JUNEAU EGAN DRIVE & YANDUKIN DRIVE INTERSECTION IMPROVEMENTS

Virtual Public Meeting
Questions & Answers (Q&A)

Project # SFHWY00601 (Stage 1)

Meeting Date: February 18, 2026

Prepared for Alaska DOT&PF Southcoast Region

Prepared by Parametrix and Michael Baker International

March 19, 2026

About This Document

This document compiles the questions submitted during the February 18, 2026 Virtual Public Meeting and the project team's verbally provided responses. Verbal responses have been edited for grammar and clarity while preserving the technical meaning. Where applicable, follow-up commitments made by the project team are included as written next steps.

Project contact email: contact@eganyandukin.com

Questions and Responses

Question

Why is the reduced speed limit (45 mph) only in effect from November 1 through January 31? What went into that determination, and why only these three months?

Response (provided verbally during the presentation)

DOT&PF implemented the seasonal 45 mph speed reduction as a near-term safety measure targeted to the time of year when historical crash data show the highest number of crashes at the Egan Drive/Fred Meyer area. The seasonal window also aligns with darker winter conditions, when reduced speeds can help lower crash severity and provide additional driver reaction time.

Members of the public also noted interest in extending the seasonal period. DOT&PF can consider that feedback alongside crash trends and operational considerations.

Question

Will the right-turn traffic off Egan Drive have yield signs to yield to the signalized left-turn traffic on both sides?

Response (provided verbally by Yuri Mereszczak)

Yes. The traffic engineer confirmed that yield control will be provided for the free right-turn movements. The project will include yield signs, and the team also plans to use flashing yield signage similar to the flashing yield sign installed previously as part of a Highway Safety Improvement Program (HSIP) treatment for the outbound right-turn lane onto the Fred Meyer access.

The intent is to make the yielding requirement more conspicuous for drivers using the channelized right-turn lanes.

Question

As construction approaches, will the project team reach out to the tour companies that operate buses, minibuses, and smaller vehicles from May through mid-October? Using the Tourism Best Management Practices (TBMP) Administrator to pass notifications has been successful in the past.

Response (provided verbally by Karin McGillivray)

Yes. The public involvement lead thanked the commenter for the suggestion and confirmed that the team will use the TBMP Administrator network to help distribute construction notifications as the project moves closer to construction.

Question

Why do you believe a signal is safe given distracted driving? Won't this create more rear-end crashes?

Response (provided verbally by Yuri Mereszczak, Jim Brown)

The traffic engineer acknowledged that the design includes advance warning flashers tied to the signal controller. These warning flashers are planned to be located about 500 feet in advance of the intersection and are intended to activate in advance of the signal changing from green to yellow and then red.

The project team described this as a treatment intended to improve driver awareness and help reduce surprise stopping, which can help mitigate rear-end crash potential.

Question

How will pedestrians get to this intersection? Few pedestrians walk along Glacier Highway. How many pedestrians were injured? Bikes have an alternate—why not just lower the speed limit?

Response (provided verbally by Gordon MacDonald, Jim Brown, Yuri Mereszczak)

The project manager and design team explained that they have observed people crossing Egan Drive at this location, including pedestrians traveling from the Nugget area toward Fred Meyer who currently make an informal crossing by finding a gap in traffic. The team described this behavior as unsafe and noted that providing a signalized crossing opportunity would reduce the need for people to 'run across' the highway.

The team also stated that, based on the crash data they have reviewed since 2015, there have not been any documented pedestrian injuries at this intersection during that period. They emphasized, however,

that pedestrian activity is expected to increase over time due to changing land uses and development in the area (including Honsinger Pond area development) as well as transit use near Fred Meyer.

Regarding access from Glacier Highway, the team noted that there is a sidewalk on one side of Glacier Highway and that they are evaluating whether future pedestrian access connections from that sidewalk toward the intersection should be provided to support future development and safe walking routes.

In response to the question about lowering speeds, the design team noted that the signal operations themselves require vehicles to slow and stop at red indications, which effectively lowers travel speeds through the intersection when considered across green and red phases.

Question

What is the solution for vehicles exiting Fred Meyer and trying to accelerate to merge onto Egan Drive when the merge/acceleration lane feels short?

Response (provided verbally by Yuri Mereszczak)

The traffic engineer stated that the team reviewed the acceleration lane early in design and found it to be within applicable national guidance and standards for its current configuration. The team also acknowledged that community concern remains and stated they would re-check the acceleration lane to ensure it provides what drivers need to get up to speed and merge safely with Egan Drive traffic.

The project team captured this as a follow-up item to review as design advances.

NOTE: After the meeting, the team re-evaluated the length of the acceleration lane and determined that it is approximately 300 feet too short. Through this project, the lane will be extended to meet current guidance.

