

APPENDIX Q

Community Focus Group 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:	Community Focus Group Meeting #3
Meeting Date/ Time:	Friday, August 21, 2020 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
Location:	WebEx

List of Attendees:	PROJECT TEAM	CFG MEMBERS
	Jim Brown, DOT&PF Joanne Schmidt, DOT&PF Ben Storey, DOT&PF Marie Heidemann, DOT&PF Julius Adolfsson, DOT&PF Verne Skagerberg, DOT&PF David Epstein, DOT&PF Christy Gentemann, DOT&PF Ryan Bare, DOT&PF Emily Haynes, DOT&PF Doug Kolwaite, DOT&PF Jill Taylor, DOT&PF Joseph Galgano, DOT&PF Sam Dapcevich, DOT&PF Bilal Al-Bayati, DOT&PF Taylor Horne, HDR Gina McAfee, HDR Chase Quinn, HDR Aurah Landau, HDR Josie Wilson, HDR Jeanne Bowie, Kinney Engineering Michael Horntvedt, Parametrix	Scott Gray, DOT&PF Sgt. Nick Zito, Alaska State Troopers Trp. Christopher Umbs, Alaska State Troopers Roscoe Bicknell IV, Bicknell, Inc. Richard Peterson, Central Council of Tlingit and Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska William Ware, Central Council Royal Hill, Central Council John Hawkins, Central Council Michelle Hale, City and Borough of Juneau Richard Etheridge, City and Borough of Juneau Ed Foster, City and Borough of Juneau Hal Kulm, City and Borough of Juneau (Capital Transit) Denise Guizio, Captial Transit Alex Pierce, City and Borough of Juneau Irene Gallion, City and Borough of Juneau Patty Wahto, City and Borough of Juneau David Campbell, City and Borough of Juneau Lt. Scott Erickson, City and Borough of Juneau Mike Stoll, Fred Meyer Charlie Williams, Chamber of Commerce Mike Satre, Chamber of Commerce Mike Rose, Juneau Christian Center Rob Welton, Juneau Freewheelers Mike Lesmann Cathy Schlingheyde Representative Andrea Story Jerry Godkin, Juneau Airport Senator Jesse Kiehl Jessica Eller

Bold: in attendance

Project Documents: [Website Link](#)

Agenda Items

1. Workshop Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Items
2. Agenda Review – Jim

MEETING SUMMARY

3. Project Timeline – Jim

Rep. Story: Remind me what HSIP stands for?

Marie H: Highway Safety Improvement Program

4. HSIP Update – Jim

5. Purpose & Need – Jim

No questions.

6. Level 1 Screening Criteria and Results – Michael/Jeanne

Sen. Kiehl: I appreciate the work on crash severity and focus on providing an alternative route when there is a crash.

Irene: Under primary concerns on Level 1 screening criteria: what kind of data do we have available in regards to pedestrians and vehicles?

Michael: We will use data available throughout the state. Right now we're looking at crash modification factors to better understand how each alternative will rate for safety. Quantitative evaluations will be in Level 2 Screening.

Rob Welter: How will the team quantify bike and pedestrian conflicts based on the national experiences with similar treatment?

Michael: This will be more on the numbers side in Level 2 Screening. The number of points and level of detail will be provided in Level 2 Screening.

Rob: Crash modification factors are data that the state maintains, but doesn't usually track bike/ped and is usually vehicle related. What tools are out there for bike/ped type things?

Jeanne: Anytime anyone in the nation does a study that looks at before and after situation for safety improvements is included in a CMF warehouse. Ped and Bike are included in some of those.

Denise: Pedestrians don't always use the overpass. There is a bus barn by the brotherhood bridge and there are still a lot of pedestrians crossing the at-grade high speed traffic, even though there is an underpass. The signage is confusing for people.

Michelle: the signage is difficult to figure out where you are going to end up at this location, so maybe signage could be improved to allow for better use.

Sen. Kiehl: Insight is great for pedestrian behavior. Sunny Point interchange moved the crosswalk 100 yards away and people would not walk 100 yards there and 100 yards back, they instead crossed illegally.

Sen. Kiehl: What's the wetland permit criterion about if not cost?

Michael: The permitting is about process and risk. There is a higher level of impacts to the system.

Taylor: Green for wetlands is: no impact, white: mid-level permit, red: high impact. Since no ranked white, Level 1 shows whether there is impact or not. Level 2 will look at quantifying the impact.

Irene: How was the scoring different between OVP-2, ELE-5 and OVP-3? They seem to have the same color scheme. Answered, thanks.

Sen. Kiehl: Can you help us understand the "business visibility" criterion? Some things that close the median at E-Y score badly on that, others don't. Some interchanges score badly on it, others don't.

Michael: Business visibility is set to be "can people see the businesses they want to go to?" Overpasses would block their views.

