

APPENDIX N

Agency Workgroup Meeting #2 Summary

This page is intentionally left blank.

WORKSHOP SUMMARY

DRAFT



Prepared by:	Taylor Horne, HDR
Project:	Egan Drive and Yandukin Intersection PEL – SFHWY00079
Meeting Subject:	Agency Workshop #2
Meeting Date/ Time:	Tuesday, June 30, 2020 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
Location:	Webex
Meeting Website:	https://storymaps.arcgis.com/stories/25803b2c89fc4a79b2c91990faff041c

Group Members and Attendees:	PROJECT TEAM	AGENCY MEMBERS
Bold: in attendance	Jim Brown, DOT&PF Joanne Schmidt, DOT&PF Ben Storey, DOT&PF Marie Heidemann, DOT&PF Verne Skagerberg, DOT&PF David Epstein, DOT&PF Christy Gentemann, DOT&PF Ryan Bare, DOT&PF Emily Haynes, DOT&PF Jill Taylor, DOT&PF Joseph Galgano, DOT&PF Sam Dapcevich, DOT&PF Taylor Horne, HDR Gina McAfee, HDR Chase Quinn, HDR Aurah Landau, HDR Josie Wilson, HDR Jeanne Bowie, Kinney Engineering Michael Horntvedt, Parametrix	Barbara Trost, ADEC Bill O’Connell, ADEC Adeyemi Alimi, ADEC Terri Lomax, ADEC Jesse Lindgren, ADF&G Kate Kanouse, ADF&G Judith Bittner, DNR Sarah Meitl, DNR Lee Cole, DNR Chris Carpeneti, DNR Irene Gallion, City and Borough of Juneau Alix Pierce, City and Borough of Juneau Benjamin Soiseth, USACE Delana Wilks, USACE Matthew Brody, USACE Randy Vigil, USACE

Summary of Agency Workshop #2

1. Workshop Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Items – Josie, Aurah
 - Josie welcomed everybody to the second in the series of Agency meetings to discuss progress on the Egan / Yandukin Intersection Improvements Project. She oriented attendees on how to navigate the workshop website and participate in the meeting. She held roll call and Aurah assisted individual participants with audio and visual challenges.
2. Agency Role Review – Jim
3. Agenda Review – Jim
 - Jim provided an agenda overview for the workshop. Agenda items were:
 - Recent Work and Results from Public Outreach

- Area and Data
 - Purpose and Need
 - Intersection Improvement Alternatives
 - Screening Criteria
 - Next Steps
4. Project Presentation – Taylor, Jim, Jeanne
- Taylor summarized stakeholder and public outreach efforts from winter 2019/2020.
 - The project is in the planning and public outreach phase. The Project Team is working to find the best improvement options for this intersection by examining:
 - Interim solutions that offer high-value, low-cost options to improve safety; and
 - Potential long-range solutions for the intersection and corridor
 - At the last Agency meeting in November, the Project Team presented traffic and accident data and the group workshopped the project purpose and need.
 - After that, the Project Team hosted a public meeting, an online open house, and a comment period ending in late December to ask people what they thought about the intersection.
 - More than 100 people attended the public meeting, 168 people visited the online open house, and over 50 folks attended CFG and agency meetings. There was quite a bit of conversation on social media about the intersection as well.
 - Jim highlighted public comments and explained the Highway Safety Improvement Plan (HSIP) nomination and process.
 - We've received lots of feedback, including 132 discreet comments. Many people highlighted safety and alternate routes as primary needs to meet when improving the intersection.
 - In response to the high interest in improving safety in the intersection area, DOT&PF recently submitted a funding request through the State of Alaska HSIP for a near-term, lower-cost project that can reduce the number and likelihood for serious crashes at the intersection.
 - Jeanne explained the HSIP nomination.
 - People commented that when heading southbound and turning into Fred Meyer, they cannot tell if a northbound vehicle is in the right turn lane into Fred Meyer or in the right through lane.
 - Offsetting the right turn lane and placing reflective markers will help distinguish which lane northbound travelers are in.



