

From: Pasvogel [pasvogel@comcast.net]
Sent: Wednesday, June 10, 2009 9:59 PM
To: curt.kobilarcsik@co.anoka.mn.us; jack.corkle@co.anoka.mn.us
Cc: Timothy A. Chalupnik
Subject: CSAH 52/CSAH 116 EA/EAW

Please provide your contact information and comments below:

Name: Matt Pasvogel
Address: 12896 Mankato str NE
Phone: 763.754.2397

Comments: You state "Safety will also be improved by the construction of the raised median, which will reduce the number of full access intersections, thereby reducing the number of vehicle conflicts." You are now going to force over 70 households to use Mankato street as a single choke point to get to the Quail Creek parkway traffic light and head south on Radisson. I am concerned that an entire development of mostly dual income households (100+ commuters) are going to all crowd/speed down one street to use the one exit they have. This will also cause additional danger to the children at the homes along Mankato street. I can live with the sound of traffic but not the sound of someone getting run over because of traffic you forced to a single choke point.

Please tell me why the intersection of 127th and Radisson can not have access like Radisson and 116th Street? A traffic light at Quail creek parkway will stop vehicles north and allow access to Radisson with less risk than there is today. Or, why can't you extend Mankato street south all the way to 125th Ave as I was told it would be when we moved in? If none of this happens then I recommend speed bumps on Mankato street because you will have created a minor arterial roadway in a residential neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration.

Matt Pasvogel

From: Jack Corkle [Jack.Corkle@co.anoka.mn.us]
Sent: Tuesday, June 23, 2009 10:17 AM
To: Jerry Schlenker
Cc: Curt Kobilarcsik; Timothy A. Chalupnik
Subject: Re: Raddison road project

Mr. Schlenker -

Your comments have been documented and will be responded to as part of the environmental document process. As you may be aware, we are receiving comments on the Radisson Road project through July 7, 2009. Once we receive all of the comments, we will respond to them all as we are required to do. Some of the comments may require a bit of additional research and follow up from city, county or consultant staff.

There is a public hearing scheduled for this evening at 6:00 pm at the Bunker Hills Activity Center. Your comments will be incorporated into the comments we receive this evening.

thank you again -

Jack

Jack Corkle, PTP, AICP
Anoka County Highway Department
1440 Bunker Lake Blvd NW
Andover, MN 55304

Phone: 763-862-4219
Fax:763-862-4201

E-mail: Jack.corkle@co.anoka.mn.us

>>> "Jerry Schlenker" <schlenker@comcast.net> 06/18/2009 9:36 AM >>>
What is the accident/injury/fatality rate for the section of Raddison road South of hwy 14? I don't think it is any different than the 2 lane section of Radisson road north of hwy14? So, selling this as a traffic safety improvement is debatable.

Also, you fail to address the safety issue to residents living along Raddison road with up to 27,500 vehicles passing by at the end of their driveway.

Jerry Schlenker
2047 130th CT NE
Blaine MN
763-862-5626

From: Dean Sime [Dean@dsime.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 07, 2009 12:20 AM
To: curt.kobilarcsik@co.anoka.mn.us; jack.corkle@co.anoka.mn.us
Cc: Timothy A. Chalupnik; Minnesota.fhwa@fhwa.dot.gov
Subject: CSAH 52/CSAH 116 EA/EAW, Comments during public hearing
Attachments: Comments regarding the Traffic.pdf

Importance: High

Please provide your contact information and comments below:

Name: Dean Sime
Address: 13269 Owatonna CT NE, Blaine MN 55449
Phone: 763.767.9401

Comments:

Please see attached.

Comments regarding the Traffic-Related Noise Analysis

Regarding Project t to reconstruct Radisson Road/County State Aid Highway (CSAH) 52 from 125th Avenue NE to Bunker Lake Boulevard (CSAH 116) and Bunker Lake Boulevard from Highway 65 to Radisson Road.

Included are a list of items that show where the current noise analysis is inadequate and invalidates the analysis either individually or collectively.

1. Qualifying the Noise measurements

- a. Failed to qualify the selection sites where existing noise levels were monitored.
- b. Failed to state the environmental conditions during the measurement period
- c. Failed to state the traffic volumes measured during the noise measurement period.
- d. Existing noise levels were not measured in some of the critical areas. They were only predicted.
- e. Being that measured sites were close to the threshold, continued more thorough and expanded measurements is warranted.
- f. Predicted values show less than actual monitored values in two of the four measured locations. 1 dBA in location N4, 5db in location N3. This shows a flaw in the predictions as future traffic would see quadruple the amount of cars traveling the road at times.

2. Predicted measurements

- a. Location of predicted measurements were located at or near residence. Location for exterior noise impact should be the right-of-way line (a point farthest away from a house) to be on the conservative side when doing the noise impact analysis
- b. If using predicted results of the noise levels as given in the current study at the sites shown, the noise abatement criteria should be 64dBA being they are located at the residence. This would meet the 54 dBA abatement criteria for interior residential space.
- c. Predicted measurements show an increased number precision to the nearest tenth. Reported precision must not be greater than lowest measured precision or design parameters. Measurement equipment specified has a precision of +/- 1.5 dBA.
- d. Because of the invalid precision used sites that meet the criteria for abatement were ignored. This of course ignores that fact that the predicted numbers used are inaccurate and miss used as stated in item b.
- e. Predicted values neglected to take into consideration of existing noise abatement, Trees Berms, Distance, etc.
- f. Predicted results violated standard expected results:
 - i. Sound intensity increases with the square of the distance. Approximately 4.5 dBA in this environment.
 - ii. Doubling of the traffic on a particular roadway will increase the volume of the noise by about 3dBA.
 - iii. Because of the new road design with traffic signals, the future prediction of double the traffic volume, Four lanes instead of the two. It is expected to see

a minimum increase of quadruple the traffic volumes at periods during peak traffic.

- iv. The predicted results should show a minimum of 3db increase in noise levels. Any results not showing expected results needs further investigation and explanations.

These discrepancies were not validated in the study. The Traffic Noise Model lookup tables show that the values do follow the standard rules stated above.

- g. Noise values for adjacent predicted locations are inconsistent. Being that this is unexpected the results were not explained.
3. Statements are made that if there is any break in the noise barrier that it would be totally ineffective. This is false the correct wording and abatement direction is that it would be less effective and the results still need to be evaluated.
 4. It has been stated during some of the open house meetings that because the road is new it will be quieter. It has been documented by the FHWA that this is not true. The road will also not always be new and smooth.

