

## **2019-2022 AMATS Transportation Improvement Program Comment Response Summary**

This comment response summary was produced during the development of the 2019-2022 AMATS TIP. Comments were received during two comment periods, the first from July 19<sup>th</sup> until August 20<sup>th</sup>, 2018 and the second from September 2<sup>nd</sup> until October 1<sup>st</sup>, 2018. The MOA Assembly was given a period to provide comments which ended on December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2018. All comments were review by the AMATS Technical Advisory Committee and acted upon by the AMATS Policy Committee during their December 29<sup>th</sup>, 2018 meeting.

Any comment number with an N before it was provided during the 2<sup>nd</sup> comment period.

All comments were organized into three categories:

- Green – No action recommended.
- Blue – UMED specific comments.
- Yellow – Policy Committee action needed.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
1	Debbie Ossiander	7/30/2018	General	I was surprised to see the AMATS expenditures to be made outside the AMATS area. Isn't the STIP supposed to cover those?	Federal regulations require all surface transportation projects utilizing federal funds be shown in the TIP. Tables 2-7 are the AMATS allocation, tables 8-12 are funded outside the AMATS allocation.	No action needed.	Concur
2	Debbie Ossiander	7/30/2018	General	There has been massive work done already on the Glenn-Muldoon interchange. Is this new expenditure necessary? Is it to finish the current work?	The information in the table reflected the money needed during the 2015-2018 TIP cycle. It has since been updated and does not have the Glenn-Muldoon interchange listed.	No action needed.	Concur
3	Debbie Ossiander	7/30/2018	General	It is disheartening to see no planned expenditures for the Glenn, particularly after the major traffic problems we experienced this year when an Eagle River overpass was harmed. What was the basis for the decision to work on the Seward instead? We have been told that South Eagle River bridge must be replaced. Shouldn't it be listed in the TIP?	Tables 8-12 are funded outside the AMATS allocation and reflect the current approved STIP/other funding sources.	No action needed.	Concur
4	Debbie Ossiander	7/30/2018	Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection	I was surprised to see we are still planning on working the Seward-Glenn connection. I had heard it was too expensive to continue. I would like to see justification for continuing to pursue this project.	The Seward Hwy to Glenn Hwy PEL was nominated and scored high enough for inclusion in the TIP.	No action needed.	Concur
19	Fairview CC	8/17/2018	Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection	<p>The Fairview Community Council at its August 6th General Membership meeting approved a Motion From the Floor directing the President to submit written comments on the public draft AMATS FFY2019-FFY2022 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). As a result, I am writing in support of the proposed programming of \$5,000,000 in FFY2019 for TIP Need ID PLN00003: Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study and \$1,000,000 in FFY2022 for TIP Need ID RDY00012: Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection PEL Design.</p> <p>It is the hope of the Council that AMATS will remain sincere in its attempts to resolve the uncertainties on the alignment, funding feasibility and cooperative design of this important Interstate connection. Said uncertainties have led to significant disinvestment within the Fairview commercial corridor and created a breeding ground for social miscreants and public safety issues. The Council is fully aware of past evaluations of this connection and accepted the need for the project if it is done in a way that results in a betterment of the Fairview community, its residents and businesses.</p> <p>It is our expectation that the PEL will illustrate how a well-designed corridor linking transportation and land use development will work to benefit all the affected stakeholders and lead to successful integration of environmental, community and economic concerns early on in the project development process. The Council, in particular is looking forward to the incorporation of the Fairview Greenway over the future covered Interstate facility. The inclusion of this important public amenity for the urban core is essential if the urban core is to attract market-rate mixed-use development. The Council has developed a working draft Fairview Form Based Code with Winter City Design Guidelines that will be used to craft a new positive vision for this part of town in association with the larger transportation project.</p> <p>The Council has worked hard over the years to gather into place significant development incentives (Opportunity Zone designation in the Federal tax code, Reinvestment Focus Area and Special Study Area in the Anchorage Land Use Plan, Downtown Abatement District in Municipal Code, etc.) and a professionally done PEL Study will bring all these components together, substantially contribute to the revitalization of the Fairview area and identify a viable strategy for advancing a major infrastructure project of regional, state and national significance.</p> <p>It is our fervent hope a successful PEL Study will produce a work product that substantially reduces the uncertainties for the investment community, brackets the unknown risks and allows for land developers to move forward with market ready development projects. As the PEL Study project advances the Council encourages the lead organizations to give serious credence to the benefits of a joint partnership between the Municipality and the State DOT&amp;PF. Said partnership would give the Municipality primacy for land use development on the covers within the airspace above the interstate facility and give the DOT&amp;PF primacy for the controlled-access facility beneath the surface.</p> <p>The Fairview Community Council strongly supports a progressive, balanced and well-thought approach to advancing the connection between the Glenn and New Seward Highways. We look forward to working together with the PEL Study project team to advance an effort that carefully considers and produces robust solutions to the environmental, community and economic issues associated with such a connection.</p>	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
27	Sharon Stockard	8/19/2018	General	<p>I have already submitted my comments to the AMATS board in opposition to the proposed Bragaw Extension/U-med Road, which, despite opposition from the surrounding neighborhoods and 10 community councils, remains on the list for funding by AMATS.</p> <p>In addition to my opposition to that road, which would destroy the peace and calm in my neighborhood and the surrounding wetlands, forest and park area, as well as create safety risks to schoolchildren, pedestrians, bicyclists and university students without providing any verifiable benefits – I am also urging AMATS to consider community goals in any AMATS decisions. There are many goals more important than simply moving traffic. For example:</p> <p>I urge AMATS to consider adding bus service as a way to decrease traffic congestion and increase pedestrian and bicycle safety by reducing the number of cars on the road.</p> <p>AMATS should consider the safety of schoolchildren to cross roads on foot in conjunction with road-building decisions.</p> <p>AMATS should also consider that residents put a high value on recreational area, wildlife, wetlands, greenbelts and forests in midtown, and that these lands should be preserved for use by wildlife.</p> <p>Finally, AMATS should consider ways to calm high-speed traffic through neighborhoods, especially with the use of improve public transit. Our transportation budget is inadequate and service has been drastically reduced this past year, with the resulting continuing decline in ridership and rise of more cars on the road. We are going in the wrong direction.</p> <p>Anchorage is falling behind in how it uses transportation funds to improve and strengthen our neighborhoods. There are many examples of this, including the Bragaw Road Extension back in the budget. Please consider our values and goals in any AMATS decisions.</p>	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
45	Claude Funnston	8/20/2018	Sitka Street Park Connection	The <u>Sitka Street Park Connection</u> outwardly seems like a good idea. On the other hand, my concern is that it will allow more access into the area by vagrants. As the Roger's Park resident, vagrants are a huge problem for this community - not to mention elsewhere - and we should think twice about more amenities no matter how otherwise desirable that will effectively become attractive nuisances.	The Sitka Street Park Connection did not score high enough to be included for funding in the draft TIP but it can be nominated in the future.	No action needed.	Concur
47	David Evans	8/20/2018	General	1. Please extend the deadline for comments on the draft TIP until after you publish the criterion scoring points for all of the projects. The Interim 2035 MTP, the basis of the draft TIP, does not indicate any priority order and says that priority will be determined through the AMATS TIP process. For the 2019-2022 TIP, AMATS has published the roadway ranking criteria and overall project rank but has not published the criterion scoring points for the projects. The public should have the opportunity to comment on the way the projects were ranked, including the scoring points for each criterion. Please publish the scoring details for all of the projects and extend the deadline for comments on the draft TIP to allow for public review and comment.	Lists of the scored and ranked projects with all of the criteria were posted to the AMATS website.	No action needed.	Concur
51	Mark Butler	8/20/2018	Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation	<b>RDY0001 Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation</b> - I am all in favor of this proposal, as I was a wildly enthusiastic proponent of the North Spenard Road "road diet". I am in favor of the three-lane option for the west end of Fireweed Lane ("C" Street to Spenard Road.) This area has three schools (North Star Elementary, Holy Rosary Academy, and Steller Secondary) that would benefit from the proposed changes. Between "C" Street and New Seward Highway, however, there is a much higher volume of vehicular traffic and Municipal traffic engineers have said in the past that the 3-lane system would not work.	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
52	Mark Butler	8/20/2018	Spenard Road Rehabilitation	<b>RDY0003 Spenard Road Rehabilitation</b> - As a huge supporter of the North Spenard Road safety project, I am all in favor of continuing the safety improvements south from 30th Avenue to 36th Avenue. These 3 and 4-lane safety improvements should not be controversial in any way. Businesses in this area see how the northern section looks and works and will be supportive.	Thank you for your comments. Staff will share your comments with project managers.	No action needed.	Concur
54	Mark Butler	8/20/2018	Fish Creek Trail New Connection	<b>NMO00002 Fish Creek Trail Connection</b> - I am an enthusiastic supporter of this project and am glad that it is in the TIP. The trail would provide access to the coast and the Coastal Trail for thousands of people who live in the Spenard and South Turnagain neighborhoods.	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur

AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
55	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	General	In general, I hope the AMAT TIP process will follow the comprehensive plan by actively and innovatively building facilities for transit and non-vehicular travel. The percentage of AMATS funding for transit and non-motorized travel has long been miserly compared to the roadway budget. This imbalance continues to result in more auto-dependence and congestion and the local level, and will fail to address the global issue of sustainability.	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
56	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	O'Malley Road Reconstruction	O'Malley Road Reconstruction Add to the scope: improvement to Pedestrian Facilities must include safe, controlled pedestrian crossings near public destinations, including parks, the Alaska Zoo, and O'Malley Elementary School. The traffic volumes and speeds plus the three lane design would otherwise make proposed crossings too hazardous for non-motorized users.	Thank you for your comment. It will be forwarded to the project manager for consideration.	No action needed.	Concur
57	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation	Fireweed Lane - I support the scope of this project. The proposed conversion of Fireweed Lane to a 3-lane road will enhance non-motorized access and create a more intraconnected commercial zone.	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
58	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	Rabbitt Creek Road Reconstruction	Rabbit Creek Road Reconstruction - Specify that Context Sensitive Design with active public outreach will be part of the scoping and design. Right-of-way takings and urban features of the proposed road must be balanced with adjoining neighborhoods' interests. Add to the scope that the nonmotorized improvements must include safe, controlled pedestrian crossings near public destinations, including Golden View Middle School. The traffic volumes and speeds plus the three lane design would otherwise make proposed crossings too hazardous for non-motorized users.	Context Sensitive Design is already part of the project development process for both DOT&PF and the MOA. The current project scope already included non-motorized improvements that will be developed in greater detail during the project design.	No action needed.	Concur
60	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	Potter Marsh Improvements	Potter Marsh Improvements - I support this project. Safe access is overdue for this highly-valued regional destination. Safe, well-designed connections will enhance the Seward Highway as a National Scenic Transportation Corridor.	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
61	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	Old Seward Highway Pathway	Old Seward Highway pathway (DeArmoun Road to Rabbit Creek) I support this. This is a missing segment that is needed for commuter safety.	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
62	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	Anchorage Areawide Trails Rehabilitation	Anchorage Areawide Trails Rehabilitation Increase this amount by 100 percent in 2019 and 2020! There are immediate needs to rehabilitate dangerously-deteriorated trails such as Campbell Creek trail. The amount budgeted is not commensurate with the immediate hazards and missing features on our non-motorized system.	Thank you for your comments. The percentages allocated to all categories is set by the current AMATS Policies and Procedures.	No action needed.	Concur
66	Rep Geran Tarr	8/20/2018	General	Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the draft Transportation Improvement Plan. As the State Legislator for House District 19, I represent the hardworking people in the Airport Heights, Russian Jack and Mountain View neighborhoods. I would like to give my strong support for projects that provide connectivity in neighborhoods, particularly your transportation alternatives program, and projects to build trails, sidewalks and improve transit. I also strongly support projects to improve air quality, promote rideshare programs and improve existing roadways. Specific projects in and near my district that I support include: • Safety Improvements for University Medical District Transit and Pedestrian Access.	Thank you for your comments. The Safety improvement project mentioned is part of the Highway Safety Improvement Program and was completed in 2017.	No action needed.	Concur
67	Rep Geran Tarr	8/20/2018	Mountain View Drive Pathway	• Mountain View Drive pathway connecting Peterkin Ave with Mountain View Drive between Bliss Street and North Bunn Street (TAP00002) - Support project	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
68	Rep Geran Tarr	8/20/2018	20th Ave Sidewalk Pavement	• 20th Avenue sidewalk – Bragaw Street to Tikishla Park - Support project	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
69	Rep Geran Tarr	8/20/2018	Airport Heights Road Pavement Replacement	• Airport Heights Road – Debarr Rd to Glenn Hwy - Support project	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
83	Bob Butera	8/20/2018	Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation	Lots of good projects in the draft TIP, Fireweed Lane Rehab in particular.	Thank you for your comments.	No action needed.	Concur
84	Cathy Gleason - Turnagain Community Council	8/20/2018	Fish Creek Trail New Connection	<b>NC000002</b> — Fish Creek Trail Connection (Northern Lights Blvd. to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail) This project will construct a connection of the Fish Creek Trail to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail.  TCC supports the inclusion of a Fish Creek Trail Connection, Northern Lights Blvd. (WNL) to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail (Coastal Trail) in the Draft 2019-2022 TIP Non-Motorized project list.  After an informal public use trail located within the Alaska Railroad (AKRR) right-of-way in Turnagain was blocked off as part of an Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility project a few years ago, TCC members have been participating in a Fish Creek Trail to Ocean (FCTO) working group, with the goal of reestablishing a trail between WNL and the Coastal Trail.  TCC's conceptual support of this trail connection project, which we have expressed at FCTO meetings and to the Parks Department, is contingent upon the opportunity, as a stakeholder, to collaborate with the Parks Department and other relevant stakeholders (GreatLand Trust and AKRR) with regard to the actual trail route location as well as the physical nature of the trail (paved vs. unpaved and width). We feel important factors that need to be taken into consideration include potential impacts to area property owners, Fish Creek hydrology and water quality, stream setback widths and vegetation, the wetlands of the Fish Creek estuary, and waterfowl and wildlife that use the area, and — of course — project cost.  After discussions with the Parks Department, the FOCT working group was presented four potential, conceptual trail routes some time last year. At that point, informally, the group's preference was for the Municipality to work with the Alaska Railroad (AKRR), so that some form of trail could be located back within the AKRR right-of-way — as this would be the least expensive and quickest way to reestablish a connecting trail in this area for public use. Since that discussion, FOCT has not met for some time and TCC has not been provided information by the Parks Department on 1) the status of AKRR's position of allowing the trail to be placed within their right-of-way; 2) GreatLand Trust's input on various trail routes near or within protected estuary boundaries; 3) updates on the feasibility of other potential route locations; or 4) cost projections for the Fish Creek Connection project now included in the Draft 2019-2022 TIP.  As a result, it is difficult to comment on whether \$4M is an appropriate amount of funding to include in the TIP document (\$500,000 for 2020; \$500,000 for 2022; \$3,000,000 after 2024). However, as a result of TCC's engagement with the proposed changes to the Municipality Stream Setback Code, we do understand there are bank erosion impacts from locating paved trails near creeks as well as high costs associated with maintenance or repair of existing paved trails near municipal creeks. Thus, TCC recognizes a less expensive, unpaved, narrower trail may need to be considered for this location along Fish Creek within the Turnagain area. If that is the case, the trail could likely cost significantly less than \$4M — and could be developed in a much shorter timeframe than projected in the Draft 2019-2022 TIP.  TCC's desire for this important trail project is that it ultimately provides the community a trail that balances the need to provide connectivity from the existing Fish Creek Trail south of WNL to the Coastal Trail, with the need to address negative impacts and protect the existing natural, environmental and neighborhood attributes in this area of Turnagain. We look forward to our council's participation as a stakeholder as the Fish Creek Trail Connection project proposal moves forward as an AMATS 2019-2022 TIP project to accomplish this goal.	Thank you for your comments. Cost estimates for the Fish Creek Trail Connection to the Coastal Trail project came from the MOA Parks Department.	No action needed.	Concur

