

Appendix E

Public Involvement 2006-2007

AGENCY SCOPING MEETING INVITEES

Local Government

John Smith, P.E., Project Manager
Julie Makela, P.E., project Administrator
Steve Shrader, P.E., Technical Support Supervisor
Mike Krueger, Geotechnical Services Supervisor
Tom Knox, P.L.S., Municipal Surveyor
Lori Schanche, Non-Motorized Transportation Coordinator
Scott Wheaton, Watershed Scientist
Bob Kniefel, P.E., Municipal Traffic Engineer
Phil Saunders, Facilities & Maintenance
Dan Southard, Street Maintenance Superintendent
Shawn Dooley, Street Maintenance
Jack Frost, ROW Supervisor
Cathy Hammond, Planning Supervisor
Sharon Ferguson, Planning Department
Dave Zaloudeck, Horticulture Division
Monique Anderson, Parks & Recreation Superintendent
Steve Kalmes, ASD Transportation
Alton Staff, Public Transportation Operations Supervisor
John Kiewik, AFD Deputy Chief of Technical Services
Nancy Reeder, APD Traffic Commander

Agencies

Dave Post (Anchorage Area Planner), ADOT&PF
Greg Drzweicki, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation
ADOT&PF Street Maintenance (Note: this road is maintained in the summer by MOA and in the winter by ADOT&PF)

Utilities

Mike Tullius, CEA Engineering
Greg Schmid, ACS Engineering
Joseph Whittaker, GCI Engineering
Drew Smith, ENSTAR Engineering
Don Keefer, AWWU
Dan Roth, On-Site Water & Wastewater Program
Bill Kositz, Alaska Fiber Star

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Municipality of Anchorage
Internal Agency Meeting
May 10, 2006

Agenda

Purpose of Today's Meeting

- Understand Municipality of Anchorage and Alaska Department of Transportation goals for the project
- Understand what each department would like to see included in these projects
- Determine what is and is not open for negotiation with the public

Introduction – John Smith/Julie Makela

Project Overview – Todd Jacobson

Discussion of Project Components/By Department – Anne Brooks

1. What should be included in the scope of this project to advance your agency's mission? (i.e., transit stop improvements, stimulate economic development, etc.)
2. Is this negotiable?
3. What support can you lend to the project team to assist in public understanding of your need (#1) above?

Project Coordination -- All

Support Needed



Municipality of Anchorage
Project Management & Engineering Department



**DIMOND BOULEVARD UPGRADE:
Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road**

April 19, 2006

Project Objective

The Project Management & Engineering Department is currently managing the Dimond Boulevard Upgrade project. The objective of this project is to upgrade approximately 5,300 feet of Dimond Boulevard between Jodhpur Road and Sand Lake Road to MOA urban collector standards. Improvements will include roadway foundation and surfacing, curb and gutter, storm drainage, street lighting, pedestrian facilities and landscaping.

Existing Condition

The existing roadway is generally contained within a 100' right-of-way and consists of two 12' wide lanes with 2' wide gravel shoulders. Built on rolling terrain, several crest vertical curves appear deficient in terms of sight distance. No pedestrian facilities exist within the corridor. Drainage along the corridor is provided by shallow roadside swales along the majority of the alignment. No storm drain or public water and sanitary sewer systems exist along the project corridor. Overhead telephone and electric lines exist throughout the project and support mounted street lights at intermittent locations on the south side of Dimond Boulevard

Agency Scoping Meeting

The project team is soliciting comments and information on the proposed upgrades to Dimond Boulevard from Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road. You are invited to an agency scoping meeting on Tuesday, May 9, 2006 in the MOA Permit Center Training Room (4700 Bragaw Street) from 2:30 p.m. to 3:30 p.m. Should you have any questions on the proposed project, please feel free to contact us by phone or e-mail. We look forward to seeing you on Tuesday, May 9, 2005.

Project Contacts

Julie Makela, P.E.

Project Management & Engineering
Project Administrator, 343-7598
makelaja@muni.org

John Smith, P.E.

Project Management & Engineering
Project Manager, 343-8422
smithjw@muni.org

Todd Jacobson, P.E.

R&M Consultants
Project Design Engineer, 522-1707
tjacobson@rmconsult.com

Anne Brooks, P.E.

Brooks & Associates
Public Involvement Coord., 272-1877
annebrooks@ak.net



Meeting Notes

SUBJECT: W. Dimond Boulevard Upgrade
(Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road)

PROJECT NO.: 05-005

GROUP: MOA Inter-Agency/Departments

DATE: May 10, 2006

TIME: 2:30 pm

LOCATION: MOA Development Service Department
Training Room

MEETING OUTREACH: E-mail invitation to MOA Departments

MEETING ATTENDANCE: Lori Schanche, MOA Non-motorized Transportation Coordinator
Marty Elkins, Supervisor, ASD Pupil Transportation
Julie Makela, Project Administrator, MOA PM&E
Bradley Dunker, MOA Parks & Recreation
Dan Boots, MOA Traffic
Steve Schrader, MOA PM&E
Dan Roth, On-Site Water and Wastewater
Randy Ribble, MOA Facilities Maintenance
Cleo Hill, Deputy Fire Marshal, AFD
Sharon Ferguson, MOA Planning
Lynn McGee, MOA Right of Way
Brian Baus, AWWU
JoAnn Contreras, Sr. Planner, MOA Planning
Kristi Bischofberger, MOA Watershed Management Program

MEETING MATERIALS: Handouts: Agenda and Public Meeting Announcement (copies attached)

STAFF PRESENT: MOA PM&E: Julie Makela
R&M Consultants: Todd Jacobson and Paula Winfree
Kinney Engineering: Randy Kinney and John Pekar
Brooks & Associates: Anne Brooks
Earthscape: Elise Huggins

MEETING INFORMATION:

This meeting was held to incorporate internal Municipal stakeholders input into the project in accordance with the principles of Context Sensitive Design.

Project Zoning-

- R1A on the north side of Dimond (Single Family Residential District)
- R6 on the south side of Dimond (Suburban Residential District-Large Lot)

Anchorage School District -- Randy Ribble from the Anchorage School District provided an update concerning future school sites as a result of new development in the area.

- 2 schools are being planned: a middle school site located in the northeast quadrant of Sand Lake and Dimond and an elementary school in the center of the new Sand Lake development. Access for the elementary school will be off of West Point Drive. Mr. Ribble noted the MOA Assembly chose the new school sites and school site selection reports were done by F. Robert Bell & Associates. They are currently in negotiation to acquire the necessary land.

Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility -- Brian Baus from the Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility provided the following information.

Water –

- Minimal water utilities exist within the project limits.
- According to the 2020 Master Plan, a 12” main is proposed but not essential for meeting flow requirements for full development.
- The need/desire for water/sewer utilities is driven by the public’s building plans.
- If residents are interested in water service they should contact AWWU.
- Brian heard the Alaska State Legislature appropriated \$1 million for a water line along Dimond.

Sewer Service –

- All properties south of Dimond would require lift stations if served by public sewer because gravity flow is not possible.
- If residents are interested in sewer service they should contact AWWU.

Non-Motorized Transportation Plan -- Lori Schanche from MOA Project Management & Engineering Department discussed the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan for the project area.

- A multi-use trail is planned along W. Dimond Boulevard
- MOA wants to consider pedestrian improvements on both sides of Dimond due to new development in the area.
- Ms. Schanche recommended thinking outside the box and considering new ideas such as a path in the center of the roadway.
- There is a planned trail along the west side of Jodhpur.
- Public annotations of regional maps received at pedestrian plan regional meetings identified the locations of two fatal accidents in the project area; one involved a car/bicycle and the other involved a single motorcycle.
- A bike lane is needed along W. Dimond Boulevard.
- There is blind access at West Park Drive.
- The public has noted drivers do not stop at the Sand Lake/Dimond Boulevard intersection. They frequently go right through stop sign.

- Is there flexibility in location of the multi-use pedestrian facility?
 - Yes, there is flexibility, however, try to avoid crossing driveways and intersecting roads.
 - The Municipality prefers the trail be located on the south side of Dimond.

Anchorage Fire Department -- Cleo Hill, Deputy Fire Marshal, spoke on behalf of the Anchorage Fire Department.

- The Fire Department considers any improvement to the roadway good.
- Water would be good and it would impact any future development.
- It would be helpful to have hydrants on Dimond.
- The Fire Department would prefer a minimum of 20' from back of curb to back of curb.

Anchorage School District Pupil Transportation -- Marty Elkins, Pupil Transportation Supervisor, spoke on behalf of the Anchorage School District Transportation Department.

- Ms. Elkins requested the ASD be kept in the loop for busing.
- There are no current problems with busing students in the project area.

MOA On-Site Water and Wastewater -- Dan Roth, the Program Manager for On-Site Water and Wastewater, addressed onsite water and wastewater.

- Mr. Roth stated MOA is currently not aware of wells within the right-of-way. If any wells are discovered in the course of the field survey, Mr. Roth would like to be notified. He indicated that we may need to work around wells in right-of-way.
- If the project cannot work around these wells, they may need to be re-drilled and/or re-located.

MOA Watershed Management -- Kristi Bischofberger, from Watershed Management, noted we may want to consider alternate approaches to storm water. It will be important to eliminate flow down the bluff by infiltration and use of the natural vegetative swales.

MOA Right of Way -- Senior Right-of-Way Plan Reviewer, Lynn McGee, provided the following comments.

- West of Sand Lake there is a right-of-way disconnect that is “massive” and will need to be resolved.
- There are dangerous terrain and sight distance issues in the vicinity of the White Raven Development.
- Some improvements desired by developers around West Park Drive are within the right-of-way.
- On-property slope easements may be necessary in areas where cuts/fills go outside of existing right-of-way.
- All private improvements within the right-of-way (fences, wells, etc.) will need to be identified. The team noted that they plan to talk with private property owners who are affected by the right-of-way issues.
- If there are questions on something within the right-of-way, call the MOA right-of-way staff. The project team will need to address anything within right-of-way.

MOA Planning -- Joanne Contreras, a Senior Planner with MOA Planning, discussed the planning impacts within the project area.

- There is room for pedestrian improvements on the north side of Dimond.
- The R6 property owners on the south side of Dimond will appear to lose right-of-way with the project improvements.
- The multi-use trail can mimic the road grade.
- Can you do a non-separated pedestrian facility? *Yes, it is possible. Speeds may dictate the type of barrier needed to separate a pedestrian facility from the road.*

Project Management & Engineering -- Steve Schrader, with Project Management & Engineering discussed street standards; urban collector versus rural collector. The corridor land use/zoning varies throughout the project limits. The standards the team will be working with include:

- Current collector (residential)
 - Urban
 - 11-foot lanes; 3.5 to 5-foot shoulders,
 - Pathways possible on both sides,
 - Curb and gutter
 - Rural
 - 10 to 11-foot lanes, 4-foot shoulders,
 - No curb and gutter,
 - Pathway on one side
 -

Mr. Schrader also indicated lighting will be a concern in this area as it has been raised on other projects in more “rural” areas. Street Maintenance indicated that in general, induction lighting is preferred. Mr. Schrader suggested we consider metal halide lighting.


MOA Planning – Sharon Ferguson, with MOA Planning suggested the rural character and existing vegetation be maintained. *The project team indicated they would look at the integrity of the existing vegetation prior to making decisions about its removal and replacement.*

Attachment: Agenda
Meeting Announcement

Related documents on file:


Sign in Sheet
Handouts (Door Hanger)
Large plot of the aerial and ROW lines

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road
PM&E Project No. 05-005

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road
PM&E Project No. 05-005

**A DESIGN STUDY IS
BEGINNING ON A
PROJECT NEAR
YOU!**

The Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) is conducting a design study to upgrade approximately 5,300 feet of Dimond Boulevard between Jodhpur Road and Sand Lake Road to MOA urban collector standards. Improvements will include roadway foundation and surfacing, curb and gutter, storm drainage, street lighting, pedestrian facilities and landscaping.

Your input, observations, and concerns are vital to a successful project for your neighborhood. To provide the project team with your insights, please attend the upcoming public meeting:

Monday, May 22, 2006
Library, Dimond High School
7 to 9 p.m.

The project team will be assembling a Citizens' Advisory Committee to assist them during project development, if you are interested in serving, please contact the project team.

For more information, contact:

Anne Brooks, P.E., Public Involvement Coordinator
Brooks & Associates
Tel: 272-1877; Email: annebrooks@ak.net

Todd Jacobson, P.E., Project Manager
R&M Consultants
Tel: 522-1707; Email: tjacobson@rmconsult.com

Julie Makela, P.E., Project Administrator
MOA Project Management & Engineering
Tel: 343-7598; Email: makelaja@muni.org

Project web site: www.brooksandassociates.info/dimond

**A DESIGN STUDY IS
BEGINNING ON A
PROJECT NEAR
YOU!**

The Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) is conducting a design study to upgrade approximately 5,300 feet of Dimond Boulevard between Jodhpur Road and Sand Lake Road to MOA urban collector standards. Improvements will include roadway foundation and surfacing, curb and gutter, storm drainage, street lighting, pedestrian facilities and landscaping.

Your input, observations, and concerns are vital to a successful project for your neighborhood. To provide the project team with your insights, please attend the upcoming public meeting:

Monday, May 22, 2006
Library, Dimond High School
7 to 9 p.m.

