

# US Highway 16

CORRIDOR STUDY

## Public Involvement Meetings #3 Summary, February 2021

Pennington County, South Dakota

April 29, 2021



## Contents

1.0	Public Meeting Overview .....	1
1.1	Summary of Comments .....	2
2.0	Written Comments .....	4
2.1	US16/US16B/Catron Boulevard Intersection .....	1
2.2	US16 Urban Area Corridor .....	4
2.3	US16/Neck Yoke Road Intersection.....	11
2.4	American Buffalo Resort - Bear Country - Croell Curve Area.....	13
2.5	Strato Rim - Busted Five - Wilderness Canyon Area .....	14
2.6	Rockerville Area and West.....	17
2.7	Other Topics (Bike/Ped Plan, ITS and Long-Range Interchange Concepts) .....	22
3.0	Landowner/Business Owner Meetings.....	24
4.0	Additional Outreach .....	25

## 1.0 Public Meeting Overview

Due to limitations on public gatherings recommended by the Centers for Disease Control, third and final public meeting of the US16 Corridor Study was held virtually through the study website rather than presenting documents at an in-person public meeting.

**Date:** January 30 - February 28, 2021

**Format:** Virtual (online) public meeting

**Virtual Public Meeting Website:** [www.us16corridor.com/openhouse](http://www.us16corridor.com/openhouse)

**Study Website:** [www.US16corridor.com](http://www.US16corridor.com)

### Public Meeting Website Statistics:

Total users who visited site: Approx. 450 users

Average time on the online meeting: 15:30

Total sessions by device:

- Desktop: 59%
- Mobile: 37%
- Tablet: 4%

Acquisition by session:

- Direct: 63%
- Social media: 17%
- Via Search: 15%
- Referral: 5%

Peak visit dates:

- Monday 2/1 (69 visits)
- Tuesday 2/2 (57 visits)
- Friday 2/26 (31 visits)

Online comment submittals by webpage:

- Virtual public meeting page: 54
  - Introduction/welcome: 11
  - US16/US16B/Catron Boulevard Intersection: 11
  - US16 Urban Area: 3
  - US16/Neck Yoke Road: 6
  - Bear Country/Croell Quarry Area: 4
  - Busted Five/Wilderness Canyon Area: 3
  - Rockerville Area and West: 12
  - Urban Area Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan: 3
  - Long-Range Interchange Concepts: 1
- US16 Corridor Study main page comment: 17

## 1.1 Summary of Comments

### *US16/US16B/Catron Boulevard Intersection*

#### Single Point Interchange Comments

- Most submitted comments supported the SPI Build Option
  - Stated benefits included driver familiarity, simplicity to navigate, traffic operations, and safety.
  - Benefits associated with winter weather/fog were also noted.

#### Displaced Left-Turn Intersection Comments

- One submitted comment supported the DLT option due to the innovative design and lower cost.

### *US16 Urban Area Corridor*

#### Comments

- Several comments supporting traditional intersection (signalized) at US16/Moon Meadows Drive over the RCI configuration.
- Questions regarding potential impacts to access, and timing, at Tablerock Road, Enchantment Road, and Section Line Road.
- Lower speed limit on US16, current speeds are too high.
- Difficult to turn out of Wellington Drive intersection(s).

### *US16/Neck Yoke Road Intersection*

#### Comments

- Support generally favored an RCI with multiple access points.
- Limited support for the Base Option.
- One comment did not support an RCI and suggested an overpass.

### *American Buffalo Resort - Bear Country - Croell Curve Area*

#### Comments

- Comments were mixed across the different options, though they were typically supportive of the need for safety improvements.

### *Strato Rim - Busted Five - Wilderness Canyon Area*

#### Comments

- Comments were mixed across the RCI and traditional intersection options.
- RCI concerns primarily centered on large vehicle turning movements, inconvenience, and safety concerns.

### *Rockerville Area and West*

#### Comments

- Comments were mixed across the scenarios, though Scenario 1 and Scenario 3 options were generally favored.
  - Factors associated with these comments included cost, visibility of development along the corridor, and travel patterns.
- Several comments expressed concern about the recent ‘private road’ closure between Pine Haven Drive and Main Street.
  - Noted some traffic using the Rockerville Road on-ramp (Rockerville Road to WB US16) in the wrong direction as the new route from Pine Haven Drive to Main Street.
  - Safety, inconvenience, and unfamiliar drivers were the most frequently identified concerns.
- RCI concerns primarily centered on large vehicle turning movements, inconvenience, and safety concerns.

### *Other Topics (ITS and Long-Range Interchange Concepts)*

#### Comments

- Noted considerations for signage, context sensitive design, and bicycle/pedestrian.

## 2.0 Written Comments

Written comments were provided to the study team through the following methods:

- Phone
- Email
- Virtual public meeting website
- Corridor study website main page

The following is a summary of individual comments and study team responses. Given the diverse and long corridor, comment statements that covered multiple segments were split to assign a comment topic to the respective segment. To protect the privacy of those who submitted comments, the report does not include names, email addresses, phone numbers or specific information about the commenter's property or business. Each comment, in its entirety, was provided directly to the SDDOT.

## 2.1 US16/US16B/Catron Boulevard Intersection

### Comments

Date	Method	Comment	Response
1/29/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	Thank you for your work on this project as I have witnessed accidents. I appreciate one of the reasons for improving US 16 is to reduce traffic accidents and improve safety. If that is truly one of the top priorities, then design option 1 is easily the option we should choose. In my opinion the debate should be whether we want 1.1 or 1.2 (which I prefer). I would disregard option 2. Thanks again for your consideration	See general response
1/29/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	Ootion 1 is best!!	See general response
1/29/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	Option 1 makes most sense for carton hwy 16	See general response
2/12/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	As a resident of this area, the best option appears to be SP1.1 with the natural terrain lending an advantage. Most local travellers are familiar with the existing sps.	See general response
1/30/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	As someone who travels through this intersection often several times during the day, I would recommend some version of option 1 given the improvement in traffic flow that would result. Not having to stop at that intersection is a big plus both from a safety standpoint and from traffic flow standpoint. That area is subject to fog and other icy conditions during the wintertime on a quite frequent basis. Coming down that he will on Highway 16 from either direction can often result in cars sliding into the intersection inadvertently. I do understand that this is a more expensive option, but I do think it would be much better for the long-term use of that intersection and for its safety. Another concern is the complexity of that intersection especially during the summertime when you have tourists who are not familiar with the workings of an option 2 which appears to be significantly more complicated for the driver to understand initially.	See general response
2/3/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	The SPI is the best option; Utah put displaced left turns on the Bangerter Highway in Salt Lake City and then had to replace them with SPI's so doing the SPI now would mean it wouldn't have to be replaced in the future.	See general response
2/21/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	Strongly favor SPI 1.1. Through traffic on US 16 is safer and allows better uninterrupted flow for this increasingly busy area. Elevations in this area also seem conducive to an SPI.	See general response
2/22/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	I think that one of the variations of the SPI option would be the best choice. Mt Rushmore Rd traffic could flow unimpeded and there are already other examples of this type of intersection in town.	See general response
2/22/2021	Virtual Public Meeting	I think the single point interchange makes the most sense. It has the best traffic flow and that intersection is busy now and is only going to get busier.	See general response
1/30/2021	US16 Main Page	I prefer SPI Build Option #1 from what I've seen on the animations.	See general response
1/30/2021	US16 Main Page	<p>A little late to this but after reviewing the presentation slides for the first two public meetings, I thought I'd add a little about Catron/Hwy16 intersection safety.</p> <p>Approaching from the south, the light and intersection seems to surprise many drivers as they crest the hill. More signage or perhaps reducing the speed limit prior to that intersection might help. I hate to suggest it as the whole corridor has already slowed so much with the stoplights that keep popping up everywhere. Altering speeds limits could be done now though.</p> <p>Visibility is the issue and it's worse during inclement weather. One foggy morning, turning from Catron to 16 northbound, our two lanes of green-lighted traffic had to panic stop just short of the intersection as 5-6 southbound cars ran the light at highway speed. Due to the fog, they didn't see the light or recognize the intersection was approaching. This is difficult to do even if you are familiar with the area.</p> <p>I'm not sure how intersection redesign will help there but it's an issue that needs addressing and probably sooner than the eventual construction.</p>	See general and speed responses
2/3/2021	US16 Main Page	<p>First, let me compliment you on an excellent website and overall content. Well done!</p> <p>My strong preference is for the SPUI option. It is a familiar configuration for most drivers, and is simple, straightforward and elegant, really. I could be</p>	See general response

Date	Method	Comment	Response
		<p>mistaken, but it seems to me that it would also be easier to maintain in ice/snow conditions, and the no-stop north/south feature would help in many conditions, including fog and our heavier traffic periods.</p> <p>I do not like that the CFI option requires the addition of two more signals, and it's honestly rather confusing.</p> <p>Urban Interchange, #1 choice. Thank you.</p>	
2/23/2021	US16 Main Page	Thank you for efforts regarding this project. I tend to favor the continuous flow alternative for the Hwy 16/Catron Blvd intersection. I favor this because of its innovative design & lower cost.	See general response
2/23/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	What is planned for the service road on the west side of US16? (Northwest of the Catron intersection between Promise Road and Catron) What is the plan for a stoplight at Promise Road and 16?	<p>Service road in NW quadrant: Part of the existing service road has been removed through development. The segment closest to Promise Road is shown to be maintained with a modified connection to Promise Road in order to increase spacing between US16 mainline and the service road/Promise Road intersection.</p> <p>Traffic signal at US16/Promise Road intersection: see traffic signal warrants response. Timing for meeting traffic signal warrants likely dependent on timing of development in the northwest quadrant of the intersection.</p>
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	I support the SP1 1.1 scenario as presented. It seems to be the easiest to navigate. The second scenario appears to be confusing, especially for the tourist. There is some concerns about the closer or Addison Road. If there is an alternative way to get to the medical facilities from Hwy 16, I hope that is reviewed.	<p>See general response</p> <p>Access to/from the medical facilities will be provided via Healing Way and the Catron Boulevard/Healing Way intersection. The recommended configuration also provides for access at Section Line Road.</p> <p>Future development will provide additional local network connectivity, with future Healing Way connectivity to Section Line Road and Moon Meadows Drive. Timing of these connections are dependent on development in the area.</p>
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	I definitely support the SPI option. This option seems to make the most sense, is less confusing, and would serve all of the great tourists that we have in the Black Hills much better. Thanks so much!	See general response
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Of the options presented, I prefer Option 1.1. My second choice is Option 2.2. I like 1.1 because it allows the most constant travel of vehicles on H16, as well as non-stop travel from NB H16 to EB Catron.	See general response
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Build option 1 would be better--keep the traffic moving on US16 (like SD 79/Catron Blvd a few miles east). The DLT is too complicated, especially with all the tourist traffic. Whatever option is chosen, the NB to EB right turn lane needs to be re-engineered--it has a terrible angle.	See general response
2/24/2021	US16 Main Page	Please do not implement the CFI. I have lived in the Edinborough neighborhood for 15 years. During tourist season I regularly see people westbound on Catron turning left onto Healing Way at the light thinking they're turning south onto 16. I know they thought they were turning onto 16 because without warning they pull out of the turn lane (typically while the light is still red) and right into traffic heading west on Catron. It is only a matter of time before a serious accident occurs there. I also regularly watch people try to turn left onto 16 from one of the 2 westbound lanes on Catron (that cross 16) despite 2 turning lanes existing. I doubt many people have encountered a CFI and implementing one here would only make a bad intersection worse. I have a friend who lives in Loveland Colorado and they have a CFI. By looking at the traffic numbers it appears to be working well. However what a traffic study won't tell you is that most people purposely go out of their way to avoid the CFI. From a pedestrian standpoint, I feel that an overpass with sidewalks would be much safer than a CFI because pedestrians would not have to actually cross 6(?) lanes. Thanks	See general response
2/28/2021	US16 Main Page	You've worked on the carton interchange since 2007. We saw 7 ideas at that time. Why one that is not for this area with the fog and disoriented out of state tourist we have here in the hills. Just do the the single point interchange with an overpass for 16. HDR is the one making the dollars! This should have been done ten years ago. Why not think big and make three lanes both ways out to the keystone y. And why not a bike lane.	<p>See general response</p> <p>Traffic operations analysis do not show a need for additional lanes beyond a 4-lane section (2 lanes in each direction) within the Year 2050 Planning Horizon. The recommendation includes 8-foot shoulders plus a shared-use path on the east side.</p>



