

Sterling Highway MP 45-60
STAKEHOLDERS SOUNDING BOARD

Meeting #1 Summary

May 30, 2001

6:30pm – 9:30pm

Kenai Princess Conference Room

Cooper Landing

PARTICIPANTS

(See attached sign-in sheets)

AGENDA

- | | | |
|------------------|--|--------------------|
| 6:30 p.m. | Displays of Information | |
| 6:45 p.m. | Welcome | ADOT&PF |
| | Purpose of the Stakeholders Sounding Board | |
| | Introductions | Jamie |
| | ▪ Name/Organization | |
| | ▪ “At the end of this process I hope that...” | |
| | Purpose of this meeting | Jamie |
| | ▪ Issues Workshop | |
| | ▪ Opportunities and Constraints discussion | |
| | Sounding Board Meeting Guidelines | Jamie |
| 7:15 p.m. | Status Report | Mark |
| | ▪ Work-to-date | |
| | ▪ Alternatives-to-date, Visual Simulation Presentation | |
| 7:50 p.m. | Break | |
| 8:00 p.m. | Issues Workshop – Small Group Discussion | All |
| | ▪ Issues to address through this project | |
| | ▪ Constraints/opportunities associated with the alternatives-to-date | |
| | ▪ Additional options to investigate further | |
| 9:00 p.m. | Small Group Report Back | |
| 9:20 p.m. | Next Steps | |
| 9:30 p.m. | Close | |

DISPLAYS OF INFORMATION

The meeting began with an opportunity for participants to look through the maps and other displays of information in the room and talk with project staff.

WELCOME

Steve Horn, from the ADOT&PF welcomed the group and gave some background on the project. The ADOT&PF has been trying to resolve transportation problems in the corridor for many years without success. He talked about how the stakeholders process was a new approach for the ADOT&PF and how the ADOT&PF was hopeful that the issues to be resolved could be discussed, and that creative solutions to the problems would be the result.

INTRODUCTIONS

Jamie Damon, the facilitator, lead the group in introductions, asking each person to state their name, where they are from, any history with the project, and to answer the question “at the end of this process I hope that...” The following is a how participants answered the question.

At the end of this process I hope that...

- Seems positive
- Preserve wonderful trail opportunities in the area.
- A solution that works for locals and satisfies environmental concerns.
- New solutions-understandings between interest groups.
- Better informed.
- Why do we need to spend \$30-60 million to lay pavement?
- Want to understand why anything needs to be done. Want to be emotionally o.k. with the outcome.
- Maybe another alternative with lesser impacts. Don't open up new impacts.
- Who are the real decision-makers? Who decides at ADOT&PF?
- Better inform folks in Soldotna.
- Come to consensus on the road that goes through here.
- Balance transportation needs and community with all other competing needs.
- Juneau Creek and Kenai River remain as is.
- Pick the safest, most reasonable route for least tax dollars.
- Hope to see a good study of the 3R.
- Least amount of harm done to least amount of people, animals, environment, pocket book, follow the law.
- Safety should be the first thing considered.
- Better informed.
- Protect watershed-balance community/all interests.
- See all concerns previously forwarded letter addressed.
- Consensus can be reached!
- Hope that something can be settled!
- At the end of the process hope a new community doesn't spring up.
- Environments, community, river-all balanced.
- Will consensus be effective?
- Address safety issues, bike-pedestrian. Protect river.
- Want a safe highway.
- Juneau Creek Alternative.
- Community preference is government preference.
- Want alternative to match up with community values, ideals, and plans.
- Have as many people involved and informed about process.

- Better informed-make it safe.
- Protect the river-it's our community's biggest asset.
- Choose an alternative that best meets the objectives.
- Red's goals here...*see attached letter from Red Smith.*

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

Jamie then discussed the purpose of the meeting:

1. To conduct an Issues Workshop – an in depth look at the transportation problems that need to be addressed in the corridor.
2. Have a discussion about the Opportunities and Constraints present in the corridor and what does that mean to the range of alternatives that can be investigated?

SOUNDING BOARD MEETING GUIDELINES

Jamie discussed the Roles and Responsibilities and Meeting Guidelines with the group (see attached.) There were several comments from participants about the process:

- Concern about the process name-looks like a done deal. Possibly change the name to the “Draft Supplemental EIS (DSEIS)”.
- Adhere to ground rules!
- How do we finalize how we make recommendations?
- Follow the technical letter of the law!

STATUS REPORT AND VISUAL SIMULATION PRESENTATION

Mark Dalton, Project Team Manager from HDR Alaska, Inc., gave a brief update on what has been happening. The project team has been focusing on gathering data on the current conditions, traffic counts, mapping, and reviewing the range of alternatives from previous studies. Mark presented a “Visual Simulation of three alternatives under consideration. The purpose of the visual simulation is to see how the alternatives look when applied to the landscape. The simulations provided a 3-D graphic view of the alternatives to aid in further discussion. The alternatives discussed included:

- No Build – a no action alternative, leaving the highway in its current location.
- Juneau Creek – building a full bypass of Cooper Landing to the north.
- Cooper Creek- building a partial bypass of Cooper Landing to the south
- Kenai River – realigning the highway in its current location and building several new bridges over the river.

The group had the following comments/questions on the simulation organized by alternative:

Juneau Creek

- Avalanche danger-What is it? Where?
- What is the elevation at the falls?
- Any data gathered on snowfall/temperature?
- What is the difference from the top of the JCA to beginning?
- What is the maximum grade?
- Is the road crossing above the bridge (footbridge)?
- How wide is the bridge?
- What do the trucking interests think about this, are they involved?

- Any supports for bridge inside valley of creek?
- Concern that a PIO requires an act of congress.
- Need climate data!
- How do you determine where 100-year flood is? (Has happened for last 5 years!)
- What will lower crossings do for noise abatement?
- Why big curve at Resurrection Pass Trail?
- How much Canyon Creek Bridge cost? Span?
- How do consultants get chosen to work on the process?
- How many miles of wilderness (3/4 of a mile?)

Cooper Creek

- Why not cut lower than current bridge location?
- Would this route reconstruct the existing bridge?
- Concern about how to get off the top of the Southern route?
- How will Cooper Creek affect noise level in town? Will we be looking at road from Kenai Princess?
- Getting across highway at high speeds makes it difficult to cross.
- What if design speed was 65 mph? How will that be different in design?
- The options tie back into the existing alignment, how will pedestrians/bike parking be handled?

Kenai River

- Width of the bridge?
- Why design to 55 mph?
- Existing bridge removed?
- Does Juneau Creek include the cost to retrofit existing bridge?
- Why bridges across river below, at Kenai Princess?
- Are the bluffs something that can be dealt with today?
- How about going straight through to Cooper Creek?
- If you were to design this for less than 55-how would it be different?

ISSUES WORKSHOP/OPPORTUNITIES AND CONSTRAINTS DISCUSSION

The group decided to not break up into small groups, but to stay together and use the visual simulation as a tool to work through a discussion of the issues, opportunities and constraints in the corridor segment by segment.

