW INFRASTRUCTURE

PARCEL IMPACT REMOVAL PROPERTY LINE ACCESS TO BE CLOSED WALL
I-90 Exit 65

Alternative 6 - Interchange at Radar Hill Rd. with Braided Ramps to Commercial Gate Rd.

- Carry Forward: **NO**
  - Property Impacts
  - Environmental Impacts
  - Access Impacts
Alternative 7 - Split Tight Diamond with Radar Hill Rd. and Commercial Gate Dr.

- Carry Forward: **NO**
  - Property Impacts
  - Environmental Impacts
  - Access Impacts
  - Does not Meet Desired Intersection for Intersection Ramp Spacing
I-90 Exit 65

Alternative 8 - Split Diamond Interchange with Radar Hill Rd. and Commercial Gate Dr. with Exclusive Ellsworth AFB Ramp

Carry Forward: NO

- Property Impacts
- Environmental Impacts
- Access Impacts
- Does Not Meet Desired Intersection Ramp Spacing
- Interchange Complexity
**I-90 Exit 62**

**Alternative 9 - Interchange at Bennett Rd.**

- **Carry Forward:** **NO**
  - Does Not Facilitate Movement to EAFB
  - Does Not Accommodate Existing Transportation Planning
  - Property Impacts
  - Proximity to Exit 61
  - Lack of Connectivity to Existing Transportation Network
I-90 Exit 65
Alternative 10 - Split Diamond Interchange at Radar Hill Rd.

Carry Forward: NO
- Interchange Complexity
- Property Impacts
- Environmental Impacts
- Access Impacts
I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 11 - Exit 63 Removal
at County Hwy 1416

 Carry Forward: YES
- No Property Impacts
- Low Construction Cost
- Maintains N. Service Road Access
### I-90 Exit 63 Corridor Study

#### Interchange Alternatives Evaluation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING INTERCHANGE RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>ADDRESS THE NEED FOR THE PROJECT</th>
<th>AIP CONFLICTS</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>PRIVATE PROPERTY AND ROW</th>
<th>FACILITATES MOVEMENTS TO AND FROM EAFB</th>
<th>ACCOMODATES TRANSPORTATION APPROVED PLANS</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTABILITY</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION COSTS</th>
<th>COMPATIBILITY WITH AUS</th>
<th>CONNECTIVITY WITH EXISTING ROAD NETWORK</th>
<th>SIMPLICITY OF INTERCHANGE CONFIGURATION</th>
<th>DESIGN CRITERIA</th>
<th>CONTROL OF ACCESS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The No Action Alternative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 1 - Interchange at Westgate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 2 - Interchange at Westgate with Direct Access to EB 141A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 3 - Interchange at Westgate Exit 61-67 Corridor Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 4 - Interchange at Highway 141A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 5 - Interchange at Radar Hill Road</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 6 - Interchange at Radar Hill Road with Baseline Ramps to Commercial Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 7 - Split Interchange at Radar Hill Rd and Commercial Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 8 - Split Interchange with Radar Hill Rd and Commercial Dr with Exclusive EAFB Ramp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 9 - Interchange at Westgate Exit 61-67 Corridor Study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 10 - Split Diamond Interchange at Commercial Dr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alternative 11 - Remove Exit 63 Interchange</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **Point Value = 0** - Last meets criterion
- **Point Value = 1**
- **Point Value = 2**
- **Point Value = 3**
- **Point Value = 4** - Best meets criterion

- Alternatives have most impacts on low income and minority populations
- Alternatives at Radar Hill Road have highest construction costs

Best utilizes existing infrastructure

Alternatives at Westgate are most compatible with EAFB and Box Elder Land Planning

Best accommodates current Long-Range planning efforts

Has the fewest impacts to property
Current ITS Devices

Potential I-90 Corridor ITS Solutions and Benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITS Solution</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Goal/Potential Benefits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Roadway condition warning/anti-icing for existing WB Exit 63 on-ramp to I-90</td>
<td>Uses sensors and signs and/or sprayers to reduce crash risk</td>
<td>Improve safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Intersection conflict warning for County Highway 1416 intersections</td>
<td>Uses detection and flashers to alert drivers approaching conflicting traffic</td>
<td>Improve safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Remotely operated “intelligent” gates</td>
<td>Allows current manual closure gates to be operated remotely</td>
<td>Improve safety and staff efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Additional vehicle detection and surveillance on I-90</td>
<td>Allows data collection and monitoring of “trouble” spots, reducing response time and improving awareness</td>
<td>Improve mobility and efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Fiber optic “trunk” along I-90 to connect devices to unify communications</td>
<td>Enables reliable communications and full-motion video. Places all devices on one high performance network</td>
<td>Improve mobility and efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Control software to unify DMS, CCTV, detection and other operations</td>
<td>Enables monitoring, data collection and control from a single interface. Reduces training time and IT workload</td>
<td>Improve efficiency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Variable speed limit signs (VSL)</td>
<td>Uses active signs to display speed limits that vary based on conditions</td>
<td>Improves safety</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interstate 90 Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study
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Meeting Handout
**Schedule/Work Plan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Months</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>August</th>
<th>September</th>
<th>October</th>
<th>November</th>
<th>December</th>
<th>January</th>
<th>February</th>
<th>March</th>
<th>April</th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Study/Feasibility</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Core Team Meetings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs Assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solutions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Recommendations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone Milestone</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Legend**

- **Baseline Conditions**
- **Needs Assessment**
- **Solutions**
- **Project Recommendations**

**Next Steps**

- Conduct More Detailed Analysis of the Advanced Exit 63 Alternatives
- Develop Preliminary Corridor Recommendations for Public Review
- Continue Analysis of Environmental Resources

**For more information, please contact:**

Steve Gramm, PE - Planning Engineer  
South Dakota Department of Transportation  
(605)773-6641  
steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Lyle DeVries - Consultant  
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
303.721.1440  
lyle.devries@fhueng.com

**Or visit the website:**

www.i90corridor61to67.com

---

Thank you for your interest in the **Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study**

This handout includes some of the displays from the March 6, 2017 Open House.