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
84	Ben Arians	8/20/2018	Hillside Drive Pavement Replacement	This is a comment specifically regarding the paving of Hillside Drive, which was recently repaved between O'malley and Dearmound roads. I was very unimpressed by the stopgap paving job that was done, which consisted of new pavement being applied over the old, but only out to the white line, instead of all the way to the edges. The established bike line is very cracked and in poor repair, and has been neglected during the last few pavings. It is in fact dangerous to ride a bike on the road to the right of the white line due to the presence of multiple cracks and a significant amount of debris that collects. Also, the step-down that is created at the white line due to the partial paving strip makes a dangerous obstacle for cyclists. Hillside Drive is a popular place for cyclists, both those that live nearby, as I do, and for those that make the Hillside a destination for their riding. Please make sure that Hillside Drive is repaved completely, edge-to-edge, as soon as possible to avoid injury, whether due to the cracked road surface on the edges, or worse, a car/bike collision due to the margin of the the road being rendered unridable.	Thank you for your comments. It will be passed along to the appropriate entity responsible for Hillside Drive for consideration.	No action needed.	Concur
85	Cathy Gleason - Turnagain Community Council	8/20/2018	Anchorage Ridesharing/Transit Marketing	<p><b>• CMA00001 Anchorage Ridesharing/Transit Marketing</b></p> <p>This project funds the Municipal Share-A-Ride program, which promotes, subsidizes, and contract manages an areawide vanpool commuter service, and a comprehensive public transportation marketing effort.</p> <p>TCC supports the continued funding of ridesharing and transit marketing in the Municipality of Anchorage, which is included in the Draft 2019-2022 TIP.</p> <p>Unfortunately, the Turnagain neighborhood lost significant coverage of bus service with the discontinuation of Route 36 in 2017, leaving fewer transit options for people living north and west of Spenard Rd., including Wisconsin St. and West Northern Lights Blvd. We understand the reasons for the changes, and appreciate that our neighborhood is fairly close to other People Mover bus routes in adjacent areas.</p> <p>Promoting transit use and increasing ridership may allow People Mover to expand bus service again in the future, and TCC hopes that our neighborhood could, once again, have bus service in Turnagain. In the meantime, we support the municipality's efforts to educate Turnagain residents and the general community about existing options for people to get to work and other destinations, including transit and the vanpool service for commuters. This helps reduce congestion on our roads, gives residents more options to get around town, and helps vulnerable neighbors like the elderly and people who cannot afford a car.</p>	Thank you for your comments	No action needed.	Concur
86	Cathy Gleason - Turnagain Community Council	8/20/2018	Air Quality Public & Business Awareness Education Campaign	<p><b>CMA00002 Air Quality Public &amp; Business Awareness Education Campaign</b></p> <p>The goal of this program is to further inform the public about air quality issues and what steps people may take to reduce pollution.</p> <p>We are fortunate to have access to many beautiful natural and green space areas in or near the Turnagain neighborhood, and live in a city that does not have the same level of pollution as many larger or older cities in the Lower 48. However, living near Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport, residents of Turnagain are near a busy transportation and industrial area. As a result, we often are exposed to emissions and odors from nearby sources, such as jets, general aviation aircraft, buses, trucks, taxis and vans serving the airport and surrounding businesses.</p> <p>TCC is also aware of the air quality issues associated with people starting up their cars and letting them idle for long periods of time on cold days in the winter.</p> <p>Our council supports funding proposed for the Air Quality Public &amp; Business Awareness Education Campaign in the Draft 2019-2022 TIP. To keep our community healthy, it is important for the Municipality to take steps to address sources of air pollution within our community, and to increase awareness of residents and businesses on how they can reduce emissions and impacts on our air quality.</p>	Thank you for your comments	No action needed.	Concur
88	Bob French	43332	General	<p><b>General Comments:</b></p> <p>Our commenting on the TIP seems premature. Many of the projects are co-located with the MTP, and the MTP is not yet finalized. The information available is disjointed and included outdated tables 8 to 12.</p> <p>With the information currently available, it is difficult to figure out what the actual project includes. For example what does the Minnesota Drive Weaving Lane, or Duben St. #14 crash location include? While the NOMO and Roadway project scoring tables refer the MTP, the MTP is not updated, so there is no information on the new projects that are not in the existing Interim MTP. That has to be fixed before the Public Hearing Draft. I would suggest at least a project description similar to what was in the TAC Draft tables. The information needs to be all in one place to facilitate public understanding and commenting.</p> <p>Some projects reportedly will have different impacts that depend on what developer or development happens. Such as Harry McDonald Road, Terrace Lane, and MLK Jr. Ave Extension. While I understand the need to plan ahead, it seems a bit premature to set a design, when the future need is not understood yet.</p>	Federal regulations require updating the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) every 4 years. Delaying the creation of a new TIP until the adoption of the updated Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP) will delay the adoption of a new TIP at least 12 to 18 months. During that time no new projects can be started and no new phases of existing projects can be started. The information in tables 8-12 includes projects that are not part of the AMATS allocation and AMATS does not decide the priority and schedule for those projects. That information is currently being updated and will be up to date when the public hearing draft is created.	No action needed.	Concur
91	Bob French	8/20/2018	Eagle River CBD Study Phase II	It is not clear what the Eagle River CBD Study – Phase II is supposed to be studying, since there apparently was not a conclusion to Phase 1. Same comment on Eagle River Traffic Mitigation Phase 1, which appears to be construction funding to create Phase 1, but there was no preferred alternative determined by the Phase 1 study.	Thank you for your comment.	No action needed.	Concur
92	Bob French	8/20/2018	Potter Marsh Improvements	I support the inclusion of the following Non Motorized Projects: NM00001; NM00002; NM00004; NM00007 and NM00008, but am not clear on what NM00006, the Potter Marsh Improvements will actually benefit. That seems like a park project, not an AMATS project.	Thank you for your comment.	No action needed.	Concur
93	Bob French	8/20/2018	Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection	I support Fairview in their comments that the Highway to Highway project RDY00012 needs to be done correctly, to fix the problems created by the existing 5&6th / Ingra Gambell couplets. There needs to be a complete solution accepted by the affected communities instead of piecemeal add-on's.	Thank you for your comment.	No action needed.	Concur

## AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
96	Frank Pugh, Chair Rabbit Creek Community Council	9/8/2018	Various Project Support	<p>Below are projects supported by members of our Council, we would like them to be considered for implementation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RDY00007 - Rabbit Creek Reconstruction [Seward Highway to Golden View Drive]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Project would reconstruct Rabbit Creek Road from the Seward Highway to Golden View Dr. with a center turn lane and includes non-motorized improvements. We would like the Context Sensitive Design available for comment when it comes out.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• NM000006 - Potter Marsh Improvements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o This project would make improvements to the Potter Marsh boardwalk and southern parking facility.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• NM000007 - Old Seward Pathway [DeArmour Road to Rabbit Creek Road]: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o This project would construct a pathway along Old Seward Highway from DeArmour Road and connect to the termini of the non-motorized improvements(s) done as part of the Rabbit Creek Road [Seward Highway to Golden View Drive] Reconstruction project.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• NM000008 -Anchorage Area Trails Rehabilitation: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Project will analyze existing pathways for rehabilitation needs community-wide and promote specific projects to rehabilitate those existing pathways. The scope is primarily expected to include pavement replacement with a focus on trails that form the Anchorage Bicycle Plan Core Bicycle Network.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Pavement Replacement #3- Brayton Drive- DeArmour Road to- O'Malley Road.</li> <li>• Pavement Replacement #8- Rabbit Creek Rd- Old Seward Hwy to Hillside Drive.</li> <li>• 12259- Recreational Trails for Alaska: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o This program provides funding for various small recreational trail projects statewide. The program is administered by ADNRR</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Thank you for your comment.	No action needed.	Concur
N10	Tyler Robinson	9/28/2018	Spenard Road Rehabilitation	Can you tell me why the TIP definitively describes the 36th and Spenard couplet when we were supposed to reconcile the issues in the Spenard Corridor plan?	The Spenard Road Project is in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan. This language is taken directly from the project description in the MTP. Staff can't change that language but the committees can.	No action needed.	Concur
N26	Fish Creek Trail to the Ocean working group	10/1/2018	Fish Creek Trail New Connection	See attached PDF.	The Fish Creek Project is the draft 2019-22 TIP. If this project is included in the final approved TIP the required public involvement process will include opportunities for the public to weigh in on the project as it progresses.	No action needed.	Concur
N33	Dave Evan	10/1/2018	General	In addition, I request that AMATS consider not scheduling of AMATS meetings during work hours. Since I and many others interested in Anchorage's transportation infrastructure are employed, it is nearly impossible to participate in these meetings on a regular, or even occasional, basis.	Thank you for your comment. This will be shared with the TAC and PC.	No action needed.	Concur
N39	Jay Stange President Spenard Community Council	9/3/2018	Spenard Road Rehabilitation	The line item referenced as "RDY00003 Spenard Road Rehab [Benson Blvd to Minnesota Dr] - Project will rehabilitate to improve traffic flow. Includes Spenard Rd/36th Ave couplet." is a project which has not been presented to the Spenard Community Council and I am unaware of any person or business in our community which supports a proposal including a couplet concept at 36th Avenue. The SCC has identified Spenard Road between 30th Avenue and Northwood Drive as a capital improvement priority, however the "couplet" concept has only been referenced informally by the Alaska State Department of Transportation and does not have our support.	The Spenard Road Project is in the current Metropolitan Transportation Plan. This language is taken directly from the project description in the MTP. Staff can't change that language but the committees can.	No action needed.	Concur
N40	Jay Stange President Spenard Community Council	9/3/2018	Fish Creek Trail New Connection	The item, "Table 3. Non-Motorized Projects:• NCO00002 — Fish Creek Trail Connection (Northern Lights Blvd. to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail)," references a concept we support as a culmination of work to connect our community to the Coastal Trail via the Fish Creek Trail corridor, however, we have not been presented publicly with a proposal to complete this project. We support the work done to identify preliminary routes as presented by the Municipality of Anchorage Parks Department and the Fish Creek Trail to the Ocean working group. We are excited to see this project as it moves into a Draft public review stage, but our understanding is its stakeholders are still being contacted, including private landowners and the Alaska Railroad, and support for a final route is premature.	The Fish Creek Project is the draft 2019-22 TIP. If this project is included in the final approved TIP the required public involvement process will include opportunities for the public to weigh in on the project as it progresses.	No action needed.	Concur
N41	Jay Stange President Spenard Community Council	9/3/2018	Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation	We are supportive conceptually of the item "RDY00001 Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation [Spenard Road to Seward Highway] - This project would rehabilitate Fireweed Lane from Spenard Road to the Seward Highway and include a road diet, changing Fireweed from 4 lanes to 3 lanes (2 with a center turn lane). This project would also include non-motorized improvements." but once again, this has not been presented to our Council in a form which would provide us with a chance to meaningfully review it.	Thank you for your comment.	No action needed.	Concur
N42	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	General	Bike Anchorage is pleased to see the emphasis on non-motorized projects in the draft Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). We applaud AMATS for its demonstrated commitment to a more inclusive transportation system. Because of this emphasis, we feel the draft TIP aligns well with the goals and objectives of the Metropolitan Transportation Plan.	Thank you for your comment.	No action needed.	Concur
N43	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	General	There are several projects listed in the draft TIP that we feel should be prioritized. One project in particular is the Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation. Initiating a road diet and installing non-motorized facilities on Fireweed will provide a much needed upgrade to the safety and appeal of an already popular non-motorized thoroughfare. The infrastructure upgrades will tie in nicely to the completed and future upgrades to Spenard Road, Arctic Boulevard and C Street. While the type of non-motorized facility is not listed, protected bike lanes, where feasible, would increase the comfort and appeal of this corridor to cyclists of all skill levels.	The Fireweed Lane Rehabilitation project is shown in the draft TIP with funding for FY19. Projects in the TIP are not prioritized. Funding is shown in the TIP based on available funding and agency resources.	No action needed.	Concur
N44	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	General	When possible, we would encourage AMATS to list the types of non-motorized facilities being considered for a project. The type of facility selected will affect the safety and appeal of the project for non-motorized users and that should be reflected in the project's scoring. This specificity would also help AMATS ensure a project aligns with the Complete Streets Policy.	AMATS does not list the type of non-motorized facilities improvements in a project descriptions for roadway as AMATS is not a design entity and to allow maximum flexibility when the project is later in design.	No action needed.	Concur
N45	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	General	We were also excited to see Downtown Trail Connection and Fish Creek Trail Connection listed in the Draft TIP. The connection between the Ship Creek Trail and the Coastal Trail completes a missing link in our bicycle and pedestrian network, and has the potential to improve access to Downtown. We support the preferred near-term alternative identified in the DSR, which provides designated bicycle facilities along 2nd Ave and North C St. The Fish Creek Trail Connection, which extends the Fish Creek trail to the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail, will also complete a critical link in our non-motorized network. This project would increase connectivity towards Midtown and create a safe non-motorized north/south route between residential neighborhoods and Downtown.	Thank you for your comment.	No action needed.	Concur
N46	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	C Street/Ocean Dock Road Ramp and Intersection Improvements	RDY00002 - C Street/Ocean Dock Road Ramp and Intersection Improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o This project should address improvements to the existing crosswalk.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comments. If the project remains in the final approved TIP AMATS will share these comments with the project managers.	No action needed.	Concur
N47	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Academy Drive/Vanguard Drive Area Traffic Circulation Improvements	RDY00004 - Academy Drive/Vanguard Drive Area Traffic Circulation Improvements <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o We recommend this project extend bike lanes from Abbott to King Street, crossing both the Seward and Old Seward Highways. This offers a non-motorized alternative parallel to Dimond Boulevard.</li> <li>o Any improvements should include on-street bicycle facilities.</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comments. If the project remains in the final approved TIP AMATS will share these comments with the project managers.	No action needed.	Concur

