

Seward Glenn Mobility PEL Study Comment Log*
 *Personal identification information has been removed from comments



Comment Number	Commenter	Comment	Response
1	Bennett Norman	Why do delays and miles travel increase more than population?	[From the Meeting Transcript] We tend to all be using the same roads, at the same time, so that's why congestion is going up more than the other factors, because we're all trying to use the Glenn Highway and other corridors, so those rush hour peaks are really a factor there.
2	Dana Gilam	My name is Dana and I own property in the coupling between Gambell and Ingra. I have kind of a comment, and then a question. The reason we purchased was largely high volume of traffic and easy accessibility, if we lose one or both of those things that will greatly impact our small business that is planning to open around the end of the year. We've already began \$100,000 remodel and had planned a second phase. We've actually put a stop on the second phase until we get a little better information about the future of the area. With the highway potentially going straight through my building I'm extremely concerned I'll lose my property to eminent domain. The Fairview community has already been tainted by negative effects of the Sullivan Arena Shelter, just as they allegedly planning on moving people out of the Sullivan Arena now there's again the looming uncertainty of where the Seward to Glenn connection will go. The uncertainty makes it challenging for me and many others to move forward with any investment in the area. Being a young person, this is my husband and I's first brick and mortar business, and we have put every penny into trying to pull this project off. To find out, it could be destroyed in the near future is disheartening and hard to swallow as a startup company. From what I can see on the timeline. We don't know where the connection will go for two years, what can you tell businesses, property and homeowners in the area about when they will know what possible routes the connection will take? Two years is a long time for uncertainty.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thank you for your comment and thank you for expressing your concerns. I think, as we move through the process, when I was talking about coming up with the alternatives, the about five alternatives that will combine ideas into the alternatives to move through the process that's when you'll see lines on the map. So right now is a great time to give those comments and exactly what you're saying really encourage you to also stay engaged. The next public meeting is when you'll see the alternatives have alignment on them, lines on a map that can be rough. But also during this comment period I really encourage you to give more comments and also be specific about your concerns about the uncertainty regarding where a corridor might be or any changes because that's important to get it into the record.
3	Emily Wiser	Yeah hi my name is Emily Wiser, I have a question on the traffic study, so I was wondering if you consider two things in that so, the first being the last couple of years during the pandemic, you know we've seen a lot of changes in travel and commuting and working from home and a lot of those changes are going to persist. So are those considered when you're forecasting traffic. And then also have you considered the intended road shifts so there's several policy documents in Anchorage that call for more biking more walking more transit facilitating those shifts from driving cars. So were those included in the travel study as well, thank you.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Travel models are based in 2019 that's pre pandemic conditions and that's what our 2050 model also assumes because right now, it is in such a state of flux, we have seen communities experienced traffic decreases due to the pandemic. But in the past few months they've also been going back to what they were previously, and we have changes in volumes of remote work, but we also have more delivery services and just a lot of different changes to our travel patterns so we're trying to incorporate enough flexibility into the project. So that as the recommendations are identified and implemented at that time, they can be adjusted to accommodate the trends that are going on at that time. we're trying to make sure we're kind of future proofing it so we're not excluding the possibility of making those changes, but at this point it's just a little too early to have tangible, trends showing we're going to have reduced traffic in the future. And your other question about road shifts is also a good question because it's another case where the trends are changing and we are acknowledging that. So that's why we are trying to include more of a multi modal approach to what our solutions are and it's also something that will be updated, over time, as the recommendations get implemented, as we see those shifts in the travel modes.
4a	Allen Kemplen	Talking about traffic. I think you noted in your documentation there are performance metrics travel time reliability is one of those and travel time reliability uses person trips so why have you instead decided to ignore person trips and then concentrate on vehicle tips.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Laurie: The travel model is set up to do vehicle trips so that's why as part of our criteria, we will be looking at travel time, but that is a good suggestion, so I would encourage you to submit that as a comment that we consider looking at person trips. Taylor Horne: it's taken as a comment on the record.
4b	Allen Kemplen	I just want to make sure that my comments made verbally will be taken on the record.	Yes, all comments made during tonight's meeting will be documented for the project record.

5	Shellie Smith	Hi I'm Shellie and I'm from Mountain View and I just have a couple of comments. Looking at the proposal and here that talks about the East Airport Heights so I'm assuming you're looking at Bragaw as a major access from the Glenn Highway going north to 20th avenue, and there are a number of schools along that corridor and businesses and stuff and Mountain View is a community where a lot of people walk, they don't have transportation, so if you're going to make a lot of traffic through there it would be really good to put in the study how you can move sidewalks back from the street and maybe put in pedestrian crosswalks for people going to and from the school. And I don't know about the port what you're planning there, but I would hope that you will keep big trucks on the Glenn Highway until they got to Reeve Blvd. and did not bring them through mountain view because again there's a number of small children walking along there. There's also a junior high, there's a number of people going to and from the Red Apple market, and so I think it makes it a dangerous combination to have large trucks coming off a main interstate highway going fast and then trying to slow down and negotiate pedestrian traffic moving the same direction, thank you.	[From the Meeting Transcript] I'll just add that those are great comments and something we will definitely consider as part of the alternative evaluation process, so thank you for sharing your concerns.
6	Kenny P	Haven't we already gotten to this point previously a number of years ago with alternative solutions, whatever happened to those efforts of results?	[From the Meeting Transcript] Yeah, thanks for that comment, and you are right, this has been studied repeatedly. We have actually used information from one of the highway studies we have documented in the environmental study report that was in the sixties. We have used relevant information and updated what's been done. For example, you're probably referring to the highway to highway project that started and then stopped in about 2010. A lot of things have changed since then, the traffic forecast that Laurie presented on back to then and they were using forecasts that really show the steep increase in traffic. For example, also in the approved plan was the Knik Arm crossing, so we're taking what what's good from the prior studies what's still valid and salient but also updated it. And what I would offer is the change the difference is the process itself. Also that prior effort, if you're referring to the highway to highway effort was environmental impact statement which has less flexibility and more of that kind of process orientation than the venn diagrams that I was talking about earlier in my presentation, about how planning and environmental process allows for this level of interaction and numerous points throughout the process, you know that wedge, I was showing where we're going to come out to you with a draft product and ask for your feedback and the hope is, the goal is, have broad community input and support with that recommended alternative or alternatives that come out at the end and then it moves forward from there, thank you.
7	Kenny P	What happened to those other alternatives, are they going to be considered and carried forward?	[From the Meeting Transcript] So, if you're referring to alternatives from the highway to highway effort that was really looking at highway connections, you know, it was in the title, so there were ideas of doing connections that went far east in Anchorage and other areas. Those aren't necessarily going to be included in this project, because we're focusing in on that study area that we presented at the beginning of the project really looking at what is the right solution, what are the needs, in where we are right now, what's wrong here with connecting to the port and the Seward and Glenn. And then, what can be done in that area, so if there are pieces in a part of those the ideas that come out we're not going to take an alternative pre baked from a prior effort and automatically bring it into this, but if we hear from the community, from elected officials that list of folks that can give the ideas, if there's something that was proposed in a prior plan, even if that plan wasn't implemented it can be incorporated into one of those alternatives that we take through so it's not that something's automatically off the table, but it's not automatically on the table, either we are starting fresh with an open mind, for what could be a solution, and what types of modes and ideas are parts of those two.
8a	James Thornton	I am a member at large with the Fairview Community Council, I live in Fairview, I work in Fairview, I own a business. I'm also a member of the new newly re-started Fairview Business Association representing some longtime Fairview business owners, as well as new business owners such as myself, and I'm also on the Fairview ad hoc community committee for homelessness which is addressing the Sullivan Arena and the exit strategy and what happens after so a lot of stakeholders they're very concerned about you know the outcome of this study. So I wanted to start off by saying thank you so much to Josie we talked about wanting to see something different happen with the Community outreach flyers and some of the documentation going out she was extremely helpful She invited me to the HDR home base. I came up, we had a sit down with her team, it was excellent got a chance to kind of meld the minds and although maybe not everything got through, I really felt like they are trying, and they are listening so we appreciate that moving forward here and we're going to continue to work together, it takes all of us to do this, obviously, she can only do the outreach we actually have to respond show up and then keep going here so that we, you know we see the kind of quality of life improvement that we're all looking forward Fairview not just motorized. So besides that, I just had to I just a few questions and we talked about this before and apologies if it was maybe in the material but I was just curious on three quick things. You mentioned other stakeholders who have influence on the project, I was curious if you could go into detail on who those other stakeholders are just for my information and some of the others listening.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thank you, James and thank you for that kind remarks and I welcome anybody who has any ideas or suggestions for how we can improve our reach, please don't hesitate to make a comment here today in the meeting room, virtual meeting room or one of our other methods. To answer the question about stakeholders, we use the word stakeholders to mean quite a lot. we have tribal entities, we have agencies that have jurisdiction, resource agencies, so we have quite a few different entities that are part of this process and we've created what we call committees. And so we have Community Councils, we have a Community advisory committee, we have our third avenue radicals, we have quite a few wonderful folks that are all part of this process, so we use the word stakeholders to kind of meet everybody that is providing us comments and part of the process, but I happily will provide any other further information about who the stakeholders are involved in the committees. You can go to the website, you have our committee list right there, so you can see, as well, but if anybody has any questions about outreach or any questions about people involved in this process don't hesitate to ask questions or reach out.

8b	James Thornton	And also appreciate the purpose statement I felt like it did have quite a few of our concerns in it. So I can tell that you guys are listening and that you're including that not just the motorized not just the highway but some of those non-motorized needs, I was really glad to hear that, actually, and then the last just the quick one is how long about until that alternative screening process phase, if you could give people kind of an idea on that and then what that might be extensions may be or the timeline is kind of the world we live in, right now, you know it makes the deadline just about so thank you.	[From the Meeting Transcript] We're trying to stick to our schedule we're on. Where we are right now is at this public meeting #2 and it's about the end of this phase. So we're here at the end of spring 2022. So phase four, which is what we're moving into is summer to fall 2022. That is developing and doing that first round of screening. So there was a prior question about when you'd be able to see what these alternatives look like that set of five and the draft results of that first level of screening that's at the next public meeting, which is in the fall-winter of 2022. We're going to be coming back out and applying these screening criteria to a set of five-is alternatives and coming back with the draft results what those results are going to look like it's kind of like a matrix a way to say well, this is an idea, this is how well we saw applying those criteria, how well it met the needs of safety, of the community, of solving the multiple everyone doing everything on the roadway at once issue. So, then, in the winter of 2023, this coming winter into the summer, we will be refining the top tier of those. So we get everyone's feedback that says yes, it looks like there's these two or three ideas that really shine we're going to then dive into detail, it's going to need more engineering work and more analysis to really tease out the differences. There can be tweaks done to those alternatives, at that point too. If there was an idea that really performed well that met a need in one alternative that can be applied to more than one the idea can go into more than one alternative. so that happens, basically until about this time next year is when you have public meeting number four.
8c	James Thornton	And also appreciate the purpose statement I felt like it did have quite a few of our concerns in it. So I can tell that you guys are listening and that you're including that not just the motorized not just the highway but some of those non-motorized needs, I was really glad to hear that, actually, and then the last just the quick one is how long about until that alternative screening process phase, if you could give people kind of an idea on that and then what that might be extensions may be or the timeline is kind of the world we live in, right now, you know it makes the deadline just about so thank you.	[From the Meeting Transcript] And that is that refinement and then the level two screen, like the results of how well that did in a recommended alternative like which one or set of more than one perform the best at that second level and so the final outcomes of that are the winter to spring of 2024 that step six here, and this is where everything we're doing gets documented and it's done in a way that meets the reason there's such a high bar to documentation and Community involvement, it has to be done to the same level of detail, as required by those federal regulations by NEPA national environmental policy act. So, for example, imagine the recommended alternatives that come out of this study are let's do these five projects well to be able to use these public meetings to use these comments in that subsequent project development process, they have to be documented to that level. so it's going to be it'll be a big thick document, it will hopefully be readable but there'll be all these technical appendices included so, then they can be rolled right into the potential projects that come out.
9a	Allen Kemplen	I noticed in your handout underneath the comments that you received during January 24-February 2022, the largest number of comments, you received were regarding the non-motorized. But when you look at your alternative selection criteria there's squat about non-motorized or about pedestrian safety. There is a real inconsistency in what has been shown between the first part of the project and what you're presenting now. You say that you've heard what the people said, well, it doesn't look like you heard what the people said right, because otherwise you would have more emphasis on pedestrians, can you explain that?	[From the Meeting Transcript] One of our evaluation criteria is focused on non-motorized safety, under measure two the number of conflict points between vehicles and non-motorized users to try and measure how we are improving safety for non-motorized users in our study area. And yes, and in addition, under the social demands and economic development, we are looking at consistency with Anchorage 2020 the 2040 land use plan, the Fairview neighborhood plan and other land use plans which have identified similar issues. In addition to what we have here is a level one screening, we also have as part of the process level two screening that we haven't talked a lot about tonight because it's a future stage, but that will also go into more detail about non-motorized and other community based concerns.
9b	Allen Kemplen	Just like to point out that these complex points that you're talking about least from what I can see is all about the intersections but while the number of the comments are made regarding pedestrian safety was about the district safety along the entire corridor in between the intersections. The utility poles that are in our sidewalks they're just not in the sidewalks at intersections, they are in the sidewalks throughout the corridor, so I just like to point that out, that your approach in terms of your criteria doesn't appear to be adequate.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thanks for that comment, Allen, I just wanted to point out we are hearing you loud and clear, and definitely will take that into consideration and we want to hear people's ideas if you think we are not adequately representing pedestrian and non-motorized users in this level one screen criteria let us know. I just want to ask folks to take the time to dive into the documents. we couldn't put everything that's in the documents gone to a single slide here so this is taken from the draft recommended alternative selection criteria memo and then there was the system performance memo that Laurie presented on. We did dive into those issues to a lot of non-motorized issue, so I really hope folks take the time to read that and give us your comments on those. But we are hearing loud and clear from folks and that's why we wanted to present that heat map of where we heard comments from that non-motorized are issues also in this corridor, hence if you go back to the draft purpose needs statement, there are several statements in there about multiple modes and how that's incorporated into the different needs and the purpose statement.

10	Leslie Kleinfeld	What considerations are being given for increasing public transportation options from South Anchorage to the base JBER to eagle river to the valley, which is a bulk of noncommercial traffic that could greatly decrease the delays in traffic at peak times	[From the Meeting Transcript] The first question had to do with increasing public transit essentially between the South and out to the destinations, along the Glenn. We are incorporating, so that that is done through the planning process that AMATS has done and we are considering adopted plans, so we have as part of the need statement and also part of the measures is saying okay we're going to look at these alternatives and how well do they meet the plans, so there are adopted plans for public transit in the area and that's why we're putting multiple modes when we say the word mode that doesn't mean just driving in a car, that is riding your bike, and taking transit so alternatives that are going to go through the process so it's certainly a component that can come with that.
11	Leslie Kleinfeld	Please also consider not further dividing already disenfranchised neighborhoods of Mountain View and Fairview. Underground the fast traffic.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Well, the other comment was about you know undergrounding the high traffic, and that is an idea that we've explored in the past and previous projects and that's an idea that we will be considering as part of the alternative identification process so thanks for that comment.
12a	Sharon Chamard	Sharon a 19-year resident of Fairview, and currently the treasurer of the Fairview Community Council. And so, this question is, a follow up to one that I asked in a previous public forum, which was all online, thank you for doing an in-person component at this time that's great. So I asked about what types of data you would be collecting with respective pedestrian movement and I think the response was we don't have a plan to do that, but we might be able to you know kind of repurpose the cell phone data that we use to look at motorized vehicle trips to see if that will work for pedestrians. And I think in a written comment I said it'd be really nice if you could get your project modified to have some actual like purposeful collection of data pertaining to pedestrian volume, so I guess, I would like to know did that happen, but what are you doing for collecting data about pedestrians?	[From the Meeting Transcript] Taylor: Regarding work to date the cell phone data so the traffic modeling does not include data from people walking it is using vehicles, it's focused on vehicles. We have not, to date, done a specific pedestrian or bike movement study and as part of this process. But what I would offer is again kind of going back to my response to the prior question by Allen is that we're hearing loud and clear from folks that that is a concern and hence we incorporated into the purpose and needs statement for it. I'm going to hand it over to Kelly, the project manager. Kelly: so we don't have any plans to do a data collection effort for pedestrians, I guess, I would ask you where would you have us count pedestrians in this entire project area? Then I don't see how that would be meaningful. Anywhere we do improvements is going to be improved for all modes and since we don't know where alternatives are going to be. It wouldn't really be a data set that we could use to inform but we could see pedestrian counts at a later phase of the project when we've identified an alternative, and we start going into a design of a project, and we of course will accommodate all modes. John: I would take a look at what we have in that system performance memo because we did collect and report quite a bit of information from the non-motorized plan we got all of those maps we've specifically analyzed them for the study area they have pretty good information on the you know bike and pedestrian demand locations, we also did collect you know the last 10 years or 12 years of safety data, not just crash data from vehicles but bike and pedestrian crashes and analyze that specifically so when Taylor says we are hearing you we you know I would look and see what we have in there and then, if you think that there's something missing, I would make a comment about that. Josie: What I was going to offer as the public involvement person, we would be happy to meet with you and or somebody who's really passionate about it, to really understand what you're looking for Kelly has always made herself available so if we can take the action after this meeting to get with you to maybe sit down with maps and kind of go through what is it that once you have a chance to look at those system performance memos like what's in there and what is potentially missing or desirable and we'd love to follow up on that.
13	Dana Gilam	Can you please explain and address what the cut and cover concept would look like exactly?	[From the Meeting Transcript] yeah I think that's referring to the concept that was studied during the highway to highway project .So the concept at that time would have would have sort of depressed or put the highway connection in a you know, in a trench and the cross streets would have gone over the top, and some of those blocks could have had a lid or basically a wide bridge on top that you could put a park or other amenities on top. That was the concept at that time. I think one of the important things about this study is, like Taylor said we're coming in fresh, so I know people might be thinking Oh, this is where they're going to decide where to put the highway and I think the important thing first is to figure out, you know is a highway a solution that we need, so I really encourage folks to look at the purpose and need statement that the traffic forecast and then we'll start figuring out, you know what are the solutions that we need to fix the problems that we see out there.

14a	Nathan Wiley	With the history of highways cutting through minority communities, does the current project take into get into account this history and make efforts to correct previous mistakes, this is especially prevalent in the Fairview Community.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The simple answer is yes and how we are trying to account for that is, I'm going to refer back to the purpose and needs statement there and how we have a category and the words that are written underneath the community and social impacts section actually I'm going to go back to point you towards the third intent statement, the so I'm in the purpose part of the purpose and needs statement and it talks about improving neighborhood connection so we've heard that this is a concern from folks and incorporated that into there and the idea of the purpose being to improve mobility, accessibility and safety for people, people and goods traveling by all modes, so that's walking and riding their bikes and also driving across the roadway system and along. And so under the social demands and economic development section this is where we're trying to bring in the idea of there are numerous plans that have been adopted in the area that either the assembly or Community Councils have adopted and have visions for. And we're using the terms here the current built environment, right now, the study area is inconsistent with the vision expressed with recently adopted development plans and is adversely affecting neighborhood redevelopment efforts, Community cohesion, and quality of life. And the reason I'm going back to this is the purpose needs statement is like the bedrock statement for what the study does and how we go through the idea filtering process, it's all starts with the purpose and needs, and we are going to weigh how these ideas and the alternatives compete against one another, how well they fulfill and fix the problems as represented by those words. So in response, I just want to say yes, we are trying to incorporate these concepts as much as possible, as we move through this as the community expresses their concern.
14b	Nathan Wiley	With the history of highways cutting through minority communities, does the current project take into get into account this history and make efforts to correct previous mistakes, this is especially prevalent in the Fairview Community.	[From the Meeting Transcript] I might just encourage the commenter to read the document, there's quite a bit of information in there. You know kind of the social conditions that are in the neighborhoods but, but like Taylor pointed out, that third need is essentially recognizing that the past highway or Gambell and Ingra street couplet and so forth the way it's designed is in conflict with the adopted plans so part of what we would be trying to solve is, how do we find solutions that that bring that corridor more in line with those adopted plans.
15	HellBilly	Strava, it's a website has significant data and bicycle movement, largely focused on recreational riding. They make their data available to government agencies for transportation planning purposes, this data set, including heat maps is even substantial in Anchorage. I would highly recommend the project team look into gaining access to this data to better inform the team on typical or more frequently used routes.	[From the Meeting Transcript] So great comment our performance report does include Strava data for the study area, so thanks again for the comment.
16a	James Thornton	Thank you Josie. What's your name again? Taylor. Did we meet on the way out? We had an awesome conversation kind of about some of the historical things going on and kind of what the community is looking for, and I really felt like you vibed with that and understood, and I really appreciated the conversation and the feedback, thank you, I just want to make that comment because I really appreciated that one on one as you were leaving for the day, not just trying to get to your car but actually listening to you know what I have to say, as a new Fairview person, so thanks for that.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thanks, and I'll remind everybody, both in person and virtually that all comments are being recorded and are part of the project record and it will be considered as part of this process.
16b	James Thornton	I definitely wanted to back up what Sharon said about the non-motorized, obviously we'd like we understand that you guys are asking us do you have an idea of how we might accomplish that maybe it's not something that's normally done. I know I see the motorized studies happening on an annual basis, regularly, with the high traffic that we have in our area, and I think moving forward if we see gas prices stay at this rate, which I can't imagine they will we're going to need a lot more non-motorized everything so and also Fairview particularly with our extremely diverse demographic has so many types of non-motorized to keep in mind that it really does kind of bump residents and business owners up a level, I think, with when you say non-motorized, I hear a lot of the bicycles, or the walking we also have wheelchairs and walkers and we have strollers we have a lot of new families coming to Fairview, I hope more as we are up and coming. People that can afford housing in our area they're going to have kids, those kids are going to want to be safe, we have several recent deaths on the road, because of our existing outdated streets that have been overlooked for decades, while we facilitate the transportation through Alaska of hundreds of millions of vehicles, a year, while other people are complaining about trucking routes down Down Northern Lights, you know we're looking at rolled curves and four feet from the Black Angus Inn to Gambell, I mean I understand there's challenges, not everybody has answers, but we are ready for ready for fairness so the app tracking was a concern for me, obviously it's not going to address the non-motorized, also not those who have phones, especially people that are you know, taking advantage of those services, which we do have a lot of those.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thanks, and I'll remind everybody, both in person and virtually that all comments are being recorded and are part of the project record and it will be considered as part of this process.
16c	James Thornton	speaking of documentation, are you all familiar with the Fairview neighborhood plan, have you all read it? Included in the 2040 Anchorage Land Use Plan. Yeah, OK cool, so the cut and cover idea that's kind of in there, it might be a little bit understated, I don't know if it's actually word for word in there. But we have ideas for Fairview we would like to see, obviously we're going to meet somewhere in between it's going to be expensive I assume for cut and cover. But we have to consider it as an option and we're looking for more green space to facilitate the non-motorized, to make it prettier for all of Anchorage, for Alaska, for point of privilege, for all of us.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thanks, and I'll remind everybody, both in person and virtually that all comments are being recorded and are part of the project record and it will be considered as part of this process.