From Quartz Creek-Kenai Lake

- Need data for fatalities-accidents-reasons for accidents.
- Access to Quartz Creek area.
- Blind driveways.
- Pulling away from pullouts.
- Impacts to residents.
- Avalanche issues.
- Bears/sheep habitat.
- Noise impact on both sides of lake.
- Steep slope at sunrise-curves.

- School bus stops.

From Kenai Lake-Kenai River Bridge

- The curve prior to the bridge is dangerous.
- Curves around school bus stops.
- Many driveways/accesses.
- School bus stops.
- Is a straighter road necessarily a safer road?
- Grade that comes down just before Kenai Lake Lodge-folks speed up there.

Kenai River Bridge-Cooper Creek

- If post office is moved there is a bottleneck at Snug Harbor Rd.
- Impacts to boat launch.
- Impacts to properties.
- Need a full corridor center turn lane.
- Proximity to Kenai River is a problem – potential spills.
- Poor soils around Fisherman’s Bend, parts of automobiles picked up there from numerous accidents!
- Access for local residents.
- Mix of tourist/local traffic-boats/trailers.
- Fisherman’s Bend, unofficial pull out—watch out for rafters.
- Question the 55-mph speed limit through town!
- 35 mph speed in town is not enforced/not abided by.
- Mist off of river at Fisherman’s Bend creates slippery conditions/icy.
- Building road to 55-65 creates safety net for those driving faster, designing for a lower speed may slow folks down.
- Economic impact to business. Economic study needs to be done.

From Cooper Creek- Sportsman’s Landing

- Gwin’s curve is a problem.
- Foot traffic between RR camp and Gwin’s.
- Foot traffic in Cooper Landing through town.
- Mile Post 54- common accident site.
- The road is again close to the river in this stretch.
- Narrow shoulders.
- Mud slides.
- Access to RR campground.
- Resurrection Trailhead curve on north side.

Sportsman-Skilak Lake Rd

- By Pruitt’s curve.
- The road is again close to the river in this stretch.
- Foot traffic/parking.
- Junction of new/old road-proximity to river-not getting trucks off.
- Road close to river at Skilak Lake.
- Black ice can get ugly near just before Skilak Lake Road. Before State Park pull out.

- Habitat corner.

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

- Several participants drew additional alternatives to consider on the maps provided.
- Possibly use the technique of visual simulation to overlay the data needs and the range of issues to give us a better picture of what we can work with in the corridor.
- Use a laser pointer to point at places.
- We need more information about how the decision-makers will use this input and who the decision makers are.
- Skepticism about ADOT&PF/Agencies using outcomes from this process.
- Are there other similar processes that ADOT&PF has used?

NEXT STEPS

- The next meeting of the Stakeholder Sounding Board will be in September in Cooper Landing.
- We will coordinate with SSB participants about the next meeting date at least 3 weeks in advance of the next meeting.
- We will be conducting another round of Listening Posts in August to hear from seasonal travelers.
- The next meeting of the Agency Consultation Committee will be in September.
- The web site address is www.sterlinghighway.net and will be on line very soon.

Sterling Highway MP 45-60

STAKEHOLDERS SOUNDING BOARD

Meeting #2 Summary

September 11, 2001

6:00 pm – 9:30 pm

Kenai Princess Conference Room

Cooper Landing

PARTICIPANTS

(See attached sign-in sheets)

AGENDA

6-7:00 p.m. Displays of Information

7:00 p.m. Welcome/Introductions

Meeting Guidelines

Purpose of this meeting

- Update on work completed including new data collected; discuss the range of alternatives identified-to-date, and begin the discussion of developing Evaluation Criteria.

7:15 p.m. Process Steps Update - Presentation

7:30 p.m. Introduction to Evaluation Criteria –Presentation/Discussion

- Begin discussing the development of evaluation criteria as a step in the process, including, how are the Purpose and Need statement and the highway standards/policies a part of the evaluation criteria?
- The ACC/SSB Role in developing Evaluation Criteria- begin discussion of other evaluation criteria to be developed and how.

8:00 p.m. Range of Alternatives Review - presentation

- Overview of alternatives-to-date
- Results of preliminary technical work as it relates to the alternatives

8:35 p.m. Range of Alternatives – Small group discussion

- In small groups, review the range of alternatives identified-to-date – are there any additions? Deletions? Other input regarding alternatives?
- Small group report back

9:25 p.m. Next Meeting/Agenda

9:30 p.m. Close

DISPLAYS OF INFORMATION

The meeting began with an opportunity for participants to look through the maps and other displays of information in the room and talk with project staff.

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

Jamie welcomed the group and explained that the purpose of the meeting has been modified slightly. Because of the East Coast attacks, several Sounding Board members could not make the meeting. The evaluation criteria discussion has been postponed until the October SSB meeting when full attendance is expected. The September meeting will focus on discussing the range of alternatives-to-date and the technical analysis completed.

PROCESS STEPS UPDATE - PRESENTATION

Listening Posts

The second series of Listening Posts were held August 21, 22, 23 in Anchorage, Soldotna, and Cooper Landing. The purpose of the meetings was to give seasonal residents and travelers an opportunity to find out more about the process and talk with project staff. Over 70 people attended the meetings. The majority of participants attended to pick up a newsletter, add their name to the mailing list, and otherwise get updated on the process. The meeting summary is available on the website.

Website

The project website is up and running. The technical memorandums, an updated map, and meeting summaries are available on the website. The address is www.sterlinghighway.net. Frequently Asked Questions and Public Comment documents are in the process of being developed and will be posted on the website prior to the October meeting.

RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES – REVIEW

Ed Lightwood from R&M Consultants discussed the range of alternatives identified-to-date using a wall size map to talk from. The description of these preliminary alternatives included locations, cost, design features (e.g., grades, major structural features, speeds). The SSB had the following questions/comments (*information in italics is the staff answers*):

- How far below is the lower JLA from the falls? *Over half a mile*
- What is the highest elevation of the Cooper Creek Alternative? *700 feet*
- Wall Alternative is designed to a 60-mph design speed. *Yes, that's the intent.*
- What was the design speed of the previous section? *60 mph*
- Comparison of grade with these alternatives and Hope – Seward Highway? *We will provide one.*
- Are we familiar enough with the topography to show how the alternatives may look on the oblique photo? *It was pointed out at the meeting.*
- What is the budget for this project? *\$18 million is currently identified in the State Transportation Improvement Plan.*
- What will the ultimate budget be? *We don't know yet, we don't have a preferred alternative.*
- Concern that the Walls Alternative is as expensive as the Juneau Creek, how is that? *The structure cost (for the wall itself) is considerable.*