Question

Why isn't a pedestrian overpass included?

Response (provided verbally by Jim Brown)

DOT&PF explained that a pedestrian overpass was evaluated as part of the PEL study's phased approach. The current project is focused on near-term safety improvements at the intersection. The team stated that the traffic signal and pedestrian-actuated crossing features may meet current needs, and that an overpass could be reconsidered in the future if growth and pedestrian volumes warrant it.

The project manager summarized this as 'to be determined' based on future conditions and projections.

Question

With the added lanes and added width, would a traffic circle/roundabout fit at this location?

Response (provided verbally by Yuri Mereszczak, Gordon MacDonald, Jim Brown)

The traffic engineer stated that the PEL study evaluated a roundabout alternative. They explained that the project is not substantially widening the overall intersection footprint; the added left-turn lanes are largely accommodated within existing median areas. Based on measurements shared during the meeting, the paved width across the intersection is about 160 feet, which the team described as on the smaller side for fitting a roundabout without widening.

The team also noted that widening to fit a roundabout could trigger impacts to adjacent properties such as Fred Meyer and the Juneau Christian Center and could introduce right-of-way acquisition needs. The team stated that minimizing right-of-way impacts is a key constraint for delivering the safety project on an accelerated timeline, and that right-of-way acquisition can be a lengthy process.

Question

Why not eliminate the left turn into Fred Meyer from Glacier Highway and have drivers use the nearby intersection (e.g., the MAPCO area) and come back?

Response (provided verbally by Gordon MacDonald, Yuri Mereszczak)

The design team noted that routing drivers to another intersection could be used as a construction staging strategy, but they explained it would not address the desire for pedestrians to cross at this location. If the project needed to stop traffic to allow pedestrians to cross, the team stated it would have a similar effect on through movements regardless of whether left turns were allowed.

Because pedestrian crossing opportunities are part of the project purpose, the team stated that if traffic is being stopped for pedestrians, it is more efficient to also allow the protected left-turn movements to operate in coordination with the pedestrian phase when feasible.

Question

People may park and walk across Egan Drive to reach Honsinger Pond. How will this mesh with changes near Twin Lakes? Egan will have several complex intersections—why not extend Glacier Highway to the Glacier–Nugget intersection?

Response (provided verbally by Yuri Mereszczak, Gordon MacDonald, Jim Brown)

The traffic engineer acknowledged that some people may cross between businesses and destinations near the intersection, including transit users who get off near Fred Meyer and continue on foot. The team emphasized that providing safe crossing options supports people who do not have access to a vehicle and improves transportation choice.

Regarding 'meshing' with changes near Twin Lakes, the traffic engineer stated that the projects are separated by a couple of miles and do not directly interact operationally. The team also stated that a standard traffic signal is a common and well-understood treatment, and that the design intent is to separate conflict points and provide clear treatments for each movement.

On the question about extending Glacier Highway to the Glacier–Nugget intersection (sometimes referred to locally as the 'McNugget' area), the design team stated that this type of corridor extension was not part of the current safety project scope, and that the current effort is focused on targeted safety improvements at the Egan/Yandukin location. DOT&PF noted they are in very early stages of exploring funding options for preliminary design of broader improvements.

Question

Rectangular rapid flashing beacons (RRFBs) are typically used at non-signalized crossings. Is using RRFBs with a signal overcomplicated, and are there successful examples of RRFBs used in conjunction with a signalized intersection?

Response (provided verbally by Yuri Mereszczak)

The traffic engineer stated that he has seen numerous examples of RRFBs used in conjunction with signalized intersections, including examples in the Boise, Idaho area where RRFBs are used near signalized intersections to address pedestrian crossings of channelized ('free') right-turn lanes.

He described RRFBs as a nationally recognized treatment for improving driver yielding behavior at pedestrian crossings in those conditions. He also noted that, from a driver's perspective, the expectation is that drivers in the right-turn lane focus on the crosswalk and yield control ahead of them, and that the beacon activation is intended to draw attention specifically to pedestrians entering the crossing.

Question

Do you have video evidence of crashes, and can the public see the crash/accident data?

Response (provided verbally by Gordon MacDonald, Jim Brown, Yuri Mereszczak)

The team stated that they are not aware of video evidence of the crashes, but they have reviewed crash data and police reports. The design team described the most severe crashes as those involving left-turn movements across Egan Drive, where drivers are attempting to judge gaps in high-speed traffic.

The traffic engineer noted that the crash dataset they reviewed contains extensive detail fields. DOT&PF stated that members of the public can request available crash data by contacting the project team (e.g., via the project email) and that requests route through the DOT&PF project manager's office to determine what can be shared.