

APPENDIX P

Agency Workgroup Meeting #3 Summary

This page is intentionally left blank.

MEETING SUMMARY



Prepared by:	Taylor Horne, HDR
Project:	Egan Drive and Yandukin Intersection PEL – SFHWY00079
Meeting Subject:	Agency Meeting #3
Meeting Date/ Time:	Thursday, August 20, 2020 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
Location:	WebEx

List of Attendees:	PROJECT TEAM	AGENCY MEMBERS
	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 Alex Pierce, City and Borough of Juneau Benjamin Soiseth, USACE Delana Wilks, USACE Matthew Brody, USACE Randy Vigil, USACE

Project Documents:

Agenda Items

1. Workshop Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Items
2. Agenda Review – Jim
3. Project Timeline – Jim
4. HSIP Update – Jim
5. Purpose & Need – Jim
6. Level 1 Screening Criteria and Results – Michael/Jeanne

Lee: I’ll have to look at the data further and I’ll provide some comments later on, but I don’t see any problems from my perspective, or have any additional comments.

Alex: I agree with Lee, I will need to spend a little more time with the data before I can really provide comments.

7. Alternatives – Jeanne

HSIP Interim Action

Randy: The title of this alternative has interim in it, does this deal with the situation now at the intersection with the understanding that in the future it would have to be dealt with it again? What is the level of permanency in dealing with the conditions at the intersection and how the alternatives address that?

Jeanne: This is called interim because we are in a hurry to get it down. The title hasn't been changed since the other elements have been added to meet all of the needs. This could be a forever solution, but will be better answered once the results of the Level 2 Screening are available and will be able to look at the quantitative results (amount of ROW, amount of delay), but the current data is a qualitative (delay or no delay).

Jim: These are all long term alternatives. Once this moves through the HSIP nomination to address the safety needs, the other add-ons are included to address all other needs for this intersection improvement to create a long term solution.

Alex: I like the additional pedestrian accommodation, especially with the potential for increased pedestrian use in the area with new development.

Full Signalized Intersection

Alex: How does the peak hour delay piece rank compared to other criteria and metrics?

Jeanne: Level 1 Screening did not rank one criteria above the other. Each criteria could either plus one (green), minus one (red), or stay the same (no fill color). Peak hour delay is only 1/14th of the score.

Diamond Interchange

Randy: If this was to be used, it would involve USACE permitting. What is the weighting of each valued criteria? What are the other important criteria as compared to others? Would some have more weight than others?

Michael: Baseline metrics in first evaluations will receive a higher weight than the others as they are the primary goals. The weighting of each criteria might come up in the second level of screening. Baseline purpose and need will have a higher weighting over others.

MEETING SUMMARY

Alex: As this project moves forward I'd like to understand more how the other considerations are being weighed as they are all different and might not be a one to one consideration. CBJ would weigh level of service higher than economic impact.

Michael: These criteria are looking at travel time, not level of service as a metric so that we are understanding how these integrated alternatives will affect people's travel times on all modes. We are still open to conversation.

8. Level 2 Screening Criteria – Taylor

Alex: This might be an offline conversation but Alex would like to discuss transit and transit impacts. Given the increased development in the area of transit reliant service programs like the Glory Hole Campus, but will also include other social services. Transit might need to be considered as a larger impact than it typically would. This is a conversation to have offline.

Josie: We will take the action to follow up with you after the meeting.

9. Next Steps – Jim

10. Comment Form & Work Shop Survey – Josie

Lee: Thank you for the work that has gone into this presentation.

Randy: No questions. Thank for the opportunity to attend the meeting and ask questions.

Alex: All questions and comments were asked, thank you for the meeting, it was really great and engaging.

Joanne: Great job, great presentation.

11. Project Contact – Jim

This page is intentionally left blank.