*General Responses for US16/US16B/Catron Boulevard Intersection Comments*

Comment Topic	Response
General	<p><i>Thank you for taking the time to review the public meeting material and providing your feedback. This information will be shared with the Study Advisory Team (SAT), made up of representatives from the SDDOT, City of Rapid City, Rapid City Area MPO, and Pennington County. Revisions identified by the SAT will be incorporated in the final recommended layout for the US16/US16B/Catron Boulevard intersection.</i></p>
Speed	<p><i>The SDDOT sets speeds in accordance with guidance provided in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 2009 edition. Considerations for adjustment to posted non-statutory speed limits are identified through speed studies, where the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is determined through a sampling of traffic of free-flow traffic. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed reflects the speed at which 85 percent of traffic traveling through a monitored point is traveling at or below. Per the MUTCD, posted speed limits should be within 5 mph of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of free-flowing traffic (MUTCD 2B.13.12).</i></p>
Traffic signal warrants	<p><i>The SDDOT follows traffic signal warrant guidance provided in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 2009 edition. There are nine warrants that consider traffic volumes, pedestrian volumes, crash history, and other characteristics of the corridor. Per guidance in the MUTCD (MUTCD 4C.01.05), ‘a traffic control signal should not be installed unless one or more of the factors’ described above are met. Further, meeting one of the warrants does not necessitate installation of a traffic signal.</i></p> <p><i>The SDDOT regularly conducts traffic volume counts at several intersections within the corridor study area, such as US16/Moon Meadows Drive and US16/Promise Road. Additionally, traffic crash reports for the intersections are reviewed whenever the counts are collected. Currently, neither intersection exhibits traffic volumes that warrant a traffic signal. The installation of a traffic signal at US16B/Catron Boulevard/Healing Way in early 2020 is an example of installing a traffic signal when traffic volumes met warrants.</i></p>

## 2.2 US16 Urban Area Corridor

### Comments

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/15/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Promise Road needs a pedestrian signal for both pedestrians and cyclists trying to cross here. Promise Road is generally a better alternative to Highway 16/Catron intersection for cyclists, but it is difficult to cross here unless a vehicle is also waiting at the light.	<p>See general and traffic signal warrant responses. Currently, a traffic signal is not warranted at US16/Promise Road intersection.</p> <p>The bicycle/pedestrian plan identifies several potential underpass crossings of US16 for consideration in future projects. These would be provide in lieu of at-grade crossings.</p>
2/22/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Appreciate the work going into these studies. I'd like to discourage the use RCI's where proposed in US16 at Moon Meadows. With these you are forced to cross lanes quickly to get to a u-turn area. In busy summer traffic this would be difficult and stressful to accomplish safely on US16. Considering large vehicle setups such as trucks with campers and boats, RV's with towed vehicles, busses, and such, getting across traffic to make a u-turn area is even more difficult and un-safe. Performing the actual u-turn across both opposing lanes of traffic too is a concern. Personally living off US16 and having to go South to go North constantly is not ideal. In off summer traffic, it is not an issue to find a opening to turn across lanes as needed. During summer, it may take a few minutes at most to find a safe opening to turn. I'd also discourage the use of traffic lights along any highway, especially at the top or bottom of large hills, if ample turn-lanes are provided there really is no reason for stopping traffic on a highway. Thank you.	See general response
2/1/2021	US16 Main Page	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I am curious how this may impact Tablerock RD, including our access in and out of the neighborhood.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>	<p>See general response</p> <p>In both US16 Urban Area scenarios, Tablerock Road is shown to be shifted north to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Line up with Fox Road with increased spacing between US16 and US16 service road</li> <li>2) Provide adequate separation from Promise Road that is shifted north due to the SPI ramps</li> </ol> <p>The layouts show a ¾ access that restricts left turns and through movements out of the side-street approach and redirects this traffic to downstream U-turns at Promise Road and Enchantment Road.</p>
2/4/2021	US16 Main Page	Whatever gets done at 16 & Catron intersection. The speed limit needs to be changed! North on 16 is 60 miles per hour that means when your trying to get 16 north from Catron from housing development the traffic is coming at at 70! Those turn lanes where a waste of money. All you had to is slow the traffic DOWN! Those turning lanes are the most confusing things I have ever seen ! Only been in for 7 months and I met a lady going on the wrong side of road do to the turn lanes.	See general and speed responses
2/11/2021	US16 Main Page; Email	<p><i>Initial comment:</i></p> <p>I was told that there are plans to try to align Highwood Road with Enchantment Road. I can't find any reference to this in any of your documentation. Can you tell me what your plans are for Highwood Road?</p> <p><i>Follow-up questions:</i></p> <p>Do you know what the motivation is for the proposal for alignment of Highwood and Enchantment? Highwood Road services 3 households and there is virtually no cross traffic with Enchantment Road. I don't think any of the 3 properties plan to develop their property and given the steep canyons to the west and north there won't be much traffic growth in the future. The majority of the traffic onto Highway 16 is generated by the churches/schools to the north and south of Highwood, and Enchantment Road. It would seem to make more sense to keep the current alignment of Enchantment.</p> <p><i>Follow-up comment:</i></p> <p>Thanks for the link and the explanation. I understand the need to plan for potential development. In reading the slides it states that "local network roadways along the corridor are driven by development, that as areas are developed, the roadway network will be constructed with tie points to existing infrastructure". Hopefully this means if the Highwood Road area isn't densely developed it wouldn't justify these infrastructure upgrades. I've seen instances in other cities where these upgrades have been made and property owners have subsequently been forced to sell as cities raise taxes to pay for them. If this is the spirit of the plan it makes sense.</p>	<p>See general response</p> <p>Considerations for the Enchantment Road realignment included, but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Long-range planning for potential higher density development in the area. Local network improvements are typically driven by development.</li> <li>• Direct connections of Enchantment Road and Highwood Road to a planned full access intersection (that could be signalized when warranted by traffic volumes).</li> <li>• Providing an intersection at Highwood Road provides an opportunity to increase spacing between US16 mainline and the US16 service road/Highwood Road intersection.</li> <li>• Increases spacing from a potential future Tablerock Road/Fox Road intersection that is shifted north due to spacing with a shifted north US16/Promise Road intersection.</li> </ul>

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/18/2021	US16 Main Page	<p>I apologize for losing track of the corridor plans and asking a likely repetitive question. I ‘...’ appreciate the new median turn lane that we have now. Will we be getting a northbound right turn lane at some point? No matter how long I have my turn signal on a majority of drivers don’t want to slow down appropriately behind me. On Sunday my son was nearly rear ended while preparing to turn onto Tablerock.</p> <p>Will this be remedied and, if so, when?</p>	<p>See general and turn lane warrant response</p> <p>This intersection will continue to be monitored. Both scenarios considered for this corridor study include right turn lanes in anticipation of additional development and traffic growth in the area.</p>
2/23/2021 2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	<p>I believe the speed limit on H16 should be reduced to 55 mph for the section of the roadway from Enchantment Rd to Gondola Rd for safety. Added traffic along the route and the opening of the quarry support this change.</p>	<p>See general and speed responses</p>
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	<p>I do not support the use of median u-turns on a roadway as busy as H16 is during the tourist months. I also wonder how well RVs pulling trailers can safely negotiate such u-turns.</p>	<p>See general and U-turn responses</p>
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	<p>Don't make the left lane turns/U-turns--people have to accelerate quickly into the passing lane to get into the left turn lane--and then if they're making a U-turn they have to accelerate because they're entering the passing lane. Carefully consider the light timing on Moon Meadows Rd--during busy times, people may be stopped on 16 on the hill to the south. During winter weather, that could cause a lot of accidents if they try to start on that slippery hill.</p>	<p>See general and U-turn responses</p> <p>In the virtual public meeting webpage, on the US16 Urban Area tab, there is a graphic that shows where northbound US16 traffic would likely be stopping if the US16/Moon Meadows Drive intersection would be signalized in the future.</p>
3/2/2021	Email	<p>What is your reason for moving the road so you would cross over where our garage stands and destroy it? What is wrong with the intersection that is there now? This is just destruction of our property.</p> <p>My other question is this: If we were coming from the south and were coming back to our home towards Rapid City, we would have to go all the way to the intersection of Catron and if we could cross over to the left on it, we would have to go to the light at Black Hills Power and turn left around the power company to get to the service road to come back to our home. What is the object of this? You allow the people to cross the highway at Moon Meadows where the traffic is much heavier. What makes you think this plan is workable?</p> <p>What would you want if you had property here? Seems to me there is no consideration for the people who have homes in the area. It's all about you can just build roads wherever you want and take peoples property.</p> <p>Your consideration and immediate response is appreciated.</p>	<p>See general responses</p> <p>Two goals with the US16 service road modifications at Section Line Road:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Section Line Road intersection needs to shift south to provide adequate separation from the SPI on-ramps</li> <li>2) Increase spacing between the US16 mainline and US16 service road/Section Line Road intersection to the SDDOT desired spacing of 250 feet (SD Road Design Manual).</li> </ol> <p>As these layouts are still conceptual, the layout reflects one option. If this concept moves forward, the SDDOT will work with you to address potential impacts.</p> <p>The US16 Urban Area scenarios include an option for a northbound left turn lane at the Section Line Road intersection. The right-in right-out access was shown on the US16/US16B/Catron Blvd intersection recommendation layouts due to the safety benefits of prohibiting left turns and eliminating the high-severity angle crash conflicts. The SPI provides significant safety and operational benefits by consolidating turning traffic to the signalized single point intersection in lieu of various access locations throughout the corridor. Each time an access, particularly a left turn movement, is incorporated or maintained along the corridor, there is a safety consideration associated with that movement.</p>
2/12/2021	Letter	<p>Portion of letter reflective of this segment:</p> <p><b>US16 Urban Area (Segments A-C)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pennington County Highway Department is in favor of changing the access point for Fort Hayes Drive to Moon Meadows Drive with the following conditions: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Any right-of-way acquisition shall be negotiated by the South Dakota Department of Transportation (SDDOT)</li> <li>○ The proposed access road will not be added to the Pennington County Highway system for maintenance</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>See general response</p>
2/26/2021	Email	<p>We do need turning lanes and street lights out here ! With all the extra traffic and campers would make ed it a whole lot safer !</p>	<p>See general response</p>