EA/EAW COMMENT SHEET



Radisson Road (CSAH 52) and Bunker Lake Boulevard (CSAH 116)
Reconstruction Project

PUBLIC HEARING/OPEN HOUSE
Bunker Hills Activity Center
550 Bunker Lake Blvd. NW
Andover, Minnesota

Tuesday, June 23, 2009
5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Name: Don Koehler

Address: 1770 132nd LN NE
Blaine MN 55449

Phone: 763-759-6196

Comments: I heard mostly objections
to 4 lane road on Radisson
north of main to Bunker from the
residents + I tend to support those
objections. Mayor Ryan + County
engineers explained why they want
to proceed with plan.

I want to have engineers + Commissioners +
decision makers look at alternatives
to the plan. The 2 lanes with turn lanes
and lights on Radisson would
preserve "the neighborhood" + should
to have serious study + a report
to the public. Don Koehler

Comments received by 4:30 p.m. on Monday, July 7, 2009, will become part of the official record.

↳ Speed limit should
be 45 MPH!

EA/EAW COMMENT SHEET



Radisson Road (CSAH 52) and Bunker Lake Boulevard (CSAH 116)
Reconstruction Project

PUBLIC HEARING/OPEN HOUSE
Bunker Hills Activity Center
550 Bunker Lake Blvd. NW
Andover, Minnesota

Tuesday, June 23, 2009
5:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.

Name: Paul & Barb Klucsar

Address: 12625 Radisson Rd
Blaine MN 55449

Phone: 763-757-4875

Comments: If we move our driveway to
the south along the property
line going East & West would
we be able to get the sound
barrier ~~along~~ ^{across} the ^{lot to the} north side
of the lot to connect up
with the lot north of us?

Comments received by 4:30 p.m. on Monday, July 7, 2009, will become part of the official record.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

PUBLIC HEARING/OPEN HOUSE
for the
RADISSON ROAD (CSAH 52)/BUNKER LAKE BOULEVARD
(CSAH 116) RECONSTRUCT PROJECT
taken
JUNE 23, 2009 COMMENCING AT 6:00 P.M.

JOHNSON & DZIUK COURT REPORTERS
2852 Anthony Lane South
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55418
(612)333-8986

1

2 everyone, on behalf of the County and the City of Ham
3 Lake and the City of Blaine, I'd like to welcome you
4 to the public hearing for the Radisson Road/Bunker
5 Lake Boulevard project. My name is Tim Chalupnik,
6 and I'm with the consulting firm of TKDA. I'm one of
7 the engineers who is working on the project, and I
8 will be giving a brief presentation to start out the
9 public hearing.

10 During the presentation I'll provide a general
11 overview of the environmental
12 assessment/environmental assessment worksheet;
13 explain the purpose of this public hearing work; let
14 you know how you can provide comments; provide a
15 summary of some of the major topics in the document;
16 review some of the social, economic and environmental
17 impact, and discuss the mitigation that we've
18 undertaken; summarize the public involvement that has
19 taken place to date, and also the agency coordination
20 that has taken place; and conclude with a look ahead
21 at the next step in the process.

22 For those of you that don't know, this is the
23 environmental assessment/environmental assessment
24 worksheet, and I'll refer to this as the EA/EAW.
25 There are copies around tonight for you to view. The

3

1 document is prepared -- was prepared for this project
2 and meets both State and Federal guidelines.

3 On the federal level, the EA is used to provide

4 sufficient environmental documentation to determine
5 whether an environmental impact statement is
6 required, or whether a finding of no significant
7 impact is appropriate. The document also fulfills
8 the State requirements for preparing an environmental
9 assessment worksheet, and actually follows the format
10 of a State EAW, with its typical 31-section format.

11 Similarly to the federal process and the State
12 level, the document is used to document the
13 environmental impact to determine whether a State
14 environmental impact statement is required or whether
15 what is called a Negative Declaration is
16 appropriate. This EA/EAW was distributed for review
17 to all the permitting and regulatory agencies, and is
18 available for viewing by the public. If you haven't
19 seen one yet, again, there's copies here tonight.
20 There's also copies available at the Johnsville
21 Branch Library, Blaine City Hall, Ham Lake City Hall,
22 the Anoka County Highway Department in Andover, and
23 electronically on the project website.

24 Well, what's the purpose of this public
25 hearing? A public hearing typically provides the

4

1 public with the opportunity to comment on major
2 design issues and the potential social, economic and
3 environmental impacts of a project in a formal and
4 documented setting. The main purpose of tonight's
5 public hearing is to obtain comments on the EA/EAW.
6 It is not to provide feedback on your comments at

7 this time. You will have opportunities to give oral
8 statements, and in a few minutes individuals who wish
9 to make oral statements can do so. Please give your
10 name and address before you give your statement, so
11 that the court reporter can get your name and address
12 correct, please. An official transcript of your
13 statement will be taken by the reporter. You can
14 also provide written statements by either filling out
15 a comment sheet, which are located over here
16 (indicating), and dropping them in the box. If you
17 don't want to do that tonight, you can mail them in.
18 You can also send an e-mail, and there's information
19 on the handout on how to send an e-mail. You can
20 also go to the project website and there is a link
21 for sending an e-mail with your written comment.

22 Comments received prior to the close of the day
23 at 4:30 -- the close of the public comment period,
24 4:30 on July 7th, will be made part of the official
25 hearing record.

5

1 So what's in this EA/EAW? Some of the major
2 topics are the purpose and need for the project, the
3 alternatives considered, the social, economic and
4 environmental impacts and mitigation, and a summary
5 of public and agency involvement.

6 The purpose and need for the project: Why are
7 we doing this project? The project is needed to
8 address the need for additional roadway capacity.

9 Both roadways need to be four-lane facilities to
10 provide satisfactory traffic operations for existing
11 and forecasted traffic. The project is needed to
12 provide additional infrastructure to support existing
13 and proposed development in the area. The project is
14 needed to address access management needs.

15 Along this project there are approximately 60
16 driveways and 11 local streets where full access is
17 provided. This number of accesses is inconsistent
18 with the County's access spacing guidelines and
19 creates safety concerns and hinders mobility. The
20 project is needed to address safety issues that exist
21 due to lack of adequate shoulders, lack of turn lanes
22 and insufficient gaps during peak periods when people
23 are trying to turn onto those roadways and off the
24 roadways. Finally, the project is needed to address
25 the current lack of provisions for pedestrians and

6

1 bicyclists.