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N48	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Dr Martin Luther King Jr Avenue Extension	RDY00005 - Dr. Martin Luther King Jr Avenue Extension o It's important that this project does not impact the adjacent Campbell Creek Trail.	Thank you for your comments. If the project remains in the final approved TIP AMATS will share these comments with the project managers.	No action needed.	Concur
N49	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Potter Drive Rehabilitation	RDY00009 - Potter Drive Rehabilitation o Potter Drive Rehabilitation is an important, yet somewhat unknown, connection between the Campbell Creek Trail and Arctic Boulevard. Efforts to provide on-street bicycle facilities and pedestrian facilities would be even more valuable if paired with improvements along Arctic Boulevard and E 56th Avenue.	Thank you for your comments. If the project remains in the final approved TIP AMATS will share these comments with the project managers.	No action needed.	Concur
N50	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Lake Hill Drive Shared Bike Facility	NMO00004 - Lake Hill Drive [Old Glenn Highway to Mirror Lake Middle School] o We recommend this project include shoulder widening and separate on-street bicycle facilities rather than a shared road.	This project is being recommended for removal from the draft AMATS TIP.	No action needed.	Concur
N51	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Old Seward Highway Pathway	NMO00007 - Old Seward Highway Pathway [DeArmoun Road to Rabbit Creek Road] o We recommend this project provides a connection to pedestrian facilities north of DeArmoun Road. These facilities should be designed in a way that does not eliminate the bicycle shoulder along Old Seward Highway.	Thank you for your comments. If the project remains in the final approved TIP AMATS will share these comments with the project managers.	No action needed.	Concur
N52	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Traffic Control Signlization	CMA00004 - Traffic Control Signalization o This project should address crosswalk signals, and where appropriate, decrease non-motorized wait times, increase non-motorized crossing time, and automatically queue the crosswalk signal without the need of a push button in areas with frequent non-motorized use such as crossings of Minnesota and the New Seward highway.	Thank you for your comments. If the project remains in the final approved TIP AMATS will share these comments with the project managers.	No action needed.	Concur
N54	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Arctic Blvd Bike Lane - not in the TIP	• Extending Arctic Boulevard bike lanes further south, including completing bike lanes through intersections where they are currently discontinuous.	This project was not included in the original nominations for inclusion in the TIP and thus wasn't scored or ranked using the AMATS TIP criteria and have not gone through the AMATS public involvement process.	No action needed.	Concur
N55	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018		• Installing continuous bicycle facilities that cross Seward Highway at Lore/76th, 36th Avenue, and Dowling Road.	This project was not included in the original nominations for inclusion in the TIP and thus wasn't scored or ranked using the AMATS TIP criteria and have not gone through the AMATS public involvement process.	No action needed.	Concur
9	Peter Mjos	8/15/2018	UMED	Aside from the fact that DOWL and contractors wish to revisit the U-MED Road, the facts against it are unchanged and speak volumes why this project must be jettisoned once and for ever. Particularly with the improved Providence Drive the need for this access is eliminated. As a daily user I can attest that with the exception of one hour morning and evening rush hour there is no congestion, none whatsoever. And during rush hour the wait to traverse the Northern Lights and Providence Drive intersection is a delay of one to three lights maximum. This is nothing in the real world. And even this would not be an issue if the U-MED complex would coordinate flex work and study scheduling. Should AMATS not lead in addressing this solution? The other much more serious issue is that of the overwhelming impact on Bragaw and the Bragaw-Northern Lights intersection-massive traffic tangles, dangerous air quality impacting three schools and dense neighborhoods, and serious traffic disruption, businesses impacted, and pedestrian endangerment. That scenario is simply unacceptable. As before, No U-MED road.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
10	Neil Waggoner	8/16/2018	UMED	I am writing to request that you please remove the UMED northern access road from the Municipal Transportation Plan (MTP) and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). I live in UMED and frequently use the area of the proposed road extension for recreational purposes. Please do not allow public funds to be wasted on this unneeded project that will detrimentally effect the area.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
11	Sharon Lee	8/16/2018	UMED	I do NOT want the U-MED Road. As you know, all community councils surrounding the U-Med area have signed resolutions stating the community's opposition to act new access road into the U-Med District. A total of 10 Community Councils have formally opposed a new access road to the U-Med district. The public's response to a survey regarding U-Med congestion overwhelmingly favors improved public transportation, rather than a new road. The public, including residents beyond the U-Med district continues to be against building the road for many reasons. Please take any road into the U-Med District OUT of your transportation plan.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
14	Sharon Stockard	8/16/2018	UMED	<p>I have lived in Airport Heights for nearly 30 years, and for most of that time, I have been fighting to keep the Bragaw Extension from punching through my neighborhood. This project has been consistently opposed by my neighborhood and 10 community councils, including all that border the U-Med district.</p> <p>Additionally, the public in Anchorage came out overwhelmingly against the project when the 2040 MTP project team conducted a public survey. People (including me) prefer an increase in public transit in the U-Med district instead of building a new road that will disrupt the neighborhood, increase traffic congestion and reduce safety for pedestrians and bicyclists.</p> <p>The project design team in 2015 estimated that the four-lane Bragaw Extension would increase traffic on Bragaw Street north of the U-Med district by nearly 50 percent (without completion of both the Highway to Highway and the Lake Otis to Glenn extension). They estimated that construction of the road would also increase wait times at Bragaw/Northern Lights and Elmore/Tudor intersections.</p> <p>Increasing traffic on Bragaw Road, north of U-Med, which is the heart of my neighborhood, would create safety hazards at three school zones where children walk to school: Russian Jack Elementary, East High School and the Anchorage Native Charter School.</p> <p>Additionally, there is no right of way available along Road. The road would require condemning private property -- homes and small business -- for a road we do not want. The city would also suffer a loss of \$50 million in property tax values.</p> <p>This road would also create safety hazards for students going to UAA and APU, and students walking between the two campuses. The two universities share a library, and students frequently travel between them on foot. My son attends APU, and this concerns me in a personal way.</p> <p>No safety provisions -- such as roundabouts, traffic calming, overpasses, etc. -- seem to have been considered or priced for this project. Anchorage already has a tragic number of pedestrian and bicyclist deaths and injuries from cars every year; safety paramount should be paramount in any discussion of this road.</p> <p>This road remains in the Municipal Transportation Plan (MTP), with a request for more money and federal funding. The Bragaw Extension/U-Med road should not be on this list. During the public process in 2015 for the interim MTP, AMATS was asked to reduce priority for this road. Now AMATS is requesting full funding for this road without address the public's concerns.</p> <p>This road is unpopular and controversial, it provides no traffic benefits, is too costly, is destructive to established neighborhoods, poses numerous safety risks to schoolchildren, pedestrians and bicyclists, would take private property through eminent domain with a big cost to city property tax revenue, and is in conflict with community values. It would disrupt an area rich in desirable wildlife, and destroy valuable habitat and wetlands. Residents place a high value on these amenities and will continue to fight for them.</p> <p>The opposition to this road was so great that before an appeal of a flawed Planning and Zoning decision was heard in 2016, the Alaska Department of Transportation withdrew its support and shut the project down.</p> <p>I urge you to also shut it down and remove it from the TIP and from the MTP.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
16	Helen & Gayle Nienhueser	8/16/2018	UMED	<p>We are writing to ask you to delete the UMed north access road (project 125) from the TIP. As was demonstrated a few years ago, this is an extremely unpopular road project that is not needed and will cause a raft of problems. There is already very good access to the UMed district from Tudor, Boniface, Elmore, Providence Drive, and UAA Drive. Only residents of Eagle river and a small part of the northeastern section of the Anchorage bowl would find their travel time reduced and that would not be significant. Where is the pressure coming from to build this road? I suspect from UAA and possibly APU administrations. Why do they think they need this north access? Is it because they want to develop the wetlands for commercial uses and they want a road built with public money to make that feasible? In an era of fiscal austerity, when we cannot adequately fund our schools and police, this would be an irresponsible use of public money. It would also destroy a fine ski trail system where world class athletes now train. The wetlands that would be destroyed are so valuable that they are now posted against people walking there.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
17	Helen & Gayle Nienhueser	8/16/2018	UMED	<p>We also ask that you delete project 111, the expansion of Northern Lights from Lake Otis to Bragaw. This is a sister project to the UMed access. Currently it is not congested except perhaps sometimes briefly at rush hour. If you build the UMed project traffic demand on this stretch will increase because traffic that now uses Providence Drive will use Northern Lights. But if you delete the UMed project this project is also unnecessary. The relatively recent improvements at the intersection of UAA Drive with Northern Lights have improved travel flow immensely. The closure of the pedestrian crossing on UAA Drive has also helped a great deal. Unless and until the Legislature figures out a sustainable, dependable income stream we are losing population, not growing it, and we don't need this road widened. The noise level in the Anchor Park neighborhood is already very disturbing. Bringing in further traffic and noise would negatively affect this neighborhood and is simply unnecessary.</p>	Project 111 is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
18	Clyde Vicary	8/16/2018	UMED	<p>Please do not allow the U-Med road to go through. Anchorage needs the existing wetlands and continuous forested lands to remain intact so Anchorage will remain viable and be a vital city of the future as a forward thinking community that will thrive from cherishing its natural spaces. I am a year round user of that area and have been so for 30 years and would be heart broken if this road finally goes through. Please don't do it, no good will come of it in the long run. I beg you, the snowshoe hares beg you, the moose beg you, the birds beg you, please take the U-Med Road Project off this list.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
20	Dianne Holmes	8/17/2018	UMED	<p>The draft TIP 2019-2022 includes: RDY00010, North Access to U-Med. This project should be removed from the TIP: 1) The AK Legislature passed a bill removing the funds for this project. 2) The Anchorage mayor also requested this project be removed. 3) In the past, dozens of residents and organizations have requested that this project be deleted from projects list. 4) This road would do nothing but add more traffic to a residential street. 5) This road would not connect to a major highway or collector that would enhance traffic flow. 6) The projected route would go through wetlands. 7) The road would disrupt the U-Med's internal network of roads that also provide for safe walking and biking paths. This project has been rejected by the Legislature and the public and should not be on the TIP list again. Please honor the public's wishes.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
21	Becky Bitzer	8/17/2018	UMED	<p>To whom it may concern, As a resident of the Airport Heights neighborhood, I wish to voice support for the removal of funding for the U-Med Northern Access road project from the TIP. Although Mayor Berkowitz stopped the U-Med Northern Access/Bragaw Road Extension project and our legislators passed a bill in Juneau which Governor Walker signed, that clawed back the money for the road, funding for the project is still included in the TIP with a request for more money and federal funding. The community, myself included, does not want this road. Ten community councils have signed on stating they are opposed to the road.</p> <p>In addition to a lack of community support, it is well documented that the road extension will create more traffic problems than it solves. Traffic congestion on Bragaw will present safety hazards to three schools along Bragaw Road (the Alaska Native Charter School, Russian Jack Elementary, and East High School) as well as safety hazards for APU and UAA students attempting to access the shared library on UAA's campus. It is estimated that traffic wait times at Bragaw and Northern Lights would increase if development moves forward.</p> <p>Finally, the construction of this road would disrupt wildlife habitat and intersect at non-motorized corridor that currently Connects, Nunaka Valley, Russian Jack, and Wesleyan with downtown Anchorage and Kincaid. As a bicycle commuter and recreational cyclist, our city's bike trails are invaluable both for their health and recreational benefits, as well as safety, keeping cyclists and drivers separated as much as possible.</p> <p>Please REMOVE funding for the U-Med Northern Access/Bragaw Road Extension project from TIP.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
22	Clark Yerrington	8/18/2018	UMED	<p>Considering the entirety of the two project lists, Roads and Non-Motorized, it's clear that priority continues to be given to private vehicles [overwhelmingly single occupant] over any other modes. Partly this is a symptom of a bad development pattern that has resulted in way too much surface parking, no residential in close proximity to commercial centers and is a generally unproductive use of land [doesn't provide reasonable function or tax revenue; land use is primarily retail, hotel/restaurant, office, industrial uses not particularly robust at this time or projected to be in the future]. The transit system is especially stripped down now, more than at any point in its 35 year history, with little incentive for improvements as long as we keep building and widening roads.</p> <p>As long as we're still clinging to our cars and trucks as the primary mode, we could begin to do so in a way that's not so destructive to our future. Anchorage would be a perfect place for EVs to flourish [as is happening in Norway on the same latitude] since its relatively compact with almost all work commutes under 10 miles one way. In a couple more incremental annual upgrades, range will be extended so a Mat-Su to Anchorage commute is doable. A popular EV in the other 49 states, the Nissan Leaf is not sold by the sole local Nissan dealer and they have no plans to add it to their offerings. One can purchase this car [that is typically acquired on a two- or four-year lease with an option to buy at lease conclusion] from a dealer in the Seattle area, 2,700 miles away and pay \$1,500 to have it shipped to Anchorage. Given this situation, there should be state subsidies available to pay the shipping cost and pay for [or support, in consideration of income of the applicant] acquisition and installation of fast home charging systems. And there should be a publicly funded initiative to add fast charging stations with multiple hookups along the road system north and south every 75 to 100 miles. This would be a far better expenditure of public funds than half or more of the projects on the Roads list; or continuing to subsidize the fossil fuel industry that is still needed but not to the extent we are now using it. If we do not get off fossil fuels significantly in the next few years there will be an environmental apocalypse that will quickly become our primary focus and eclipse all other concerns. Am I exaggerating? Wait and see.</p> <p>The road project, MTP125 North Access to University-Medical District, aka Bragaw Extension should be removed from the list. There is no legitimate public purpose. Access from NE Anchorage is currently via Muldoon Rd. to Tudor Rd.; Boniface Pkwy.; Lake Otis Blvd.; and UAA Drive between Northern Lights Blvd. and Providence Dr. The engineering study notes that travel time reduction on average would be two minutes. The project would be similar to the portion of Elmore Rd. between Providence Dr. and Tudor Rd., with mostly one lane in each direction, roundabouts and full pedestrian and bike routes alongside the new road both sides. The drawback is that the new road would bisect an intact large parcel of undeveloped land that includes wetlands and wildlife habitat [and unimproved trails] -- the last remaining contiguous parcel of this size in the area. If the road is put through, in another ten years there will be a series of low-rise medical and/or university buildings, lots of surface parking and/or a small parking structure or two, similar to the existing UAA campus and/or the existing Native Hospital campus adjacent. If both UAA and ANH had developed taller buildings and parking structures previously, there would not be any pressure to conquer adjacent raw land to expand. The same as in the larger Municipality, we reward public entities who refuse to make difficult decisions or engage in visionary long term planning by making it easy to expand our current unproductive land use pattern. MTP125, more than the others is a vivid demonstration of this. We had the good sense in the last four years to cancel KABATA and the Highway to Highway project and this one should be canceled too.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
23	Judith Anderegg	8/18/2018	UMED	<p>I am opposed to any funding for the U-Med Northern Access Road otherwise known as Bragaw Extension. Governor Walker, Mayor Begich, and my legislative delegation have all opposed this project and have at various times cut the funding for this project over the years. There are better and more necessary road improvements and construction efforts than this one to be funded.</p> <p>Please remove this project from the Transportation Improvement Program for the Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
24	Diana Redwood	8/18/2018	UMED	<p>I would like to submit my public comment that I am strongly against constructing the Elmore-Bragaw extension. This proposed extension will not reduce commute times, or increase hospital or university access, but will decimate ski trails, hiking trails, and other pedestrian modes of travel in the area. As I submitted in my comments several years ago during the public comment process, I urge you remove this proposed road from any further plans going forward. As someone who lives and works in the area, I think we should work to reduce road congestion by increasing pedestrian and bicycle planning, not by building more roads. Thank you for your time and attention.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
25	John Beebee	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>I considered this proposed road extending Bragaw from East High School south to Elmore road. I first heard about the proposal 45 years ago, when I taught at Alaska Methodist University. Although I think it would facilitate the movement of vehicles it would compromise tranquility on the two University campuses, replacing it with road traffic. The road would also interfere with the drainage from Russian Jack Springs. I think NO, the Bragaw extension isn't a good idea.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

## AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
26	Quinn Berry	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>I have lived in Airport Heights my entire life, and the Bragaw Extension/U-Med road has been a constant topic of conversation. I don't understand why AMATS feels it's necessary to punch a road through a forest in order for drivers to save two minutes of time. And studies show they won't save time, but in fact add to drive time through increased traffic congestion. The proposed extension would be barely over half a mile long and would inexplicably cost millions. Except it's not inexplicable. The cost would go toward clearing out the forest that's in the way. Homes and small businesses would also be in the way, and they would be condemned. This would be foolish.</p> <p>The road that currently goes from the U-Med District to Bragaw functions perfectly fine and handles traffic and safety issues well. And there are also alternate routes for motorists to travel through the area. Pedestrian and bicycle safety, and the wishes of the surrounding communities should be considered before any road is punched through.</p> <p>Residents in this area have been opposing this project for decades, and it would make sense that residents get to decide what happens in their neighborhood, wouldn't it? I'm also a student at APU, and the roads in that area are busy enough as is. Adding a major thoroughfare is not only costly but dangerous. Many pedestrian and bike trails crisscross the area, and APU and UAA students would have to cross the proposed extension just to use the university library. The safety risks are too great, along with the extensive neighborhood opposition.</p> <p>I urge you to remove funding for this project from the Transportation Improvement Program, and eventually remove this unwanted project from the Municipal Transportation Plan.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
28	Steve Carwile	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>The U-Med Northern Access / Bragaw Road Extension project is a waste of money and an abuse of the public process for the reasons listed in the comments submitted by the Citizens for Responsible Development U-Med. In addition, many if not most of those supporting this proposed road have decided to live outside of the UMED area (Eagle River to Mat-Su, etc.) so that they can purchase a bigger lot and house than they could buy (with the same money) near where they work. This desire for additional open space where they live should not come at the expense of what open space remains for those living near UMed. This desire to have more open space at home and remove someone else's open space to support that desire is very selfish and unseemly. The projected saving of 20-40 seconds in time for someone commuting from an outlying area is tiny when compared with the total commute time, and the expenses of 1) building to the present (substandard) design, 2) making connected action improvements to Bragaw and eventually to the U-Med proposal itself, and making safer the resultant East High vehicle-pedestrian mix. These expenses could be funneled to making the Glenn Highway (commute) safer or connecting the Glenn to the Seward in a different way.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
29	Pauline Hessing	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>There is a long chain of hearings/meetings etc. documenting why this extension is a terrible idea. I can reiterate them, but until this project is dead, DEAD, what is the use? It already seems as though those of us opposed to this new road are not being heard (that is different than being listened to, in my opinion.).</p> <p>PLEASE for once and for all, take this ill-conceived project off the books. Most of us in adjoining neighborhoods do NOT want our green belt carved into smaller pieces. As a wildlife biologist, I can't imagine mitigating for the wetlands that would need filling. I walk / ski/bike in this area almost daily and it is why I decided to retire in this neighborhood. There are clearly safety issues, rights of way, and aesthetic reasons that cannot be resolved. Even our mayor has taken it off the books. PLEASE listen to those who would be most affected--we who live here--and get this monster off your master plan for once and for all.</p> <p>In the 13 years I have lived in my house, I have noticed an increase in traffic, noise and, yes, crime, even without this extension. I cannot imagine that yet another road will ameliorate any of these issues.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
30	Thomas Wilson	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>I, Thomas R, Wilson am submitting my comments on this proposal to destroy one of Anchorage's most important Greenswards. This project has been stopped before due to public concerns, the harm it will do, and its redundancy as it serves no useful public purpose.</p> <p>U-MED PUNCHTHRU</p> <p>My comments in opposition to the U-Med Road Project come in several perspectives, they will include:</p> <p>The origins of the By-Pass idea and its application in Anchorage.</p> <p>Feeding pass thru traffic into the zone of Universities &amp; Hospitals.</p> <p>The ease and incredible convince of automotive transportation versus "time saved".</p> <p>The commercial Real estate development plans of Alaska Pacific University.</p> <p>The vendetta of some "developer" promoters.</p> <p>Finally, what Anchorage, Alaska &amp; future generations will pay for the loss of this green space and its trails.</p> <p>The East Side By-Pass is complete.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
31	Sheila Toomey	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>This extension is such a bad idea it's difficult to imagine who exactly is in favor of it -- with the exception of traffic engineers who tend not to recognize the existence of human beings or neighborhoods. And the new owners of APU, with their real estate dreams.</p> <p>You plan to punch this road through to a designated mental health land use area, a neighborhood filled with schools, learning centers for the disabled, non-profit service organizations including Catholic Social Services and an outreach center for problem pregnancies, an ESL school for recent immigrants, the Anchorage Cooperative Extension headquarters, and -- only slightly further afield, an old trailer park and a hospital for mentally ill teens. Do you have a logarithm to predict the body count?</p> <p>Seriously, have you all lost your minds?</p> <p>You claim to have a problem with traffic in the U-med area -- I drive there all the time to both Providence and UAA -- and to cut through to Tudor -- and have no problem. It is not necessary to the future of civilization that all cars get to whiz through every neighborhood all the time. Please find another way to solve your problem -- real or imagined.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
32	Robin Beebee	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>Please remove the U-Med Northern Access Road from the TIP list. There are many reasons this road is deeply unpopular in the community:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is a HIGHWAY through a quiet campus and primary and secondary school zones: Punching Elmore through will turn Elmore/Bragaw into one of the longest uninterrupted roads in Anchorage, extending from Abbot to the Glenn Highway. As such, it will attract a large volume of cut-through traffic. This was estimated by project engineers in 2015 to increase the current traffic volume on Bragaw St. by 50%. Bragaw St. is already congested at peak time. It was not designed to take this traffic. The ONLY way engineers were able to show any time-savings from this road was by assuming both Highway to Highway and Lake Otis to Glenn extensions were built FIRST. Then WHY is this road on the list before H2H and Lake Otis to Glenn?</li> <li>2. It cuts through a popular non-motorized route. Both the north end of the road and south end of the road are maintained, high-volume bike commuter corridors. The south end is part of the longest continuously car-free commuter and recreation routes in town, linking Nunaka Valley, Russian Jack, and the Campbell Creek Trail with Midtown,</li> </ol>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
				<p>Downtown, and the Coastal Trail. The project team has told us over and over that they will provide overpasses and round-a-bouts, and in the end proposed just a straight road with not a single nod to maintaining trail connectivity or pedestrian and bike safety. There is no reason to believe this time will be different. Adding a congested, high-traffic intersection to a previously safe car-free trail will greatly increase the chances of collisions and hazards for cyclists. In fact, an APU trustee testified that without an overpass, APU risked losing its accreditation. That should tell you how dangerous this road is.</p> <p>3. It slashes one of the few remaining wetlands in the Chester Creek watershed. Flooding problems in Chester Creek are directly related to the loss of wetlands and increase in road drainage networks in the watershed. It is not by a small factor. The USGS estimated in 1986 that flood runoff had already doubled (that is the flood flow in Chester Creek for a given amount of rain). It appeared in 2012 that is has doubled again, based on the fact that we had our flood of record with half the rain of a similar event in 1987. The remaining green spaces and wetlands are the absolute cheapest flood mitigation this town can find.</p> <p>4. None of the neighbors want it. A transportation plan should address the needs of the community, not just the desires of a few powerful institutions who have land needs. I believe every surrounding community council voted to oppose the road. The most recent surveys reported on the AMATS site show that most of Anchorage agrees with me that we would rather see money spent on transportation solutions that are NOT new roads.</p> <p>I personally spend a lot of time enjoying the Mahaffey ski trails this road would obliterate as well as the commuter routes on the north and south ends of the proposed road corridor. I work on campus, and although there are times when it would save time to drive straight through, I am well aware of the current benefits and uses of the land. This road is in the wrong place at the wrong time. Once built, there will be no going back. I believe this town would need to wrestle with cyclist collisions at the intersections, with hazards in school zones at East High and Russian Jack, and with unmanageable congestion on North Bragaw Street for the foreseeable future. Fix the real problems first, don't create new ones.</p>			
33	Tom Lahey	8/19/2018	UMED	As a resident of a nearby area – Airport Heights- I have opposed the Northern Extension Road through the Russian Jack Greenbelt area and the U Med area. There are no good arguments for it. We would be losing a much used green space and it would create hazards by East High and what would be left or the green space used for ski and walking trails.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
34	Gordon Jones	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>I am writing in opposition to the UMED road extension of Elmore/Bragaw road, which is in the Municipal Transportation Plan. Many Anchorage community councils have voiced repeated opposition to this road extension. The road is unneeded. The road will increase traffic into the UMED district which is already crowded. The road will affect wetlands in the area including negatively affecting Mosquito Lake.</p> <p>Please remove the UMED road extension of Elmore/Bragaw so this proposed road does not get future funding.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
35	Jennifer Hall Jones	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>Please remove this road option (MTP 125 - North Access to U-Med) from the TIP for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is almost unanimous opposition to this project among communities in and adjacent to the proposed road (10 community councils as well as many public meetings conducted over a years time).</li> <li>• Increased hazards to schools and college campuses</li> <li>• More traffic congestion on Bragaw St., an already busy street</li> <li>• Loss of recreation and commuter trails/paths</li> <li>• The public prefers increasing public transit options to help relieve congestion in this district instead of a new road</li> <li>• Budget realities do not account for wildlife preservation (a fundamental part of how we identify with this city)</li> <li>• Maintenance of this road is likely to land in taxpayers laps</li> <li>• Paving is short-sighted given what we know about how climate change increases the value this watershed in reducing flooding in the area</li> <li>• The incomplete public process regarding the impacts of this road will make this project even more expensive.</li> </ul>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
36	Robin Bronen	8/19/2018	UMED	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to the inclusion of the UMed Access Road in the draft Transportation Improvement Plan. I am stunned to learn that this project is included in the TIP after Mayor Berkowitz cancelled the project due, in part, to the strong community opposition to the Project. I am deeply concerned that my voice, along with the ten Anchorage Community Council resolutions objecting to the UMed Access Project, are being ignored. In addition, a 2040 MTP survey asked the public's opinion on the solution for U-Med congestion. Between the options of promoting public transit and building the U-Med Road, the respondents overwhelmingly favored the public transit solution, with 225 respondents favoring public transit and only 68 favoring a new road.</p> <p>In addition, as a fiscal conservative there is absolutely no justification for spending \$37 million dollars of public money to build a road that is less than one mile long and does not address the alleged reason to build the road - stop traffic congestion. The project design team in 2015, estimated that the four-lane U-MED road would save on average, 20 seconds of travel time during peak traffic, but only AFTER both Highway to Highway and the Lake Otis to Glenn extension are built and functional. Without those two projects, the project engineers estimated that traffic on Bragaw St. north of the U-Med District would increase by nearly 50%, and that wait times at the intersections of Bragaw and Northern Lights, and Elmore and Tudor would also increase. With all of the funding desperately needed to address the opioid epidemic drastically affecting Anchorage, there is absolutely no justification to spend 37 million dollars on a road that has no benefit - a 20 seconds benefit is an oxymoron - to the people living in Anchorage.</p> <p>With the Municipality finally taking strong steps to address the climate crisis, which requires reducing greenhouse emissions, the construction of this road, with so little benefit to alleviating traffic, is a slap in the face to these efforts.</p> <p>Remove the UMed Access road from the draft TIP.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
37	Alice Knapp	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I'm a lifelong Anchorage resident who has lived in East Anchorage for 33 years. I am vehemently opposed to the proposed Bragaw/Elmore extension for a bunch of reasons.</p> <p>First- this road is not needed! I have commuted to and from work through the Bragaw/N.L.'s intersection for over 30 years and rarely is there any significant wait. Adding more traffic by creating a road through the Umed district will add not decrease traffic at this intersection plus become a major safety issue for East High and Russian Jack Elementary. Providence argues that this is a safety need for emergency vehicles to access their facility...Emergency vehicles coming from the North can go to AK Regional in less time even with the proposed extension. So if time is critical they'll go there anyway. APU wants the Bragaw/Elmore to access their lands for future development. Even if the road is built it is unlikely they would be able to afford to build educational buildings...all the development they have done up to this point is having private entities build and lease building on their land...i.e. USGS, Spring Hill Suites, AK Spine Institute- It is not the Muni. of Anc or the State of AK responsibility to build roads for a private school.</p> <p>Second- to build this road up to the original proposed extension with bike trails, pedestrian access and roundabouts would require additional funding. The State of AK is in a budget crisis. Money should not be spent on projects like this when there are greater needs for example, funding schools, crime prevention, and/or homelessness. If a lesser road is built with the budgeted funds with no roundabouts, bike trail or overpasses then this extension becomes a pass through road. MLK blvd already provides that pass through from Elmore to Boniface- MLK was built with those amenities and is utilized. Its design can allow for additional traffic.</p> <p>Third-Green spaces are vital to the value of a community. Anchorage is better for its bike trails and parks. The Goose Lake, APU lands and Russian Jack Park provide a contiguous green space which is used not only by wildlife but also many recreational walkers, runners, skiers, and bikers. To bisect this green space with a major road would lose much of its appeal. Once a road is built you can never regain that space.</p> <p>It seems that every couple of years we have to fight this fight over keeping this road from happening. Over and over all the local community councils pass resolutions opposed to the building of this road. Please, please take this road off the TIP/MTP list.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
38	Karen Willmore	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I have a long personal history with the community through which the proposed road would go. When we moved to Anchorage in 1971, we lived in faculty housing on the AMU campus until AMU briefly closed. To us then, these acres of trees and bogs with all the trails were what living in Alaska was all about: there was Anchorage; there were also accessible undeveloped semi-wild spaces. As my spouse and I spent our professional lives as professors at ACC and then UAA, we lived through all the buildings and parking lots replacing the trees. If the proposed road is built, it will have a much greater negative impact on those who study and work at APU and UAA than all the previous development: just the increased noise and safety issues of so many cars is sad to contemplate. People don't move to and stay in Anchorage because of more roads that inevitably bring more traffic; it's the amenities like trails and green spaces that appeal to people and not the 20 seconds they might, eventually save in their commute time.</p> <p>I fail to see the benefit of this proposed road. What does it actually accomplish? What keeps it from becoming one more congested street? And shouldn't the wishes of the surrounding neighborhoods be taken into account? The neighbors will have to live with all the negative consequences of a new road; people who work at the involved institutions leave after their work day. Presumably the hospital and universities have economic reasons for wanting the road. Will those be allowed again/still to outweigh people's right to keep their neighborhoods intact and livable? Money vs. quality of life—all over again.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
40	Barbara Carlson - Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I write on behalf of Friends of the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge (FAR) with comments and in support of the proposed improvements to Potter Marsh. Several FAR Board members and volunteers were part of the 2014 scoping project and discussion about how to address further needs at this popular and valuable access to the Anchorage Coastal Wildlife Refuge while honoring the Potter Marsh Master Interpretive Plans (2007) of which we were also a part. 1. FAR supports development of a destination at the current terminus of the boardwalk with viewing, interpretive and seating opportunities. The 80' boardwalk will bring visitors closer to a shallow water pond for viewing of shore birds and further away from highway noise. The platform if low will minimize road noise and bring people nearer marsh level for intimate viewing but be at least 10' back from the pond to respect the space wildlife needs and provide a buffer. It should be 350 square feet and accommodate no more than 15-20 people. If the platform is raised it could also provide views out towards Cook Inlet, but would be noisier. 2. FAR supports light infrastructure collaborative multi-agency planning including improved parking and access to the marsh, signage and benches and a short boardwalk through the trees with a small viewing platform with interpretation as recommended in the Master Interpretive Plan. Since wildlife is generally better at other spots at Potter Marsh this location would cater to winter recreation and the occasional visitor. 3. FAR understands that DOT is not comfortable with the plan to upgrade the larger highway pullout where visitors stop to observe the tern-nesting colony. If a way can be found to accommodate those plans, it might be better. The scoping group was concerned that people will stop there regardless, so it would seem wise to provide a safe place to stop.</p>	The nominated project was reviewed by DOT&PF who expressed concern about the pullout improvements included in the nomination. DOT&PF will not support those improvements and as such they were not included in the project description when added to the TIP.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
41	Mei Mei Evans	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>Please find attached my (continuing) objections to continued funding for the U-Med Northern Access road. The Community does not want the U-Med Road</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
42	Sen Berta Gardner, Sen Tom Begich, Rep Andy Josephson	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>The Northern Access/Bragaw Road Extension Project has recently been added to the Draft AMATS TIP schedule. For many reasons with which you are already familiar, we urge you to oppose this project. Additional Comments Attached.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
43	Wayne Hall	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I thought the U-Med Northern Access / Bragaw Road Extension project had been abandoned. Now I see a "back door" approach is being used to implement the project. The project is a bad idea that will fragment and destroy undeveloped land. It will cost too much and will only temporarily displace traffic while encouraging even more traffic in the long run. Implementing mass transit in some fashion is the only solution other than doing nothing and letting traffic congestion increase to the point where motorists are forced to pursue other routes and/or options (like mass transit). I am opposed to any further pursuit or funding of the U-Med Northern Access / Bragaw Road Extension project.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
44	Claude Funnston	8/20/2018	UMED	It flabbergasts me that in spite of the overwhelming public opposition to the U-Med Road and despite all of the solidly-grounded arguments against it, the U-Med Road is back on the table. The scoundrels are at it again trying to make an end-run this time by attempting to get federal funding for it. I cannot see where your site states who the sponsor(s) is nor is there any discussion as to why this issue is being revisited. Furthermore, my overall criticism of the TIPS is that the Muni's approach to transportation congestion issues continues to be more pavement which is ultimately a failed strategy.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
46	David Pelto	8/20/2018	UMED	U-Med Northern Access - This project has already been roundly rejected by the community. It is an insult to the public that someone is once again pushing a road through the university.  For the second time... WE DO NOT WANT THE TRAFFIC OR THE NOISE THROUGH THE UNIVERSITY. Please bring any further planning or funding to a stop.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
48	David Evans	8/20/2018	UMED	2. Please remove project RDY00010 North Access to University Medical District from the draft TIP. It is ranked just 31st out of the 46 projects in the draft 2019-2022 ranking. Furthermore, ten community councils in Anchorage, including all of those surrounding the U-Med area, have passed resolutions opposed to the road and an overwhelming fraction of 2040 MTP survey respondents prefer non-road alternates to solve this (and other) traffic congestion in Anchorage. And, as argued in the attachment, the project should be ranked lower and moved to the illustrative category.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
49	Cherie Northon	8/20/2018	UMED	Regarding the U-Med Northern Access/Bragaw Extension project, It is sad to hear that this idea has reared its head again. It is a road that will destroy some of the Chester Creek greenbelt, fragment habitat and wildlife corridors, and destroy beneficial wetlands for a minimal savings of time. Studies suggest that detrimental effects far outweigh the benefits and it is greatly opposed. It's time Anchorage looked to some other alternatives to reduce traffic, e.g. increased public transit.  Let's not make Anchorage another Los Angeles.  Please remove this item from the TIP.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
50	Marty Freeman	8/20/2018	UMED	Please remove the U-Med Northern Access/Bragaw Extension project from the TIP plan and funding requests.  This project is broadly opposed, as shown by having 10 community councils speak against it. We are grateful that Mayor Berkowitz, our legislators, and Governor Walker worked to shut down this project the last time it arose. It would be a shame if the municipality ignored all these efforts and bulldozed this project through.  The direct costs of this project – economically, environmentally, and socially – will only continue to grow as the value of intact university grounds and open space increase. The opportunity costs of not using this money for other more beneficial projects are also growing as state funding for capital projects shrinks. Cor  As a senior citizen, I am also increasingly aware of the need to prioritize public transportation over new road projects. We need to find ways that everyone has access to Anchorage facilities, not just drivers. Emphasizing public transportation will also put Anchorage in a leadership position for reducing carbon emissions and slowing climate change.  Dropping this project was the right thing to do last year, and that is only clearer now. Just say no.  Thank for listening to the public and respecting community organizations.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
53	Mark Butler	8/20/2018	UMED	<b>RDY00010 - North Access to University Medical District</b> - This should be removed from the TIP. Take the monies from this item and move it to RDY00013 Pavement Replacement Program as the roads and streets of Anchorage are in horrible shape and need many, many years of resurfacing and other improvements.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
59	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	UMED	North Access to University Medical District Delete this project. The community, both local and citywide, have opposed this project as a high-volume traffic corridor that will split and diminish the University and medical campuses as well as adversely impact adjoining neighborhoods and schools. It is not an "access" project: it is a throughway.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
64	Sally Gibert/ Dick Mylius	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>Please remove the U-Med Northern Access Road/Bragaw Road Extension project, and all of its funding, from the State's Transportation Improvement Program and the Anchorage Municipal Transportation Plan.</p> <p>We live in the Airport Heights neighborhood and know the area and the issues well. We have followed this ill-conceived project in its various forms for many years. Connecting the Northern Access Road to Northern lights Blvd will not improve congestion. As proposed the road will create congestion at the expense of the many values that are important to those who live, work and recreate in the area.</p> <p>Design alternatives to mitigate the substantial impacts on habitat, trails, pedestrian access, East High School access, and the bisection of the U-Med campus are continually ignored or underfunded. The single-minded effort to punch through a road without fully recognizing and addressing the long-term impacts is not defensible. The project should be removed from all local and statewide planning initiatives. Thank you for your consideration of these comments</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
65	Cheryl Chapman	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>U-Med Northern Access - . Anchorage has lost more than 12,000 residents since the last oil-boom year of 2014 (304,000 in 2014 vs. a projected 291,826 in 2018);</p> <p>2. The area's fastest-growing demographic is the over-60 population, which doesn't drive much to work;</p> <p>3. That the borough's population increases all are to the north, in the Mat-Su:</p> <p>Why is this Bragaw boondoggle still in play?</p> <p>It will not serve Anchorage residents in any way; it will endanger children at three schools; it will split the UAA and APU campuses, putting students walking between them every day at risk; infrastructure to handle its next-step traffic at both ends doesn't exist; there's not enough money to build it with necessary safety features like speed-slowing roundabouts or busy cross-street overpasses; developers would have to seize land along Bragaw under eminent domain where there's no right-of-way (what about the merchants? Tax dollars?); every single community council adjacent to this project has fought it, with good reason, since its proposal; wetlands that prevent neighborhood flooding would be lost as would signature city greenspace -- and for what?</p> <p>So developers can once again fill their pockets, then leave their mess behind? So APU's new owners can cash out their acreage?</p> <p>And why and at whose behest was this project's resurrection handled with little to no public notification?</p> <p>Those with money to spend on roadways should turn their attention instead to the Glenn and its ever-increasing traffic instead of wasting it on this futility in these short-pocket times.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
70	Rep Geran Tarr	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>Additionally, I want to state my strong opposition to the proposed northern access road to the University Medical District - (Project RDY00010). The road is opposed by nine organized neighborhood associations, many State Legislators and Municipal leaders. It threatens existing pedestrian and bikeway connections and the world-class wildlife habitat and green space along Chester Creek and Campbell Creek. It also doesn't take into consideration improvements in transit to make the area more accessible. I would like to see this road removed from the Transportation Improvement Plan and from your Municipal Transportation Plan. It does not fit into the quality of life for present and future generations.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
71	Diana Evans, Citizens for Responsible Development	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>We request that TIP Need ID RDY00010 North Access to University Medical District be removed from the 2019-2022 TIP for the reasons below. A list of citations denoted by superscript numbers follow these comments as an attachment.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
72	Gail Dudley	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I'm writing to state that I'm opposed to the U-Med road extension. As polls showed before the majority of people were opposed to this and neighborhood community councils still oppose this. This extension will only cause more congestion in the area and won't improve traffic flow. The increase in cars will cause more safety concerns for all the walkers in the area...university students from both schools that walk about campuses, library and dorms; medical personnel who walk between facilities as do patient's families; and people in area that walk all about the area for exercise.</p> <p>Again, I state my strong opposition to this road.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
73	Barbara Karl	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I am requesting that any and all references to an extension of Bragaw Road into the U-Med District (Northern Access) be eliminated from the TIP before it is adopted and from the Interim MTP, both Short Term and Long Term. My community council (Airport Heights) adopted resolutions in opposition to this project as did I believe nine other community councils. In the past, the community has expressed its opposition to this road and has favored a public transit solution. Funding for this project has previously been eliminated and the project was withdrawn by the Department of Transportation two years ago.</p> <p>Such an extension would create traffic problems on Bragaw, particularly if it were built before the Highway to Highway project is developed and completed. There is no need for this project since traffic improvements have been completed on UAA Drive.</p> <p>The funds requested are not sufficient to build this project and the economy of the state is such that no state funds will become available. This project is a bad idea for a myriad of reasons that have been expressed in the past when it was first brought before the public. Please eliminate it from all further TIP and MTP documents.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
74	Paige Coatney	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I am concerned that the UMED plan is still seeking funding via the TIP. This program was canceled and funds reappropriated in 2017 via HB 57.</p> <p>UMED should not still be asking for money. Nor should it be asking for more money. There is something quite wrong for a road that is less than a mile long to cost \$37 million dollars. I looked into the UMED plan and supporting documents and found a number of things lacking. First of all, no TDM was conducted. There were several pages of Case Studies, but no actual TDM on the UMED. No construction is permitted without a TDM, so how the UMED plan was considered done and presented to the public with no TDM is quite alarming. Another aspect lacking is the Army Corps of Engineering's approval to develop in Class A and B wetlands in the Chester Creek Watershed.</p> <p>I am gravely concerned that the UMED designs plan to build in Class A and B wetlands. The following definitions come from the MOA website (<a href="https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/zoning/Pages/Wetlands.aspx">https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/zoning/Pages/Wetlands.aspx</a>)</p> <p>Wetlands are classified as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Class A (highest value)</li> <li>• Class B (moderate to high value)</li> <li>• Class C (lowest value)</li> </ul> <p>Class C wetlands may be developed according to an opinion of compliance from the Planning Department. Class A and B wetlands may only be developed with a permit from the Corps of Engineers.</p> <p>Based on MOA Watershed Management Services' own Mission Statement (<a href="http://anchoragewatershed.com">http://anchoragewatershed.com</a>)</p> <p>The mission of Watershed Management is to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintain the viability and integrity of our aquatic resources by protecting and preserving healthy watersheds.</li> <li>• Provide leadership and guidance in watershed management through sound technology and ecological engineering and planning.</li> <li>• Encourage sustainable growth, maximize safety, minimize flood damage, and conserve natural resources to ensure the best quality of life for current and future generations.</li> </ul> <p>Based on the UMED plan, I fail to see how WMS will meet their Mission Statement or the Chester Creek Watershed Plan.</p> <p>Though the hyperlink is no longer accessible through the WMS's website (<a href="http://anchoragewatershed.com/Documents/Chester%20Creek%20Watershed%20plan.pdf">http://anchoragewatershed.com/Documents/Chester%20Creek%20Watershed%20plan.pdf</a> result "Error 404: Page not found), I have a hard-copy of the Chester Creek Watershed Plan. The UMED plan cuts through the Chester Creek Watershed, specifically the following wetlands: A18, A18A, B18B, and C18. It abuts watershed C18A. These watershed listings are directly from the Anchorage Wetlands Atlas 2008 (<a href="http://anchoragewatershed.com/datalibrary.html">http://anchoragewatershed.com/datalibrary.html</a>) map and are within sections 22 and 33.</p> <p>I do not see how the UMED plan can be compliant with the Chester Creek Watershed Plan. Developing a road and expecting to build residential and business features will negatively impact water quality, water quantity, and wildlife habitat. Chester Creek Watershed Plan implementation would not even be tertiary if the UMED plan is adopted; preserving and/or utilizing wetlands for water quality improvement (1.1), reducing pollutants from entering the creek (1.9), and preserving the existing floodplain (2.1) would not happen. The UMED plan would increase the amount of impervious surface within the watershed, directly opposite of goal 2.6. All Wildlife Habitat goals (3.1-3.5), and Fish Habitat 4.3 would be ignored. Has a cost/benefit analysis of a healthy Chester Creek watershed been done (5.1)? Is it financially beneficial for the MOA to obtain eminent domain, dump enough material to stabilize over 60 feet of unstable peat, and maintain such road? Is it really worth the \$37 million for less than one mile of road through highly valuable wetlands? And in the end, the UMED project MIGHT shave a few SECONDS off a commute. Meanwhile, we would lose wetlands that provide water quality, reduce flooding, and provide safe movement for wildlife.</p> <p>I do not approve of the UMED plan. HB 57 defunded it. It's consideration should be removed from the TIP.</p>	<p>The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.</p>	<p>Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.</p>	<p>Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.</p>
77	Paul Stang - University Area Community Council	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>These are the University Area Community Council's Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) - UACC Comments on the U-Med Road Provided to AMATS 8-20-2018</p> <p>1. The UACC has long been and remains opposed to the Northern Extension of Elmore Road (aka U-Med Road). Funds for this road should be reissued to complete far more pressing, high priority roadwork needed within the U-MED area. See specific recommendation re use of these funds at the end of these comments. We understand that the U-MED Road (aka Northern Extension of Elmore Road) is still in the Municipal Transportation Plan and in the Transportation Improvement Plan. We want the U-Med Road permanently removed from the TIP and the MTP. Attached is a resolution to Governor Walker dated March 3, 2015, and testimony on the Interim 2035 Metropolitan Transportation Plan City Hall dated July 21, 2015, both of which express our strong opposition to the U-Med Road.</p> <p>2. After extensive public input on this road in 2014 and 2015, DOWL developed and publicized a plan to include features of the road the public demanded to make it at least minimally palatable. But that turns out to have been a perverse smoke screen -- the \$20 million won't be nearly enough to complete the road, let alone fund the pedestrian overpasses, adjacent walkways or access to existing trails that the public demands.</p> <p>3. Also, the MOA would be on the hook for all road maintenance and repair. And DOWL's own report says that the road will have to be rebuilt in 5-8 years due to settling because it would be built through wetlands.</p> <p>4. Public opposition to this road is well documented. Ten community councils in Anchorage, including all of those surrounding the U-Med District, have signed resolutions stating that they are opposed to the construction of a new northern access road into the U-Med District. There are numerous reasons, but the most basic is that the public does not believe there will be a benefit that offsets the increased hazards in school zones and college campuses, increased congestion on Bragaw St., and loss of popular non-motorized commuting and recreation corridors.</p> <p>5. The U-MED Road will create traffic problems instead of solving them, especially if it is built before Highway to Highway and Lake Otis to Glenn Extension.</p> <p>As specified in the U-Med District plan, a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study and implementation effort should be completed before building any road. The project design team in 2015, estimated that the four-lane U-MED road would save on average, 20 seconds of travel time during peak traffic, but only after both Highway to Highway and the Lake Otis to Glenn extension are built and functional. Without those two projects, the project engineers estimated that traffic on Bragaw St. north of the U-Med District would increase by nearly 50%, and that wait times at the intersections of Bragaw and Northern Lights, and Elmore and Tudor would also increase. Situations like this, attempting to start dependent projects prior to the implementation of primary projects, are the reason the AMATS scoring process requires that timing of need and logical sequence be considered when prioritizing projects.</p> <p>a) Traffic congestion along Bragaw, north of U-Med District, would create safety hazards at 3 pedestrian-heavy school zones including Russian Jack Elementary, East High School, and the Anchorage Native Charter School.</p> <p>b) There is no right-of-way (ROW) available along this stretch of Bragaw. Adding a lane would require eminent domain condemnation in established neighborhoods and a loss of over \$50 million per year in tax assessed property value.</p> <p>c) Traffic congestion would create a safety hazard to faculty and students who move between APU and UAA campuses to the shared library.</p> <p>d) Measures to reduce cut-through traffic and improve pedestrian safety, including roundabouts and overpasses, were previously eliminated because of budget constraints. It seems likely the project team will continue to consider these design elements superfluous and not include these measures.</p> <p>6. U-MED Road Should not be on the TIP or MTP.</p> <p>AMATS was asked during the public process for the 2015 Interim MTP to reduce priority of the U-Med Road to long-term or illustrative categories. AMATS deferred considering this change,</p>	<p>The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.</p>	<p>Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.</p>	<p>Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.</p>