- Do we have an accounting of how many private property impacts will there be? *Don't know yet.*
- Can't fathom why the road needs to be designed to a 60-mph speed! Would it cost less if designed to a lesser speed? *Cost would not be appreciably less if designed to a lesser speed, such as 50-mph.*
- Talk more about the "no build" – can the existing road be worked on to improve it without moving the road? What does the "do nothing" option really look like? *The no action alternative means there would be no improvements proposed under this project.*
- Will we be talking about the design speed so that it can be changed? Or is it an explanation? *We will provide the rationale for why it is 60 mph.*
- Will the issue of property ownership be a driving factor in which is selected? *It's one of the factors assessed in the NEPA process.*
- What is the existing highway designed to? *The existing road was actually not designed to any specific highway design standard.*
- Design speed vs. enforceability speed is what we need to distinguish between. *Comment noted.*
- Seems like the traffic in the alternatives is being funneled at a high speed to the bridge – how does internal community circulation mix with the through traffic? *This is an issue requiring further analysis.*
- Would like to see a "no build modified" – one step above no build – one step below Kenai River Alternative. Use some of the money allocated to the study to enforce the speed through town. *Comment noted.*
- What about building a four lane – 60 mph coming in / four lane – 60 mph going out of town but have a narrower stretch just in the middle of town? Perhaps if the section of highway that was narrower and at a lower speed was not very long, drivers would not get so frustrated and try to pass at unsafe locations.
- Any mitigation costs yet? *No, will become available later in the process.*

PRELIMINARY TECHNICAL ANALYSIS

Mark Dalton, (HDR) presented some of the information contained in the Affected Environment Technical Memorandum including noise. The Affected Environment document updates the 1994 EIS. There have been concerns expressed about the noise levels along the different alternatives. HDR collected baseline data to characterize ambient noise in the project area. Also, HDR hired Doug Fesler to map high-risk avalanche areas that might affect the alternatives. The SSB had the following questions/comments:

- Interested in more information regarding the kind of modeling ability available to assess the potential noise impact of the various alternatives. Does it allow for seasonal fluctuations? *Noise modeling can account for topography and other variables.*
- Concerned about the noise impact on the wild environment. *Comment noted.*
- Would noise walls be required behind residential properties? *The use of noise walls as mitigation for project impacts would be specifically determined once the alternatives are finalized.*
- The Juneau Creek Alternative (JCA) uses the hills as a natural noise wall – perhaps move the lower JCA option closer to the mountain to use the hills as “noise walls”. *Comment noted.*

Traffic

Don Galligan, HDR presented the traffic analysis completed-to-date which includes traffic counts, travel patterns, travel speed, mix of vehicles, and accident data. The SSB had the following questions/comments:

- Questions about why speeds were looked at at the areas selected. *We had a specific request to assess speed at this location.*
- Questions about why the day was chosen to survey – not necessarily representative of all days in the summer. *Day was chosen to be representative of summer peak traffic and through trips.*
- Would like more information about how the data collected reflect the “local circulation.” *31.8% of the trips entered area and did not travel through the corridor. This is considered local traffic.*
- Quartz Creek → Skilak – look at again for accident data. *Accident data contains all reported accidents from MP 45 to 60.*
- How does the accident data compare to other highways in the state? *DOT&PF accident analysis for 1991 (most recent year) in Southcentral Alaska shows an annual average accident rate of 2.0 accidents per million vehicles per mile.*
- State Trooper website shows driver cited for driving excessive speed in almost 100% of the accidents. *Accidents on slippery roads are presumed to be caused by drivers traveling too fast for the conditions.*
- The corner past Gwin’s was not shown as a high accident location - how can that be? *Most likely it is because the accidents involved a low level of damage and were not reported.*

- Will temperatures be looked at along the corridor? *Some idea of temperature affects will be considered in the sun shadow analysis. We had not planned on taking temperature measurements.*
- Need to look at weather-related issues. *Comment noted.*
- People's experience show dangerous curves (fatal crashes) at the following locations:
 - mile 54
 - mile 49.5*Fatal accidents were assessed to ensure that correctable roadway conditions did not contribute to the crash.*

NEXT STEPS

The next meeting of the SSB will be in late October – possibly sometime during the week of October 22nd, in Cooper Landing. The conference space at the Kenai Princess Lodge is not available so we will meet in the Community Center. The ACC is meeting on September 13 and we will set the next SSB meeting date to be the day before or the day after the ACC meeting. We will contact the SSB through email and send a follow up post card to inform the SSB of the next meeting date.

Sterling Highway MP 45-60
STAKEHOLDERS SOUNDING BOARD
Meeting #3 Summary
October 30, 2001
6:00pm – 9:30pm
Cooper Landing Community Center

PARTICIPANTS

(See attached sign-in sheets)

AGENDA

- 6pm – 7pm Displays of Information Available
7:00 p.m. Welcome/ Introductions
Meeting Guidelines
Purpose of this meeting
- Focus on new data collected; Purpose and Need; Evaluation Criteria
- 7:15 p.m. Range of Alternatives – recap from last meeting
7:30 p.m. Technical Analysis Update - new data collected
- Transportation –Level of Service
 - Highway standards/policies a part of the evaluation criteria
- 7:45 p.m. Introduction to Evaluation Criteria - Presentation/Discussion
8:15 p.m. Developing Community Evaluation Criteria – small groups
- Review, discuss, and amend sample criteria statements developed from community issues identified-to-date.
 - Additional criteria statements to consider?
 - Other concerns/ideas about developing and applying evaluation criteria?
- 8:50 p.m. Report back from small groups
9:20 p.m. Next steps – next meeting
9:00 p.m. Close

DISPLAYS OF INFORMATION

The meeting began with an opportunity for participants to look through the maps and other displays of information in the room and talk with project staff.

PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

Jamie Damon welcomed the group and after a round of introductions, explained the purpose of the meeting is to update the group on the range of alternatives and focus on the development of evaluation criteria.

RANGE OF ALTERNATIVES

Ed Lightwood walked the group through a wall size map outlining the range of alternatives-to-date. Ed highlighted information outlined in the “Technical Design Memorandum” dated 10/8/2001, which described all of the preliminary alternatives except the Russian River Alternative – which has been recently added. The SSB had the following additional comments and questions:

TECHNICAL ANALYSIS UPDATE

Transportation – level of service

Don Galligan presented information regarding transportation level of service and why it is an important consideration in developing alternatives (see attached power point slides.) The SSB had the following comments and questions:

- Why does the level of service on the bypass get a “C” if the level of service in town gets a “B/C”?
- How do you calculate how much traffic would use a “bypass” if the traveler is making a through trip versus going through town?
- Does it depend on the time of year who will go through town versus who will bypass?
- How much growth are you projecting? *4.5-7% annual growth – used a 3% growth.*
- How do you account for the mix of traffic?
- What would the LOS be on a through town alternative if it was designed to 50 mph?
- Where does safety fit into the equation?
- Compare with the improved Seward Highway get that area’s the accident data.
- Need to clarify what will be done on the existing alignment if a bypass is selected.
- Has there been a “study” of whether or not trucks will use a steep bypass?
- If trucks will not use the steeper bypass, then we have not solved the problem that happened yesterday.
- If the existing alignment was “cut off” and 10% of traffic used the bypass, what would the LOS be?
- If the existing road is so bad, why has it not been fixed?
- Are the costs of the Kenai Lake Bridge replacement (and others) included in the cost estimate?
- Public safety data shows improved highways at higher speeds have fewer accidents, but higher severity.
- Need to reflect the safety analysis in the information.
- How long for construction if preferred is selected next summer?