Date	Method	Comment	Response
1/31/2021	Email	<p>I have shared my concerns previously with Todd Seaman with the Rapid City DOT. He was very helpful and understood the dynamics of our impending situation.</p> <p>We currently struggle to turn into traffic on Catron. Some of the issue is the result of speed of the vehicles using Catron. The majority of the issue is the volume of traffic. A considerable number of homes access Catron from the Wellington Drive intersections. The new signal at Healing Way does interrupt the flow to some extent but only east bound.</p> <p>As concerning, and potentially dangerous as the current situation is, it will become significantly worse the result of construction of 95 new apartments to the north of the Wellington Drive intersection. Their only access to Catron will be the Wellington Drive intersection. To exacerbate the conditions, drivers from the west Wellington Drive access, as well as drivers attempting to reach the day care center east of Wellington Drive, both use the Wellington Drive intersection to make a u-turn in order to change direction.</p> <p>As a result of the number of autos attempting to enter Catron Blvd from different directions and exercising u-turns, entering traffic will be virtually impossible. It can create a 5-10 minute delay as we speak depending on the time of day. I can't imagine what the delay might be after the new apartments begin filling up. The developer has targeted the Ellsworth population for occupancy. That means most will be attempting a left hand turn further complicating the situation.</p> <p>The overall improvements to the corridor can only create additional traffic. The close proximity from Wellington Drive to Healing Way would make signals at both intersections somewhat of an annoyance however, I feel that is the only solution that will make it safe for the existing as well as new residents of the area.</p> <p>Thank you for your considerations.</p>	<p><i>See general response</i></p> <p><i>This topic will be discussed with the Study Advisory Team in the recommendation meetings.</i></p>
2/28/2021	US16 Main Page	<p>The new turn lanes at 16 and enchantment road are unsafe. Snowplows had to put flags up to know where to plow. You drive right at oncoming traffic with their bright lights. Hopefully when slick you don't slide into someone.</p>	<p><i>See general response</i></p>
2/11/2021	Phone	<p><i>Comment summary from phone conversation:</i></p> <p>The new turn lanes at Tablerock (and others) are confusing with how they were constructed and sees a risk for turning traffic to turn down these left turn lanes instead of US16 mainline.</p>	<p><i>See general response</i></p>
3/18/2021	Email	<p>We drive Sammis Trail and Moon Meadows Drive to access Hwy 16.</p> <p>We are very familiar with the traffic changes and development that has happened in this area of Rapid City. We also understand the future development that is expected in this area. We see there is a proposed traffic light for the intersection of Hwy 16 and Moon Meadows Drive.</p> <p>With that said, we do want to be on record as opposed to a traffic light at the intersection Hwy 16 and Moon Meadows Drive.</p> <p>The traffic approaching this intersection from the south is already stressed by the incline up the hill from Reptile Gardens/Neck Yoke Road. If this traffic, especially camper trailers, truck haulers and the large gravel trucks that commonly use this road, needs to come to a dead stop on this incline due to a traffic light, there could be dire consequences. With the increased traffic from tourists in the summer, this will be a major problem.</p> <p>I certainly hope you take the fact that the long haulers(gravel trucks from the quarry) have increased their presence on Hwy 16 and the fifth wheel campers of the summer tourists will affect the traffic back up of a traffic light at this intersection.</p>	<p><i>See general response</i></p>

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/20/2021	Letter	<p>February 20, 2021</p> <p>Dear Mr. Gramm,</p> <p>We discussed the speed limit issue on S. Highway 16 (aka Mt. Rushmore Rd) with you after a Stakeholders meeting at Black Hills Energy. You told us you wanted to hear people's opinions about the speed limit and provided Resident/Commuter Survey cards for interested people to fill out and respond to questions regarding the Corridor project - including the speed limit. Jon Wiegand reported on surveys done in Keystone &amp; Hill City regarding the speed limit and said results were to be made available on your Corridor project computer site. We have not seen a summary of either and could not locate anything on your web site. Is that information available? If Keystone &amp; Hill City are considered relevant factors in your study, why didn't you do Custer, New-castle and other communities' residents who regularly drive into Rapid City for services? None of these towns are located in your Corridor study area. How relevant are they? Of course, driving in from outlying communities for shopping, appointments and/or recreation, people want the trip to be as time efficient as possible, so 60 mph undoubtedly does meet their desires.</p> <p>You said you wanted to hear from the people, so we decided to do petitions to gather interested individuals' opinions on the impact of closing Addison Ave. access to our shop &amp; lowering the speed limit to improve safety. The results were overwhelmingly in favor of keeping turn-in access &amp; to lowering the speed limit to improve safety. Some responses can't be repeated, but to summarize: Really? Why would they do that? You're kidding me. Sure I'll sign a petition. How can the State take away your entrance. We see the shop &amp; turn in. If there's no turn in, we can see you, but we can't get there. If traffic is at 60 mph, how could we read signs for roads we've never heard of before? How will we find you? Why would the State want to make it so hard for us to find you? Your property &amp; business should be protected by laws. There must be laws that protect you. Some people stressed what an inconvenience it would be to them. Many were concerned it would ruin our business and the shop would disappear. Repeat customers from other states were very concerned. And there were those who had shopped with us, gone home &amp; recommended us to their friends. Parents and grand-parents had children who saved their allowances for months or mowed yards, did chores, etc. to save their money to spend at "that rock store". There were adults who planned a vacation around the repeat visit; they were really upset with the prospect of their favorite shop not "being there."</p> <p>You can't just let this go. We've come a long way to shop here, again. What will you do to be able to keep the shop open? You can't let them close you down. You have to do something.</p> <p>Our reply has always been, "we're trying."</p>	See general and speed limit responses

Date	Method	Comment	Response
		<p>Our petitions were signed in primarily a 3 month period in our off-season which is not tourist based business. The shop was "closed by symptomatic" on March 12, 2020 and "closed temporarily due to Covid-19" on March 19, 2020. In that period of time we received the enclosed 236 signatures. Normally, we are open year-round, unlike other rock shops that close for the winter. If we had been able to remain open, we estimate, with the consideration of tourist season, our signature total would have been around 4,000. This petition project shows a lot of people appreciate Addison Ave. access that is access to both our shop and the health providers and others on the east side of Addison Ave. As noted, we do stay open year-round. Regional health care, shopping at big box businesses, and tourism draw heavily on the surrounding states of not only Nebraska and Wyoming but also Iowa, Minnesota, &amp; Colorado. Because of these regional services and the Mt. Rushmore Monument, we benefit from the numbers of people who travel to Rapid City all year. It only makes sense that our shop remains easily accessible to these visitors. Our petitions &amp; comments demonstrate their attitudes.</p> <p>Signal lights have been added to Leschters Way and Neading Way to assist with traffic control &amp; safety. A signal light at Addison Ave. would not be as close to the US 16/US 16B intersection as both of them. It seems a signal light would be a solution to our difficulties regarding Addison Ave.; Wierupno's concerns for traffic flow, access, safety and long term planning could be met. Years ago, according to Planning &amp; Zoning, the US 16B around the east of Rapid City was intended to improve convenience, traffic flow, &amp; safety versus downtown, city, and neighborhood driving. A portion of this US 16B, from Hwy 79 to US 16/US 16B intersection, has added signal lights with the growth and expansion of 5<sup>th</sup> Street. Now that 3.5 mile stretch of US 16B has 5 signal lights. We ask you to consider the similar solution for the expansion of businesses and neighborhoods to the south of US 16/US 16B intersection. There will never be less traffic in this area than there is now. As we all know, this portion of Mt. Rushmore Rd has drastically changed over the past few years, and your long term plan should address current needs, potential explosive growth, and future necessities.</p> <p>Your mid 2020 Corridor project between Saintment Blvd (Enchantment Hills) and the US 16/US 16B intersection is a welcomed addition to safe driving. The turn lanes to the left for those traveling 60 mph in the traffic flow left-lane have been such an improvement, especially for night driving which we very often do in returning to Rapid after work. The number of those who must make these left-hand turns has increased so significantly in just a few years. We're sure many people are grateful for these changes and improvements for their access and safety. We certainly appreciate your efforts toward an improvement for that issue. We hope a solution will be found for our predicament, as well. Please let us know if you have any questions regarding these petitions.</p>	

Date	Method	Comment	Response
		<p>To HDR &amp; SD DOT</p> <p>DO NOT CLOSE ADDISON AVENUE!</p> <p style="text-align: right;">LOWER THE SPEED LIMIT!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Currently, we have a “safe and convenient” access turn into the Rock Shop and the turn into the Orthopedic &amp; Spine Center and the other businesses on the east side of the Addison Ave. crossroad. We want to keep them.</li> <li>• Lower the speed limit from 60 mph to match any other street in the city limits.</li> <li>• Put in a traffic control signal light for increased safety, such as the signal lights at the east and west approaches to the intersection.</li> <li>• Allow Buffalo Crossing more than one entry / exit point for all their traffic. BHE has more than one. In case of an unforeseen or unimaginable emergency, it is a significant safety issue.</li> <li>• Currently, the approaches to the intersection from the east and west are at 45 mph or lower. Change the north and south approaches to match the other 45 mph approaches to increase safety.</li> <li>• The name of the Corridor until recently was S. Hwy 16. Now it is called Mt. Rushmore Rd from downtown Rapid City to Cathedral Drive and all the way to Moon Meadows. Downtown speed limits are lower than 60 mph; this roadway or street is now within the city limits; we just don't have 60 mph speed limits in the city. Lower speed limits are more reasonable, safe, and appropriate and will help to cut down on accidents. Remember, this is a 2050 long term plan.</li> <li>• Keep the Addison Ave. access to our Rock Shop, so customers can turn in from either direction and also for the convenience of the facilities across the Ave. We all live busy lives and none of us want unnecessary complications when we go to a health care center, school, church, bank, grocery store, civic center, restaurant, recreation or rock shop.</li> <li>• Keep the access “safe and convenient” for local customers and tourists who can see the Rock Shop and simply turn in. It is important to all of us who enjoy the shop; people are letting you know their opinions and wishes with signatures on this petition.</li> </ul> <hr/> <p>Mr. Gramm,</p> <p>This letter is in response to the July 23, 2019 public meeting regarding the US Highway 16 Corridor Study. There are many issues of concern, but we are responding to your request for input regarding the speed limit on US 16 from Cathedral Drive to Moon Meadows.</p> <p>Expansion and growth have occurred at a very rapid rate along the Corridor and the Rapid City “City Limits” have been expanded in response. Now the speed limits need to be changed to reflect the difference between country and highway driving to that of city and city streets. According to the Rapid City Planning Office, there are no other streets in the Rapid City city limits which have a 60 mph limit – with the exception of Interstate 90 as it passes through north Rapid City. Our point is that 60 mph is just not compatible with city living.</p> <p>Slow the speed limit for public safety and convenience. Allow our citizens to access their normal lifestyle, health and entertainment needs with a more comfortable experience of this expanded portion of our city.</p> <p>Because this is such a long term plan and given the continuing expansion toward Moon Meadows, and considering the fog and animal issues discussed at meetings, we recommend the lowered speed limit for the Corridor to Moon Meadows. Rapid City and tourism will continue to grow with businesses, housing, services, and recreation in the years to come.</p>	