The project team will be assembling a Citizens' Advisory Committee to assist them during project development, if you are interested in serving, please contact the project team.

For more information, contact:


Anne Brooks, P.E., Public Involvement Coordinator
Brooks & Associates
Tel: 272-1877; Email: annebrooks@ak.net

Todd Jacobson, P.E., Project Manager
R&M Consultants
Tel: 522-1707; Email: tjacobson@rmconsult.com

Julie Makela, P.E., Project Administrator
MOA Project Management & Engineering
Tel: 343-7598; Email: makelaja@muni.org

Project web site: www.brooksandassociates.info/dimond

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road
PM&E Project No. 05-005

The Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) proposes to make changes to W. Dimond Boulevard from Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road. Improvements may include drainage, road surface and sub-surface improvements, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities.

To ensure that all possible factors are considered in the proposed project, MOA is seeking public comments and recommendations. If you are a nearby resident, business owner, or frequent user of the road, your input is important to the project.

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING

If you are unable to attend the meeting and have comments or you would like more information, please call us, send us an e-mail, or log onto the web site.

When: May 22, 2006, 7-9 p.m.

Presentation at 7:30 p.m.

Where: Dimond High School Library
2909 W. 88th Avenue

Questions? Please contact ● ● ●

Anne Brooks, P.E., Public Participation Coordinator, Brooks & Associates
301 W Northern Lights Blvd Suite 440, Anchorage, AK 99503
Phone: 272-1877; Fax: 743-6087, comments@brooksandassociates.info




www.brooksandassociates.info/dimond

Brooks & Associates

301 W. Northern Lights Blvd, Suite 440
Anchorage, AK 99503

PRESORTED STD
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
PERMIT NO. 537
ANCHORAGE, AK

Dimond Blvd Upgrade




You are invited!

OPEN HOUSE ◆ May 22!

Newspaper Clipping

Publication:	Anchorage Daily News
Day/Date Published:	Monday, May 15, 2006
Section/Page No.:	A-6
B&A Project No.	3908.04
Project Name:	W. Dimond Boulevard Upgrade, Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road
PM&E Project No. 05-005

The Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) proposes to make changes to W. Dimond Boulevard from Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road. Improvements may include drainage, road surface and sub-surface improvements, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities.



To ensure that all possible factors are considered in the proposed project, MOA is seeking public comments and recommendations. If you are a nearby resident, business owner, or frequent user of the road, your input is important to the project.

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING

May 22, 2006, 7-9 p.m.
Presentation at 7:30 p.m.

Dimond High School Library
2909 W. 88th Avenue

Please come!

If you are unable to attend the meeting and have comments or you would like more information, please call us, send us an e-mail, or log onto the web site.


Questions? Please contact ● ● ●

Anne Brooks, P.E., Public Participation Coordinator, Brooks & Associates
301 W Northern Lights Blvd Suite 440, Anchorage, AK 99503
Phone: 272-1877; Fax: 743-6087, comments@brooksandassociates.info

▶ www.brooksandassociates.info/dimond

-shaped coffins at his shop in Teshie.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road
PM&E Project No. 05-005

The Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) proposes to make changes to W. Dimond Boulevard from Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road. Improvements may include drainage, road surface and sub-surface improvements, pedestrian, and bicycle facilities.

To ensure that all possible factors are considered in the proposed project, MOA is seeking public comments and recommendations. If you are a nearby resident, business owner, or frequent user of the road, your input is important to the project.

PUBLIC OPEN HOUSE MEETING

May 22, 2006, 7-9 p.m.
Presentation at 7:30 p.m.

Dimond High School Library
2909 W. 88th Avenue

*Please
come!*



If you are unable to attend the meeting and have comments or you would like more information, please call us, send us an e-mail, or log onto the web site.


Questions? Please contact ● ● ●

Anne Brooks, P.E., Public Participation Coordinator, Brooks & Associates
301 W Northern Lights Blvd Suite 440, Anchorage, AK 99503
Phone: 272-1877; Fax: 743-6087, comments@brooksandassociates.info

► www.brooksandassociates.info/dimond

RV SALE

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Public Meeting & Workshop Sign In Sheet

Dimond High School
May 22, 2006, 7-9 p.m.

Please print clearly:

NAME	Do you own property on Dimond Blvd? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the South Side <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the North Side <input type="checkbox"/> No Please tell us how you use Dimond Blvd. between Sand Lake and Jodhpur. <input type="checkbox"/> Drive <input type="checkbox"/> Walk <input type="checkbox"/> Bike <input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Check here, if you want the project team to contact you about specific project concerns.
ADDRESS	
PHONE	
EMAIL	
NAME	Do you own property on Dimond Blvd? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the South Side <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the North Side <input type="checkbox"/> No Please tell us how you use Dimond Blvd. between Sand Lake and Jodhpur. <input type="checkbox"/> Drive <input type="checkbox"/> Walk <input type="checkbox"/> Bike <input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Check here, if you want the project team to contact you about specific project concerns.
ADDRESS	
PHONE	
EMAIL	
NAME	Do you own property on Dimond Blvd? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the South Side <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the North Side <input type="checkbox"/> No Please tell us how you use Dimond Blvd. between Sand Lake and Jodhpur. <input type="checkbox"/> Drive <input type="checkbox"/> Walk <input type="checkbox"/> Bike <input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Check here, if you want the project team to contact you about specific project concerns.
ADDRESS	
PHONE	
EMAIL	
NAME	Do you own property on Dimond Blvd? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the South Side <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the North Side <input type="checkbox"/> No Please tell us how you use Dimond Blvd. between Sand Lake and Jodhpur. <input type="checkbox"/> Drive <input type="checkbox"/> Walk <input type="checkbox"/> Bike <input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Check here, if you want the project team to contact you about specific project concerns.
ADDRESS	
PHONE	
EMAIL	
NAME	Do you own property on Dimond Blvd? <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the South Side <input type="checkbox"/> Yes, on the North Side <input type="checkbox"/> No Please tell us how you use Dimond Blvd. between Sand Lake and Jodhpur. <input type="checkbox"/> Drive <input type="checkbox"/> Walk <input type="checkbox"/> Bike <input type="checkbox"/> All <input type="checkbox"/> Check here, if you want the project team to contact you about specific project concerns.
ADDRESS	
PHONE	
EMAIL	

Sign In sheets on file, available upon request only



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road


Public Meeting #1
May 22, 2006

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Where will the work be done?



May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade




Who is the Project Team?

- MOA Project Management & Engineering
 - **John Smith**, Project Manager (MOA)
 - **Julie Makela**, Project Administrator (MOA)
- R&M Consultants, Inc.
 - **Todd Jacobson**, Project Manager (R&M Consultants)
 - **Paula Winfree**, Project Engineer (R&M Consultants)
 - **Randy Kinney**, Traffic Engineer (Kinney Engineering)
 - **Anne Brooks**, Public Involvement (Brooks & Assoc.)
 - **Elise Huggins**, Landscape Architect (Earthscape)
 - **John Faschan**, Electrical Engineer (EDC)

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Existing Conditions



Utilities

- No Water
- No Sewer
- No Storm Drain
- Light Poles on South Side

100' Right-of-Way

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Existing Conditions Continued



- Rolling Terrain
- No Pedestrian Facilities
- Substandard Vertical Curves (Sight Distance)
- Substandard Horizontal Curve (Sight Distance)
- Pavement Deterioration
- Approaches
 - Driveway
 - Neighborhood/Local Street Access

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Existing Road Sections

- Road Sections Today
 - 10' lanes with drainage ditches
 - 12' lanes, 2' paved shoulders, 4' gravel shoulders, drainage ditches
 - Posted Speed Limit of 45 miles per hour
- Road Not Centered in Right-Of-Way
 - Dimond Boulevard
 - Portions outside of right-of-way along Jodhpur Road


May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Existing Road Sections




May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Existing Road Sections



May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Land Use, Zoning, & Development in Project Area

- R-1A - Single Family Residential District
Urban and suburban with low population densities
- R-6 - Suburban Residential District (Large Lot)
Low density development while protecting physical and environmental features
- PLI - Public Lands and Institutions District
Designated for significant public open space

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



(Zoning boundary = dotted lines, Developed residential land = dark shade, Undeveloped residential land = light shade)

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Recorded Average Annual Daily Traffic Volumes (AADT), 1996 & 2004

Street	Begin	End	1996	2004
Dimond Boulevard	Sand Lake Road	Jodhpur Road	660	1,433
Dimond Boulevard	Edinburgh Drive	Sand Lake Rd	2,877	3,804
Sand Lake Road	Dimond Blvd	Kincaid Road	1,956	2,786
Jodhpur Road	Dimond Blvd	Kincaid Road	398	540

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Existing Intersection Sight Distance

Three locations identified where sight distance is less than today's standard of 360 feet for a vehicle traveling at 45-mph.

All other intersections meet or exceed 360 feet of sight distance.

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Existing Intersection Sight Distance



May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Projected Average Anual Daily Traffic Volumes (AADT)

Street	Begin	End	Base Year AADT	Projected Year AADT's				
			2004	2006	2008	2018	2028	
Dimond Boulevard	Sand Lake Road	Jodhpur Road	1,433	1,591	1,863	3,147	5,317	
Dimond Boulevard	Edinburgh Drive	Sand Lake Road	3,804	4,225	4,945	8,354	14,114	
Sand Lake Road	Dimond Boulevard	Kincaid Road	2,786	3,094	3,621	6,118	10,337	
Jodhpur Road	Dimond Boulevard	Kincaid Road	540	600	702	1,186	2,004	

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Intersection Operational Performance

- The Sand Lake Road Intersection will reach an unacceptable Level Of Service of F between 2018 and 2028. Future signalization or reconstruction will be warranted within this timeframe.
- The remaining intersections will maintain an acceptable LOS throughout the project life (LOS of C through 2028)


May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Fatality & Injury Accidents

- Crashes from 1995 and 2005 were examined. 18 total.
- Segment accident rate below average.
- Sand Lake Road intersection above average, although not significantly.
- Accident severities were average, with exception of fatality in 2005.



May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade




Speed Study Findings February & May 2006

Roadway	Mean Speed (mph)	85 th Percentile Speed (mph)	Posted Speed (mph)
Jodhpur Road (Feb '06, South of Kincaid Gate)	32	34	35
W. Dimond (Eastbound, Feb '06, between West Park & Sand Lake)	38	44	45
W. Dimond (Westbound, Feb '06, East of Sand Lake Road)	40	47	
W. Dimond (Eastbound, MOA, May '06, 24 hr, between Lori & Sommers)	45	50	
W. Dimond (Westbound, MOA, May '06, 24 hr, between Lori & Sommers)	44	48	
Sand Lake Road (Feb '06, North of Dimond Boulevard)	48	53	50
Kincaid Road (Eastbound, MOA, May '06, 24 hr, between Lucy & Ingram)	44	49	35

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



What is to be done?

- Upgrade roadway to current and applicable MOA Collector standards
- Improvements may include:
 - Roadway Foundation and Surfacing
 - Curb and Gutter
 - Storm Drainage
 - Street Lighting
 - Pedestrian Facilities
 - Landscaping


May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



MOA Collector Standards




May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



MOA Collector Standards



May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



How will the work be accomplished?

- With Public Input and Advice
- Utilizing principles of Context Sensitive Design
- With assistance from:
 - **Municipality of Anchorage**
 - Project Management & Engineering
 - Public Transportation (People Mover)
 - Anchorage School District
 - Traffic Department
 - Anchorage Water and Wastewater
 - Parks and Recreation
 - Anchorage Fire Department
 - Right-Of-Way Department
 - Facilities and Street Maint.
 - Wetland Management Division
 - Planning Department

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



What is the public process?

- We plan to INVOLVE you!
 - Our public participation goal is to work directly with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered. © IAP2 2005
- Our Promise to you--
 - We will work with you to ensure that your concerns and aspirations are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how public input influenced the decision. © IAP2 2005


May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Balancing project needs/desires?




© 2005 International Association for Public Participation

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Context Sensitive Design

- Defined Steps
 - Identify the decision maker
 - Define the problem(s) and opportunities
 - Develop evaluation criteria
 - Develop alternatives
 - Select preferred alternative

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Who is the decision maker and what are everyone's roles and responsibilities?

- **Municipality of Anchorage** – Owner, will maintain, operate, and direct development of the road, ultimate decision maker
- **R&M Consultants** -- Engineering firm, will recommend engineering solutions, alternatives and design
- **Citizen's Advisory Committee (CAC)** -- Advise the Municipality on road problems/improvements; represent interests of the stakeholders, not interests of individual
- **Contractor** -- Construct road improvements

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Facility Users/ Stakeholders




- Local Residents
- Bicyclists, Skiers, Runners, Pedestrians, Etc.
- Kincaid Park Visitors
- Kincaid Motorcross Users
- US Postal Service
- Utility Companies
- Additional Stakeholders to be determined throughout public involvement process

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



How do you get involved?

- Attend a meeting
 - Three planned at 1) problem definition; 2) draft design study; 3) preliminary design
- Watch for a bright yellow postcard or newsletter in the mail
- Comment via project website:
www.brooksandassociates.info/dimond/
- Call a project team member
- Voice Concerns to Citizens Advisory Committee

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



What happens next?