Highway Standards/Policies

Miriam Tanaka made a presentation about engineering design considerations that the ADOT&PF need to adhere to (see attached power point presentation slides.) The SSB had the following comments and questions:

- When will the range of alternatives end!
- How do you choose “design speed?”
- Are any of the alternatives designed to a 50 mph?
- We need to consider a lower design speed range.
- Why are we constrained to a national standard? Does the national standard take precedence over the state standards?
- Would like to consider how a scenic highway designation could fit this corridor.
- Need to take a bigger look at where the road should be from Anchorage to Homer.
- Could the existing highway be “designed” to a 50 mph design speed?
- There must be other highways in the nation that go through rural communities – we need to learn from them.

- Do we need to build it to these standards because of the federal funds?
- We should consider this “mountainous terrain.”
- There is flexibility – we do not know what a 50 mph design speed road would look like.
- What about environmental considerations when you build near the river, what do you do?

EVALUATION CRITERIA

Jamie discussed with the group the process for developing evaluation criteria and how it will be used. The evaluation criteria is to be used as a discussion tool to evaluate the range of alternatives in order to winnow the set of alternatives down to a smaller number that warrant a higher level of analysis. It is cost prohibitive to develop the current range of alternatives to a greater level of detail. The evaluation criteria and accompanying discussion will hopefully result in a smaller array of alternatives that everyone agrees are reasonable to pursue further. The evaluation criteria will be developed from the issues brought forward by the ACC, SSB, and public participants. Initially, there will be three sets of draft criteria that reflect the issues of importance to each group – the ACC, the SSB (including listening post input), and the ADOT&PF/FHWA. It is anticipated that there will be overlap and that the criteria will be merged into one set.

The large group broke up into eight small groups to discuss and formulate draft evaluation criteria. Each group had a “worksheet” with sample criteria listed as a starting point. Twelve worksheets were handed in with the following draft criteria statements (each worksheet has been transcribed exactly as written and are separated by a line):

1. Safety
 - Drivers of selected route
 - Locals
 - Speed
 - Pedestrians
2. Environment
 - River
 - During Construction
 - Spills
 - Fish
 - Eagles
 - Wildlife
 - Wetlands
3. Minimize impact on private property and businesses
 - Short term
 - Long term
4. Facilitate movement of traffic
 - Through traffic
 - Local traffic
5. Minimize impact on recreation facilities
6. Climate considerations – ice on roadway
7. Coordinate with local planning – access to developable land

After an alternative is chosen, spend enough to mitigate cons of selected route.

1. Minimize impact on wildlife habitat
 2. Minimize impact on backcountry trail aesthetics (incorporate local trail systems at appropriate times)
 3. Increase pedestrian/bike trails through town
 4. Retain highway scenic qualities (work with national scenic byway system)
 5. Minimize light pollution
 6. Coordinate subdivision development with borough land sales and 1996 Cooper Landing land use plan
 7. Follow Kenai area plan
-

1. Reduce accidents at high accident locations:
 - Bean Creek Road
 - Gwin's Curve
 - "S" Curves
 2. Reduce travel speed through town
 3. Increase pedestrian/bike safety through town
 4. Minimize impact to private properties
 5. Minimize impact to river recreation
 - Provide safer, higher speed road for through traffic.
 - Impact to Resurrection Pass Trail is overblown, cross it and get over it.
-

1. Safety – driver
 2. Environment – river wildlife
 3. Wildlife habitat
 4. Minimize impact on private property
 5. Movement of traffic
 6. Climate considerations
 7. Impact on local businesses
 8. Traffic movement (thru and local)
-

- Keep it "safe" as possible for all
 - Reduce accidents: Bean Creek Road, Gwin's Curve, "S" Curves, and others
 - Reduce travel speed through town
 - Minimize impact to river or eliminate
 - Need to upgrade existing roadbed while this process is going on!
-

- Reduce accidents: Bean Creek Road, Gwin's Curve, "S" Curves
- 50 mph zone along river

- Cost \$\$\$
 - Environmental impact
-

1. The primary problems are routing heavy, commercial truck traffic and private “through” traffic away from Kenai River as much as possible, and away from the residential part of Cooper Landing.
 2. In doing so, consideration must be taken of seasonal use by transient and local traffic and probably uniform use by heavy through commercial traffic.... fuel trucks, freight semi trailers, etc.
 3. The Juneau Creek Alternative and the wilderness variant, plus leaving the local highway through town, would answer these problems with the least private property disturbance and most economically. The wilderness variant would have through traffic re-entering the Sterling Highway below the dangerous Russian River area.
-

- Economics
 - Safety issues; reduce accidents at any location – 90% of accidents are due to driver error in this stretch
 - Need enforcement to maintain posted speed compliance and caution lights/signs
 - Reduce travel speed through town
 - At Pruitts MP 54, road is too close to river, needs to be raised
 - 100-year floodplain – design road to not be impacted with high water events
 - Design bridge at Cooper Landing to the west to minimize potential for truck accidents impacting the river
 - Protect 50’ Kenai Peninsula Borough river habitat setback
 - 35 mph & 45 mph speed limit through town with double fines
-

- Build the bypass for 65 mph
- Need enforcement of posted speeds
- Reduce accidents at high accident locations:
 - Bean Creek Road
 - Gwin’s Curve
 - “S” Curves
- Minimize impact to private properties
- Minimize impact to existing businesses
- Coordinate with current local planning
- Resolve local traffic circulation issues
- Access in/out of driveways
- Crossing traffic – left turns
- Increase pedestrian/bike safety through town
- Don’t create new weather-related driving hazards: sun shadow; elevation/ice
- Reduce travel speed through town
- Minimize impacts on area trails (hiking/skiing)
- Minimize impact to river recreation

- Resolve seasonal shoulder parking problems
- Minimize impact to wildlife and fisheries
- Minimize disruption to summer recreation traffic during construction
- Take into consideration the impact on private property including businesses
- Consider where new housing will be built and what's most desirable and build highway in less desirable area – away from the “sunny” side
- Avoid roadless areas and eligible wilderness
- Protect Resurrection Pass Trail
- Include pedestrian pathway on the existing road regardless of the alternative chosen; see pages 136 for existing plan
- Check the stats on accidents
- Consider noise pollution
- Design for future additional capacity – possibly beyond 2025
- Maintain integrity of the Kenai River watershed ecology
- Obtain survey of truckers association and how they intend to use the highway and the alternative that is developed
- Alternative shifted should meet criteria of brown bear study
- Maintain similar/same visibility that has been established for the section from the “Y” to Sunrise to reduce animal kills
- Address human waste problems at pull-offs and consider environmentally sensitive areas that collect waste even though there are no facilities
- Meet concerns of USFS & USFWS biologists
- Beware of current designs that impede fish migration
- Consider cost of maintenance