2 The need for this project has resulted in the
3 project being included in the County's Five-Year
4 Highway Improvement Program, the Metropolitan
5 Council's Transportation Improvement Program, and
6 MN/DOT's State Transportation Improvement Program.

7 The proposed improvements include reconstruction
8 of the roadways with four-lane divided roadways with
9 turn lanes and paved shoulders, access closures and
10 modifications, a pedestrian/bicycle trail, traffic
11 signal improvements and drainage systems.

12 A main feature of the EA/EAW is the discussion
13 of other alternatives considered. Other alternatives
14 that were considered included rehabilitation.
15 Rehabilitating the existing roadway, to rehabilitate
16 the pavement and add turn lanes. This alternative
17 would not address a number of the needs of the
18 project, including capacity needs, pedestrian and
19 bicycle needs, and access spacing issues.

20 Another alternative that we always look at is a
21 new location alternative. This alternative would
22 construct either or both roadways on a new location.
23 This alternative would not address the needs of the
24 project and would likely have much greater
25 environmental impact than this project has. We also

7

1 needed to consider the, "Do nothing alternative," but
2 this alternative would not address any of the needs
3 of the project.

4 And lastly, we looked at alignment alternatives,
5 mostly in the area of the historic farmstead, which I
6 will discuss in a little bit.

7 A summary of the construction costs and funding
8 for the project is as follows: The estimated
9 construction cost of the project is approximately 11
10 million dollars. This cost does not include
11 right-of-way acquisition, relocations, or the cost of
12 development and delivering the project, that is just
13 for construction. The project will receive 7.65

14 million dollars in federal funding. Anoka County,
15 Blaine and Ham Lake will fund the rest of the
16 project.

17 The current schedule includes completing the
18 environmental process by the fall, gaining approval
19 by late fall, completing the right-of-way process by
20 late fall, possibly starting tree clearing and
21 utility relocations in late fall, and starting
22 roadway construction in 2010. Construction is
23 anticipated to be complete in 2011.

24 Now I'll discuss some of the major social,
25 economic and environmental impacts that are mentioned

8

1 in the EA/EAW. The project results in wetland
2 impacts of 2.43 acres. Impacts will be mitigated to
3 satisfy the requirements of the Wetland Conservation
4 Act.

5 There are water quality impacts. Due to the
6 widening of the roadways the project will increase
7 the area of impervious surface, which will increase
8 the volume of water runoff. Storm water ponds and
9 other measures will provide rate control and improve
10 the water quality of runoff of the project area.

11 The project also has right-of-way impacts. The
12 County Right of Way Department has been in contact
13 with each of the property owners where land
14 acquisition is required. Appraisals have been
15 completed and offer letters have been sent to the
16 property owners. The project will require relocation

17 of three residential properties. The environmental
18 study also looked into archaeological, historical or
19 architectural resource impacts. And the project does
20 impact a historic property adjacent to Radisson Road.

21 The property known as the Boxwell Farmstead is
22 located at 13401 Radisson Road. The study determined
23 that the property is considered eligible for the
24 National Register of Historic Places. As a property
25 that's considered eligible for the National Register,

9

1 it is protected by what is called Section 4(F)
2 legislation.

3 A unit of MN/DOT a Cultural Resources Unit and
4 the State Historic Preservation Office determined
5 that the project will have an adverse EFFECT to the
6 property. The County worked with the Cultural
7 Resources Unit and the State Historic Preservation
8 office to minimize the property impacts by studying
9 alternative alignments in front of the property and
10 other studying other mitigation measures. An
11 agreement was made between the County, the Cultural
12 Resources Unit, the State Historic Preservation
13 office, the County Historical Society and the
14 Preservation Alliance of Minnesota on mitigation for
15 the impacts. The evaluation of the 4(F) property is
16 documented in the report and is attached to the back
17 of EA/EAW.

18 A noise study was completed and is included in

19 the EA/EAW. Noise levels for the year 2030 were
20 predicted and compared to the federal noise abatement
21 criteria. The year 2030 noise levels exceeded the
22 criteria in a number of locations in the project
23 area. Noise barriers were studied where they would
24 be an effective mitigation measure. Noise barriers
25 are not effective if houses are isolated or when

10

1 driveways do not allow a continuous barrier to be
2 constructed. Noise barriers were studied on the east
3 side of Radisson Road south of 127th Lane and between
4 127th Lane and Quail Creek Parkway. It was
5 determined that these two barriers are cost
6 effective.

7 Other social, environmental and economic items
8 discussed in the EA/EAW include: Land use, farmland,
9 floodplains, potential environmental hazards, fish,
10 wildlife and ecologically sensitive resources. A
11 botanical survey was completed at the request of the
12 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. Other
13 items: Erosion and sedimentation, air quality, odors,
14 noise and dust during construction, the cumulative
15 impacts of recent, ongoing and future projects in the
16 area, social impacts, pedestrian and bicyclist
17 considerations and environmental justice.

18 The public involvement that has been done to
19 date includes open house meetings on May 30th, 2007,
20 November 8th, 2007 and June 24th 2008, and a public
21 meeting with Blaine residents on May 20th, 2009.

22 Additional meetings have been held with the
23 individual property owners to discuss the
24 right-of-way process or project impacts and issues.
25 In addition to meetings, a project website has been

11

1 maintained to provide information throughout the
2 project.

3 Agency coordination has been extensive. Review
4 and permitting agencies were contacted to notify them
5 of the project, provide information, determine
6 permitting and approval requirements, and request
7 input. In addition to Anoka County and the cities of
8 Blaine and Ham Lake, the following agencies were
9 contacted: The US Fish and Wildlife Service, the
10 Natural Resource Conservation District, US Army Corps
11 of Engineers, the Minnesota Cultural Resources Unit,
12 State Historic Preservation Office -- as I mentioned
13 earlier -- the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency,
14 the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Anoka
15 County Parks and Recreation, the Anoka Conservation
16 District, Coon Creek Watershed District and the
17 Minnesota Land Trust.

18 Permits will be obtained from the US Army Corps
19 of Engineers, the Coon Creek Watershed District, the
20 Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, MN/DOT and
21 the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency.

22 Now that I have discussed the purpose of the
23 public hearing and how you can make comments and

24 summarized the major items in the EA/EAW, I'll
25 conclude by outlining the next steps in the process.