16d	James Thornton	<p>We all drive through Fairview and I'm just tired of everyone saying you know don't look, don't look on that's the Gambell Carrs, just put your head down don't look don't look right we got to stop that so we were looking at a green space to connect Ship to Chester over Ingra. If you look I'm not a geologist, but if you look at the actual topography of the area I don't know the math and science here, but it sure looks like a cut and cover would be a potential idea of possibility with the way that it jumps up and then it kind of swoops back down so again more green space. When we get the arena back, maybe even the aces eventually or something you know to be taking pride in again. A lot of the property owners around they're going to want to possibly sell, and we could be looking at a great arena district. We're talking about an innovation area which could take advantage of our geostrategic location and do some neat things like essentially you know printing things that we are now currently getting from out of state. A lot of things. So this is more of a statement just to remind everybody that it wasn't just the highway to highway that considered a cut and cover, we all want a cut and cover because you know, we want to see the quality of life improve for everyone. So that was all I had on this one thanks.</p>	<p>[From the Meeting Transcript] Thanks, and I'll remind everybody, both in person and virtually that all comments are being recorded and are part of the project record and it will be considered as part of this process.</p>
17a	Allen Kemplen	<p>The flyers you have is about the number of comments that people made in terms of sort of the transportation issues. Well, a significant number of individuals raise the issue of environmental justice, right and I don't see your environmental justice dealt with in your purpose and need or your alternative selection criteria. Like to be able to understand how you're incorporating environmental justice, you know into the project so that's tick number one. And two, I'd like to read something. Field reports, two pedestrians struck in vehicle pedestrian collision at Gambell and 15th Sunday evening March 22, 2022. Pedestrian struck, killed here in downtown Anchorage on Friday, March 5, 2022. Pedestrian dead after collision with truck March 19, 2022. Pedestrian struck by cargo van near downtown, seriously injured, police say March 24, 2022. People are dying along this corridor on a regular basis and yet if you look at your alternative selection criteria it's all about the peak period freight travel time. Peak period travel time and how is the roadway going to handle peak period volume and keep capacity ratio about 0.8, peak period delay. Now the road with average peak period travel, was at 20% design speed. What does that talk about? That's talking about fast, that talks about moving vehicles quickly, right. So there's inconsistency here between the reality of this neighborhood the facts and the data that's being presented and the lives that are being lost.</p>	<p>[From the Meeting Transcript] I'm going to take people's safety and lives question first, because that is very important, and the reason we're having this meeting, right now, and this process is to say, this is our ideas for what the screening criteria are, if they're not meeting what you think they should be. We will take into consideration, any additional measures that you recommend. So, on the draft screening criteria we've got the three needs, so if those aren't something that, well excuse me, so we have the needs statement, and then we try to match up and come up with measures of how you can improve how to measure the differences. So it's not only the purpose and needs, but also the measures. I really want to stress that this is a summary statement that you're seeing on this slide and in the handout and then the basis for these are in that document that it's referred to. The conflict points idea for safety and the crashes so we're not just talking about vehicle crashes, here we have in the system performance memo. We have several maps that are mapping the crashes in identified hotspot intersections, in areas where there are pedestrian-car and bicycle-car crashes, so we are taking a look at that and incorporating. And those will be factors that get factored into Okay, what are the ideas for improving that, How does that function. I want to reiterate that. The point of having the evaluation criteria is not to drive what the solutions are, it is to try to back to see which ones are the better performing solutions, the better performing ideas. So we are asking you for your input on Okay, if you don't think we're hitting the mark here on how to measure one idea versus another on how well it improves pedestrian safety, how well it improves folks that are walking down the sidewalk, please let us know we are trying our best here. But we want to hear your feedback about that.</p>
17b	Allen Kemplen	<p>And this project, are you moving forward with this project, with this purpose and need. The purposes and need and these alternative selection criteria, they don't match up with this purpose and need, and how do you reconcile that disconnect?</p>	<p>[From the Meeting Transcript] Secondly, about environmental justice, we're trying to incorporate. Environmental Justice means a lot to different people. It originated from an executive order that that is applied to federal agencies that's one thing that happens during the NEPA process, that's a technical side of things. We want to get ahead of that and talk about equity issues and incorporate what's going on in the neighborhood, social demands, and economic development. We're trying to incorporate concerns that are expressed by the folks that live here in their express not only through the adopted plans as we wrote here but also ideas about Okay, you know, there is this issue going on with folks have to traverse a highest speed corridor, how can we reconnect them. And that's why we're trying to incorporate into the purpose and needs statement this idea of connections and improving community cohesion and quality of life. But I'm going to keep coming back to, these are drafts right now and we're really asking you for your input on this, we are not here to present the solution. And that's why it's an iterative process with all these red boxes on the bottom that represent times we go out and ask you for your input, we've taken our best stab, our best guess at incorporating this information we gathered. We definitely want to hear from you, because Allen, it sounds like we're not hitting the mark and we want to know how we could hit the mark.</p>
18	Faith Klida	<p>Faith says great job by Taylor and his team, excellent presentation and also the online access is very much appreciated.</p>	<p>[From the Meeting Transcript] Thank you for that comment, I will say that doing a hybrid meeting was a recommendation by the Community Advisory Committee, so we decided to do this hybrid approach based on the feedback from the community.</p>

19	Dana Gilam	Are you reaching out to the businesses and homes of the alternative routes before they're presented to the public.?	[From the Meeting Transcript] Taylor: We don't have any alternative routes planned right now, I think it was a question of the schedule. You see the top row on our schedule. So we have several advisory groups set up to try to engage Community Councils, engage folks as we're building these ideas. So they meet at each one of these steps, so one of them is the Community Advisory Group that we have, and so we would come to them first and ask for their input and we certainly want to know. Now, at this stage, also that's why one of our asks right now is for alternatives and solutions, part of that is also Let us know where you don't want to see a road, or what's important, like knowing what's out there is it's very important for folks. So that's the first step, and then the next step would be during the next public meeting, where there are the five or so alternatives that will have lines on the map and or you can see those. Josie: I just also add the project team is very accessible, if you have any questions about you know, once we get past that and closer to the alternatives, if you have any questions about that we will happily meet with you.
20a	Peggy Ammann	My name is Peggy and I live in Eastridge I'm a little concerned about the other side but I have always been kind of intrigued with going underground things and green belts and roads across. However, I think there's one thing and again probably you consider it just didn't get in any things and that is the railroad, why are we building roads you're talking about 2050 you're still talking about individual cars. I think this city could pump up mass transit. I pictured this railroad coming with all those people from the valley and buses going everywhere constantly. 10,000 people work in the U-MED district, why couldn't that be buses rather than building more roads for more individual drivers and more cars. And Kelly, more people. A bus that holds 60 people could certainly cut down on that. So have you considered, I know there are problems with the railroad but I, I really think that that is one of the answers. I rode those trains for years and that rail belt that rail bit from Palmer gets better and better and better every year. It goes right through base, I don't understand why that isn't a part of this study, which would make this whole study moot.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Taylor: thank you for that comment about the railroad. Right now the railroad is not part of an adopted plan. If it were part of the plan that like say the assembly adopted or Mat-Su that would be incorporated into the model and numbers, the traffic numbers that we're looking at. Right now it's it just hasn't gotten off the ground in the Community right now. So if that changes during this it could, but right now we're just looking at that tight little corridor. John: I would just add, I mean the study we're doing is a sub area study, so, if you look at the at the study area, we're trying to solve problems in a fairly discrete location. There's a metropolitan transportation plan that's going on and broader questions about how we move around the entire region, you know really should be pointed to that team and at addressed in that process, and we have to sort of fit within the bounds of you know what's what can happen within the study area.
20b	Peggy Ammann	My name is Peggy and I live in Eastridge I'm a little concerned about the other side but I have always been kind of intrigued with going underground things and green belts and roads across. However, I think there's one thing and again probably you consider it just didn't get in any things and that is the railroad, why are we building roads you're talking about 2050 you're still talking about individual cars. I think this city could pump up mass transit. I pictured this railroad coming with all those people from the valley and buses going everywhere constantly. 10,000 people work in the U-MED district, why couldn't that be buses rather than building more roads for more individual drivers and more cars. And Kelly, more people. A bus that holds 60 people could certainly cut down on that. So have you considered, I know there are problems with the railroad but I, I really think that that is one of the answers. I rode those trains for years and that rail belt that rail bit from Palmer gets better and better and better every year. It goes right through base, I don't understand why that isn't a part of this study, which would make this whole study moot.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Aaron Jongenelen: I'm the project manager for the 2050 MTP, the long range transportation plan for AMATS. Right now, we're actually going through a project nomination process, so that's the project that's looking 20 plus years out of what kind of transportation projects, we would like to see, or what our transportation system should look like by 2050. So that plan is happening right now and nominations are being accepted, you can go to AMATS2050.com and you can get the information on how to nominate projects. That's a perfect plan to integrate some of these recommendations I've been hearing tonight so thankfully, this team is recording it and capturing it and some of that can be carried forward. So you can either put the nomination in yourself, or you can call my office or email my office and talk to me about it, and we can drop the nomination in for you. so if you guys have any other questions, let me know I'll be here for a little while longer. Thank you.
21a	Karen Gonne'-Harrell	Hello, my name is Karen and I'm a member at large of the Fairview Community Council for about 10 years now, but in life just a few blocks away from the Seward location. So anyway, I'm a born and raised Alaskan. The comment about how you can't count pedestrians because you don't know where you're going to do this, well the last comment was you don't really have another plan for where the road is going to go, it's going to be Ingra Gambell that corridor. A nyone been on the bike trail and see that beautiful thing counts bicycles and pedestrians down at Chester. We count out on the bike trail, they have this post now that is counting people as they go by. It seems that if you have these big things that count cars and count people that would be a way to. So when it's a very small area actually both trails 10 miles long and that's just more steps relative Kincaid, so it seems to be fairly easy to count people, you can hire teenagers to stand there and tick tick tick to actually count the number of people. They have things on the road that count our cars, and so I think what's missing that we are frustrated with is that, yeah yeah yeah we will make it good for people, but you haven't been out there to really see how many people and the kind of people that use all the area, but really in our neighborhoods.	[From the Meeting Transcript]I just wanted to add that we did get information from the city about bicycle and pedestrian movement along the trail system and that information is contained in the system performance report. We also included information from the non-motorized plan about where the highest demand is for walkers and bikers and other non-motorized type of uses, so please take a look at our system performance report, and let us know if there's additional data that you're expecting.
21b	Karen Gonne'-Harrell	I walk a lot. In the winter there's days I won't because it's impossible. I walked over here tonight, and I came down Carla St. and part of Carla is beautiful, there's a sidewalk a big sidewalk on one side and small sidewalk away from traffic. They do that more around schools, but perhaps if there was team that actually drove around parked and watched what happens in the neighborhood. And they're right, there's more than walkers, there's people at Sullivans, we have people who have lots of issues that are hard to deal with if there is traffic. We have lots of motorized wheelchairs and in the winter they are literally in the street. And you cannot see them in the corners. This is because, I remember when they put in Ingra Gambell, so it's been a while, since they did something over there. But they didn't take into consideration that growth, phone poles, same. So counters, I'm sure you can count people.	[From the Meeting Transcript]I was you know basically going to say the same thing Laurie just did there. You know we think you know the project team has pretty good information. We know that there is a high proportion of the population of people who walk and bike in the neighborhood we have pretty good data on that so we know as is reflected in the purpose and need, how we deal with we have national highway systems with trucks and freight and heavy volumes and high speeds, and then we have people who need to walk and bike and get across safely get along those roadways safely and that's really the crux of what we're trying to solve here is how do we make the system work for all those uses and either ideas what can we can put forward to you know, to make it better, so that it works for all those uses.

22a	Daniel McKenna-Foster	Thank you, my name is Daniel I'm speaking for myself tonight. I just had actually two questions, the first is about could you go back to the criteria. So this might have been already asked, I got here little bit late but I'm wondering, is there any way to put something on there about noise and air quality. I'm just thinking if you were going to build a factory that produced the amount of noise or emissions that a highway facilitates you'd have to probably go through a lot of mitigation actions I don't know roads are required to do that or not. But I wonder if that could be one of the measures that was considered. My second question is talking about the volume to capacity ratio above 0.8, just wondering why point eight what does it mean if you get to one, to what would it mean if you get to five, what if you get to 10. Is that a problem, and if it slows things down, I mean is that los, or I'm just thinking kind of what other people have said that when things slow down things get a little bit safer, co could you explain a little bit about what that means and what it would mean to go above 0.8?	[From the Meeting Transcript]Great questions, so the first one about noise and air quality that's actually in our level two screening criteria. Our level one screening criteria really looks at how does the alternative match up with our purpose and need factors and then, once we've done that initial screening of Level one. We're going to refine the alternatives and then we're going to look at more how are these alternatives going to be impacting the Community. So we have air quality, noise, land use, environmental justice I want to say about 16-18 different factors that the alternatives provide into that level to screening will be looking at. And your second question about the volume to capacity ratio, basically the volume to capacity ratio relates to level of service and it's kind of on a zero to one scale, if you have one or anything above one we're basically in gridlock and it's almost impossible to move. 0.8 is about where we consider acceptable congestion. If it's better than that, we can get around town and nobody's complaining a lot. When it's worse than 0.8, we notice it and that's when we start going Okay, we started having congestion problems and safety problems because there are just too many vehicle trying to use that space. And that does relate to non-motorized because when you do have those congested conditions it does create an uncomfortable pedestrian environment as well, because you start having those higher volumes of congestion, creating air quality concerns.
22b	Daniel McKenna-Foster	I'm just wondering, it seems to me that one vehicle slow down it gets a little safer for pedestrians, at least my experience I've been walking and it's safer to walk near a slow car than a fast car. And also when you reach those higher levels of congestion, people start to make that decision to get out of their cars because of the comparative the cost of driving. So, I'm just wondering, it feels kind of like a values position to say 0.8 .9 or why not 1. But that's it I don't need any follow up on this.	[From the Meeting Transcript]Thank you, that comment has been recorded for the record. Level of service .8 corresponds to level D. DOT&PF strives to maintain a level of service of D or better in urban areas.
23	Bob R	Thanks for putting this on, I really appreciate it. Bob R of Northeast Community Council. We love parks and trails. That said, you know I'm for the roads, but also for the pedestrians and bikes. I'm kind of a strange duck because I'll drive my pickup truck to a trail and I'll go on the trail, I won't walk on the sidewalk and if I want to go skiing I will hop in the truck and go on the trails. so, it's twofold you need to watch out for the traffic, mobility and also for the pedestrians and bicycles. So, it's twofold. It's about 20 years ago I attended a conference and it was folks there from Seattle and they said don't let Anchorage be like another Seattle, a lot of congestion. So I've got two hats here, thank you.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thank you, that comment has been recorded for the record.
24	Mikhail Siskoff	This project should really be more about quality of life, other than level of service. Level of service being how efficiently we move vehicles through this corridor. And so, when you mentioned what we want to see, and what we don't want to see. And people said, we want to see the cut and cover project, we want to see the quality of life be restored to this area not be severed by this this massive roadway. Another thing, what I really don't want to see is if that project should be determined to be unfeasible, for whatever reason, and not pursued I don't want to see that traffic being deferred to other roads and other roads be improved by adding more lanes to take on that additional capacity that has been taken away from that other, so I don't want to see the traffic just to another place.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thank you. All comments are being documented. Based on this comment, quality of life has been added to need three.
25	Loren Hill	Personally, my biggest concern is being able to get from one side of the neighborhood to the other side safely, whether I am in a car or not. I know we addressed a lot of the concerns with our intersections and pedestrians and traffic but for anyone who's ever tried to cross Ingra on 11th headed east, you know that you can't see around that corner and so safety is certainly first. One of the other things reading through some of the documentation from the PEL the MTP and I apologize, because the two of them are now blurred together deeply in my mind. Is that the visual landscape, like the reality is I walked this neighborhood all the time, I bike this neighborhood all the time, I'd love to be able to bike across by 10th but I probably drive it as often as I, as I walk or bike here. And, and something that I saw multiple times was that the visual environment of this corridor is not important to the driver likely that oh it's just commercial district and driving through they don't really care that it's pretty. To be honest and the uncertainty around this corridor is the reason that there hasn't been investment in these properties, who would want to live between two four lane highways if they had a choice. So, please take into account, we live in, like maybe the most beautiful place on earth, I may be slightly biased. This part does not reflect that and it doesn't work like that because the design is bad.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Thank you. All comments are being documented. Improving neighborhood connections is a part of need three. Visual changes will be discussed in the PEL in the second phase of alternative evaluation (after the initial screening).
26	Frank Pichler	Project Team Wrote the road, Glen Highway to Super Highway. I'm going to be attending. I am behind, this, was in your project being before, when we talk about, about 10 years ago, down at the billing downtown and we were talking about how we get the highway nine and I've been waiting for this. Me, I'd be waiting. Waiting for you guys gave me a call. I'd be at your meeting at 4 30 at the February rec center on Thursday, at 4 30, Drop it sooner. I'd be at that meeting. I have some things I wanted to say. I just got back from Chicago and Seattle and see their system. We should I have ideas. My array system will work day care. And we were marvelous monetary system. And I'm electorate, Lexus there. So, I have ideas and that I'll be waiting to talk to you. I would get that. We want to have a meeting and talk to you everyone and have got ideas because I've been here in 19 60 and I was born here in the roads are getting worse and worse or anywhere. So, it takes three hours from the guy in highwayfrom La cira.Good work. five hours, almost coming home,same is Lisa HighwayHour, maybe two hours.	Return call to Frank. He Supports the project and is planning to attend the May 25 Public Meeting. He also supported the H2H project. He recently traveled to Seattle and would like to implement a monorail system. He is in opposition to how long it takes to travel from the Mat-Su Valley to Anchorage. He would like to see a bridge built across the bay. Alice let him know about the various ways he can submit comments and that we look forward to chatting with him during the public meeting
27a	Carolyn Ramsey	Hello Josie, It came to my attention that this resolution did not make it to you. Please add this resolution to the file and public comments. Thank you.	Thank you!

27b	Carolyn Ramsey	AIRPORT HEIGHTS COMMUNITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2022-01 A RESOLUTION REGARDING URBAN DESIGN, FREEWAY PROJECTS AND OUR COMMON DESIRES FOR A PROSPEROUS, DYNAMIC AND MORE LIVABLE CITY WHEREAS, the Anchorage Bowl is bounded by Chugach State Park, Federal Lands, Turnagain Arm, and Knik Arm water bodies; WHEREAS, the reality of a city bounded on all sides by water, mountains or federal lands results in higher land values as a product of economic growth and population increases; WHEREAS, continued growth in a physically constrained urban environment will increase demand for the limited developable land in the Anchorage; WHEREAS, the value of increasingly scarce land in the Anchorage Bowl will create higher value development; WHEREAS, removing high value land for freeway development from the tax rolls results in a revenue loss to the city for generations to come and increased tax burden to the residents of Anchorage; WHEREAS, it is in the self-interest of all residents to ensure infrastructure projects requiring acquisition of private lands must warrant the loss in perpetuity of tax revenues; WHEREAS, the Anchorage Land Use Plan serves as a guide for development of our city with an awareness that increasing growth within a finite area requires thoughtful approaches in order to optimize economic prosperity and sustain a high quality of life for residents; WHEREAS, the Department of Transportation of Public Facilities (DOT&PF) is proposing to construct multi-lane, controlled access freeway through the middle of the Anchorage Bowl in order to connect the Glenn and New Seward Interstate facilities;	The proposed highway connection project is in the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan. That plan is prepared jointly by the Municipality of Anchorage and DOT&PF through AMATS. Similarly, this PEL is a study jointly commissioned as part of the MTP to take a fresh look at the transportation needs in the study area. No alternatives have been proposed as part of the PEL. Alternatives development happens in the next phase. Whether a highway connection remains the recommended alternative will be determined during the PEL study. That decision will again be a joint decision of DOT&PF and the MOA through AMATS. Right-of-way needs of the alternatives has been added as an evaluation criterion.
27c	Carolyn Ramsey	WHEREAS, current design proposals emphasize the rapid movement of regional traffic at the least cost irrespective of environmental justice impacts to the urban fabric, the future economic vitality of the city or quality of life for residents; WHEREAS, constructing elevated interchanges, controlled access freeways will require an inordinate amount of right-of-way land forever lost to the betterment of our community council areas; WHEREAS, incremental freeway projects without a common vision for the transportation corridor will result in disjointed and unbalanced designs that only increase environmental degradation and rip apart the urban fabric of our city, reduce future tax revenues, worsen resident's quality of life and ignore Anchorage's unique physical environment; WHEREAS, incremental corridor development without a comprehensive understanding how the entire transportation corridor functions in an urban context can be perceived as segmentation which is a technique not allowed under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA); WHEREAS, the Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS) is tasked by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to ensure federally funded transportation infrastructure occurs through a continuing, comprehensive and cooperative process with consideration of planning factors other than safe and efficient movement of vehicles;	There are no "current design proposals" for this study; they will be developed summer 2022 incorporating ideas generated during the public comment periods. The proposed highway connection project is in the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan. That plan is prepared jointly by the Municipality of Anchorage and DOT&PF through AMATS. Similarly, this PEL is a study jointly commissioned as part of the MTP to take a fresh look at the transportation needs in the study area. No alternatives have been proposed as part of the PEL. Alternatives development happens in the next phase. Whether a highway connection remains the recommended alternative will be determined during the PEL study. That decision will again be a joint decision of DOT&PF and the MOA through AMATS. Right-of-way needs of the alternatives has been added as an evaluation criterion. The overall intent of the PEL is to develop a comprehensive understanding of how the transportation corridor functions in an urban context
27d	Carolyn Ramsey	NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, THAT AMATS, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) approve a resolution obligating DOT&PF to substantively engage with the Municipality of Anchorage and Community Councils to craft a common vision for how best to establish an improved connection between the New Seward and Glenn Highways that complies with FWHA; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT design project work on discreet individual projects within the corridor be paused to allow for a robust public participation process, professionally facilitated and that engages residents, businesses and property owners in meaningful urban design workshop; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT pedestrian safety, multi model access and environmental justice dictate that this must be done as a cut and cover project; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, THAT residents across Anchorage desire an attractive northern city, that is economically prosperous with a high quality of life for all residents and supports the "Live. Work. Play Narrative." THIS RESOLUTION WAS APPROVED by the Airport Heights Community Council on April 21, 2022, by a vote of FOR 17, AGAINST 0, ABSTAIN 0. Carolyn Ramsey President	This PEL Study prepared with engagement by both MOA and DOT&PF staff. See the make up of the advisory committees on the project web site. The team engaging with MOA and Community Councils to creating solutions for the needs identified in the study area, via their participation in the project's advisory committees, review and comments on draft documents, and input provided during public comment periods. Nonmotorized safety and multi-modal access is a key element of the purpose and need statement. A team member will reach out to contact the AHCC president to offer a meeting to discuss their comments and provide additional information on the study.
28	Steve Ribuffo	I thought it was easier to just pen-and-ink mark up the suggested changes to the DRAFT Purpose and Need Statement. Please see attached. Call if you have questions. Thanks.	Suggested changes were incorporated.
29	Sandra Millhouse	My name is Sandra Millhouse. I recently purchased a piece of property in downtown Anchorage. I got the Seward-Glenn Planning and Environmental Linkages Study. I did have a question on how this is going to impact my property. It looks like I'm directly involved in the line of traffic. When I went to the website, I couldn't tell what was going to happen with my property.	The project team has not developed any alternatives yet. That will occur at a later step of the project (phase 4). A public meeting and comment period will be held to present draft alternatives and request public input on them. The commenter is encouraged to stay connected to the project.
30	Susanne Di Pietro	Hi, my name is Susanne Di Pietro. And I'm calling on behalf of the Government Hill Community Council. We submitted some comments on the project. during the last round, and I have now studied the updated documents that you're requesting comment on by Friday, and I'm what I would like to give me, help me to counsel, would like to comment again. I have some questions, particularly about the of the draft alternatives memo, and I'm wondering if one of the project team members who has subject matter expertise on that particular in that particular area, could give me a call back. I'd really appreciate it. My name is Suzanne Di Pietro calling on behalf of Government Hill Community Council. Thank you.	A team member reached out to the commenter and provided instructions on how to submit comments during this public notice period.
31a	Allen Kemplen	How a person feels as they walk along a street is important. There is no separation on Gambell and Ingra- 4 lanes with a 4-ft sidewalk, and on Ingra there are large utility poles in the sidewalk. To not address this is a significant gap in study so far. Ingra- before the couplet, used to be residential street. Cars traveling 40-55 mph coming up hill. There are only two visual cues presented for people to slow down, 2 little signs, other than that - nothing. Physical design of that corridor is anti-pedestrian, anti-people, and anti-neighborhood. This needs to be addressed.	[From the Meeting Transcript]The project team has tried to capture this issue in the need statement. The current roadway design is lacking in accommodating all the different needs.
31b	Allen Kemplen	It's relevant to issue of environmental injustice. The only part of neighborhood affected by this bad design is ethnically diverse and low income.	[From the Meeting Transcript]This issue is captured in the purpose and need statement as well. Laurie added there is an HSIP project in process to remove the poles.
31c	Allen Kemplen	There has been no action on the HSIP for 8 years	[From the Meeting Transcript]The HSIP project is a recent one. Construction funding is shown for Fiscal Year 2023 in the AMATS TIP.