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
				<p>citing time constraints, and promised to address public concerns later. AMATS has now requested full funding for this road in the TIP, before considering whether it should be on the short-term list and without addressing any of the public concerns. It is baffling that such an unpopular project yielding no traffic benefits should be thrust out ahead of the planning effort that was supposed to address its deficiencies.</p> <p>Long-term, large scale, reasonable planning efforts should not be thrown out the window because of pressure from a few institutions that would reap benefits. We have only one university campus in Anchorage. Connecting Elmore and Bragaw functionally puts a highway through the middle of it.</p> <p>7. The U-Med Road may not be adequately built with the requested amount of money, and who will pay the long-term bill for maintenance? As mentioned above, we believe that answer is the Muni and that implies those who pay Muni property taxes.</p> <p>The project team in 2015 claimed that they could not build a two-lane road with an overpass for the \$20 million they had. Can \$37 million be stretched to build a four-lane road and include mitigation for the safety hazards imposed by running a highway through a college campus and popular non-motorized commuting routes, let alone those features demanded by the public as mentioned above and discussed below? We all know that the answer is "no."</p> <p>a) Three overpasses presented in initial public meetings for the project were deleted when PZC considered the project's Design Study Report in 2015. Only when APU said it would lose its accreditation if students had to cross the road did PZC require restoring the overpass at the south end. The north end crosses the Chester Creek trail, which is currently a completely non-motorized corridor connecting Nunaka Valley, Russian Jack, and Wesleyan all the way to downtown Anchorage or Kincaid. Constructing a road and intersections to this corridor will put people at risk of grave harm as it introduces vehicles to a previously exclusive non-motorized area.</p> <p>b) Mitigation for wildlife, including overpasses or rock slope deterrents, were left out of the final project because of budget.</p> <p>c) Roundabouts to slow traffic and to discourage cut-through use were deleted because of budget.</p> <p>d) Maintenance of a four-lane road in a poorly drained wetland with pedestrian facilities will become the taxpayers' burden, as will costs of any projects to reduce congestion on Bragaw St.</p> <p>8. The Land has Other Important Value</p> <p>Flooding on Chester Creek has increased in recent years and regularly damages properties. The 60+ feet deep peat wetlands the road would displace are some of the few acres left in the Chester Creek watershed. These fill with water in the spring, summer, and fall and act as a critical buffer for flooding. Road drainage would eliminate the flood-buffering capacity of the wetlands and would likely impact the adjacent Class A (high value) Mosquito Lake.</p> <p>The natural areas within the wetlands provide habitat for moose, waterfowl, and forest-dwelling birds. Building a road through this wetland will remove ever-diminishing habitat and fragment wildlife movement, making movement more perilous, as stated in the Chester Creek Watershed Plan.</p> <p>Please immediately remove the U-Med Road from the MTPO and TIP.</p> <p>Instead, please re-issue the funds to complete the UACC's three top priority projects on the Muni's CIP list. They are more important and less expensive. See the UACC's CIP priority list at <a href="http://www.munibudget.org/Council/university-area">http://www.munibudget.org/Council/university-area</a></p>			
78	Carolyn Ramsey - Airport Heights Community Council	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I request that the funding for the UMed Northern Access Road, be removed from the TIP and the MTP.</p> <p>Public opposition to this project has been shown from multiple directions; Of 244 public comments submitted on this project 42% stated that they favored the no road at all option, when that was not even one of the given options by the project developers. Ten community councils from across Anchorage including every council surrounding the project area passed resolutions against this project. The 2040 MTP project survey asked the public's opinion for a transportation solution for the U-Med district. Out of 225 respondents only 68 or 30% favored a new road. The Page &amp; Turnbull October 28, 2013 letter to DOWL submitted as a public comment stating the "overwhelming" public opposition to this project (*See attached letter).</p> <p>The U-MED Road will CREATE traffic problems instead of solving them. The project design team in 2015, estimated that the four-lane U-MED road would save on average, 20 seconds of travel time during peak traffic, but only AFTER both Highway to Highway and the Lake Otis to Glenn extension are built and functional. Without those two projects, the project engineers estimated that traffic on Bragaw St. north of the U-Med District would increase by nearly 50%, and that wait times at the intersections of Bragaw and Northern Lights, and Elmore and Tudor would also increase. Situations like this, attempting to start dependent projects prior to the implementation of primary projects, are the reason the AMATS scoring process requires that timing of need and logical sequence be considered when prioritizing projects.</p> <p>a) Traffic congestion along Bragaw, north of U-Med District, would create safety hazards at 3 pedestrian-heavy school zones including Russian Jack Elementary, East High School, and the Anchorage Native Charter School.</p> <p>b) There is no right-of-way (ROW) available along this stretch of Bragaw. Adding a lane would require eminent domain condemnation in established neighborhoods and a loss of over \$50 million per year in tax assessed property value calculated at the 2014 tax rate.</p> <p>c) Traffic congestion would create a safety hazard to UAA/APU faculty and students who move around the campus.</p> <p>d) Measures to reduce cut-through traffic and improve pedestrian safety, including roundabouts and overpasses, were previously eliminated because of budget constraints. It seems likely the project team will continue to consider these design elements superfluous and not include these measures.</p> <p>AMATS was asked during the public process for the 2015 Interim MTP to reduce priority of the U-Med Road to long-term or illustrative categories. AMATS deferred considering this change, citing time constraints, and promised to address public concerns later. AMATS has now requested full funding for this road in the TIP, before considering whether it should be on the short-term list and without addressing any of the public concerns. It is baffling that such an unpopular project yielding no traffic benefits should be thrust out ahead of the planning effort that was supposed to address its deficiencies. As specified in the UMed district Plan page 49 #5 and by the Page &amp; Turnbull letter October 28, 2013 a UMED TDM should be funded and completed.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
79	Marilyn Houser	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>I am disturbed the U-Med Bragaw extension has appeared again, this time in the Transportation Improvement Plan.</p> <p>The community has loudly spoken against this project. Nothing has changed. It is still a bad idea.</p> <p>I do not want this road built. It will create a nightmare of congestion on the existing Bragaw Road and force widening a road that has no ROW between DeBarr and Northern Lights. That will be an extremely costly project.</p> <p>In addition, the wetlands that will be destroyed by the Bragaw extension will be at a cost to wildlife and the human residents of Anchorage. The wetlands are an important buffer to prevent flooding and protect Mosquito Lake.</p> <p>The U-Med Bragaw extension needs to be removed from the TIP.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
80	Dael Devenport	8/20/2018	UMED	<p>Please prioritize people instead of cars in the "Transportation Improvement Program" by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- adding bus service</li> <li>- ensuring that it's safe for children to cross streets on foot</li> <li>- preserving recreational lands and wildlife habitat in midtown</li> <li>- calming high speed traffic that divide downtown historic neighborhoods</li> <li>- improve Anchorage's walkability and livability, not drivability</li> </ul> <p>Anchorage continues to fall behind other cities in the nation that are shifting transportation spending to build stronger communities. Please do not build any new roads until the ones we currently have are properly maintained, especially during the winter. No Bragaw Extension through the U-Med district.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
81	Anne Wilkas	8/20/2018	UMED	I am a concerned citizen who lives in Rogers Park and am very much against the U-Med Road being pushed through at this juncture. As our community has already spoken, there is general agreement that the road is not only not necessary, but will do far more harm to wildlife, land, and people (such as congestion north of the U Med Road, such as Russian Jack, East High and Alaska Native Charter) than it will do for traffic. As well, there are already sufficient roads to handle current traffic. There are other non motorized options available that could be developed, such as bike lanes and pedestrian walkways/trails. In addition, TDM should be completed before any road is built. Other projects, such as the Lake Otis extension and the H2H should be reviewed and completed before this project goes forward, as it will make traffic worse, not better.  Please listen to the community, which has already spoken loudly and clearly their desire NOT to build the U-Med Road.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
82	Bob Butera	8/20/2018	UMED	An exception is MTP 125 - North Access to University-Medical District. Unclear, but is this the Bragaw extension under yet another name? I served on the steering committee for the U-med district Framework Master Plan in (adopted in 2003, and prepared under the supervision of Senior Planner Cathy Hammond) and it was very clear at that time that this road would be very disruptive to the area. Please delete this project from the list	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
90	Bob French	8/20/2018	UMED	I suggest that MTP 125, U-Med Northern Access and the companion project MTP 111 be deleted. The voters spoke pretty loudly on this in the past, and both projects scored relatively low.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
95	Christine Klein, Chief Lands Office UAA	9/12/2018	UMED	Our office would like to provide a letter of support for the roadway projects listed in the "Draft 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) Roadway Projects", in particular, MTP 125 - North Access to University-Medical District. The University of Alaska ("University") is the owner of the parcel directly affected by the North Access road project and supports its proposed development.  The University supports this project not only because it provides critical new access to our campus and undeveloped parcels on Northern Lights Boulevard, but also improves the overall access to the U-Med District. Improving access will relieve congestion and facilitate safer and better routes for pedestrians and emergency vehicles. This project will also potentially benefit the community by increasing access and development opportunities in the areas served by the North Access road.  Our mission is to engage in the responsible land and resource development of University of Alaska trust lands while maintaining our fiduciary responsibility. Proceeds from the trust fund benefit the UA Scholars Fund, natural resources related education and research, fund inflation proofing and the effective management and development of the University's land portfolio. The University looks forward to providing continuing support for this North Access road project.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N1	Vivian Mendenhall	10/1/2018	UMED	I often hike and ski on the trails in this greenbelt (both UAA and APU parts). This wide natural area of forest and marshes is quiet and beautiful, a real gift for calming one's mind. It's also an environmental gem-- few such large forests and bogs remain in Anchorage. Do not bisect it with noisy traffic.  Also, are the planners aware that almost the entire alignment is through a deep, permanent subarctic bog? The bog isn't just seasonal-- ground water flows into it all the time, from uplands on each side. In order to build this road, you must either surcharge the bog for years (with a drainage system), or put the road on a causeway. Either will be extremely expensive.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N2	Roald Helgesen, Chief Executive Office and Administrator Alaska Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium	10/2/2018	UMED	On behalf of the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium (ANTHC), I write in strong support of the Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMA TS) Policy Committee retaining the U-Med Northern Access Road project currently under consideration in the draft 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). This project will provide much needed access to the Alaska Native Medical Center (ANMC) and the Alaska Native Health Campus. ANMC is a Level II trauma center, responsible for treating many of the highest level emergency cases in Anchorage area. In a medical emergency, immediate access to care is critical and every additional second required to access care can change the course of an individual's future. Delays of mere minutes can mean the difference between life and death. This project would provide greatly improved access to emergency care at both ANMC and Providence Hospital, providing residents of Anchorage and the surrounding areas with a greater level of safety. The U-Med district is also one of Anchorage's most vibrant and fastest growing social and economic areas, providing educational, medical, and social services to Alaskans from across the state. One in nine jobs in the Anchorage area are located in the U-Med district and thousands of employees and students travel to and from the area on a daily basis.  The existing road system is inadequate, unsafe, and unsustainable for the level of traffic congestion to meet the needs of our expanding health and educational facilities. Those depending on timely access to emergency care, as well as the students and employees commuting to the area every day, are constrained by the limited existing access points and corridors. The U-Med Northern Access Road project is the only viable option to address the need to alleviate this strain. The project provides a commonsense solution to the current lack of access as well as accommodating future growth in the U-Med district.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

### AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N3	Jim Johnson, President UAA	10/1/2018	UMED	<p>I understand that the Anchorage Municipal Area Transportation System (AMATS) Policy Committee is accepting public comments on the road projects to be included in the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). This letter is intended to communicate the University of Alaska's continued support for the inclusion of the University-Medical District Northern Access project on the TIP Roadways Project list.</p> <p>Healthcare is a bright spot in Alaska's economy and the University-Medical (UMed) District is home to several of the sector's largest employers. Meeting the growing demand for healthcare professionals is one of the University of Alaska's (UA) highest strategic priorities and we are making significant investments in the College of Health at the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA). The high concentration of education, science, and medical facilities in the U-Med District provides a tremendous economic opportunity for Anchorage and our entire state. Unfortunately, the transportation infrastructure supporting the area hasn't kept up with the area's growth and is now impacting the safety, vitality, and economic potential of the entire region. Improving access via a new transportation corridor is a critical part of a longterm solution.</p> <p>The university has long supported a road corridor between Elmore Road and Bragaw Street to improve access to the UAA campus. UA owns the majority of the land directly affected by the Northern Access project and, over many years, we have participated in planning and analyzing solutions that can meet our needs in full consideration of the diverse interests of businesses and residents in the area. The project also enjoys the broad support of Alaska Pacific University, Providence Alaska Medical Center, the Alaska Native Tribal Health Consortium, the Southcentral Foundation, and many other business interests in Anchorage. As with any large infrastructure project, satisfying every constituency is difficult, but we remain committed to actively participating in an open and inclusive public process, and ultimately to completing this project while advancing the safety and well-being of the district's residents, patients, students, and employees.</p> <p>The U-Med Northern Access project is critical to the University of Alaska and is clearly consistent with Anchorage's exiting long-term transportation improvement plans. It addresses immediate traffic congestion and safety concerns, protects billions of dollars of current investment in the district, and positions us for future growth and prosperity. I respectfully request that the project be retained in the 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).</p> <p>We stand ready to work with your administration, AMATS, and our local business, community partners, and interested area residents to continue work on this important initiative.</p> <p>I appreciate your continued trust and support.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N4	Cathy Sandeen, Chancellor UAA	10/1/2018	UMED	<p>It is my pleasure to provide comments in support for the MTP 125- Northern Access to University Medical District project within the "Draft 2019-2022 Transportation Improvement Program." My support comes with my responsibility to represent the more than 16,000 students, faculty and staff who travel to and from the University of Alaska Anchorage (UAA) main campus for academic, research and support services. UAA exists to discover and disseminate knowledge by educating and preparing the workforce of the Anchorage metropolitan area and the broader State of Alaska.</p> <p>As the University and Medical District has grown there has been increased load on the infrastructure to and through the district. Much of the north traffic enters the district on UAA Drive- a collector road that is serving as an arterial.</p> <p>I am concerned about the traffic demand on UAA Drive for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UAA Drive bisects our campus and serves as the connection for the east and west campus parking lots. Increased north-south traffic makes it difficult for students and employees to exit onto this collector road safely. Vehicular accidents and near-misses are common in this area.</li> <li>• Access to and from our east campus is through two intersections- UAA Drive and Alumni Drive, and Providence Drive and Alumni Drive- both of which struggle to meet the traffic load. In addition to the constraints at UAA Drive, the Providence Drive intersection is also one of the main access points to the Providence Alaska Medical Center. Vehicular congestion is high. Pedestrian activity at this intersection is also very high, as this is the connection between our residence halls and the campus. The northern access road would allow for an additional access point to the east campus, improving both vehicular and pedestrian safety.</li> <li>• The heavy traffic on UAA Drive prevents UAA from achieving its vision of a more pedestrian-friendly campus. The northern access road would reduce traffic on UAA Drive, improving the safety for non-motorized users. If our campus can increase its pedestrian focus we expect a reduction in cross-campus vehicular movement, further reducing traffic in the district.</li> </ul> <p>As the largest university in the state, UAA strives to meet regional and statewide workforce needs. A safe and accessible campus is essential to our students' academic success. We rely on the Municipality of Anchorage and the State of Alaska to work with us to provide adequate and timely infrastructure improvements to ensure safe access to our campus.</p> <p>The lands proposed for this northern access have for years been used primarily for recreation trails through the district. We continue to support that use for the community as noted in our published Campus Master Plan; however, it's important to keep in mind that these are not public lands. Through law and regulation, dating back to 1915, we exist as a land-grant university and with declining state budgets we will continue to rely more heavily on other revenue, including potential revenue from our lands.</p> <p>UAA fully supports creating infrastructure to benefit our mission of educating Alaskans and the Governor's mission of providing a safer Alaska. We fully support responsible development of our resources and lands to accomplish these noble and important missions on behalf of our University, our state and our combined future.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N5	Sharyl Eve Toscano	9/27/2018	UMED	<p>I'm writing in opposition to the proposed bragaw to Elmore extension. The extension will have a negative impact on the Winterberry Charter School as well as other communities and community members that heavily use the green space bike and ski paths that currently exist there. The citizens of Anchorage have weighed in on this project time and time again and it continues to come back. Anchorage citizens value their outdoor spaces. We must all work to protect and maintain ALL of the green belt spaces.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N6	Karen Walker	10/1/2018	UMED	<p>I would like to express my strong desire to have the funding removed from the Transportation Improvement Program for Roadway Project MTP 125 North Access to University-Medical District. This is a wonderful wilderness area in this part of town that is used by thousands of Anchorage residents. If a large road were to be built, the area would be ruined forever. This road project is not needed. Other transportation improvements for this part of town should be looked at instead of building the North Access Road. This area is also a wetland and shouldn't be disturbed. If any development were to happen to this area, it should be used by the land's owner, the University of Alaska Anchorage, for their needs. The North Access Road should not be built; therefore, I request that the funding be removed from the Transportation Improvement Program. Thank you for your consideration,</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N7	Elizabeth Howell	10/1/2018	UMED	Please do not move forward with any funding for the University Bragaw road extension. My concern is that the funding is not available to do the project correctly allowing for the many pedestrian users who pass through the area year round, including Iditarod and Tour of Anchorage. I have owned a home and lived in this neighborhood for nearly 15 years and value this area as green space and wish for it to be left alone.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N8	Mackenzie Slater	10/1/2018	UMED	I am writing to express my concern about and opposition to the proposed Bragaw extension through the greenspace in the "UMed" district. One of the things that makes Anchorage such a special city is the presence of trails and parklands within the heart of the city. This green space in particular is heavily used by residents of the nearby neighborhoods, employees of ANMC and Providence, college students, and community members who may be visiting the area. Extending a busy road through the middle of this space would effectively cut off direct access to these trails for many.  Please keep Anchorage green and recreation available to all by not approving the construction of another road.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N9	Russell Hood	10/1/2018	UMED	Count me as another "NO" vote regarding the proposed Bragaw extension. We:  (a) Do not need to spend millions of dollars on this that we don't have. (b) Do not need to improve access to Providence Hospital. There are 3 area hospitals that any emergency vehicles can choose from and providing better access to Providence is a total red herring. Coming from the north = choose Regional. Coming from the south = choose ANMC. Coming from the east or west = choose Providence. (c) Traffic right in front of East High is already VERY heavy during the morning and afternoon rush hours. It will be heavier much more frequently if this proposal goes through. It'll only be a matter of time before an EHS students is involved in a car accident in front of the school. (d) The locally affected community councils have also voice their opposition.  Please do NOT proceed with this project.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N13	Karlene Leeper	10/1/2018	UMED	Please eliminate the project and funding for the "U-Med North Access Road" from the AMATS Plan. In these times of fiscal restraint, the money required to build this road can be better spent on necessities. The stated expense for this very short corridor does not come close to what is needed for construction, planning, permitting, mitigation, trails and landscaping.  The "U-Med North Access Road" is not needed because it does not serve its purpose of relieving traffic in the UMed area. It is not needed to relieve congestion associated with the UAA, APU, hospitals and the Alaska Airlines Sports Center. The proposed road will increase traffic congestion at some of Anchorage's busiest intersections. It will not decrease travel time to nor through the U-Med district.  The "U-Med North Access Road" is not wanted. At least ten Community Councils have passed resolutions against the road (Airport Heights, Mid-Hillside, Old Seward-Oceanview, Rabbit Creek, Rogers Park, Russian Jack, South Addition, Tudor Area, and University Area). Throughout the planning process for this road, a large majority of public comment registered against construction of a road, even when there was no alternative proposed for "no road" or "no action". Many preferred options for better public transportation.  The "U-Med North Access Road" is bad for the U-Med district. It will break up the U-Med neighborhood. The universities benefit from the non-developed lands that surround them, allowing for studies of wetlands, vegetation and wildlife. The area contains several important corridors for non-motorized transportation which would be sorely compromised if the road is built. Mitigations that would serve non-motorized commuters were left out of recent plans to save money. In addition, many students, faculty and staff oppose construction of the road.  Please remove the "U-Med North Access Road" from the TIP. Thank you very much for your time.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N14	Daryl N. Jordan	10/1/2018	UMED	As a concerned citizen and daily user of both the UMed District roads and the Goose Lake/Chester Creek area trails, I would like to voice my disapproval of this road project being considered once again. I would also say that it is very frustrating that I have to go through the trouble of fighting this road project year after year when the feedback for this road project continues to be negative. Please discontinue all talks tearing up the Green Belt. Thank you.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N15	Jessica Cochran	10/1/2018	UMED	I was distressed to see the Northern access to the UMED district included on the TIP list, particularly with some crucial language edited out. Neighbors have vehemently objected to this road extension, as will moose and bears -- creating more wildlife conflicts in the UMED district. This area is well-used by Anchorage residents, UAA/APU students, and visitors -- the closest spot to get a taste of "real" Alaska.  When this road was proposed in the past, and planning begun, there was a lot of talk about making sure any road extension was bike/pedestrian friendly -- with separated bike lanes and ski trail overpasses. I attended one of the planning meetings and felt that only the very minimum was even being considered -- nothing I would have felt safe biking in the winter. Now I see that even those requirements have been deleted. Does removing this language mean that we have NO way to insist that safe pedestrian/bike access is included in any future development?  I urge you to remove this project from the list until these questions are resolved.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N16	Jack Curtiss	10/1/2018	UMED	I write as a resident of Anchorage and a UAA neighbor to voice my opinion that the development of any road cutting through the trail systems on the university, especially any attempt to connect Bragaw and Elmore roads would be a horrible mistake. It would seriously impact the neighborhood by both breaking up our access to trails and by developing a new thoroughfare through the area thereby increasing vehicular activity in the area. Please do not allow any further road development in the university area. Thank you.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N17	Shannon Gramse	10/1/2018	UMED	I am writing to express my continued opposition to the Bragaw extension. This is a stupid idea that seemingly will not die, despite a lack of support from the people who live in the district, our mayor and our governor. These people all know the proposed road would be a profound mistake and would ruin one of the nicest areas of town forever. University and medical campuses around the country are trying to recreate the sense of natural peace we already enjoy the UMED District. They are limiting vehicle access and creating pedestrian zones built for humans rather than machines, yet these institutions scratch their heads at our foolish intentions to turn our beautiful campus zone into a highway thoroughfare. This project would bisect the largest green space in central Anchorage and create more traffic. It will be a perhaps final fatal blow to what makes life in Anchorage Alaskan. It is stupid, stupid idea that will be hard to explain to future generations. Just say no again and again and again!	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N18	Richard Snyder	10/1/2018		<p>I am opposed to the Bragaw Extension. My main reason is the pedestrian and vehicle traffic intersection of Northern Lights Blvd. and Bragaw Street at East High School. The June 2015 issue of Scientific American has an article titled "The Teen Brain". It states:</p> <p>"Teenagers are more likely than children or adults to engage in risky behavior, in part because of a mismatch between two major brain regions."</p> <p>What this means is that emotion overtakes control.</p> <p>I am concerned that if Bragaw Street is extended, this intersection will become much more dangerous.</p> <p>Please do not put our teenagers at more risk at a time of change in their lives.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N19	Patrick Conway	10/1/2018	UMED	This comment is being written to express opposition to the inclusion of project RDY00010 - North Access to University Medical District. The environmental services and recreational function of the wetland and green space provided by the parcels of land between Northern Lights and the APU/UAA campuses outweigh the purported need for additional routes of motorized vehicle access from the north. The municipality should exhaust all efforts on more affordable housing, public transportation and transportation efficiency (including emergency vehicles) prior to exploring or funding an additional road project through a rare and sensitive environmental area. If these efforts have been made, the municipality, universities, and medical industry have not provided adequate information about the efforts to improve current transportation systems and nearby housing options to warrant muni funding for a new road project in this area. Additionally, if the total costs for this project at ~\$13mm as shown in the draft TIP, they have been grossly underestimated by AMATS. This is evidenced by the previous "Bragaw Extension" planning process in 2013 when the necessary components for pedestrian and recreational facilities needed be removed from the project near the end of planning process in order to meet the budget constraints for the project which at that time were ~\$20mm. Consequently, I oppose the inclusion of this project in the 2019-2022 TIP.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N20	Gary Snyder	9/30/2018	UMED	<p>I ask that you not support the extension of Elmore Road to Bragaw for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Bragaw cannot handle an increase in traffic. The extension would make Bragaw way over capacity, and this is not good for the adjacent neighborhood drivers and pedestrians. It would be unsafe.</li> <li>2) East High does not need a major intersection adjacent to it. Already it is difficult to get in and out of East High when school is opening and closing. A four way intersection at Bragaw and Northern Lights would not be safe for students, employees, and parents for East High. Would you want a major intersection near your child's school? Mine attend East.</li> <li>3) Access between UAA Drive and Northern Lights has been improved. The new double left turns installed recently at this intersection have reduced the bottle neck that used to occur here. An improved route in and out of Umed to the north is not needed as much.</li> <li>4) none of the city councils in the area support this project. We who live here already deal with major traffic issues due to proximity to Umed. We don't need more major roads through the area.</li> </ol>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N21	Jen Smith	9/29/2018	UMED	Please don't put this through! Utilize existing Road ways, expand and improve them with less impact on the environment: Muldoon, take out some stop lights and improve pavement! Lake Otis: improve/widen section near Debarr.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N22	Cindy Nielsen	9/29/2018	UMED	Please please please do not put that road through. The green belts are good of all of us. I'm a long-time resident and taxpayer here. We are keeping an eye on you. please do not put the Elmore extension road through.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N23	Robert Onders, President APU	9/27/2018	UMED	<p>On behalf of Alaska Pacific University (APU) and the numerous students, staff, faculty and the Anchorage community we serve, I write to support the AMATS Policy Committee retaining the UMED Northern Access Road in the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP).</p> <p>APU is the only private, not-for-profit baccalaureate University in Alaska serving early honors high school students, undergraduate, graduate and doctorate students from the Anchorage bowl, the Mat-Su Valley, and distance students from across the state. Our campus is also host to a variety of community events, conferences, theater productions, First Friday events, and summer camps.</p> <p>APU is located in one of Anchorage's most important geographically defined and important economies. More than 9,000 employees and virtually every resident of Anchorage utilize these services for their healthcare and educational needs. The continuous growth of the UMED district has increased traffic congestion dramatically. The road extension is paramount to ensure proper safety response time to the growing U-Med district.</p> <p>In addition to the challenges with traffic and safety, the absence of the access road with pedestrian friendly features hinders the accessibility of our campus and the entire UMED district to the communities along Bragaw to the north. The access road would facilitate safe lighted access to the Universities and the Consortium Library to East High School students, the Alaska Native Cultural Charter School, Catholic Social Services beneficiaries, and others along Bragaw.</p> <p>APU acknowledges the local communities' concerns and are supportive of accomplishing completion of the project congruent with the level of amenities consistent with preserving the trail system and atmosphere of APU's privately owned land. Of the many proposed solutions to access into the U-Med area, the one included in the TIP is the one that least affects the integrity of the APU campus, least affects the trail system, and least affects the atmosphere of the academic areas.</p> <p>The project needs to be included in the TIP so that the appropriate planning studies, public processes, and design can commence.</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N24	Helena Spector	9/28/2018	UMED	For our quality of life in Anchorage, for wildlife, for beautiful green spaces, for future generations — the UMed Northern Access Route is a terrible idea.  Please, please have the good sense to leave this ugly prospect behind. For all of us, keep the lovely parts of Anchorage safe for our children and grandchildren!	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N25	Sheryl Maney	9/27/2018	UMED	My name is Sheryl Maney, and I am a lifelong Alaskan. Born and raised here in Anchorage. Been here some 61 years....so I was born in the Territory of Alaska!  I am writing you today to state that I am FIRMLY against pushing Bragaw through. I love that green belt area and I would absolutely hate to see a road pushed through it. I am sure that a lot of wildlife utilize that area and would suffer mightily from all the traffic that would be sent through it. And all that traffic would really ruin that part of town. It's busy enough as it is. PLEASE.....don't add to it!!	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N27	SJValek Wilson	9/27/2018	UMED	I request that the MTP, U-Med/Bragaw extension project be deleted. The road is not needed and is financially and socially irresponsible.  Citizens of Anchorage care about their city and do not profit from stopping wrong minded road projects. Yet powerful interests often profit from big road projects.  Citizens have thoughtfully examined the plans, studies and history associated with the UMED North Access Road. The data support the assertion: the cost of the project exceed the benefit and the road is not needed. Neighborhood citizens often have a more accurate understanding of need for and the financial and social impacts of the project than powerful entities who insist upon the project and will ultimately profit from building it.  There is no need to destroy the natural beauty of the U-Med district by building a new road when it is possible to improve safety, access and traffic flow by supporting road projects that improve and upgrade existing roads. For example, the rebuilding of Lake Otis between Northern Lights and DeBarr/15th, an existing road, would address safety issues, traffic flow and access.  Please put our State's money into needed improvements of existing infrastructure and delete all funding for this proposed project.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N28	Marvin Ebnet	9/26/2018	UMED	I am in 100% support of the north access and the preferred route would be from elmore to brag (I believe that would be route/option G). We desperately need that connection. Those that oppose this (mainly those that don't want the highway going through their back yard/swamp can be address by sound barrier walls and over/underpasses.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N29	Chris Jackson	9/24/2018	UMED	This road cutting through our trails, green belt and recreation space is unnecessary. The current financial issues we are experiencing in this city and state are good reasons not to go forward with this, in addition to destroying the wonderful trail system in that area.  Why not explore other options and encourage the use of other transportation to ease congestion? Buses, biking, walking. Invest more in online learning, telemedicine and other technology based solutions to help ease congestion on the campus.  This road is a bad idea for Anchorage.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N30	Hope Meyn	9/21/2018	UMED	As a resident in the U-Med area I strongly oppose the construction of a road through wetlands in my neighborhood. As a recent graduate of UAA I additionally oppose this road due to it's location cutting through campus. Students, faculty, nearby community councils, residents in the area, and businesses have expressed their opposition to the road in years past and again now. Please heed the advice of those who live, work, learn, and play in this area by not allowing the U-Med Northern Access Road to be constructed.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

## AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N31	Jeff Schmitz	10/2/2018	UMED	<p>Today I write in opposition of the proposed/recycled Northern Access Route. This is not to dismiss the fundamental merits of the proposal but an attempt to establish a basis to possibly move forward to implementing the proposal. I was born and raised here, am a very active participant in my Community Council as a transportation advocate as well as a cycling advocate and active user of the non motorized network in Anchorage.</p> <p>A core issue of this proposal is the time worn approach to managing transportation in Anchorage that Cars are King (CaK). It colors the discussion in both major and subtle ways to produce the adversarial point we frequently find ourselves in. Today and going forward, CaK is not being tolerated by increasing numbers if stakeholders for multiple reasons. Physical health, mental health and carbon footprints and transportation costs are four major ones.</p> <p>The polarization of this and pretty much all proposed motorized projects stem from a long standing process flaw of project management, ie the non motorized community has largely been a lip service obligation in project management. Meetings held, input taken, heads nodded and the required Boxes are checked on the forms. Then the project unfolds like the managers really intended, "Value Engineered" or as expeditiously as possible and the non motorized stakeholders are left to figure out post mortem that they have been swindled yet again.</p> <p>An utter irony of the proposal is that today we have a highly utilized, very functional network of non motorized assets in the area that would be adversely impacted by the Northern Access Route which would translate into more need for more motorized utilization of the Med district! Crazy talk.</p> <p>This is not to say the proposal cannot or should not move forward but a fundamental shift in process is an utter minimum or the opposition will be strong and unified as has been noted before. And no one benefits from that.</p> <p>What does that process look like? For starters, trust has to be established with the non motorized community. It has to be real, it has to be solid and it has to be effective. That means more than lip service or pinky promises. Those ships have sailed and sunk. Today, there is a robust and highly utilized non motorized network in place in the UMED district and that must be preserved. The plans and alternatives previously proposed shoved the non motorized community into an after thought category. Yes, the project will cost more to do it right. But that is what it will take to do it at all.</p> <p>As a recent user of MED district services I found a number of processes in place that go significantly towards mitigating traffic impact in the area. Prov for example, has established a satellite blood draw site on Tudor Rd to minimize a full trip into the District. It works. The PS4 (Parking Structure 4) facility on Piper has again, taken a significant amount of pressure off the deeper part of the District. A Skywalk connects it to the main Prov hospital campus. Genius!</p>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N34	Dave Evans	10/1/2018	UMED	<p>I appreciate that the comment period was extended, as it allowed me the opportunity to review and provide follow-up comment on the scoring breakdown I requested in my comment of August 20th. (The detailed scoring spreadsheet was posted on the AMATS website close of business September 10th, only two days before the TAC public hearing.)</p> <p>The attached comment PDF provides more detail, but in summary: I believe that five of the 14 sub-scores for the North Access to U-Med road project are too high. That is important since eight other projects ranked lower but were within 5 points. Thus, with more appropriate scores for the U-Med project, one or more of the other projects could score higher and replace it in the TIP.</p> <p>At the TAC public hearing on September 13, 2018, after public testimony had been closed, a member of the TAC stated that the U-Med North Access project couldn't be removed from the TIP because it had scored high enough to be included. Unfortunately, the scoring table (which showed how each project scored against the scoring criteria) was made available only two days before the hearing and there wasn't enough time to digest the scoring and make substantive comments.</p> <p>Now, judging from the scoring tables, it appears that the following projects were not included in the TIP, even though they scored higher than the U-Med North Access project:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- MTP 118 Lake Otis Pkwy – N. Lights Blvd to DeBarr</li> <li>- MTP 109, Jewel Lake Rd-Diamond to International Airport;</li> <li>- MTP 130 92nd Ave /Academy Drive</li> <li>- Eagle River CBD Study</li> <li>- Eagle River Traffic Mitigation – Phase 1 Business Blvd Extension</li> </ul> <p>So, apparently the statement that the U-Med road couldn't be removed from the TIP because it scored high enough is not true.</p> <p>There were also eight other projects within 5 points of the U-Med North Access project score of 33. U- Med project scores for several criteria appear to be unrealistically high, and if they were revised downward, some or all of the other projects may rank higher than the Road, pushing it even farther down the list:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Relieves Congestion: The project received a score of 6.8 of 7.5, but that completely ignores the 2011 Project Team's traffic modeling. According to the 2011 Reconnaissance Report for a four- lane road:</li> </ul> <p>"The operational benefits to the U-Med District from implementation of the 2027 LRTP are heavily dependent on two projects, H2H and Lake Otis to Glen Hwy. If either one or both of these are cancelled or delayed, nearly all of the intersections in the study area will be at LOS F in 2030."</p> <p>It is apparent that the scoring team did not have access to information required for an objective decision; a lower "relieves congestion" score is appropriate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Neighborhood Liveability/Quality of Life: The project received a score of 3 of 5. As neighbors, we have tried to respect UAA's right to develop their own lands and focus on traffic and safety issues, but since this is a scoring criterion it begs the question: "Whose quality of life?" The U-Med natural lands through which this road would cut are used extensively by not only students, faculty, and U-Med workforce but the public bordering the U-Med. The U-Med District wetlands also offer flood mitigation protection for residents living on the lower reaches along Chester Creek.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Preserves Existing System: The project received a score of 0.7. Since this is a new road, a score above zero doesn't make sense. The criteria explanation says that to be eligible for points in this category preservation must be a major element of the project cost or purpose.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Environmental Justice: The project scored of 4.5 out of 7.5 points. This score is too high since the project would have significant negative effects in the area around two elementary schools (Russian Jack, a Title 1 school and the Alaska Native Charter School) and East High School, all three serving low-income neighborhoods. In those areas, this project would increase traffic congestion, impede use of transit and pedestrian facilities, and decrease air quality. This project would not benefit these populations, particularly those students and other residents who rely on the safety of the sidewalks and crossings to bike or walk to school and work or to access the bus stop on the south side of the Northern Lights/Bragaw intersection.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Security and Emergency Response: The scoring breakdown does not show the breakdown for the AFD 4-Minute response time and the MOA All Hazards Plan, so the basis of this 1.4 score is unknown. But, it matches the maximum if those two sub-criteria are zero and the "Improves evacuation, diversion, or alternate diversion" sub-score is maximum. If that is the case, it seems too high, since there are currently six routes into/out of the U-Med District, and there is low likelihood of that this project would improve emergency response/ evacuation route unless and until all segments of the Seward to Glen Highway connections are made, and Lake Otis to Glen Hwy connection is made.</li> </ul>	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N35	Molly Tarby	10/1/2018	UMED	I would like to register a comment in opposition to the Bragaw Extension (MTP 125). This space is valued wetland in the middle of our city. This area is used by many people for recreation and activity. Creating a road in this area will negatively effect our community.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N36	David Tarby	10/1/2018	UMED	I would like to register a comment in opposition to the Bragaw Extension (MTP 125) as it will provide no benefit in drive time except for a very limited number of people of about 2 minutes based on previous study. This has been repeatedly voted down by multiple surrounding community councils and will bisect wetlands and greenspace used for recreation and wildlife. There are numerous projects much more worthy of the enormous tax dollars that this road would cost.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N37	Sharon Lee	9/26/2018	UMED	It is essential that you remove the funding from the TIP and ultimately remove the U-Med Northern Access road from the MTP. Any Bragaw extension to the UMED district is a colossal waste of money! Please take this project off the table once and for all, because it won't improve access, nor effectively reduce the time it takes to access the UMED area. We do not approve of this project in any way, shape or form.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N38	Sharon Stockard	9/28/2018	UMED	I oppose the U-Med Road, also known as the Bragaw Extension, something my neighborhood has been fighting for over 20 years. It has been unanimously opposed by 10 community councils, representing thousands of residents in the area for numerous reasons. I am disappointed to see that it is still included on a list for funding.  It is not neighbors and community councils that are opposed to this unwanted project, but public opinion in general is opposed to it. A survey by the 2040 MTP project team asked the public to weight in on a solution to congestion in the U-Med area. We were given choices that included public transit and building the U-Med punchthrough. The public overwhelmingly supported the public transit option (225 favored public transit vs. 68 favored new road.) That is further evidence that this project is not only controversial but unwanted.  Further, there are studies showing it would not speed traffic, would not reduce congestion, but would instead take private property (homes and small businesses) from people -- and off the city tax rolls -- as well as destroy valuable wetlands, wildlife habitat and a valuable recreational asset to our community.  I urge you to remove this project from funding and put it on the "kill" list.	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
N39	Coleen Dalton	10/2/2018	UMED	I'd like to voice my preference to NOT connect Bragaw and Elmore. First, I don't think the extension is necessary. The worst traffic impact is at rush hour and frankly, rush hour isn't that bad. Rush hour traffic that lasts at most a couple hours a day certainly isn't enough of a justification for all that money and for the impact to the greenspace and the nice balance we have in the university area with open space.  Second, I would expect you to focus on improving roads and traffic patterns where you expect new housing, not in already developed areas. Is there a significant amount of new housing going into this area?	The northern access to U-Med project is in the short term of the current Interim 2035 MTP. All projects in the short term of the current MTP must be ranked and scored for possible inclusion in the draft TIP. The existing TIP criteria were used to rank and score projects and that project scored well in enough categories to have it added to the draft TIP. Comments on the draft TIP will be adjudicated by both the Technical Advisory and Policy Committees. Those committees can add and subtract projects as they see fit.	Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.	Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.
5	Jerry Hansen - MOA PM&E	8/6/2018	Academy Drive/Vanguard Drive Area Traffic Circulation Improvements	As I mentioned the Draft TIP for Academy/Vanguard in Table 2 is incorrect. It shows \$1m in 2022. Currently we are about 65% done for design. If we go with federal funding for this project, we need \$500k for the environmental document in 2019, \$5m for ROW in 2020 and \$6.5m for construction in \$2022. This would allow this project to keep up with the DOT's New Seward Highway project to keep from having a traffic issue at this location when they complete their project. It would be possible to have them combine ours and theirs together.		Recommend removal of the project from the TIP.	Approved
6	Stephanie Mormilo - MOA Traffic Department	8/7/2018	Lake Hill Drive Shared Bike Facility	NMO00004 Lake Hill Drive – This is a rural local road that already functions as a shared road and has an existing separated multi-use trail. To convert this section to a shared use roadway with no connections past the Old Glenn Highway is not recommended as it sends the bicyclists to higher speed/volume roadways with no facilities.	Staff recommends removal of this project.	Concur with staff recommendation.	Approved
7	Stephanie Mormilo - MOA Traffic Department	8/7/2018	10th Ave Pathway	NMO00005 10 <sup>th</sup> Avenue Pathway – The North Fork of the South Branch of Chester Creek lies within this ROW as such, this will be a very difficult project to achieve using federal funds.	Staff recommends removal of this project.	Concur with staff recommendation.	Approved
8	Steve Ribuffo - Port of Alaska	8/13/2018	Port of Alaska Information Update	Update the Port of Alaska Modernization project with attached information.	Staff will update the tables using the information provided by the Port of Alaska.	Concur with staff recommendation.	Approved
12	Brian Lindamood - AKRR	8/16/2018	C Street/Ocean Dock Road Ramp and Intersection Improvements	RDY0003, Ocean Dock Ramp and Intersection improvements: The results of the reconnaissance study of this area did not result in providing a significant improvement to the traffic congestion in this area. The problem is largely created by railroad traffic blocking the roadway, backing traffic into the port, south on C Street, and up the ramp. When the train clears, traffic remains locked because there is no reasonable means to turn left from C Street into the Port until the rest of the traffic clears, which sometimes in not until another train arrives. The only reasonable means to fix this problem is to swap the location of the railroad tracks and Port Avenue (road from the west to the east, track from the east to the west). This will largely separate the traffic flows, and will provide fluid roadway movement to and from the port via the C- Street viaduct. Any proposed improvements in this area need to be held until this project can be properly vetted.		Recommend adding a study, title to be determined, in FY2019 with a cost of \$250K. This study would look at making improvements to the road into the Port of Alaska.	Approved

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
13	Brian Lindamood - AKRR	8/16/2018	92nd Ave Extension	RDY00007, 92nd Avenue Extension: This project does not seem feasible. The proposal to connect the Old Seward Highway with C Street in this area must cross the Alaska Railroad at a point where the track is on a raised embankment (about 10 feet), but we also have an active industry track near grade. To further complicate matters, there is a Chugach Electric transmission line on the west side of the railroad right-of-way. Crossing at grade will not be possible. Raising the railroad to provide an underpass will also be very difficult, and will result in some sort of grade crossing with the industry track that will not likely have adequate sight distance. If this project is to remain in the TIP, ARRC would recommend that any plans to cross ARRC as part of the project be removed.		Recommend changing this project to a study in FY2021 with a cost of \$250K. This study would look at the 92nd Ave area from Old Seward to C street.	Approved
15	Michelle McNulty, MOA Planning Department	8/16/2018	Chugach Way Master Plan	Thank you for the opportunity to review and comment on the draft Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS) 201-2022 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP). All of the projects included are important to the Municipality of Anchorage and glad to see them included in the TIP. However, one project that was nominated, but did not make the TIP, is the Chugach Way Master Plan (the Plan). I ask that this nominated project be reconsidered to be included in the TIP for a variety of reasons: The Plan and subsequent development of the area is supported by multiple departments, the administration, and the public. The Chugach Way Reconnaissance Study is almost complete and will dovetail into this Plan. The in-kind match will be very easy to acquire with long-range planning staff working to manage the project. This plan is a key element in helping us develop this corridor and provide more transit oriented development.	Staff recommends adding the Chugach Way Study Element into the Draft TIP.	Concur with staff recommendation.	Approved
39	Bart Rudolph - MOA Public Transportation Department	8/20/2018	MOA PTD Edits	As discussed, please see MOA PTD's comments/edits in the attached Excel spreadsheet. Our comments and edits are in red text and found in Table 5 and Table 10.  In addition to the Excel spreadsheet, we also request that "Dimond Center Pedestrian and Transit Improvements" project remain in the Non-Motorized Table showing a carryover of \$2M.	Staff will update the tables using the information provided by the MOA Public Transportation Department.	Concur with staff recommendation.	Approved
52	Mark Butler	8/20/2018	Spenard Road Rehabilitation	However, the intersection of Spenard Road and Minnesota Drive is very controversial and could hold up the safety improvements on the 30th to 36th section of Spenard Road. I propose that we split out the 30th to 36th Avenue improvements from the Minnesota/Spenard Road Intersection improvements. By keeping them together we risk delays on improving Spenard Road safety. The intersection should remain a State of Alaska DOT&PF project because it is clearly a highway traffic style project. The Spenard Road improvements should be a Municipal project and funded first before the intersection work.			Policy Committee edited the Spenard Road project description to read "Project will rehabilitate to improve traffic flow. This project would also include non-motorized improvements. Project shall not include improvements to the Minnesota Intersection except ADA requirements on the east side".
63	Nancy Pease	8/20/2018	KAC	Knik Arm Crossing Projects - Delete these projects from your numbered list. Stop holding open a place for an ego project that would deal a serious blow to Anchorage's efforts to become a vibrant modern city. Local planners and economists have asserted strongly that this project will drain public funds and will not pay for itself. The bridge would create urban blight in Anchorage and suburban sprawl in the Mat-Su Borough, and exacerbate greenhouse gas emissions. Drop it from the list altogether.	The projects in Table 11 had not been updated in the Public Review Draft but have been for the Public Hearing Draft.	Concur with staff recommendation.	Approved
75	Jenny Miner	8/20/2018	Non-motorized Projects	AMATS is currently updating and combining the 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan (APP), the 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan (ABP), and the 1997 Areawide Trails Plan into one AMATS Anchorage Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP). This effort will not be completed in time to recommend and include projects for the 2019-2022 TIP. It is critical that the momentum for implementation continues to move this community toward a safer, more accessible, and more reliable multi-modal transportation network.  The AMATS Anchorage Pedestrian Plan Implementation Project was nominated in the call for Non-Motorized TIP nominations in March of 2018. Under the previous TIP, the APP implementation project was able to design and construct two pedestrian projects, totaling approximately \$1.5 million, providing missing links within the non-motorized transportation system.  The nominated project submitted in March 2018 followed the previous TIP format nominating the implementation of, not specific projects within, the APP. Funding the implementation of the APP allowed for flexibility as to which project(s) from the plan could be designed and constructed with the funding provided in the TIP.  It is our understanding that an overarching parent project is no longer the preferred method, but individual projects should be nominated instead. We urge the review committee to add at least one of the following high priority projects from the 2007 APP into the Non-Motorized 2019-2022 TIP table. Adding at least one of these projects to the next TIP will ensure the continued implementation of projects that improve safe access and movement of pedestrians throughout the municipality.  Costs provided include design and construction, design and construction management, overhead, and ICAP.  W 36th Ave – Woodland Dr to Iowa St/Woodland Park Estimated Cost: \$1.5 million Description: The project would provide a 5-foot sidewalk with curb & gutter on the north side of W 36th Avenue from Iowa Street (Woodland Park entrance) east to an existing crosswalk west of Willow Street, providing access to the Boys & Girls Club, and on the south side of W 36th Avenue from the existing crosswalk east to Woodland Drive (approximately 0.2 miles). ADA ramps would be installed at every intersection and major approach. This project will directly benefit the Boys and Girls Club and the surrounding neighborhood. The new sidewalks would provide safe passage to and from Fish Creek Trail, as well as to and from other existing sidewalks that lead to Municipal Transit System bus stops on Spenard Road and Minnesota Drive. This project will complement the Fish Creek Trail project. Fish Creek Trail is currently being upgraded, construction began this summer, and a new connection was added which will allow pedestrians and cyclists to travel from W Northern Lights Blvd south to Minnesota Drive near the Spenard Recreation Center.  Wilson St – 40th Ave to Tudor Rd Estimated Cost: \$2 million Description: The project would provide a 5-foot sidewalk with curb & gutter on the west side of Wilson Street from 40th Avenue (Wilson Park) to Tudor Road. It would also provide a pathway from the north end of 40th Avenue into Wilson Park. Total length of improvements is 0.3 miles. ADA ramps would be installed at each side street. The	These projects were scored individually based on this comment and they did not score well enough to be including for funding in the draft TIP, but they can be nominated for funding in the future.	Concur with staff recommendation.	Approved