**General Responses for US16 Urban Area Comments**

Comment Topic	Response
General	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the public meeting material and providing your feedback. This information will be shared with the Study Advisory Team (SAT), made up of representatives from the SDDOT, City of Rapid City, Rapid City Area MPO, and Pennington County. Revisions identified by the SAT will be incorporated in the final recommended layouts for the US16 urban area corridor. Timing of potential future projects on US16 and US16B, beyond the planned US16/US16B/Catron Boulevard intersection, will be determined by the SDDOT.</p>
Speed	<p>The SDDOT sets speeds in accordance with guidance provided in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 2009 edition. Considerations for adjustment to posted non-statutory speed limits are identified through speed studies, where the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is determined through a sampling of traffic of free-flow traffic. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed reflects the speed at which 85 percent of traffic traveling through a monitored point is traveling at or below. Per the MUTCD, posted speed limits should be within 5 mph of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of free-flowing traffic (MUTCD 2B.13.12). Setting speeds unrealistically low leads to safety, operations, and enforcement issues due people still feeling comfortable driving at higher speeds and the resulting speed differential throughout the flow of traffic.</p>
Traffic signal warrants	<p>The SDDOT follows traffic signal warrant guidance provided in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 2009 edition. There are nine warrants that consider traffic volumes, pedestrian volumes, crash history, and other characteristics of the corridor. Per guidance in the MUTCD (MUTCD 4C.01.05), 'a traffic control signal should not be installed unless one or more of the factors' described above are met. Further, meeting one of the warrants does not necessitate installation of a traffic signal. The SDDOT regularly conducts traffic volume counts at several intersections within the corridor study area, such as US16/Moon Meadows Drive and US16/Promise Road. Additionally, traffic crash reports for the intersections are reviewed whenever the counts are collected. Currently, neither intersection exhibits traffic volumes that warrant a traffic signal. The installation of a traffic signal at US16B/Catron Boulevard/Healing Way in early 2020 is an example of installing a traffic signal when traffic volumes met warrants.</p>
Turn lane warrants (at unsignalized intersections)	<p>The SDDOT follows turn lane warrant guidance provided in the South Dakota Road Design Manual as to when and where to consider turn lanes on the major highway at unsignalized intersections. Turn lanes at signalized intersections and on the stop-controlled approaches are determined through traffic operations analysis. The SDDOT turn lane warrant guidelines review three criterion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Vehicular volume</li> <li>2) Crash experience</li> <li>3) Special cases, such as railroad crossings, geometric/safety concerns, and non-traversable medians</li> </ol> <p>A location meeting one of these criterion does not necessitate installation of a turn lane. The SDDOT monitors traffic volumes at these intersections and works with developers to identify timelines for when a turn lane will be warranted. Turn lanes have been included in this corridor study where volumes are anticipated to meet warrants within the study's 2050 Planning Horizon.</p>
U-turns	<p>Reduced Conflict Intersection (RCI) U-turns were all designed for a WB-67 semi truck. U-turn geometrics can be adjusted during final design if a different design vehicle is required. Through numerous urban/suburban and rural implementations across the state, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has found large vehicles safely and efficiently navigate RCI U-turns. Additional information can be found here: <a href="http://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/docs/rci-info-sheet.pdf">http://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/docs/rci-info-sheet.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/index.html">https://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/index.html</a> While not shown in every instance, traditional intersections would also be designed to accommodate U-turns in areas with adjacent partial access intersections (right-in right-out and ¾ access).</p>



## 2.3 US16/Neck Yoke Road Intersection

### Comments

Date	Method	Comment	Response
1/30/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	'...' I think that any of the RCI options that have been presented would work well for me. I highly agree with closing at least 3 of the access points off of highway 16, as these are quite dangerous in at least 2 cases. I certainly would hate to see a stoplight at NeckYoke Road.	See general response
2/22/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Neck Yoke Road; Understand this is hard intersection being in the valley. I have nearly wrecked there with motorcycles coming off Neck Yoke whom were not paying attention to the down hill traffic. Largest concern with 1.1d is again the u-turn lanes. Given summer traffic vehicle types you have a high percentage of busses, long camper rigs that would be required to use these u-turn lanes. Given the u-turn lane at the South end of 1.1d is literally at the base of the one of the steepest hills in the area, having heavy loaded gravel trucks and large campers potentially needing to stop allowing a u-turn seems risky. Concerns too with the u-turn and exit lane for Southbound traffic overlapping. I didn't see any plan or review of an overpass solution. Seems that would solve all the issues without stop light, RCI's or all the other major re-works needed in that area. Assuming it's too costly to do, though it might be the best option with no restriction to N/S traffic.	See general and U-turn responses  Long-range interchange concepts were developed to provide a high-level assessment of feasibility and impacts. These are shown under the virtual public meeting website 'Long-Range Interchange Concepts' tab.
2/1/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment; US16 Main Page; Phone	<p><i>US16 main page submitted comment:</i></p> <p>I would like to express my thoughts on the neck yoke road proposal. I would be in favor of the reduced conflict intersection, 1.1d: RCI at Neck Yoke Road (West)                      RCI at Neck Yoke Road intersection, shifted 250 feet west                      All area access points consolidated to main RCI                      New frontage road on west side of US16                      Scenario 1.1d diagram                      1.1e: RCI at Neck Yoke Road (West) plus Central Partial Access (2 options)                      Similar layout to 1.1e                      Adds partial access at central Reptile Gardens/US16 service road intersection                      Option with and without frontage road on west side of US16</p> <p><i>Summary of additional comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Does not favor options where intersection geometrics creates islands or extends turn lanes back through access points.</li> </ul> <p><i>Summary of phone conversation and submitted virtual public meeting page comments:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts from signalized intersection Build Options, good to see them eliminated.</li> <li>Shifted west options improve access, (turning) traffic flow and separation of intersections.</li> </ul>	See general response
2/25/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Of the options presented, we favor the one shown in figure 1.1E. Improving Hwy 16 is a difficult process though one we think is ultimately necessary. We request that Happy Holiday be provided one more exit to Hwy 16 toward Rapid City only. There are two of these exits already existing so either one would work for us. Please consider making that change; it would help mitigate our outbound traffic quite a bit.	See general response
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	For reasons of safety as well as getting large numbers of cars and RVs on and off Highway 16 in this valley, I strongly support the plan listed as 1.1e	See general response
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	I can support the 1.1e RCI at NYR plus a central partial access (to the west at Reptile Gardens). I feel it's very important to allow 2 access points into RG with a right in and a right out. In terms of safety I do not believe you can do an incremental approach with the base option for 10-15 years and not see more dangerous accidents by turning left at NYR. I feel the full RCI should be part of the design from the beginning.	See general response
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Whatever plan is chosen, right turn lanes (SB) into Reptile Gardens are needed. Only one left turn (SB) to Neck Yoke Rd should be allowed. Either the median should be widened or crossing the median should be prohibited because too many large RVs try to fit but they are too long.	See general response

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/12/2021	Letter	<p><i>Portion of letter reflective of this area:</i></p> <p><b>Neck Yoke Road (Segment D)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Pennington County Highway Department prefers Option 1.1c as it has the least adjustment to Neck Yoke Road</li> <li>Any right-of-way acquisition shall be negotiated by the SDDOT</li> </ul>	See general response
2/12/2021 2/22/2021	Letter	<p><i>Portion of letter reflective of this area:</i></p> <p>US Highway 16 contributes significantly to our area in many ways for residents and visitors to our area. We are aware the impact Mount Rushmore Memorial has in fueling our tourism industry, but additionally, the central and southern Black Hills have many other businesses which rely heavily on US Highway 16.</p> <p>As residents of the central and southern Black Hills, we personally rely on US Highway 16 to get to and from Rapid City and get access to I-90 and beyond. This is crucial to keeping our businesses competitive.</p> <p>As the south side of Rapid City grows, we have many residents of our area who commute into Rapid City via US Highway 16. As a result of our reliance on US Highway 16, we make the following requests for consideration.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While the safety of motorists is paramount, we request that swift and efficient traffic flow be maximized to minimize congestion on US Highway 16. This is especially important to our local businesses.</li> </ol>	See general response
4/16/2021	Email	<p><i>Email summary:</i></p> <p>Noted circuitry is not ideal for local traffic crossing US16, but acknowledged safety benefit of the proposed RCI improvements. Preferred RCI 1.1e with frontage road. Does not want to 'dodge cars' in the Reptile Gardens parking lot when access property to the north.</p>	See general response
4/16/2021 4/19/2021	Email	<p><i>Email summary:</i></p> <p>Preferred option is RCI 1.1e.</p>	See general response

**General Responses for US16/Neck Yoke Road Intersection Comments**

Comment Topic	Response
General	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the public meeting material and providing your feedback. This information will be shared with the Study Advisory Team (SAT), made up of representatives from the SDDOT, City of Rapid City, Rapid City Area MPO, and Pennington County. Revisions identified by the SAT will be incorporated in the final recommended layout for the US16/Neck Yoke Road intersection.</p>
U-turns RCI additional information	<p>Reduced Conflict Intersection (RCI) U-turns were all designed for a WB-67 semi truck. U-turn geometrics can be adjusted during final design if a different design vehicle is required.</p> <p>Through numerous urban/suburban and rural implementations across the state, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has found large vehicles safely and efficiently navigate RCI U-turns. Additional information can be found here:  <a href="http://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/docs/rci-info-sheet.pdf">http://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/docs/rci-info-sheet.pdf</a>  <a href="https://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/index.html">https://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/index.html</a></p> <p>While not shown in every instance, traditional intersections would also be designed to accommodate U-turns in areas with adjacent partial access intersections (right-in right-out and ¾ access).</p>