- We also heard people say they aren't confident that northbound vehicles turning into Fred Meyer will yield to southbound vehicles turning into Fred Meyer.
 - A concrete curb traffic island will be added so that it will not be a question if there is an open space available to you to complete your left turn across the two lanes of northbound traffic. It will help drivers make the turn with confidence.
- Additionally, DOT&PF is proposing to adjust the left turn locations in both north and southbound directions to reduce the total width of pavement drivers must cross to complete the left turns.
- The final component in the submitted HSIP nomination is lowering the posted speed limit to 45 mph during the darker, poor-weather winter months. This is because both reduced visibility and roadway conditions have been identified as contributing to the number and severity of crashes.
- Jim added that the proposal must compete for funds, and the Egan / Yandukin intersection improvements project is continuing.
 - This HSIP nomination will be scored against other proposed safety improvements throughout the state. The Project Team will know in September/October whether or not the proposal is accepted.
 - If funded, the HSIP nomination package would be moving in the next year, with the goal of finishing construction by fall 2022 at the earliest.
 - HSIP implementation will also include coordination with local law enforcement and a public education campaign.
 - Other identified needs such as alternative routes and bicycle and pedestrian improvements are not met by this smaller-scale HSIP project.
 - Those will be addressed in the intersection improvement project Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) process that is ongoing.

5. Area and Data – Taylor

- Taylor provided a short navigation tutorial on the area and data section of the website so people can review that information later on their own.

6. Purpose and Need – Michael H.

- Michael H. explained that the project Purpose and Need statement evolved in response to public comment.
- The primary purpose is to improve safety for all users at the intersection. Secondary purposes address creating route diversity, improve access for people walking, cycling, or using any other active transportation mode, and to maintain traffic flow through the area.
- Several other economic considerations were added as additional goals for the project.



- DOT&PF's Statewide Environmental office has approved the draft Purpose and Need. The language will officially remain a draft until it is adopted in a later environmental process used to develop a project.

- Discussion:

Terri asked what other land use plans are mentioned.

Michael: We want to make sure we are consistent with the City of Juneau land use. If there are economic or land use improvements that are planned, then we want to make sure we are considering those plans before we propose a parallel route that may interfere with it.

Terri: Is there a watershed plan or a community that is developing a plan?

Michael and JB: We are unsure of this, but will look into this and provide an answer.

Emily knows there are some in Juneau, but is unsure if there is one at this particular intersection.

Alex: We have them for specific watersheds; I don't know about those in the area.

7. Intersection Improvement Alternatives – Jeanne

- Over the last few months, the Egan / Yandukin Project Team has developed a draft range of 15 alternatives for improving the intersection and 6 design features called Compatible Elements that may overlay the alternatives.
- Many of the public comments on the project contained specific design suggestions. Those were included in the draft range of alternatives. The Project Team sometimes used more than one of these ideas in an alternative.
- The various design features and alternatives are grouped into types for review: Compatible Elements, Intersection, Closure, and Overpass/Interchange.
- Jeanne explained each of the six Compatible Elements that layer over alternatives: Travel Demand Management, Intelligent Transportation Systems, Flashing Intersection Ahead or Signal Ahead Sign, Median Crossover, Frontage Road to Nugget, and Grade Separated Connection between Yandukin Drive and Glacier Lemon Road.
- Discussion:
 - Jesse:** ELE-5 – is this always open or just if there is an accident?
 - Jim:** The intention here would be an always-open road.
 - Sarah:** Would the grade design option have an on-off ramp option to get off Egan at Yandukin Drive?
 - Jeanne:** As a Compatible Element, no. There are some overpass alternatives that would use the on-/off-ramp.
- Jeanne described how to read the graphics of the alternatives.

- The upper right-hand corner has the three “needs” for the project. This shows the purpose met by each alternative. There is also a Compatible Element circle that shows which of the Compatible Elements could be included in the improvements.
- Click left and right through intersection alternative groups to see all alternatives. Click on the alternatives to see larger versions without the overlay text boxes.
- Jeanne then explained each alternative.
 - Intersection Alternatives
 - INT—1: No Build – HSIP Alternative Safety Improvements
 - INT—2: Partial Access Signalized Intersection
 - INT—3: Full Access Signalized Intersections
 - INT—4: Move Signalized Intersection from Glacier/Nugget to E/Y Intersection
Example: If you’re coming from downtown, you’d come to Egan / Yandukin and turn left to go toward the airport or housing back there, no longer being able to turn left at Nugget.
 - INT—5: Roundabout Intersection
This would be two lanes. Right now it is not designed for non-motorized access, but we could add signals for non-motorized access.
 - INT—6: Two Signalized T-Intersections
 - INT—7: Relocate Intersection to Southeast of Church
This can utilize any of the signal options.
 - INT—8: Diverted Left Turn Intersection
This is used more in the lower 48, but not in Alaska. This includes three lights, but if they are timed well, you would likely stop at only one of them. The main benefit is at the main intersection, to be able to travel at the same time. This is more efficient for traffic flow, but takes up more space.
 - INT—9: Diverging Diamond Intersection Pair (Nugget and Yandukin Intersection)
If coming from downtown to go to the airport, you’d come to a signal at Glacier Lemon to cross to the other side of the road. Now, when we make the left turn, it would act like a right turn, so the vehicle does not cross traffic.
 - Terri:** Is there a learning curve for drivers when switching over to the other side?
Causing an initial spike in crashes and confusion?
 - **Jeanne:** There is a learning curve, but once it’s learned, it’s designed to feel natural, and you don’t feel like you’re doing something you’re not supposed to.
 - Closure Alternatives (started at 10:20 a.m.)