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
				<p>new sidewalk would provide safe passage to and from the neighborhood. It would provide continued access from Wilson Street Park south to Tudor Road. Existing pedestrian facilities on Tudor provide continued access to nearby restaurants and retail centers, the pedestrian overpass to Willow Crest Elementary School, and to Municipal Transit System bus stops on Arctic Road and Tudor Road.</p> <p>A Street – E 23rd Avenue to Chester Creek Trail                      Estimated Cost: \$1.1 million                      Description: The project would provide an 8 to 10-foot wide paved pathway on the east side of A Street from 23rd Avenue to the Chester Creek Trail south of 16th Avenue. The proposed pathway would connect to the existing trail north of E 23rd Avenue and run adjacent to A Street. There is currently no pedestrian facility along A Street in the project area. The proposed improvements will directly increase quality of life of pedestrians by providing a missing connection within the non-motorized transportation system thereby increasing pedestrian safety and walkability. Although there is a greenbelt trail to the east of this project, most pedestrian commuters walk a well-worn path along A Street to remain visible and eliminate the circuitous route of the greenbelt trail. Construction of this link will provide pedestrian access adjacent to A Street from Klatt Road north to the A-C Couplet.</p>			
76	Jenny Miner	8/20/2018	Non-motorized Projects	<p>AMATS is currently updating and combining the 2007 Anchorage Pedestrian Plan (APP), the 2010 Anchorage Bicycle Plan (ABP), and the 1997 Area-wide Trails Plan into one AMATS Anchorage Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP). This effort will not be completed in time to recommend and include projects for the 2019-2022 TIP. It is critical that the momentum for implementation continues to move this community toward a safer, more accessible, and more reliable multi-modal transportation network.</p> <p>The AMATS Anchorage Bicycle Plan Implementation Project was nominated in the call for Non-Motorized TIP nominations in March of 2018. Under the previous TIP, the ABP implementation project was able to design and construct 12 bicycle plan projects, totaling approximately \$4.8 million, providing missing links within the non-motorized transportation system.</p> <p>The nominated project submitted in March 2018 followed the previous TIP format nominating the implementation of, not specific projects within, the ABP. Funding the implementation of the ABP allowed for flexibility as to which project(s) from the plan could be designed and constructed with the funding provided in the TIP. It also allowed for cost efficiencies during design and bidding.</p> <p>It is our understanding that an overarching parent project is no longer the preferred method, but individual projects should be nominated instead. We urge the review committee to add at least one of the following high priority projects from the 2010 ABP into the Non-Motorized 2019-2022 TIP table. Adding at least one of these projects to the next TIP will ensure the continued implementation of projects that improve safe access and movement of bicyclists throughout the municipality.</p> <p>Four of the projects described below, the 76th Avenue projects and the Baxter Road projects, are high priority core/collision routes. This means that these routes and intersections either have a high number of bicycle-vehicle crashes or are part of the proposed core bicycle network. Core/collision projects are first-priority projects as they have the potential to reduce crashes and address locations expected to be the most heavily used. Costs provided include design and construction, design and construction management, overhead, and ICAP.</p> <p>76th Avenue – Alaska Railroad Crossing to Taku Lake Road and 76th Avenue – Alaska Railroad to Seward Highway:                      Estimated Cost: \$900,000                      Description: These projects are identified as core/collision routes. The projects would designate bicycle facilities in the form of a bicycle lane from Alaska Railroad Crossing to Taku Lake Road, and a shared road from Alaska Railroad Crossing to Seward Highway. These two projects will directly benefit the neighborhoods north and south of 76th Avenue by designating on-street bicycle facilities along 76th Avenue to the Campbell Creek Trail, local retail centers, restaurants, and breweries. Additionally, a new grade separated highway crossing at 76th Avenue/Lore Road and New Seward Highway provides a connection for all motorists from the west side to the east side of New Seward Highway; designating space and acknowledging bicyclist's presence on this route would go far to encourage ridership along this route, one of the few highway crossings with bicycle friendly status.</p> <p>Baxter Road – Northern Lights to 21st Avenue at Cheney Lake and Baxter Road – Cheney Lake to DeBarr Road                      Estimated Cost: \$750,000                      Description: These projects are identified as core/collision routes. The projects would provide bicycle facilities in the form of a bicycle lane from Northern Lights Boulevard to 21st Avenue at Cheney Lake, and a shared road from 21st Avenue at Cheney Lake to DeBarr Road. This section of Baxter Road is a heavily traveled route; providing designated space and acknowledging bicyclists' presence on this route would improve safety for bicyclists traveling this corridor. A highly used east/west trail connects to Baxter Road at Cheney Lake providing a route west from the proposed on-street bicycle facilities to Craig Drive and the trails within Russian Jack Park and the pathway along Boniface Parkway. These two projects will directly serve the many neighborhoods around Baxter Road providing designated on-street bicycle facilities to those traveling to and from multiple neighborhood schools, parks, and churches; local restaurants; and local retail centers.</p> <p>Craig Drive – Boniface Drive to Nunaka Valley Park                      Estimated Cost: \$200,000                      Description: The project would designate the road as a shared road providing on-street bicycle facilities. The project would further serve the neighborhoods around Baxter Road by providing the link from Baxter Road to the trail systems within Russian Jack. This route is heavily used by commuter bicyclists; providing designated space and acknowledging bicyclists' presence on this route would improve safety for bicyclists traveling this corridor.</p> <p>36th Avenue – Iowa Street to Minnesota Drive                      Estimated Cost: \$500,000                      Description: The project would designate the road as a shared road providing on-street bicycle facilities. This project will directly benefit the Boys and Girls Club and the surrounding neighborhood providing on-street bicycle facilities to and from Fish Creek Trail, as well as, to local retail centers and restaurants. This project complements the high-priority pedestrian project W 36th Ave – Woodland Dr to Iowa St/Woodland Park, which provides sidewalk along 36th Avenue on the west end of the project corridor.</p> <p>The proposed projects will contribute directly to increased quality of life of bicyclists by providing missing links within the non-motorized transportation system therefore increasing bicycle ridership, safety, and efficient movement throughout the municipality. Adding any or all of these projects to the 2019-2022 TIP will ensure improved safe access and movement of bicyclists throughout the municipality and encourage the use of bicycles as a means of everyday commuting. Encouraging bicycle travel improves quality of life as it is affordable, reduces traffic congestion, benefits the rider's health, promotes efficient use of public space, and reduces automobile emissions.</p>	<p>These projects were scored individually based on this comment and they did not score well enough to be including for funding in the draft TIP, but they can be nominated for funding in the future.</p>	<p>Concur with staff recommendation.</p>	<p>Approved</p>
94	Bob French	8/20/2018	C Street/Ocean Dock Road Ramp and Intersection Improvements	<p>I cannot support RDY00003, C Street, Ocean Dock Road Ramp and Intersection Improvements: While there are admittedly drainage problems that affect the longevity of the roadbed, fixing those drainage problems alone is all that I can support. The vast majority of the other "problems" with that intersection can be fixed by slowing down the trucks. What can't be fixed by slowing down trucks can be fixed by moving the railroad tracks. The "Reconnaissance Study" had an estimated cost of \$5 million for Alt. 3. Explain how the TIP shows a cost of \$1.5 million?</p>	<p>The current TIP only include money for the Design and ROW of this project. The construction funding was accidentally left out of the out years of the TIP and will be added in. Staff recommends adding in the construction funding of \$5M for this project in 2024.</p>	<p>Concur with staff recommendation.</p>	<p>Policy Committee added \$6M for construction in beyond 2022 in the TIP.</p>

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N11	Barbara Karl	10/1/2018	UMED	<p>I wish to reiterate my comments below sent on 8/20/18 regarding the Northern Access to the U-Med District extension. I urge that all reference to such extension be removed from the TIP and both the Short Term and Long Term to the Interim MTP and that it be replaced with a request for a TDM study that was recommended a few years ago. Such a study will determine what is the best method for eliminating congestion (if any) into the U-Med District. Also, previous studies have shown little or no time savings to the Providence E-R and please remember that there is an Emergency Room readily available north of the U-Med District at Alaska Regional Hospital, access to which would be compromised by increased traffic on Bragaw as such an extension were built. I believe that a TDM will reveal less costly options to deal with traffic into the U-Med District that will also have less costly maintenance requirements.</p>		<p>Recommend removal of "a 0.5 mile 4-lane facility with non-motorized facilities." from project description and forward to PC for consideration.</p> <p>Recommend adding "Project will completed a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) study." to the project description.</p>	<p>Policy Committee removed the UMED roadway project and added a Transportation Demand Management Study and a TDM Implementation project for the UMED area.</p>
N12	Sarah Ludwin-Peery	10/1/2018	Spenard Road Rehabilitation	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed 2019-2022 TIP plan.</p> <p>Cook Inlet Housing Authority's (CIHA) main office is located at 3510 Spenard Road; we have been located here for over fifteen years. In the past seven years, we have acquired a number of parcels in the immediate area of 36th and Spenard. To date we have invested more than \$7 million in acquisition, demolition, platting, and environmental remediation.</p> <p>During this time we have garnered the support of a number of groups, including the Municipality of Anchorage, the Spenard Community Council, the Spenard Chamber of Commerce, the Anchorage Economic Development Corporation, and the State of Alaska. Our primary community development goals include environmental remediation of the former Tesoro Olson site, elimination of blighted properties (we have demolished 13 properties), elimination of illegal uses (two properties had been seized by government entities for unlawful activities), and the development of new affordable and market rate housing and retail to support the city's transit oriented development goals, needs for new infill housing in midtown, and a vibrant mixed-use Spenard corridor.</p> <p>Last summer we completed the first phase of our Spenard redevelopment efforts, a 33-unit with retail mixed use building at the former PJ's strip club. This \$10 million dollar investment will demonstrate that Spenard is an opportunity site as Anchorage looks to redevelop our core urban neighborhoods with quality infill supported by a street network that supports cars, bikes, transit, and pedestrians.</p> <p>It is with this context in mind that I offer the following comments.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The Spenard Road area is ripe for redevelopment. Many structures are aging and blighted, and zoning supports a higher intensity than what exists currently. The state owned Minnesota Drive is an important part of the Municipality's efforts to redevelop in this area. Minnesota is needed for circulation of vehicles; east/west streets between Spenard and Minnesota have access only via Spenard and Minnesota. These streets cannot be turned into dead-end streets at Minnesota.</p> <p>In addition, Minnesota is an important link in the pedestrian network. However, sidewalks along Minnesota are inadequate given the speed of travel (they are neither wide nor buffered from traffic), and due to lack of snow removal it is not uncommon to see pedestrians walking in Minnesota Drive as much as a week after a snow event. This is both dangerous and embarrassing for a city our size, and must be addressed during road improvements.</p> <p>Finally, much of the area between Spenard and Minnesota lacks storm drainage. As we look to develop this area in the future, it will be essential that upgrades to Minnesota include upgrades to the storm water system to accommodate the Municipality's storm water needs to support future development.</p> <p>We are glad to see Spenard Road included in the 2019-2022 TIP and excited to work with the Municipality to invest in infrastructure and revitalization efforts. CIHA recently went through the process of planning developments on several more of our parcels in the area. While the final plat has not yet been recorded, CIHA will be granting land along the front of multiple plots to the city bring down costs for road redevelopment and help facilitate investments along Spenard Road. While we broadly support efforts in Spenard, we believe that the current plan will create new problems for area residents and businesses while failing to address our neighborhood's most pressing issues.</p> <p>Spenard at Minnesota Drive – 36th and Spenard One-Way Couplets</p> <p>Simply stated, CIHA is adamantly opposed to the proposal to create one-way couplets with Spenard and 36th. To do so would be to significantly impact the viability of our retail and residential developments. Access is essential to retail in particular, and to require customers to circle around via Minnesota to reach properties along Spenard is unrealistic and damaging to the value of our commercial properties. The couplets would create an island that would be both difficult and undesirable to access.</p> <p>In addition, Spenard Road is designated by the Municipality as a transit oriented development corridor. To remove one way of bus service from this section of Spenard violates a basic premise of TOD.</p> <p>Finally, the neighborhood encompassing the intersections of Spenard Road with Arctic Boulevard and Chugach Way with Tudor Road already struggles from access issues. The neighborhood, surrounded by arterial roads, ironically is inconvenienced as most ingress and egress is controlled right in right out. The couplet would exacerbate this situation.</p> <p>Accessibility and Equity</p> <p>Beyond the myriad of issues with the proposed couplets, the current project fails to directly address the most disadvantaged area of Spenard. The stretch between Benson and 36th is home of some of our most underprivileged residents, those who are most in need of improved public transit and pedestrian accommodations. The proposed couplet system would compound rather than ameliorate these existing concerns.</p> <p>In particular, this area needs sidewalks and bike lanes to connect with those recently completed along the North end of Spenard Road. The current infrastructure is not sufficient for pedestrians and bikes, let alone those with disabilities. I have personally seen individuals in motorized wheelchairs travelling in the lanes of Spenard Road because the sidewalks do not properly accommodate them, a clear and unacceptable violation of ADA. Addressing these issues of accessibility should be our top priority. Investment in this infrastructure would result in vastly improved functionality for some of this city's most underserved and act as an important symbolic gesture.</p> <p>Suggested Bifurcation</p> <p>In view of the existing issues and limitations, we suggest a bifurcation of the project currently described in the 2019-2022 TIP Development draft. The project should be split into two sections—one stretching from Benson Boulevard to 36th Avenue to be developed now and another comprising the intersections of Minnesota and 36th, Spenard and 36th, and Minnesota and Spenard. This will prioritize the area most greatly in need of redevelopment while allowing for continued discussions on improving Minnesota traffic flow and the opportunity to suggest solutions other than the proposed 36th and Spenard one-way couplets. We hope that the 2019-2022 TIP will fund Spenard Road improvements stopping at 36th Avenue.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>There are other, more detailed comments that we can offer at a later stage, but we have chosen to focus on the larger, fundamental issues at this time. While we understand that there are regional transportation issues regarding Minnesota Road traffic flow, the state and its contractors must also understand the significant municipal goals in the area. A successful design must accommodate both moving traffic throughout the Anchorage bowl, as well as preserving our neighborhoods and supporting redevelopment in west Anchorage.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to contact me for further information or feedback, and please keep me posted on the process as it unfolds.</p>		<p>Recommend removing "Includes Spenard Rd/36th Ave couplet." from the project description.</p>	<p>Policy Committee edited the Spenard Road project description to read "Project will rehabilitate to improve traffic flow. This project would also include non-motorized improvements. Project shall not include improvements to the Minnesota Intersection except ADA requirements on the east side".</p>

**AMATS 2019-2022 TIP Comment/Response**

Comment #	Commenter	Date submitted	Project Name	Comment	Staff Comments	Technical Advisory Committee Comment	Policy Committee Comment
N32	Moira Sullivan Gallagher, President South Addition Community Council	10/1/2018	Complete Streets Study for A, C, I, L	(See attached resolution for Whereas statements)  Now therefore, South Addition Community Council resolves that AMATS' 2019 - 2022 Transportation Improvement Program should include funding for a Complete Streets study of A, C, I and L Streets within the next year that will identify capital improvements needed to 1. Make the roadways compatible with adjacent homes and neighborhood character, 2. Continue to accommodate vehicle traffic, 3. Slow traffic speeds and noise, 4. Promote improved transit service, 5. Allow people to safely walk along and across the streets, 6. Encourage more people to walk and bicycle. Adopted unanimously by the South Addition Community Council on September 20, 2018		Recommend waiting until the South Addition Community Council neighborhood plan and the AMATS Complete Streets policy are completed before starting a Complete Streets study on these roadways.	Approved
N53	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Spenard Road Multimodal facility	In our most recent meeting with Mayor Berkowitz, we outlined our top priorities for creating a safer, more accessible city for bicyclists and pedestrians. The following projects were included in our top priorities, and we urge AMATS to include them in the TIP:  • Completing multimodal facilities for the full length of Spenard Road, from 33rd Avenue to McRae Road. We feel strongly that bike lanes be included in this.	The draft TIP contains the Spenard Road Rehabilitation project that can look at non-motorized improvements from Benson Blvd to Minnesota. Staff recommends adding the following language to the project description "Project includes non-motorized improvements."	Concur with staff recommendation.	Approved
N56	Bike Anchorage	9/20/2018	Spenard Road Rehabilitation	RDY00003 - Spenard Road Rehab [Benson Blvd to Minnesota Dr] o This project should include bike lanes. o We recommend removing the Spenard Rd/36th Ave couplet from the Draft TIP. Converting Spenard Road and 36th Avenue east of Minnesota Drive into a one-way couplet would increase stress and decrease safety, utility, and appeal for non-motorized users.		Recommend removing "Includes Spenard Rd/36th Ave couplet." from the project description.  Recommend adding "Project includes non-motorized improvements." to the project description.	Policy Committee edited the Spenard Road project description to read "Project will rehabilitate to improve traffic flow. This project would also include non-motorized improvements. Project shall not include improvements to the Minnesota Intersection except ADA requirements on the east side".