

## **APPENDIX S**

---

### **Agency Workgroup 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:	Agency Meeting #4
Meeting Date/ Time:	Wednesday, January 6, 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>Joseph Galgano, DOT&amp;PF</b> Sam Dapcevich, DOT&PF <b>Greg Weinert, 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>	Barbara Trost, ADEC Bill O’Connell, ADEC <b>Adeyemi Alimi, ADEC</b> Terri Lomax, ADEC <b>Jesse Lindgren, ADF&amp;G</b> Kate Kanouse, ADF&G Judith Bittner, DNR <b>Sarah Meitl, DNR</b> <b>Lee Cole, DNR</b> Chris Carpeneti, DNR Irene Gallion, City and Borough of Juneau <b>Alex Pierce, City and Borough of Juneau</b> Benjamin Soiseth, USACE Delana Wilks, USACE Matthew Brody, USACE <b>Randy Vigil, USACE</b> Dawn Collinsworth, USFS <b>Don MacDougall, USFS</b>

Project Documents:

## Agenda Items

1. Workshop Welcome, Roll Call, Housekeeping Items
2. Agenda Review – Jim
3. Project Timeline – Jim
4. HSIP Update – David
5. Virtual Open House #2 Results – Jim
6. Purpose & Need – Jim
7. Screening – Michael

**Jesse:** What is the orange on the new access road?

**Michael:** They are calculated cut and fill limits. Please remember that this is preliminary.

# MEETING SUMMARY



**Alex:** Can you describe the difference between pedestrian access from the airport side to Fred Meyer in the partial versus the full?

**Michael:** If you are coming from the airport side, you would walk using the available sidewalks that are there today. You would come along the roadway and the new connection would allow a crossover to the beginning of the ramp or trail, stay on a path, and then come up and over.

**Alex:** The main reason I ask is because we have a lot of development in that area especially the relocation of the Glory Hall and the Social Services campus over there. So, I was just understanding the pedestrian impacts, thank you.

**Michael:** The difference is rather than up and over you would have to walk along the road or a trail, because that sweeping connection by Egan would be repurposed. We think that we would put a little trail in there somewhere, then you would cross Egan. In our metrics the overpass was a little further out of the way, but you're not crossing Egan. This did better than the intersections without the pedestrian crossover. Would a pedestrian crossover feel functional to you? Or do you think people will, rather than going up and over, just run across Egan?

**Alex:** I think that, especially if we're talking about the Social Services campus, people will probably use a pedestrian crossover. They may hang out on it and possibly discourage other pedestrians, but I don't think that they would run across Egan.

**Michael:** We would try to discourage pedestrians from crossing Egan with fencing or other measures to make it difficult. Remember we are still in preliminary design and having conversations about how to maintain and keep it functional through the wintertime. Any comments or concerns or likes about the Lemon spur extension to Nugget?

**Jesse:** I think it serves a good need. The only thing for habitat related is before you get to the access turn, where you make the swoop to go into Nugget, right along the road there is a fish stream. It crosses along under Egan and in the ditch towards the airport. It's not something that would stop construction by any means, we'd probably prefer to add the culvert under Egan and block fish there so they can't access the ponds on the other side that the road would go through. Something to consider and talk about mitigation.

**Jim:** I would like to follow up on Alex's question on the differences in the access. One of the questions we have with the pedestrian crossover that we are also discussing is would you

# MEETING SUMMARY



use it? I should say, versus what? The “the versus what” would be that you don’t do the pedestrian crossing over Egan and that path continues down to the intersection, and there would be a traditional pedestrian crossing, which could be arranged as well. The drawback on that is that it is a little less safe than totally being isolated from crossing Egan. It is a little less safe, but they are both safe alternatives. The other impact would be if you are a driver, and there is a lot of foot traffic there, you are going to be delayed more. Question for agency folks—what are your thoughts on that?

**Michael:** This shows we have both. They would not go hand in hand. What are each of your thoughts about traveling by foot would you prefer to come up this ramp wait for a signal and then you could cross until the middle then wait to cross again OR same kind of start you could come across on this path and then come up and over here.

**Alex:** I prefer the crossover.

**Jesse:** Overpass is preferred.

**Dawn:** When it comes to the signalized crossings towards Fred Meyer, south of the wetlands, that is something I have not thought about or engaged with much. I am not sure what, if any, comments the Forest Service has submitted. Being with the Forest Service I am more interested in the use of National Forest System lands to have this access route in the north and just making sure if that is something that is going to go forward that we have plenty of time to work through the governmental process to get easement access or authorization to use that land. The one thing I would take into consideration is does elevation accommodate cyclists.

**Michael:** It would, the design would be ADA compliant.

**Don:** Overpass.

**Lee:** My interest is that whatever you select, that we can get the easements that you need, on behalf of DNR. My personal preference is to have the overpass.

**Randal:** From my agency’s prospective, the pedestrian overpass doesn’t appear to affect any aquatic resources, so we would be happy about that. From a public interest factor and safety, we would agree that an overpass is safer than a signalized intersection. From a personal perspective, I would use it.

**Dawn:** Will there be federal highway dollars involved, or will this be state funded?

# MEETING SUMMARY

**Marie:** We don't have funding for the project right now, the PEL is a separate entity. All the above is an option, but we do anticipate federal funding on this project.

**Dawn:** Okay, if there is Federal Highways funding involved then typically Federal Highways will be the lead agency on a NEPA document and the Forest Service can just consult and not have to do separate NEPA for that. That's going to be part of our process, figuring out who the lead federal agency will be and then consult on terms and conditions and any potential mitigation during a NEPA process. Whether federal dollars are involvement makes a difference on whether Federal Highways issues an easement on behalf of the United States or the Forest Service does it directly.

**Randy:** There needs to be a determination on who the lead federal agency will be for the NEPA process. Where is the forest boundary that would be affected?

**Taylor:** Sort of that narrow area, at the curve, which is represented in orange. It pinches down in that area there, and those are private property parcels that you can see a dirt area where the existing road ends.

**Alex:** From a CBJ perspective, I think our permitting process will be similar for all of the alternatives, and definitely shorter than the Forest Service or Corps permitting, but we'd want to be aware and involved with where DOT is in those processes so we can be sure to align our permitting process with those.

**Jesse:** Fish and Game's fish habitat permit is similar to this when dealing with the access road. It would be more related to when construction is about to start, and it would be a pretty short process to get a permit

**Taylor:** Randy, I heard you ask about whether there are aquatic resources in the area. The answer is yes. Part of the PEL process is doing an EA analysis-lite, looking for effected resources. Each of the alternatives that were analyzed under level two had wetlands impacts; specifically, what we are seeing by using the National Wetlands Catalogue is this section will have 3.4 acres of potential wetlands impacts. All this information will go into a summary report and be available for comment and that is where we will summarize the impacts for the alternatives. Also, I wanted to thank Fish and Game for your support on this project in surveying the corridor several times. We have essentially laid your updated fish stream information over these DIS layers and those calculated impacts will be included in that draft report.

**Randy:** Jesse what is the pathway for fish to get in and out of the area?

# MEETING SUMMARY



**Jesse:** It is a very complicated one. There is a culvert that goes under Egan, near the red roofed building, and they go from Jordan Creek and run along the ditch between Egan and Old Dairy Road. All along the new access road near the hillside is wetland with fish in it.

8. Project Next Steps, PEL Study Report Overview – Jim
9. STIP Process Overview – Marie
10. Project Next Steps – Jim
11. Project Contact – Jim

*This page is intentionally left blank.*