## 2.4 American Buffalo Resort - Bear Country - Croell Curve Area

### Comments

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/11/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Like scenario three on this option with a u turn back to RC	See general response
2/22/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Bear Country/Croell Area: Bear country traffic will be lined up down the shoulder of Hwy 16 in the mornings so like the idea of longer queue there, but would flow into newly created lanes for Croell. ABR Scenario 1-3: Dislike the idea of increasing in/out traffic down the steep 6% grade location versus on the top of the hill with better visibility and easier acceleration. Need a 3rd slow vehicle/truck lane coming up this grade - at very least signage for slow vehicles to stay right. Nothing like following a gravel truck and camper up the hill at 36mph. Again u-turns on steep grade considering buses, rvs, etc, is no good. Please consider light-pollution with all these improvements as well as nearing the "hills" that is a considerable draw-back as well.	See general response
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	American Buffalo Resort Scenario 2 is preferred, moving all the traffic entering H18 to 47th St / Wilderness Canyon Rd. Thank you for addressing the Bear Country exit. They also need a westbound acceleration lane. When busy, people pull out of the exit, turning right, and then the cars already southbound on H16 are having to merge left into traffic, resulting in great congestion and potential for high-speed accidents. I've seen many near accidents there!	See general response
2/12/2021	Letter	<p><i>Portion of letter reflective of this segment:</i></p> <p><b>Bear Country/Croell Quarry Area (Segment E)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Any right-of-way acquisition shall be negotiated by the SDDOT</li> <li>The proposed access road will not be added to the Pennington County Highway system for maintenance (this includes the option of a frontage road connecting it to 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue West)</li> </ul>	See general response
2/4/2021	Phone	<p><i>Comment summary of phone conversation:</i></p> <p>Concern about linking the ABR area campground with Wilderness Canyon (via 47th Street). Indicated this will lead to too much traffic at intersection.</p>	See general response

### General Responses for American Buffalo Resort - Bear Country - Croell Curve Area Comments

Comment Topic	Response
General	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the public meeting material and providing your feedback. This information will be shared with the Study Advisory Team (SAT), made up of representatives from the SDDOT, City of Rapid City, Rapid City Area MPO, and Pennington County. Revisions identified by the SAT will be incorporated in the final recommended layouts for the US16 corridor through this area. US16 Corridor Study recommendations through this corridor segment neither signify nor guarantee construction of a future project. At this time, no projects are programmed into the SDDOT's 8-year developmental STIP.</p>

## 2.5 Strato Rim - Busted Five - Wilderness Canyon Area

### Comments

Date	Method	Comment	Response
1/31/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment; Phone	'...' I have serious questions and doubts about the RCI concept. To make a left turn trailers/motor homes and construction vehicles are forced to turn right, cross both lanes of traffic to exit left, then U-turn only to be required to merge into traffic. Especially with tourists, this is an unexpected and confusing movement. Therefore, I am much more supportive of Scenario 2 or, better yet a combination of Scenarios 2 and 3. Consider moving the EB lanes of 16 to the south, creating a greater storage area in the median which would allow an expected and conventional left turn. It would also better accommodate future signalization. Please schedule me for a call or meeting. Thank you.	See general and U-turn response  Scenario 2 reflects an intersection improvement option similar to what was constructed at the US16/Croell access in summer 2020: left turn lanes and a median acceleration lane for left turns out of the side-street heading towards Rapid City. Scenario 2 also includes right turn lanes.
2/10/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Thanks for the presentations about these various intersections. I am curious how the DOT can justify the highway crossover for Croell but remove crossover for citizens along this corridor? As an example Wilderness Canyon. Please explain how a crossover for Croell is safe but crossover for passenger vehicles is not.	See general and U-turn response  Scenario 2 reflects an intersection improvement option similar to what was constructed at the US16/Croell access in summer 2020: left turn lanes and a median acceleration lane for left turns out of the side-street heading towards Rapid City. Scenario 2 also includes right turn lanes.
2/22/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Busted Five/Wilderness Canyon area: Median width is an issue. The use of RCI's and u-turns is not acceptable here. If Croell trucks can turn across all 4 lanes of highway on a hill, turning North, then no reason residents and visitors are to be restricted with RCI's. RCI's were suggested for Croell and were "not acceptable" to Croell or DOT. Reducing intersection conflict points and create turn/acceleration lanes would do it without RCI's and u-turns - looks to be Scenario 2. Can force use of the acceleration lanes with barriers if that's an issue. Again use of u-turns for large vehicles (RV's with towed items, Trucks/Boats/Campers - a lot of these in the area), forcing them to quickly cross lanes to make a u-turn does not make sense in real life driving. To the comment around delayed wait times without RCI's, believe that is a stretch. One must wait to turn South, get up to speed, merge cross lanes, stop or slow for u-turn, wait again for u-turn opening, then accelerate again. Doing this is a car isn't bad, in a truck/camper/bus is nuts.	See general and U-turn response  Scenario 2 reflects an intersection improvement option similar to what was constructed at the US16/Croell access in summer 2020: left turn lanes and a median acceleration lane for left turns out of the side-street heading towards Rapid City. Scenario 2 also includes right turn lanes.
2/5/2021 2/9/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment; Phone	Comment summary from phone conversation: For Scenario 1, the access option #2 is not feasible due to property impacts.	See general response
2/20/2021		Your proposals 1 and 2 for changes in this area are not beneficial to the residents and businesses in this area. They would be a detriment to businesses that depend upon tourists who wont be able to find access to the businesses. It is also damaging to the property owners who would be effected by the rearage access. At best, these proposals would be a temporary bandaid. The only proposal that makes sense is proposal #3, moving hwy 16 to the south. Any other solution would be temporary and would not meet the needs when the land on the south side of the highway is developed. As you may know, '...' recently sold this land to a developer. Before your road project could be completed, this area will no doubt be filling up with houses and businesses. Please reject proposals 1 and 2 and choose to implement lasting and permanent improvement to the traffic issues by implementing proposal 3. Thank you.	See general response
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Preferences: Scenario 3 and then Scenario 1.	See general response
2/12/2021	Letter	Portion of letter reflective of this segment: <b>Busted Five/Wilderness Canyon Area (Segment F)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Proposed scenarios do not affect Pennington County Highway Department</li> </ul>	See general response
2/1/2021	Email	'...' I have reviewed the schematics in some detail and would like some clarification about Segment F and Segment E. First, with respect to the RIRO design for Wilderness Canyon (WC), what is the distance from the west ROW line of WC to the gore point of the left turn lane serving the U turn from the WB lanes? What is the proposed U turn turning radius to merge onto EB 16? Regarding Scenario 2 for segment E, I am very concerned about bringing all of the motorhome and travel trailer traffic onto a local street designed to minimal county standards in order to access a RIRO intersection. Do you have traffic projections for this movement?	See general and U-turn responses

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/23/2021	Letter	<p>This letter is in opposition to the planned alignments proposed for the Highway 16 traffic corridor south of the city.</p> <p>[Redacted] The only access to our housing tract is via Wilderness Canyon Rd. It has come to our attention the proposal to eliminate our ability to make a left turn leaving Wilderness Canyon Rd. to go to Rapid City. The proposal is residents would have to make a right turn, go down to the nearest "break" in the median and then make a u-turn to go north on Highway 16. I respectfully submit that this would cause more confusion than necessary. Those of us who live off Wilderness Canyon Rd. are well aware of the increased traffic during the summer months due to seasonal tourism. It is a stated situation we "deal" with. I submit that having to first make a right turn then negotiate a u-turn to travel north on Hwy 16 would only create more "congestion". Especially when we may be driving a larger vehicle; ie a motorhome or towing a trailer. Currently we have the option to negotiate the southbound traffic first, and wait in the short pavement area before attempting to pull into northbound Hwy 16 traffic. Many times we have seen the courtesy of other drivers heading north on Hwy 16 pull into the number 2 lane so that those of us wanting to merge onto Hwy 16 have the number 1 lane open. In the winter months even though road crews plow Hwy 16, navigating a u-turn in icy conditions constitutes an additional hazard. Consideration was made for the large trucks exiting the Croell mining development to go north on Hwy 16. Do we not deserve the same consideration?</p> <p>I understand that it is also proposed to eliminate the access to 47<sup>th</sup> Ave West via the Rockerville District Department Rescue Station at 13720 US-16. The school bus drops off the children in that parking lot. If school busses are not able to drop the students there, where are you proposing they make their stop? On Wilderness Canyon which is already a narrow, two-lane road? How will the school bus turn around? Certainly it is not suggested to have the school bus stop on Hwy 16!?</p> <p>Lastly, I would like to request do statistics support the construction of a raised median at the intersection? Have there been multiple traffic accidents to warrant such a drastic measure? As I shared previously, those of us living in the development are well aware of the increased traffic during the warmer months and negotiate the intersection accordingly. It would be a huge inconvenience and i feel detrimental to traffic flow to eliminate the access for vehicles to make a left turn onto Hwy 16 and go to Rapid City, where the majority of us travel.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration of this letter.</p>	<p>See general response</p> <p><b>US16/Wilderness Canyon crash history:</b> between 2014 and 2018, this intersection had the second highest weighted crash rate of all stop-controlled intersections along the study corridor. The weighted crash rate method accounts for both the rate and severity of crashes, by applying a 'weighting' factor to crashes based on injury. During this timeframe, there were 5 total crashes reported at the intersection, four of which were angle crashes. Three of these four angle crashes resulted in an injury (1 fatal injury crash, 1 incapacitating/serious injury crash, and 1 possible injury crash). Three of the four angle crashes involved a vehicle turning left out of Wilderness Canyon (towards Rapid City) and a westbound through vehicle. The fatality involved a motorcycle.</p> <p><b>US16/Croell Quarry question:</b> This was considered. Scenario 2 provides the same improvements implemented at the US16/Croell access: turn lanes plus a median acceleration lane for Wilderness Canyon to EB US16 (towards Rapid City) left turning traffic.</p> <p><b>Rockerville Fire Station Access:</b> School buses could still access the fire station parking lot via 47<sup>th</sup> Avenue. We have been in discussion with the Rockerville Fire Department regarding their access and they have indicated they are open to further discussion of its removal due to traffic using it as a cut-through.</p> <p><b>RCI (with the raised median) safety benefits:</b> One of the primary benefits of an RCI is the reduction in angle conflicts, particularly those that have resulted in the higher severity crashes at this intersection.</p>
2/02/2021 2/04/2021	Letter	<p>Wilderness Canyon Road is the <u>only</u> entrance/exit to the Copper Oaks neighborhood. A main concern is <b>FIRE EVACUATION</b>. There are over 150+ family homes in this neighborhood occupied <u>all year around</u> (with at least 2 vehicles per household). The majority of these homeowners mainly go to and return from Rapid City. We need additional access, not restrictions and closures. Closing other access from the Rockerville Fire Dept., Scandinavian House and the campground forcing everyone to use the same access extremely handicaps evacuation and makes for a worse situation. Turning right only, then having to make a U-turn certainly does not increase safety. The Battle Creek fire in 2004 threatened our neighborhood, going west was not an option in that situation, fire danger needs to be a top consideration.</p> <p><b>Combining several accesses into one and bringing all traffic to the Wilderness Canyon Road access creates more hazards.</b> School buses currently stop at the Rockerville Fire Dept. to pick up and drop off children, they would need to make U-turns to return back toward Rapid City. Tour buses pulling in and out of Bear Country, tourists driving RVs and pulling campers from the campground would all need to make U-turns, they are often confused knowing where they are going anyway.</p> <p><b>Weather conditions. Exiting right (west) facing into the setting sun is blinding and dangerous,</b> including seeing oncoming traffic before negotiating a U-turn. Turning west at that time of day does not increase safety. <b>Making U-turns during snowy, slippery conditions increases safety concerns.</b></p> <p>As an example of a U-turn situation our son used to live in Edinborough neighborhood off Catron Blvd. A few years ago, the left turn off Edinborough Dr. was eliminated necessitating one to turn right -then make a U-turn back to Highway 16 on the busy Catron Blvd. ---not safe. This also created more traffic driving through their whole neighborhood dodging parked cars and safety concerns for young children playing.</p> <p>Yes, there are certain times of the day which traffic is heavy on Highway 16 during the summer, but currently to make a left turn, one only needs to be a bit patient and wait for the oncoming traffic from the left to clear, move out, in the median, stop and make the left turn when the traffic clears to do so. Much easier and safer than negotiating a U-turn after having to first turn right.</p> <p><b>Truck traffic entering and leaving Croell's property creates more hazards and problems</b> than any of the other above-mentioned areas along that area of Highway 16.</p> <p>More accidents are caused by deer which often lay dead along the roadside in this area than auto accidents.</p>	<p>See general, U-turn, and speed limit responses</p>