- We analyze the corridor
- We form a 4-6 person Citizen's Advisory Committee
- We meet with the CAC and public to formulate alternatives
- We draft a Design Study Report (DSR)
- We hold additional public meetings

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



When will the work be done?

- Design Study
 - 2006
- Design
 - 2007
- Construction
 - Beginning Summer 2008

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.



What can you tell us about Dimond Boulevard?

- To help us design the best possible project for you, you can help by sharing your knowledge of ...
 - Places where children cross the road
 - Places where you can't see oncoming traffic because something blocks your vision
 - Places where people speed
 - Places where the drainage is bad
 - Other

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.




Open House

- It is now time to view the drawings and talk one-on-one with the project team

May 22, 2006 Public Meeting

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



PM&E Project No. 05-005

Your comments, please...

Please use this comment sheet to share any issues, needs or local knowledge you believe will help us as we continue our work. If you wish to discuss your comment with a member of the project team, please check the box below. Thanks for your input!

Check this box if you would like the project team to contact you regarding specifics of the project. Provide your contact information and the best time to contact you on the back.


Fax this form to 907-743-6087 or fold and **mail** to address on the back of this sheet.

I'm already on your mailing list.

Please add my name to the project mailing list:

Name
Street Address or PO Box
City, State, Zip
Email

(To mail, fold here, tape lower edge, and affix first class stamp)



Anne Brooks, P.E., Public Participation Coordinator
Brooks & Associates
301 W. Northern Lights Blvd, Suite 440
Anchorage, Alaska 99503



Meeting Notes

SUBJECT: Dimond Boulevard Upgrade Project Public Meeting

PROJECT NO.: MOA PM&E 05-005

GROUP: Public

DATE: May 22, 2006

TIME: 7-9 pm.

LOCATION: Dimond High School Library, Anchorage

MEETING OUTREACH:

- Doorhangers delivered to all corridor residences May 13
- Post card notice mailed to corridor area week of May 15
- *Anchorage Daily News* ads published May 15 and 19
- Announced at SLCC meeting on May 8

MEETING ATTENDANCE: 34 (from sign-in)

MEETING MATERIALS:

- 1) PowerPoint presentation;
- 2) Presentation handout
- 3) Aerial photo of corridor with property and right-of-way lines;
- 4) Large scale drawing of typical collector road cross section;
- 5) Comment sheet

STAFF PRESENT:

John Smith, MOA PM&E
Julie Makela, MOA PM&E
Teri Albrecht, MOA PM&E
Todd Jacobson, R&M
Paula Winfree, R&M
Anne Brooks, Brooks & Associates
Kathy Burgess, Brooks & Associates
Betty Caudle, Brooks & Associates
Randy Kinney, Kinney Engineering
John Pekar, Kinney Engineering
Elise Huggins, Earthscape

MEETING INFORMATION:

Attendees were greeted, asked to sign in, and given copies of handouts. They were invited to view the aerial photo of the corridor and to place a sticker on their property, if they lived on the project corridor. They were also encouraged to mark the map with conditions they thought the project should address or information the project team should know.

The sign in sheets queried whether they owned property on the corridor. 7 said yes, on the south side; 9 yes on the north side; 6 said no. Asked the modes of use of West Dimond, 11 said they drive, 6 said they walk, and 8 said they drive, walk and bike the corridor. (NOTE: Numbers do not reflect true percentages because some people did not answer the question and some checked more than one answer to each question.)

At 7:30 Anne Brooks welcomed all present and introduced members of the project team. Todd Jacobsen then began a presentation that outlined project background, current corridor conditions, traffic projections, and anticipated project milestones.

The following is a summary of comments and questions brought up during and after the presentation. The public's remarks are in plain type; project team responses are in *italics*.

- Does the future traffic projection include rumored development along Sommers Place?
No
- Both 2005 crashes were west of West Park Drive (Also known as Snead).
- I think the average speeds are higher than the study shows.
The 85th percentile numbers show that most people are pretty close to the speed limit.
- Are you intending to widen and flatten the road? This encourages speeding.
We don't know yet; we have not begun any design. We are aware of the studies that show this effect.
- National studies wouldn't show our local conditions and characteristics.
We will have more flexibility than usual on this project because of the rural character of the area.
- Traffic calming is a concern.
Our study was done in February; speeds were closer to 50 mph in a Municipal study done in May.
- Dimond is a speedway people use to get to the motocross racetrack. Traffic calming is crucial.
- When Kincaid Road was built, people asked that the hills not be cut down and I feel the same way about this road.
- What are municipal standards for turn lanes? They seem wider than travel lanes.
We will be looking at road geometrics as part of our work.
- I'd like to find out if 45 is the right speed limit for this road.
- I'd volunteer to help with a speed study to record high speeds. I see speeding every day.
- Are most of the projected traffic increases from the new housing development off Sand Lake? That's really outside the project boundaries.
Traffic from the development and potential new schools are large factors.
- The new people in the development will use Dimond,—they'll want to go to the park, etc., too.
- Does the road need to be the same size everywhere?
- During construction will we be able to get out of our driveways?
Municipal policy is that one travel lane must remain open during construction.
- Will city water connections be included as part of this project?
AWWU may pursue a Water Improvement District in conjunction with this project. It isn't likely that the same will be true for sewer service in this area, as many of the large R-6 lots are lower than the main and lifting would be required for each of those houses.
- It would be short-sighted not to put water mains in with the road project.
- Who owns the road?
The city owns the part of Dimond in this project. East of Sand Lake it is a state road. Sometimes ownership is a part of maintenance issues.
- The pedestrian facility should be on the south side. The Coastal Trail is shown on the north side, but that is no longer relevant. On the south side, it would connect directly with the motocross entrance. Please minimize clearing of trees for the improvements.

- Why is a storm drain needed?
It has the potential to use less right-of-way land than the swales that would otherwise be needed.
- Why are you doing this road rather than others that need it more, like Raspberry? Minimize the work here—just repave it, add wide shoulders for walking, and don't overdo it. We don't need lighting.
Raspberry is a State-owned road and part of a different project process. For Municipal roads, a Capital Improvement list goes to the Community Councils every year for ranking. West Dimond was ranked number one in Sand Lake Community Council's list. If the SLCC decided that they no longer want the project we might have to re-evaluate it.
- I'm not aware of getting any priority list this year at Sand Lake Community Council.
- How long will construction take?
It would probably last one season—the summer of 2008.
- Will our mailboxes have to be moved?
We don't know about that yet.

Attendees were asked to place a sticker on the large aerial map to show their property or residence. Approximately 16 people marked lots either bordering the right-of-way or accessed by a driveway connected to the corridor. The following notes were also made on the map:

General Comments

- We were told (before the pit development) that our water was better than city water.
- Slowing down can take care of a lot of the problems/issues being brought up.
- Street lights: Less is better. This area used to be quiet, would like to keep it that way. (Rural feeling) We don't need landscaping. There are natural trees and good old dirt. The road is used as a speedway. (Reduce to 25 mph) To what extent is AWWU involvement?
- Request one bike/multipath.
- Traffic calming a must.
- The wider the road the more cars abreast will be drag racing.
- Driveways that are steep can't be sacrificed to a trail. Access to Dimond must be maintained at all times.
- Right-of-way is not big enough for a path and a sidewalk.
- Bike trail is better suited on south side.
- If on the north it [bike trail] will connect to existing trails; there are fewer driveways
- What about the existing mail boxes?
- Speed limit should not increase. Let's try <30 mph.

West Park Drive to Sommers Place

- Entire section marked "Road surface in bad shape."
- Runoff from southern West Park Drive and driveway of Tract 1 & 2 flows onto W. Dimond and westward along the street and then drains off the road to the south at about Tract 3. This water action erodes the road surface.
- Site of motorcycle fatality marked just west of West Park Drive intersection.
- Site of bike/car crash marked beside driveway of south side Tract 5 driveway.
- Area framing West Park Drive intersection marked "Vertical sight distance problems."
- South side Tract 7 marked "Driveway missing (not shown)."
- House close to road, Tract 5 north side would like fence or privacy screening.

Sommers Place to Jodhpur Road

- Well in right-of-way [southwest corner of lot on east side of Sommers Place]

- Can we underground power line?
- Sommer should be spelled Sommers
- Dimond/Jodhpur curve too tight.

Jodhpur Road

- Take Dimond trail into Kincaid park motocross area at Jodhpur corner—with good separation.
- Kincaid Jodhpur entrance has gate that is often locked. Consider a parking area for approximately 6 vehicles in this area.
- Cul-de-sac off Jodhpur has paved trail that would connect with Skyhills Drive if missing segment would be paved. Easement already exists.

Related documents on file:

PowerPoint presentation

Doorhanger

Post card notice

Anchorage Daily News ad

Comment Sheet



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade

Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road
MOA Project No. 05-005

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting #1

July 12, 2006, 5:30 to 7:30 pm
Jewel Lake Plaza Multipurpose Room
8300 Jewel Lake Road, Anchorage

Agenda Discussion items

Introductions (introduce yourself and give one personal anecdote)

Committee Members
Project Team (MOA, R&M, KE, etc)
Observers

Overview of CAC Charter

Sign Charter/return to team

Define the steps we will take on our journey to a recommended solution for West Dimond Boulevard?

Describe Context Sensitive Solutions (CSS) Design Process

“An effective CSS approach to transportation planning and project development can take many different forms, but should include the following key elements.

- A common understanding of the purpose and need of the transportation project;
- Stakeholder involvement at critical points in the project;
- Interdisciplinary team approach to planning and design;
- Attention to community values and qualities including environment, scenic, aesthetic, historic and natural resources, as well as safety and mobility; and
- Objective evaluation of a full range of alternatives.”¹

What is the context of West Dimond Boulevard?

- Owner, maintenance, use, setting, road classification (road maps, land use map, aerial photo, OSHP map, etc.)

¹ Context Sensitive Solutions in Designing Major Urban Thoroughfares for Walkable Communities, ITE Proposed Recommended Practice, 2006, p7

Who is the West Dimond Boulevard “interdisciplinary” team?

Transportation Planners	Highway/traffic engineers
Environmental Scientists;	Resource agency representatives;
Land use planners;	Urban designers, architects;
Landscape architects, urban foresters;	Property owners;
Utility and transit owners/operations;	Community leaders/representatives;
Elected or appointed officials; and	Fire, police and maintenance folks

Identify Stakeholders

What are the existing street characteristics? (classification, right of way width, landscaping, etc)

Define the problem to be solved with this project.

Where did this project come from?
What is the purpose and need for this project?
What the consultant’s work to date tells us – survey, reconnaissance, etc.
What the current and future traffic volumes tell us
What analysis of the current road operations tell us
What Municipal Planning documents tell us
What we’ve heard from the “interdisciplinary” team?
What we’ve heard from the public?

What have we missed?

Develop criteria for evaluating West Dimond Boulevard alternatives?

When we have finished our work and the road is constructed, what would you like to see?

How can translate this vision into evaluation criteria for project alternatives?

Items to consider:

- Cost
- Maintainability
- Functionality
- Safety aesthetics
- Pedestrian friendly
- ROW/Footprint
- Code/Criteria Compliant

Typical Road Cross-Section (Rural & Urban)

Design Criteria

CAC Member Homework

Develop Agenda for Upcoming CAC Meetings

Subject Matter Experts (SME) to consider inviting:

- Street Maintenance Dept.
- Traffic Dept.
- Non-Motorized Transportation Coordinator
- AWWU
- Parks & Rec – Park Access/Landscaping
- Planning Dept. (20/20 Compliance, LRTP, Trails Plan)
- Police Department
- Fire Department
- ASD (Planning, & Student Transportation)
- ADA Compliance

Committee Comments

Observer Comments

Adjourn

W. Dimond Boulevard Upgrade
 Citizen's Advisory Committee

SIGN-IN
 Wednesday, 07/12/06
 5:30-7:30 pm
 Jewel Lake Plaza,
 Multipurpose Room

✓ Here	Name1	Name2	Org/Business
	Judith	Hoersting	Neighbor
	Susan	Ritter	Sand Lake Community Council
	Mike	Carlson	Neighbor
	Layne	Ratcliffe	Neighbor
	Matt	Michetti	Hultquist Homes
	Jonathan	Williams	Arctic Bicycle Club
Project Team			
	John	Smith	MOA - PM&E
	Julie	Makela	MOA - PM&E
	Todd	Jacobson	R&M Consultants
	Paula	Winfree	R&M Consultants
	Randy	Kinney	Kinney Engineering
	Elise	Huggins	Earthscape
	Anne	Brooks	Brooks & Associates
	Kathy	Burgess	Brooks & Associates
	Betty	Caudle	Brooks & Associates

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road
PM&E Project No. 05-005

Sign In Sheet

Jewel Lake Plaza, Multipurpose Room
July 12, 2006, 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting

Please print clearly:

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

Sign-In Sheets on file. Available upon request only.