All displays may be viewed at www.i90corridor61to67.com

We look forward to your continued involvement in this project!
Mainline I-90 Analysis

Traffic Forecasts

2016 and Forecast I-90 Weekday Traffic

(approximate 4-Lane Capacity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location along I-90 (By Exit #)</th>
<th>2-way Vehicles Per Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>West of 61</td>
<td>6000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61 to 63</td>
<td>5000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63 to 67</td>
<td>4000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East of 67</td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4-Lane I-90 is expected to be adequate beyond the year 2045

When widening becomes necessary, it could be accomplished as shown

Exit 63 Alternatives

6 Alternatives have been selected for further consideration, they include the No Action, Removal of Exit 63, and these:

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 1 - Interchange at West Gate

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 2 - Interchange at West Gate Rd.
with Direct Access to Eastbound 1416

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 3 - Interchange at West Gate Rd.
with Existing West Ramps and New East Ramps

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 4 - Diamond Interchange
at Highway 1416

When widening becomes necessary, it could be accomplished as shown

Eliminated Alternatives include:

- Interchanges at or around Radar Hill Rd./I-90
- Interchange at Bennett Rd.

- Full size PDF versions may be viewed at -
www.i90corridor61to67.com

Feedback Appreciated!
Interstate 90 Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study
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Comment Sheets
What Exit 63 alternatives or corridor improvements that you like have not been considered by the project team?

I am in favor of Alternative (4) as it maintains a connection to I-90 from 1416, but may reduce or at least slow traffic headed eastbound on 1416. It also has little impact on currently developed properties.

Do you agree that the Exit 63 Alternatives selected by the project team are all appropriate for further consideration? [ ] Yes [ ] No

If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

However, any Alternative with direct access to 1416, similar to current situation, will not resolve traffic issues/safety concerns on Hwy 1416.

What Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology solutions appeal to you for this corridor?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

I think the public should be informed of other projects/improvements (planned or in the works) for areas west of Exit 63 and along Hwy 1416. This may help gain community support.

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by March 24, 2017.

NAME: Robert Miller
ADDRESS: 320 Rune Lane Box Elder SD 57719
PHONE #: (Optional: ) EMAIL: rmillertime@yahoo.com

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager: Steve Gramm
P: (605)773-6641
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Return Comments to: Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600
Centennial, CO 80111
P:(303)721-1440
F:(303)721-0832
E:lyle.devries@fhueng.com
What Exit 63 alternatives or corridor improvements that you like have not been considered by the project team?

Do you agree that the Exit 63 Alternatives selected by the project team are all appropriate for further consideration?  

YES ☒  NO ☐  If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

What Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology solutions appeal to you for this corridor?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Very glad the meetings are taking place

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by March 24, 2017

NAME: Brenda & Mike Whiting
ADDRESS: 4000 N. Elk Vale Rd., Rapid City SD 57702
PHONE # (Optional): ______________________________________ EMAIL: degen.ranch@gmail.com

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager: Steve Gramm  
P: (605) 773-6641  
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Return Comments to: Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
P: (303) 721-1440  
F: (303) 721-0832  
E: lyle.devries@fhueng.com  
6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600  
Centennial, CO 80111
What Exit 63 alternatives or corridor improvements that you like have not been considered by the project team?

Closing of Exit 63 is not a good idea. Hundreds of people live on the North side of I-90 just in Thunderbird alone. There is no other way out except over county road 5. This is not a good road to have hundreds of people on daily.

Do you agree that the Exit 63 Alternatives selected by the project team are all appropriate for further consideration? YES ☐ NO ☑

If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

What Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology solutions appeal to you for this corridor?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by March 24, 2017

NAME: Gregorraj Estomay
ADDRESS: 577 South Hill Ave Box Elder SD
PHONE # (Optional): 605-430-9305 EMAIL: p126006@hotmail.com

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager:
Steve Gramm
P: (605)773-6641
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Return Comments to:
Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600
Centennial, CO 80111
P:(303)721-1440
F:(303)721-0832
E:lyle.devries@fhueg.com
What Exit 63 alternatives or corridor improvements that you like have not been considered by the project team?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you agree that the Exit 63 Alternatives selected by the project team are all appropriate for further consideration?

If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology solutions appeal to you for this corridor? 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ADVANCED</th>
<th>TRAVEL</th>
<th>INFORMATION</th>
<th>FURTHER</th>
<th>DOWN</th>
<th>THE</th>
<th>Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by March 24, 2017

NAME: Eileen Miller

ADDRESS: 

PHONE # (Optional): 

EMAIL: 

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDDOT Project Manager:</th>
<th>Return Comments to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gramm</td>
<td>Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt &amp; Ullevig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: (605)773-6641</td>
<td>6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:steve.gramm@state.sd.us">steve.gramm@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>Centennial, CO 80111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P:(303)721-1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F:(303)721-0832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E:<a href="mailto:lyle.devries@fhueng.com">lyle.devries@fhueng.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Exit 63 alternatives or corridor improvements that you like have not been considered by the project team?