1. Quality of “small town” life maintained – avoid any noise, giving urban impression
2. Improvements to local traffic and pedestrian safety and flow
3. Provide roadside enhancement for public use Resurrection Trail, snow machines
4. Access for local residents and businesses
5. Increase involvement at local level for planning area of future land development

- Straighten out certain stretches of existing road (Gwin's) regardless of route selected
- Consider the long-range impact on community development if a bypass is selected. Look at potential for kind development.
- Minimize noise impact; take advantage of topography to muffle noise.
- Maintain 35 mph through town and straighten existing road will meet most criteria
- Affect on local businesses
- Consider view sheds
- Stay minimum 50 ft. from river with new construction
- Affect of a natural disaster on highway and community
- Minimize impacts on area trails (hiking/skiing)
- Minimize impact to river recreation or reduce impact of existing road in river
- Minimize impact to wildlife – particularly moose and bear
- Reduce accidents at high accident locations, regardless of route selection

NEXT STEPS

- Jamie is going to compile a list of issues and a 1st draft of the SSB evaluation criteria for distribution to the SSB in December and for posting on the website.
- **Next SSB Meeting January 16th in Cooper Landing (location to be determined.)**

Sterling Highway MP 45-60
STAKEHOLDERS SOUNDING BOARD
Meeting #4 Summary
January 16, 2002
6:00pm – 9:00pm
Cooper Landing Community Center

PARTICIPANTS

(See attached sign-in sheets)

AGENDA

- 6:00 -7:00p.m. Displays of Information Available
- 7:00 p.m. Welcome/ Introductions
Meeting Guidelines
- Review from last meeting
- Purpose of this meeting
- Focus on refining Evaluation Criteria.
- 7:10 p.m. Follow up on issues from last meeting
- Question for the Sounding Board about stakeholder representation – is it broad enough given the range of issues? How to broaden?
 - Recently passed resolutions of support for work on the existing highway. Can something happen sooner?
 - Outstanding questions about design speed.
- 7:45 p.m. Technical Information – Presentation
- 4(f) impacts – What is 4(f)? Why are these impacts important?
- 8:00 p.m. Refine Evaluation Criteria - Presentation/Discussion
- Evaluation Criteria draft #1 memo
 - Clarifications? Amendments?
 - Applying the criteria
- 8:15 p.m. Applying Criteria - small groups
- Using the matrix, work through the criteria statement “minimize impacts on recreation” as it relates to each alternative.
 - What are the impacts to recreation associated with each alternative?
Number/name of trails, are they high use? Low use? Ski/hike? Campgrounds impacted? River recreation? Other recreation impacts?
 - Are there modifications to each alternative that could help minimize/avoid impacts?
- 8:45 p.m. Report back from small groups
- 8:55 p.m. Next Steps – next meeting – early March 2002
- 9:00 p.m. Close

DISPLAYS OF INFORMATION

The meeting began with an opportunity for participants to look through the maps and other displays of information in the room and talk with project staff.

PURPOSE OF THIS MEETING

Jamie Damon welcomed the group and after a round of introductions, explained the purpose of the meeting is to follow up on issues raised at the last meeting and begin to refine and apply the evaluation criteria. Jamie reminded the group of the following meeting guidelines:

- Get up to date.
- Speak one at a time.
- Be respectful of different points of view.
- Stay focused on the agenda. Remember we are moving forward together.

OUTSTANDING ISSUES FROM LAST MEETING

In order to continue to move forward in the process, the project team is committed to tracking issues and questions that are raised at SSB meetings, and addressing them at the next meeting – if possible – or at least providing the group with a status report of what is happening with the issue. At the October 2001 SSB meeting several issues were raised that the group wanted more information or discussion about:

- How do we make sure that we have broad stakeholder representation when applying the evaluation criteria as we get closer to selecting a preferred alternative?
- What will happen to the existing road as a part of each of the “bypass” alternatives?
- What can be done on the road now to resolve safety concerns?
- Need more information/discussion about why the design speed needs to be 60mph.

The group then worked through each of these issues.

Stakeholder Representation

The SSB would like to see the list of SSB members – those stakeholder groups who are regularly notified of the meetings – posted on the website to ensure that we have not forgotten anyone. The group acknowledged the need for broad input and encouraged the project team to include surveys, using the web, and other ways to reach a larger audience.

Status of Existing Road

The project team acknowledged that this is an important consideration when thinking about the highway improvements as part of a transportation system and committed to being prepared to talk about this issue in more detail at the next SSB meeting.

Work on the Road Now

At the last meeting, Representative Lancaster discussed the possibility of writing a letter with some ideas for “quick fixes” on the highway to address safety concerns in light of the recent tanker accident. Rep. Lancaster did write a letter and the cities of Homer, Soldotna, and the Kenai Peninsula Borough passed resolutions of support for “something” to be done as soon as possible on the highway. The ADOT&PF, in response to the letter and resolutions of support, is pursuing placing yellow warning flags on the speed limit signs through town. The idea of lowering the speed limit further is more of an enforcement issue and SSB members agreed that

lowering the speed limit without enforcement won't resolve the problem. The ADOT&PF expressed concern about raising traffic fines through the area (similar to a construction zone) because it has the potential to desensitize drivers to the importance of driving slower in construction zone. The project team highlighted that it is not an easy task to simply "straighten a few curves" without assessing the environmental impacts – which is what this SDEIS process is doing. The SSB was asked if there are additional ideas for the project team to pursue to address the question of "do something now." There was much interest in the group of pursuing placing a "speed trailer" in town during peak travel times with accompanying spot enforcement to establish the section of highway through town as a "speed trap" in travelers minds and force them to slow down. Another idea was to triple the fines through town, rather than double.

Design Speed

The group then spent some time discussing the ongoing concern of "design speed." The ADOT&PF clarified that they understand that this is a concern to the community. However the Governor's policy is to improve the quality of life in Alaska by building the transportation backbone or infrastructure for the state Bringing the National Highway System up to national standards is a primary purpose of this project. This SDEIS process needs to answer the question of "is a 50 – 60 mph design speed highway feasible in this transportation corridor?" The project team emphasized that there is much more work to do to answer this question and that engineering feasibility is only part of the answer. The SSB had the following comments/questions:

- Different alternatives may need different speeds.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) representatives clarified that they will support the state's standards.
- If it is designed to 60 mph, but posted at a lower speed, people will drive the 60 mph and we will have an enforcement issue again.
- Mountainous terrain– vs. Rolling terrain– what flexibility do we have?
- To comply with NEPA – don't you need to look at an optional lower speed?
- Is there precedent for design exceptions?
- Why does the State need to adhere to the standards?
- It seems as though the upgrades to the Seward Highway have resulted in more rollovers – need justification for lower speeds.
- Would like ADOT&PF to consider potential lower speed.
- Design speed does affect all the alternatives – it has an impact on many of the issues and may affect the kinds of alternatives we can consider.
- Who/how do you decide what the posted speed is?
- Need to know what will happen to the existing highway as part of the alternatives.