32	Allen Kemplen	After recently attending a meeting of American Institute of Architects about reimagine downtown. One of the main components of revitalize downtown is the need to deal with traffic. If you want a vibrant area, attractive to people and tourists, it has to be safe. This study encompasses the downtown area, but we're not seeing the voices from the downtown area joining in this dialog.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Improving safety is part of the purpose and need. The downtown community council is represented on the citizen advisory committee.
33	Silvia Villamedes	The project is awesome for our community, but the whole city of Anchorage needs to buy in. How can we get other people involved outside of this core. If we have all the players around the table, then we'll have less problems.	A team member discussed with the commenter what additional efforts are being taken to include feedback from downtown stakeholders.
34	Allen Kemplen	Would like to see more criteria that address non-motorized, suggests wording including person trips and moving people.	[From the Meeting Transcript] John responded to Allen that, as an example - on the last criteria, "social demands and economic development," regional VMT criteria isn't clear but reducing VMT is the goal. Creating less traffic on the road network would be improving the quality of travel for everyone. In the inconsistency of plans discussion, the needs in the specific plans are presented. The project team learned at the public meeting that the wording is unclear and more balance is needed in these measures. Team plans to revise some of the evaluation criteria. John acknowledged that the project team needs to do better at balancing the measures.
35	Mikhail Siskoff	Mikhail commented that it seems like peak congestion is the main concern, but that timeframe is so limited. Putting peak congestion as a priority is like building a parking lot to accommodate Black Friday shoppers. On Black Friday the lot will be full, but every other day of the week it will be nearly empty. Peak congestion should not be given such priority when weighing other priorities. Silvia agreed that is a really good idea.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The needs and corresponding criteria are not in any kind of priority order. The purpose and need statement is not focused on congestion, because traffic forecasts are considerably lower than they have been in past years.
36	Allen Kemplen	Allen asked where to find the project team's consideration of the federally required planning factors.	[From the Meeting Transcript] John responded they are in the purpose and need chapter and there is an evaluation of the criteria against those federal factors in the screening document.
37	Paula Pawlowski	The senior center is surrounded by low-income senior housing and disability housing, there are 240 units. The neighborhood is not very walkable, particularly when the roads are plowed, so there is nowhere to walk except in the middle of the road. There are many people with mobility issues and sometimes the senior center will help people with wheelchairs or walkers because the streets aren't plowed. There is a lot of foot activity and car activity and with Chester Creek Park at the end of the road, it's busier than people would think.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The project has documented that non-motorized demand is very high in the Fairview neighborhood. Addressing nonmotorized needs is an integral part of the purpose and need statement.
38	Allen Kemplen	Is any type of noise assessment or monitoring being done?	[From the Meeting Transcript] Yes, but on planning level, there is not monitoring proposed or noise modeling of alternatives at this time. The planning level is more screening level noise analysis, like looking at noise sensitive land uses within a screening distance of potential alternatives. The examination of those details are what is in the Level 2 screening, which would be done on a shorter list of alternatives, not initial list.
39a	Allen Kemplen	Will transit be addressed, including how productive the transit routes are?	[From the Meeting Transcript] Yes there is transit information in the system performance memo, including transition ridership generation in the study area.
39b	Allen Kemplen	Will the system performance memo cover person trips?	[From the Meeting Transcript] Yes, the memo talks about bus riders, so yes.
39c	Allen Kemplen	The difference between vehicle occupancy ratios versus transit. Transit is different because you have to walk or bike to a transit stop, and when you get off, you have to walk or bike to your destination. So, there is a linkage there between bus usage and the ability to get to bus stops. If you're just trying to factor in vehicle travel time reliability it's painting a false picture, because once a person gets off a bus, it could take them a significant amount of time depending on weather conditions. Pedestrian safety, mobility, and infrastructure are critical to mobility and accessibility in this geographical area. The Anchorage land use plan identifies the future land use along the corridor, along Gambell. It's going to be mixed use community development which means there will be more intra-zonal trips vs inter-zonal trips. That is relevant to the performance measures which are all about regional traffic, if land use in Anchorage is changing to create more mixed use, then there will be less trips moving from traffic analysis zone to traffic analysis zone, and more trips staying within a particular traffic analysis zone. This needs to be acknowledged as we refine the alternative screening criteria.	[From the Meeting Transcript] John responded that could be a contributing factor to what Laurie is describing in traffic forecast. The traffic forecasts on the Glenn and Seward highways, compared to the early-mid 2000s are vastly different. There are a number of reasons for that, and this could be one of them, because the traffic modelers are attempting to model land use in the 2040 land use plan map.
40	Assemblers on Chris Constant	When and how does the draft purpose and need statement become finalized?	[From the Meeting Transcript] This document is draft, and the project team will review input from the current public comment period. The project team will develop a revised draft based on the public comments. Then the DOT will present the revised draft to the policy committee.
41	Assemblers on Chris Constant	What is missing in the top paragraph of the draft purpose and need statement is any reference to the environmental conditions caused by the project. What gets framed as neighborhood connections, which is an important part of it, is missing an element which is the environmental conditions of humans, so many people living so close. That includes the crashes, conflicts of cars and people, the divestment that is happening surrounding the highway facilities which causes increases in poverty, those are the kind of environmental concerns. The connectivity is very important because that will help mitigate those concerns. At the top paragraph, there should be a reference to environmental concerns. In the first paragraph sentence, it would be helpful for the public to see it referenced there instead.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Josie: so after, "mobility, accessibility, add environmental concerns, and safety. And then the project team would need to define what those environmental concerns mean. Taylor: I think you are using the environmental definition, like you are saying: there is support by the document the project team has already produced.

42a	Assemblypers on Chris Constant	Let me guess if my comments are aligned with what occurred. Under the social demands and economic development section, it talks about plans, it talks about volume of miles traveled, but it does not talk about the impact of the facilities on the residences and the neighbors, the density of the residential uses right next to a federal highway, right? One of the key messages that could be somehow communicated in the evaluation process is impacts on those residential and neighborhood uses as consistent with plans. There is a lot of room in there for interpreting things away from the impacts of the residential uses. I would drive a little more tightly towards residential uses relative to transportation.	[From the Meeting Transcript]Could you help us flesh that out, what impacts, what is an impact and how to measure it.
42b	Assemblypers on Chris Constant	Traffic accidents are important to track. If you measure on-ramps and off-ramps to federal highways, or the federal system in Anchorage, how many on-ramps and off-ramps do you have from the 36th Ave stoplight to that federal highway. And count how many offramps you have between 36th Ave and Airport Heights Rd. and you see that on-ramps and off-ramps are the streets in the neighborhoods, but they do not get treated that way, they get treated as turns. Yet, some of these ramps are so dangerous. So, I don't know how to measure that, but all of these people are living right on this federal highway.	[From the Meeting Transcript]Yeah totally understand, and that is also what we were trying to address with conflicting functions too.
42c	Assemblypers on Chris Constant	But all the functions are related to traffic flow, travel time, peak period, miles of roadway, peak period delay, miles of road average travel. None of that gets anywhere near the question of impacts on people who live within that zone, the 300 feet of the edges of that facility, which DOT maintains a right-of-way and the authority to take. It has for 50 years. Which then causes the deterioration of properties, loss of property value, and increased various uses, because people who would otherwise be there defending their homes are not there anymore.	[From the Meeting Transcript]I just want to make sure, one, we are recording for note taking purposes and so all of these comments are part of our public outreach process. So, anything that is said as far as, I would like to see... that is all considered a formal comment. So, I just want to make sure it was clear. And two, I will say your name for note taking purposes just so that we know, so that was Rep. Constant, and then Sen. Begich is the one that made that suggestion. And three, any metrics that you can come up with, that you think would be helpful to measure the things we are talking about, please send those our way. We are hearing comments like, "we would like to see..." and the project team agrees, yes, we would like to see those too, but how do we measure it? How can we make it a criteria? The project team could use some verbiage around those suggestions. Sen. Begich, that comment was really helpful. Any other comments about how we measure criteria, so when we get to alternatives, we can determine this alternative is better than this other alternative because of that criteria.
43	Senator Tom Begich	Maybe in the social demands category, after the word plans, the project team needs to say "...and other neighborhood uses as identified by public comment." Because that gets to the bulk of the public comment for non-motorized right in the area of Gambell-Ingra area. So, maybe ensuring the public comment is also heard, not just the plans themselves.	[From the Meeting Transcript] I just want to make sure, one, we are recording for note taking purposes and so all of these comments are part of our public outreach process. So, anything that is said as far as, I would like to see... that is all considered a formal comment. So, I just want to make sure it was clear. And two, I will say your name for note taking purposes just so that we know, so that was Rep. Constant, and then Sen. Begich is the one that made that suggestion. And three, any metrics that you can come up with, that you think would be helpful to measure the things we are talking about, please send those our way. We are hearing comments like, "we would like to see..." and the project team agrees, yes, we would like to see those too, but how do we measure it? How can we make it a criteria? The project team could use some verbiage around those suggestions. Sen. Begich, that comment was really helpful. Any other comments about how we measure criteria, so when we get to alternatives, we can determine this alternative is better than this other alternative because of that criteria.
44	Senator Tom Begich	Suggest that the project team contact the Fairview working group to get verbiage.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The project team will take the action to contact the Fairview working group and report back to Rep. Constant.
45	Senator Tom Begich	The community is happy with the plans that have been adopted with the municipality land use plans. What the community is concerned with is the lack of progress. The highway-to-highway became the next plan, then this plan, and no apparent progress and yet deterioration ongoing, and the impacts are historically cataloged to be the fruit of the highway policy runs through neighborhoods of poverty, I do not know exactly how to say that without offending anyone, last time I said, are you calling us racists. That is not my point here, my point is there has been a historic pattern and there is a federal drive to fix these problems that have been created, but now looking at 2050 and the fact that the section between 5th and 6th Avenue and 15th Avenue, it looks green, not brown. Then that puts into my mind that great, this section is going to be put off again. We will all be retired or beyond at the time this question comes to fruition. So, the deterioration is truly measurable. You can see it, you can feel it, walk through it. There are now empty lots that should be bought if this is a project that is going to happen. There is a failure happening in the neighborhood and it is due to the highway.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The suggested affect that the current roadway system has had on Fairview's development is reflected in the purpose and need. It is one of the elements that will be considered - with alternatives being explored to remedy the issues.
46a	Assemblypers on Chris Constant	With the purchase of the property up on Government Hill. Are we sure we are not going to see an amendment to this project for adding the bridge back in? Because there is a taking of property for a bridge right now. That is the hottest conversation that I have had from my constituency in the last 15-21 days, saying wait a minute, if the bridge is back on, should not it be a part of this study. I am not advocating for that; I am just saying what is going on here.	[From the Meeting Transcript]The purchase of that property is the final clean-up step in closing out DOT&PF's responsibilities to FHWA. The Knik Arm Crossing is not in the metropolitan transportation plan and is not being evaluated as part of this PEL.
46b	Assemblypers on Chris Constant	There is a purchase of a property happening right now, closing a business, the building is slated to be demolished in service of the right-of-way to the bridge.	[From the Meeting Transcript]The purchase of that property is the final clean-up step in closing out DOT&PF's responsibilities to FHWA. The Knik Arm Crossing is not in the metropolitan transportation plan and is not being evaluated as part of this PEL.
46c	Assemblypers on Chris Constant	I certainly do not want to add it to this project, I just want to be fundamentally in service to reality as opposed to fiction	[From the Meeting Transcript]The purchase of that property is the final clean-up step in closing out DOT&PF's responsibilities to FHWA. The Knik Arm Crossing is not in the metropolitan transportation plan and is not being evaluated as part of this PEL.

46d	Assemblpers on Chris Constant	John McPherson, I think those are fabulous words, yet the purchase and demolition of a building to me weighs heavier than words.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Jill Reese: This was the last acquisition from the prior effort for the bridge and it has been on the right-of-way, in their files working with Tesoro for many years, and it has allowed them to stay for many years. But in order to close that phase of the bridge project, we must finish that acquisition. It is not something that is new, it has been on the books and has been working through for many years. There were other acquisitions in that area, for instance, the subway across from there that we are not pursuing because there is no more right-of-way activity going forward. We had to clean up the details of what they had started prior and that is what this is.
46e	Assemblpers on Chris Constant	There is a natural connection to this if there is a subversive project happening, we should bust it out from under the shade and put it on the table so it can be fully explored.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Kevin Jackson: It is important to recognize that this PEL is a planning study, once we get to the end, all this will do is resolve into a recommendation.
47a	Senator Tom Begich	Rep. Constant is referring to the Tesoro, up on Government Hill. It is a complicated issue; the owners of the Tesoro have been under the taking order for some time and have chosen to press the department to purchase the property. And there is some question as to whether federal money would be lost if it was not purchased, and we are trying to get some understanding from the department on that issue now. What Rep. Constant is getting at is, if indeed the bridge project is still on, part of the right-of-way that has been set aside is the Gambell-Ingra corridor, potentially for that bridge, which just means that everything we are doing is fiction if indeed that bridge comes back into fruition. So just a heads up, not to delay the project or delay moving forward, but it could significantly change the outcome.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The purchase of that property is the final clean-up step in closing out DOT&PF's responsibilities to FHWA. The Knik Arm Crossing is not in the metropolitan transportation plan and is not being evaluated as part of this PEL.
47b	Senator Tom Begich	We are letting you at the table know it is out there. You probably do at some point have to address it, at least in cautionary tones in the document that you produce. The Knik Arm Bridge has never been fully eradicated. There have been some Governor's orders under the Walker administration and a lack of activity under the current administration both of which imply the bridge will never move forward.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The project team had some questions about this in the first public meeting and the project team has this documented in the FAQ document. What the project team has told the public is this PEL is a step-down examination, a sub area plan of the overall metropolitan transportation plan and we must be consisted with that plan. Right now, there is no Knik Arm Crossing in the metropolitan transportation plan. None of our modeling includes that and we do not intend to have any kind of examination of a Knik Arm Crossing. If a project like that resurrected itself, it would have to first get adopted into the plan. I do not know if that provides you with any assurance, but we must be consistent with the adopted plan.
47c	Assemblpers on Chris Constant	When you say, closing the right-of-way, it does not mean it is completing it for any actual planning and construction of the bridge. You are saying we are just closing the right-of-way files for any loose ends, put this project to sleep for now.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Yes, exactly.
48	Assemblpers on Chris Constant	People are well aware and have been watching this since 2000. In 2017 we put money in and secured the PEL, then we got short circuited and jumped over for the Midtown project. They fully proceeded with the Midtown project before they began the Fairview section. People are concerned about getting to work because we have been talking about this since kids were not even born out there now have juris doctorate degrees. That is what is going on here, that is the pressure.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Priorities for the order that projects are undertaken are set in the metropolitan transportation plan and transportation improvement program processes through AMATS.
49	Senator Tom Begich	Appreciate the level of inclusion in the CAC, it is important because part of the issue is addressing things early in the process. Josie responded yes and the end goal of PEL study with alternatives and recommendations that the community is supportive of.	Comment noted.
50	Assemblpers on Chris Constant	How is this project interfacing with the Midtown congestion project and how will the process reflect the connections between the two projects?	[From the Meeting Transcript] The Midtown congestion PEL is completed, so we will need to make our solutions match up with what they have come up with. The project team will not reexplore issues in Midtown but will pick up from where it ends and figure out what needs to happen within this study area.
51	Assemblpers on Chris Constant	There are changes happening to the Midtown study that are based on current conditions. It might be wise to have some reflection of those changes and how they connect in this study, maybe measure them somehow like how are those connections beneficial, do they cause harm to the Midtown project, or does the Midtown project cause harm to this project. Do we have some way to analyze between the linkage studies.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Yes, when the project team reaches the evaluating and modeling the alternatives step, the project team will ensure it has the latest design in Midtown to ensure consistency.
52	Emily Vullo	USACE can utilize the project's purpose and need statement, other documentation, and the NEPA document that result from the PEL study.	Comment noted.
53	Emily Vullo	On the alternative screening process, page 16 section 1.2, the least environmentally damaging alternative might cost more.	Comment noted.
54	Steve Ribuffo	The purpose and need statement is perfectly clear. Steve does not want the project to get bogged down in the minor grammar edits of these documents. Steve will also share thoughts in the future as a member of the freight advisory committee.	[From the Meeting Transcript] There is information about the port in the draft system performance memo and purpose and need memo. John encouraged Steve to review sections about the port for accuracy.
55	Brian Lindamood	ARRC will have comments later in the process when alternatives are identified. ARRC is more interested in port connectivity.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Comment noted. The project team will continue to coordinate with ARRC regarding port connectivity.
56	Bob Charles	The Knik Tribal Council will review and provide comments by June 24. The Knik Tribal Council comments will focus on mitigation of storm water, regular runoff, and drainage surrounding the new construction.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Environmental factors covering items like water quality will be discussed in the second phase of screening.
57	Steve Ribuffo	Inviting the Alaska Trucking Association will be important.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The Alaska Trucking Association is a member on another committee.

58	Brian Lindamood	ARRC is working with AMATS on a study to de-clog the main gate going in and out of the port and the connection between C Street and Whitney Road; that connection has several issues. Whitney road is undersized for the current amount of truck traffic. It is very difficult for drivers to make a left turn onto 5th Avenue off of C Street. Drivers often re-route to Reeve Boulevard. That entire route is not ideal. ARRC is also working on intermodal facility improvements. There are several sub-projects that Brian and Steve could discuss with the project team.	[From the Meeting Transcript] There is an all-day workshop in the project scope to discuss alternatives and that might be a good time to discuss sub-projects and include inter-modal folks in the discussion.
59	Bradly Coy	Based on the public feedback regarding non-motorized, if the project focuses on Fairview just being a through route for traffic, people will not want to live there. Traffic demand will grow along 5th Avenue because no one would want to live in Fairview. Fairview should be a place where people want to live, has connections, and has non-motorized functionality. How much would those features draw people to that area and reduce travel demands along the outskirts? Those are the questions the model isn't set up to answer well. Can the project do right by Fairview homeowners and business owners, but also balance the regional needs. What is the environment that we are creating, what will it be like, not just as through routes, but standing in the neighborhood, how would you feel in the area as a non-motorized user?	[From the Meeting Transcript] When the national highway system was originally built, it emphasized the through-movement, Laurie's presentation covered travel forecasts in early 2000's, which were up to 90-100K vehicles a day. The metropolitan transportation plan was needing to deal with those higher volumes; however, volumes are now not predicted to be nearly as high. It is important for leaders in Anchorage transportation to know these forecast numbers are changing, so the needs are changing too. Previously, addressing regional congestion was a top need, but now we are seeing changing conditions, which means there are different opportunities and needs that the study is evaluating.
60	Scott Thomas	Purpose looks good - covers a lot of needs. I think there are 2 sets of performance measures to jointly gauge alternatives which do all things well - Regional and Local transportation measures. We cannot get to alternatives with only one set of criteria. The purpose statement reveals that.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Regarding the criteria, it is important for committee members to read the entire memo. On the third set of criteria regarding consistency with the plans, the plans point out the conflict between regional travel and through movement verses the neighborhood needs. The plans address how to make the corridor work better for both regional and local needs, which is a big challenge. What the project team means by regional VMT, (Vehicle Miles Traveled) is that the PEL would measure reducing VMT in study area. The project team missed the target on the conflicting functions, the criteria are currently too roadway focused, the project team needs to figure out other measures that address local functions or reduce conflicts.
61	Scott Thomas	The draft purpose covers the dilemma that Bradly pointed out, through-road versus local impact. The Seward-Glenn Highway is about serving regional need, and if the highway does not serve regional need, then people will go to other roads and impact other parts of the community. The project must focus on the function, because by not serving the function we are causing this problem, change the problem from Fairview to Muldoon or somewhere else. The project team has captured the competing purposes that do not work well together with one solution or one performance criteria. There are no problems with the purpose statement, but the performance criteria are limited because the traditional regional measures are vehicular oriented. Designing the solution to meet local needs would require more signals and more crossings, which changes the performance for all users. The project team should provide more performance criteria for local uses than what is currently listed.	[From the Meeting Transcript] Regarding the criteria, it is important for committee members to read the entire memo. On the third set of criteria regarding consistency with the plans, the plans point out the conflict between regional travel and through movement verses the neighborhood needs. The plans address how to make the corridor work better for both regional and local needs, which is a big challenge. What the project team means by regional VMT, (Vehicle Miles Traveled) is that the PEL would measure reducing VMT in study area. The project team missed the target on the conflicting functions, the criteria are currently too roadway focused, the project team needs to figure out other measures that address local functions or reduce conflicts.
62	Scott Thomas	Regarding the conflicting functions criteria, the project team will need to have separate measures for local and regional use. The result will likely be that one road does not do everything well. The area will need a network with connections that are separated. The project area needs a network road with connections. The project can potentially achieve all performance measures, but it will require more than one design on one road.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The PEL study area includes a large area of north Anchorage. Alternatives are likely to include multiple solutions in the entire subarea, not just in one corridor.
63	Bradly Coy	The project should include new metrics that address land use and transportation accessibility, meaning how easy it is to get from one land use to another. Mobility measures traffic and delays but mobility does not tell you where the person is driving from. Accessibility would include how long does it take to get from a house to a business and what are the conflicts and challenges. The project needs an iteration between land use and transportation. For example, when looking at peak period travel time, does that mean how long it takes to get from one end of the corridor to the other, or does it mean how long it takes people to get from their home to a business or work?	[From the Meeting Transcript] The intention for those travel times were not just the corridor, they address key origins and destinations, for example, freight travel time would be measured from the port to the industrial reserves, or travel time from downtown to U-Med.
64	Bradly Coy	Recommend having a discussion on motor vehicle needs and through traffic versus impact on neighborhood. Is there a way to differentiate the results and impact for Fairview residents? How would metrics and alternatives measure the impact of Fairview residents? A highway creates induced demand, meaning if we build a system to have a through-highway focus, then way more people in the valley are going to use it. Can we account for travel time and future modeling with different alternatives?	[From the Meeting Transcript] John: The study area is a sub-area plan, the project will address improvements between the two highways, but also to the port. The alternatives are likely to be system alternatives with improvements throughout the study area. Laurie: Multi-modal effects will be addressed in the level two criteria. The project team is currently in level one which addresses the purpose and need. Level two will address those finer details. John: the project team will address impacts to the neighborhood in the second screening.
65	Drielle Welch	The biggest concern for MOA is ingress and egress access for emergency vehicles.	Comment noted.
66	Scott Thomas	Forecasting demand - needs, uses - causes us to look forward with a boom-and-bust bias. Want to confirm AMATS volumes and AMATS land use/population, and then make a historical lookback to temper that forecast based on our past economy.	[From the Meeting Transcript] The project team has used two different forecasting techniques. One that uses historical trends of population and traffic. The other updates the travel model and uses the latest land use plan as well as latest population forecast from Alaska Dept of Labor.
67	Scott Thomas	Ideas for grey "conflicting functions" are still percolating: concur w John M. Desire to be quantitative for local needs - may add Xing delay, Xing gaps, Conflicting speeds faced, Local People Miles of Travel to/from O-D points within the Subarea vs VMT Regionally (PMT is lower with more direct arterial crossings) We measure alternatives that improve Xings, reduce speeds, and reduce PMT by being more direct travel vs lots of internal distance required	Comment noted.

68	Scott Thomas	These measures for local subarea - if quantified - could show designs which reduce conflict and improve social and economic development.	Comment noted.
69	Bradly Coy	My thoughts on priorities: #1 Great places, #2 Safe travel, #3 Efficient movement.	Comment noted.
70	Scott Thomas	There could be a lot of bridges in these alternatives. Scott is interested in advice the project team will need in the future from Rich on bridge costs, bridge heights, depth, and footprints.	Comment noted.
71	Donald Fritz	Suggestion for Purpose: This project is sorely needed and was unfairly affected last time by the threats of First National Bank to move their operations center to Fairbanks. The new project might be assisted by coordination with the bank. Also, the project last time was unduly discouraged by "community activists" supposedly representing "stakeholders" in the area. As a property owner in the affected area, I feel that the real stakeholders are the people who own homes and buildings in the affected area, Not the transient "homeless" who infest the publicly accessible parts and defecate in the alleys and back yards of our properties. Having resisted the horde for about 28 years, please note that WE are the real "stakeholders" in this area, not the transient group of drunks and petty criminals that are the pets of the "Progressive" left activists. Let's get this project going!	Comment noted.
72	Donald Fritz	Suggestion for Design or Alternatives: the sunken grade replacing Hyder St was best	The suggested alternative will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase.
73	Stacey Dean	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: Under Safety, Not just numbers of crashes, but the times, day of week, and health condition of all parties involved.	For the selection criteria it is not possible to predict what time of day or day of the week future crashes on various alternatives. Based on this comment the potential severity of crashes will be discussed qualitatively based on travel speed and number of conflict points associated with each alternative.
74	Stacey Dean	Other Comments or Suggestions: We cannot continue to locate public and social services along with RuralCAP facilities on this route. It just adds to the amount of intoxicated people that could get hit. When you have a high density of people that are not capable of taking care of themselves and you add a lot of vehicle traffic, it's a life-safety issue.	DOT&PF does not have authority over land use or facility siting decisions. Pedestrian safety and potential conflicts with vehicles is a part of the purpose and need for the project. The next study phase will focus on developing alternatives which will include improving pedestrian safety and vehicles conflicts though the designs.
75	Larry Southard	Suggestion for Purpose: First, we need traffic to slow down! I drive from Northern Lights north to Ingra Street and 15th Ave and if you drive the Posted speed limit of 45 MPH traffic will be passing you 10 to 15 MPH faster than the posted 45MPH... EVERYONE has no consideration for pedestrians, and will not slow down if the light is Green at 15th Ave. Make the area 3 lanes and have a show of police vehicles along Ingra and Gamble Streets.	The suggested alternative will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase. DOT&PF does not have the authority to allocate Anchorage Police Department resources. We suggest you contact the Anchorage Police Department and request additional enforcement.
76	Larry Southard	Suggestion for Needs: This is and has been residential / small business community not a high-speed Interstate!	The conflicting functions of national highway travel and local residential/business travel is one of the of the needs identified in the Purpose and Need Statement.
77	Larry Southard	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: Safety for the pedestrians and bicyclists. Find a way to slow the traffic down.	The proposed safety-related evaluation criteria are not specific to vehicles but will include safety of people biking and walking. Based on this comment the draft Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo has been updated; the potential severity of crashes will be discussed qualitatively based on travel speed and number of conflict points associated with each alternative.
78	Larry Southard	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: Already suggested 3 lanes of traffic NOT 4 going through Ingra and Gamble Streets. Wider separation of traffic from the sidewalks.	The suggested alternative will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase.
79	Jack Bonney	Suggestion for Purpose: add that the project should maintain or improve neighborhood/community continuity for residents and nonmotorized users.	Improving neighborhood connections and recognition that the current roadway design affects community cohesion is captured in the purpose and need statement.
80	Jack Bonney	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: Add assement of whether alternative would reduce noise, reduce vehicle emissions in the study area, encourage future development/deployment of mass transit in the study area. I would encourage travel time, delay and vehicle miles of travel to account for improving those metrics for nonmotorized and pedestrian travel, not just motor travel.	How alternatives may change noise and air quality are considerations that will be undertaken in the Level 2 screening. Additional non motorized criteria have been added to the level 1 screening criteria that are included in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo.
81	Jack Bonney	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: In general, reduce motorize vehicle speeds , minimize one-way, multilane roadways. Avoid a sloution that makes the gulf of vehicle traffic through the area unwelcoming for residents and other users. I'd encourage cut and cover for major roadways that must cut across the study area, if they are needed at all.	The suggested alternative will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase.
82	Jack Bonney	Other Comments or Suggestions: Solve for the cohesion of the neighborhoods in the study area, rather than cars traveling through. Avoid repeating the 1950s era errors made by many cities that bisected communities with highways.	Improving neighborhood connections and recognition that the current roadway design affects community cohesion is included in the purpose and need statement.
83	Brandon Maes	Suggestion for Needs: Commute time in general. Commuting from south Anchorage to base or from the valley in to Anchorage is slowed significantly by the fact the Seward and Glen are not connected. By creating a thoroughfare, bypassing the Merrill field corridor, straight to 20th Ave (eventually bypassing 36th, benson, northern lights, and fireweed would be nice too), commute times would be significantly decreased, allowing not only for a speedier, but safer commute.	Maintaining the functionality of National Highway System is a part of the purpose and need statement. The current metropolitan transportation plan alternative of creating a highway connection will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase, which begins in Summer 2022.
84	Brandon Maes	Other Comments or Suggestions: I love this idea. The commute is very slow as is. It is also a very unsafe area. With the amount of pedestrian traffic, there should not be an exposed sidewalk. Same can be said for driveways, or any intersections in general. This is an area that should be a thoroughfare with accessibility ramps for vehicles to exit. With the way it is constructed now, the highways pose a significant safety threat as well as a significant inconvenience for both motorized and not motorized forms of transportation.	Safety is a part of the purpose and need statement. The current metropolitan transportation plan alternative of creating a highway connection will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase, which begins in Summer 2022.
85	Nicole Zegiestowsky	Suggestion for Purpose: I would like to see more discussion or acknowledgment of roadways that are used for pedestrian traffic not just cars or goods.	The purpose of the project includes all modes of traffic, including nonmotorized traffic.