- CLS—1: Southbound Left Closure at the Egan / Yandukin Intersection and Two-Way Frontage Road to Nugget
Extending Glacier Lemon Road all the way down to the Nugget intersection.
- CLS—2: Median Closure and Two-Way Frontage Road to Nugget from Egan / Yandukin Intersection
- CLS—3: Median Closure at Egan / Yandukin Intersection, Interchange at Nugget Intersection
- Interchange/Overpass Alternatives
 - OVP—1: Single Point Urban Interchange
Ramp traffic all meets at one signal under the bridge. This allows all movements at this intersection.
 - OVP—2: Diamond Interchange
Egan Drive traffic goes over the intersection with no stop. All alternatives allow non-motorized traffic under the bridge.
 - OVP—3: Split Diamond Interchange Pair (Nugget and Yandukin Intersections)

Alex: It would be helpful to see the land ownership in the areas where new ramps or roads are proposed.

Jeanne: The next round will include more information on these impacts.

Randy: What are the different tradeoffs that are represented by these alternatives? Traffic flow, pedestrians, etc. Will this be outlined somewhere?

Josie: We haven't talked about screening, but will get into that shortly. If this next section does not answer your question, let us know.

Josie: Are there any missing ideas? Any other comments on the alternatives presented?

Terri: I have no comments yet, since I'm not from Juneau and this is not ADEC's wheelhouse. But it looks like the group has looked at quite a few options, although some look a bit easier than others for a driver navigating.

8. Screening Criteria – Michael

- Michael described the screening process and the screening criteria developed based on the purpose and need.
 - Screening Process: 1. Describe Needs, 2. Develop Alternatives, 3. Screen Alternatives
 - Use a two-level screening system to analyze qualitative information.
 - Level 1 screening criteria are drafted for your comments:
 - Safety is the primary purpose for the project, so if one of the safety criteria is not met, the alternative will be screened out.

- Providing alternate driving routes and improving non-motorized access are also important project purposes.
- Other criteria that will be used for screening in Level 1 of the screening process are those related to economic growth, the environment, cost, and traffic operations.

- Discussion:

Terri: Are the environmental impacts assumed to occur just during construction? I'm thinking of storm water runoff; would this be one of the factors being considered?

Michael: No, this is long-term effects, the permanent impacts.

Christy: This is an impact that would be considered in the NEPA process and we would look at the impact during construction as well.

Jesse: Fish habitat would be an area to consider, but this might be something that would be addressed later. Some of these alternatives might need to move streams.

Sarah: There is some preliminary research that can be done regarding the ages of the built environment through tax records to get the number of historic age buildings in the area or GIS data of new structures going in.

Randy: Another item to be discussed could be technology and how each alternative would affect construction. Whether or not each alternative is within current technology, and what designing or constructing these alternatives would impact.

9. Next Steps – Jim

- Jim provided information on next steps.
 - After this workshop is complete and comments are submitted, the Project Team will compile input and send each participant and group member a summary.
 - Suggestions on the draft range of alternatives and Level 1 screening measures will be incorporated.
 - The Project Team will then screen each alternative with the Level 1 screening measures and draft the Level 2 screening measures. Both of those will be shared in the next Agency meeting.
 - September is a tentative date for the next Public Open House meeting.
 - Agency members are requested to provide comments on the range of alternatives and draft Level 1 screening criteria. Comments are most useful by July 10, 2020.

10. Comment Form – Josie

- Josie provided information on the comment form and what to expect after this workshop.
 - Everyone will receive a link to the workshop website in an email.

WORKSHOP SUMMARY DRAFT



- The website will have all information presented along with a comment form and a survey to provide feedback on how the virtual workshop went.
- Josie restated that comments would be most useful by July 10, 2020.
- She added that agency representatives can contact the Project Team using the contact information on the last page of the website.