TECHNICAL INFORMATION PRESENTATION – 4(F) IMPACTS

Laurie Mulcahy, ADOT&PF, discussed 4(f) impacts with the SSB and why the 4(f) issue is important to this process. Laurie explained that when an area is designated by an agency or native corporation as important because of habitat, recreation, cultural, or sensitive lands issues, DOT&PF is required to look at ways to avoid adverse impacts to such property. The SSB reviewed a map showing a patchwork quilt of potential 4(f) impacts throughout the area. The group had the following questions:

- Explain Kenai River Special Management Area (KRSMA) “blue dot” areas.
- FHWA representatives clarified that this is preliminary – more 4(f) areas may be identified and some may be pulled.
- The Juneau Falls area is part of a recreation withdrawal and is considered 4(f) – but the upper reaches of the other creeks are not designated 4(f).
- Do not lose sight of the Kenai Peninsula Borough selection on the map.
- FHWA clarified that we are required to evaluate alternatives that avoid 4(f).

EVALUATION CRITERIA

The SSB was notified by mail that the draft evaluation criteria was available on the website in mid December. Several SSB members took the time to review and provide comments on the criteria. Because of time constraints at this meeting, the group decided not to take group time to refine the criteria, but to send any additional comments to Jamie by February 8 at jdamon@jlainvolve.com. Jamie will assimilate the criteria and it will be posted on the website the week of February 18. The group reviewed the evaluation criteria process steps:

- Step 1 – Create (began at October 2001 meeting)
- Step 2 – Refine (all comments in by February 8, 2002 – post on web.)
- Step 3 – Apply (over a 4-6 weeks from late February through early April on the website)
- Step 4 – Summarize (preliminary results at the April SSB meeting)
- Step 5 – Results (mid Spring)

The group then worked in small groups to begin applying one of the criteria statements to all of the alternatives using a sample matrix. The purpose of the exercise was to work out the bugs and get feedback from the group about the best way to apply the criteria. The group used the following guidelines:

- Remember the criteria are not “weighted” at this time and still draft.
- The purpose of applying the criteria is to:
 - Match up issues with alternatives in an organized way.
 - Help identify data needs, additional analysis, and unresolved questions.
- Try the matrix – we will need to figure out a better way to work through the criteria and will most likely post on web for easier completing.
- When applying criteria, ask yourself, (your neighbors, your colleagues...):
 1. What do we all need to know/understand about?
 2. Suggested modifications, if any, to minimize/avoid impacts.
 3. Other “non-engineering” ideas to resolve, address criteria. We will call those “side bars.”

The group then worked in six small groups to talk through the matrix and criteria. Each group handed in their completed sample matrix and comments (see attached.)

NEXT STEPS

- Comments on draft criteria by February 8th.
- Check website week of February 18th for revised criteria and matrix.
- We will send out a postcard to the mailing list when criteria format is on the website.
- We will call and check in around the middle of March
- The next SSB meeting will be the second week in April – to be confirmed.

Sterling Highway MP 45-60
STAKEHOLDERS SOUNDING BOARD

Meeting #5 Summary

April 16, 2002

6:00pm - 9:00pm

Kenai Princess Lodge Conference Room

PARTICIPANTS

(See attached sign-in sheets)

AGENDA

- 6:00-7:00 p.m. Information Displays and Staff Available
- 7:00-9:00 p.m. Presentation and Discussion
- 7:00 p.m. Welcome/Introduction
 - Update since last meeting
 - Follow-up
- 7:30 p.m. Process check-in
 - How do we get to an array of reasonable alternatives?
- 8:00 p.m. Small group work
- 8:50 p.m. Next steps
- 9:00 p.m. Close

PURPOSE OF THE MEETING

The purpose of the meeting was to begin the discussion of how to focus the array of alternative~ for further analysis.

MEETING GUIDELINES

- Get up to speed from prior meetings before asking questions.
- Keep comments focused.
- Share the airtime.
- Listen respectfully to other points of view.

UPDATE SINCE LAST MEETING

Recent clearing work along the highway

- There had been concerns expressed by some community members about the recent clearing along the highway. Rex Young from the DOT&PF explained that the district maintenance supervisor worked closely with the State Troopers and the Forest Service to determine how wide to clear along the highway. The clearing was prompted by the State Troopers in response to concerns about doing something on the highway quickly to increase safety. Opening up the "clear zone" will give drivers more sight distance and enable them to respond quicker to animals in the road, cars crossing the center line, or other hazards.

Agency/Stakeholder meetings

- The project team met with agencies and stakeholders in small groups or one-on one during January and February. The purpose of the meetings was to work through issues specific to the different groups and update agencies and stakeholder groups who have missed several meetings or who we have not heard from. The project team met with the following agencies and stakeholder groups:
 - √ US Forest Service
 - √ Kenai Peninsula Borough Planning
 - √ Kenai Peninsula Borough Mayor
 - √ Corps of Engineers
 - √ Environmental Protection Agency
 - √ Department of Natural Resources, Parks and Recreation
 - √ Department of Fish and Game
 - √ Salamatof Native Corporation
 - √ CIRI

We also talked by phone with the Alaska Trucking Association, Teamsters and State Troopers.

Evaluation Criteria

- We developed the merged set of evaluation criteria from the ACC and Stakeholder Sounding Board (SSB) drafts and additional input received from agencies and stakeholders. The final version of the evaluation criteria is available on the project website.

Web Survey

- We developed and posted a web survey to gather input on the evaluation criteria and the range of alternatives. Over 230 people participated. Results of the survey are posted on the website. The survey was advertised through a postcard mailing to over 2500 people, through email distribution lists, and through press releases to the local papers.

Detailed Description of Alternatives

- A detailed description of each alternative was developed including engineering description, cost, associated issues to address, and how the alternative works with the existing highway. These descriptions labeled "fact sheets" are available on the website.

FOLLOW UP ON ISSUES FROM LAST MEETING

Spill Risk Analysis

- DOT&PF is considering a spill risk analysis, as requested by several of the agencies and the Cooper Landing Fish and Game Advisory Committee. HDR Alaska, Inc. is working with the DOT &PF to determine the scope of the analysis. The spill risk analysis will not determine removal of an alternative, but will provide a greater level of detail about the risk.

PROCESS CHECK-IN

The group then reviewed the schedule, the work accomplished to date and the work yet to do.