12

1 Comments received during the public comment period
2 will be considered for future project-related
3 decisions. Responses to your comments will be
4 included in an update to the EA/EAW. Anoka County
5 and the Federal Highway Administration will make a
6 determination on the adequacy of the environmental
7 documentation. If the determination is made that an
8 Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary, the
9 County will prepare a Negative Declaration for the
10 State process and a request for a Finding of No
11 Significant Impact for the federal process. That
12 request will be submitted to MN/DOT and the FHWA. If
13 the FHWA agrees to this finding, they will issue the
14 Finding of No Significant Impact. Public notices of
15 the decisions made and the availability of these
16 documents will be provided.

17 That concludes this presentation and oral
18 statements can now be made. So again, I'd like to
19 reiterate that the purpose of the public comment
20 period or your oral statements is to provide comments
21 on the EA/EAW. If you have individual comments about
22 your property, the impact to your property, say,
23 trees or berms or driveway access, those questions
24 are best met by talking to the County and City
25 representatives in the back like you did before the

1 public hearing, because we will be accepting comments
2 right now, but we won't be providing feedback to your
3 comments. So for those who want to step forward, you
4 can come to the microphone, state your name and
5 address clearly so that the court reporter can get
6 that accurately. We'd appreciate that. Thank you.

7 MR. SIME: My name is Dean Sime, my
8 address is 13269 Owatonna Court. And I've had a
9 little bit of time to look at the environmental study
10 with regards to the traffic noise analysis and I have
11 several comments here, which are included, that show
12 that where the current noise analysis is inadequate
13 and an invalid analysis either individually or
14 collectively. I just want to kind of run through my
15 bullet items here for the record.

16 As far as qualifying a noise measurements, A)
17 they failed to qualify the collection of sites that
18 were existing -- where existing noise levels were
19 monitored. Which is -- they picked four sites only
20 along the whole corridor, no analysis was given to
21 why they selected those sites. They failed to state
22 the environmental conditions during the measurement
23 period. They didn't give the environmental
24 conditions, such as wind, rain, weather, et cetera,
25 during their measurement period to say that the level

1 should be accepted as is or not. And that is a
2 requirement according to law in the FHA document.

3 They failed to state the traffic volumes
4 measured during the noise measurement period. So
5 during the noise measurement period that they did,
6 they did not state if the traffic levels were at
7 expected highs and lows, et cetera. Existing noise
8 levels were not measured in some of the critical
9 areas, they were only predicted, they did not explain
10 that. Being that the measured sites were close to
11 the threshold, continued more thorough and expanded
12 measurements is expected. So some of the
13 measurements were close, however, they did not expand
14 their measurement period beyond two five-minute
15 measurements.

16 Predicted values in their measurement tables
17 show less than actual monitored value in two of the
18 four measured locations: One DBA in one location,
19 N4, and five DBA in location, N3. So what that's
20 saying is they measured a value at one location,
21 their predicted value is five DB less than the values
22 they measured. No qualification on that number.

23 Regarding the predicted measurements, location
24 of predicted measurements were located at or near the
25 residence. Location for exterior noise impact should

15

1 be the right-of-way line, a point farthest from the
2 house to be on the conservative side with doing the

3 noise impact analysis. If using the predicted
4 results as given in the current study, the noise
5 abatement criteria should be 64 DBA, being they're
6 located at the residence. There are two criteria
7 that need to be met, out in the space, 70 DBA, where
8 you reduce it to 69 for consideration as approaching,
9 or 55 DBA inside the residence. And that is measured
10 through an open-window policy where if the window can
11 be opened or needed to be opened during residence
12 occupancy, which I'm sure they are in all these
13 spaces, that is -- they need to meet 55 DBA inside
14 the residence. And an open window is set to reduce
15 the sound by ten DBA, so that's where 64 DBA,
16 approaching 65, comes in. So in using the numbers
17 that they use for prediction located at or very close
18 to the residence, their criteria should be 64 DBA and
19 not 69. If they want to use the 69 DBA criteria,
20 they need to take their predicted measurement at the
21 property line near the road in each space of the
22 yard.

23 Predicted measurement showing increased number
24 positions to the nearest tenth, reported precision
25 must not be greater than the lowest measurement

16

1 precision or design parameters. The measurement
2 equipment used in this study, for those four
3 measurements, has a specified precision of plus or
4 minus 1.5 DBA. Because the invalid precision used

5 sites that meeting criteria for abatement were
6 ignored. This, of course, ignores the fact that
7 predicted numbers used are inaccurate and misused as
8 stated in item C or 64 DBA. What that means is they
9 each have sites there where it's like they're trying
10 to evaluate 69 DBA, for example. They have some
11 predicted values at 68.8, because they increased that
12 precision to the nearest tenth instead of the nearest
13 single digit, they disqualified 68.8 as devaluated.
14 They have no right to increase precision with the
15 analysis given to the parameters given and the
16 equipment used, therefore, that value is 69, but they
17 ignored it.

18 Predicted value, they neglected to take into
19 consideration existing noise abatement from the
20 areas, trees, berms, distance, et cetera. The
21 predicted results violated standard expected results
22 where sound intensity increases with square of the
23 distance approximately four -- four and a half DBA in
24 its environment. So where the road comes close to
25 the house -- and you look at values that were

17

1 predicted, some show a decrease in sound levels, and
2 some of them show only immeasurable increase, which
3 violates this rule of just the distance alone is
4 going to increase the sound; that's not explained.

5 Doubling the traffic on a particular roadway
6 will increase the volume and the noise by about 3
7 DBA. Again, pretty much all numbers in their

8 predicted analysis violate this expectation. Being
9 that this is -- violates what's expected. You would
10 expect to have a statement in there explaining why
11 this is not true. So these discrepancies were not
12 validated by the study. The FHA traffic noise --
13 (unintelligible) -- look up tables, however, do show
14 that the values do follow the standard rules as
15 stated above, that probably shouldn't -- I should say
16 the values shouldn't, because I used the federal -- I
17 used the federal software to punch in the parameters
18 of this project -- you punch in the existing traffic,
19 they come close to the values that they modeled.
20 However, you punch in the future traffic and it does
21 shows 3 DBA increase that they do now show in their
22 prediction. Being that this -- all the expectations
23 and rules are violated, a statement needs to be made
24 proving or showing that their values are acceptable.
25 Noise values for adjacent predicted locations

18

1 are inconsistent. That is, if you look at the map
2 and you look at the noise prediction values, you'll
3 see some of them in a row, and they're up and down as
4 much as ten DBA for adjacent locations, that's not
5 explained. The train, the runway, the roadway, and
6 everything is the same, the distances vary slightly,
7 but the value vary by about ten DBA; that is not
8 explained.