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road

Existing Corridor Characteristics and Problems to be Solved

CAC Meeting #1
July 12, 2006

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Existing Conditions



Residential Collector
Rolling Terrain
Posted Speed 45 mph
No Utilities
Right-of-Way varies
between 50' to 150'
Pavement Deterioration

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Surrounding Road Network

ROAD	POSTED SPEED (MPH)	ROAD WIDTH (FT)	SHOULDER (FT)		C&G	SEPARATED PATH (FT)		SW (FT)	ROW WIDTH (FT)	FUNCTIONAL CLASS
			PAVED	GRAVEL		PAVED	GRAVEL			
KINCAID ROAD	35	21	no	2	no	no	no	no	100	Neighborhood Collector
JODHPUR ROAD	35	21.5	2 (E)	4 (W)	no	no	no	no	50	Local
SAND LAKE ROAD	50	24	9	no	no	8	no	no	150	Minor Arterial
W. DIMOND BLVD	45	20-24	0-2	0-8	no	no	no	no	50-150	Residential Collector

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Traffic Analysis Elements

- Existing Traffic Characteristics
 - Speeds
 - Volumes
 - Operations
- Safety / Crash Experience
 - Are numbers or rates within “expectations”?
 - Severity
- Collector Standards for Vehicles, Pedestrians, Bikes
 - Does it meet current standards?
 - Do non-compliant standards contribute to crashes or congestion?

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Traffic Analysis Elements, Continued

- Traffic Volume Forecasts
 - Daily and “Design Hour”
 - Essential for determining standards, future safety and congestion treatments
- Future Operations (acceptable level of service)
 - Intersections
 - Roadway
 - Pedestrian Facilities

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Existing Traffic Characteristics

- Residential Collector
 - Mobility
 - Access
 - Typical volumes are 2,000 - 10,000 per day
 - Design speed for residential collectors is 45 mph

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Speed Study Findings
February & May 2006

Roadway	Mean Speed (mph)	85 th Percentile Speed (mph)	Posted Speed (mph)
Jodhpur Street (Feb '06, South of Kincaid Gate)	32	34	35
W. Dimond (Eastbound, Feb '06, between West Park & Sand Lake)	38	44	45
W. Dimond (Westbound, Feb '06, East of Sand Lake Road)	40	47	
W. Dimond (Eastbound, MOA, May '06, 24 hr, between Lori & Sommers)	45	50	
W. Dimond (Westbound, MOA, May '06, 24 hr, between Lori & Sommers)	44	48	

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Recorded Average Annual Daily Traffic Volumes (AADT), 1996 & 2004

Current Volumes are less than "normal" collector volumes

Street	Begin	End	1996	2004
Dimond Boulevard	Sand Lake Road	Jodhpur Street	660	1,433
Dimond Boulevard	Edinburgh Drive	Sand Lake Rd	2,877	3,804
Sand Lake Road	Dimond Blvd	Kincaid Road	1,956	2,786
Jodhpur Street	Dimond Blvd	Kincaid Road	398	540

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Current Operations

- Intersections target level of services (LOS) is C or better; less than 25 seconds of average delay per stopped vehicle.
- All intersections currently have LOS of C or better.

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Crash Experience 1995 to 2005

- 10 crashes at the Sand Lake/W. Dimond intersection
 - 9 property damage only
 - 1 minor injury
 - Intersection safety is in a “normal” range
- 8 crashes in remainder of corridor
 - 1 fatality (motorcycle)
 - 2 minor injuries (1 bicycle)
 - Crash number or rate isn’t unusual
 - Severity is significant

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.


Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Existing Road Sections



Jodhpur Street looking south at curve



July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.


Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Existing Road Sections



W. Dimond near Sommers Place, looking east



July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1


R&M Consultants, Inc.



Existing Road Sections



Near Sand Lake Road,
looking east



July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Existing Road Sections

- West Park to Jodhpur: 10' to 12' lanes, no shoulders and drainage ditches
- Sand Lake to West Park: 12' lanes, 2' paved shoulders, 4' gravel shoulders, drainage ditches
- No pathway or shoulder for pedestrian/bike
- *Existing road section does not meet current standards*


July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



**Collector Road Standards:
MOA Rural Collector
Typical Section**




July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



**Collector Road Standards:
MOA Urban Collector
Typical Section**



July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Collector Road Standards

- Horizontal Alignments
 - Curve that transitions between W. Dimond and Jodhpur has a design speed of 30 mph. Restricts intersection sight distance.
 - Other horizontal curves are adequate for 45 mph


July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Collector Standards

- Vertical Alignment
 - Grades exceed desirable (>6%, up to 8%)
 - Vertical curve lengths (L) restrict stopping sight distance (S) and intersection sight distance (worst case is 35 mph sight distance)



July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Collector Standards

- Intersections
 - W. Dimond and Sand Lake skew angle affects sight distance
 - Westbound right-turn lane into West Park Drive is less length than desirable
 - Three intersections have sight distance less than 360' for a 45 mph approach vehicle speed

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.




Existing Intersection Sight Distance



July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Dimond Blvd Upgrade

Jodhpur Kincaid Sand Lake


Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road

PM&E Project No. 05-005

Traffic Volume Forecasts

- Depends upon land use
 - Primarily residential, Kincaid Park, possible future school sites
- Zoning:
 - R-1A - Single Family Residential District
Urban and suburban with low population densities
 - R-6 - Suburban Residential District (Large Lot)
Low density development, protects physical and environmental features
 - PLI - Public Lands and Institutions District
Designated for significant public open space

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1 R&M Consultants, Inc.



Projected Average Annual Daily Traffic Volumes (AADT)

Street	Begin	End	Base Year AADT	Projected Year AADT's				
				2004	2006	2008	2018	2028
Dimond Boulevard	Sand Lake Road	West Park Drive	1,433	1,591	1,363	3,147	5,317	
Dimond Boulevard	West Park Drive	Jodhpur Street	n/a	1,072	1,325	1,731	2,244	
Dimond Boulevard	Edinburgh Drive	Sand Lake Road	3,804	4,225	4,945	8,354	14,114	
Sand Lake Road	Dimond Boulevard	Kincaid Road	2,786	3,094	3,621	6,118	10,337	
Jodhpur Street	Dimond Boulevard	Kincaid Road	540	600	702	1,186	2,004	

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Future Intersection Operational Performance

- The Sand Lake Road Intersection will reach an unacceptable Level of Service (LOS) of F (>50 seconds delay per stopped vehicle) by 2018 as a one-way stop.
 - Future alternative treatment warranted (all-way stop, signal, roundabout).
- The remaining intersections will maintain an acceptable LOS throughout the project life (LOS of C, <25 seconds delay per stopped vehicle through 2028).

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road

Next Steps

CAC Meeting #1
July 12, 2006

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Meeting No. 2 Agenda

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Roadway Typical Sections

- Alternatives
 - Rural or Urban
 - Lane width
 - Shoulder width
 - Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities (paths and crossings)
 - Traffic Calming Features
 - Intersection Treatments (Roundabouts vs. Signals vs. Stop)
 - Illumination
 - Landscaping

Determined by MOA
Methodology, function
of traffic volumes


July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



**MOA Rural Collector
Typical Section**




July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



**MOA Urban Collector
Typical Section**



July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Preliminary Design Criteria

DESIGN ELEMENT	VALUE
Functional Classification	Residential Collector
Design Vehicle	WB-50
Design Speed (Terrain)	45 mph (rolling)
Stopping Sight Distance	360 feet
Maximum Grade	6% desirable, 10% maximum
Minimum Grade	0.3% min
Minimum Radius of Curve	660 feet
Vertical Curves: Sag (Min. K)	79
Crest (Min. K)	61
Lane Width	10 feet to 12 feet
Width of Outside Shoulder	Urban: 3.5 feet to 5 feet Rural: 4 feet
Clear Zone Width	1.5 feet from face of curb
Surfacing, Lanes, and Shoulders	Asphalt Concrete Pavement
Illumination	Urban: 0.8 fc @ 4:1 uniformity
Horizontal Sight Triangle	360 feet Minimum 500 feet Desirable
Curb and Gutter	TBD
Pedestrian Provisions	Sidewalk 5' . Multi-use trail 18' minimum, 10'-foot desirable

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Committee Homework

ROAD	POSTED SPEED (MPH)	ROAD WIDTH (FT)	SHOULDER (FT)		CURB & GUTTER	SEPARATED PATH (FT)		SIDEWALKS (FT)	ROW WIDTH (FT)
			PAVED	GRAVEL		PAVED	GRAVEL		
68TH	35	23	5		Y	8		5	65
DEARMOUN RD.	40	23			N				100
DRIFTWOOD BAY @ ROAD END	25	25	3.5		N	8.5		5	50
ELMORE RD.	35	21.5	4		Y	8	6		70
ENSIGN	25	29			Y	8		5	60
GOLDENVIEW	35	22		8-10	N				65
HILLSIDE DR.	45	24	6		N				100
HUFFMAN RD.	45	22		4	N				100
RABBIT CREEK	45	24	6		N				100
RASPBERRY	35	23	5		Y	10			100
TIMBERLANE	25	22	3.5		Y	8			100

July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Summary of Public Input to Date

Problems to be solved

- Speeding vehicles
- How to maintain “rural character”
- Lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities – pedestrians currently compete with motorists in same paved surface.
- Need for multi-use trail (walking, running, bicycling, skiing)
- Accommodate increasing development along and near the corridor
- Zoning differs both sides of the road
- Road surface in bad shape
- Storm water runoff near southern West Park Drive
- Right of way encroachments
- Lack of lighting
- Lack of landscaping
- Lack of paved shoulder
- Need safe pedestrian crossing at Dimond and Sand Lake
- Poor sight distance at West Park Drive
- Lack of turn lanes at West Park Drive

Parked/Related Issues

- Water/wastewater service – several expressed the need to extend the water/sewer before or with project and if it can’t be done, wait on road improvements until it can be done so you don’t tear up the road
- Under grounding power lines

Concerns

- Construction timing and duration
- Enforcement of posted speeds
- Traffic reroute during construction

Questions to Answer – (FAQ’s)

1. Where is the money coming from for the project? (concern is that the MOA will run out of money mid-way through the project)
2. Will trees be removed?
3. Will retaining walls go in?
4. Can the power line on the south side (on private property) be under grounded along the road?

5. Can the pathway go into Kincaid at Jodhpur (Dimond) rather than follow Jodhpur?
6. Can pedestrians have a separate path from bikers & skiers?
7. Will there be curb/gutter and driveways for each lot?
8. What is being planned for storm drains?
9. What is being planned for lighting?
10. What about water lines/fire hydrants? Which side of the road will they be on?
11. What are the plans for walkways and trails, where will they be located?
12. Who will be required to maintain the sidewalks (for example, snow removal)?
13. Is Dimond Boulevard where it is supposed to be?
14. Will road be widened? If yes, how wide?
15. Will hills be lowered and valley's raised?
16. What are plans for residents to enter/exit their driveways during construction?
17. When will construction begin?
18. How long will construction take?



Example Alternatives Evaluation Criteria

Evaluation criteria help judge the effectiveness of the design alternatives in solving the problem. Knowing the criteria that are most important to the surrounding community helps the design team by focusing the study effort, defining data needs and setting the stage for creating those alternatives.

<u>Criteria</u>	<u>Sample of how criteria could be measured</u>
Safety	Crash reduction prediction calculations
Crash Severity	Severity of crashes
Congestion	Level of service in terms of vehicle delay
Pedestrian & Bicycle Accommodation	Improvement to safety and mobility for pedestrians and bicyclists
Cost	Estimated construction cost per alternative
Neighborhood Impacts	Number of homes near route
Neighborhood Impacts	Changes to average daily traffic
Private Property Impacts	Number of private residences impacted
Right of Way Impacts	Acreage or square footage of right of way needed
Mobility	Distance traveled to exit study area
Code Compliant	Alternative advances tenets of Title 21 Lane Use Code, other codes or guidance documents
Environmental	Acres of lost natural environment (green space or trees removed, etc.)
Your criteria.....	How it could be measured...

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade

Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road
MOA Project No. 05-005

Citizens' Advisory Committee Notebook

Table of Contents

Citizens' Advisory Committee Member Listing
Project Team Contacts

Citizens' Advisory Committee Charter

Reference Material

- Aerial Photo Of Project Corridor
- Land Use Map Surrounding Project Corridor
- Map Of Road Ownership
- Map Of Road Maintenance Responsibilities
- Project Development Resources And References
- CSS And The Project Development Process

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting #1

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes
- Other Materials Provided

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting #2

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes
- Other Materials Provided

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting #3

- Agenda
- Meeting Notes
- Other Materials Provided

Project Generated Documents *(to be provided when available)*

- 5/10/06 Inter-Agency Meeting Notes
- 5/22/06 Public Meeting Notes
- 5/22/06 Meeting Presentation Handout
- Public Comments
- Draft Traffic Study
- Draft Design Study



CAC Homework Assignment

Due: August 3, 2006

Please review the following list of collector streets in Anchorage and Eagle River. Some are considered “rural” collectors and others are “urban” collectors. The definition of collector streets in the *Official Streets and Highways Plan (OSHP)* is provided below:

“D. Collector Streets

A collector street collects traffic from local streets and then conducts it to arterials or to local traffic generators such as shopping centers, schools, community centers, or park and recreational facilities. It may supply abutting property with some degree of land service but this should be avoided as much as possible. Collector streets are designed to give priority over local streets in traffic control locations. In commercial areas, traffic volumes are often too high to permit the utilization of collectors. In these areas, local streets are designed to connect directly with an arterial. In large industrial areas where traffic volumes are lower, collector streets are more often needed.