Overview of Schedule and Work-to-date

TIME FRAME	STEP	TASK COMPLETED
Fall 2000	Project initiation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Agency/Stakeholder Interviews ▪ Develop Scope
Winter/Spring 2001	Scoping, identify issues	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Listening Posts I (Anchorage, Soldotna, Cooper Landing) ▪ ACC Meeting #1 (March) ▪ Refine Scope
Summer/fall 2001	Develop range of alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ SSB Meeting #1 (May) ▪ ACC Meeting #2 (May) ▪ Listening Posts II (Anchorage, Soldotna, Cooper Landing) ▪ SSB Meeting #2 (September) ▪ ACC Meeting #3 (September)
Fall/winter 2001/2002	Refine preliminary technical analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Affected Environment Technical Memorandum ▪ Traffic Analysis ▪ ACC Meeting #4 (October) ▪ SSB Meeting #3 (October) ▪ Evaluation Criteria ▪ SSB Meeting #4 (January) ▪ Agency/Stakeholder meetings (January/February)
Spring/summer 2002	Focused array of alternatives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Web survey (March/April) ▪ ACC Meeting #5 (April) ▪ SSB Meeting #5 (April)
<i>Work completed to</i>	<i>this point</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ ACC Meeting #6 (June) ▪ SSB Meeting #6 (June)
Summer/fall 2002	Engineering analysis/technical work	
Fall 2002	Develop Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement	
Winter 2002/2003	Review/Refine Draft	
Summer 2003	Final SEIS Draft Permits	

As outlined in the table above, we are currently at the process step of focusing the array of nine alternatives down to a smaller range of alternatives for further analysis. This focused array of alternatives will include the "no build."

How Do We Get to an "Array of Reasonable Alternatives?"

The SSB reviewed the evaluation criteria and the issue maps from the affected environment technical memorandum (available on the website) to see how the issues overlaid onto the map of alternatives. The SSB then worked in small groups to discuss the outstanding issues, information needs, possibilities for improvements to each of the alternatives within the three corridor groupings; North side; River/Through Town; and Southside.

Before breaking into small groups, the SSB had the following comments (responses are shown in italics):

- When will we talk to property owners to mitigate issues? *Not until we have a preferred alternative and are working through designing the alternative - at best in a few years.*
- What is the decision making process? *Through this work, the DOT&PF selects a preferred alternative to forward in the SDEIS. The FHWA will make the decision after the draft is reviewed.*
- How many alternatives will be carried forward into the draft? *Less than nine! We haven't set a specific number, probably 3-5 including the "no build."*
- Will there be a vote? *No, the stakeholders influence the decision but it is the agency's decision to make.*
- What about the "limited" versus "controlled" access issue? *Limited access and controlled access mean the same thing in the world of road designing. We have heard that some agencies and stakeholders would like to see no access on a bypass alternative and we continue to look at a bypass with limited/controlled access.*
- When will we be able to address different alternatives at different design speeds? *Design speed is just one of many factors that influence the design of the road. All of the alternatives are designed to a 60 mph design speed. The concerns that have been expressed about design speed are that a wider, straighter road, designed to 60 mph will encourage faster traffic, create too wide of a road through a constrained area, and will encourage faster speeds.*

The problems on the existing road have to do with curves, sight distances, multiple access points, and seasonal congestion. Gwin's curve, for example, which has been cited many times as one of the primary trouble spots on the existing road, is approximately a 40 mph curve. If this curve is "straightened out a little" as participants have suggested, then the resulting design speed of the curve will be higher. The speed limit could very well remain 35 mph as is currently posted but that doesn't change the design speed. Design speed is an aspect of designing the road. A road can be designed to a 60 mph design speed and have a speed limit of less than that.

This process is to work through the range of alternatives to figure out, given all of the constraints - environmental, geologic, social, etc. - if there is a way to have a road with fewer conflicts between vehicles, people, animals, and the environment that can

accommodate the projected increased traffic, safely and efficiently either along the existing alignment, partially along the existing alignment, on a new alignment, or not at all.

- Is 60 mph design speed contingent on federal funding? *No.*
- When will the cost be factored in? *When we have a smaller array of alternatives then we can develop a more detailed cost analysis and factor that in.*
- We need to know what the maintenance costs will be! *In the detailed alternative fact sheets on the web.*
- Does the controlled access issue affect the existing highway? *Yes. If an alternative is chosen that runs along the existing highway, access controls will need to be put in place (such as combining driveways, installing frontage roads, providing for fewer access points to a single property, etc.) ·Legal standards of Section 4(f) properties - what does this mean?*
- When were 4(f) properties identified? Were any selected after this process began?
- Take issue with bear habitat being everywhere - need a greater level of detail about seasonality.
 - Seasonal movement
 - Den's
 - Anadromous streams - most critical.
- Need more detail about brown bears! *The project team is working closely with ADF&G and others responsible for the Kenai Peninsula Brown Bear Strategy to develop appropriate information for use in the evaluation of alternatives.*
- Habitat fragmentation is important also.
- Follow-up on email list - have those who commented by email been added to the distribution list?

SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION WORKSHEET

The group broke into ten small groups and worked with each other to answer the following questions. The groups used the outcomes from the recent web survey as a starting point.

Compare the survey criteria priorities with your own-discuss with each other what this means to the alternative. Write down any conclusions here.

Survey priorities - out of 225 responses:

- 1. Minimize impact to water quality and fish (148)*
- 2. Minimize impact to the Kenai River (147)*
- 3. Improve driver and pedestrian safety (137)*
- 4. Efficient movement of traffic (108 tied with #5)*
- 5. Minimize impact to wildlife habitat (108 tied with #4)*
- 6. Maintain the scenic quality of the corridor (104)*

- Lower speed design needs to be addressed in the alternatives.
- All alternatives but the wall variant have too little access and would not be acceptable. Destroy the existing road dependent businesses.

- My one input to this is that the Resurrection Trail is an ANILCA Conservation Unit and this must be considered as part of the "Litmus" test for dropping nonviable alternatives this affects all alternatives on the northside of the Kenai River.
- I have a business at mile 52, would like to see the highway go on one of the northside alternatives.
- Fault Tree or Fault risk analysis of alternatives would be useful to hear-what will cause an alternative to not succeed.
- No place in present Right of Way (roadbed) that would work. Keep away from river.
- Bears more important than people?
- I do not consider "higher safe travel speeds for through-traffic" to be important. I live in Homer and find this stretch to be one of the most glorious stretches on the way to/from Anchorage why should we encourage faster speeds? Cooper Landing is a great Alaskan community with wonderful businesses. I would like those who travel through to experience it.
- All the criteria are important and should be considered. Something will always suffer and sacrifices will have to be made. We should all just try to keep the criteria in mind as much as possible.
- I would like to see watershed issues, water quality, wildlife habitat, fish habitat, etc., treated as a whole. Each one is connected to the other.
- Safety is my first priority. Traffic will only go faster with an improved road through town. Impact on the river and tributaries is next.
- Still not enough information. What did truckers and troopers say? Why choose before all info is in. Some issues can be completely met by not building road. Some criteria cannot be 100% mitigated like completely protecting river. Can't do no matter where road is.
- Keep cost down. Do not take traffic to far from town.
- This valley is important. We need to limit the spread of impact to the present corridor if at all possible. Design and speed (25-35 mph). Enforcement can do much to improve safety and reduce risk to the river.