86	Nicole Zegiestowsky	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: I'd like to see more information on what more crashes means. Travel time by what means walking biking riding a bus or driving a car? Congestion and late for similar parameters would it just be measured for vehicles or non-motorized pedestrian traffic? Vehicle miles of travel again just for vehicles or bikes people other non-motorized traffic. Congestion and delay can this please be specified if it's with roadways or sidewalks or bike paths and how to improve.	The criteria is to identify alternatives that reduce crash risk. The proposed travel time metric would be for vehicles. Buses also benefit from having efficient travel times. Reductions in congestion benefits all vehicles and can also make crossing the street easier for bikes and pedestrians. The measure for reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is a measure for vehicles. However, lower VMT means less cars on the road which is safer and more comfortable for people walking and biking.
87	Nicole Zegiestowsky	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: I don't care about cars. Let's get rid of cars and trucks in the center of valuable part of our city and make it more accessible for people across town to bike from southside to downtown or vice versa or for walking or for people who use mobility it's like wheelchair or crutches make this a walking infrastructure. I want this to look like Denmark or other European countries that don't rely on gas and roads as much which is also safer long-term and more affordable for users and city/state government because roads are expensive to maintain as opposed to bike paths and sidewalks.	Comment noted. The roads under study provide important linkages for freight and regional travel, in addition to more localized non-motorized travel. Making the system work better for all modes is a key part of the purpose statement.
88	Nicole Zegiestowsky	Other Comments or Suggestions: Cars create noise pollution air pollution and other problems. Adding more lanes and more roads will not decrease traffic that literally has not worked. I really want Anchorage to be more accommodating to people across the lifespan who use travel other than cars considering our bus infrastructure it's terrible. Give people the autonomy to live in a walkable community. Anchorage needs to be less car reliant and more human centered.	Comment noted.
89	Don't feel comfortable providing to you	Suggestion for Purpose: Please change to: "The purpose of the project is to improve motor vehicle mobility, motor vehicle accessibility, and safety for motorists, people, and freight moving on or across the roadway system..." "The intent is to maintain a certain level of vehicle flow on the national highway system and to meet the local travel needs of motorists traveling along, or residents attempting to cross those roadways."	The roadways under study provide important functions for more than just vehicles and therefore the purpose statement continues to reflect a multimodal system.
90	Don't feel comfortable providing to you	Suggestion for Needs: Evaluate the assumptions baked into past models and whether they are appropriate for an urban environment moving forward.	The traffic model has been updated to include the latest demographic trends and the land use future put forth in the recently adopted land use plan map.
91	Don't feel comfortable providing to you	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: Congestion and delay are not useful metrics. Please add something that relates more specifically to access--as in "Number of new connections created [or connections broken] within x radius" And why travel time? Have people complained about that? If so, what are we talking, like 3 minutes?	As part of the National Highway System an important function is moving vehicles efficiently. Congestion and delay are metrics that reflect that capability. Therefore, they will be retained as Evaluation Criteria.
92	Don't feel comfortable providing to you	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: Stop talking about speed limits, only design speed. Not clear that this corridor is needed, if DOT insists on the project anyway it should be buried underground.	The suggested alternative will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase, which begins Summer 2022.
93	Don't feel comfortable providing to you	Other comments or suggestions: Your data doesn't seem to show a huge need for this project. Who is behind it? Who is its champion?	This PEL study project was included in the most recently adopted metropolitan transportation plan, MTP 2040, which was adopted by AMATS as well as the Anchorage Assembly.
94	Katie	Suggestion for Needs: Attempting to "solve" congestion by widening roads is a 1950s idea that doesn't work. Adding capacity encourages more driving--Every new lane mile we build adds to our backlog of future transportation costs. This when combined with the fact that fairview is one of our best walkable neighborhoods, and PRIME to become park of a great downtown expansion	The suggested views on roadway widening will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase, which begins Summer 2022.
95	Not interested	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: It vehicle miles travel but person miles travelled	The measure of vehicle miles traveled is retained. Reducing personal vehicle miles traveled is an objective of the currently adopted transportation plan (MTP 2040). "Reduction" in VMT has been added to the criteria for clarity in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo..
96	Not interested	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: Lots of ped and bike friendly designers	The suggested views on alternatives will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase.
97	Ella	Suggestion for Purpose: Please rethink the entire purpose. This seems to prioritize cars over people. What is best for people is not necessarily what is best for cars.	The purpose of the project includes all modes of travel, including nonmotorized traffic. The needs statements are not in priority order and include both motorized and non-motorized needs.
98	Ella	Suggestion for Needs: This is focused on cars/vehicles, rather than transportation of all types. Where is the need to study local community behavior, public transport needs, bike infrastructure, etc?	The purpose of the project includes all modes of traffic, including nonmotorized traffic. Pedestrian travel, transit, and bikes are all included in the study.
99	Ella	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: How the community is improved, how walkable are the streets, how convenient is public transport.	Screening criteria measuring the level of transportation stress for people walking and biking has been added. These are measures on how walkable and bikeable the streets are.
100	Ella	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: Remove the concept of a 'corridor'.	The PEL study area includes a large area of north Anchorage. Alternatives are likely to include multiple solutions in the entire subarea, not just in one corridor.
101	Randy Brown	Suggestion for Purpose: improve mobility, accessibility, safety AND QUALITY OF LIFE	Based on this and other comments, quality of Life has been added to the Purpose and Need Statement.
102	Randy Brown	Suggestion for Needs: Must be consistent with vision of immediately surrounding community.	The need item titled "Social Demands and Economic Development" includes a discussion of the vision as expressed in adopted plans within the study area. The intention is that alternatives should be consistent and help to implement the vision expressed in those plans. This concept is also incorporated in the screening criteria described in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo.

103	Randy Brown	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: Does not destroy fabric of surrounding community	Improving neighborhood connections and recognition that the current roadway design affects community cohesion is captured in the purpose and need statement. Effects of the alternatives on the community will be covered in the PEL in the second phase of alternatives evaluation.
104	Randy Brown	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: Tunnel or sunken freeway. No viaduct or surface freeway	The current metropolitan transportation plan (MTP 2040) contains a project described as creating a sunken highway connection. This will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase, which begins Summer 2022.
105	Randy Brown	Other comments or suggestions: Two lanes in each direction is plenty.	Alternatives will be designed to accommodate the forecast of traffic.
106	Loren	Suggestion for Purpose: Safety needs to come first in this statement particularly for pedestrians and cyclists, there have been too many deaths, it is unacceptable. Second the needs of the residents and resorting the integrity of the neighborhood need to be elevated further (connectivity, health and environment).	The needs and corresponding criteria are not in any kind of priority order.
107	Loren	Suggestion for Needs: The safety section is not sufficiently urgent, that incidents are elevated fails to capture the reality which is that citizens are dying on a regular basis in these intersections. 0 pedestrian fatalities would be an acceptable need statement.	The needs and corresponding criteria are not in any kind of priority order.
108	Loren	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: Needs to include improved walkability/bikeability for Fairview and Downtown, improve quality of life for residence along the corridor including cleaner air and less noise pollution. Enable the fairview greenway.	Based on this and other comments, additional criteria have been included related to non-motorized uses in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo. One of the three needs identified includes implementation of existing plans. The greenway street identified in the adopted Land Use Plan map is described in the purpose and need statement document.
109	Loren	Recommendation for design or alternatives: cut and cover	The current metropolitan transportation plan alternative of creating a sunken highway connection will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase. The potential for cut and cover sections to mitigate impacts will be considered.
110	Loren	Other comments or suggestions: The only solution that allows fairveiw to recover from the blight of this highway is the cut and cover plan. IT allows pedestrians to move safety and the highway traffic trying to move through the area can go fast. I don't see any other equitable or safe solutions.	The current metropolitan transportation plan alternative of creating a sunken highway connection will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase. The potential for cut and cover sections to mitigate impacts will be considered.
111	Sam	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: Include pedestrian delay and pedestrian out of path travel within the study area.	Screening criteria measuring the level of transportation stress for people walking and biking has been added. These are measures on how walkable and bikeable the streets are.
111a	Daniel McKenna-Foster	Hello, I am reading through the Draft System Performance Memorandum and it references a Draft Travel Demand Modeling Report, but I am not able to find it on the library page. Do you know where I could find it? Thank you,	Hi Daniel, My apologies for the delay. Your email went into a spam/junk folder. Here is the link to the file: Seward-Glenn PEL Draft Travel Demand Model (sewardglennmobility.com) Because we would like to wrap up the public comments this week, do you think you would be able to send us any comments in the next day or two? If not, please let me know. We would appreciate having your input and want to give you the time you need. Thank you, ~Josie
111b	Daniel McKenna-Foster	Thank you Josie— Perhaps I am a bit confused—you linked me to the Travel Demand Model Memo, but the Draft System Performance Memorandum refers to the Travel Demand Modeling Report: “In summary, combining the many data points cited above, and considering the Origin-Destination Study, there are several over-arching observations from the Travel Demand Modeling Report (RSG 2022)” And the Travel Demand Model Memo also refers to the separate report: “For more detailed information regarding the model see the Travel Demand Model Development Report.” Which appears to go to this document from 2016, although in the first excerpt above the “(RSG 2022)” led me to believe it would be a 2022 document. To conclude: is there a Travel Demand Modeling Report separate from The Travel Demand Memo, and is there a Travel Demand Modeling Report from 2022 as well as one from 2016? We are working on our comments and will get them to you shortly. Thank you, Daniel	There is no 2016 Travel Demand Modeling Report. The two documents currently posted on the project website are the August 2021 Travel Demand Modeling Methodology Memorandum and the October 2022 Draft Travel Demand Modeling Report. The commenter is likely referring to the latter document, which was not yet published during the comment period. Please refer to these documents posted at http://sewardglennmobility.com/Library.html
112	Sam	Other comments or suggestions: If the point of the study is to look at addressing multi-modal conflicts impacting transportation between the Glenn Hwy and Seward Hwy, then the study area should extend south to 36th Ave as that is the first at-grade intersection coming from the south, and the same issues plaguing Gambell/Ingra, and 5th/6th Ave extend south to 36th Ave.	The Midtown Congestion Relief PEL is already completed and some of the recommended solutions are being implemented by DOT&PF. That project website is http://www.midtowncongestionrelief.com/ That effort has already addressed the transportation needs between Tudor Road and 20th.
113	Bob Charles	Suggestion for Purpose: There should also be language that provides for a dedicated express highway from the Glenn Highway, Airport Heights intersection aligned just below the Merrill Field airport, over 15th Avenue and through Sitka Street Park, Chester Creek Greenbelt Park, Woodside Park and connecting to the Seward Highway at Gambell Street.	FHWA (and other NEPA guidance) recommends against including alternatives in the purpose of the project. Alternatives that help to solve the identified problems will be evaluated in the alternatives development and screening phase. Laws and FHWA guidance and DOT&PF direction discourage the construction of highway facilities in public park lands.
114	Bob Charles	Suggestion for Needs: An express highway connection as described above would address improving transportation mobility, safety, access, and connectivity between Seward Highway and the Glenn Highway.	The alternative suggested will be considered as part of the alternatives development and screening phase beginning in Summer 2022.
115	Bob Charles	Recommendation for design or alternatives: See above answers for dedicated express highway connection between the Glenn and Seward Highways	The alternative suggested will be considered as part of the alternatives development and screening phase beginning in Summer 2022.
116	Bob Charles	Other comments or suggestions: There should also be some planning for a dedicated truck access route through JBER to the Alaska Port from the Glenn Highway.	Alternatives that help to solve the identified problems will be evaluated in the alternatives development and screening phase beginning in Summer 2022.
117	Graham Downey	Suggestion for the Purpose Statement: Mobility should not be the first goal. Safety should be the first goal. Furthermore, the needs of residents extends beyond travel. Neighbors also have the right to calm, clean air, and quiet.	The needs are not in any priority order. Noise and air quality topics will be considered in the second level of alternatives screening .

118	Graham Downey	Suggestion for the Needs Statement: The passive voice you have used to describe these needs hides blame and obscures the actual facts of the matter. For example, instead of "Conflicting Travel Functions" a plain and accurate statement would say something more like "Some drivers wish to move as fast as possible through these neighborhoods. These drivers consistently put other human beings at a high risk of injury and death. Neighbors and local businesses, in contrast, want the street to help them build wealth, stay safe, and have a pleasant place to live.	Comment noted.
119	Graham Downey	Suggestion about the Criteria: Three of these factors prioritize the flow of traffic. That's 2 too many. Travel time is an inappropriate measure of value, and vehicle miles of travel is a bad proxy for climate goals. Additionally, crashes are a limited measure of safety. Safety must also include subjective experience of neighbors (do people on the street feel safe) as well as non-traffic-specific related safety issues (like air quality). Also COST is a major factor, especially long term maintenance burdens, and the destruction of local property values.	As part of the National Highway System an important function is moving vehicles efficiently. Congestion and delay are metrics that reflect that capability. Reducing VMT and congestion both reduce emissions coming out of the tailpipe which can be a useful proxy of greenhouse gas emissions. A screening measure has been added to the criteria in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo to address the severity of potential crashes qualitatively. Cost estimates will be prepared. The environmental and social implications of the alternatives will be evaluated in the second phase of alternatives screening. Travel time has been removed as a criterion.
120	Graham Downey	Recommendation for design or alternatives: It is a fact that building more highways leads to more congestion. Highways are expensive and destructive. And this highway in particular is inconsistent with nearly every Anchorage plan. We need real and cost effective solutions, like improving public transit.	Public transit solutions, consistent with adopted plans, will be considered.
121a	Allen Kemplen	Hello, Please see attached comments from the Fairview Community Council on the draft System Performance Report, draft Purpose and Need Memo and Evaluation Criteria Memo. Respectfully, Allen Kemplen President Fairview Community Council	Hi Allen, Received. Thank you. All the best, ~Josie
121b	Allen Kemplen	Assessment of Seward-to-Glenn PEL documents. FAIRVIEW COMMUNITY COUNCIL. System Performance Memo/Report. Societal Context. The document ignores larger societal shifts underway in today's modern global economy. Several significant shifts (climate, technological, economic, etc.) are forcing a major re-think of community growth patterns and the mobility issues of the future. China now has a larger economy than America, the U.S. debt is larger than our GDP and growing, income disparity has never been so high and the Middle Class gets smaller every day. The days of widespread growth and economic prosperity that justified rampant suburban sprawl are over. We are transitioning into something new. Nobody can foretell with specifics what the future may hold in twenty years. Think of the changes we experience every day with the use of the portable digital phone and widespread use of the Internet. (See TRB report titled "Foreseeing the Impact of Transformational Technologies on Land Use and Transportation" (2019) or 2022 APA Foresight "Trend Report for Planners", American Planning Association and Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.) Our nation is adapting to these new realities. All one has to do is look carefully at the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act (IIJA) legislation. It provides strong federal guidance and funding for a different form of community/urban design and the transportation system that serves it. There is a growing emphasis on more sustainable urban areas with strong resiliency/sustainability and powered by vibrant people oriented mixed-use centers/corridors with a strong human scaled "Sense of Place." Such a future is reflected in the adopted Anchorage Land Use Plan (ALUP).	The project uses population forecasts prepared by the Alaska Department of Labor and uses land use forecasts that are derived from Anchorage's adopted plans. ADOL is the agency with the expertise to predict the prosperity of the region's future. The adopted land use plans are progressive and include the community growth and mobility patterns mentioned by the commenter.
121c	Allen Kemplen	Anchorage Land Use Plan. The System Performance Report does not seriously evaluate the mobility mix and community development issues associated with the adopted Anchorage Land Use Plan (ALUP). 1. Much of the Mobility PEL's Study Area is identified in ALUP Map 1-2 as an area for significant growth and development. Growth promoting a Center City development pattern with mixed land uses. Gambell Street is identified as a future pedestrian-centric Main Street. This formally adopted land use guidance is ignored in the System Performance Report. 2. The ALUP spells out with specific examples there is to be an increased emphasis on improved pedestrian movements, streetscape vitality, human-scaled connections and accessibility to goods and services. This reflects an emphasis on a more compact form of land use. Such a vibrant urban core area will produce significantly more connected person trip ends (Origins and Destinations) within the PEL Study Area. 3. The proposed land uses in the ALUP will increase the volume of non-vehicular trips within the Study Area. This is ignored by the System Performance Report.	The traffic forecast results summarized in the System Performance Report do reflect the land use and mobility inputs consistent with the Anchorage land use plan map. The growth and development patterns mentioned by the commenter are used as inputs to the traffic model and are reflective of the development patterns desired by the LUP. The concept of a "Main Street" along Gambell was discussed in the Environmental Setting Report. Based on this comment, information has been included in the System Performance Memo and the Purpose and Need document. The travel modeling being undertaken included updated land use and socioeconomic inputs based on the 2040 LUP. In this way mobility predictions reflect the LUP. Trip predictions for the corridor are much lower than in the past. In part, this is reflective of the land changes which are being modeled.
121d	Allen Kemplen	Fairview Neighborhood Plan. The ALUP is reflected in the adopted Fairview Neighborhood Plan (FVNP) with a more granular focus. It calls for an Overlay Zone to be developed as one of the top priorities of the Fairview Community Council (FVCC). The FVCC has produced a working draft for the Form-Based Code Overlay District and Winter City Design Guidelines. The Regulating Plan component of the Overlay Zone identifies the future land use, community and economic development expected in the Council's boundary area. The FVCC has started the formal process to amend the FVNP and engaged with Municipal staff on our approach and intent. As an adopted Municipal document, the FVNP is accepted as a component of the Anchorage Comprehensive Plan. It identifies Gambell Street as a future pedestrian-centric Main Street. There is no discussion of the issues associated with this future land use and resultant shift in the nature of the street cross-section. For example, Gambell Street would not be part of a higher speed one-way couplet but rather a slower, two-way street with parking and enhanced pedestrian infrastructure. The System Performance Report ignores this future.	The vision expressed by the ALUP for Gambell Street has been added to the System Performance Memo and Purpose and Need document. The travel modeling being undertaken included updated land use and socioeconomic inputs based on the 2040 LUP. In this way mobility predictions reflect the LUP. Trip predictions for the corridor are much lower than in the past. In part this is reflective of the land changes which are being modeled. Changes to the speeds, street configuration, cross-sections etc. have not yet been produced. Those suggestions will be considered when alternatives are developed.
121e	Allen Kemplen	Downtown Plan. Municipal planning staff recently completed a targeted update of the Downtown Plan. The process and analytical products developed for this update demonstrated a clear community and economic need to change the nature of the streets in order to establish a stronger sense of place for people. Recommendations include the necessity of building more residential units in the urban center in order to establish a stronger human presence on the streets of downtown. The System Performance Report ignores the recommendations of the updated Downtown Plan.	A summary of the 2021 Our Downtown plan has been added to the System Performance Memo and the Purpose and Need Statement.

121f	Allen Kemplen	<p>Transportation Planning in a Changing World. The document spends much of the narrative discussing old transportation issues and patterns associated with nation's urban sprawl era. The history discussion is a review of past efforts of trying to cram suburbia into a limited city space. Such a review indicates how difficult it has been trying to get local community stakeholders to give up scarce land within the Anchorage Bowl to wide roads serving suburban sub-divisions and emphasizing the fast and safer movement of regional traffic. Instead of recognizing the realities of a rapidly changing world, they have doubled down on the past Using vehicle miles traveled as a primary analytic metric is out-of-sync with current and future growth patterns, more compact communities and new disruptive transportation technologies.</p>	<p>The reports present a summary of past transportation issues and patterns to help understand the context and to understand how changes are likely to change the project needs. For example, past plans identified large traffic volumes and severe congestion on the Seward and Glenn Highways. Due to Alaska's recession, lower oil prices, changed land use patters (e.g. the Tikatnu Mall, medical and service growth in the Valley, and updated land use plan map and ADOL population forecasts) have all contributed to a very different traffic forecast. One that calls into question whether a highway connection is needed. The purpose and need reflects these changes. Only by presenting this history can the current problems defined in the purpose and need statement be understood. Contrary to the comment, reducing vehicle miles traveled is considered the standard that is currently being employed by an number of geographies across the country. In fact Colorado and California have mandated its use and limit projects that are predicted to increase VMT. In Anchorage, the most recently adopted metropolitan transportation plan has as an objective "reducing VMT". For these reasons it remains a proposed criteria.</p>
121g	Allen Kemplen	<p>Measuring Performance with a People Focus. The documents should shift their main analytic focus from vehicle trips to person trips. Person trips is the metric required by the FHWA when producing the Travel Time Reliability Performance Measure for System Performance of the Interstate System and non-Interstate National Highway System (NHS). (See 23 CFR 490.507 National performance management measures for system performance.) Person miles traveled is multi-modal and is not limited to personal vehicles or trucks. For example, when a person uses public transit on the NHS they can be considered a part of the vehicle occupancy ratio while riding in the vehicle. However, the rider is invariably a pedestrian/bicyclist to and from the transit stop within the NHS right-of-way. Thus to provide a true and accurate measure of system performance and travel time reliability, the analytical process must include an assessment of the non-motorized segments of the trip. How difficult or reliable is it for the transit rider, now pedestrian/bicyclist, to use NHS infrastructure? This information is missing from the System Performance analysis. If the data is not available then the report should explicitly state that condition, place caveats in the appropriate sections of the narrative and identify Action Items for improving the transportation planning data collection and analysis process.</p>	<p>The project team has removed travel time from the Alternative Screening Criteria and added several measures that focus on pedestrian and bike travel and livability. The outputs of the travel model will include results presented as person trips.</p>
121h	Allen Kemplen	<p>What happened to the Tourists? The document does not adequately address prevailing socio-economic conditions within the Study Area as required in U.S.C. 23.450 where Planning Factors are identified. Specifically the required planning factor of Tourism. Many public and private stakeholders actively promote the Downtown area as a special place to be frequented by tourists. Their numbers rise to significant volumes during the peak of the summer visitor season. However, the System Performance Report ignores this reality.</p>	<p>The planning factors mentioned by the commenter can be found at 23 CFR 450.306 and U.S.C. Section 134(h). 23 CFR 450.300(b) "Encourages continued development and improvement of metropolitan transportation planning processes guided by the planning factors set forth in 23 U.S.C. 134(h)" U.S.C. Section 134(h) indicates that the planning process shall provide for "consideration of projects and strategies" will achieve the listed planning factors [emphasis added]. To make sure that improvements considered in the PEL satisfy these requirements, DOT&PF established the planning factors as goals for the PEL and included them in the Purpose and Need document. The planning factors will be relied upon to help guide the development and evaluation of projects and strategies in the PEL. Consideration of "enhancing travel and tourism," is one of the factors that will be considered when projects and strategies are developed in the next phase of project development. Travel and tourism was considered in the Environmental Setting Report and while downtown is a key tourist destination, DOT&PF has not identified problems that are specific to tourism travel suggesting that that sector receive elevated treatment in the purpose and need.</p>
121i	Allen Kemplen	<p>Getting a Better Grasp of the Past. The System Performance Report should be amended to more accurately reflect past transportation system decisions and the inordinate negative burdens placed on a predominantly low-income and ethnically diverse part of town. These actions include taking a neighborhood residential street and converting it to function as a Major Arterial. The creation of the Gambell/Ingra Couplet drove a stake in the very heart of the Fairview community. The environmental injustices associated with this action, and others, continue to this day. For example, there are four one-way couplets in the urban core. Of the four couplets, there is only one with four lanes, no buffers between pedestrians and higher traffic speeds. The couplet that produces the greatest negative impacts to adjacent properties is Gambell/Ingra in the low-income, ethnically diverse Fairview neighborhood. The System Performance must accurately describe the physical realities and negative environmental impacts of past transportation decisions. These injustices need to be acknowledged and addressed in a substantive fashion by the Seward-to-Glenn Mobility PEL Study.</p>	<p>Additional information on the history and socio economic setting has been included in the system performance report and Purpose and Need.</p>