The main function of a residential collector street is to conduct traffic from local residential areas to arterials. Land access should be a secondary function of the residential collector, and both curb and driveway access should be discouraged except at those locations where traffic movement patterns may be effectively controlled. A collector may also function as an easement for utilities. Collectors may also be designed to provide access functions for commercial and industrial development, interconnecting such areas with adjoining residential districts. Such facilities should also be designed to minimize curb and driveway access except at those locations where traffic movement patterns may be effectively controlled. Parking along collectors should be discouraged.

The location of residential collectors is influenced by their function as well as by the density of urban development and topography. The following guidelines should be followed in planning for new collector streets:

- Collector streets should serve to collect traffic from local streets of all types and transmit this traffic to the arterial street system or to important trip generating activities within small residential areas.
- The collector street system should be designed so that through traffic is discouraged between larger residential areas or between larger residential areas and major activity areas. In residential areas, collector streets should be planned to not exceed one-half mile in length if possible, and to discourage continuous links between arterials.
- Collector streets should be designed to provide priority to through traffic movement, as compared to the access function of local streets. They should provide some degree of access control, in order to maximize safety and minimize traffic maneuvering problems, and they should provide a limited land service function to abutting property. New subdivisions should be designed to not allow direct driveway access to collectors. In areas of low density residential development, limited direct driveway access to collectors may be allowed but only if the collector street will not become a major link in the future to more densely developed areas.

Reverse lot design should be used in subdivisions, in order to minimize driveway access onto collector streets.

- Collector streets should provide access to local neighborhood schools and neighborhood recreation areas. Pedestrian facilities should be provided along collectors to allow for safe access between these activity centers.
- Residential collectors should be designed to provide only two travel lanes, with limited widths on shoulder areas for emergency parking.
- On-street parking is not appropriate on collector roads. Designs should be developed to discourage curb parking.”

**West Dimond Blvd. Upgrade
Collector Streets**

ROAD	POSTED SPEED (MPH)	ROAD WIDTH (FT)	SHOULDER (FT)		CURB & GUTTER	SEPARATED PATH (FT)		SIDEWALKS (FT)	ROW WIDTH (FT)
			PAVED	GRAVEL		PAVED	GRAVEL		
68TH	35	23	5		Y	8		5	65
100TH	35	36			Y	7 S, 8 N			100
ARCTIC	30	27			N				80
BIRCH RD.	45	23		2	N	8			85
BIRCHWOOD LP.	45	26	6-7		N				100
CAMPBELL	30	24	5		N	8			60
CAMPBELL	30	24		2-3	N				60
DEARMOUN RD.	40	23			N				100
DRIFTWOOD BAY @ ROAD END	25	25	3.5		N	8.5		5	50
DRIFTWOOD BAY @ SCHOOL	25	25	7		Y	8		5	50
EAGLE R. LANE	25	24		2-3	N				100
ELMORE NORTH OF HUFFMAN	45	23	5 E, 3 W		N				100
ELMORE RD.	35	21.5	4		Y	8	6		70
ENSIGN	25	29			Y	8		5	30
GOLDENVIEW	35	22		8-10	N				65

**West Dimond Blvd. Upgrade
Collector Streets**

ROAD	POSTED SPEED (MPH)	ROAD WIDTH (FT)	SHOULDER (FT)		CURB & GUTTER	SEPARATED PATH (FT)		SIDEWALKS (FT)	ROW WIDTH (FT)
			PAVED	GRAVEL		PAVED	GRAVEL		
HILLSIDE DR.	45	24	6		N				100
HUFFMAN RD.	45	22		4	N				100
KINCAID	35	21		2	N				100
OLD KLATT	30	26	2.5-3		N	4			65
OLD SEWARD TO POTTER MARSH	45	20			N				250
RABBIT CREEK	45	24	6		N				100
RASPBERRY	35	23	5		Y	10			100
SKYLINE	25	22	1	2-3 RT 4 LT	N				60
TIMBERLANE	25	22	3.5		Y	8			100
WAR ADMIRAL	25	29			Y			4	50
WAR ADMIRAL	25	20		1	N				50



Meeting Notes

SUBJECT: W. Dimond Reconstruction Project
PROJECT NO.: MOA PM&E 05-005
GROUP: Citizens' Advisory Committee
DATE: July 12, 2006
TIME: 5:30 PM – 8:30 PM
LOCATION: Multipurpose Room, Jewel Lake Plaza, Anchorage AK
MEETING OUTREACH: Emails and phone calls to Committee members. Hand delivery of notebook containing background information and meeting materials.
MEETING ATTENDANCE: 17
MEETING MATERIALS: Agenda; CAC notebook additions
STAFF PRESENT: *MOA PM&E:* John Smith, Julie Makela;
R&M Consultants: Todd Jacobson, Paula Winfree;
Kinney Engineering: Randy Kinney, John Pekar;
Earthscape: Elise Huggins, Deb McGee;
Brooks & Associates: Anne Brooks, Kathy Burgess, Betty Caudle

MEETING INFORMATION:

Committee members were greeted on arrival and asked to sign in, collect a meal, and take their place at the meeting table.

Anne Brooks opened the meeting by starting a round of self introductions. She then gave an orientation to the Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC) process, rules, and general information. Members were guided through the CAC Charter and asked to sign and turn in a copy by the end of the meeting. Anne gave an introduction to the meeting, its purpose, and the project materials.

Paula Winfree briefed the Committee on the **Context Sensitive Solutions/Context Sensitive Design (CSS/CSD) process**. Discussion highlights are below with answers to questions in *italics*:

- The first step is to engage all the stakeholders, both the municipality and the public. We have started this with meetings with the public and municipality department stakeholders.
- Are we basing this design on municipal design policy or new CSS/CSD standards? *We are using Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidelines that will be implemented into the city's new policy.*

Anne led a discussion on the **context of the project corridor**. Highlights of the discussion are below:

- The road is a rural one that transitions from a wide commercial boulevard. My major concern is the intersection with W. Park Drive on a dangerous curve. I'd like to keep the road much as it is but make it safer. The two fatalities on the road have occurred near that intersection, and there is potential for much more traffic from the new housing development.
- The hills and curves add character. Lack of long vistas is part of the character of the road.
- There are private water wells in the city right of way.

Anne asked the CAC, "Who are the **users of the road**?"

- Roller skiers in summer, regular skiers in winter.
- Bicycle racers. They value a smooth road surface with shoulders where a bike can pull off for cars to pass. Racers like to be on the road, not a separate path.
- Walkers, kids on bikes, runners.
- People walking their dogs.
- Tour companies train their bus drivers on the road.
- People going to the motocross track in the park.
- It is a school bus route for elementary, middle school, and high school students.
- Individual mail boxes.
- Sky Hills residents.
- Cruisers.
- Motorcyclists.
- Jodhpur has cars parked on it during motocross events from the Dimond corner north. Also street parking during ski events.
- Fire & rescue.
- Snow removal.
- Utilities.
- Construction vehicles.
- There are no informal paths at the roadside; people walk on the road. Occupants of the new subdivision will want to access the park.
- There is no equestrian use; people trailer their horses in to the park to use the trails.
- Wildlife.
- Roller skiers will probably use Kincaid trail along Raspberry when it opens; they may still use Dimond for the hills.

Todd Jacobson and Randy Kinney gave a presentation on **existing corridor characteristics**.

Discussion highlights are below with responses to questions or comments in *italics*:

- East of the pagoda house the hauling of peat for construction caused deterioration of the road, which was never fixed, just patched. The occurrence of this deterioration does not necessarily imply that we need a large facility.
- When I first came to Anchorage, Jodhpur was a dirt road. It was paved with leftover paving from the airport. Pavement was put down and compacted with a bulldozer. It was not well

made or very thick. Water is not an issue if you can get it off the road because underlying gravel is deep. The surface potholes easily.

- We can agree that the current condition is bad and deteriorating. A new facility will be able to handle this sort of traffic much better.
- How important is it to have consistency in the roadway? Generally it is not. We have to consider the function of the road.
- Are traffic volumes for the various segments of the corridor available? *No, but we have the forecast in segments.*
- Prior to 1995 there was a 2-fatality crash (I thought there were separate accidents with fatalities for a total of 2 fatalities?). A Volkswagen swerved to avoid a pothole in the same area where the motorcycle crashed. *The State didn't have data on that crash. Talk to Bob Paulsen and other neighbors about it. During our last public meeting there was a crash on the corridor. There was a Jeep on its side when I went home. It was on the curve.*
- My wife hit a moose on the road. *Crashes are underreported, so there could have been more that we don't have in the official statistics. My mailbox got hit. There have been numerous crashes with trees and vehicles in ditches that never were reported.*
- Why are you showing us these road examples? *We have these so you can understand what the current Municipal standards are. Hillside Drive is the best rural example. Are there any examples outside Anchorage or Alaska? Check www.contextsensitivesolutions.org. We will be giving you homework later that asks you to look at roads. What we are showing is standard, but there is room for flexibility. We will need a justified design waiver authorized by the Municipal Engineer, but it can be done. We could have a combination of sections, too.*
- When trucks going south on Sand Lake approach the intersection, I don't see how they can see down Dimond well enough to turn without pulling into the intersection. If it were perpendicular to Dimond Boulevard it would help.
- The map doesn't show the correct locations of crashes. (pointed out locations on map)
- There were other factors in the crashes besides speed. There was a dead animal in the road. Don't know about helmet use [in motorcycle fatality]. They could have been dodging water coming down the road from the south. The southern lane gets swamped in breakup.
- Safety isn't the only reason for making changes to the road. We can't make this a sterile place just to prevent accidents. We need to have correct information so we can make better decisions for this project.
- There were other deaths at Sand Lake & Dimond before 1995. *We will address that, too. Width, skew, etc. may have been contributing factors to the injury accidents.*
- Why should we care about congestion? *It creates shorter gap acceptance and people turn when it's not safe, so it's a safety issue as well as time waste, increased pollution, etc.*
- Police are saying that traffic lights cause more crashes. *Roundabouts cause all vehicles to enter an intersection at low speed.*

Anne asked Committee members for ideas for **project design solution evaluation criteria**.

Response to questions/comments from the committee are in *italics*:

- Intersection safety at Sand Lake & Dimond
- Intersection safety at W. Park & Dimond

- Pedestrian and bike safety
- Preserves rural character
- Improve safety of curve at Jodhpur/Diamond
- Posted Speed limits
- Controlling speed. How? Enforcement, traffic calming
- Aesthetics
- Smooth transition to connecting roads. *Jodhpur park entrance was chosen as a natural project terminus. This project can't do anything with a State road.*
- Will water mains be put in during construction? The Legislature may be appropriating money for this. *We will get AWWU to inform us.*
- Coordinate with utilities
- Can this project include undergrounding of utilities? They often look at road projects for opportunities. *The road project would have to pay for moving utilities. We will consider it in design study. There is an undergrounding ordinance, but this corridor is not on their plan at the moment. The Community Council might request it. The wide right of way would allow undergrounding to take place later without disturbing the road.*
- Cost
- Minimize impact to property owners during construction and long term.
- Improved road surface

After the discussion concerning the Evaluation Criteria was concluded, a few housekeeping items were taken care of, as listed below:

- A summary of public input received to date was handed out.
- Committee members agreed to sharing their contact information with other members. Email addresses only will be published on the web site.
- The Committee was given an assignment to look at other collector roads in Anchorage and Eagle River, take pictures of features they like and don't like, that would fit or not fit with the West Diamond corridor.

A **final round of comments** was requested from each member of the Committee, per below.

Project Team responses to questions/comments are in *italics*:

- I am unconvinced about the traffic projections from West Park to Jodhpur; I want more definition of the projections and more detail to back up the numbers; I think they are too high.
- Think about what they might look like in winter when you look at roads and take pictures. The south side of the road is in shade and has slower snow melting. I want to make sure this is a road that the city will take care of.
- Update the land use map.
- Redo road ownership map—the light color doesn't show up.
- Disclosure: Many people on the project team have worked for my firm as consultants.
- I would like to think out of the box. There is a global source to look at. Look outside Alaska, there are beautiful examples. We only get one opportunity; we shouldn't rush; we should do it well.

- To me the road needs shoulders and that's it. I don't want to do any harm to the road.
- We need to plan ahead so we don't have to redo it later. Let's do it right the first time. Other road users are on the road less than the residents. We like it for the rural characteristics, so let's keep it that way.
- The Sand Lake Community Council didn't make this project a priority. *It was first in 2004, but there are other factors in project choice.* It would be good to know what those factors are. *There is a no build option, but so far safety compels a need to build something.*
- The south side of W. Park may be slated for upscale condos. Is there a way to look at projections for other development? *We can ask someone from Planning.*

There was discussion, but it remained undecided what the date of the next meeting will be. Brooks and Associates will inform everyone when the date is set.

Related documents on file:

- Notebook contents
- Agenda
- Sign in Sheets
- Aerial Photo
- Engineering Drawings

Subject: W. Dimond Blvd Upgrade Project - Web Survey

Date: Monday, July 31, 2006 5:38 PM

From: Betty Caudle <betty@brooksandassociates.info>

To: Citizen Advisory Committee Members

Cc: Anne Brooks <annebrooks@ak.net>, John Smith <SmithJW@ci.anchorage.ak.us>, Kathy Burgess <kbc@ak.net>, "Makela, Julie A" <makelaJA@ci.anchorage.ak.us>, Randy Kinney <randykinney.kinneyeng@alaska.net>, Todd Jacobson <tjacobson@rmconsult.com>, Paula Winfree <pwinfree@rmconsult.com>, Betty Caudle <betty@brooksandassociates.info>, Elise Huggins <ehuggins@earthscope.alaska.com>

Conversation: W. Dimond Blvd Upgrade Project - Web Survey

Hello Everyone!