A 1 4 is Best

Do you agree that the Exit 63 Alternatives selected by the project team are all appropriate for further consideration?  YES □  NO □

If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

What Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology solutions appeal to you for this corridor?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by March 24, 2017

NAME: ____________________________

ADDRESS: ____________________________

PHONE # (Optional): ____________________________ EMAIL: ____________________________

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager: Steve Gramm
P: (605)773-6641
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Return Comments to: Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600
Centennial, CO 80111

P:(303)721-1440
F:(303)721-0832
E:lyle.devries@fhueng.com
What Exit 63 alternatives or corridor improvements that you like have not been considered by the project team?

All #4 Best

Do you agree that the Exit 63 Alternatives selected by the project team are all appropriate for further consideration?  

YES [ ]  

NO [ ]  

If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

What Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) technology solutions appeal to you for this corridor?

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by March 24, 2017

NAME:  

ADDRESS:  605 W Sunnydale Rd  Box Elder, SD

PHONE # (Optional): 605-484-3067  EMAIL:

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager:  
Steve Gramm  
P: (605)773-6641  
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Return Comments to:  
Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600  
Centennial, CO 80111  
P:(303)721-1440  
F:(303)721-0832  
E:lyle.devries@fhueng.com
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Advertisements / Communication

The following display advertisement publicizing the meeting was published on February 15, 2017 and February 24, 2017 in the Rapid City Journal and on February 15, 2017 and February 22, 2017 in the Native Sun News.
The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) in cooperation with the City of Box Elder, the Rapid City Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), will hold an open house style public meeting for the Interstate 90 (I-90) Exit 61 (Elk Vale Road) to 67 (Liberty Boulevard) Corridor Study. The study is being done to identify the recommended future configuration for mainline I-90 and the Exit 63 interchange. The purpose of this public meeting is to review the alternative concepts developed and to gather comments on the feasible interchange alternatives for a future replacement of the existing Exit 63 interchange. The open house will be informal, with one-on-one discussion available with SDDOT, FHWA, Rapid City Area MPO, City of Box Elder and consultant staff.

Between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m., public agency and consultant staff will be available with displays to discuss issues, answer your questions, and take your ideas and opinions regarding the study corridor and alternatives presented. During this time, attendees will also have the opportunity to provide written comments. A short presentation will be given at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Notice is further given to individuals with disabilities that this public meeting is being held in a physically accessible place. Any individuals with disabilities who will require a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting should submit a request to the department’s ADA Coordinator at 605-773-3540 or 1-800-877-1113 (Telecommunication Relay Services for the Deaf). Please request the accommodations no later than 2 business days prior to the meeting in order to ensure accommodations are available.

All persons interested in the corridor study are invited to attend this open house meeting to share their views and concerns any time between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. Those who cannot make the meeting are invited to visit the webpage: http://www.i90corridor61to67.com.

For further information regarding the study, please contact Steve Gramm at (605) 773-6641 or by email at steve.gramm@state.sd.us.
Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study
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I-90 Exit 61 to 67 Corridor Study
Public Meeting #3
September 13, 2017

MEETING OVERVIEW AND COMMENT SUMMARY

Meeting Overview

Date: September 13, 2017, 6:00pm – 7:30pm
Location: Comfort Suites Crown Ballroom, Rapid City, SD
Attendance: Approximately 20 people, plus consultants, Study Advisory Team members and SDDOT representatives
Purpose: Provide overview of project and gather public input on critical issues and alternatives
Meeting Graphics: Meeting handout, Power Point presentation and 15 display boards
Feedback: Six comment sheets

Comments Summary

Comment Sheet Questions:

Do you agree that the Exit 63 alternatives selected by the project team are all appropriate?

Yes  No
5   1

- This exit has needed to be addressed. Thank you!

If no, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why:

- Option 1 is not feasible. Hard impact to the businesses at the interchange and this option would not be at all efficient for traffic flow.

Of the Exit 63 feasible options, do you prefer the interchange location at Westgate Road or at Highway 1416?

Westgate Road Interchange (Alternative 1) Highway 1416 Interchange (Alternative 4A/4B)
0   6

- Divergent is best
What feasible corridor solutions do you view as the top priorities for future implementation?

- Alternative 4a would be the best option
- I think a high priority be placed on exit 61/Elk Vale due to the multi traffic lanes and closeness of the service road and Chynee Blvd. intersection.
- Business and residential growth and maintenance of current business in conjunction with weather (winter).
- Alternative 4B (diverging diamond)

General Comments:

none
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Sign-In Sheets
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gramm</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:steve.gramm@state.sd.us">steve.gramm@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 E Broadway, Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1813 Comparo Dr, RC 57705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donna &amp; Sheldon Mitchell</td>
<td></td>
<td>asmitchel10.rpo.mides.net</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lila Grace</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td><a href="mailto:elihills11@rcp.rmdco.net">elihills11@rcp.rmdco.net</a></td>
<td>233 Mockingbird Rd, Pierre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Kundra</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Gifford</td>
<td>West River Electric Mkt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy Leone</td>
<td>SDDOT</td>
<td><a href="mailto:nancyleone@state.sd.us">nancyleone@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>700 E Broadway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kip Harrington</td>
<td>RCPD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Miller</td>
<td>Box Elder</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brandon</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthony Garcia</td>
<td>Resident</td>
<td><a href="mailto:taddyy.59@gmail.com">taddyy.59@gmail.com</a></td>
<td>14796 Moonlight Dr, RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Eben</td>
<td>EAFB</td>
<td><a href="mailto:robert.eben@us.army.mil">robert.eben@us.army.mil</a></td>
<td>2125 Scott Drive, EAFB, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td>Email</td>
<td>Address</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandra Huffman</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:thuckter68@yahoo.com">thuckter68@yahoo.com</a></td>
<td>214 Douglas Rd, Brookfield</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Mellen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1000 Cardinal Dr, BE, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amanda Schanzenbach</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:Janbms5@mson.com">Janbms5@mson.com</a></td>
<td>315 Park Ln, BE, SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike Carlson</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mellmda.carlson@sttisd.uk">mellmda.carlson@sttisd.uk</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Dawson</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:leonard.dawson@bvsdmail.com">leonard.dawson@bvsdmail.com</a></td>
<td>EA FB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gene Bilodeau</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:gene.bilodeau@bhsu.edu">gene.bilodeau@bhsu.edu</a></td>
<td>4300 Cheyenne Blvd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlie Peterson</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:anvapo@aol.com">anvapo@aol.com</a></td>
<td>14860 Meadowview, Reno, NV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dyle Estes</td>
<td></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dyle.Estes@uvf.com">dyle.Estes@uvf.com</a></td>
<td>By 230, RC, SD, 57709</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Open House PowerPoint Presentation
I-90 Corridor Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