121j	Allen Kemplen	<p>Developing a Better Understanding of the Future. The document warrants a discussion of the changing socio-economic context within the Study Area. There should be inclusion of both current and future land use development patterns, associated trip generation characteristics and the challenges created by the conflict between old notions of mobility and the new transportation/land use realities of the 21st Century. The document focuses too much on past trip patterns while ignoring the implications of emerging future trip patterns. The System Performance document must widen its default analytic premises, take a more holistic approach and really assess the issues within the Study Area using a true systems perspective. Future land use development will likely significantly alter trip patterns in the Study Area (See Map 3-1 and Figure 3-6). There will be a larger percentage of local Origins and Destinations. As such the System Performance Report should discuss how the anticipated land use changes will force changes in select street cross-sections within the Study Area. The System Performance Report assumes future traffic patterns will mirror the historical record. Suburbia will continue to grow while the major employment activities remain in the Anchorage Bowl. As discussed previously, there is sufficient evidence to support the notion that the future will not be like the past. One of the reasonably foreseeable options for surface transportation is the development of some form of passenger rail service between the Mat-Su core area and the Anchorage Bowl area. The ALUP states on Page 61 its support of commuter rail between the Mat-Su Valley and the Anchorage Bowl. The System Performance Report should include a discussion of past efforts (i.e. Governor Walker's request for State GF for a Pilot Program) and the potential impact of passenger rail service on trip characteristics within the Study Area. The System Performance Report should explicitly the possible of passenger rail service as it may have an impact on transportation modes within the Study Area. The expanded analysis of the ALUP, the FVNP and the recently updated Downtown Plan will very likely lead to modifications in how the movement of people, bicyclists and vehicles co-exist within the urban core. You cannot really produce an accurate Purpose and Need Statement until one has a full understanding of what planning factors are relevant to transportation solutions within the Study Area. It is recommended the project direct attention to developing a more acceptable System Performance Report; a report that accurately reflects the complexity of the land use/transportation challenges in the Study Area. The end product of such a refinement should be a vision for the Study Area that gains the concurrence of all stakeholder interests.</p>	<p>Additional information has been included to the purpose and need on anticipated changes to trip generation envisioned by the adopted plans. One sentence about commuter rail is insufficient to consider it reasonably foreseeable. Commuter rail is not adopted in any of the transportation plans and station planning and transit supportive development planning is not in the Land Use Plan map. As a sub area study, such a question is beyond the scope of this study. MTP 2050 is currently underway and is the appropriate venue to consider commuter rail. The System Performance Report does not assume that future traffic patterns will mirror the historical record. The AMATS model for the 2040 MTP was updated to include the latest assumptions regarding population and employment distribution to be consistent with the recently adopted land use plan map. The project traffic model being used for the PEL was updated with the latest ADOL forecast data.</p>
121k	Allen Kemplen	<p>Purpose and Need Memo. The draft Purpose and Need Memo (PNM) is built upon a flawed and inadequate System Performance Report. A Purpose and Need (P&N) with little or no connection to the built, social and economic environment is severely deficient in meeting NEPA requirements. A P&N that does not address revitalization of the urban core through a balanced approach to mobility is a product of old thinking and misguided priorities. It needs to be substantively rewritten.</p>	<p>The purpose and need is multimodal and alternatives will accommodate all transportation modes, not just vehicles (i.e. it supports a balanced approach to mobility). The need statement does consider the vision set out in the adopted plans and discusses the anticipated changes set forth in those plans to the built and land use environment. See the discussion in need 3.</p>
121l	Allen Kemplen	<p>A Little History Would Be Useful. The draft PNMt presents a biased historical assessment. For example, the narrative gives the impression that Gambell and Ingra Streets were always Arterials. This is inaccurate. Prior to opening of the New Seward facility, Gambell Street was the Main Street of the Fairview community. Ingra Street was a local residential street. See photo. The history of Fairview is ignored. Fairview, until 1959, was an island within the City limits. It resisted annexation to the end – finally being forcibly annexed to the City by the Local Boundary Commission and the State Supreme Court. Once annexed, the City expressed in the betterment of the area. Local residents wanted improved city services, strict ordinance enforcement on nuisance control, and they expressed a willingness to cooperate with the city in any program that would upgrade their area. These requests were rarely acted upon. The street history is inadequate. Gambell Street connected to the Old Seward Highway prior to development of the New Seward Highway in the late 1950's. The New Seward Highway only connected to Gambell Street when it first opened. Ingra Street was a residential street and remained so until the late 1960's when the Ingra-Gambell Couplet was implemented as part of the Downtown Streets Study recommendations. The "A Neighborhood Planning Program for Anchorage, Alaska" dated June, 1965 and produced by the City of Anchorage Planning Department, states on page 113: "Residents in the western part of Fairview expressed concern about the additional traffic would be generated by the proposed one-way Ingra-Gambell Couplet. Ingra Street has already become a "speedway" for fast, non-stop traffic." It also states: "However, when the Ingra-Gambell Couplet goes in to use, it will cut the neighborhood and create an island two blocks wide and ten blocks long."</p>	<p>The document has updated to pull in the discussion on 5th Avenue, 6th Avenue, and Gambell and Ingra Streets from the adopted Fairview Neighborhood Plan.</p>
121m	Allen Kemplen	<p>What happened to the "P" in the PEL Study? The P&N does not adequately consider the federal Planning Factors. It does not discuss the economic vitality of the metropolitan core area. The Fairview Community Council is actively promoting establishment of an Innovation Area (see draft Fairview Innovation Area White Paper, 2019). This economic revitalization initiative is ignored by the P&N document. The Municipality of Anchorage recently produced a Target Update to the Downtown Plan. A key recommendation of the updated document is that the arterial transportation corridors must be redesigned to promote a more robust pedestrian and bicyclist street environment. Reasoning behind such a recommendation is to take advantage of larger societal trends (per the Smart Growth America analysis), attract the demographic markets of Generation Z and Seniors and show private capital investors that Anchorage and the State are serious about creating a more favorable climate for capital investment in the urban core. This documented "community will" is ignored in the draft P&N. The ALUP identifies significant growth is expected to occur within the Study Area. The P&N document ignores the ALUP discussion that Gambell Street is destined to be a future Main Street for the Fairview community. It also ignores local neighborhood efforts advance a Form Based Code Overlay with an Innovation Area, Main Street, Greenway and Arena District. These land use measures will increase the economic viability of East Downtown/Fairview area and increase the number of non-motorized trips within the Study Area. The planned growth and economic development patterns is ignored by the P&N document. The P&N also does not address the Planning Factor of "Protect and Enhance the Environment". The 2005-2010 Pre-EIS Study identified the negative noise impacts produced by the high volumes of traffic on Gambell-Ingra Couplet. This information is ignored by the P&N document. The P&N document does not address past environmental injustices nor does it identify a need to mitigate negative environmental impacts. It does not substantively address the issue of investment uncertainty caused by inaction and lack of progress on implementing the Seward to Glenn connection.</p>	<p>The planning factors mentioned by the commenter can be found at 23 CFR 450.306 and U.S.C. Section 134(h). 23 CFR 450.300(b) "Encourages continued development and improvement of metropolitan transportation planning processes guided by the planning factors set forth in 23 U.S.C. 134(h)" U.S.C. Section 134(h) indicates that the planning process shall provide for "consideration of projects and strategies" will achieve the listed planning factors. To make sure that improvements considered in the PEL satisfy these requirements, DOT&PF established the planning factors as goals for the PEL and included them in the Purpose and Need document. The planning factors will be relied upon to help guide the development and evaluation of projects and strategies in the PEL is indicated in the regulations. information from the downtown plan has been included. Description of the Gambell Main Street concept has been added. Additional information in the adverse affect of the current street design on the adjacent neighborhoods have been added. Land use measures as envisioned by applicable plans have been supplemented in the reports.</p>

121n	Allen Kemplen	Draft Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memorandum. This document must be significantly revised as it depends on the flawed work accomplished in the System Performance Memorandum and the Purpose and Needs Statement. Both are deficient in substance and ignore key attributes and characteristics affecting transportation issues in the Study Area.	The document has been updated.
122a	Tim Geraty	Dear Seward Glenn Mobility PEL team, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the AMATS: Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study. Below are comments on behalf of NeighborWorks Alaska (NWAK) on the draft purpose and need statement, draft alternative selection criteria, and draft system performance report. For over 40 year, NeighborWorks Alaska has been dedicated to improving the quality of life for families and individuals by preserving homes, creating new housing opportunities, and strengthening neighborhoods. Since 1993, we have offered 83 units of housing within our property Merrill Crossing at 1275 E 9th Avenue, located in the Fairview neighborhood. We offer 65 income-restricted apartment units, including 10 designated for residents who previously experienced homelessness. Based on recent data from our residents, within Merrill Crossing 62% of the residents we serve are people of color and 22% of them are over 60 years old. Our comments are not only to improve the neighborhood as a whole and to ensure the residents we serve have a safe and accessible neighborhood. These highways have disadvantaged the communities within Fairview, and going forward, solutions should preserve and restore the minority and low-income communities even if at greater costs to the project. Environmental justice should be centered on this project. Fairview is an area with approximately 8,000 residents in Anchorage, Alaska. According to census data, the area is demographically disadvantaged. Nearly half of the population (47%) is low-income and 15% of the population has less than a high school education--twice the state percentage. People of color comprise a majority of the population (62%) and 7% of the population is linguistically isolated. Eighty- four percent of occupied housing units are rentals. NWAK encourages and supports the advocacy of the Fairview Community Council (FVCC) and their efforts to improve the quality of life for residents, including the resolutions and comments they have submitted on this project. Together, we are all working to make Fairview whole after years of disinvestment, unsafe roads, and pollution. This brief and critical comment period lasts just one month in the start of summer (May 25- June 24, 2022), a difficult time to adequately engage with residents and gather meaningful input so we recommend additional time and opportunities to gather local feedback on these three draft technical documents. Additional public outreach opportunities, like walk-up comment stations at local businesses would seek more meaningful input, like at Red Apple, Carrs on Gambell, laundry mats, car washes, parks, transit stops, and more.	Thanks Lindsey. Received. All the best, ~Josie. The PEL study documentation reflects the demographic and economic conditions in the Fairview neighborhood. In particular, the environmental setting report includes statistics similar to those provided in the comment. Need three has been supplemented to reflect the importance of the demographic and economic make-up of the affected residents. Additional information provided has been included in the system performance report.
122b	Tim Geraty	Draft Purpose and Need Statement. The draft purpose statement provided through the online comment form does not match the document's language and is missing the third listed intention. The third intention, "to improve neighborhood connections" is essential to the overall purpose of the project. Reestablishing neighborhood connectivity should take priority. The project should not develop smaller streets into larger facilities for traffic. The current draft purpose statement centers on vehicular travel without including people on foot, bike, or bus. The statement should be expanded to better include all roadway users without a preference to motor vehicle numbers only, which also corresponds to public input to date. Fairview needs safe dedicated pedestrian facilities and bikeways. The draft purpose statement does not integrate the surrounding neighborhood vision on accessibility and connectivity for multi-modal travelers. The statement should include neighborhood access and connectivity for all roadway users, including those on foot, bike, scooter, stroller, or bus.	Note that none of the three needs is in any priority order. The purpose statement explicitly indicates that the purpose is for "people and goods traveling by all modes). The language has been updated to specifically list "people on foot, bikes, or bus" for clarity). The draft need statement explicitly evokes and summarizes the surrounding neighborhood vision expressed in the Fairview Neighborhood Plan. It reads "Current street design on the Seward/Glenn Highway corridor in the study area is inconsistent with the vision expressed in recently adopted plans and is adversely affecting neighborhood redevelopment efforts, community cohesion, and quality of life. "
122c	Tim Geraty	The "Social Demands and Economic Development" need should be expanded to include preserving and enhancing housing along the corridor, especially for multi-family housing, and for businesses. There is a cost for separating businesses and tourism in Fairview from those Downtown by the highway barrier. The draft study should include a "Connectivity" need to improve connections for non-motorized users (people on foot, bike, accessing buses) along the corridors. Additionally, it should include a "Health and Environment" need to minimize the impacts to residents, local stakeholders, and the natural environment, including air and noise pollution, environmental justice issues historically and presently resulting from the highway corridor.	The third need identifies that "roadway projects can foster new employment and development, and that they can benefit schools, land use plans, recreation facilities, and others." The need reflects that improved street design, consistent with adopted plans is needed and "Adopted land use and neighborhood plans envision that corridor transportation improvements will benefit economic development and reduce the impacts that past transportation decisions have had on the Fairview neighborhood. "The purpose statement reflect that part of the purpose is to "improve neighborhood connections." Alternatives will be evaluated on environmental considerations including air, noise, and environmental justice concerns.
122d	Tim Geraty	Draft Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo. Overall, the approach to the PEL should be working at the human-scale. The criteria for "Safety" should include reducing points of conflict for people in cars, on foot, and on bike, not just for the vehicles themselves. For the "Conflicting Functions" criteria, the measures should include person miles traveled as a multi-modal measure, rather than just using vehicle volumes. Measures can also include increases in non-motorized travel and reductions in vehicle volumes. For the "Social Demands and Economic Development" criteria, measures should include maintaining or improving access to adjacent businesses and employment centers. These measures should be beyond just measuring vehicle miles traveled. For the additional needs for "Connectivity," criteria measures can include improving connections to facilities, recreation areas, and neighborhood assets. For "Health and Environment," criteria measures can include maintaining and enhancing quality of life for neighbors adjacent to the corridors, minimizing or mitigating noise impacts, minimizing or mitigating air quality impacts, minimizing or mitigating negative visual impacts, and avoiding disproportionate impacts on environmental justice populations.	The criteria proposed do include measuring the "Number of conflict points (intersections) between vehicles and non-motorized users" - the intent is that fewer conflict points general means a safer facility for all users including bikes and pedestrians. Screening criteria measuring the level of transportation stress for people walking and biking has been added. These are measures on how walkable and bikeable the streets are. Additional criteria have been added to measure livability effects associated with each alternative. Note also that economic, social, and environmental considerations are a part of the second phase of evaluation.

122e	Tim Geraty	Draft System Performance Memo. This memo should build toward the common future for Fairview outlined in the Anchorage Land Use Plan 2040 (LUP) and the Fairview Neighborhood Plan. The PEL should evaluate mobility as it relates to future land use plans along the transportation corridor. The LUP emphasizes safe non-motorized movement, connections, and accessibility, while overall increasing local trips and destinations and reducing vehicle trips and vehicle miles traveled. The draft system performance memo uses data that shows stagnation or declines in traffic volumes over the last decade, but instead projects 12-26% increases. This unrealistic future growth is unrealistic. The land use goals for the corridor include a Fairview Greenway along Hyder Street, lane reductions on Gambell Street, and a main street feel along Gambell Street. Integrating the future of the highway corridors with the land use goals will create a more vibrant urban mixed-use corridor while revitalizing the Fairview neighborhood and serving residents and visitors along our highway system.	The system performance memo and Purpose and Need explicitly indicate the intent is to identify solutions that implement the vision and guidance contained in the plans mentioned in the comment. The Land Use Plan map and Fairview Neighborhood Plan are summarized. The purpose statement for the PEL is nearly identical to the emphasis mentioned in the comment and includes accessibility, safety, and connection (including those for nonmotorized movements). As suggested, reducing VMT is one of the metrics that is proposed as screening criterion. The travel modeling being undertaken included updated land use and socioeconomic inputs based on the 2040 LUP. In this way mobility predictions reflect the LUP. Trip predictions for the corridor are much lower than in the past. In part this is reflective of the land changes which are being modeled. Regarding traffic growth. Two different approaches were used for traffic forecasting, one based on trends and the second based on future population growth predictions from the Alaska Department of Labor. While the region has lost population and traffic has declined on some roadways, ADOL does predict population growth in the region by 2050. Traffic modeling reflects that predicted population growth. The land use goals mentions (greenway, Gambell Main Street) are summarized and are the foundation described in Need 3. The third need identifies that "roadway projects can foster new employment and development, and that they can benefit schools, land use plans, recreation facilities, and others." The need reflects that improved street design, consistent with adopted plans is needed and "Adopted land use and neighborhood plans envision that corridor transportation improvements will benefit economic development and reduce the impacts that past transportation decisions have had on the Fairview neighborhood. "
122f	Tim Geraty	NeighborWorks Alaska is committed to creating a safe, connected, and vibrant Fairview and Downtown neighborhoods. Please let us know if you have further questions or clarifications about these comments. Sincerely, Tim Geraty	Comment noted.
123	Larry Michael	To Whom It May Concern: I write in support of the "Comments FVCC 6-24-22." The Fairview Community Council has done an excellent job of distilling information from the Drafts of the Purpose and Need, Selection Criteria Memo and System Performance Memo. As a South Addition resident and member of the 3rd Avenue Radicals, I advocate for work that is not vehicular centric but rather considers any person who has transportation need to include non-motorized options and mass transit. Please consider quality of life of neighborhoods. Please consider the 2040 Land Use Plan, the Fairview Neighborhood Plan and the Downtown Plan. These documents are necessarily forward thinking on what is needed for sustainable urban living. Additional comments: Safety - Give at least equal consideration to non-motorized and pedestrian safety as is given vehicular safety. Increasingly people living in an urban core may not own or frequently use motorized vehicles. For example, dedicated bike lanes and wider sidewalks are necessary. Environmental and economic justice - The answer is not to expand lanes to move even greater volume of highway traffic through FV. The neighborhood experiences greater motorized noise and air pollution already. If 7 minutes is saved by maintaining high speeds as opposed to 25mph, trucking saves money. However, there is also tremendous lost economic opportunity to the neighborhood, as well, as developers do not want to invest in a community that has one way traffic at 40-60mph. Why should trucking cost be prioritized over neighborhood cost? Finally, as population increases in this area, hopefully through affordable housing, many folks cannot afford cars and gas. They need mass transit, and safe bike and pedestrian options. Connectivity - We need a downtown from Fairview to West Downtown that is unified. Our Downtown Plan includes West Fairview with the East Downtown/ Fairview Revitalization area as a priority. Unless the above areas are considered of person centric safety, environmental and economic justice, and connectivity the resulting design will not meet the downtown to Fairview neighborhood needs. Sincerely, Larry Michael	The purpose and need is multimodal and alternatives will accommodate all transportation modes, not just vehicles. The need statement does consider the vision set out in the plans mentioned. Safety - need statement specifically addresses non-motorized safety. Alternative solutions will consider bike lanes and wider sidewalks. Environmental and Economic Justice -The purpose and need, system performance, and environmental setting memos document the socioeconomic setting and recognize that environmental justice and equity should be reflected in the PEL study. The need statement recognizes the effect that past roadway design has had on Fairview's development. Connectivity - The need statement specifically identifies the need to improve connectivity and identifies the current road design as barrier. Based on this and other comments, additional information has been added to the Purpose and Need Statement regarding the socio-economic conditions and adverse effects that the past roadway design has had on the neighborhood.
124a	Daniel Volland	Hello all, Please see the attached Resolution from the South Addition Community Council, "A Resolution Regarding Freeway Projects and their Planning for a Prosperous, Dynamic and More Livable City." This item was passed last night by our general membership after it was referred to an ad hoc special committee and we were able to invite delegates from the Fairview Community Council to provide us with their perspective on the project and study process thus far. We felt it was important to dialogue with our neighbors to the east who have been most impacted by the current highway design, and will be most impacted by its future. However, we are mindful that the future of the highway connection will impact all neighborhoods in the urban core, and would like to add our voices to the record. The South Addition Community Council respectfully submits this Resolution as our comment on the Seward-Glenn Mobility PEL Study for public comment period May 23-June 24th, 2022. Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. Regards, Daniel Volland Vice President, South Addition Community Council	Thanks, Daniel. Received. All the best, ~Josie

124b	Daniel Volland	South Addition Community Council Resolution 2022-06 A Resolution Regarding Freeway Projects and Their Planning for a Prosperous, Dynamic and More Livable City. Whereas, the Fairview and South Addition Community Councils encompass lands that are within the boundaries of the Traditional Neighborhood Design area in the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Map and therefore share current and future goals in supporting orderly and sustainable social and economic development, and Whereas, Fairview and South Addition are two of Anchorage's Four Original Neighborhoods included in the Anchorage Original Neighborhoods Historic Preservation Plan that was created and funded in part to plan for and to mitigate impacts of future infrastructure development that bisects their land areas, and Whereas, the Department of Transportation of Public Facilities (DOT&PF) is proposing to construct multi-lane, controlled access freeway through the middle of the Anchorage Bowl in order to connect the Glenn and New Seward Interstate facilities, and Whereas, current design proposals emphasize the rapid movement of regional traffic at the least cost irrespective of environmental justice impacts to the urban fabric, the future economic vitality of the city or quality of life for residents, and Whereas, constructing elevated interchanges, controlled access freeways will require an inordinate amount of right-of-way- land forever lost to the betterment of our community council areas,	The proposed highway connection project is in the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan. That plan is prepared jointly by the Municipality of Anchorage and DOT&PF through AMATS. Similarly, this PEL is a study jointly commissioned as part of the MTP to take a fresh look at the transportation needs in the study area. No alternatives have been proposed as part of the PEL. Alternatives development happens in the next phase. Whether a highway connection remains the recommended alternative will be determined during the PEL study. That decision will again be a joint decision of DOT&PF and the MOA through AMATS.
124c	Daniel Volland	and Whereas, incremental freeway projects without a common vision for the transportation corridor will result in disjointed and unbalanced designs that only increase environmental degradation and rip apart the urban fabric of our city, reduce future tax revenues, worsen resident's quality of life and ignore Anchorage's unique physical environment, and Whereas, incremental corridor development without a comprehensive understanding how the entire transportation corridor functions in an urban context can be perceived as segmentation which is a technique not allowed under the National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA), and Whereas, the Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS) is tasked by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to ensure federally funded transportation infrastructure occurs through a continuing, comprehensive and cooperative process with consideration of planning factors other than safe and efficient movement of vehicles,	A key result of the PEL study process is to develop a comprehensive understanding of how the entire transportation corridor functions in an urban context. Toward this end, the study team has updated travel model results based on the adopted land use plan map and a key part of the purpose and need is to identify transportation solutions that are consistent with the adopted plans for the area (see need 3). Regarding the FHWA planning factors - to make sure that improvements considered in the PEL satisfy these requirements, DOT&PF established the planning factors as goals for the PEL and included them in the Purpose and Need document. The planning factors will be relied upon to help guide the development and evaluation of projects and strategies in the PEL. Consideration of "enhancing travel and tourism," is one of the factors that will be considered when projects and strategies are developed in the next phase of project development.
124d	Daniel Volland	Therefore, Be it Resolved that AMATS, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) approve a Resolution obligating DOT&PF to substantively engage with the Municipality of Anchorage and Community Councils to craft a common vision for how best to establish an improved connection between the New Seward and Glenn Highways that complies with FHWA, and Therefore, Be It Further Resolved that design project work on discreet individual projects within the corridor be paused to allow for a robust public participation process, professionally facilitated and that engages residents, businesses and property owners in meaningful urban design workshops, and Therefore, Be It Also Further Resolved that residents across Anchorage desire an attractive northern city, which is economically prosperous with a high quality of life for all residents and supports the Live. Work. Play.	There is substantial coordination between DOT&PF and the MOA and AMATS. The PEL is being jointly overseen by DOT&PF, AMATS, and the MOA. Each entity has representation on the internal project team, which meets monthly and conducts reviews of draft document and provided direction to the contractor. A citizen advisory committee which includes representation from all the Community Councils has been established to provide input to the team. The South Addition Community Council is encouraged to visiting the project web site to see the extensive involvement that has been conducted to date and the current project documents that were revised in response to public comments.
124e	Daniel Volland	After establishing the necessary quorum, the South Addition Community Council approved this resolution on June 23, 2022 at its general meeting in Anchorage. Passed: Ayes 14, Nays 0, Abstentions 1. Attested by John Theubar President of the South Addition Community Council.	Comment noted.
125	Sharon Chamard	To Whom It May Concern: The efforts made to seek out additional data sources to quantify pedestrian activity are appreciated. However, data from Strava, a subscription-based fitness-tracking app marketed to athletes, particularly serious cyclists, is probably not a reliable measure of routine neighborhood pedestrian activity. The Strava users that are the bases of these data are unlikely to be a representative sample of Fairview residents. Further, this particular app will probably not be engaged by users when they are doing day-to-day errands, such as going to the grocery store, because the primary purpose of the app is to track training activity. This lack of proper sampling and representativeness is problematic; the data from Strava suggest that most pedestrian (and bicycle) movements in the Fairview area are on the structured trail system, when it is not these movements that are the source of the vehicle-pedestrian/bicyclist conflict described elsewhere in the draft documents. Reliance on Strava undercounts the real volume of pedestrians and bicyclists on the road and street network in Fairview. There is still inadequate measurement of pedestrians and bicyclists in the study area. Given the importance given to non-motorized traffic noted throughout the draft documents and in previous public comments, this deficit needs to be addressed in a satisfactory manner. Thank you and regards, Sharon Chamard	The project team has included Strava data because it was available and was suggested by member of the public and helps to flesh out the nonmotorized travel, but the team is not relying on it as the sole source of pedestrian and bicyclist information. Importantly, the team also included information from the AMATS Nonmotorized Plan, which provides additional detailed information on pedestrian travel and thoroughly documents the level of nonmotorized demand in Fairview. The project team does not believe that detailed nonmotorized user counts are necessary at this initial stage of alternative development and selection. Pedestrian counts will be obtained when analyzing a smaller set alternatives that move forward in the process, if deemed necessary for alternatives design refinement. Additional information from the System Performance Report has now been included in the Purpose and Need to further describe nonmotorized uses in the area.
126	Nancy Pease	Hi, this is Nancy Pease. I was just trying to confirm where to send comments on three documents for the Glen Seward Mobility study. It's really not clear online. There's no, the three documents are listed there. It says, when comments are due, it says, the day doesn't say the time. And then there's no indication what e-mail to send it to, but I did talk with someone at DOT. So I think I will send it to info at Seward Glenn Mobility dot com and hope it gets there. But it should be really clear, on the project page where to send comments, And it's not. Also exactly when the due date or time sometimes critical. So, I'm going to assume it's midnight, because it didn't say otherwise. And I hope you can clarify that on the website. Thank you. Bye.	The home page and the comment page, clearly indicated that comments could be submitted via the online form or via email to the email link on the web site. The due date was listed as June 24. The comments from the commenter were received and have been included in the project record.
127a	Susanne DiPietro	Dear Project Team, Please accept these comments on behalf of the Government Hill Community Council. Below are GHCC's comments on the May 2022 Draft Purpose and Need Statement, the May 2022 Draft System Performance Memorandum, and the May 2022 Draft Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria memorandum. Draft Purpose & Need Statement: GHCC notes that the study area includes the Government Hill Neighborhood; however, the document does not reference the Government Hill Neighborhood Plan (https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Publications/Pages/GovernmentHillNeighborhoodPlan-2013.aspx) which was adopted in 2015 by AO No. 2015-18. The Plan documents the neighborhood's vision, including a future neighborhood center, and improved access to downtown and other key activity centers by alternative and traditional modes of transportation. Please include the Government Hill Neighborhood in the planning documents referenced beginning on page 23.	Information from the Government Hill Neighborhood plan has been added to the purpose and need.