In preparation for the next West Dimond project Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting on 8/21/06, we have two action items for you to complete by **Monday, August 14**.

1. Web Survey

We would like for you to visit the link below to give us your opinion of which road users use which road elements.

To help you envision both the typical rural and urban road elements, you may wish to print out the attached cross section diagrams from our previous meeting and have them available to consult as you do the survey.

Link to web survey: <http://www.surveymonkey.com/s.asp?u=862712405008>

If the link does not work automatically, then cut and paste it to your internet explorer.

2. Collector Road Samples

Please consider this a friendly reminder to complete your homework assignment given at the 07/12 meeting to look at other collector roads in Anchorage and Eagle River, take pictures of features that you like or don't like, that would fit or not fit with the West Dimond Corridor. The attached cross-section diagrams mentioned above can help you with this assignment as well.

Many of you wanted to use your digital cameras to take pictures. Please e-mail the pictures to us when complete. If you are using a 35mm camera, please call me so we can arrange to have the film developed.

Feel free to give us a call, if you have any questions about these requests or problems accessing the web survey.

Thank you for your prompt response.

~Betty


--

Betty L. Caudle
Brooks & Associates
301 W. Northern Lights Boulevard, Suite 440
Anchorage, AK 99503
Tel: 907.272.1877 Fax: 907.743.6087
Email: betty@brooksandassociates.info

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Collector Road Standard MOA Rural Collector Typical Section




July 12, 2006 CAC Meeting # 1

Dimond Blvd Upgrade




Collector Road Standards: MOA Rural Collector Typical Section



Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Collector Road Standards: MOA Urban Collector Typical Section





Results Summary

Show All Pages and Questions

[Export...](#) [View Detail >>](#)

Filter Results

To analyze a subset of your data, you can create one or more filters.

[Add Filter...](#)

Total: 7
Visible: 7

Share Results

Your results can be shared with others, without giving access to your account.

[Configure...](#)

Status: Enabled
Reports: Summary and Detail

1. Untitled Page

1. For each road user (identified by the advisory committee and project team) listed below, check off the road elements they use (check as many as apply):

	Travel lane	Paved shoulder	Lighting	Separation btwn travel lane/pathway	Multi-use path	Drainage Ditch	Clear zone (vehicle recovery area)	Sidewalk (Urban cross-section element)	Curb & gutter (Urban cross-section element)	Landscaping	Respondent Total
Bicycle--adults	43% (3)	100% (7)	71% (5)	57% (4)	86% (6)	14% (1)	29% (2)	57% (4)	0% (0)	29% (2)	7
Bicycle--kids	14% (1)	57% (4)	57% (4)	71% (5)	86% (6)	14% (1)	14% (1)	71% (5)	0% (0)	14% (1)	7
Bus driver trainees	100% (7)	57% (4)	71% (5)	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	57% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (1)	7
School bus	100% (7)	71% (5)	71% (5)	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	57% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (1)	7
Construction vehicles	100% (7)	57% (4)	71% (5)	29% (2)	29% (2)	29% (2)	71% (5)	14% (1)	29% (2)	29% (2)	7
Cruisers	100% (7)	29% (2)	43% (3)	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	57% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	29% (2)	7
Emergency Service vehicles	100% (7)	71% (5)	71% (5)	43% (3)	14% (1)	29% (2)	57% (4)	29% (2)	43% (3)	14% (1)	7
Kincaid park users	86% (6)	43% (3)	57% (4)	29% (2)	71% (5)	14% (1)	43% (3)	43% (3)	0% (0)	43% (3)	7
Motocross users	100% (7)	43% (3)	43% (3)	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	57% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (1)	7
Motorcyclists	100% (7)	43% (3)	43% (3)	14% (1)	0% (0)	14% (1)	57% (4)	0% (0)	0% (0)	14% (1)	7
Postal carriers	100% (7)	100% (7)	57% (4)	14% (1)	14% (1)	14% (1)	57% (4)	29% (2)	14% (1)	14% (1)	7
Total Respondents											7
(skipped this question)											0

2. For each road user (identified by the advisory committee and project team) listed below, check off the road elements they use (check as many as apply):

	Travel lane	Paved shoulder	Lighting	Separation btwn travel lane/pathway	Multi-use path	Drainage Ditch	Clear zone (vehicle recovery area)	Sidewalk (Urban cross-section element)	Curb & gutter (Urban cross-section element)	Landscaping	Respondent Total
Residents	86% (6)	86% (6)	57% (4)	43% (3)	100% (7)	43% (3)	57% (4)	71% (5)	14% (1)	71% (5)	7
Runners	14% (1)	57% (4)	43% (3)	57% (4)	100% (7)	14% (1)	29% (2)	71% (5)	14% (1)	43% (3)	7

Skiers--roller	43% (2)	57% (4)	43% (3)	57% (4)	100% (7)	14% (1)	14% (1)	43% (3)	0% (0)	43% (3)	7
Skiers--XC	14% (1)	29% (2)	29% (2)	71% (5)	100% (7)	0% (0)	14% (1)	29% (2)	0% (0)	43% (3)	7
Snow removal equipment	100% (7)	100% (7)	57% (4)	57% (4)	43% (3)	71% (5)	57% (4)	29% (2)	14% (1)	14% (1)	7
Utilities	67% (4)	67% (4)	33% (2)	67% (4)	17% (1)	83% (5)	50% (3)	17% (1)	17% (1)	17% (1)	6
Walkers--dog	14% (1)	57% (4)	57% (4)	71% (5)	100% (7)	14% (1)	29% (2)	86% (6)	0% (0)	71% (5)	7
Walkers--recreation	14% (1)	86% (6)	57% (4)	71% (5)	100% (7)	14% (1)	43% (3)	86% (6)	14% (1)	43% (3)	7
Parking near Jodhpur--Motocross event	17% (1)	100% (6)	50% (3)	50% (3)	33% (2)	33% (2)	67% (4)	17% (1)	17% (1)	17% (1)	6
Parking near Jodhpur--Ski race special event	20% (1)	100% (5)	60% (3)	60% (3)	40% (2)	40% (2)	80% (4)	20% (1)	20% (1)	20% (1)	5
Total Respondents											7
(skipped this question)											0

3. Can you think of any road users missing from the list above? If so, list them here:

	Response Percent	Response Total
View User 1	100%	1
View User 2	100%	1
User 3	0%	0
Total Respondents		1
(skipped this question)		6

4. What road element(s) would the users you named in the previous question need? (Check as many as apply.)

	Travel lane	Paved shoulder	Lighting	Driving lane/pathway separation	Multi-use path	Drainage Ditch	Clear zone (vehicle recovery area)	Sidewalk	Curb & gutter	Landscaping	Respondent Total
User 1	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1
User 2	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	100% (1)	100% (1)	100% (1)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	1
User 3	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0% (0)	0
Total Respondents											1
(skipped this question)											6

5. Are there any road elements missing from the lists above? If so, what are they?

	Response Percent	Response Total
Element 1	0%	0
Element 2	0%	0
Element 3	0%	0
Total Respondents		0
(skipped this question)		7

6. What users would use the elements you named in the previous question? (List as many users for each element as needed, separated by commas.)

Response Percent	Response Total
------------------	----------------

Element 1	0%	0
Element 2	0%	0
Element 3	0%	0
	Total Respondents	0
	(skipped this question)	7

[SurveyMonkey is Hiring!](#) | [Privacy Statement](#) | [Contact Us](#) | [Logout](#)

Copyright ©1999-2006 SurveyMonkey.com. All Rights Reserved.
No portion of this site may be copied without the express written consent of SurveyMonkey.com.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade
 MOA Project No. 05-005
 DIMOND ADVISORY COMMITTEE SURVEY RESULT
 WHAT ROAD USERS USE WHAT ROAD ELEMENTS?
 CAC MEMBER RESULTS

	Travel Lane	Paved Shoulder	Lighting	Separation Btwn Travel Lane/Pathway	Multi-Use Path	Drainage Ditch	Clear Zone	Sidewalk	Curb & Gutter	Landscaping
Bicycle -- adults										
Bicycle -- kids										
Bus Driver Trainees										
School bus										
Construction Vehicles										
Cruisers										
Emergency Service Vehicles										
Kincaid Park Users										
Motocross Users										
Motorcyclists										
Postal Carriers										
Residents										
Runners										

Dimond Blvd Upgrade
MOA Project No. 05-005
DIMOND ADVISORY COMMITTEE SURVEY RESULT
WHAT ROAD USERS USE WHAT ROAD ELEMENTS?
CAC MEMBER RESULTS

	Travel Lane	Paved Shoulder	Lighting	Separation Btwn Travel Lane/Pathway	Multi-Use Path	Drainage Ditch	Clear Zone	Sidewalk	Curb & Gutter	Landscaping
Skiers--roller	●	●	●		●					●
Skiers--XC	●	●	●		●		●			
Snow Removal Equip.	●	●	●	●	●	●	●			
Utilities	●		●							●
Walkers--dog	●	●	●	●	●					●
Walkers--recreation	●	●	●	●	●			●		●
Parking Near Jodhpur-- Motocross Event	●	●	●	●			●			
Parking Near Jodhpur-- Ski Race, Special Event	●	●	●	●			●			



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade
 Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road
 MOA Project No. 05-005

**Citizens' Advisory Committee
 Meeting #2**

August 21, 2006, 5:30 to 7:30 pm
 Jewel Lake Plaza Multipurpose Room
 8300 Jewel Lake Road, Anchorage

Agenda

- | | | |
|---------|--|---|
| 5:30 pm | Introductions | |
| | Pick-up dinner | |
| 5:40 pm | Comments/Corrections to Draft Meeting Notes | Anne Brooks |
| 5:45 pm | Who are we designing the corridor for? | Todd Jacobson, R&M |
| | Pedestrian Facility Requirements and Opportunities | Lori Schanche, MOA Non-Motorized Transportation Coordinator |
| | Planning and Zoning and Urban Design Commissions | Sharon Ferguson, MOA Planning |
| | Street & Pedestrian Facility Maintenance | Dan Southard, MOA (unconfirmed) |
| 6:00 pm | Present and discuss results – | |
| | Committee Web Survey | Paula Winfree, R&M |
| | Committee homework assignment | Elise Huggins, Earthscape |
| 6:10 pm | Discuss Evaluation and Design Criteria for West Dimond Boulevard | Todd Jacobson, R&M |
| 6:20 pm | BREAK (if desired) | |
| 6:25 pm | Build a Roadway Cross Section | Todd Jacobson, R&M |
| 7:20 pm | Next Steps | |
| | 2 nd Public Meeting (Sept/Oct) | |
| | CAC Meeting #3 Agenda items | |
| 7:25 pm | Committee Comments | |
| | Observer Comments | |
| 7:30 pm | Adjourn | |

W. Dimond Boulevard Upgrade
 Citizen's Advisory Committee

SIGN-IN
 Monday, 08/21/06
 5:30-7:30 pm
 Jewel Lake Plaza,
 Multipurpose Room

✓ Here	Name1	Name2	Org/Business
	Judith	Hoersting	Neighbor
	Susan	Ritter	Sand Lake Community Council
	Mike	Carlson	Neighbor
	Layne	Ratcliffe	Neighbor
	Matt	Michetti	Hultquist Homes
	Jonathan	Williams	Arctic Bicycle Club
Project Team			
	John	Smith	MOA - PM&E
	Julie	Makela	MOA - PM&E
	Todd	Jacobson	R&M Consultants
	Paula	Winfree	R&M Consultants
	Randy	Kinney	Kinney Engineering
	John	Pekar	Kinney Engineering
	Elise	Huggins	Earthscape
	Anne	Brooks	Brooks & Associates
	Kathy	Burgess	Brooks & Associates
	Betty	Caudle	Brooks & Associates



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road

Evaluation Criteria, Design Criteria, and Roadway Cross Section

CAC Meeting #2
August 21, 2006



Outline

- Discuss Web Survey and CAC Homework
- Review & Finalize Evaluation Criteria
- Review Flexible & Inflexible Design Criteria Elements
- Develop List of CAC Preferred Design Elements for Cross Section



Web Survey - CAC and Project Team Results



August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

3

R&M Consultants, Inc.