Public Meeting #3
March 6, 2017
BHSU Rapid City Center
Introduction

• Welcome
• Housekeeping Items
• Methods of Commenting
  • Comment Card tonight
  • Comment Card later
  • Conversation with project representatives
  • Correspondence after the meeting
• Comments due by September 29
Project Contacts

SDDOT Project Manager:
Steve Gramm, PE
Planning Engineer
Ph: (605)773-6641
steve.gramm@state.sd.us

FHU Project Contacts:
Lyle DeVries
Todd Frisbie
Ph: (303)721-1440
lyle.devries@fhueng.com

Study Advisory Team Entities:
• Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
• City of Box Elder
• Rapid City Area MPO
Project Background

• Recommended in BESTPlan as a more focused study of important corridor

• Positioned to:
  • Answer key questions in advance of I-90 rehab/reconstruction (8 yrs. out)
  • Address future of Exit 63

• Collaborative effort among several entities
Study Goals:
Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-90 corridor within the study area

Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

Two primary areas of need will be investigated in this study.

1. **I-90 Corridor Capacity**
The need for I-90 and the surrounding roadway network to provide acceptable traffic operations and safety now and into the long range future.

Traffic counts, forecasts and analyses may support:
- The need for an additional travel lane along I-90 for all or part of the study corridor
- The need for particular regional roadway network improvements to accommodate vehicle-trips and support I-90
- The need for other multimodal mobility enhancements

2. **Interchange Access**
The current half movement interchange provides only for movements to and from the west, not in compliance with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy requiring that service interchanges provide for all movements. The study will investigate options to bring Exit 63 into compliance with FHWA policy.
Project Update

• Public Meeting held March 6, 2017 to present project and existing conditions information, input included:
  • Need for east-west connections supporting I-90
  • Favor for new Exit 63 slightly west of current location
  • Maintain business access

• Project efforts:
  • Further analyses/screening to identify feasible solutions
  • Coordination with Study Advisory Team

• Now presenting findings to public for review and input
Schedule/Work Plan

Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

Baseline Conditions
- Project Initiation
- Data Collection:
  - Traffic counts
  - Mapping
  - Travel Patterns
  - Infrastructure Conditions

Needs Assessment
- Existing Traffic and Safety
- Future Growth Impacts
- Regional Road Connections
- Intelligent Transportation Systems Assessment

Solutions
- Identify Solutions
- Evaluation and Screening
- Conceptual Design
- Select Build Scenarios

Project Recommendations
- Package Corridor Wide Improvements
- Recommendations
- Report

Environmental
- Environmental Resource Scan
- Agency Outreach

Purpose and Need Development
- Identifying Needs and Solutions Analyses
- We Are Here for NEPA Process

Study Advisory Team Meetings

Website

Public Involvement
- Public Meetings
- Rapid City Area MPO Meeting (open to the public)

We Are Here

Legend

2016
May
June
July
August
September
October
November
December

2017
August
September
October
November
December
Solutions Process

- Identification of Solutions
- Initial Investigations
- Feasibility Screening
- Final Recommendations

1. Actions
2. Description
3. Description
4. Description
5. Description
6. Description
7. Description

Identification of Solutions:
- External Scenarios
- Comprehensive List of Corridor Solutions
- Non-Feasible Projects

Initial Investigations:
- Conceptual Design Options
- Feasible Scenarios
- Comprehension of Scenarios

Feasibility Screening:
- I-90 Mainline
- Exit 63 Reconstruction
- I.T.S. Components
- Other Projects

Final Recommendations:
- Scenario A
- Scenario B
- Scenario C

Ensure that project goal(s) are met in recommended scenarios.

Solutions Workshop:
- Needs Assessment
- I.T.S. Assessment
- Public Input
- External Scenarios

We Are Here
Exit 63 Alternatives Carried Forward for Further Evaluation

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 1
Interchange at West Gate
Fewer Property Impacts
Simplicity of Configuration
Uses Existing Infrastructure

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 2
Interchange at West Gate Rd. with Direct Access to Eastbound 1416
Facilitates Movements to EAFB
Simplicity of Configuration
Uses Existing Infrastructure

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 3
Interchange at West Gate Rd. with Existing West Ramps and New East Ramps
Facilitates Movements to EAFB
Uses Existing Infrastructure
Maintains N. Service Road Access
Provides Desired Ramp Spacing
Exit 63 Alternatives Carried Forward for Further Evaluation

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 4
Diamond Interchange at Highway 1416

Carry Forward: YES
- Fewer Property Impacts
- Simplicity of Configuration
- Provides Desired Ramp Spacing
- Minimal Impact to Existing Property Access
- Maintains N. Service Road Access