127b	Susanne DiPietro	Seward-Glenn PEL Draft System Performance Memo. GHCC notes that the study area includes the Government Hill Neighborhood; however, the doc	Information from the Government Hill Neighborhood plan has been added to the purpose and need.
127c	Susanne DiPietro	Seward-Glenn PEL Draft Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memorandum Memo. GHCC has questions and suggestions about this memo. First, how will each of the proposed Level 1 screening criteria be weighted? GHCC suggests that the criteria be given different weights based on relative importance, and further suggests that the "Social Demands & Economic Development" criteria be given controlling weight compared to the other criteria. This suggestion is based on the findings of "considerably lower traffic forecasts for the Seward and Glenn Highways in the study area compared to previously adopted forecasts" and the finding at page 20 of the Performance Memo that "By 2050, LOS is not expected to rise to unacceptable levels during rush hour in most of the study area." Since traffic congestion is not now a problem and is not expected to become a problem, criteria related to congestion should be excluded or given minimal weight.	Selection criteria are not proposed to be "weighted." Some criteria are quantitative and some qualitative which does not lend itself to weighting. DOT&PF will use the totality of the analysis embodied by the criteria, and public input, to evaluate the alternatives and make a decision on whether to screen out some alternatives.
127d	Susanne DiPietro	Regarding the "Conflicting Functions" criterion, why are most of the proposed measures formulated around the "peak period" travel time? By focusing on possible delays during the few hours a day when traffic is at its peak, the criteria could result in overemphasis on motorized vehicle mobility at the expense of other factors that are more important to the community, namely non-motorized access and mobility and social justice. GHCC suggests reworking these measures to encompass travel time throughout the day, both peak and non-peak hours?	DOT&PF feels that peak period level of service and delay are important measures for gauging the health of the National Highway System. Additional measures have been added based on public input to reflect the more balanced needs in the corridor.
127e	Susanne DiPietro	With regard to the "Social Demands and Economic Development" item, please add the Government Hill Neighborhood plan to the documents that will be consulted. Also, GHCC has concerns about how the qualitative assessment will be implemented. The assessment must include feedback from GHCC and FVCC, at a minimum.	Information from the Government Hill Neighborhood plan has been added to the updated documents posted on the project website. Some screening criteria are quantitative and some qualitative, depending on the data upon which the criteria rely. Please see the updated Recommended Alternatives Selection Criteria memo on the project website for an updated description of the screening process. DOT&PF and the MOA will use the totality of the analysis that result from the screening process, and public input, to evaluate the alternatives and make a decision on whether to screen out some alternatives on their respective facilities. The evaluation will be published as draft and will include public input oppprtunities, including the project advisory committees. All community councils in the study area have representative on the citizen advisory committee, including Government Hill and Fairview.
127f	Susanne DiPietro	Also, "Impacts to Section 4(f) Resources" is extremely important and should be given significant weight. The tip of Brown's Point Park abuts the Port off ramp, and in the past, misguided proposals have been made to shave off the point of the park by those who would "improve" the off ramp at the expense of the neighborhood.	While the criteria are not weighted, Section 4(f) has special protections afforded in federal law and regulation that will be taken into consideration during screening.
127g	Susanne DiPietro	Regarding the "Safety" Criterion Purpose and Need Category, GHCC agrees the safety is an important goal and conflict point should be reduced. However, GHCC worries that the way the proposed measures are formulated might promote reduction of conflict points at the expense of encouraging and enabling non-motorized transportation. Could the project team add additional measures reflecting the community's need to walk and bike? One measure that comes to mind is increased miles of grade-separated bike or walking route. Sincerely, Susanne DiPietro, GHCC Treasurer	Additional measures have been added to gauge the level of stress for walking and biking. Alternatives that reduce the stress will be rated more highly.
128a	Aaron Jongenelen	Here are comments on this project. These are not from the AMATS Policy Committee, but from me as the AMATS Coordinator. If you have any questions please let me know. Thank you.	Thanks, Aaron! Received. All the best, ~Josie
128b	Aaron Jongenelen	Josie, I forgot to attach this document to letter I sent on Friday for my comments on the PEL. I reference it in the letter and just plain forgot to include in my e-mail. If you could include it with my letter that would be great. Sorry about that. Aaron AMATS Coordinator	Letter attachment received and included in the comment/response documentation. This letter is addressed in Section 1.6 of the purpose and need document.
128c	Aaron Jongenelen	Dear Seward to Glenn Mobility Project Team, Thank you for the opportunity to provide feedback on the draft documents. This letter will have two parts, one to address some errors in the documents that need to be corrected and the second part to provide comments on the documents and criteria for consideration.	Comment noted.
128d	Aaron Jongenelen	Part One -Errors that need to be corrected:1. Throughout the DRAFT Purpose and Need Statement and the DRAFT Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memorandum there are statements that say DOT&PF and AMATS will be doing an action together, such as developing the purpose and need or applying the criteria to alternatives. This PEL and associated documents are not being developed by AMATS, they are being developed by and for DOT&PF. AMATS was not involved in the development of the RFP, the consultant selection process, nor are documents being submitted for review and approval by the TAC and PC. The Seward to Glenn Highway PEL is being developed by DOT&PF following the DOT&PF process, not the AMATS process. Please changes these statements to remove AMATS.2. The model being used for the Seward to Glenn PEL is no longer the AMATS model. To use the AMATS model for a project an MOU is signed between AMATS and the consultant team that explains any changes to the model make it no longer the AMATS model. In all documents for this PEL this needs to be noted. Remove the reference to the AMATS model and put in that it is the Seward to Glenn Mobility PEL model.	1. Regarding the AMATS roll description on documents: DOT&PF will follow up with AMATS leadership regarding the appropriate verbiage to describe the collaboration on this PEL Study. AMATS leadership is a part of the PEL Study leadership through the executive committee and monthly managers meetings. 2. Regarding the AMATS model, a note will be added and appropriate agreements are in place.

128e	Aaron Jongenelen	Part Two –Comments on the documents and Criteria: 1. Attached is a letter from Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) Planning Department, Long Range Planning, that outlines policies from the 2040 Land Use Plan and the Fairview Neighborhood Plan that are related to the Seward to Glenn Highway PEL. These are key policies that should be reviewed, and the project team should outline how each policy is being addressed. This can help to show how the PEL is matching these two very important local plans and if there are any deficiencies that need to be addressed. While the DRAFT Purpose and Need Statement document discusses the 2040 Land Use Plan and the Fairview Neighborhood plan, the discussion is very limited and doesn't show in enough detail how these documents are being used.	This information provided by MOA planning has been included in the Purpose and Need document in Section 1.6.
128f	Aaron Jongenelen	2.Overall, all documents that have been released to date for the PEL are very confusing and hard to follow along. Serious consideration should be given to producing documents that are easier to read, contain less technical jargon, and use more plain language. It is understood this is not easy to do as the 2050 MTP project team is grappling with the same issue, but that should not detract from attempting to make it easier for everyone to comprehend.	The project team will endeavor to do better especially in the actual PEL chapters. Technical documents like the modeling report and O/D study are necessarily technical in nature.
128g	Aaron Jongenelen	3.The State of Alaska developed a PEL guidebook dated April 2021, https://dot.alaska.gov/rfpdocs/25213030/pel_guidebook.pdf . After searching these two documents it was unclear how this guidebook is being incorporated into this process. It is recommended a paragraph or two explaining how the guidebook is being used for this PEL be added to the documents with an associated reference in the footnotes.	The DOT&PF is following the guidance provided in the DOT&PF PEL Guidebook (April 2021) in conducting this PEL study process and developing the final PEL Study Report. A reference to this guidebook will be inserted into the documents and a description will be added to the final PEL Study Report at the conclusion of this process.
128h	Aaron Jongenelen	4.Outlined below are comments on the Level 1 screening criteria: a. Overall –Each criterion should have a number or letter assigned to it. For example, under safety you could say Safety 1A that would reference “Number of crashes with the Build Condition compared to the No Action Condition”. This would make it easier for comments to be submitted. The comments below will use this convention. b. Overall –It is not clear in the document if the Level 1 screening criteria will be used before or after alternatives are modeled. It appears the criteria would best be used after alternatives are modeled as it relies on data from the model. It might help to have a flow chart of when modeling will take place. Figure 2 on page 5 can be updated to note when modeling will take place. c. Overall –Continuing from the comment above, if the Level 1 screening will be used after alternatives are modeled, how are the alternatives being developed? Maybe the project can host a public workshop to sit down with the public and work out some alternative ideas before going to the project team/committee to develop them. Either way this should be spelled out in the criteria memo so the public can follow along with the process. Right now, it is unclear. d. Overall –How many alternatives will be modeled? All of them? How will you determine which ones won't be modeled? This should be outlined in the criteria memo. e. Overall –Recommend adding another column to Table 2, Level 1 Screening Criteria, to explain how the criteria will be used. The criteria are very technical. The “Why the Measure is Important” column is good information, but hard to understand and match up with how the criteria will be used or what benefit it will provide to the alternative selection process. For example, “Miles of Roadway in study area that have a peak period volume to capacity ratio above 0.8”needs some more explanation about how it will be used. What happens if you find roadways mile below this amount? How many roadway miles are acceptable to be below 0.8? How will it be used to select alternatives?	(a) Numbering have been assigned to the criteria. (b) Alternatives will be modeled and the model results used as part of the Level 1 screening. The alternatives will undergo additional public input and engineering refinement and modeled again. Additions to the text and graphic added as requested. (c) The project team will develop initial alternatives share them internally with DOT&PF and MOA Staff, revise them. A workshop will be conducted with invited members of agencies and public. The alternatives will then be modeled and the draft results and draft alternatives will be shared at a public meeting. Details were added to Table 1.(d)The project team plans on modeling the five alternatives brought into the screening process. The Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria memo has been updated and posted on the project website. (e) Technical wording has been rewritten. Alternatives that are not reasonable will be eliminated.
128i	Aaron Jongenelen	f. Safety 1A –How does this criterion get the crash number? The data and method just say it will use safety stats and VMT/ADT. Can you explain how you are able to directly correlate this information to an increase or decrease in crashes in the area? A more in-depth explanation would be appreciated on how the data and method will provide reliable data that shows an increase or decrease in crashes. g. Safety 1A –What will you do if a roadway or area has no safety data? The AMATS MTP uses the traffic engineer for the MOA and DOT&PF to help identify if a project will address these safety concerns where there is no data. h. Safety 1B –There are areas of safety concerns besides just the intersections. Driveways for example are a serious conflict point for non-motorized and vehicular users. Will these be considered? If an alternative will provide benefit outside of an intersection for safety for non-motorized users how will that be accounted for? i. Safety 1C –Does conflict points include driveways? The data/method just says intersections.	The screening criteria have been updated to add a better description of the data and methodology. The project team does not intend on collecting driveway location data. A qualitative assessment of an alternative's change in number of driveways and/or potential crash severity will be included. Specificity regarding non-motorized users has been added. Additional pedestrian and nonmotorized screening criteria have been added.

128j	Aaron Jongenelen	<p>j. Conflicting Functions 1A & 1B –Recommend you remove travel time. The AMATS MTP team had a lot of discussion about travel time and the negative impacts it could have on projects for the criteria selection process. The MTP response to a public comment about travel time was as follows: “Travel time negatively impacts transit and other modes of non-vehicular travel and heavily favors vehicular usage. It also favors higher speeds.” The project team is urged to not use travel time, but instead just use delay or another metric. k. Conflicting Functions 1B –The “Why the Measure is Important” states that “Travel time delays can have a substantial impact on the cost of freight movement.” Can you state how much of an impact it has? If this is one of the main reasons why you are recommending this criterion it might help to have this information available to support this position. l. Conflicting Functions 1B -Why is the “Why the Measure is Important” section blank for this criterion? This criterion appears to be the non-freight version of the other Period travel time and would be good to have something filled in. If there is nothing to put, then why have the criterion? m. Conflicting Functions 1C –The system performance reports indicates that with the no build, congestion will not change much by 2050. So, the first question anyone would ask is, is this criterion needed? This is an example of adding in a column to the table that explains how this criterion will be used. This allows you to explain that this criterion will be used to show which alternative is increasing congestion or keeping it the same. It is very jargony and would recommend you just say Level of Service D or higher. Conflicting Functions 1C –The AMATS model does not include local roads. Does the model used for the Seward to Glenn PEL include local roads? If not, this should be noted for all criteria that use outputs from the model that it doesn’t include local roads. o. Conflicting Functions 1D –Are you able to provide any data to support the statement in the “Why the Measure is important” about cost saving benefits and air quality benefits? How much of a cost savings benefit? How much of an air quality benefit? p. Conflicting Functions 1E –It is hard to understand what this criterion is supposed to do? Is this supposed to look at each alternative to see if they will be inducing speeding or not? What inputs are going into the model to make these assumptions? Additionally, the word “speed” might be missing after “peak period travel...”.</p>	<p>Travel time removed and delay has been retained based on AMATS recommendation. Corrections made to blank cells. Table rewritten to be less jargony. Modeling approach and limitations are described in the Travel Demand Modeling Memorandum and the Draft Travel Demand Modeling Report.</p>
128k	Aaron Jongenelen	<p>q. Social Demands and Economic Development 1A –This is good, but it could use some additional explanation on how it will be used. Right now, it isn’t clear how useful this criterion will be for alternatives analysis.</p>	<p>Additional explanation has been added to the document to further detail the alternatives screening process and the application of screening criteria.</p>
128l	Aaron Jongenelen	<p>r. Additional Criteria for Consideration–i. There should be an equity or EJ impact criterion or criteria. That should be in the Level 1 screening. An example could be looking at the number of low-income housing in the area before and after the alternative is modeled. ii. There should be some criterion or criteria for Transit. For example, the 2050 MTP is looking at using Transit Delay and Transit Access/Accommodations. While there is no transit route on Ingra/Gambell there are cross town connections in the area and any future alternative should make considerations for future transit connections. iii. Non-motorized needs more representation in the criteria. This can be accomplished with separate criteria or using the land use connection pieces to demonstrate how the alternatives are providing non-motorized access or projects to specific land uses. While the Level 2 screening criteria has impacts to non-motorized users, there should be more in the Level 1 criteria.</p>	<p>Number of housing units affected from low-income areas has been added. Note that social impacts will be evaluated in the second phase of screening. Road designs will be consistent with the adopted plans and therefore would make accommodation for future transit considerations. However, DOT&PF does not believe transit criteria would be useful for screening. Nonmotorized criteria have been added to level 1.</p>
128m	Aaron Jongenelen	<p>The work being done on this Seward to Glenn Highway PEL is significant and is greatly appreciated. This PEL will help shape the transportation system within the AMATS area for generations to come. Should you have any questions on these comments please feel free to reach out. Thank you for your efforts and consideration. Aaron Jongenelen AMATS Coordinator</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
128n	Aaron Jongenelen	<p>Date: June 16, 2022 To: Aaron Jongenelen, AMATS Coordinator Through: Craig Lyon, Planning Director Through: Kristine Bunnell, Long-Range Planning Manager From: Daniel Mckenna-Foster, Senior Planner, Long-Range Planning Subject: Seward-Glenn Mobility PEL Planning Document Support. The Long-Range Planning Division would like to inform you of Assembly and community support for a cut-and-cover to mitigate the current and future impacts of vehicle traffic, and vehicle-caused pedestrian deaths, while supporting economic development, new housing, and implementation of the greenway supportive corridor identified in municipal-adopted plans. The Planning and Zoning Commission makes recommendations of approval to the Anchorage Assembly on planning projects. In 2014, the Assembly adopted the Fairview Neighborhood Plan, and in 2016, the Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan (2040 LUP). Each of these planning efforts received a robust community input process. The Fairview Neighborhood Plan was a grassroots effort that includes drawings for a cut-and-cover. Associated policies and actions support the cut-and-cover proposal. The 2040 LUP aligns the proposed West Fairview Reinvestment Focus Area (WFRFA) "to catalyze infill and redevelopment in strategic areas." A cut-and-cover with developable land will support the WFRFA. Housing and job growth in Downtown Anchorage and Fairview is contingent on the current Ingra/Gambell roadways being funded and redeveloped to the direction of these two plans. There will be no to very little economic recovery in this area of Anchorage until the cut-and-cover is built. Handout materials for the Seward-Glenn Mobility Planning and Environmental Linkages Study list consistency with land use plans as one of the measures for the project. Below are the goals and policies from the 2040 LUP and the Fairview Neighborhood Plan, which should be considered for any proposal. The Fairview Neighborhood Plan specifically calls for a cut-and-cover approach, as well as other planning information and guidelines particular to this project area.</p>	<p>This letter is addressed in Section 1.6 of the purpose and need document.</p>

128o	Aaron Jongenelen	2040 LUP Policies. LUP 1.5 Align Anchorage's land use, transportation, and infrastructure planning, design guidelines, and investments. Account for existing infrastructure and transportation system capacity and planned facility investments when determining areas of growth. Link capital improvement priorities with the elements of the Comprehensive Plan, including the 2040 LUP and area-specific plans. LUP 1.8 Engage Anchorage residents, businesses, and property owners in a predictable and transparent process leading to the adoption of plans that guide growth. Engage affected communities when making long-term land use decisions, with particular attention to communities that are historically underrepresented. LUP 3.2 Promote the development of main street, transit-oriented, and mixed-use corridors that help meet the city's needs for retail, services, jobs, and housing; and that support these uses and adjoining neighborhoods with access to multiple modes of travel and attractive pedestrian environments. LUP Policies 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 5.2, 5.3, 5.4, 6.1, 6.2, 6.3, and 8.3 are also integral to this Goal. LUP 4.1. Provide sufficient land to meet the diverse housing needs of Anchorage's citizens, where the integrity of the residential neighborhood area is protected from expanding commercial corridors or non-neighborhood employment activities. LUP 4.4 Encourage property owners to preserve, rehabilitate, or redevelop properties in ways that minimize housing displacement and maintain affordability, health, and safety for residents. LUP 4.5 Consider actions that will affirmatively further fair housing and avoid having the effect of housing discrimination in decisions regarding land use, allocation of housing opportunities, and zoning map or land use regulation amendments. LUP Policies 1.5, 2.1, 2.3, 5. LUP 5.3 Accompany infill development with "placemaking" investments in infrastructure, such as walkable streets, enhanced streetscapes, parks and public spaces, and other services that improve the quality of life in targeted growth areas. Coordinate and prioritize capital improvements to upgrade neighborhoods that have capacity to accommodate infill housing near services, centers, public transit, with a walkable street grid and sidewalks. LUP 6.1 Provide sufficient transportation infrastructure to support the growth that the Comprehensive Plan anticipates in Centers, Corridors, other employment areas, and neighborhoods. LUP 6.2 Provide new or upgraded pedestrian and local/collector street connections in Centers and Commercial Corridors to improve access to and from surrounding neighborhoods. 22Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan LUP 6.3. Adopt and execute a Complete Streets policy to design streets to serve all users, including pedestrians, transit riders, and bicyclists, and align the design and scale of streets to be compatible with compact, accessible, and walkable land use patterns. LUP Policies 1.5, 5.1, 5.2, and 5.7 are also integral to this Goal.	This letter is addressed in Section 1.6 of the purpose and need document.
128p	Aaron Jongenelen	Fairview Neighborhood Plan Policies 1.3 Foster high-intensity mixed-use development for Gambell/Ingra Corridor and North Fairview (4th to 8th, Ingra to Orca). 2.1 Focus on priority corridors for pedestrians and bikes on 9th, 13th, 15th Avenues; Cordova, Gambell, and Karluk Streets. 2.2 Improve connections within Fairview and to Downtown, including the need and potential for improved People Mover service, a shuttle to downtown, and improved walking and biking options. Fairview is "East Downtown." 2.3 Create better walking, driving and parking linkages to major public and commercial destination facilities – e.g., connections that would link people using Sullivan Arena with Fairview shops and restaurants. 2.4 Implement the Gambell Street Redevelopment and Implementation Plan – reduce Gambell to three lanes, improve sidewalks, underground utilities, add street amenities, study and adjust zoning to allow for more pedestrian interaction, perhaps establishing maximum setbacks for commercial development. 2.5 Fund and plan for the Seward to Glenn Highway connecting network. Maintain the integrity of Fairview, by following a cut and cover approach, creating a greenway connection between Ship and Chester Creek with a Hyder Street alignment or alternatives that reduce impact on the neighborhood, while providing needed neighborhood street and pedestrian improvements that support mixed-use and other land-use redevelopment and development identified on the approved land use plan map. 2.8 Fund, develop, and finalize the Seward to Glenn Highways transportation corridor plan, and potential Federally-required Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), in-lieu of segmented projects currently defined in the 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (Project #s 104, 114, 141, 136, etc.) to determine the appropriate mitigation for the full project. This will provide stability for investment in the neighborhood and business corridor along Ingra and Gambell in the face of the impacts created by large infrastructure projects. Mitigate fully the loss of housing, utilities, and other community assets to be defined during the EIS. We would encourage AMATS and its partners to consider these adopted land use plans as the guiding direction for which this roadway project should be funded, designed, and built. Time is of the essence. Our economic future, the futures of generations of Alaskans, including this underserved neighborhood, is impacted by the lack of action on this roadway.	This letter is addressed in Section 1.6 of the purpose and need document.
129a	Nancy Pease	Hello, Josie Wilson and Project Team, please confirm receipt of these comments. Thank you.	Thanks, Nancy. Received, All the best, ~Josie
129b	Nancy Pease	June 24, 2022, TO: info@sewardglennmobility.com Attn: Josie Wilson, HDR public involvement staff. RE: Comments on the Seward- Glenn Mobility project: Statement of Purpose and Need and draft recommended Alternative Selection Criteria. Regarding the Draft Statement of Purpose and Need. The statement of Purpose and Need is inadequate. It does not embody essential community goals that the Municipality has developed and adopted through local land use plans, transportation plans and the Anchorage Climate Action Plan. It does not address lifetime project maintenance costs. In this decade, it is imperative that any mega-project address the mitigation of existential problems looming over current and future generations: affordability, sustainability, public health, equity, and climate change. None of this is adequately reflected in the Statement of Purpose and Need. Why is the function of the Interstate Highway System given first mention, and apparently, highest priority? Are highways a protected class? Or a prioritized class? Please, not. The vitality of the community should be a priority. The Statement of purpose and need should speak of safety, sustainability, and equity.	The purpose and need does include relevant information from adopted plans. Information from the Anchorage Climate Action Plan has been included in the purpose and need. The third need specifically reviews the adopted plans covering the PEL study area and summarizes the relevant vision for transportation and land use. Additionally, travel modeling done for the project includes the land use plan map land uses. Alternative will be developed and reviewed based on their consistency with these plans. The items listed (project maintenance costs, affordability, sustainability, public health, equity, and climate change) are impacts that will be discussed in the alternatives evaluation after the level 1 screening has occurred. The needs are not listed in any priority order. One need is not more important or weighted differently than another.

