

Summary of Public Walk-Around Sessions
Thursday, July 9, 2009 from 10:30 a.m. to 2:30 p.m.
CSAH 9/20 Corridor Study

Introduction

A public walk-around meeting for the referenced project was held on July 9, 2009 from 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. for specific stakeholders along CSAH 9 who owned properties just south of 510th St. and another walk-around was held from 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. for stakeholders who lived on the north side of CSAH 9 and west of the Yacht Club.

Notice of the Public Walk-Around Meeting

Notices of the public walk-around meetings were distributed by SRC member Gary Lawrence who was advised to deliver the notices to each of the specified stakeholders.

The notice invited specific property owners to attend a public walk-around meeting to continue discussions regarding proposals presented at the May 30, 2009 Public Open House. The walk-around sessions were intended for specific stakeholders along CSAH 9 who owned properties just south of 510th St. and for stakeholders who lived on the north side of CSAH 9 and west of the Yacht Club.

The public walk-around was conducted to give stakeholders the opportunity to visualize each alternative in the field, identify potential impacts to individual properties, and discuss modifications. Representatives for multiple stakeholder groups were present to help guide the walk-around meetings, they included: Gary Lawrence and Jim Beckstrom from the Lakeshore Association, Chuck Grotte from Otter Tail County, and Rick Lane and Craig Vaughn from the SRF Consulting Group.

Summary of 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m. Western Area Meeting

The meeting was held from 10:30 a.m. to 12:00 p.m., July 9, 2009. The meeting consisted of approximately 15 stakeholders, two members of the SRF staff, and one Otter Tail County engineering staff. Attendees engaged in one-on-one discussions with the project staff and participated in a question and answer discussion regarding alternatives.

A summary of the verbal comments and questions is included below:

- One property owner indicated that he was upset that the roadway would be moved any closer to his home.

- Rick Lane explained what the new options were for potential roadway cross section layouts. The smallest would include 12 foot wide lanes and a six foot shoulder on each side.
- Rick Lane then stated that the east side homes would not have the roadway move any closer to their homes.
- Rick Lane then discussed the option of having a four to six foot shoulder on the east side, 12 foot lanes, a six foot shoulder on the west side with the potential for a six foot sidewalk on the west side.
- A citizen asked if they would be compensated if it were necessary to go through their property/structures.
 - Chuck Grotte explained that the County would not be responsible for compensating property owners who owned structures that fell in County right-of-way.
- Craig explained to the public that dynamic speed signs would still be included within the current proposal as a method of speed mitigation.
 - Attending citizens supported the dynamic speed signs.
- Multiple citizens asked if it would be possible to change the classification of CSAH 9 to a rural residential area in order to lower the speed limits.
 - Gary Lawrence stated that they would review this possibility at the SRC meeting later in the afternoon.
- One citizen asked how truck traffic could be reduced.
 - Chuck stated that the County could not force trucks to take an alternate route. However, if additional/more aggressive calming measures were implemented it would assist in deterring truck traffic away from CSAH 9/20.
- One citizen inquired if the bypass would ever be built.
 - It was stated that the County is leaning toward an official mapping process to reserve right-of-way for a future long-term bypass route.
- One citizen stated that he did not want curb and gutter on the west side of the roadway. Another citizen wanted curb and gutter on the west side. Both expressed that they did not want a sidewalk on the west side of the roadway. It was determined that a six foot shoulder and a curb and gutter section would be acceptable to the residents in this area.
- Gary stated some other citizens would like sidewalk, wherever it can be placed.
- One citizen stated that a sidewalk would be a welcomed addition to the corridor.
- Another stated that he felt like few residents walked along the corridor.

SRF and County staff then met with four other residents who did not attend the initial meeting and the following comments were received:

- One citizen asked if the sidewalk could be placed on the east side of the roadway and start at the east pavement edge.
 - It was stated that this was a potential possibility.
- One resident was concerned with the maintenance of the sidewalk during winter.
- A citizen asked if it would be possible to construct a suspended walk bridge through the wetland.
 - It was explained that in order for this to happen, the funding would have to be separate from any roadway improvements.

Summary of 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m. Northern Area Meeting

The meeting was held from 1:00 p.m. to 2:30 p.m., July 9, 2009. The meeting consisted of 3 stakeholders, two members of the SRF staff, and one Otter Tail County engineering staff. The walk-around was conducted in the same manner as the previous meeting.

A summary of the verbal comments and questions is included below:

- One citizen spoke in favor of a sidewalk option, but the neighbor did not want a sidewalk constructed. Both of these residents were open to having curb and gutter installed, however one preferred the six foot shoulder, while the other preferred a four foot shoulder, but they would accept a six foot shoulder being constructed.
- The remaining citizen would accept a six foot shoulder being installed, but was not interested in a sidewalk being constructed. They would like to see a curb and gutter system installed on the high area of their property and a ditch system developed in the lower area.