



ROBERT PECCIA & ASSOCIATES

Memorandum

TO: Kelly Williams, PE, MDT Consultant Design Project Manager

FROM: Thomas Cavanaugh, PE, RPA Project Manager

SUBJECT: I-90 EB Scale Site – Ramsay
STPX 90-4(731)214
UPN 8797000

DATE: October 13, 2016

Kelly-

This memorandum was prepared to summarize attendee comments heard at the project's second public informational meeting. The open house meeting was held October 4 in the Ramsay School cafeteria (3 Russell St.) from 5:30 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. RPA prepared and made available five displays showing the project intent, including photos of the representative "go-by" Rocker I-90 westbound scale site and plan schematic; study area map with preferred I-90 eastbound site shown at RP 213.3 at the top of Gregson Hill, and three displays showing this feasibility study's preliminary engineering plan and profiles of the preferred site.

Meeting notification by MDT included a display ad within the *Montana Standard* on September 18 and October 2. A MDT news release was circulated September 21. RPA utilized the display ad copy as a direct mailer to those on the mailing list. The mailing list was all property owners within the study area and those signed in at the first public meeting March 10, 2016 (also held at the Ramsay School cafeteria).

The meeting attendee sign-in sheet is attached. One comment form (also attached) was left at the meeting. The MDT responses to comments heard at the first public meeting were made available at this second meeting as hand-outs.

Comments heard at this second public informational meeting were obtained through individual discussions and are characterized as follows. Please note the order that comments are presented is not meant to indicate how many times the general comment was heard during the meeting.

- Several comments noted the study area and the chosen site on Gregson Hill are concerning due to winter icing conditions often seen in this area.
- Some attendees felt the scale site should be moved north of the I-90 RP 212.0 Gregson/Fairmont Interchange to remove it from proximity of the area's homes and subdivided land in which people intend to build homes.
- If the site is to be developed where shown, many asked for the addition of an outside auxiliary lane from the Gregson/Fairmont Interchange interstate entrance ramp to the scale site. This would allow trucks to stay in this lane, or otherwise merge into, to decelerate well in advance of the site. Reasons cited for the new lane included the large volume of trucks seen in the area and increased safety during icy winter road conditions. In general, having a longer lane dedicated to trucks entering the site was requested by many.

- Attendees praised the newer acceleration lane added east of the Rocker Interchange. Some noted that it seemed truckers however merged into the outside interstate travel lane way too soon prior to reaching speed.
- Strong concerns about the potential for property devaluation due to the implementation of this project were heard from several area residents. Questions were asked about how persons not physically impacted by right-of-way acquisition go about receiving compensation for proximity devaluation.
- One attendee who resides just south of the study area was agitated because she was not personally notified of this meeting. In her opinion, direct mail notifications to residents should have been throughout the whole valley. (The mailing list included those who attended the first meeting and all owners within the study area according to that derived boundary). We responded that by her signing in at this meeting, the mailing list would be updated to include her on any future notifications. We noted that no future public meetings were planned in this current feasibility study stage. Her additional comments generally reflected all concerns summarized herein and that MDT is more sensitive to generating income from administering fines to non-compliant truckers than it is about the impacts to the livelihood and home devaluations the project would have to area residents.
- Another attendee who resides in that area was not opposed to the project since he felt his home was far enough removed from the proposed site that it would not be in his view shed.
- Several other questions were posed by attendees at the meeting including:
 - What is the project development timeline moving forward and anticipated construction?
 - When will the next project meeting will be held?

Rpa:f:\highways\15502_000_i 90 ramsay scale site\public involvement\public meetings\october 4_2016\8797000 public meeting 2 summary_october 4_2016.doc