Jeanne: Closure 3 includes an interchange at the intersection. If there is an interchange, it impacts the view; if an alternative didn't include an interchange, it did not impact view.

7. Alternatives – Jeanne

HSIP Interim Action

Denise: With Alternative driving route would there be missing service from Sunny Point to Yandukin?

Jeanne: No, this allows you to cross the road if needed during a crash, putting two directions of traffic on one side of the road. So the access would really depend on where the crash occurs.

Sen. Kiehl: If the road is still designed to be safe at 60 (wide lanes, wide medians, wide shoulders, lights..., will 45 signs change driver behavior? That seems a little dubious. How do you evaluate criteria like crash frequency/severity/bike-ped safety when people keep driving 60+ in the winter?

Jeanne: We are doing the best we can since we can't change the road for 3 months of the year. There could be an education campaign that helps people realize why the speed is reduced. A sign when you get there will also be included.

Jim: This isn't just speed drop signs, there will be changeable message signs with the messaging systems to alert people as they come in towards the speed drop.

Rep. Story: Seems like good recommendations for improvements. We usually are driving slower in the winter because of darkness and winter conditions.

Partial Access Signalized Intersection

Rep. Story: Hard to imagine crossing here and makes me anxious.

Jeanne: It is a big road to cross, there are people crossing at Nugget intersection, but it is a big road.

Full Access Signalized Intersection

Patty: No questions, but something she always looks at is what will cut into the airport property as this will be a very long process.

Jim: I was just sitting here thinking about the added signals, and absolutely right that is a lot of pavement. We can definitely look at narrowing the pavement width in those areas, there may be some options with shoulder width and different things.

Denise: is there no speed reductions with option 2 and 3?

Jeanne: correct, not inherently. We would not be looking at the effects of the speed reduction.

Sen. Kiehl: Just a pure logistical issue: Who would put out the cones for crossovers when there's an accident? DOT? JPD? Where would they store 450 yards-worth of cones and how long do they take to deploy?

Jeanne: This is something to look at in Level 2.

David: Maintenance is well schooled in traffic control, but that detail is yet to be worked out. To clarify with alternatives and ROW requirements, what you see here is not design level, just concept level. What comes out of the design level could be less impact than what is showing here.

Michelle: The cones remind me of Kauai! Thank you David for preparing the HSIP Nomination for Juneau. They put cones out twice a day for traffic control in Kauai.

Rep. Story: Busy time for traffic back up? With so much traffic flowing through there, they will all stop, but have there been studies on how much traffic would be going through there?

Jeanne: While the busy time of day has more cars, coordinating the signals would occur to help reduce the amount of stopping. These are the things that would be looking at in Level 2.

Comment: It's important to mention that the federal highway approval of the traffic signal would not degrade the status of Egan/Yandukin.

Rep. Story: I just wanted to share a little bit more on my comment about having a traffic light there because there's so much traffic flowing through there. When we stop I understand that yes, it'll be coordinated. But have there been any traffic count or studies done to prevent back-up?

David: Traffic counts in Juneau are done on a regular basis, so we know how much traffic is going through there. Kinney has done some preliminary study on this.

Jeanne: There is a study previously done that talks about the delay. When you add the full access, the plan is to take a look at what can help improve this. Reducing the width for pedestrians (less time exposed to traffic, and less time allotted to pedestrian movement and reduce the delay). When this is looked at more closely it will be better to compare with the other alternatives.

Josie: After Jeanne goes through the alternatives, Taylor will present the proposed level 2 screening criteria to be able to describe and rank one of the metrics.

Two Signalized T-Intersections

Sen. Kiehl: Wait times and stop times for people using two lights. Will people hit both of them if they don't time it correctly?

Jeanne: hopefully we can coordinate these lights so if you get stopped at one, you won't be stopped at the other. There is also a geometric option to look at.

David: If this ends up being selected as a final alternative, there is a coordinated signal network in the valley that can be used to that you wouldn't stop at any of them, there is continuing updates for this program to increase effectiveness and efficiency.

Patty: Coordinating with other things that come up: the second crossing – how is impact for where that ends up? What impacts does that have if they are coordinated together?

David: The second crossing is also subject to a PEL study. There would be a lot of opportunity to bring up questions such as this one. These will be taken into consideration.

MEETING SUMMARY

Michael: We are pretty close to finding a preferred alternative by the time DOT would start evaluating alternatives for the second crossing and the preferred alternative for this project will likely be a baseline assumption for the second crossing project, and that is where the coordination happens.

Marie: I will be the PM for second crossing. The timeline for these two projects are very distinct from each other. We haven't started the second crossing so wouldn't be able to coordinate with that project. We wouldn't want to delay this project and this project will become the baseline of the other project.

Rep. Story: This alternative seems like it would contribute to the time delay problem. It also seems like you'd have more stop and go and seems like you'd have more cars idling contributing to air pollution and maybe some frustration.

Jeanne: This will be addressed in Taylor's section about Level 2 Screening.