9 Statements are continuing to be made in the

10 noise analysis that any break in the noise barrier
11 that would be totally -- made totally ineffective,
12 this is false. The correct wording in the abatement
13 direction is that it would be less effective and
14 results still need to be evaluated.

15 Now I did leave my working notes at home
16 accidentally, but I would be happy to explain any
17 results that I've come up with.

18 UNIDENTIFIED MAN: (Raising hand.)

19 MR. SIME: Yes.

20 THE COURT REPORTER: Okay. Wait a minute.
21 If you're going to do this, you're going to need to
22 come up and give me your name. I need to have
23 everything --

24 UNIDENTIFIED MAN: Okay.

25 MR. SIME: Or we could do it one on one,

19

1 too, and you can include it in your comments to the
2 --

3 UNIDENTIFIED MAN: How about if I ask a
4 rhetorical question and --

5 MR. SIME: All right. At this moment I'll
6 step aside.

7 MR. SEIFERT: My name is Bill Seifert, I
8 live at 13252 Palisade Street Northeast in Blaine.
9 And my house is impacted in this project as well as
10 many of yours are I'm sure. I just had a couple of
11 comments -- and I've always had a tough time getting
12 the answers. And, unfortunately, I can't get them

13 out of the materials, so there was some of you
14 earlier were asking questions on traffic, and the
15 lady and the gentleman who were answering these just
16 said these were the traffic models that were
17 predicted. And I've been through two other meetings
18 and no one was ever there could tell me where this
19 model came from. And now I'm looking at -- I don't
20 disagree with the need for improvement of the
21 roadbed, I disagree with the scope of the project for
22 this roadbed, but whenever I do ask a question it's
23 because the traffic model -- and I think you had
24 mentioned that, too, in the report -- the traffic
25 model suggested that future traffic is going to

20

1 demand a better roadbed. But my question lies -- the
2 65 corridor, was that model taken into account with
3 the increased capacity with 65 roadbed improvements
4 in limited access. Meaning, how necessary is a
5 four-lane Radisson project, when now Central doesn't
6 have as many stoplights? Because it seems to be
7 counter-intuitive, you'd want to take less traffic
8 off of a safer roadbed, which is Radisson.

9 I don't disagree that we could use turning
10 lanes. Sound abatement is always an issue, but the
11 easiest way to reduce sound is reduce traffic and
12 reduce speed.

13 If you look at the last four accidents that
14 happened -- one of my neighbors just pointed out one

15 happened yesterday -- there's a corner where most of
16 the accidents happen. It's not the corner that's the
17 problem, it's the speed that's the problem. By
18 simply slowing down the speed, you can control both
19 noise and the distance one needs to merge safely into
20 traffic. And this is very confusing because, again,
21 I asked the question and there's never a person
22 responsible for who's in charge of controlling the
23 speed on the roadbed.

24 Going north on Radisson, the first sign you see,
25 40 miles an hour, 100 feet later, 55 miles an hour,

21

1 and that's where sound would be affected.

2 The social impact, I think, or the -- you know,
3 we talk about the environmental impact, but I also
4 think the social impact is very important to our --
5 it can't be dismissed. And by that I mean, you
6 know, a four-lane road might be useful further south,
7 it's already there, but what's the impact of having a
8 four-lane road north of Main Street, and where is it
9 going to go to and where is that traffic coming
10 from? The amount of open -- and I've just got two
11 more comments and I'm done -- the amount of open
12 space that's available for homesteads is limited and
13 finite. There's not going to be that much more
14 population, so the only additional traffic could be
15 from the extension coming off of 65. Now why would
16 we be wanting to pull traffic off of 65 -- again, as
17 I mentioned earlier -- when we just improved it? And

18 as far as a secondary roadway to get over to 35, with
19 Bunker being wider, can't they go straight over to
20 Lexington and down? So that's just what I wanted to
21 say. I appreciate your time.

22 MR. JORGENSEN: My name is Gary Jorgensen,
23 I live at 13180 Palisade Street Northeast in Blaine.
24 And I have three or four comments, mainly focused on
25 safety and the environmental impacts, which includes

22

1 safety. And the biggest is my concern and my request
2 for a traffic light at Quail Creek Drive and Radisson
3 Road. And I know I and my children and many others
4 try to get across Radisson Road on occasions on
5 bicycles or walking, and I think anybody that's
6 navigated the S-turns on Radisson Road and tried to
7 cross knows that it's an extremely dangerous crossing
8 area, and there's not a lot of other options,
9 unfortunately. A traffic signal in that area,
10 although it does not meet the requirements of the --
11 whatever the requirements are to have a traffic
12 light, by the number of movements, I would argue that
13 safety is a lot more critical than the number of
14 movements in that area. And at some point someone --
15 unfortunately, I think it's going to take someone to
16 get run over by a car, and that's very sad.

17 I would echo Bill's comments regarding the
18 noise. I know as far as changing the subject to the
19 safety, but the environmental impact -- and I know

20 Dean came up with a lot of very technical data -- and
21 the only data I need is sitting up on my deck in the
22 evening and listening to a great deal of noise. And
23 it's scary to think that that is going to increase
24 even greater with this project with the number of
25 cars. The fact that the environmental impact study

23

1 and the noise study that they did was very limited in
2 scope. And it looked at -- it was very easily --
3 easy to dismiss by the number of residences that they
4 were actually using that we were affected by the
5 actual noise in the area. Almost like noise just
6 happened in a very concentrated area as opposed to
7 distributing, like we all know it does. So that is
8 why many of the areas along the route are not even
9 considered for noise -- any type of noise
10 abatements.

11 I would also like to say that the -- it was
12 stated that fencing or any kind of natural barriers
13 would only be a visual barrier, not a noise barrier,
14 and I would argue that that is equally important to
15 note. Is looking at a road -- looking at cars pass
16 is less attractive than not looking at cars passing.
17 So in certain areas I think even a visual barrier,
18 being trees or some sort of a fencing, I think would
19 be very effective, even if it was psychological to
20 the homeowners. I think it would be very effective.
21 And I don't see why along the entire route some form
22 of barrier or fencing couldn't be considered.

23 They mentioned on this project, it was set for
24 11 million dollars, and I would argue that that
25 budget was set a number of years ago in the middle of

24

1 a huge construction boom. And I think they're
2 discounting a lot of things -- potential improvements
3 like the traffic lighting, the traffic signals on
4 Radisson and Quail Creek Drive, and I would be very
5 surprised if this project didn't come in well under
6 budget. And so having said that, in the current
7 economic conditions there are very -- there are a lot
8 of contractors out there that are hungry for work.
9 And if this is going to be in an open-bid process,
10 like I'm sure it is, I would be willing to bet that
11 those figures are going to come in well under budget,
12 and there might be some room for some of these
13 nice-to-have things that are being discounted due to
14 the costs. That's all I have.