		Travel Lane	Paved Shoulder	Lighting	Separation Btwn Travel Lane/Pathway	Multi-Use Path	Clear Zone	Sidewalk	Landscaping
MOTORIZED VEHICLE USERS	Bus Driver Trainees	Yellow	Green	Green			Green		
	School Bus	Yellow	Green	Yellow			Yellow		
	Construction Vehicles	Yellow	Yellow	Green			Yellow		
	Emergency Service Vehicles		Green	Green			Green		
	Kincaid Park Users	Yellow	Green	Green		Green			
	Motorcyclists	Green					Green		
	Postal Carriers	Yellow	Green	Green			Green		
	Residents	Yellow	Yellow	Green		Green	Green	Green	Green
	Snow Removal Equip.	Yellow	Green	Green	Green		Green		

PEDESTRIAN, BICYCLE, AND OTHER USERS	Travel Lane	Paved Shoulder	Lighting	Separation BtwnTravel Lane/Pathway	Multi-Use Path	Clear Zone	Sidewalk	Landscaping
	Bicycle--Adults	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green		
	Bicycle--Kids	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow	Green	Yellow	
	Runners	Yellow	Green		Yellow	Green		Yellow
	Skiers--Roller	Yellow	Green		Green	Green		
	Skiers--XC				Green	Green		
	Walkers--Dog		Yellow	Green	Yellow	Green	Green	Yellow
	Walkers--Recreation		Yellow	Green		Green		Yellow
	Walkers--Recreation		Green	Green	Green	Green	Green	

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2 5 R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade
Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road
PMA&E Project No. 05-005

Committee Homework Assignment

Comments on Design Elements

- Lanes
- Shoulders
- Pathways
- Buffer
- Sidewalks
- Landscaping
- Illumination
- Traffic Calming

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2 6 R&M Consultants, Inc.



Evaluation Criteria

- Evaluation Criteria are used to measure the performance of alternatives.
- These characteristics represent the range of stakeholder values and provide the “context” for CSD/CSS.
- Evaluation Criteria are measured quantitatively (e.g. specific values, “delay”, “level of service”, “crash reduction”) or qualitatively (e.g. best vs. worst, high vs. low).

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

7

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Evaluation Criteria Review

Evaluation Criteria	Quantifiable Measure
Vehicular Safety	Roadway And Intersection Crash Reduction
Intersection Provides Vehicle Capacity	Vehicular Level Of Service
Pedestrian Safety	Pedestrian Accident & Conflict Reduction
Typical Section Provides Improved Pedestrian Facilities	Number Of Ped. Facilities, Facility Widths, Connectivity, And Continuity
Preservation of Rural Character Maintained	?
Minimizes Impact To Property Owners During Construction	Temporary Construction Easement Area
Minimizes Right-of-way Impacts	Right-of-way & Easement Area
Construction Cost	Total Of Construction, Right-of-way, & Utility Costs

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

8

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Evaluation Criteria Review (continued)

Evaluation Criteria	Quantifiable Measure
Maintenance & Operations Cost	Equipment And Labor Costs to Maintain Facility Over The Project Life
Controls Vehicle Speeds	Consistency Of Design Elements, Need for Traffic Calming

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

9

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Design Criteria & Identification of Flexible Design Elements

Typical Sections

- Urban and Rural
- Location of Pedestrian Facilities

Intersection Treatments

- Roundabouts, Signals, and Stop Control

Traffic Calming Features (if required to control speeds)

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2


10

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



MOA Urban Collector Road Typical Section Elements




Pathway Buffers:
7'; Ideal minimum width for pedestrian separation, snow storage, enhancements space
3'; Minimum for vegetated buffer

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2


11

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



MOA Urban Collector Road Typical Section Elements



Shoulders:
3.5'; Minimum for on-shoulder biking, space for evasive maneuvers, and emergency parking (not allowed where buffer < 7 feet)
5'; Required for temporary snow storage if there is no pathway buffer, also desirable for designated bike lanes


12

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



MOA Urban Collector Road Typical Section Elements




Travel Lanes:
 10'; adequate for low speeds, low volumes, and few trucks for segment west of West Park Drive
 11' minimum; between Sand Lake Road and West Park Drive segment due to vehicle traffic volume

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2


13

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



MOA Urban Collector Road Typical Section Elements



Pathways & Sidewalks:
 8' - 10' Pathway required on one side, entire project
 5' - 10' Sidewalk on opposite side is recommended between Sand Lake Road and West Park Drive


August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2



MOA Rural Collector Road Typical Section Elements

Pathway:
8 to 10-foot Pathway required on one side

Travel Lanes:
10-foot, adequate for low speeds, low volumes, and few trucks for segment west of West Park Drive
11-foot minimum, between Sand Lake Road and West Park Drive segment due to vehicle traffic volume



August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

15

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Pathway Location Evaluation Criteria

Criteria	Comments	Favored Pathway Location	
		North	South
Construction Cost	Lowest Cost Favored		
Maintenance Cost	Lowest Cost Favored		
Access To Kincaid Park	Park Is More Accessible From The South		X
Access From Adjacent Subdivisions	Subdivisions Are On North Side	X	
Access To Proposed Schools	Schools Are On North Side	X	
Continuity & Connection To Other Trails In Area	Existing Paths Are To The North	X	
Conflicts At Approaches	Less Conflicts To The North	X	
Separation From Roadway	(Pending Design Alternative Review)		
Exposure To Sunlight	North Side Provides Higher Sun Exposure	X	
Conformity With Existing Topography	(Pending Design Alternative Review)		
Conformance To Areawide Trails Plan	Trails Plan Shows Trail On South		X
Impact To Existing Utilities	(Pending Design Alternative Review)		
Impact To Existing Vegetation	(Pending Design Alternative Review)		
Other			

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

16

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Intersection Treatment Elements

- **Stop Signs**
 - Feasible for all intersections. Sand Lake Road will require additional turn lanes and provide LOS of D in 2028.
 - Provides good Pedestrian LOS.
- **Roundabouts**
 - Feasible for Sand Lake Road and West Park Drive intersections.
- **Signals**
 - Feasible for Sand Lake Road after 2018
 - Provides acceptable Pedestrian LOS

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

17

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Traffic Calming Elements

Vertical Speed Control	Speed humps (For posted speed of 30 mph or less)
	Speed Tables (For posted speed of 30 mph or less)
	Gateway/Landscape
	Raised Crosswalks (For posted speed of 30 mph or less)
	Raised Intersections (For posted speed of 30 mph or less)
Horizontal Speed Control	Mini traffic Circle
	Roundabouts
	Road Narrowings (Must maintain minimum lane & shoulder widths)
	Lateral Shifts (Are not known to reduce speeds)
	Chicanes (Must maintain minimum lane & shoulder widths. Are not known to reduce speeds)
	Neckdowns (Must maintain minimum lane & shoulder widths)
	Chokers (Must maintain minimum lane & shoulder widths)
	Island Narrowing

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

18

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Develop CAC Preferred Alternative

Flexible Design Element	Element Value / Description					
Lane Width - Sand Lake to West Park	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12				
Lane Width - West Park to Jodhpur	<input type="checkbox"/> 10	<input type="checkbox"/> 11	<input type="checkbox"/> 12			
Typical Section Type - Sand Lake to West Park	<input type="checkbox"/> Rural	<input type="checkbox"/> Urban				
Typical Section Type - West Park to Jodhpur	<input type="checkbox"/> Rural	<input type="checkbox"/> Urban				
Shoulder Width - Sand Lake to West Park	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	_____	
Shoulder Width - West Park to Jodhpur	<input type="checkbox"/> 3.5	<input type="checkbox"/> 4	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	_____	
Sidewalk - Sand Lake to West Park	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No				
Sidewalk - West Park to Jodhpur	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No				
Sidewalk Width	<input type="checkbox"/> 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Other	_____			
North Buffer - Sand Lake to West Park	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 2' Conc.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3' Veg.	<input type="checkbox"/> 7' Veg.	<input type="checkbox"/> Othr	_____
North Buffer - West Park to Jodhpur	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 2' Conc.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3' Veg.	<input type="checkbox"/> 7' Veg.	<input type="checkbox"/> Othr	_____
South Buffer - Sand Lake to West Park	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 2' Conc.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3' Veg.	<input type="checkbox"/> 7' Veg.	<input type="checkbox"/> Othr	_____
South Buffer - West Park to Jodhpur	<input type="checkbox"/> 0	<input type="checkbox"/> 2' Conc.	<input type="checkbox"/> 3' Veg.	<input type="checkbox"/> 7' Veg.	<input type="checkbox"/> Othr	_____

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

19

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Develop CAC Preferred Alternative (Cont.)

Flexible Design Element	Value / Description		
Intersection Type - Sand Lake Road	<input type="checkbox"/> All-way Stop	<input type="checkbox"/> Round-about	<input type="checkbox"/> Stop & Future Signal
Intersection Type - West Park Drive	<input type="checkbox"/> Stop	<input type="checkbox"/> Roundabout	
Gateway Landscaping for Traffic Calming	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No	
Other Landscaping Description			
Other Traffic Calming Description			

August 21, 2006 CAC Meeting # 2

20

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Next Steps

- Preliminary Design Alternative Development
- 2nd Public Meeting (Sept/Oct)
- CAC Meeting #3 Agenda items



Thanks for attending!

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road
PM&E Project No. 05-005

Sign In Sheet

Jewel Lake Plaza, Multipurpose Room
August 21, 2006, 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting

Please print clearly:

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

NAME
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

Sign-In Sheets on file. Available upon request only.



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade

Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting #3

January 4, 2007, 5:30 to 7:30 pm
Jewel Lake Plaza Multipurpose Room
8300 Jewel Lake Road, Anchorage

Agenda

5:30 p.m.	Introductions	
	Dinner	
5:40 p.m. – 5:45 p.m.	Comments/Corrections to Meeting Notes	Anne Brooks
5:45 p.m. – 6:00 p.m.	Summary of CAC Input	Anne Brooks, Brooks & Associates
6:00 p.m. – 6:15 p.m.	Summary of the Internal Agency Meeting held on 10-20-06	Todd Jacobson, R&M John Smith, MOA
6:15 p.m. – 6:45 p.m.	Design Alternatives- Typical Sections Roadway Impacts/Design Challenges Intersection Alternatives	Todd Jacobson, R&M Paula Winfree, R&M
6:45 p.m. – 7:00 p.m.	BREAK (if desired)	
7:00 p.m. – 7:20 p.m.	Discussion/Questions	
7:20 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.	Next Steps 2 nd Public Meeting (Feb/March)	
7:30 p.m.	Adjourn	

W. Dimond Boulevard Upgrade
 Citizen's Advisory Committee

SIGN-IN
 Thursday, 01/04/076
 5:30-7:30 pm
 Jewel Lake Plaza,
 Multipurpose Room

✓ Here	Name1	Name2	Org/Business
	Judith	Hoersting	Neighbor
	Susan	Ritter	Sand Lake Community Council
	Mike	Carlson	Neighbor
	Layne	Ratcliffe	Neighbor
	Matt	Michetti	Hultquist Homes
	Jonathan	Williams	Arctic Bicycle Club
Project Team			
	John	Smith	MOA - PM&E
	Julie	Makela	MOA - PM&E
	Todd	Jacobson	R&M Consultants
	Paula	Winfree	R&M Consultants
	Randy	Kinney	Kinney Engineering
	John	Pekar	Kinney Engineering
	Elise	Huggins	Earthscape
	Anne	Brooks	Brooks & Associates
	Kathy	Burgess	Brooks & Associates
	Betty	Caudle	Brooks & Associates

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Jodhpur Road to Sand Lake Road
PM&E Project No. 05-005

Sign In Sheet

Jewel Lake Plaza, Multipurpose Room
January 4, 2007, 5:30-7:30 p.m.

Citizens' Advisory Committee Meeting

Please print clearly:

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

<i>NAME</i>
ADDRESS/ZIP
PHONE
EMAIL

Sign-In Sheets on file. Available upon request only.



Dimond Boulevard Upgrade Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road

Summary of CAC Input, Agency Stakeholder Meeting, and Recommended Alternative

CAC Meeting #3
January 4, 2007



Agenda

- Summarize Public & Advisory Committee Input
- Summarize Agency Stakeholders Input
- Present Recommended Alternative
 - Typical Cross Sections
 - Intersections
 - Alternative Evaluation
- Discussion
- Public Meeting



Project Stakeholders

- Residents, local
- Residents, area
- Children & Adults
- Athletes (roller skiers, bicyclists, runners)
- Dog walkers
- Wildlife
- Emergency services (Fire, Police)
- Kincaid Park Users
- School buses
- Motorcyclists
- Street Maintenance
- Others



Public & Advisory Committee Input

- Road improvements are needed
- Design to slow traffic
- Design to maintain rural character of road & neighborhood
- Consider shoulders and/or pedestrian facilities (comments mixed on one/both sides)
- Underground utilities, if possible
- Coordinate with water/sewer improvements
- Less street lighting is better
- Provide safe pedestrian crossings



Agency Stakeholders Input (October 2006)

Met with representatives from MOA

Departments:

- Project Management and Engineering
- Parks and Recreation
- Planning
- Traffic (Motorized & Non-Motorized)
- Mayor's Office



Agency Stakeholders Input

Purpose of Meeting:

- Provide update on progress of project.
 - Present current state of street design
 - Findings of Preliminary Traffic Analysis
 - Overview of CAC and public input
- Obtain internal input and guidance on project design
- Review/evaluate appropriateness for and justification of Design Criteria Waiver



Conclusions of Agency Stakeholders Meeting

Design OK as presented with one change:
Construct Pedestrian Facilities on Both Sides of Roadway

Why?