Date	Method	Comment	Response
		<p><b>Improvements</b>                      Adding turn lanes to all accesses, especially at Wilderness Canyon would be a great improvement for making a turn.                      Road signs reminding people to keep to the right and stay in the right lane except to pass or turn.                      Speed limit is 60mph from the Catron intersection then changes to 65 past Reptile Gardens going uphill perhaps that needs adjusting.                      Educating drivers and/or install signs to keep to the left lane when making a left turn instead of making a wide turn.                      Caution signs/flashing lights to warn drivers of traffic entering roadway near these exits could be considered.</p>	
2/1/2021	Phone	<p><i>Comment summary from phone conversation:</i>                      OK with the removal of the direct access to the fire station and going to Wilderness Canyon Road to get access to US16, but was wondering about being able to make a left out of Wilderness Canyon Road when doing emergency response rather than taking the fire trucks through the U-turn.                      Concern with larger trucks being able to make some of the turns (especially U-turns) given the turning radius.</p>	<p>See general and U-turn responses</p> <p>RCIs could be installed with mountable curb at the intersection to allow large equipment to make such a maneuver and would be handled more in the design phase (noted in phone conversation).</p>

**General Responses for Strato Rim - Busted Five - Wilderness Canyon Area Comments**

Comment Topic	Response
General	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the public meeting material and providing your feedback. This information will be shared with the Study Advisory Team (SAT), made up of representatives from the SDDOT, City of Rapid City, Rapid City Area MPO, and Pennington County. Revisions identified by the SAT will be incorporated in the final recommended layouts for the US16 corridor through this area. US16 Corridor Study recommendations through this corridor segment neither signify nor guarantee construction of a future project. At this time, no projects are programmed into the SDDOT's 8-year developmental STIP.</p>
Speed	<p>The SDDOT sets speeds in accordance with guidance provided in the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 2009 edition. Considerations for adjustment to posted non-statutory speed limits are identified through speed studies, where the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed is determined through a sampling of traffic of free-flow traffic. The 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed reflects the speed at which 85 percent of traffic traveling through a monitored point is traveling at or below. Per the MUTCD, posted speed limits should be within 5 mph of the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed of free-flowing traffic (MUTCD 2B.13.12).                      Setting speeds unrealistically low leads to safety, operations, and enforcement issues due people still feeling comfortable driving at higher speeds and the resulting speed differential throughout the flow of traffic.</p>
Turn lane warrants (at unsignalized intersections)	<p>The SDDOT follows turn lane warrant guidance provided in the South Dakota Road Design Manual as to when and where to consider turn lanes on the major highway at unsignalized intersections. Turn lanes at signalized intersections and on the stop-controlled approaches are determined through traffic operations analysis. The SDDOT turn lane warrant guidelines review three criterion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Vehicular volume</li> <li>2) Crash experience</li> <li>3) Special cases, such as railroad crossings, geometric/safety concerns, and non-traversable medians</li> </ol> <p>A location meeting one of these criterion does not necessitate installation of a turn lane. The SDDOT monitors traffic volumes at these intersections and works with developers to identify timelines for when a turn lane will be warranted. Turn lanes have been included in this corridor study where volumes are anticipated to meet warrants within the study's 2050 Planning Horizon.</p>
U-turns RCI additional information	<p>Reduced Conflict Intersection (RCI) U-turns were all designed for a WB-67 semi truck. U-turn geometrics can be adjusted during final design if a different design vehicle is required.</p> <p>Through numerous urban/suburban and rural implementations across the state, the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) has found large vehicles safely and efficiently navigate RCI U-turns. Additional information can be found here:  <a href="http://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/docs/rci-info-sheet.pdf">http://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/docs/rci-info-sheet.pdf</a>  <a href="https://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/index.html">https://www.dot.state.mn.us/roadwork/rci/index.html</a></p> <p>While not shown in every instance, traditional intersections would also be designed to accommodate U-turns in areas with adjacent partial access intersections (right-in right-out and ¾ access).</p>

## 2.6 Rockerville Area and West

### Comments

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/1/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	<p>I would encourage the adoption of Scenario 3A for the Rockerville area for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3A will greatly reduce traffic on about 1/3 of the roads in Pine Haven Road District. This will reduce the deterioration and maintenance required by the Pine Haven Road District in the future.</li> <li>• 3A will ensure that traffic from the proposed RV park does not travel thru the Pine Haven residential neighborhood. Traffic from a commercial enterprise should absolutely not be directed into a residential neighborhood.</li> <li>• Noise from Hiway 16 will be moved farther south resulting in positive sound impacts in the Pine Haven neighborhood.</li> <li>• The 3A proposal shows the need to acquire additional ROW. I believe that most of the area shown as needing new ROW already exists and the need for the most of the new ROW is in error. The proposed road would line a current, non-abandoned, section line ROW.</li> <li>• 3A will eliminate the current highly dangerous turns required to go east from Pine Haven Drive that was caused by the recent closure of the private access road. I would also encourage that the priority of addressing the Rockerville area be moved forward. The recent closing of the private access road at the end of Pine Haven drive has created a very hazardous situation for vehicles wishing to return to Rapid City. Currently, vehicles are making a 140-degree left turn from Hiway 16 onto Main Street. This turn is made from the passing lane with a speed limit of 65mph. To make the turn you must reduce speed to 5-8mph while still in the passing lane. At the posted speed limit, the sight lines provide only 2.2 seconds for following traffic to see that the vehicle ahead is turning. I fully expect there to be more than one, multivehicle, high speed accidents during the summer of 2021. Even if a “No Left Turn” sign is installed, many will still attempt this turn. All of the navigation software I have reviewed, show this turn as the way to return to Rapid City. Non-residents will not recognize the hazard until it is to late to correct the action.</li> </ul>	See general response
2/3/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	I would like to say I am in favor of the 3A option for the Rockerville area. I believe it would benefit local residents the most in the long-term as well as the high volume of tourist traffic.	See general response
2/22/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	3A would be an excellent option for the reason ‘...’ has in his comments. Would also make a safe and convenient entrance and exit to the Rockerville Lodge. The Rockerville Lodge traffic goes back and forth from the Lodge to the registration office on main street. You can see the lodge on your map at the south end of the new road off Pine Haven Drive	See general response
2/23/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	<p>Great overview. Options 2 and 3 are favorable over Option 1 because of the dramatic reduction in fatalities with either option.</p> <p>Option 3 (1) would be my first choice for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) It maximizes safety while straightening the highway (less cost)</li> <li>2) It mitigates traffic and safety concerns for the RV park going in adjacent to Pine Haven Drive (vs. Option 2)</li> <li>3) It reduces traffic on the existing roads which will save money in maintenance in the long run</li> <li>4) It keeps the aforementioned RV park traffic off the peaceful residential neighborhood streets which was a major concern that our useless elected officials on the Pennington County Board of Commissioners refused to take into consideration.</li> <li>5) It is the only option that gives all of us in the neighborhood a direct and safe access to Hwy 16</li> </ol>	See general response
2/5/2021	US16 Main Page	‘...’ Sun County Estates west of Rockerville. I talked to Tood Seaman about a left turn lane as we have to do to get to our development if we’re going west. It’s definitely a safety concern mostly in the summer but always exists being we have to slow down in the passing lane to make a uturn.	See general response
2/27/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	I am responding to the US16 Corridor plan with regards to Rockerville. ‘...’ I support option 3A as the safest and most preferred option to the changes that will be made to US Hwy 16. Thank you.	See general response
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	The proposed changes to Highway 16 in Scenarios 1 and 2 would affect my family negatively in numerous ways. It would greatly increase the amount of traffic going by on the highway at least doubling the highway noise and pollution that we already have. It would also put a large amount of very fast moving traffic perpendicular to our proposed access. We would always have to be crossing one or both lanes of heavy traffic in order to go east towards Rapid City or across into Rockerville. If changes must be made Scenario 3a would take all of the traffic and the noise completely away from our neighborhood. I would be totally in favor of that choice.	See general response
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	First of all thank you for all of your leg work in presenting the options for the US Highway 16 Corridor Study. After reviewing the information, I would like to put my wife's and my support to Option 3A. It seems to be the safest option in our mind. Again, thank you.	See general response