15 MR. CHALUPNIK: Any more questions?

16 MR. EICHORN: My name is Jess Eichhorn, I
17 live at 13275 Owatonna Court. Probably some of these
18 questions could probably be answered later, but I'm
19 going to ask them anyways. When the construction
20 starts -- what I have to ask is: Are we going to be
21 able to use those roads or are we going to have to
22 take back roads? The next one is: The bike path --
23 I see you talk about the bike paths, but it's only on
24 one side, well, how the heck are the other people

25 that are crossing it be kept safe when there's almost

25

1 8,000 more cars that are going to be coming through
2 there? So with only one stoplight through there, I
3 don't think it's going to be very safe for my family
4 and some of the other families down the road there.

5 The speed, I don't know what the speed is going
6 to be. Right now along Radisson Road it fluctuates,
7 it goes from 45 to 50 to 55 -- it goes all over the
8 place. We should make this one speed limit all the
9 way through. Where I live around the corner there,
10 on 129th there there was a young lady killed here
11 during that rain storm here in March.

12 If we had that speed limit down to a 45, I could
13 actually go outside and enjoy myself and not listen
14 to the traffic --

15 THE COURT REPORTER: You need to slow
16 down.

17 MR. EICHHORN: Slow down. Okay. It's a
18 residential area. This is not -- there are no
19 businesses down there, we don't need those four
20 lanes. We have semi trucks coming through there. We
21 don't need semi trucks coming through there, 65 was
22 meant for that, Radisson Road from 100 -- from County
23 Road 14 to Bunker there, there is not one business at
24 all. We don't need semis, we don't need four lanes,
25 we don't need this. If you only do one thing for us,

1 put the bike lanes in, put it on both sides, that's
2 all we need. And, finally, what they're talking
3 about in the future is that there's supposed to be
4 8,000 cars a day extra going through there, why do
5 you need that through a residential area? We don't
6 need it. Thank you.

7 MR. ARROWSMITH: My name is Barry
8 Arrowsmith, I live at that corner of Radisson and
9 Bunker, 13734 Radisson Road. I'm just going to say
10 the exact same thing, it's a residential area. I
11 moved to Ham Lake to be out in a rural area and I do
12 not want to put a freeway through my front yard. I
13 don't think we need it. I think it's a waste of the
14 taxpayer's money, and I think we should save it and
15 spend the money on something useful for kids or
16 something in the future.

17 MR. KARBO: Well, if everybody else is
18 going to go. My name is Bill Karbo, I live at 1660
19 Bunker Lake Boulevard. When I first heard about the
20 road coming through about three, four years ago -- I
21 have a blind, autistic son, and we didn't want to be
22 on that kind of road. It's bad enough being on a 55
23 mile-an-hour speed zone, but we didn't have, you
24 know, have that son when we moved in. We tried
25 selling our house at the time, but we had to disclose

1 that letter, and we had people say we like the house,
2 but what they're going to do with the road, we don't
3 want to buy it. So there we're still sitting there.
4 And I've been coming to the meetings and trying to
5 figure out why they're doing the road. I agree with
6 what everybody has been saying, we don't need it,
7 it's a residential area. Neighbors have been there
8 for a long time -- since it was a sand road -- we all
9 know it's sand out in that area. And I remember
10 going out in Ham Lake years ago, it was sand, then
11 tar. I do agree it needs improvements, it needs a
12 shoulder, some turn lanes, a light at Radisson and
13 Bunker, that would be great, but with all the traffic
14 that's coming through, I agree the only reason why
15 they're coming down Bunker to Radisson is because of
16 Highway 65, the lights, but that's being fixed, we've
17 already got rid of some of them. A lot of people I
18 know, they don't come down that road anymore. Plus,
19 when the project was first started, I had talked to a
20 gentleman at Anoka County Highway, he said that in
21 the future -- which would probably be maybe six years
22 from now -- at the time -- he said that they're going
23 to more than likely put in an overpass -- Bunker Lake
24 over Highway 65 with no on and off ramps. So if
25 you're not going to having people coming down 65 and

28

1 getting on Bunker to go to Radisson, so that makes it
2 even less traffic.

3 And as far as the noise level, I agree it's

4 noisy now, but I was told that when they make the
5 divided four lane it will be quieter. That's what I
6 was told. And that -- there's a lot of other things
7 that I won't get into because it's my own personal
8 property and that -- a lot of lies, a lot of things
9 won't get put on paper, it's all hearsay, but I just
10 wanted to give my opinion. Thank you.

11 MR. CHALUPNIK: Anybody else want to come
12 up at this point?

13 MR. SCHROER: My name is Wayne Schroer,
14 and I live at 13123 London Street, which my back yard
15 is to Radisson Road. And when I bought that property
16 ten years ago and I built the home, I could sit and
17 have dinner without closing my windows. And up to
18 about five years ago I no longer need an alarm clock
19 to wake up in the morning, because the traffic is so
20 loud -- the semis come through -- they started to do
21 that. And I don't even open up my windows at night
22 for dinner until about 8:00 because it's just -- it's
23 so noisy. And people that come over, have dinners at
24 my place, they say, "I can't believe that they're
25 going to change that to a four-lane." And I hope

29

1 they think a little bit more about what they're
2 doing, because I think what people have talked here
3 with kids, that would be -- people would tend to go
4 in the opposite direction away from that, because --
5 I think it's more an area for accidents to happen.

6 Thank you for your time.

7 MS. ANDERSON: My name is Sung Anderson,
8 and I live at 13140 Owatonna Street Northeast. I
9 would concur with what everybody is saying, and I'd
10 liked to reiterate what everybody is saying. And if
11 you haven't come up to this podium because you think
12 everything has been said, I encourage you to come up
13 and state it over and over and over because we do
14 need to have our voices heard. And even if it may be
15 coming from every single individual, and it's the
16 same message that we are sending, we need to make
17 sure that our voices are being heard.