129c	Nancy Pease	The purpose and need for this transportation corridor must address Anchorage’s adopted local goals. The Municipality of Anchorage has adopted overarching land use goals to support infill and redevelopment and to develop transit-supported neighborhoods; top reduce vehicle dependence; and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. These goals are adopted in the Anchorage Comprehensive Plan, Anchorage Land Use Plan, Anchorage Climate Action Plan, and the Metropolitan transportation Plan 2040 and draft MTP 2050. There are other, more specific goals in the district and neighborhood plans, including those of Fairview and Downtown, that speak to livable, walkable neighborhoods that incorporate the natural setting. Therefore, the statement of purpose and need should NOT focus mainly on the maintenance of the National Highway System but sustaining the community. Suggested elements of the statement of purpose and need: 1) reduce vehicle miles traveled. 2) reduce vehicle dependence and 3) decrease greenhouse gas emissions 4) maximize accessibility for residents. With regard to reducing vehicle dependence and vehicle miles traveled, the keys are to avoid induced demand for vehicle travel; and to create low-stress, convenient walking, biking and transit options. To measure accessibility, the concept 15-minute walkable neighborhoods is used in many cities, such as Seattle and Minneapolis. Reducing Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) is important to economic efficiency (both for individuals and for commercial and community efficiency. Most importantly, reducing VMT is critical to cutting back on GHG emissions.	The PEL purpose and need addresses the transportation needs that have been identified in adopted plans. The purpose and need was developed based on a review of the adopted plans including both Muni-wide plans and neighborhood plans. The transportation needs as identified by the adopted plans are discussed in Need 3 in the draft purpose and need statement. Reducing VMT is one of the proposed screening criteria. Improving nonmotorized facilities, which would help to reduce vehicle dependence is part of the purpose and need. Climate change is a topic that will be discussed in the second level of screening.
129d	Nancy Pease	Regarding the draft recommended Alternative Selection Criteria 1. The Level 1 Screening Criteria (Table 2) are grossly prejudiced to favor highway lane expansion rather than travel demand management, mode shift, neighborhood accessibility, and neighborhood livability. The current draft criteria are prejudiced to favor vehicle speed, not safety (since the two have an exponential inverse relation. By favoring vehicle speed, they create a high-stress environment for active transportation and for residential and commercial land uses. The FHWA is de-emphasizing Level of Service at peak hour of travel. LOS-based projects result in egregious overbuilding of roads, and induces further vehicular travel demand. A. Instead of scoring the number of conflict points, score the number of non-conflict points, e.g., safe intersections and grade separated crossings. That will ensure a network of safe crossings: whereas the current proposed criterion will allow a project with almost no crossings to earn points. B. Instead of peak period freight travel time, score off-peak freight travel, or average freight travel time.	The criteria have been updated and additional non-motorized criteria have been included. Vehicle speed has been removed.
129e	Nancy Pease	One way to reduce vehicle conflicts and to expand capacity of existing lanes is to move freight at the off-peak hours for passenger travel. C. Instead of peak period travel time and peak period delay, score transportation demand management potential. D. Score trip length. Trip length captures compact land use, infill and redevelopment, and it also captures the possibility to shift from vehicles to active transportation. E. Delete the miles of road with average peak period travel within 20% of design speed. Many urban roads of Anchorage are currently designed for excessive speed at the expense of safety. Furthermore, this prioritizes vehicular travel above all other modes. F. Score the travel time for transit users relative to vehicular users	The criteria have been updated and additional non-motorized criteria have been included. Vehicle speed has been removed. Because the routes are National Highway System routes DOT&PF kept level of service criteria and delay to be able to gauge the efficiency of the system.
129f	Nancy Pease	2. Regarding the Social Demands and Economic Development, this section needs quantitative measures that will constitute at least 51 percent of the scoring potential. That apportionment is the only way to design this project for people and community benefit, and not just for the grand ol’ Interstate Highway System. A. The criterion of “overlaying the project with the Land Use Plan Map” is a token effort and does not adequately consider consistency with land use plans. B. To assess the impact on compact infill and redevelopment, use these criteria: i. Percent of land developed as roadways and parking. ii. Percent of residents within 15-minute safe walking neighborhoods. iii. Induced vehicular travel demand and parking demand. C. To assess sustainability and public health, use these scoring criteria: i. Greenhouse gas emissions. ii. Air quality. iii. Percent of students with safe walking routes to schools. iv. Percent of lane-miles of non-motorized routes with physical separation from vehicular traffic. V. Percent of grade-separated crossings. Vi. Transit travel time relative to vehicular travel time (this helps to capture equity and mode choice). D. Regional VMT should be measured and scored with and also without a per capita basis. A per capita basis implies that VMT can and should rise in tandem with population growth. An urban travel system should be designed to reduce per capita VMT as well as to reduce total VMT. Reducing total VMT is a measure of infill and redevelopment, and less land committed to parking and road lanes. E. Impacts to Section 4(f) resources. The impacts of fragmentation, noise pollution, and roadway particulates and visual intrusion should be specifically listed as part of the data and method for 4(f) impacts. F. New criterion: assess and score the micro-climate effects of the project. Paved roadways and parking, and loss of natural vegetation and hydrology all exacerbate the urban heat island effect and should be considered in the scoring. G. New criterion: lifetime project maintenance costs. This seems like a major oversight.	The criteria are not weighted nor is there an algorithm proposed whereby a score will be produced to make a decision. The criteria include a mix of quantitative and qualitative measure that will be used to evaluate the alternatives. The criterion that is proposed is to determine if alternatives are consistent with the adopted plans. Overlaying project and comparing them with the proposed land use plan is just one way to assess the alternative's consistency with the plan. Reducing VMT is one of the proposed criteria as is effects on Section 4(f) resources. Criteria have been added to measure amount of pavement affecting residential areas and amount of green space provided.
129g	Nancy Pease	3. It is unclear how DOTPF intends to weight the scoring criteria. As noted above, the criteria appear to heavily skew toward vehicular speed and vehicular travel time. The Social and economic development impacts should be weighted at a minimum of 51 percent of points.	The criteria are not weighted nor is there an algorithm proposed whereby a score will be produced to make a decision. The criteria include a mix of quantitative and qualitative measure that will be used to evaluate the alternatives.
129h	Nancy Pease	Finally, on a general note, words matter. Don’t label the social needs as social “demands”. That has derogatory connotations. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Seward-Glenn mobility project. Nancy Pease.	The wording is taken directly from FHWA guidance. The project team will make an effort to explain the guidance without being derogatory. Changed to Social Equity and Economic Development.
130	Bob French	Suggestion on Purpose Statement: The intent needs to include "restoring the vitality of affected neighborhoods from damage caused by past road construction"	The purpose statement has been updated reflective of the comment.
131	Bob French	Suggestion on Needs Statement: Past projects crushed economic development due to isolated islands surrounded by high speed streets, and econmic blight near the SG HW, and adjacent affected neighborhoods.	The purpose statement has been updated reflective of the comment.
132	Bob French	Suggestion on Alternative Selection Criteria: The criteria needs to include an evaluation of the extent that the project will promote revitalization of the affected neighborhoods. The criteria needs to include evaluation of the effects to improve connectivity by bike/pedestrian/wheelchair and other non-motorized users crossing and along the corridor. The criteria needs to include evaluation of the improvements to health and safety of residents by decreasing vehicle-related noise, and air pollution impacts.	Screening criteria measuring the level of transportation stress for people walking and biking has been added. These are measures on how walkable and bikeable the streets are.

133	Bob French	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: A partially buried highway with ample park, non-motorized, and local sized streets above would go a long way to restoring economic vitality and neighborhoods.	The current metropolitan transportation plan alternative of creating a sunken highway connection will be considered during the alternatives development and evaluation phase. The potential for cut and cover sections to mitigate impacts will be considered.
134	Bob French	Other comments or suggestions: This project provides a opportunity to correct past Environmental "In-Justice" to repair decades of disinvestment and economic distress caused by the current Ingra/Gambell/5th/6th streets on the Fairview and Downtown areas, as required by Executive Order 12898	This sentiment is included in the updated purpose and need statement documentation.
135	Nancy Pease	Suggestion on Purpose Statement: "Mobility" is a loaded term that is often measured in terms of how fast and how far people can travel. Accessibility is the term of art for modern transportation planning: how many destinations are connected. The statement is inadequate with regard to the needs of local neighborhoods, public health, and the overarching local goals to reduce vehicle dependence and decrease greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, the statement of purpose and need should include: 1) provide low-stress, convenient walking, biking and transit options; maximize accessibility, with a goal of 15-minute walkable neighborhoods; support a measurable and significant travel mode shift toward transit and non-motorized travel; reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled; reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions; avoid induced vehicular travel demand.	The purpose and need statement contains updates to recognize the sentiment of this comment regarding the importance and prevalence of nonmotorized users in the study area. The Seward and Glenn highways are National Highway System routes that provide vehicular mobility functions as well as nonmotorized and local traffic accessibility functions. Therefore, the purpose and need statement recognizes these competing functions and the project will seek to balance these functions to meet the identified needs. Level of service, delay are important metrics for evaluating National Highway System routes and have been retained as criteria in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo . Screening criteria measuring the level of transportation stress for people walking and biking has been added. These are measures on how walkable and bikeable the streets are. The criteria have been updated to reflect that "reducing" VMT in the study area is the goal.
136	Nancy Pease	Suggestion on Needs Statement: Avoid induced vehicular travel demand; reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled; reduce Greenhouse Gas emissions; minimize the conversion of land to roadways and parking; achieve a significant travel mode shift to transit and active transportation; provide a low-stress, convenient active transportation system; measure accessibility for the surrounding neighborhoods in terms of the 15-minute walking neighborhood concept.	In transportation vernacular, needs are problems. The suggestions however have been considered and reflected in the updated screening criteria. For example, reducing VMT is one of the screening criteria now in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo. We have also added the amount of roadway pavement fronting residential areas and measuring both pedestrian level of traffic stress and bicycle level of transportation stress to the criteria in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo.
137	Nancy Pease	Suggestion on Alternative Selection Criteria: Do not measure congestion and delay at peak traffic times. That is the antiquated Level of Service model. Measure potential travel time across all modes; and seek to create shorter trips. Score the elements of the project based on trip length and trip duration, not on vehicular delay or vehicular speed. There MUST be a calculation of induced vehicular travel demand and parking demand as a criteria: we cannot sustain ever-increasing vehicle travel. there must also be a criterion for estimating GHG emissions from various alternatives.	Travel time has been eliminated as a measure in the revised Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo based on this and other comments. Level of service, delay are important metrics for evaluating National Highway Routes and have been retained. Climate change is a topic that will be evaluated in the level two screening, as described in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo.
138	Nancy Pease	Recommendation for Design or Alternatives: 1. Non-motorized crossings should be grade-separated and should be closely spaced. Non-motorized transportation should be convenient as well as safe. 2. Reduce the vehicle speeds to achieve a higher vehicle density as well as greater safety. Unless you build a tunnel, there is no way to have safe travel over 30 mph through an urban area. 3. Maximize the Alaska Railroad freight capacity. Do not design this corridor for maximal truck sizes and freight capacity. 4. Apply a metric for separating vehicle lanes from other modes and land uses that increases the separation based on vehicle speed. E.g: do not build curbside pathways if the traffic is moving more than 30 mph. 4. Urban trees--include trees in the corridor design for screening, cooling, and aesthetics.	These suggestions will be considered during the development of alternatives.
139	Nancy Pease	Other comments or suggestions: Every corridor project from 2022 forward should be designed with the demonstrated capability to reduce VMT, reduce GHG emissions, and provide convenient, safe alternatives to vehicular travel. Every corridor project within the urban area should avoid induced travel demand and avoid expansion of the footprint of roadways and parking.	This suggestion is beyond the scope of the PEL. The commenter is encouraged to participate in the Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2050 to express this sentiment through that forum.
140	Joshua Sy	Other comments or suggestions: The Fairview neighborhood is widely perceived as one of the worst neighborhoods in Anchorage. I believe that Fairview is exactly the opposite. Fairview is not just at the center of this project; it is at the heart of Anchorage. If the scope of MTP looks far into the future, then the solution of linking two major freeways with more freeways and overpasses is striking a sword into the heart of the city. Anchorage will deteriorate because it made itself a thoroughfare. It prioritized the needs of frantic passersby over the concerns of more local residents. It chose to suffocate a neighborhood than to revitalize a neighborhood. The Pixar movie Cars comes to mind. One difference is that in the movie, the freeway was constructed alongside a fictional town, not forced over the town. In the Seward/Glenn connection, if the engineering decision of creating an overpass will later be regretted, the action will be impossible to undo without spending more money. Fairview simply cannot be ignored because it is in a prime, central location. It has to be cared for by everyone because this area serves and benefits the whole southcentral Alaskan population and its visitors. So how do we improve the mobility and safety of motorized and non-motorized users without compromising the health and security of Fairview? This critical junction connects four areas of town: downtown: JBER, Seward Highway, and the Glenn Highway. By treating the corridor as a big intersection and utilizing less-used roads (Post/Reeve to the north, 3rd/4th Ave and 5th/6th Ave to the west, Ingra/Gambell to the south, and Glenn/Commercial to the east), we can move large and changing volume of traffic more efficiently. From motorcycles to trucks. From those who want to stop to get coffee to those who want to pass through. From the little traffic needs of midnight to the rush of rush hour. This improved junction should not deter cyclists, pedestrians, and local businesses. We can add greenways, bike paths, and restaurants along Hyder St and 9th or 10th Ave and 12th or 13th Ave. We can be further creative and make the speed limit dynamic via traffic lights (like downtown's 5th and 6th Ave) and stretch the "intersection" (the south part) down to 15th Ave. There are lots of options, opportunities, and growth at this crossroads. The Seward/Glenn Connection project is an exciting and challenging one, and with a dose of innovation, satisfying everyone's needs is very possible. I am can't wait to see Fairview bloom with people, cars, houses, and shops.	The project team has endeavored to create a purpose and need chapter that reflects this sentiment. Past transportation and land use decisions have "created a big intersection" through Fairview that connects downtown, midtown, JBER to points east and south right at Fairview. The challenge for this PEL study is to identify recommended solutions that remedy the situation and meet the identified needs. The alternatives development and screening phase beginning in Summer 2022 will produce draft alternatives that seek to embody the sentiment described in this comment.

141	Brad Coy	Suggestion on the Purpose: The project purpose should not just be about moving people and goods. It must also account for how the roadway system has significant impact on the character and livability of the neighborhoods and those who live and work here. Transportation and land use must be considered together. This is the best way to meet the Municipality's traffic needs in a holistic way. Suggested revised wording: "The purpose of the project is to improve mobility, accessibility, safety, and livability for people who live, work, and/or travel on or across the roadway system connecting the Seward Highway, the Glenn Highway, and the POA. The intent is to maintain the functionality of the national highway system and to meet the local needs of residents that live, work, and safely travel across or along those roadways."	This sentiment has been included in the purpose and need statement documentation.
142	Brad Coy	Suggestion on the Alternative Selection Criteria: Analyze "Accessibility" and report for different neighborhoods and user types (See https://ssti.us/wp-content/uploads/sites/1303/2020/12/Measuring-Accessibility-Final.pdf)	While this PEL Study is will not include an Accessibility analysis as shown in the example provided due to the need for specialized software, the project team has added additional screening criteria that analyze pedestrian and bicycle level of stress. The project team believes that these criteria are appropriate given the volume of public comments submitted regarding safety concerns as non-motorized users cross and travel along high-volume roadways in the study area. The study area includes neighborhoods that have nearly complete roadway grid systems, with the need to cross the NHS routes (Gambell/Ingra/5th) as the primary physical barriers to users reaching their destinations.
143	Brad Coy	Other comments or suggestions: I have concerns about how in past projects (such as the Midtown PEL) the AMATS travel demand model has estimated an unreasonable amount of traffic using freeway alternatives. The project team (of which I was a part) had to incorporate additional impedance factors to try to reduce the excessive estimates (which were beyond the lane capacity of the highways). The AMATS model also lacks critical functionality, such as select link and select zone runs. This limits understanding and creates more uncertainty about what is being assumed by the model. Including some scenario planning could help reduce the reliance on the model. Because Downtown and the Fairview neighborhood already have a much higher non-motorized mode share (30% is a number I've heard), contributing to greater vibrancy of these neighborhoods is the most likely way to increase the economic wellbeing of the community with the least amount of traffic congestion and volumes. A sensitivity analysis may be a great way to consider this scenario.	The project team has used two different forecasting techniques. One that uses historical trends of population and traffic. The other updates the travel model and uses the latest land use plan as well as latest population forecast from Alaska Dept of Labor. The project team first issued a methodology memo that was reviewed to get input into the modeling procedures and assumptions. The model results are also being reviewed by the project's technical advisory committee and subject matter experts within the MOA and DOT&PF. The model forecast for the Glenn and Seward Highways in the study area are considerably lower than past forecasts.
144a	Emily Weiser	Hello, Attached please find comments from Bike Anchorage for the May 23 – June 24, 2022 Public Comment Period on the Seward-Glenn Mobility PEL. Please don't hesitate to get in touch if you'd like to discuss our comments further. Thank you, Emily Weiser (she/her/hers) President, Bike Anchorage	Thanks, Emily. Received.
144b	Emily Weiser	To the Seward-Glenn Mobility PEL project team: We're writing to comment on the Seward-Glenn Mobility PEL Study. Bike Anchorage is committed to improving the quality of life for people who travel by bicycle, as well as supporting people who live in and near the project area. Accordingly, here we provide comments on the Draft Purpose and Need, Draft Alternative Selection Criteria, and Draft System Performance Memorandum, as well as suggesting solutions for identified needs, as requested by the project team for the May 23 - June 24, 2022 comment period.	Thanks, Emily. Received.
144c	Emily Weiser	Suggested solutions to the identified problems: We strongly support finding a solution that improves quality of life and economic opportunities in Fairview, by reconnecting and revitalizing the area around the Gambell-Ingra Couplet, without simply transferring the existing negative impacts of the highway (noise, dangerous crossings) to another part of Anchorage. We suggest solutions that will reduce the traffic volume, especially from daily commuters, traveling from the Glenn Highway into Anchorage. These solutions would mitigate traffic and congestion while allowing the Seward-Glenn Mobility PEL to focus on improving life for those who live in the city instead of prioritizing people who choose to travel to or through the city. Commuter rail from the Mat-Su Valley (with stops along the way) coupled with improved bus service from the Ship Creek rail depot to employment centers and a citywide bike-share program. This would drastically reduce the need for single-occupant vehicles to use the Glenn Highway. If traffic does end up increasing as predicted by the Draft System Performance Report, the inconvenience of congestion will motivate many commuters to switch to passenger rail if it is available and effective for commuting. Land use within one half mile of stations should be dedicated to dense infill development including multifamily housing and business development. Non-motorized access and connectivity to practical destinations in the vicinity should be prioritized over surface parking and vehicle-oriented developments. Improved bus service between the Valley and Anchorage would help fill the gap until commuter rail is available. Prioritize high speed bus service. People use public transit when it is useful. More frequent buses on more useful routes, dedicated bus lanes, and additional funding for bus maintenance could all be far cheaper and more effective solutions to traffic congestion than a bigger highway.	Light rail and commuter rail have been studied in past plans. The adopted metropolitan transportation plan does not include light rail or commuter rail as a solution for intercity travel in the Anchorage area. This PEL study is a step down study and will be examining solutions that are consistent with the framework established by the MTP, Anchorage Comprehensive Plan, and other adopted plans. Broad changes in direction like commuter rail need to be addressed in these other planning processes.

144d	Emily Weiser	Draft Purpose and Need: 2.1 Purpose: We appreciate that the Purpose highlights the need to improve the ability to safely travel across the highway corridor and to improve neighborhood connections. 2.2.1 Conflicting Travel Functions: We appreciate the recognition here that non-motorized users are currently underserved and at risk in this corridor. In particular, statements such as “Freight, NHS functions, transit, bicycles, and pedestrians are all using and crossing a facility that has an auto-oriented design” and “connectivity of facilities for walking and with recently adopted development plans” (both on pg. 14) accurately describe the current conditions. This recognition of the need to improve non-motorized conditions aligns with the fact that problems identified by the public in the first comment period referred to non-motorized needs and safety more often than any other topic, as summarized in the presentation at Public Meeting #2 on May 25th, 2022. 2.2.3 Social Demands and Economic Development: We appreciate the recognition that “Current street design on the Seward/Glenn Highway corridor in the study area is inconsistent with the vision expressed in recently adopted plans and is adversely affecting neighborhood redevelopment efforts, community cohesion, and quality of life” (pg. 23). Please add the Anchorage Climate Action Plan to the list of relevant plans considered for the PEL. This plan, which has been adopted by the Anchorage Assembly to guide municipal development, is highly relevant to any transportation project. Management of the Seward and Glenn Highways will play a key role in meeting the goals of the Climate Action Plan.	Information from the Climate Action Plan has been added.
144e	Emily Weiser	Draft Alternative Selection Criteria: General: Please specify the directionality of each Measure. Would a larger or smaller value result in an alternative scoring higher? We hope we can assume that a lower number of crashes would result in a more favorable score, but it’s less clear with other Measures.	Information clarifying the desired direction of the measure has been added for clarity.
144f	Emily Weiser	Level 1 Screening Criteria: Safety: Number of conflict points (intersections) between vehicles and non-motorized users. This Measure notes that “Reducing the number of conflict points can increase safety.” Please revise this Measure to ensure that connectivity does not suffer from an effort to reduce the number of conflict points. As written, this could be taken to mean that a sparser non-motorized network is safer than a more complete network (which may have more intersections due to the larger number of facilities). However, in reality, a sparse network leads to more conflict because non-motorized travelers are forced to use unsuitable options that were not designed to optimize safety of all modes. We suggest revising the measure to “Number of conflict points (intersections) between vehicles and non-motorized users per mile of non-motorized infrastructure” to help ensure that this measure does not unduly favor alternatives with a restricted bike/ped network. Safety: The safety of residents in the project area is affected not only by traffic, but also by the health impacts of the project. Please add Measures to quantify the effects of alternatives on personal and environmental health, including air pollution and noise levels.	Updated as requested.
144g	Emily Weiser	Conflicting Functions: The Draft Purpose and Need describe all modes of traffic under Conflicting Travel Functions: freight, passenger, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian. However, all five of the Measures listed in the Draft Alternative Selection Criteria refer specifically to the peak period of motorized freight and passenger traffic. While some of these Measures may have side-effects for non-motorized traffic, such as the note about vehicle speed affecting non-motorized comfort (last row on pg 10), these Measures strongly prioritize motorized traffic. The effects of an alternative on transit or non-motorized use would thus not factor into the alternative’s score, which is badly unbalanced and disregards the concern the public has expressed about non-motorized use in the project area. The discrepancy between the Draft Purpose and Need and these Measures must be resolved, providing a balanced set of criteria that represents all modes of travel. Given that the five draft Measures focus on two Conflicting Functions (passenger and freight), adding 7-8 new Measures that focus on the other three Conflicting Functions (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) would achieve a balanced representation of all modes. We suggest adding Measures such as: Miles of bus service (more = higher score), Number of bus stops per mile (more = higher score), Miles of bus-only travel lanes (more = higher score), Miles of bicycle facilities that meet NACTO standards (more = higher score), Miles of pedestrian facilities that meet ADA standards (more = higher score), Ratio of non-motorized to motorized infrastructure miles (higher = higher score)	Additional measures have been added to gauge the level of stress for walking and biking. Alternatives that reduce the stress will be rated more highly. Also miles of bike and pedestrian infrastructure were added based on this comment.
144h	Emily Weiser	Social Demands and Economic Development: “Consistency with Anchorage 2020, Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan, Fairview Neighborhood Plan, and other land uses plans”: As written, this is not measurable. Please quantify how “consistency” will be measured and scored. Please also add the Anchorage Climate Action Plan to this Measure, as it is not a land-use plan and thus not included as written, but it is a highly relevant policy document for this project.	The criteria are a mix of quantitative and qualitative factors. Consistency with adopted plans will be described qualitatively.
144i	Emily Weiser	Draft System Performance Memorandum. 5.2.3 Future Vehicle Traffic: We are still concerned that the final Traffic Forecast overestimates the future traffic demand, even in the Low scenario. In their response to our previous comment (bottom row on pg 55 of comments and DOT&PF responses document), the project team stated that “The low scenario uses a best fit that actually reduces [sic] predicts a reduction in traffic using a technique suggested by the commenter.” (It is unclear to us which “technique suggested by the commenter” is meant here.) However, the final Traffic Forecast (pg 2, second paragraph) states that “The low-growth scenario assumes that traffic would remain constant at 2019 levels,” which contradicts the response to our comment. Which is correct? If the low-growth scenario assumes constant traffic into the future, we are concerned that alternatives considered for this project will be too limited. Given changes in commuting patterns caused by the COVID-19 pandemic (some of which are expected to persist), increasing interest in alternative forms of transportation such as bicycling and transit, and the potential for other major changes such as implementation of commuter rail or tolls on the Glenn Highway, the Seward-Glenn Mobility PEL must consider the possibility that a reduction in traffic may occur. At the May 25th public meeting, the project team stated that because the effect of the pandemic and potential mode shifts are not yet well defined, the project aims to build enough flexibility into the recommended alternatives to allow the selection of the most appropriate option once future travel patterns become more clear. To achieve this flexibility, the project must include consideration of a scenario in which traffic is reduced from 2019 levels.	The project team has used two different forecasting techniques. One that uses historical trends of population and traffic. The other updates the travel model and uses the latest land use plan as well as latest population forecast from Alaska Dept of Labor. The project team first issued a methodology memo that was reviewed to get input into the modeling procedures and assumptions. The model results are also being reviewed by the project’s technical advisory committee and subject matter experts within the MOA and DOT&PF. The model forecast for the Glenn and Seward Highways in the study area are considerably lower than past forecasts. By estimating a range of possible future traffic forecasts from low to high the project team is confident that future traffic will fall within that range. Of note, because of the considerably lower travel forecasts, congestion on the highways in the study area is predicted to be considerably less than had been predicted in past studies and as a consequence, addressing congestion (which has been the primary reason for suggesting a highway connection in the adopted plan) is not central to the purpose and need.