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 11
Exit 63 Removal at County Hwy 1416

Carry Forward: YES
- No Property Impacts
- Low Construction Cost
- Maintains N. Service Road Access
## I-90 Exit 63
### Evaluation of Options Carried Forward

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXIT 63 INTERCHANGE RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>ADDRESS THE NEED FOR THE PROJECT</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>PRIVATE PROPERTY AND ROW IMPACTS</th>
<th>FACILITATES MOVEMENTS TO AND FROM EAFB</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTABILITY</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION COSTS</th>
<th>CONNECTIVITY WITH EXISTING ROAD NETWORK</th>
<th>DRIVER EXPECTANCY</th>
<th>DESIGN CRITERIA</th>
<th>CONTROL OF ACCESS</th>
<th>PUBLIC COMMENT</th>
<th>CARRY FORWARD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># NAME &amp; LOCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 NO ACTION</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 WESTGATE DIAMOND WITH DIRECT ACCESS TO EAFB</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 2" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 WESTGATE WITH LOOP RAMP</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 4" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 HIGHWAY 1416 DIAMOND</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 3" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 REMOVE EXIT 63</td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
<td><img src="#" alt="Point Value = 0" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### LEGEND
- **Point Value = 0**  Least meets criterion
- **Point Value = 1**  Least meets criterion
- **Point Value = 2**  Least meets criterion
- **Point Value = 3**  Least meets criterion
- **Point Value = 4**  Best meets criterion

### Notes
- **Control of access cannot be achieved**
- **Alternatives have most impacts on private property**
- **Lowest driver expectancy**
- **Best meets driver expectancy**
- **Best utilizes existing infrastructure**
- **Easiest to construct**
Feasible Option 1 - Westgate Diamond

Evaluation Results:

- **Parcels Impacted**: 13 (10 with property access option)
- **Area of New Right-of-Way**: 5.84 Acres
- **Construction Costs**: $11.3 M
- **Ramp Terminal Operations**: EB Ramps - B/B, WB Ramps - A/B
- **Maintenance of Traffic During Construction**: Easiest compared to other alternatives

**Map Description**:
- North Service Road must be closed due to control of access.
- Property access options are marked.
- Railroad crossing required.
- New driveway connection for parcels is indicated.

**Legend**:
- Parcel impact due to loss of access
- Parcel impact removal
- Property line access to be closed
- Wall

** Interstate 90 Exit 61-67 Corridor Study**
Feasible Option 4a -
Highway 1416 Diamond

Parcels Impacted: 2
Area of New Right-of-Way: 10.12 Acres
Costs: $17.1 M
Ramp Operations: EB Ramps - B/B, WB Ramps - B/B
Maintenance of Traffic During Construction: Hardest compared to Alternative 1

Evaluation Results
Feasible Option 4b - Highway 1416 Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI)

Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Impact</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of New Right-of-Way</td>
<td>9.10 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$23.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Terminal Operations</td>
<td>EB Ramps - A/A, WB Ramps - A/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Traffic During Construction</td>
<td>Hardest compared to Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatives 4a and 4b
2045 Projected Traffic Conditions

Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

LEGEND
- D/D = AM/PM Peak Hour Signalized Intersection Level of Service
- a/b = AM/PM Peak Hour Unsignalized Movement Level of Service
- B/B = AM/PM Freeway Level of Service
- c/c = AM/PM Merge/Diverge Level of Service
- f/f = Stop Sign
- Y = Traffic Signal
- X = Yield Sign
- X/X = Intersection Approach Lanes

1. Alt 4a Diamond Lanes
2. Alt 4b DDI Lanes
3. Bluebird Dr.
4. West Gate Rd.
5. Commercial Gate Dr.
6. N. Ellsworth Rd.
7. Space Dr.
8. S. Ellsworth Rd.
9. Radar Hill Rd.
10. County Highway 1416

I-90 Exit 61-67 Corridor Study 16-034 09/13/17
Generalized Project Implementation Steps may include:
- Further study/documentation as needed to achieve agency clearances
- Inclusion in local, Rapid City Area MPO and statewide transportation plans
- Identification of funding and year of construction

**Recommended Actions from I-90 Corridor Study**

**I-90 Mainline Widening**
- Accommodate and advance with 2023 I-90 grading and surfacing
- Pave and stripe for 6 lanes when need is triggered by operational condition (post-2045)

**Exit 63 Reconstruction**
- Accommodate with 2023 I-90 grading and surfacing
- Reconstruct interchange when triggered by:
  - Structural condition
  - Operational need

**ITS Solutions**
- Accommodate and advance with 2023 I-90 grading and surfacing
- Incorporate solutions into statewide ITS planning efforts
- Coordinate with stakeholders
- Conduct Systems Engineering process
- Deploy cost effective ideas

**Other Actions**
- External roadway connections (e.g., Mall Drive project)
- Local development projects
- Infrastructure projects
- Ellsworth AFB Actions

**ITS** = Intelligent Transportation Systems
Next Steps

• Update Rapid City Area MPO Committees 9/14
• Incorporate public and MPO input
• Formulate final recommendations
• Develop draft and final reports

**Ongoing input appreciated!**

• Visit the project website at [www.i90corridor61to67.com](http://www.i90corridor61to67.com)
  • Contact the project team
  • Fill out a comment card
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Open House Exhibits
Please provide your views and ideas through discussions with study team members, and written comment sheets, and keep up to date with the project through: www.i90corridor61to67.com
Schedule/Work Plan

Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study

Study Advisory Team Meetings

Website

Continues for 6 Months After Project End

Public Involvement

Baseline Conditions
- Project Initiation
- Data Collection:
  - Traffic counts
  - Mapping
  - Travel Patterns
  - Infrastructure Conditions

Needs Assessment
- Existing Traffic and Safety
- Future Growth Impacts
- Regional Road Connections
- Intelligent Transportation Systems Assessment

Solutions
- Identify Solutions
- Evaluation and Screening
- Conceptual Design
- Select Build Scenarios

Project Recommendations
- Package Corridor Wide Improvements
- Recommendations
- Report

Environmental
- Environmental Resource Scan
- Agency Outreach

Purpose and Need Development

Environmental Impacts

Environmental Documentation

LEGEND
- Public Meeting
- Rapid City Area MPO Meeting (open to the public)

We Are Here

Months
- May
- June
- July
- August
- September
- October
- November
- December

2016

2017

We Are Here

August September

2016 2017

October November December January February March April - July August September October November December

Available for NEPA Process
Study Area & Project Goals & Needs

Study Goals:
Complete a list of transportation issues and needs facing the I-90 corridor within the study area

Develop feasible solutions to address those issues and needs that meet current design standards and/or traffic level of service expectations under both the current and predicted future traffic conditions while promoting a livable community that will enhance the economic and social well-being of all users of the corridor.

Two primary areas of need will be investigated in this study.

1. I-90 Corridor Capacity
The need for I-90 and the surrounding roadway network to provide acceptable traffic operations and safety now and into the long range future.

Traffic counts, forecasts and analyses may support:
- The need for an additional travel lane along I-90 for all or part of the study corridor
- The need for particular regional roadway network improvements to accommodate vehicle-trips and support I-90
- The need for other multimodal mobility enhancements

2. Interchange Access
The current half movement interchange provides only for movements to and from the west, not in compliance with current Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) policy requiring that service interchanges provide for all movements. The study will investigate options to bring Exit 63 into compliance with FHWA policy.
Solutions Process

Solutions Process Diagram:

- Identification of Solutions
- Initial Investigations
- Feasibility Screening
- Final Recommendations

1. We Are Here

- External Scenarios
- Comprehensive List of Corridor Solutions
- Non-Feasible Projects
- External Scenarios

- Conceptual Design Options
- Feasible Scenarios
- Recommended Improvement

- Actions
  1.
  2.
  3.
  4.
  5.
  6.
  7.

- We Are Here
Exit 63 Alternatives Carried Forward for Further Evaluation

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 1
Interchange at West Gate

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 2
Interchange at West Gate Rd. with Direct Access to Eastbound 1416

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 3
Interchange at West Gate Rd. with Existing West Ramps and New East Ramps

Carry Forward: YES

Fewer Property Impacts
Simplicity of Configuration

Facilitates Movements to EAFB
Simplicity of Configuration
Uses Existing Infrastructure

Facilitates Movements to EAFB
Uses Existing Infrastructure
Maintains N. Service Road Access
Provides Desired Ramp Spacing

Carry Forward: YES

Fewer Property Impacts
Simplicity of Configuration

Facilitates Movements to EAFB
Uses Existing Infrastructure
Maintains N. Service Road Access
Provides Desired Ramp Spacing
Exit 63 Alternatives Carried Forward for Further Evaluation

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 11
Exit 63 Removal at County Hwy 1416

I-90 Exit 63
Alternative 4
Diamond Interchange at Highway 1416

- Carry Forward: YES
- Fewer Property Impacts
- Simplicity of Configuration
- Provides Desired Ramp Spacing
- Minimal Impact to Existing Property Access
- Maintains N. Service Road Access

- Carry Forward: YES
- No Property Impacts
- Low Construction Cost
- Maintains N. Service Road Access
### I-90 Exit 63 Evaluation of Options Carried Forward

#### LEGEND
- Point Value = 0  Least meets criterion
- Point Value = 1
- Point Value = 2
- Point Value = 3
- Point Value = 4  Best meets criterion

#### I-90 Exit 61-67 Corridor Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXIT 63 INTERCHANGE RECONSTRUCTION ALTERNATIVES</th>
<th>ADDRESS THE NEED FOR THE PROJECT</th>
<th>ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS</th>
<th>PRIVATE PROPERTY AND ROW IMPACTS</th>
<th>FACILITATES MOVEMENTS TO AND FROM EAFB</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTABILITY</th>
<th>CONSTRUCTION COSTS</th>
<th>CONNECTIVITY WITH EXISTING ROAD NETWORK</th>
<th>DRIVER EXPECTANCY</th>
<th>DESIGN CRITERIA</th>
<th>CONTROL OF ACCESS</th>
<th>PUBLIC COMMENT</th>
<th>CARRY FORWARD?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name &amp; Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ACTION</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTGATE DIAMOND</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTGATE DIAMOND WITH DIRECT ACCESS TO EAFB</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WESTGATE WITH LOOP RAMP</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGHWAY 1416 DIAMOND</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMOVE EXIT 63</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="value" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Key Points
- **Best meets driver expectancy**
- **Best utilizes existing infrastructure**
- **Easiest to construct**
- **Alternatives have most impacts on private property**
- **Control of access cannot be achieved**
- **Lowest driver expectancy**
Feasible Option 1 - Westgate Diamond

Parcels Impacted: 13 (10 with property access option)
Area of New Right-of-Way: 5.84 Acres
Construction Costs: $11.3 M
Ramp Terminal Operations: EB Ramps - B/B, WB Ramps - A/B
Maintenance of Traffic During Construction: Easiest compared to other alternatives

