

# **APPENDIX T**

---

## **Community Focus Group Meeting #4 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 #4
Meeting Date/ Time:	Thursday, January 7, 2021 9:00 am – 12:00 pm
Location:	WebEx

List of Attendees:	PROJECT TEAM	AGENCY MEMBERS
	<b>Jim Brown, DOT&amp;PF</b> <b>Joanne Schmidt, DOT&amp;PF</b> Ben Storey, DOT&PF <b>Marie Heidemann, DOT&amp;PF</b> Verne Skagerberg, DOT&PF <b>David Epstein, DOT&amp;PF</b> <b>Christy Gentemann, DOT&amp;PF</b> Ryan Bare, DOT&PF <b>Emily Haynes, DOT&amp;PF</b> Jill Taylor, DOT&PF <b>Doug Coalway, DOT&amp;PF</b> <b>Joseph Galgano, DOT&amp;PF</b> <b>Sam Dapceovich, DOT&amp;PF</b> <b>Taylor Horne, HDR</b> <b>Gina McAfee, HDR</b> <b>Nikki Wray, HDR</b> <b>Alice Rademacher, HDR</b> <b>Jeanne Bowie, Kinney Engineering</b> <b>Michael Horntvedt, Parametrix</b>	Sgt. Nick Zito, Alaska State Troopers Trp. Christopher Umbs, AST David Womer, Bicknell Inc Richard Peterson, CCTHITA William Ware, CCTHITA <b>Royal Hill, CCTHITA</b> John Hawkins, CCTHITA <b>Michelle Hale, City and Borough of Juneau</b> Richard Etheridge, City and Borough of Juneau Ed Foster, City and Borough of Juneau <b>Hal Kulm, City and Borough of Juneau</b> <b>Denise Guizio, City and Borough of Juneau</b> Alex Pierce, City and Borough of Juneau <b>Irene Gallion, City and Borough of Juneau</b> <b>Patty Wahto, City and Borough of Juneau</b> David Campbell, City and Borough of Juneau Lt. Scott Erikson, City and Borough of Juneau Mike Stoll, Fred Meyer <b>Charlie Williams, Juneau Chamber of Commerce</b> Mike Satre, Juneau Chamber of Commerce Mike Rose, Juneau Christian Center Rob Welton, Juneau Freewheelers <b>Rep. Andi Storey</b> <b>Sen. Kiehl</b>

Bold: in attendance

Project Documents:

## Agenda Items

1. Workshop Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Items
2. Agenda Review – Jim
3. Project Timeline – Jim
4. HSIP Update – David

# MEETING SUMMARY



**Rep. Story:** That's great news!

5. Virtual Open House #2 Results – Jim
6. Purpose & Need – Jim
7. Screening – Michael

**Irene:** On Alternative 4 did you look at moving the road access to Egan down to the East T and away from the FM curve? (Basically, closing the access at FM and moving the intersection south of the Church.)

**Michael:** We did not look at relocating this full connection to this area. In our evaluation we didn't identify this curve as an issue and so that full relocation of the E-Y intersection and additional impact to Right of Way down below, it was not considered as another option. We were trying to maintain this connection and focus on the issues that we had identified. Again, the curve was not one of those identified issues.

**Sen Kiehl:** We were once looking at the connection to McNugget separately from the interchange options. How did we decide to combine the two?

**Michael:** When we looked at this alternative we had defined that we would include the connection here and determined we just needed to include it into one of the alternatives. We could talk about how it could be compatible with any of the others. When we did the evaluation, all the alternatives were evaluated with this connection, as well as with the median crossovers. We want to include this as an element for all alternatives. When we ran the analysis we drew the line here, and decided to evaluate it this way, get some answers, and talk about ways that you can mix and match the best elements of each of the alternatives to get the right sized solution for the area.

**Patty:** A quick question on the Full and Diamond alternatives. Instead of taking the huge swath through airport property, why can't these options simply continue Yandukin to a stop sign? Left to the exchange or light, or straight to the onramp. This would be similar to the Walmart area with stop signs at the base.

**Michael:** In this case we would still need to push this out, maybe a little bit flatter but not much. On the full intersection the idea would be to push this out, and then have a stop sign for a left turn. It would put a stop sign right adjacent to a signalized intersection, and it is just far too close for safe connections there. Even if there was a stop sign connection, it would still need to be brought out to get the appropriate separation between the signalized intersection and the

# MEETING SUMMARY

next controlled intersection. That is usually about 300 feet between a limited access facility and the next connection.