*Can any of the alternatives be modified to make them more acceptable/address issues?
Review the survey results to help your discussion.*

Southside alternatives

- Yes-Fix existing road-have it be part of the overall plan.
- No
- No-Too much access unacceptable ·
- Yes-Move Cooper Creek Bridge closer to Creek mouth (reduce impact and cost) ·
- No-Shady in winter, too expensive ·
- Pursue further discussion the interrelationship between the upcoming FERC Rell...
and Cooker Creek Alternative and campground relocation options.
- No
- No-Not really

- No
- Yes-Cooper Creek, lower grade desired.
- No-Russian River unacceptable, too many river crossings
- No-Can't do these without new bridges. New bridges affect water quality of covered waterways and allow potential oil and hazardous spills from increased vehicle traffic.
- Yes-Take the Russian River off the table.
- No-Russian River, too many trails and habitat impacted. Could be possible if the bridge/intersection is moved more northward, away from the trails and campground ·
- Yes-Cooper Creek or Russian River alternative ·
- No
- No/Yes-With strong reservations I could see using the Cooper Creek bench to move the road around town. The Russian River alternative is totally unacceptable. Speed enforcement is still necessary to reduce risk to the river.
- No

Through Town/River Alternatives

- Yes-Wall-Spill response, speed/control/enforcement ·
- Yes-Walls route with "context sensitive highway design" for lower speed limit with maximum possible site distances. Landscape design could mitigate some of the visual impacts if money is spent. This highway design should take into account far more than the simple flow of traffic! Aesthetics and speed control should play into the mix as more than lip service!
- No-Wall variant only acceptable. 4 bridges was dead in 1982. Just need level and straighten original with wall variant.
- Yes-Design wall variant to lower speed rated suitable to mountainous not rolling hill type terrain ·
- No-Would be a danger to the river and fish ·
- Least land disruption are alternatives around existing routes. Actual effects need to be better-estimated and social economics developed.
- No ·
- No ·
- No ·
- No-Kenai River, too many bridges.
- Yes-Wall variant, spill impact assessment ·
- No-There is limited area through the town in which to deviate the direction of these alternatives and would affect private property. Traffic will increase over time and is increasing, therefore through-town alternatives will be a waste as far as addressing future traffic impact needs ·
- Yes-No build and wall alternatives. They should include a plan for slow speed enforcement ·
- Yes-No build is not an alternative. Kenai River alternative has too many bridges and should be deleted.
- Yes-The Wall Variant Alternative would definitely be # 1 preferred if even more would be done for spill prevention. This could include decreasing posted speeds,

more patrol cars, wider shoulders without impacting existing riparian buffers (widening away from Kenai), etc. People can slow down and make the road through town safer without the impact of new construction.

- Yes-More information needed, private property affected ·
- No
- Yes-Cooper Creek
- Yes-Work with enforcement agencies to control speeds, which will control chances of spills/accidents. Design can mitigate safety concerns within the village.
- No

Northside Alternatives

- Yes-Commit a plan to fix the existing road. Have it be part of the overall plan.
- No-The 2 Juneau Creek Alternatives should be dropped because they do not consider the impacts to an ANILCA Conservation Unit-The Resurrection Pass Trail-A national recreation trail, so designated long prior to passage of ANILCA.
- No-Went through this in 1978-1982 and all agencies were against except AKDNR and AKDOT and KP. All who would benefit.
- No-Project goals can be achieved with southside alternatives to eliminate huge environmental impacts inherent in all northside alternatives.
- Yes-Juneau Creek Alternative, F variants · ANILCA required process need to be displayed with discussion of barriers and what choice would be implemented if process fails.
- Yes-out of 5 at table, Wilderness 4, Northside 1 · Keep Greenbelt · Yes-Wilderness variant
- Yes-Extend Forest Variant to Skilak so Kenai River Valley is completely isolated from new highway bypass. Maybe "Senator for Life" Ted Stevens could get you more money and the necessary right-of-way approval.
- No-too many concerns about habitat fragmentation, loss of wilderness ·
- No-Both the JC Forest Variant and the wilderness variant allow for access to potential Borough land, which is good. Both variants remove the major impact of highway traffic (the greatest portion) near the Kenai River more removed than the other variants. Both will give access to Resurrection Upper Pass Trail and Juneau Falls to people who couldn't otherwise access those areas. These variants use less bridge and only call for small span bridges. These alternatives are less expensive than those calling for new bridges.
- All versions of Juneau Creek alternatives-I feel this alternative impacts habitat too greatly. It fragments habitat for bears, sheep, and other species. I don't think it can be modified in any way to be an alternative I would support.
- G Alternatives can go off the table. If you're going on that side go all the way. No new Kenai River bridges.
- No-They are all too extreme in their habitat destruction, both from the road building and the opening up of the area for development and recreation.
- No
- The two Juneau Creek/Juneau Falls alternatives should be removed from further consideration to meet the legal requirements of ANILCA, specifically the impact

on a conservation system unit. The ANILCA process should be used as a criteria for alternative selection/non-selection of a reasonable array of alternatives.

- No
- No
- No-Check out ANILCA. It can knock out all northside alternatives because of Resurrection Pass Trail
- Yes-Crossing (tunnel or bridge) for Resurrection Trail, protect Juneau Falls, Private water supplies-provide protection or new well

What more information do you need to forward an alternative for further consideration or remove an alternative from further consideration?

- Travel time study between the east and west point alternatives as opposed to the wall variant.
- Comply with the 4(f)s
- Do a current traffic study count
- Socioeconomic evaluation of effects of alternatives on local business and residents, short term and long term. Opportunities for related actions such as FERC relis... at Cooper Creek, which will happen within the life of the proposed project schedule.
- Spill risks toxic materials going through CL?
- Specific habitat impact JCA compared to JCA "F" variant as a mitigator or other specific mitigator that could be used to determine which is the better alternative.
- I feel all alternatives should be removed except the Juneau Creek alternatives.
- Is it appropriate for a facilitator to express her opinion?
- Effects on brown bear habitat, habitat fragmentation issues ·
- Annual cost of maintenance on alternative in addition to present road. I believe cost opinions.
- Environmental Impact Study · I need to know what enforcement agencies are willing to do to control speeds and thereby contribute to protection of the river.

NEXT STEPS

The next Stakeholders Sounding Board meeting is scheduled for June 10, 2002 from 6pm - 9pm at the Kenai Princess Lodge in Cooper Landing. The project team will also have a booth at the Kenai River Festival in Soldotna on June 8th and 9th.

The meeting adjourned at 9:00pm.