- Safety
- Better local and area wide access to Kincaid Park
- Title 21 Requirements (ADT>1,000)
- Continuity with West Park Drive
- Future Development of Residential Areas
- Elementary and Middle School
- Conformance to 1997 Areawide Trails Plan


CAC Meeting #3, Jan. 4, 2007

7

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Recommended Cross Section: Jodhpur Street to West Park Drive




CAC Meeting #3, Jan. 4, 2007

8

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Recommended Cross Section: West Park Dr to Sand Lake Rd



CAC Meeting #3, Jan. 4, 2007

9

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Intersection Treatment Elements

- Existing (Stop signs):
 - Sand Lake Road intersection control fails by, or before [2028](#).
- Treatment Options (3):
 - All-Way Stop Signs
 - Feasible for all intersections. Sand Lake Road will require additional turn lanes and provide LOS of D in 2028
 - Provides good Pedestrian LOS

CAC Meeting #3, Jan. 4, 2007

10

R&M Consultants, Inc.




Intersection Treatment Elements

- Treatment Options (continued)
 - Roundabouts
 - Feasible for Sand Lake Road and West Park Drive intersections.
 - Signals
 - Feasible for Sand Lake Road after 2018
 - Provides acceptable Pedestrian LOS



Recommended Sand Lake Roundabout




Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Recommended West Park Roundabout

Roundabouts provide excellent operations!



CAC Meeting #3, Jan. 4, 2007

13

R&M Consultants, Inc.

Dimond Blvd Upgrade



Recommended Alternative Evaluation

- The following slides present project evaluation criteria and performance of the recommended alternative.
- “Do-Nothing” is always an alternative
 - No safety benefits would be realized.
 - Pavement would continue to deteriorate with increased maintenance burden.
 - No pedestrian or bike facilities.

CAC Meeting #3, Jan. 4, 2007

14

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Recommended Alternative Evaluation

Evaluation Criteria	Recommended Alternative Notes
Vehicular Safety	Improves vehicle safety by increasing lane and shoulder widths which decrease lane departure and head-on crashes. Crash severity is reduced because the roadside is improved (a contributing factor to fatalities). Roundabouts are proposed for major intersections, also enhancing safety. Retains vertical curves and lower design/posted speed.
Intersections Provides Vehicle Capacity	Sand Lake Road intersection will fail during design life. Alternatives propose roundabouts, which provide good Levels-of-Service and accommodate pedestrians.
Typical Section Provides Improved Pedestrian Facilities	Connectivity and continuity are provided on both sides of roadway. Limits concern for pedestrians crossing roadway expressed by MOA Traffic.
Pedestrian Safety	Accommodates pedestrian movements on both sides of roadway which minimizes mid-block crossings.
Preservation of Rural Character	Retains vertical curvature. Minimizes slope limits.

CAC Meeting #3, Jan. 4, 2007

15

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Recommended Alternative Evaluation (Continued)

Evaluation Criteria	Recommended Alternative Notes
Minimizes Impact To Property Owners During Construction	
Minimizes Right-of-Way Impacts	Improvements within the right-of-way with some exceptions (see plans).
Controls Vehicle Speeds	Alignments support reduced speeds and provide potential to integrate traffic calming.
Maintenance & Operations Cost	Project will reduce M&O costs for pavement repair.
Construction Cost	Construction costs are anticipated to conform with typical collector-road upgrades.

CAC Meeting #3, Jan. 4, 2007

16

R&M Consultants, Inc.



Next Steps

- Discussion
- Next Steps
 - Design Alternative Development/Design Study Report
 - 2nd Public Meeting (February/March) -- review draft Design Study Report



Thanks for Attending!



Meeting Notes

SUBJECT: W. Dimond Boulevard Upgrade

PROJECT NO.: MOA PM&E 05-005

GROUP: Citizens' Advisory Committee (CAC)

DATE: January 4, 2007

TIME: 5:30 PM

LOCATION: Commons Room, Jewel Lake Plaza, Anchorage AK

MEETING OUTREACH: Emails and phone calls to CAC members.

MEETING ATTENDANCE: CAC Members: Susan Ritter, Mike Carlson, Layne Ratcliffe

MEETING MATERIALS:

- 1) Handouts: Agenda, Printout of PowerPoint presentation
- 2) Graphics: Strip plot of the recommended plan, profile and typical sections.
- 3) PowerPoint presentation

STAFF PRESENT:

MOA PM&E: John Smith

R&M Consultants, Inc.: Todd Jacobson, Paula Winfree

Kinney Engineering: Randy Kinney

Earthscape: Elise Huggins

Brooks & Associates: Anne Brooks, Kathy Burgess

MEETING INFORMATION:

Anne Brooks opened the meeting with a round of self-introductions. She asked for comments and/or corrections on the previous meeting notes. One of the CAC members wanted to make sure their comment regarding not building the road without constructing utilities was included in the minutes.

Todd Jacobson summarized the progress of the project to date. He reviewed the list of stakeholders and input received from the public, the CAC, and agency stakeholders. The stakeholders in the project include residents, athletes, dog walkers, wildlife, emergency services, Kincaid Park users, school buses, motorcyclists, and street maintenance. The public and CAC has stated roadway improvements are necessary and should be designed to slow traffic and maintain the rural character of the roadway. Comments have also addressed pedestrian facilities but opinions vary regarding having one or two facilities. The project team has also received input regarding the undergrounding of existing utilities and coordinating this project to include the installation of any future utilities. Comments have been received to minimize the street lighting.

A second internal agency meeting was held in October 2006. The persons who attended this meeting represented Project Management and Engineering, Parks and Recreation, Planning, Traffic (motorized and non-motorized) and the Mayor's office. The purpose of the agency meeting was to summarize the progress of the project and provide the input received from the public and the CAC. The agencies were asked to provide input on the design and evaluate whether it was appropriate to obtain a Design Criteria Waiver in order to provide only one pedestrian facility. The agencies required pathways to be constructed on both sides of West Dimond Boulevard in conformance with MOA design standards, planning documents, and Title 21. It was determined a Design Criteria Waiver was not warranted. Constructing two pathways will increase pedestrian safety, be in conformance with the 1997 Areawide Trails Plan, provide better access to Kincaid Park, provide continuity with West Park Drive, and accommodate future residential development and schools. The recommended typical roadway section and intersection design was presented to the CAC. The typical roadway section will provide two pedestrian facilities - a 10' multi-use path on the south and an 8' multi-use path on the north of Dimond Boulevard from Jodhpur Street to Sand Lake Road. In addition, the typical section from Jodhpur Street to West Park Drive will have 10' lanes, 3.5' shoulders and curb and gutter. The typical section from West Park Drive to Sand Lake Road will have 12' lanes, 5' shoulders and curb and gutter. The recommended intersection treatment at West Park Drive and Sand Lake Road are roundabouts. Figures for the recommended design can be found in the attached PowerPoint presentation.

A discussion with the CAC committee followed the presentation. A summary is given below with CAC member comments and questions in *italics* and project team responses in plain type.

- *Will this fit in the existing right of way?* There are isolated areas along the project corridor that will require a slope easement or a retaining wall. Potential areas outside the right-of-way effect approximately 5% to 10% of the corridor length. Efforts will be made to keep improvements within the right of way.
- *Is it OK to have road drainage flow onto nearby property?* There is already some drainage onto adjacent properties from the existing road. However, storm drains and vegetated swales will handle most of the water from the new streetscape.
- *Are you buying out the property at the corner of Sommers Place because their wells are on/near the right of way?* We don't know at this time. If the wells or any other private improvements are located in the right-of-way, we will determine whether the improvements are permitted encroachments. If not, MOA will likely require the relocation of the improvements outside of the right-of-way.
- *The Crocketts' house and another big house under construction will be impacted. With a wide road like this, where will snow from private driveways be stored? Who will maintain this larger facility and its sidewalks?* The shoulders of the road and the 7-foot buffer between the road and the pathway are intended for interim snow storage. The Municipality will maintain both the road and the paths. There are now many more trail plows in use and the City has been doing a much better job in recent years clearing pedestrian paths promptly after a snowfall. During the detailed design of the road we will be working with individual property owners to discuss their driveway needs. Snow

storage will also be a part of this conversation to ensure we don't create additional winter maintenance headaches for the city or the property owners.

- *It looks like the full right-of-way plus some more area will be cleared to build the road.* There will be impacts to the existing vegetation within the right-of-way. It is necessary to construct the road changes. To minimize the impacts, the team will investigate whether the pedestrian facilities may be pushed closer to the road in some specific areas to reduce clearing in those areas.
- *This looks like it will require a lot of fill and be very expensive.* We want to maintain the road's horizontal and vertical curves in order to maintain rural character and require slower vehicle speeds. However, due to the proposed width of the corridor in comparison to the existing conditions, substantial earthwork will be required in some locations. During the design process, there will be a significant effort to balance the cut and fill areas to minimize the import of additional fill material.

Randy Kinney presented the intersection designs, including roundabouts at Sand Lake and West Park. Discussion highlights:

- *What about a driveway that enters the roundabout/intersection?* The driveway would become just another entrance/exit leg of the roundabout or intersection. We will work with individual property owners on solutions to access.
- *How about traffic from the proposed new school?* Traffic from the proposed new school has been considered in the traffic projections for the project.
- *Will the roundabouts handle trucks and long vehicles?* Roundabouts are designed with an apron at the edge of the circle that handles the trucks and long vehicles.
- *Will the roundabouts fit in the existing right-of-way?* It looks like it. A small amount of right-of-way may be required for the West Park roundabout.
- Having a roundabout at West Park would provide additional safety, speed control, and form an entrance to the rest of the corridor even though it is not required for congestion control.
- *There may be a sight distance problem for cars approaching the roundabout on West Park from the north.* Noted. Our design team will address all site distance issues during the design of the project.

Todd continued the presentation with design alternative evaluation using the criteria developed with input from the committee. Discussion highlights:

- *Are there other traffic calming measures being considered besides roundabouts?* We're looking for additional input from the CAC on this. Possibilities include narrowing the roadway or providing chokers at pedestrian crossings, textured concrete, and/or possibly some center islands. Tree plantings may be effective between back of curb and pathways

in some places. We will continue to work with the community throughout the design to fine tune these elements.

- *This is an awfully big project for a small road. I wonder if we're getting the right balance of what we get for what we give up. This just might be a way to bring in a part of the South Coastal Trail.* The next public meeting will address the broader public audience, their needs and desires, and their opinions of the tradeoffs. The dual pedestrian pathway is required to meet design standards and the dual nature of the road (urban on the north and rural on the south).
- *We need a commitment to do as much as possible to slow people down. I worry the wider road will invite greater speed. I don't see the safety issue. By doing nothing to the road, I think it would be safer than widening it. There's got to be a simpler way to achieve safety than this big project.* One of the safety problems we are trying to solve is because the crashes that happen on West Dimond are generally severe. Wider roads and shoulders can lessen that severity.
- One comment from the agency meeting was this road serves a lot of people that live outside the area, and these user numbers will increase over the life of the project improvements. People who use the road daily may feel safe in the current configuration, but people who do not travel the corridor on a regular basis do not feel safe.
- *I want to be sure that there is a commitment to traffic calming. Drop the speed limit to 35 mph.* Speed studies done before and after improvements on collector roads within the Municipality have shown us that vehicle speeds generally remain the same. People may tend to speed in a rural environment like West Dimond because they feel no one sees them. Road width does not have as much to do with the tendency to speed as the surroundings of the road do.
- *Can dollar values be assigned to evaluate the difference between just improving the pavement we've got now and the maintenance of the proposed alternative?* We could try to do that. Remember that the no-build alternative is just that—it would mean not repaving, as that would be a capital project. Also, the no-build does not address the future capacity problems that are sure to arise with the building of the housing development, schools, and general city population increase.
- It would be good to have the CAC review the draft Design Study Report (DSR) and meet to discuss it, especially the traffic calming measures, slope easements, and drainage issues.
- *What will be done with the curve as West Dimond turns into Jodhpur?* That might be one of the places where we have a retaining wall to lessen the right-of-way impacts. One comment was to take the pedestrian path right into the park.
- *Is it the intent of the Municipality that similar improvements be considered on the adjacent Kincaid Road?* That is one of the challenges of the Municipality of Anchorage's state- and city-owned roadway system. Sand Lake, Kincaid and Jodhpur are all state-owned. The MOA owns West Dimond Boulevard. We can work with the State

to improve Kincaid Road, but the City cannot unilaterally do it. Once this project gets built, other roads might be candidates for transfer to the city, which often comes with an upgrade of the facility before transfer. That's currently happening on 100th Avenue.

- *What's the funding picture like for this road?* We are funded through the draft Design Study Report, and then will go through design. If we get it designed, it will go to the head of the line for construction funding.
- *There is ongoing interest in bringing city water to the area because of worries about pollution from the development of the sand pit. But once the mains are there, growth would be possible.* We met with a representative from AWWU to determine future water and sewer plans for this corridor. There is a water master plan for the Sand Lake area that will be available sometime in February. Water planners said that an Water Improvement District (WID) would have to be created and paid for by property owners along Dimond in order to bring city water to the road project area.
- *Will we have to clear the whole right-of-way to build this?* Yes, a good deal of the right-of-way will be impacted to construct the proposed improvements.
- *What will happen to the culverts that we have put into our driveways?* We will have to meet with individual property owners to work out what will have to be done to driveways and drainage to facilitate the new road design.

The next public meeting will be after the school spring break and will likely be held at Dimond High School. The next CAC meeting will probably be in early March to discuss the draft DSR.

Related documents on file:

Agenda

Sign in sheets

PowerPoint presentation