144j	Emily Weiser	8.2.3 Non-motorized Facilities: The usage data presented here, from Bike to Work Day and Strava, do not represent everyone who needs to use non-motorized facilities in the project area. Both data sources underrepresent lower income levels and historically vulnerable populations, and thus are not relevant to many Fairview residents. The PEL must include bike and pedestrian counts to document current use and provide a baseline for monitoring changes in use after construction of new or updated facilities.	The project team has included Strava data because it was available and was suggested by member of the public and helps to flesh out the nonmotorized travel, but the team is not relying on it. Importantly, the team also included information from the nonmotorized plan, which provides additional detailed information on pedestrian travel and thoroughly documents the level of nonmotorized demand in Fairview. The project team does not believe that detailed nonmotorized user counts are necessary at this initial stage of alternative development and selection. Pedestrian counts will be obtained when analyzing a smaller set alternatives that move forward in the process, if deemed necessary for alternatives design refinement. Additional information from the System Performance Report has now been included in the Purpose and Need.
144k	Emily Weiser	Thank you for this second opportunity to comment on the Seward-Glenn PEL Study. We hope our suggestions will be useful. Most importantly, the disconnect must be resolved between the Draft Purpose and Need, which recognizes the need to improve options for transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel, and the Draft Alternative Selection Criteria, which almost entirely ignore transit and non-motorized modes. A balanced set of selection criteria that represents all modes of travel must be developed before this project moves forward. Sincerely, Emily Weiser President, Bike Anchorage	The screening criteria have been updated to add better balance between modes.
145	Paul Benson	Suggestion for Purpose: "...along those roadways" while restoring cohesion to the community of Fairview lost as a consequence of the existing infrastructure and as much as practicable create enhancements which stimulate economic, social and psychological healing and growth within the built in environment.	This sentiment has been included in the purpose and need statement documentation.
146	Paul Benson	Suggestion for Needs: Build a Seward/Glenn connection which meets the needs of all transportation demands without marginalizing the economic, political or social wellbeing of the Fairview neighborhood. A low income community at the heart of Anchorage which has already suffered decades of negative externalities from the existing connection.	This sentiment has been included in the purpose and need statement documentation.
147	Paul Benson	Suggestion for Alternative Selection Criteria: * Community restoration and enhancement value.	The evaluation criteria have been updated to include several livability factors as described in the Recommended Alternative Selection Criteria Memo. The project team believes that if alternatives can be developed that are consistent with adopted plans, the result will be that the community will be restored and enhanced.
148	Paul Benson	Recommendation for design or alternatives: Cut and covers suitable for community enhancements. Restoration of Ingra to a neighborhood right of way with 2 way traffic and calming measures. Utilization of gateway elements, colors etc that conform with the unique identity of Fairview.	The current metropolitan transportation plan (MTP 2040) project of creating a sunken highway connection will be considered as an alternative during the alternatives development and evaluation phase. The potential for cut and cover sections to mitigate impacts will be considered.
149	Paul Benson	Other comments or suggestions: Too many. But, I would like to believe that this time we can leverage the political will to create a piece of design and engineering that will be a source of pride instead of embarrassment for all Alaskans. This piece of highway is arguably the most important and yet probably the most neglected and undervalued in our state. Many like myself feel it is a vestige of the kind of engineering that puts the convenience and needs of stakeholders who pass through communities ahead of those of stakeholders living in the shadow of these pieces of infrastructure. Almost with a certainty causing harm to those most vulnerable - to the detriment to us all eventually.	This sentiment has been included in the purpose and need statement documentation.
150a	S.J. Klein	Hi and thank you for the opportunity to provide comment on the existing conditions final draft, the purpose and need statement, the draft alternative selection criteria document, the chart combining purpose/need and outcomes, and the draft system performance report.	Comments received and addressed below.
150b	S.J. Klein	Existing Conditions: 1- Pedestrian Usage: I believe the existing conditions document has a fatal flaw: it fails to look at the Seward/Glenn corridor as a multi-modal transportation corridor, and instead defines the corridor as a vehicle traffic corridor that intersects with other modes of transportation. This is incorrect. The Seward Highway, especially Gambell Street, is a heavily used pedestrian corridor. The contractor and DOT engineering has failed to define the pedestrian usage in this corridor, both by failing to measure and model actual pedestrian usage of the corridor, and by defining "pedestrian interactions" with the corridor in terms of accidents and crossings. The document does a good job of describing the insufficiencies of the facility for this use (narrow sidewalks, utility poles in the middle of them), but fails to document what is a primary usage of the corridor and so will solve problems and prefer alternatives that fail to recognize this usage. Surveillance of pedestrian usage of the corridor is necessary to properly address this usage. 2- The neighborhood and growth projections: The Fairview Neighborhood Plan and the Anchorage Land Use Planning Map seek to make Fairview a more dense, livable neighborhood. By increasing the highway's footprint in the neighborhood, this project risks failing to support those goals. For example, if 14 lanes of traffic are built on grade in the Ingra/Gambell corridor, further increasing the split of the neighborhood and making walkability more difficult, it will drive more people to leave the neighborhood or choose to live in farther away places. In other words, this project could, by its very existence, create the conditions and trends that it is seeking to address. Projections should include what would be expected if the neighborhood is more connected by this project, increasing residential density and liveability. 3- It should be documented (as it is in the Fairview Neighborhood Plan), that Fairview has lower car ownership than most neighborhoods (about 35% of residents do not own vehicles according to census data from 2000). By increasing density and liveability in Fairview, as called out in the LUPM and Fairview Neighborhood Plan, you can expect a lower demand on the highway system. This is not some pie-in-the-sky conjecture about digital natives moving to Anchorage. This already exists, and should be encouraged and grown.	The project team included information from the nonmotorized plan, which provides detailed information on pedestrian travel and thoroughly documents the level of nonmotorized demand in Fairview. The project team does not believe that detailed nonmotorized user counts are necessary at this initial stage of alternative development and selection. Pedestrian counts will be obtained when analyzing a smaller set alternatives that move forward in the process, if deemed necessary for alternatives design refinement. Better neighborhood connectivity is part of the purpose and need. The project is assuming that the land use patterns envisioned by the Anchorage Land Use Plan Map and the Fairview Neighborhood plan will come to fruition to make Fairview a more dense, livable neighborhood. The challenge for the PEL study is to determine transportation solutions that can help make those plans possible, while also maintaining the functionality of the connection between the Seward and Glenn highways.

150c	S.J. Klein	<p>Purpose and Need: 1- The P&N statement addresses "improving neighborhood connections", but there are larger issues of access that need to be addressed in the document: The highway exists in a densely populated residential neighborhood, and the facility currently prevents access of neighbors to greenspace, businesses, services and amenities. Access of residents to those amenities should be a stated purpose and need. "Improving connections" suggests that you are going to put a crosswalk or some other means to safely cross the facility. This fails to address the core issue: the facility has prevented that access, while access to these amenities along the corridor is primary to the corridor's function. For instance, the facility should develop green spaces within the Ingra/Gambell couplet to provide access to individuals who live in that area. Nobody is going to cross a highway to access a park, no matter how great a connection you improve. 2- The P&N seeks to address "conflicting travel functions" which suggests that other modes of transportation are anathema to the project. This suggests that restricting access, providing safe crossings, and managing flow of pedestrians and bicycles will be a result of this purpose. It again fails to address the fact that this is a multi-modal transportation corridor. Any P&N needs to safely accommodate the multiple transportation modes that utilize the corridor. They are only conflicting when not accounted for in the design. 3- Much of the supplemental documentation in the P&N document supports an expanded purpose and need that should include: Increasing property values and land use around the facility, increasing access to services and amenities along the corridor, and increasing liveability in the corridor.</p>	Information from the commenter has been included in Need 3.
150d	S.J. Klein	<p>Draft Alternative Selection Criteria: 1- Level one screening criteria planning factors call out economic, social factors as well as safety for non-motorized users, however the actual criteria do not reflect these goals. Access to amenities and services along the corridor, access to green space, and accommodation of non-motorized users along the corridor should all be criteria. 2- Only one of the policy goals call out something other than motorized uses: non-motorized mobility through the corridor should be one policy goal. Supporting adjacent land uses should be a separate goal. Supporting economic vitality should be a third.</p>	Additional measures have been added to gauge the level of stress for walking and biking. Alternatives that reduce the stress will be rated more highly. Also a measure greenspace was added based on this comment.
150e	S.J. Klein	<p>Purpose and Need/Outcomes Chart: 1- is VMT really the only way to measure social, economic, and quality of life issues around the corridor? Why couldn't increasing non-motorized usage of the corridor be an outcome? Or increased property values/tax base? The facility is a thing that will exist in a neighborhood of people that exist in that same space. Why do all the outcomes focus on the users of the facility, who only spend between 5 and 30 minutes on or in it, while the people who live and work around the facility spend 8-16 hours a day in that same space? The experiences of the people who live and work around the facility should have weight in this process, and none of the outcomes listed directly measure or prioritize those individuals. 2- Decreasing VMT without a corresponding increase in PMT (person miles travelled) focuses only on the experience of individuals driving through the corridor, not those who live and work around it. 3- An outcome could include: increased access to amenities, greenspace, and services for those living and working around the corridor.</p>	Additional measures have been added to gauge the level of stress for walking and biking. Alternatives that reduce the stress will be rated more highly. Also a measure greenspace was added based on this comment. Other Livability metrics were also added.
150f	S.J. Klein	<p>Draft System Performance Report: 1- The draft SPR defines motorized and non motorized uses as things that interact in the corridor. The map on fig 23 fails to show the existing usage of Gambell st as a heavy pedestrian corridor. While not in the ped plan for MOA, if the contractor or DOT had done any reconnaissance in the area they would have found this heavy pedestrian usage to be a defacto corridor. Strava data are insufficient, as the heaviest pedestrians of the corridor do not use their smartphones to track their workouts in that area. I think about "social trails" and other heavily trafficked walkways that exist despite the lack of plan or infrastructure to support them (for example, there is no "sidewalk" between 15th and Chester Creek on the west side of Gambell, but there is not a time of day or night when you can't find a person walking on the side of that road. 2- The map on fig 24 shows the bike plan, but shows no connection between the eastern terminus of 10th ave bike boulevard, and the chester creek or 15th bike paths. Do you think bikers put their bikes on a bus or catch an uber between the two? Bikers utilize whatever means they can to get to these paths. 15th's official bike bath ends at Ingra, but bikers keep going down 15th. Likewise, bikers get on the 10th ave boulevard from parts north and south, though it is not in the plan. Access to and between these connections need to be considered in this document. 3- 10.2- the Gambell Street Redevelopment Project has demonstrated the potential to reduce lanes on Gambell, and increase sidewalk width. This would significantly decrease the number of pedestrian crashes in and of itself. The fact that no action has been taken by DOT to address the safety issues along Gambell Street for decades makes it hard not to blame the engineers who work for that bureaucracy for the deaths of dozens, if not hundreds of pedestrians and bicyclers. We have known these issues for decades. We proved that it could be solved, and the Technical Advisory Committee of AMATS found excuses to shoot the project down every time we were able to get it on the agenda. 4- Can the system performance report give metrics to issues of accessibility for the people who live and work in the study area? If access is not measured, how are we going to know if we have achieved it as a goal? S J. Klein Alaska Sprouts : : Sprouted Here t: 907.727.6774 w: alaskasprouts.com</p>	The project team has included Strava data because it was available and was suggested by member of the public and helps to flesh out the nonmotorized travel, but the team is not relying on it as the sole source of pedestrian and bicyclist information. Importantly, the team also included information from the AMATS Nonmotorized Plan, which provides additional detailed information on pedestrian travel and thoroughly documents the level of nonmotorized demand in Fairview. The project team does not believe that detailed nonmotorized user counts are necessary at this initial stage of alternative development and selection. Pedestrian counts will be obtained when analyzing a smaller set alternatives that move forward in the process, if deemed necessary for alternatives design refinement. Additional information from the System Performance Report has now been included in the Purpose and Need to further describe nonmotorized uses in the area. Figure 24 shows what is in the adopted bike plan. If a connection is missing from the plan, we can consider adding it to this PEL study. The project team proposes to measure the level of traffic stress for both bikers and pedestrians as a way to determine if alternatives are meeting the goals.
151a	Kristine Bunnell	<p>Dear Ms. Wilson: Thank you for the opportunity to comment. We apologize for the delay in getting back to you, as it seems our inquiry to the project on June 21, 2022, was overlooked. We appreciate your follow-up on June 27, 2022. This letter provides comments and recommendations on the following issues related to the Fairview PEL draft documents. 1.Follow Adopted Plans - Fairview Neighborhood Plan, Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan, Anchorage Original Neighborhoods Historic Preservation Plan Include the Entire Planning Area. 2.Include the Entire PEL Corridor and an Appropriate Surrounding Area of Impact. 3.Purpose and Need Statements. 4.Address Land Use & Housing. 5.Address Shortcomings & Assumptions of the Model. 6.Use Funding More Appropriately for Community Needs.</p>	Received, thank you.

151b	Kristine Bunnell	First and foremost, we are concerned that traffic counts and traffic flow are the primary focus of this project. The provided purpose and need statements also do not adequately consider low-income residents, small businesses, current and proposed land uses, historic properties, and environmental considerations including the Chester Creek watershed and how changes to traffic might affect these assets. These same community assets currently and in the future will bear the brunt of any infrastructure expansion and should be addressed through the PEL process. The PEL project should center on adopted municipal documents to guide the important work that needs to be accomplished with the PEL.	The purpose and need statement is specifically multi-modal. Problems identified in the need statement include safety and addressing the inconsistencies between the current roadway design and the vision as expressed in adopted municipal documents. Applicable adopted documents are summarized in need 3. Potential environmental consideration including potential impacts to businesses, land uses, historic properties and Chester Creek will be discussed in the PEL. Additional information on the low-income and minority residents has been included in the purpose and need statement.
151c	Kristine Bunnell	1. Follow Adopted Plans - Fairview Neighborhood Plan, Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan, Anchorage Original Neighborhoods Historic Preservation Plan. The Fairview Neighborhood Plan was adopted in 2014 by the Anchorage Assembly and is the primary policy guide for this area. This plan provides guidance on roadway design priorities and should be considered authoritative over truck traffic or commuting vehicles from the MatSu Valley. Additionally, the Our Downtown: Downtown Anchorage District Plan 2021 provides guidance and support for creating a corridor that reconnects Downtown and Fairview. The Anchorage 2040 Land Use Plan and the Anchorage Original Neighborhoods Historic Preservation Plan should also provide guidance and direction for this PEL. The following references in the Fairview Neighborhood Plan provide specific guidance on how the Ingra/Gambell streets should be redeveloped in the future. Planning materials should refer to the Fairview Neighborhood Plan Appendix A, pages98-101, Drawings A, B, C, and D as Build Alternative #1 proposed in the PEL. Planning materials should refer to Appendix D – City of Cincinnati “Connect the Blocks,” process and visualization as Build Alternative #2. The No Build Alternative should always be the first and foremost alternative discussed in any planning process for this corridor.	Guidance suggested by the MOA has been included in its entirety in Section 1.6. Information from the Downtown Plan, and Anchorage Original Neighborhoods plan has been included.
151d	Kristine Bunnell	2. Include the Entire PEL Corridor and an Appropriate Surrounding Area of Impact: The Fairview PEL should be combined with the Midtown PEL and in conjunction be used by the community to determine the best ways to repair the decades-long injustice to the neighborhood areas of Fairview, Mountain View, Midtown, Rogers Park, North Star, and Airport Heights. Topic #3, and Topic #4 below go into more detail about this issue.	AMATS policy committee, through adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plans split the corridor into two pieces and commissioned separate PEL studies. The project team's area of study was established through that process. This PEL will review and coordinate with the results and ongoing development activities in the Midtown PEL. Addressing the past road design given current direction based in adopted plans is at the center of Need three in the PEL.
151e	Kristine Bunnell	3. Purpose and Need Statements. Need statement for the PEL: A clearer need statement might be: To provide the community, a set of realistic alternatives based on adopted plans including the Fairview Neighborhood Plan, Mountain View Neighborhood Plan, the 2040Land Use Plan, and the Our Downtown: Downtown Anchorage District Plan 2021 to create reinvestment opportunities for new housing and businesses by fixing the roadway that we have within the right-of-way that we have. Purpose statement for the PEL: A clearer purpose statement might be: To determine a reasonable set of realistic alternatives to be evaluated during a subsequent NEPA process that will bring the community and the state the conclusions it needs to fund and fix the Seward-to-Glenn Highway connection, while providing neighborhood connectivity, a clean and viable Chester Creek watershed area, economic development through new housing and business development, and environmental justice for the underserved minority and low-income populations living in Fairview, Mountain View, Midtown, Rogers Park, North Star, and Airport Heights.	The suggested statement is appropriate for the overall purpose of why the PEL was commissioned and what we hope to achieve. The "Purpose and Need" statements in the PEL are carefully written so as to be applicable for future NEPA project implementation. The Statement suggested by MOA planning has been incorporated in the introduction section to better set the stage for the purpose of the PEL.
151f	Kristine Bunnell	4. Address Land Use & Housing. PEL draft technical materials indicate the primary focus for this project is motor vehicle traffic. The draft technical materials do not address land use issues related to how economic development, housing provision and transportation are connected. Anchorage 2020 Policy #14 states: “Conservation of residential lands for housing is a high community priority. New residential development at densities less than identified in the Neighborhood or District Plans is discouraged. No regulatory action under Title 21 shall result in a conversion of dwelling units or residentially zoned property into commercial or industrial uses unless consistent with an adopted plan.” According to MOA CAMA data, the area between 6th Avenue, Gambell, and Ingra has 222 living units (81 in B-3 zoning and 141 in R-4 zoning). This totals about 10.5 acres of land with residential development. Suggestions related to housing: Planning materials should address where the community might find an equivalent number of housing units. As many of the parcels in this area are currently under capacity for housing potential, planning materials should address where the community might find similar-sized areas of R-4 or B-3 zoned land with like access to amenities. Planning materials should address how anticipation of potential road development in this area has impacted reinvestment in the past, and how the square footage tax revenue of areas impacted by ROW projects compare to other similar areas. Planning materials should address the waste/landfill impacts of removing tons of building materials and its ultimate endpoint. Fairview Between Gambell & Ingra: 2022 CAMA Data. Figure 1. This area has many under-utilized parcels that could provide more housing for the community.	The project will address potential right-of-way impacts and the affect on housing and other community impacts in the PEL in the second evaluation phase, when considering the refined alternatives.

151g	Kristine Bunnell	<p>5. Address Shortcomings & Assumptions of the Model As noted above, the PEL materials appear primarily focused on vehicle flow rather than measuring other variables that might better align with community priorities. The following excerpts from the Travel Demand Modeling Memo provide some examples: “The model does not forecast pollutant emissions. It also does not represent safety improvements, sidewalks, bicycle lanes, pedestrian crossings, and non-capacity enhancements or policies. Impacts of such improvements will need to be assessed with tools other than the model, although model outputs such as volumes can be helpful to such assessments.” (Page 6) “The 2019 base year recalibration will ensure that overall volume and flow estimates will remain robust, but any project treatment of TNC and MaaS will need to be done off-model.” (Page 6). “The project team does not plan to test different future land use scenarios.” (Page13). “Future traveler behavior for both passenger vehicles and freight vehicles will largely be motivated by existing behavioral patterns. The model forecasts cannot account for ‘paradigm shifts’, for example wholesale future changes in where people work or where residents and businesses obtain goods and services.” (Page 14). “As mentioned in the model limitation sections above, the model does not produce outputs on some topics that may be of interest to SG PEL stakeholders. It does not deal with safety improvements and thus produces no findings on crashes; nor does it by itself estimate mobile source air pollutant emissions.” (Page 15). Although draft PEL materials do offer information about historical documents, travel characteristics, and traffic counts, the documentation is not clear whether the model is the AMATS model or a modified variant. The materials do not provide adequate discussion of: Declining traffic counts over the past 10 years. Considering the “corridor” as a length of ROW from Airport Heights to Tudor Road. Assumptions about building to peak conditions. Existing economic conditions and concerns about a recession. The changes to workforce behavior and commuting patterns that may linger after COVID-19. Whether increasing freight truck traffic will be coming from the Port of Alaska or Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport (TSAIA), and whether cargo at TSAIA enters the road system or is simply transferred to other flights.</p>	<p>The quotes pulled from the traffic modeling technical report already acknowledge the short-comings of the model. The traffic model is only one potential tool that is proposed to be used. A considerable number of other topics and evaluations will be used in the consideration of alternatives. The following FAQ provides some details: The study is being prepared as a Planning and Environmental Linkages Study. According to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Planning and Environment Linkages Studies represent a collaborative and integrated approach to transportation decision-making that 1) considers environmental, community, and economic goals early in the transportation planning process, and 2) uses the information, analysis, and products developed during planning to inform the environmental review process. See more at: https://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/env_initiatives/PEL.aspx. Learn more about the PEL process in this downloadable handout: https://dot.alaska.gov/stwddes/desenviron/assets/pdf/procedures/pel_guidebook.pdf. Specific questions are answered below: (1) The traffic model is a modified variant of the AMATS model used for the 2040 MTP. The AMATS model was updated with the latest population and employment projects. (2) Traffic trends, including declining traffic counts on some facilities are presented in the Traffic Forecast Technical Memorandum available on the project web site. (3) Considering the “corridor” as a length of ROW from Airport Heights to Tudor Road. The Midtown area has already had a PEL study. This PEL study will coordinate and be consistent with the results of that study. Breaking the corridor at 20th Avenue was a decision made by AMATS in the adopted MTP. (4) Building to peak hour conditions is common traffic engineering practice. (5) The traffic forecast memo recognizes that existing economic conditions and concerns about a recession and changes to workforce behavior and</p>
151h	Kristine Bunnell	<p>6. Use Funding More Appropriately for Community Needs. PEL funding should be directed toward a more comprehensive NEPA process focused on additional planning, appropriate review and considering of alternatives, the environmental, social, and economic impacts, and engineering concepts to meet a purpose and need that in not focused on moving cars and trucks. Thank you again for the opportunity to comment. Kristine Bunnell Manager Long-Range Planning Division.</p>	<p>The PEL study was commissioned by AMATS which includes both DOT&PF and MOA representation. The PEL planning process occurs prior to a NEPA process for a specific construction process; it is considered a "pre-NEPA document". The purpose and need document has been updated and posted on the project website; it includes more discussion of nonmotorized uses. Moving cars and trucks is the purpose of the highway system. The challenge is finding solutions that meet the conflicting goals of the different functional classifications of the facilities within the study area.</p>
152	Sandra Millhouse	<p>Hello. My name is Sandra Milhouse. My phone number is (907) 373-8761. This is the third message I've left in the last two weeks, trying to get information about the project when I go online. My building has directly online to what's going on, but it doesn't actually specify what's going to happen. As I said, this is the third request I sent for a return phone call. If somebody could please call me. Really, really appreciate it. My number is (907) 373-8761. And again, my name is Sandra Mail House and my property is a 10 East Sixth Avenue. Thank you so much.</p>	<p>A member of the project team contacted the caller and provided information on how to reach the project website at www.sewardglennmobility.com</p>