Diamond Interchange

Question: Would the ramps still be compatible with bikes? How would this be ADA compatible?

Jeanne: We don't have this nailed down yet, and are unsure if this level of detail that would be included in Level 2 Screening. This might be a design issue to be resolved later.

Michael: We will need to make sure that there is ADA accessibility and that all active transportation modes will be able to use this system. This will be considered when we start figuring out the more detailed design.

Denise: Is the Glacier Lemon Road frontage road planned from the beginning or as a possible alternative?

Jeanne: We will look at that frontage road included in the alternative. We might show what would happen if we used cross overs instead.

Rep. Story: Since Fred Meyer is a common destination, getting into the right hand turn lane with traffic flowing to downtown, in a shorter area, what are the thoughts about that?

Jeanne: The impacts to access of the Fred Meyer would be looked with all alternatives and recommendations made on how to adjust this for access to Fred Meyer as we go forward to level 2.

MEETING SUMMARY

Denise: Keep in mind the Capital Transit access to the Fred Meyer. If they can't make the left hand turn on Glacier Lemon road, they will have to back track to Sunny Point. Access to Fred Meyer in the case of a crash would be important.

8. Level 2 Screening Criteria – Taylor

Rep. Story: Equity considerations, that are so important to consider, is a metric that we do not have. If you are dependent on transit for work, getting basic supplies, some are more favorable to those citizens, with their time and ease for elders, families traveling with small children.

Comment: Transit route time is a metric that you could say is part of the equity measurement.

Sen. Kiehl: Level 1's unweighted scoring was disappointing. (e.g.: Options that needed some ROW and options that needed *vast* amounts of ROW both got the same -1. Visibility was weighted the same as life & death issues.) So some of the better alternatives are now off the table. In level 2, how do you plan to weigh alternatives within a category, and how do you plan to weigh categories against each other?

Taylor: we are still in the process of this as we are talking to you today. Level 1 was weighing the safety measures higher than others but were able to tweak designs and add elements to turn other categories green, so it did come down to other considerations. Safety is still the number 1 priority and would carry a higher weighting but we're still in the process of working out what are the important ones and how do they weigh among the others.

Sen. Kiehl: Not sure if he agrees with what was done with level 1. Moving to Level 2 it's important to look at the achievability of some safety goals and to weight them accordingly. Rep. Story included that impact on transit isn't important to equity issues, but is important to economic issues; for example, this would be above business visibility. I don't think direction travel is a business killer. It's important not to duplicate a cost consideration but if one is a little bit negative on one option and way negative on another option, that should be ranked.

Taylor: To speak to last point, we do propose to suss out those alternatives to compare to one another to see where the range is for each of these metrics to create buckets to see if there are groupings that are higher or lower and we will compare them to one another.

Irene: Can Other Metrics - Cost include some rough-order-of-magnitude costs for maintenance? (Maybe over life of project? Not sure if that is meaningful). It seems DOT is inclined away from

MEETING SUMMARY

signals, so it would be good to know the cost impacts of signals. Also, for alternatives that add lane miles, the increased maintenance costs for that. I think M&O can give you a per-lane-mile average cost. I like the plan for bike and ped analysis.

Taylor: We are going to have a much more detailed rough order of magnitude with a rough estimate of cost to have an actual number at the end of this that can also be included as a deciding factor to the outcome. We can show how each metric ranks and the cost, including M&O and ongoing costs.

Rep. Story: And part of any ranking can add an equity metric that also can be a weight in deciding factors.

Taylor: Do you have thoughts on which go into that? Like how hard it is to walk in between destinations?

Rep. Story: Yes, I will be thinking about other equity measures. Part of this can be making sure that we hear from citizens riding the bus, be accessible at Capital Transit bus stops with the plans.

Irene: These maps are very cool, thanks for that.

9. Next Steps – Jim

10. Comment Form & Work Shop Survey – Josie

Rob: The Interim has the pedestrian overpass, can that also be bike friendly? Just wanted to make sure.

Michael: Everything would need to accommodate bike and pedestrian.

Michelle: Thanks, this is a lot to digest, and I appreciate the great job.

Rep. Story: Not suggesting getting info from people at the bus stop, but it is important to engage folks that would be using the bus but would not necessarily attend public meetings. Folks that do ride the bus will have views that we haven't considered.

Josie: Josie clarified that Rep. Story's question is, "How do we engage folks that may have social equity but wouldn't necessarily attend public meeting?" Josie stated the project team will contact her for a follow up.

Sen. Kiehl: Thank the team for all the work going into this. It's very complex, lots of variables, lots of things to look at, some very creative solutions. I'm glad this is moving forward. I will plan to submit more comments online.

Nick: Thank you for all of the information. Very informative! Nice job

Rep. Story: Yes, thank you everyone. I am so glad we will have improvements coming.

11. Project Contact – Jim