**Kitt:** How do these proposed alternatives affect the property being developed adjacent to Temsco?

**Irene:** Can you clarify how the overall score relates to numbers below? I thought it was an average of the scores but it seems that is not the case. I might have missed it.

**Michael:** There is a safety factor of two; so, where you see a six, there was originally a score of three. There is a factor of two put on to each column prior to us applying the next step, which was the overall percentage weighting. In the upper box, it is  $.31 \times 6$ ,  $.27 \times 2$ ,  $.15 \times 1$ , etc. The scores were weighted and factored.

**Robert:** Will the bike ped overpass have a ramp, or stairs?

**Michael:** It will be a ramp. You can see that the trail would be a darker color about this location you'd want to start increasing elevation on a ramp until you reach the crossover area. Then you would come back down onto a realigned trail that provides a safer area for pedestrians.

**Irene:** So we'd have the trail and crosswalks?

**Michael:** No. If there is this crossover the goal would be to lay this out and start to separate this path from the north and then disincentive crossing Egan with something like fencing. The benefit for not providing the crossing is two-fold. Firstly, we know the at-grade crossing is not unsafe, but it is less safe than the elevated crossing. Also, a pedestrian crossing time can extend the delays for traffic.

**Patty:** Airport has concerns with the 'Full Intersection' and 'Diamond Interchange' alternatives regarding Airport property. The 'Full' and 'Diamond' alternatives depict a large swath of land required to make the 4-way traffic work. To do this, a fairly large piece of the Airport's NE Development would be taken away. The NE Development is slated in the Airport's Sustainability Master Plan for development of hangars/facilities on the large aircraft parking apron. The more important piece of this is federal process required for release of airport land. FAA (HQ) drives the train on property release from an airport. This is a long and expensive process even, to acquire a ROW, and may not be approved in the long run. For these reasons, the Airport would not support the 'Full' and 'Diamond' alternatives, but the Airport would support the 'Partial Intersection (with

# MEETING SUMMARY

Spur Extension)' which does not appear to require airport property for development and still achieves the primary goal of safety.

**Sen. Kiehl:** As soon as there is a business in the new development toward Sunny Point that people want to reach, fencing will not divert them.

**Michael:** Am I correct to understand that the thought is down here people would still run across? Even if this is constructed this way there would still be an ability to include this crossing in the future, if that is still seen as an issue. What other improvements could be made to this crossing to help facilitate connectivity?

**Sen. Kiehl:** Is there a difference in total project time? (Or in any of the big elements: ROW, environmental, construction?)

**Michael:** Any impact on private ROW is going to take more time since you need to negotiate with property owners and consider that any alternative that requires federal property...whether conclusion would be in state favor or not, we're not sure. The availability of the funding plays a role in when work can begin.

**Irene:** Did costs include operational analysis?

**Michael:** The costs that we're including here are only capital costs to get through design and construction. Operations and maintenance are not included.

**Michelle:** Regarding the pedestrian crossing: Does this design draw upon studies, etc. of pedestrian behavior? Could there be a component where we analyze who the pedestrians are and what their behavior might be?

**Michael:** It was looking as if there are pedestrians that need to use the area how much time would it take for them to go from this location to the other. This is the safety risk due to number of crossings maneuvers.

**Michelle:** Thanks, and you are talking about fencing as an impediment to crossing across the highway? I think this question came up. Would bicycles be able to use the ped overpass?

**Michael:** Absolutely. The overpass would be designed as an ADA accessible ramp and have an adequate width to utilized by both cyclists and pedestrians at the same time.

# MEETING SUMMARY



**Sen Kiehl:** What was the public response to the notion of signaling this intersection?

**Michael:** We got a mix. Some said do, while others said don't, or make a roundabout. Some said close it. We heard a lot of the same level of responses in the first open house. We heard clearly to do what we could to minimize delay. In this case, by having the overpass, traffic on Egan wouldn't be delayed as long.

**Charlie:** Was a tunnel crossing for pedestrian/bicycles considered (instead of an overpass)?

**Michael:** We talked about it, and the challenge with a tunnel is that if we tried to tunnel underneath then pedestrians would be in the water table and you would need permanent pump stations running.