Evaluation Results
Feasible Option 4a - Highway 1416 Diamond

Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels Impacted</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of New Right-of-Way</td>
<td>10.12 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costs</td>
<td>$17.1 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Operations</td>
<td>EB Ramps - B/B, WB Ramps - B/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Traffic During Construction</td>
<td>Hardest compared to Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Feasible Option 4b - Highway 1416 Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI)

Evaluation Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parcels Impacted</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of New Right-of-Way</td>
<td>9.10 Acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Costs</td>
<td>$23.8 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ramp Terminal Operations</td>
<td>EB Ramps - A/A, WB Ramps - A/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Traffic During Construction</td>
<td>Hardest compared to Alternative 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Alternatives 4a and 4b
2045 Projected Traffic Conditions

Legend:
- X/X = AM/PM Hour Signalized Intersection Level of Service
- x/x = AM/PM Hour Unsignalized Movement Level of Service
- = AM/PM Freeway Level of Service
- = AM/PM Merge/Diverge Level of Service
- = Stop Sign
- = Traffic Signal
- = Yield Sign
- = Intersection Approach Lanes
Study Area
Project Implementation

RECOMMENDED ACTIONS FROM I-90 CORRIDOR STUDY

I-90 Mainline Widening
- Accommodate and advance with 2023 I-90 grading and surfacing
- Pave and stripe for 6 lanes when need is triggered by operational condition (post-2045)

Exit 63 Reconstruction
- Accommodate with 2023 I-90 grading and surfacing
- Reconstruct interchange when triggered by:
  - Structural condition
  - Operational need

ITS Solutions
- Accommodate and advance with 2023 I-90 grading and surfacing
- Incorporate solutions into statewide ITS planning efforts
- Coordinate with stakeholders
- Conduct Systems Engineering process
- Deploy cost effective ideas

OTHER ACTIONS
- External roadway connections (e.g. Mall Drive project)
- Local development projects
- Infrastructure projects
- Ellsworth AFB Actions

Generalized Project Implementation Steps may include:
- Further study/documentation as needed to achieve agency clearances
- Inclusion in local, Rapid City Area MPO and statewide transportation plans
- Identification of funding and year of construction

*ITS = Intelligent Transportation Systems*
Next Steps

- Update Rapid City Area MPO Committees (9/14)
- Incorporate public and MPO input
- Formulate final recommendations
- Develop draft report for October MPO meeting
- Finalize report for December or first 2018 MPO meeting

Please visit us at:
www.i90corridor61to67.com
Interstate 90 Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study
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Meeting Handout
Study Area Project Implementation

**Next Steps**
- Incorporate public feedback
- Formulate study recommendations
- Develop draft and final reports

**For more information, please contact:**
Steve Gramm, PE - Planning Engineer
South Dakota Department of Transportation
(605)773-6641
steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Lyle DeVries - Consultant
Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
303.721.1440
lyle.devries@fhueng.com

Or visit the website: www.i90corridor61to67.com
Feasible Alternatives for Exit 63 and I-90

Exit 63 Feasible Option 1 - Westgate Diamond

Exit 63 Feasible Option 4a - Highway 1416 Diamond

Exit 63 Feasible Option 4b - Highway 1416 Diverging Diamond Interchange (DDI)

I-90 Mainline Widening
Interstate 90 Exit 61 to Exit 67 Corridor Study
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Comment Sheets
Comment Card

Do you agree that the Exit 63 feasible options selected by the project team are all appropriate?  
YES  [X]  NO  [ ]  If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

This exit has needed to be addressed. Thank you!

Of the Exit 63 feasible options do you prefer the interchange location at Westgate Road or at Highway 1416?

- Westgate Road Interchange (Alternative 1)  [ ]
- Highway 1416 Interchange (Alternative 4A/4B)  [X]

What feasible corridor solutions do you view as the top priorities for future implementation?

Alternative 4A would be the best option

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by September 29, 2017

NAME:  Theresa Mellen
ADDRESS:  1601 Cardinal Dr.  Box Elder
PHONE # (Optional):  EMAIL:  +bucket1e8@yahoo.com

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager:
Steve Gramm  
P: (605)773-6641  
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Return Comments to:
Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600  
Centennial, CO 80111  
P: (303)721-1440  
F: (303)721-0832  
E: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Do you agree that the Exit 63 feasible options selected by the project team are all appropriate?  
YES [ ]  NO [ ]  If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

Of the Exit 63 feasible options do you prefer the interchange location at Westgate Road or at Highway 1416?

Westgate Road Interchange (Alternative 1) [ ]
Highway 1416 Interchange (Alternative 4A/4B) [x]

What feasible corridor solutions do you view as the top priorities for future implementation?
I think a high priority be place on exit 61/Elk Vale due to the multi traffic lanes and closeness of the service road + Chynee Blvd intersection.

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by September 29, 2017

NAME:  [EUGÈNE MILLER]
ADDRESS:  107 EMBARR DC # 4 BOX ELVG
PHONE # (Optional):  EMAIL:

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager:  Steve Gramm  
P: (605)773-6641  
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us  

Return Comments to:  Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
P: (303)721-1440  
6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600  
F: (303)721-0832  
Centennial, CO 80111  
E: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
Comment Card

Do you agree that the Exit 63 feasible options selected by the project team are all appropriate?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the Exit 63 feasible options do you prefer the interchange location at Westgate Road or at Highway 1416?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westgate Road Interchange (Alternative 1)</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highay 1416 Interchange (Alternative 4A/4B)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What feasible corridor solutions do you view as the top priorities for future implementation?