18 Having said that, again, I'd like to reiterate
19 what the other people that have come up here have
20 been saying, and that is we've been hearing the same
21 messages, and that is, number one: There are safety
22 issues with four lanes coming in, we are going to
23 have a lot more cars that are going to be invited to
24 come right now with a two-lane, if we expand it to a
25 four-lane it's just an automatic given that more cars

30

1 will be coming down that road. With 65 having been
2 improved and with lights being taken out -- and I
3 understand -- I've gone to every single meeting that
4 the County has invited us to, and I've learned a lot
5 of different information. And one of the information
6 that has come up is that when Lexington was expanded
7 -- which is currently four lanes -- they left it so
8 that they can expand it in the future as a six-lane

9 roadway. And there are plans the County is already
10 talking about, from what I understand, that they will
11 be expanding from Main Street going north on
12 Lexington. That is in the near future. So the
13 question that I have in my mind is with 65 being
14 improved, with the lights being taken out and
15 basically making that into an expressway, and with
16 Lexington being a future expansion, why are we
17 expanding Radisson Road, which is already a settled
18 residential area? The houses are right there by the
19 road, why are we expanding this into a four-way lane
20 when traffic -- when we don't need that?

21 The noise, you know, we -- there are -- I think
22 it's very fascinating to hear about the noise study
23 that was done, and I think there are a lot of gaps
24 that need to be addressed by the County that need to
25 be answered for the residents' satisfaction. And I

31

1 think that's important for the County to do because,
2 you know, four spots in this entire stretch, to be
3 able to say from those four locations what the entire
4 noise level is going to be projected out to 2030
5 seems very farfetched to me. And so I'd like to see
6 a clear definition of how they came up with those
7 numbers and perhaps we need to readdress and take --
8 do a new noise study level.

9 Fencing, I think that's a wonderful idea that
10 you have there, Gary, about the fencing. They're

11 going to be taking out all the trees -- a lot of
12 trees on Radisson, very mature ones, some more than
13 others. And I understand there are some more going
14 in, but I have to agree with Gary, that some of this
15 noise level is a visual impact. And with the economy
16 the way it is, and the budget more than likely
17 probably going to come in under because there are a
18 lot of contractors looking for work, you know,
19 perhaps the County can look at putting in -- even if
20 it's just privacy fencing, not sound walls, but
21 privacy fencing along the entire corridor of
22 Radisson, so that everybody -- all the residents can
23 have some kind of a positive impact out of this --
24 out of this construction.

25 This is a county road and I know that -- I've

32

1 heard this over and over from the engineers, you know
2 -- I think one of the suggestions was made, why
3 don't we make this into a parkway? This is a
4 residential area, we're trying to bottleneck this
5 four-lane -- this grand scheme of things that was
6 happening over at the Lakes area, there were already
7 plans for a four-lane with turn lanes when they built
8 the Lakes area. Now they're trying to force-feed
9 this four-lane into an existing residential area
10 that's been there for at least a decade -- two
11 decades. I'm new to this neighborhood -- I've been
12 there for four years, so I don't know the history,

13 but what I do know is that when this county road was
14 designed, this was a farmland, there was nothing out
15 here when that was considered a county road. Is it
16 possible that we can relook at that? And the reason
17 why I bring this up is because the engineers and the
18 County keep coming back and saying this is a county
19 road, this has to be a throughway, this is a place
20 where the traffic can move. And my question to that
21 is -- what I'm hearing is, there's only so much land
22 just north of Blaine that can be built, there is no
23 commercial land, it is a finite space, 65 is being
24 developed, Lexington is going to be developed.
25 Perhaps maybe we need to look at changing the road

33

1 name from a county road to a parkway or to whatever
2 else it needs to be to bring it down, the speed, to
3 make it a safer area. We don't have to make it into
4 a four lane with turn lanes.

5 I agree that the roads do need to be improved.
6 I agree that there should be -- I agree that there
7 should be some shoulders on the road. We need to
8 have traffic lights, we need to have pedestrian and
9 bike path so that it's a safer area for everyone to
10 live, but trying to make this into a four-lane with
11 turning lanes -- to make that happen may not be the
12 smartest answer. Thank you.

13 MR. KLUCSAR: My name is Paul Klucsar, I
14 live at 12625 Radisson Road. I've been a long-time
15 resident of Blaine, well over 25 years, and I've

16 watched it develop. I moved up there because I
17 wanted a nice large lot that had a wetland behind
18 it. With this road improvement I'm afraid that my
19 wetland might get a lot larger, I'm going to have a
20 lot of runoff water from the four lanes versus the
21 two lanes right now. The back section of my
22 property, while I would say my property is probably
23 50 percent wetland right now, I really don't want to
24 see it go to 75 percent wetland. I've seen that
25 they're going to build some ponds -- some holding

34

1 ponds and things like that, but really the question
2 of the runoff water affecting my property hasn't been
3 satisfied in my mind.

4 I'd like to say for the record here, that having
5 the early time for this meeting was very inconvenient
6 for myself and my wife. My wife works downtown
7 Minneapolis, she got home about 5:30, we grabbed a
8 quick bite, and get here by the 6:00 time, I had no
9 time for the open house and to see what plans changed
10 in the back of the room. I wish this meeting could
11 have been a little bit later in the evening, maybe
12 another half hour or started an hour later. Thank
13 you.

14 MR. CHALUPNIK: Would anyone else like to
15 come up at this time?

16 MS. BOCHENSKI: Good evening. My name is
17 Deborah Bochenski, I live at 12962 Radisson Road.

18 I've lived there since 1972. I'm just going to talk
19 a little bit of what I've been hearing, a lot of the
20 concerns, everybody is right on. I guess my big
21 question for our Mayor and for our County is just
22 why? It doesn't make -- this road being expanded to
23 four lanes does not make any sense. The only -- when
24 I look out and I watch the traffic, the only time
25 that that traffic is bad is during rush hour, Monday

35

1 through Friday. People that are driving down
2 Radi sson Road Monday through Friday during rush hour
3 are the problem, and it's not the residents that live
4 in that area that are driving on the road, it's the
5 people that live north and are avoiding Highway 65.
6 They've gotten used to driving down that road,
7 they've got used to driving down Radi sson, not having
8 the stoplights, and that's the way that they're
9 comfortable driving. On the weekends it's not a
10 problem. Our road is fine. We have no problem
11 getting out, we have no problem turning. The noise
12 isn't as bad. The noise is horri fic Monday through
13 Friday during rush hour, as the other people have
14 been talking about having to close their windows, I
15 can't -- I don't take my storm windows off my living
16 room because we wouldn't be able to hear our TV or
17 anything else or have conversation because of the
18 noise during that time.