**Rep. Storey:** How much of the funding will be federal?

**Joanne:** I will first state that this is not my primary focus. However, typically for most of our projects the funding is 9.03%

**Robert:** Did the team look to having the overpass finish on the "south side", closer to the new construction area to the east?

**Michael:** We haven't laid anything out. We need to understand how much of a need there would be and at this level it's looking at a 500 distance.

**Kitt:** Would utilities, if any, need to be relocated (power poles, sewer lines, sewer lift station)?

**Jeanne:** There are in the area where the road comes close to Egan Drive. There are some overhead power poles that we would need to look at and avoid or move. Those are included in the utility cost. Also, there is a sewer lift station that would need to be tweaked. Moving forward they would be looked at in more detail.

**Irene:** At our last meeting there was some discussion on how to measure equity. Has that been looked at as part of this, or is it a future analysis?

**Michael:** Equity was not an individual metric. We maintained the Level 2 screening matrix as we showed you earlier.

# MEETING SUMMARY



**Michelle:** The reason I bring up users using the overpass is the failure of other pedestrian crossings that we have seen. Senator Kiehl brought this up at a previous meeting.

**Rep Storey:** Yes, access is such a part of an equity measure and getting comments on the plan, make sure that we try and go out and get comments from agencies and other citizens.

**Rep Storey:** What agencies did you talk with?

**Jim:** Forest Service, Corps of Engineers

**Rep Storey:** I was thinking REACH, AWARE. Other public service agencies would have perspectives of the citizens that they serve.

**Michelle:** I think a lot of the public will like this Nugget component.

**Michael:** If it was you, what would you prefer for crossing?

**Capital Transit:** I don't think the old pedestrian bridge at Mendenhall Loop Road was used before there was a streetlight, so I am doubtful that this one will be used at this location.

**Irene:** I think people will tolerate a lot of inconvenience to avoid the effort to go up a slight incline.

**Sen Kiehl:** We learned after the Sunny Pt. exchange was built pedestrians walk the shorter perceived path. Pedestrians do not go out-of-direction or up and down slope if they can avoid it.

**Irene:** The thing that would make that work is if crossing Egan is super inconvenient and the overpass is faster.

**Michelle:** I'm thinking of slushy sidewalks and I would not want to walk along that path when it was icy and slushy.

**Robert:** Have you thought about that?

**Michael:** In the screening we focused on people traveling from where there is more business-related crossing. Either coming or using this crossing.

**Irene:** I agree with Michelle, especially with a stroller.

**Michelle:** If we think of users at the new-ish hotel, the overpass would likely work. People coming from the Nugget Mall, it would work.

**Capital Transit:** If this overpass is metal, it may be slippery.



# MEETING SUMMARY



**Michelle:** I do like that the overpass in that it is a ramp and not stairs. People really don't like stairs.

**Irene:** Overpass excellent for bikes.

**Rep. Storey:** It certainly is an opportunity for airport area residents, businesses, such as Extended Stay/Aspen hotel to advertise walking access to more shopping or bike trail access

**Michelle:** My big concern about the overpass is that people won't use it. There must be research out there. If there is additional business development in the Bicknell area, there is no way people accessing that would use the overpass.

**Michael:** As drawn in this layout, what we want to do is be able to talk about possible disincentives; it's easy to want to run across the road. We want to go back and make sure we make that at grade crossing unappealing.

**Michelle:** I spent about a year and a half without a car so am really coming from the perspective of taking the bus and walking. It would really be good if we could get insight from people similarly situated.

**Sen. Kiehl:** What are the odds any of these ranked high enough in the STIP to get funding? How big an impact does price tag have on this project ranking high enough?

**Joanne:** That's a tough question. The STIP is constrained. If we had one project and it ate up our funds that would be a tough sell.

**Rep. Storey:** Meaning does our DOT region put forth the project?

**Joanne:** DOT does nominate internally. The projects are evaluated statewide and each region will advance theirs.

8. Project Next Steps, PEL Study Report Overview – Jim

9. STIP Process Overview – Marie

10. Project Next Steps – Jim

**Rep. Storey:** Thanks project team! Good detail and responsiveness.

11. Project Contact – Jim

*This page is intentionally left blank.*