Business + residential growth and maintenance of current business in conjunction with weather (winter)

GENERAL COMMENTS:

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by September 29, 2017

NAME: _________________________________________
ADDRESS: _______________________________________
PHONE # (Optional): _____________________________ EMAIL: ________________________________

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDDOT Project Manager:</th>
<th>Return Comments to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gramm</td>
<td>Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt &amp; Ullevig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: (605)773-6641</td>
<td>P: (303)721-1440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:steve.gramm@state.sd.us">steve.gramm@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F: (303)721-0832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Centennial, CO 80111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:lyle.devries@fhuen.com">lyle.devries@fhuen.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment Card**

Do you agree that the Exit 63 feasible options selected by the project team are all appropriate?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the Exit 63 feasible options do you prefer the interchange location at Westgate Road or at Highway 1416?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westgate Road Interchange (Alternative 1)</th>
<th>Highway 1416 Interchange (Alternative 4A/4B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☒</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What feasible corridor solutions do you view as the top priorities for future implementation?

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GENERAL COMMENTS:**

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by September 29, 2017

NAME:  
ADDRESS:  P.O. Box 330  Rapid City, SD 57709
PHONE # (Optional):  605-209-2535  EMAIL:  doyle.e.stes@state.sd.us

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SDDOT Project Manager:</th>
<th>Return Comments to:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Steve Gramm</td>
<td>Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt &amp; Ullevig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P: (605)773-6641</td>
<td>6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E: <a href="mailto:steve.gramm@state.sd.us">steve.gramm@state.sd.us</a></td>
<td>Centennial, CO 80111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comment Card

Do you agree that the Exit 63 feasible options selected by the project team are all appropriate?  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

___________________________________________________________

Of the Exit 63 feasible options do you prefer the interchange location at Westgate Road or at Highway 1416?

- Westgate Road Interchange (Alternative 1)  
- Highway 1416 Interchange (Alternative 4A/4B)  

[ ] Westgate Road Interchange (Alternative 1)  
[ ] Highway 1416 Interchange (Alternative 4A/4B)  

What feasible corridor solutions do you view as the top priorities for future implementation?

___________________________________________________________

GENERAL COMMENTS:

___________________________________________________________

___________________________________________________________

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by September 29, 2017

NAME: Brandon Best

ADDRESS: 900 3/4 Block Hwy, SD 57218

PHONE # (Optional): ___________________________ EMAIL: ___________________________

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager:  
Steve Gramm  
P: (605)773-6641  
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us

Return Comments to:  
Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig  
P: (303)721-1440  
F: (303)721-0832  
Centennial, CO 80111  
E: lyle.devries@fhueang.com
Do you agree that the Exit 63 feasible options selected by the project team are all appropriate?

YES ☐  NO ☒  If NO, please explain which alternative(s) you would include and why?

Option 1 is not feasible. Hard impact to the businesses at the interchange and this option would not be at all efficient for traffic flow.

Of the Exit 63 feasible options do you prefer the interchange location at Westgate Road or at Highway 1416?

Westgate Road Interchange (Alternative 1) ☒  Highway 1416 Interchange (Alternative 4A/4B) ☐

What feasible corridor solutions do you view as the top priorities for future implementation?

Alternative 4B (Diverging Diamond)

GENERAL COMMENTS:

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

__________________________________________________________________________

Return this sheet tonight or mail it to the address below by September 29, 2017

NAME: Anthony Garcia
ADDRESS: 14776 Moonlight Dr., RC 57703
PHONE # (Optional): ___________________________________ EMAIL: teddy59@gmail.com

Questions? Please feel free to contact:

SDDOT Project Manager:  Return Comments to:
Steve Gramm  Lyle DeVries, Felsburg Holt & Ullevig
P: (605)773-6641  6300 South Syracuse Way, Ste: 600  P: (303)721-1440
E: steve.gramm@state.sd.us  Centennial, CO 80111  F: (303)721-0832
E: lyle.devries@fhueng.com
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Advertisements / Communication

The following display advertisement publicizing the meeting was published on August 24, 2017 and September 1, 2017 in the Rapid City Journal and on August 23, 2017 and August 30, 2017 in the Native Sun News.
The South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT) in cooperation with the City of Box Elder, the Rapid City Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), will hold an open house style public meeting for the Interstate 90 (I-90) Exit 61 (US16B / SD79 / Elk Vale Road) to 67 (Liberty Boulevard) Corridor Study. The study is being done to identify the recommended future configuration for mainline I-90 and the Exit 63 interchange. The purpose of this public meeting is to review alternative concepts and the future recommended interchange configuration for Exit 63. The open house will be informal, with one-on-one discussion available with SDDOT, FHWA, Rapid City Area MPO, City of Box Elder and consultant staff.

Between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m., public agency and consultant staff will be available with displays to discuss issues, answer your questions, and take your ideas and opinions regarding the study corridor and alternatives presented. During this time, attendees will also have the opportunity to provide written comments. A short presentation will be given at approximately 6:15 p.m.

Notice is further given to individuals with disabilities that this public meeting is being held in a physically accessible place. Any individuals with disabilities who will require a reasonable accommodation in order to participate in the public meeting should submit a request to the department’s ADA Coordinator at 605-773-3540 or 1-800-877-1113 (Telecommunication Relay Services for the Deaf). Please request the accommodations no later than 2 business days prior to the meeting in order to ensure accommodations are available.

All persons interested in the corridor study are invited to attend this open house meeting to share their views and concerns any time between 6:00 p.m. and 7:30 p.m. Those who cannot make the meeting are invited to visit the webpage: http://www.i90corridor61to67.com.

For further information regarding the study, please contact Steve Gramm at (605) 773-6641 or by email at steve.gramm@state.sd.us.