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Prefer Scenario 1	<i>See general response</i>
2/27/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	My preference is Scenario 3a followed by Scenario 3b. I believe Scenario 1 (maintaining the existing lanes) should be a non starter. Knowing the future 100 unit residential development plans of "downtown" Rockerville, maintaining a city between the Hwy 16 lanes in the future shouldn't be considered. Also, maintaining the existing lanes results in significantly less projected reductions in traffic deaths and injuries. I strongly prefer Scenario 3 (combining lanes on south side) over Scenario 2(combining lanes on north side). Given the elevation changes and curves of the lane on the north side there is much poorer line of sight on the north lane than there is on the south lane. Also, the likelihood of additional commercial development adjacent (to the north) of the north lane in this area will create additional traffic hazards beyond what I believe is currently forecast in the study. Please recognize the change in the maintain existing lanes scenario between public meetings 1 and 2 versus meeting 3 to those of us that live on Pine Haven Drive. The closing of the private road dramatically changed the Pine Haven impact. It will be easier to address unforeseen approaches, etc. of additional development to the north under Scenario 2 (south lane). I prefer Scenario 3a over Scenario 3b. Given the required elevation change, a straighter road with minimal curves is preferred. If one rolls back the clock knowing there was going to be residential(townhome) development versus commercial development in the heart of Rockerville what would have been constructed in the first place? I believe the lanes would not have been split and Pine Haven Drive would have been placed in the section line right of way. I believe the south side would have been preferred due to less elevation change and much clearer line of sight. That's exactly what's shown on Scenario 3a and why I strongly prefer that choice. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	<i>See general and private road responses</i>
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	My preference in order is 3b, 3a, 1, 2. There is more housing and business interests on the north side of highway 16 than on the south side and option 2 will create a lot of chaos and noise for those people on the north side. With the recent closure of the private road across from Pine Haven we now have a hazardous situation for people trying to get back to Rapid City that needs to be addressed prior to implementing any of the above scenerios.	<i>See general response</i>
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	My wife and I are totally for eliminating redundant ramps and reducing fatal and injury accidents. I do believe you have to consider the cost analysis. I am for not having to completely reconstruct the highway. Make improvements! Do it cost effectively. Option 1a does that. '...'. I believe option 1a does the most good for the price! The other options have a very large diminishing on return for the cost. Thanks for your time!	<i>See general response</i>
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	My first preference would be 1A primarily due to the reduced cost of this improvement along with reduction of traffic accidents. Option 2a appears to be much better option than 3a with a far greater reduction of traffic accidents and a lesser cost to taxpayers.	<i>See general response</i>
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	we would like to recommend option 3A- we would like to access the new road from the hotel parking lot. We would like that option to be built into the study.	<i>See general response</i>
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	3A is the best scenario for my neighborhood. I provides the best ease of access to both Rockerville and 16 while keeping traffic noise at a minimum.	<i>See general response</i>
2/28/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	3 A looks okay	<i>See general response</i>
2/27/2021	US16 Main Page	I would very much prefer to see option "1a" used. This would greatly benefit Grace Bible Church. During the tourist season Grace Bible Church has good exposure at present, due to West bound traffic. Under any other option than "1a" Grace Bible Church would not only lose the exposure of tourist traffic, but would need to endure the cost of changing the location of their sign as it would no longer be visible to anyone. '...' find option "1a" very desirable for access either to the East or the West. Not only is option "1a" very convenient to access the Highway in either direction, it is obvious the cost of construction to the tax payers would be much less. Option "1a" is the option I would prefer.	<i>See general response</i>
2/28/2021	US16 Main Page	My preferred option is 1A. '...', to consider shifting the flow of traffic away from the current highway would impact our exposure and create expense to move our sign to another location.	<i>See general response</i>
2/28/2021	US16 Main Page	'...' I would like to express my preference to option 1a. A large part of the ministry of Grace Bible Church is reliant upon Highway 16 exposure. It is evident option 1a for the Rockerville area is the best value for all of us as tax payers.	<i>See general response</i>



Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/28/2021	US16 Main Page	Concerning the Rockerville area. I prefer the 1a option. This keeps the bound hiway 16 on the north sde of Rockerville. It will benefit my Grace Bible Church by having exposure to hiway 16 and our sign could still be seen, Also, this seems to bet he least expensive way to meet the objective of reducing the present & future danger facing drivers passing Rockerville going EAST or West. Presently it is a hazard getting on 16 west from rockerville .	See general response
2/12/2021	Letter	<p><i>Portion of letter reflective of this segment:</i></p> <p><b>Rockerville Area and West (Segment G)</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All interior roads at Rockerville shall either stay under SDDOT maintenance or a road district should be formed. Pennington County will not add them to the system for maintenance</li> <li>• Pennington County Highway Department would suggest realignment of the west intersection of Silver Mountain Road to be perpendicular to Highway 16</li> <li>• Any right-of-way acquisition shall be negotiated by the SDDOT</li> </ul>	See general response
2/28/2021	Letter	<p>I have provided my email comments regarding the various Rockerville scenarios in the US Highway 16 Corridor Study. The purpose of this document is to explain a safety element that perhaps the study does not address in the Rockerville area, and explain the impact of the private road closing across from Pine Haven Drive and the immediate traffic safety issues caused by the private road closing.</p> <p>Because of the closing of the private road directly across Pine Haven Drive, residents living on Pine Haven Drive as well as future Rockerville Lodge motel guests travelling from the west or at downtown Rockerville will have to access Pine Haven Drive by either taking the uphill curved entrance ramp that merges onto Highway 16 into the passing lane or will have to do a 180 degree turn from the passing lane near Baker Timber. Area residents and guests of the Rockerville Lodge wanting to head toward Rapid City from Pine Haven Drive will have to make the sharp turn to the left at the Silver Mountain Road intersection or will have to do a 180 degree turn from the passing lane further to the west on Highway 16. Living here for almost 20 years, I can assure you that none of those options are very safe compared to previously crossing Highway 16 using the private road.</p> <p>The private road was not closed until the Rockerville Lodge closed for the tourist season. The motel guests staying at the Rockerville Lodge needed to check in on Main Street Rockerville, were served breakfast on Main Street Rockerville, and checked out on Main Street Rockerville. The guests were guided to use the private road to go back and forth from one side of Highway 16 to the other. In the future all of the motel guests will either use the steep on ramp that enters Highway 16 onto the passing lane a short distance before Pine Haven or will have to drive looking for a 180 degree turnaround. The majority of the motel guests leaving the motel to go to Main Street Rockerville or head to Rapid City will likely take the extremely sharp turn at the Silver Mountain Road intersection.</p> <p>The number of Rockerville Lodge motel rooms is about the same as the number of residences living off of Pine Haven Drive. During tourist season when the motel is usually fully booked, a significant percentage, if not the majority, of the traffic crossing Highway 16 will be nonresidents that are not familiar with the traffic risks associated with the steep onramp and the sharp turn at Silver Mountain Road. Residents in the area attempt to adjust their driving because of the safety risks but the nonresidents do not have the knowledge to do so. I do not believe modelling from the previous traffic pattern prior to the private road closing can adequately assess the current safety risks. I also do not believe modelling can properly take into account the fact that you have these relatively dangerous situations with a significant number of nonresident drivers unaware of the risks.</p> <p>Under ALL Rockerville area scenarios now shown in the US Highway 16 Corridor Study, the steep onramp is essentially eliminated and modifications are made to Pine Haven Drive. Given the increased traffic risks resulting from the closing from the private road, I do not believe it is prudent to significantly delay addressing some of the needs of the area. Specifically, I believe the steep onramp and sharp turn areas need to be reviewed.</p> <p>I personally consider the steep onramp to be a death trap. You cannot expect unfamiliar tourists to safely enter Highway 16 and immediately cross the highway to turn right on Pine Haven Drive when they are unaware of the risks because of the limited line of sight. Having lived here for nearly 20 years, I understand the risks and nearly always will avoid using the onramp. Even with the private road open this summer there was an injury accident on September 3, 2020 caused by a South Carolina driver using the onramp and switching lanes to turn left onto Pine Haven Drive. The traffic is moving at 65 mph and whether you are merging from the onramp from essentially a stop to turn your head back like an owl to look for traffic or are exiting and entering the highway passing lane to do a 180 degree turn I believe all can agree that the speed differential matters. Is it possible to do something in the near future regarding the steep onramp and Pine Haven Drive? Again, the onramp is eliminated under all corridor study scenarios. Why not improve the traffic safety in the area before additional fatalities or injuries occur? If the steep onramp and Pine Haven Drive cannot be addressed in the near term, then I personally support the immediate closing of the steep onramp. Any traffic in Rockerville wanting to head to Hill City can turn left at the end of main street at the Silver Mountain intersection. People wanting to use the steep onramp to get to Pine Haven (residents or motel guests) can make a 180 degree turn at Baker Timber. It's not ideal but I believe much safer than using the onramp. Keep in mind, the closing of the private road necessitates a reassessment of the risks.</p> <p>If the selected overall Rockerville scenario will not be implemented for a substantial amount of time, is it possible for the sharp left turn at the Silver Mountain intersection to be addressed near term? Specifically, there is a fairly large relatively flat area at the intersection that I believe could easily accommodate a left turn lane. Line of sight on this north lane of the highway is poor and it would be beneficial (especially to nonresident tourists) to pull into a turn lane prior to making that left hand turn. Again, all motel guests can no longer use the private road and will either make this sharp left turn or go down the road to attempt a 180 degree turn from the highway passing lane. Drivers using an app to assist their driving will be told to make that sharp turn.</p>	See general and private road responses

Date	Method	Comment	Response
		<p>In summary, the closing of the private road will have a huge traffic impact to the Pine Haven residents and the Rockerville Lodge motel guests. The road closing also impacted the Rockerville scenarios proposed in the corridor study between meetings 2 and 3. I strongly support long range studies to understand and plan for future traffic and road requirements. However, the closing of the private road modifies and increases the traffic risks in the area. While I believe it is appropriate to understand those risks and incorporate them to the extent possible in the corridor study, I believe the traffic risks we will now face in the area justify a review to determine if near term steps should be taken to reduce or eliminate some of the risks. I also believe the risks should impact the timing of implementing the recommended scenario. Especially recognizing that essentially a city is currently being built in the median of US Highway 16 at Rockerville.</p>	
2/28/2021	Letter	<p>Highway 16 was poorly designed in front of our business property. For example, when it rains, all the water runs off the main road into the property, flooding us out every time it rains. It floods out the pavilion area where families have reunions, meetings, motorcycle parking, and also inside a cabin. The water washout by these floods causes much work to clean up after every rainstorm. Additionally, when it rains, the center isle drainage cannot keep up with it, so it stays on the highway and then drains into my property, causing hydroplaning on the highway and for my guests. I have numerous photo and video evidence of this occurring on many occasions. Thus, I would like to know if there are any further plans for this study to help with this problem facing me in the future.</p> <p>For entry into the establishment, there is not a proper turning lane into our property. The traffic center aisle is not big enough for vehicles unless they are sideways for exiting the property. For the truck and trailers to get across or into our place is awful. When attempting to enter the property, customers, staff, and family members are in the fast lane to turn into the property. This is very dangerous! If you travel this highway, you know the highway traffic to Mt. Rushmore is always busy and will continue to get more active as the season approaches. This highway is hazardous, and there are two cabin rental businesses and three residential places in the surrounding area.</p> <p>I know for a fact that that there have been so many accidents in this area which have never been reported for any studies. The guide poles to enter Hillside Country Cabins are usually bent over throughout the summer from someone hitting them.</p> <p>'...'. Just for the record, I did contact them years ago and expressed that some curve sign is needed. Also, I wanted a sign showing that they are coming up towards our property. When the speeds are so high, the inclined curve is very steep; with large trucks/semis behind you, people cannot stop.</p> <p>I already pay for signages for safety reasons because I think no one should ever have an accident due to these roads. I get bashed online for the traffic, jake brakes, and entry, which hinders my business. When they jake brake, it rattles the windows, and no one can sit outside for a relaxing time that they paid for. I know that if this were you and your family, you would not like this by your home/business.</p> <p><i>Phone conversation on 2/9/2021 included discussion on some of these comments.</i></p>	<p><i>See general response</i></p>
4/19/2021	Email	<p><i>Email summary:</i> Recommended further consideration of not removing Rockerville ramps just to save time on maintenance.</p>	<p><i>See general response</i></p>