19 We don't need to direct people to that road. We

20 need to direct these people that are driving north to
21 Lexington and Highway 65. Money does not need to be
22 spent for improving a residential area. It needs to
23 be spend on improving those areas it's affecting --
24 well, I'd like to take us back. If we spend the
25 money on improving those areas that people are

36

1 traveling, it's not going to impact the people that
2 are driving north. They -- it's not going to be a
3 big deal if they can't drive down Radisson Road
4 anymore, they're going to -- you know, there's some
5 stoplights, they lower the speed, whatever, they're
6 going to take another route, but doing this project
7 is impacting the people that live on those roads, and
8 have been living there. And this is their residence,
9 these are families, these are children, and it's
10 going to impact us hugely. And the whole question is
11 why, it just does not make sense. And I would like
12 somebody to explain to me just why. It just doesn't
13 make any sense. I guess that's it. Thank you.

14 MR. STRAUS: My name is Steve Straus, and
15 I live at 1641 Bunker Lake. The question I have is
16 why are there concrete barriers in the middle of this
17 four-lane road? This is going to make -- Bunker goes
18 east before we can go into our driveway and make a
19 left-hand turn in front of traffic coming west to get
20 into our driveway. I don't think that's very safe.
21 And to my estimation, concrete in the middle of this
22 four-lane road is going to be a waste, because in the

23 wintertime it is also a danger. When the plows are
24 plowing that road they never get that snow off that
25 concrete barrier. And when the weather warms up, the

37

1 water is going to run down off that concrete barrier
2 onto the blacktop, and this makes ice, so you can't
3 tell me that that's safer.

4 And what I can't understand is why they just
5 can't go to work and put a rail with posts through
6 the center and make a break where the driveways are
7 so you can make a left turn or a right turn into our
8 driveways. This is one thing that I think is a
9 waste, the concrete in the middle of that road. But
10 the four-lane road is a good idea, there's heavy
11 traffic along that road, but that's because that
12 anybody that's living on that road right now does not
13 have any problems getting on and off of that road.
14 Anyone that has to get on that road has enough good
15 sense to wait until traffic has gone by and then get
16 on. And that's what I believe, the road should have
17 no concrete barrier in the middle of the road.

18 MS. VAN WECHER: My name is Tracie Van
19 Wencher, my address is 12710 Mankato Street. My
20 street is adjacent -- east of Radisson Road. And I'm
21 here today to just reiterate and want my voice to be
22 heard. The concerns that I have, along with my
23 fellow neighbors here, that there's going to be a
24 sound barrier on Radisson Road behind us, so to the

25 west, but on Radisson. However, there are four homes

38

1 that will not have a barrier, which will then allow
2 us to get onto this 55 mile-an-hour road to get out.
3 It concerns me, as well as the safety of the those
4 people, as well as the gap in the sound barrier along
5 Radisson Road. We also heard rumors that these homes
6 would not be livable -- (unintelligible) -- they'd
7 have to get onto this 55 mile-an-hour road to exit.
8 And there is one home for sale right now, there's
9 another home that is rental property and there's
10 people coming and going. So it's a concern for us as
11 well as the safety for the people behind us. We've
12 also heard rumors that if those homes are not lived
13 in they could be foreclosed on, and potentially being
14 low income housing going back there all along
15 Radisson, and that is a concern for me as well. As
16 well as for the safety of people for those people
17 trying to get on and off of Radisson Road who have
18 homes right there. There's also a turn lane for some
19 of those people to get out on the road, trying to get
20 off of Radisson as well as crossing the turn lane for
21 those trying to get onto 127th Lane, and concerns for
22 people's safety. So, again, I'm here to voice the
23 concern of safety, and why do we need this project
24 when there's a lot of concerns here today. Thank
25 you.

1 MR. CHALUPNIK: Anyone else at this time?

2 (No response.)

3 MR. CHALUPNIK: Well, we're halfway
4 through the two-hour comment period, and that -- your
5 opportunity to make comments verbally will last until
6 8:00, but if no one has the urge to come up right
7 now, I just offer that we could also open up the open
8 house portion of the project because some of you, I
9 think, possibly have individual questions. And I
10 think we'll do that, we'll be in the back to answer
11 your questions individually. And before 8:00 if you
12 still want to make a verbal statement, you are free
13 to do so. So again, thank you. I just want to
14 summarize that we will respond to each and every
15 comment, whether it's in written form or expressed
16 verbally. And those comments will be -- the
17 responses to the comments will be published in the
18 updates of the EA/EAW. And just keep in mind that
19 even though the County and our firm and the Cities
20 are preparing responses to your comments, those
21 comments -- those responses have to be well thought
22 out and justified, because the Federal Highway
23 Administration has to approve this project.

24 So we do take your comments seriously, and we
25 thank you for your comments. And thank you for

1 coming. If you want to leave, that's fine. If you
2 want to stay, that's fine, but again, we're going to
3 start the open house portion back up again.

4 MS. VAN WECHER: I forgot something.
5 12710 Mankato Street. Behind my property -- between
6 the property that's behind me that sits on Radisson
7 there's an easement for an alley. Currently there's
8 15 feet of easement for that alley. We were told
9 that an alley would go there. We were recently just
10 told that there's another ten feet that is needed for
11 that alley to go there. My question is when I built
12 my house there some six, seven years ago, that's what
13 they needed for the alley. Now I'm being told that
14 an extra ten feet, well, it has to come from
15 somewhere, where is it going to come from? I guess
16 it concerns me, because the property behind me, which
17 is on Radisson, certainly, from what I've heard --
18 (unintelligible) -- an additional ten feet, they have
19 to get property from the front, so I guess my
20 question is, if that alley truly needed 25 feet -- do
21 the math -- 15 plus ten -- having the 25 feet, then
22 the development at that area wasn't planned
23 appropriately for that easement of that alley to go
24 through. Therefore, if the alley was there, these
25 homes could be accessing this alley instead of trying

41

1 to get onto Radisson Road, a 55 mile an hour road,
2 which I'm not sure that's what we need right now. I

3 just want to make sure that that alley concern was
4 out there, so that others are aware of that, we need
5 25 feet instead of the 15 feet that was slated when I
6 purchased that house. Thank you.

7 MR. CHALUPNIK: It is now 8:00, the public
8 hearing is closed.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

42

1 REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

2
3
4
5

I, MICHELE MCGOVERN, do hereby certify that the
above and foregoing transcript, consisting of 41 pages,

transcript.TXT
6 is a full, true and accurate transcription of my
7 stenographic notes taken in the above case.

8

9 Dated: 2009

10

11

Michel e M. McGovern
Court Reporter

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25