**General Responses for Rockerville Area and West Comments**

Comment Topic	Response
<p>General</p>	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the public meeting material and providing your feedback. Comments here throughout the Rockerville area provide good information to the study team about current challenges and concerns for the future. This information will be shared with the Study Advisory Team (SAT), made up of representatives from the SDDOT, City of Rapid City, Rapid City Area MPO, and Pennington County. Revisions identified by the SAT will be incorporated in the final recommended layouts for the US16 corridor through this area.</p> <p>One of the primary objectives of developing scenarios in the Rockerville area is to identify a long-range plan that the SDDOT, local agencies, and developers can proactively work towards as the area changes. This provides a framework to sequentially implement improvements in an opportunistic manner, while working towards the long-range vision of the area. US16 Corridor Study recommendations through this corridor area neither signify nor guarantee construction of a future project. At this time, no projects are programmed into the SDDOT's 8-year developmental STIP.</p>
<p>Private Road Closure</p>	<p>The study team received multiple comments stating safety and operational concerns from the recent closure of the Private Road connecting Pine Have Drive and Main Street, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Wrong-way travel on US16 and the US16 on-ramp</li> <li>• Difficulty making a left turn on westbound US16 at Silver Mountain Road/Main Street due to existing intersection skew/angle</li> <li>• Left turn occurring from the westbound US16 passing lane at Silver Mountain Road/Main Street</li> </ul> <p>Based on this feedback, the Study Advisory Team (SAT) developed several potential short-term options to address these concerns, including:</p> <p>Option 1</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of the westbound on-ramp to reduce temptation to travel in the wrong direction on US16 as a shortcut</li> <li>• Provide U-turn at first downstream location where US16 eastbound and westbound come together (approximately 1.5 miles west of Pine Haven Drive).             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This U-turn location is further west than the existing US16/Silver Mountain Road/Main Street intersection and would likely not be utilized due to the extensive out-of-the-way travel.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p>Option 2</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 2a: Realign Pine Have Drive along the US16 ROW line (south of hotel) and reconstruct US16 on-ramp to provide 2-way traffic.</li> <li>• 2b: Construct new Pine Haven Drive roadway along property line east of hotel and reconstruct US16 on-ramp to provide 2-way traffic (similar to what is shown in Rockerville Scenario 2).</li> </ul> <p>Option 3</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 3a: construct westbound US16 left turn lane at US16/Silver Mountain Road/Main Street intersection</li> <li>• 3b: construct left turn lane at US16/Silver Mountain Road/Main Street intersection and reconstruct intersection to reduce skew (similar to what is shown in Rockerville Scenario 1a).</li> </ul> <p>These options were carried forward for further consideration by the SDDOT Rapid City Region and Area offices.</p>

## 2.7 Other Topics (Bike/Ped Plan, ITS and Long-Range Interchange Concepts)

### Comments

Date	Method	Comment	Response
2/11/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	like the pedestrian and bicycle recommendation.	
2/21/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Rapid City area suffers from discontinuous ped/bicycle paths. Extremely disappointed the partial “sidewalk” included in the Sheridan Lake Road project is not only unpaved, but it’s not handicap or bicycle accessible. Makes it difficult to safely access other urban paths in the community.	See general response
2/14/2021	US16 Main Page	<p>I am well aware of increasing traffic volumes on this roadway and I know improvements need to be made.</p> <p>‘...’ and realize we need to move forward with roadway designs. However, I continue to be concerned that engineers fail to take into account the need for context sensitive design. It seems as if you simply look at a problem and look at the simplest way to solve it. I can cite chapter and verse to illustrate my concerns.</p> <p>The need to reinforce the guardrail on Highway 87 is a perfect example. The initial design scarred Mt. Coolidge up to the lookout tower. It was a sledge hammer approach to what easily could have been a minor cut away of the hillside to move the guardrail back. It took a great deal of protest to get the design modified to one that was much more acceptable for the Black Hills.</p> <p>The point is that this is the Black Hills. People come here for the experience of being “in” the Hills. The more we sterilize our roadways the less the attraction of the experience. I remember old Highway 16 to the Wye. I believe we could have done a much better design that would have preserved the character of the old roadway but accommodated the increased traffic but, of course, the design was done long before we had those issues in mind. Highway 16A from the Wye is another example. In my mind, that road is a disaster in context sensitive design. I remember the old road and that pleasant drive could have been preserved without sterilizing it the entire trip.</p> <p>That is all I ask. I ask for engineers to look at the road for preservation of the driving experience as well as improving traffic movement. It can be done. We just have to think about it in another context. It is not just to improve traffic flow. It is to maintain the driving experience. We are well on our way to sterilizing 16 to just any old road but we can at least try to keep what we have left.</p> <p>I look at what is being done to Sheridan Lake Road now and just cringe. There does not appear to be any attempt to preserve the nature and character of the old road. Come on guys, I know you are engineers but you need to involve social scientists in the process. We look at the issue a bit differently and, you well know, there are other ways to design the road and still meet your objectives.</p> <p>I would be willing to discuss this with anyone</p>	<p>See general response</p> <p>Context sensitive design elements will be incorporated in the preliminary and final design of potential future projects. While US16 was not included in the current Black Hills Context Sensitive Corridors Study, it is anticipated elements from this study will be applicable to future projects along this corridor.</p> <p>Because this topic was not discussed much in the virtual public meeting, the study team wanted to highlight a few examples of considering the ‘driving experience’ in the study:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The study team invited the US Forest Service (USFS) to participate as a study stakeholder and has met with them multiple times to discuss overarching design elements and potential modifications within the USFS boundary.</li> <li>• Due to a number of considerations and potential off-alignment impacts throughout the area, scenarios presented in this public meeting do not propose any significant new alignments or large-scale modifications outside of             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A potential southern alignment shift in one of the Strato Rim - Busted Five - Wilderness Canyon scenarios and</li> <li>• Combining eastbound/westbound lanes in the long-range Rockerville scenarios.                 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rock excavation and impacts to development will be notable considerations in the feasibility of these scenarios.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• ITS recommendations take into account beneficial motorist information to address identified operational and safety needs and implement them through context-sensitive approaches such as smaller DMS signs along the side of the road.</li> <li>• While not a direct result of the study (need was reinforced in the study), SDDOT implemented a high friction surface treatment to the eastbound lanes on the horizontal curve/steep grade around the Croell Quarry, which is considerably less impactful than other measures available to address roadway departure crash history in the area.</li> <li>• One of the tasks looked at various methods to address blowing snow, such as natural and wooden snow fences, which are more in line with the context of the surrounding area than other options that are more impactful.</li> </ul>
2/26/2021	Virtual Public Meeting Comment	Bike/ped comment: I agree with the recommendation made	
2/12/2021 2/22/2021	Letter	Portion of letter reflective of this area:	See general response

		<p>2. We request consideration of future traffic flows which will impact the Hill City area in the planning phase. Though we are outside the direct study area, we see increased commuting and visitation to the Hill City area warranting additional signage for Hill City and destinations other than Mount Rushmore Memorial. Currently, the signage for Hill City is virtually nonexistent on US Highway 16, especially at the most critical point, the Keystone Wye. While many visitors do come for Mount Rushmore Memorial, travelers would benefit from increased signage to other destinations as well.</p>	<p>SDDOT has reviewed existing Hill City-related guide signage along US16, between the Keystone Wye and Fairmont Boulevard, and is propping to add the following outside of this study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A distance to Hill City sign in the Rockerville area so drivers coming from US16B can see a distance to Hill City prior to arriving to the sign bridge.</li> <li>2. At the Keystone Wye westbound gore point, 'Hill City' will be added to westbound gore point (where there is currently only a Mt. Rushmore with diagonal left arrow).</li> </ol>
2/4/2021	Phone	<p><i>Comments from phone conversation:</i>                  Noted lack of guide signs to Hill City after the one leaving Rapid City. Would like to see something at Keystone Wye.                  Expressed traffic signals in rural areas along US16 are not an ideal situation for the Hill City area, which relies on US16 for tourist traffic and a major commute route to/from Rapid City.</p>	<p>See general response</p> <p>SDDOT has reviewed existing Hill City-related guide signage along US16, between the Keystone Wye and Fairmont Boulevard, and is propping to add the following outside of this study:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. A distance to Hill City sign in the Rockerville area so drivers coming from US16B can see a distance to Hill City prior to arriving to the sign bridge.</li> <li>2. At the Keystone Wye westbound gore point, 'Hill City' will be added to westbound gore point (where there is currently only a Mt. Rushmore with diagonal left arrow).</li> </ol>

**General Responses for Other Topics Comments**

Comment Topic	Response
General	<p>Thank you for taking the time to review the public meeting material and providing your feedback. This information will be shared with the Study Advisory Team (SAT), made up of representatives from the SDDOT, City of Rapid City, Rapid City Area MPO, and Pennington County. Revisions identified by the SAT will be incorporated in the final recommended layouts for the US16 corridor through this area. US16 Corridor Study recommendations through this corridor segment neither signify nor guarantee construction of a future project.</p>

### 3.0 Landowner/Business Owner Meetings

HDR and SDDOT staff met with a limited number of landowners and business owners of properties that may be impacted by the planned projects at US16/US16B/Catron Boulevard intersection and US16/Neck Yoke Road intersection. Meeting minutes were developed for the SDDOT. Stakeholders were encouraged to provide comments via the study website or email.

**Dates:** February 24<sup>th</sup> and 25<sup>th</sup>, 2021; Follow-up in April 2021

**Location:** SDDOT Rapid City Region Office

## 4.0 Additional Outreach

Public meeting media coverage:

[https://rapidcityjournal.com/news/local/public-comments-sought-for-us-16-corridor-study/article\\_86d9723a-3a96-5911-bae4-f28b404d7123.html](https://rapidcityjournal.com/news/local/public-comments-sought-for-us-16-corridor-study/article_86d9723a-3a96-5911-bae4-f28b404d7123.html)