



ID: 01 4/20/2009 9:37:20 AM

I want to thank you for your presentation to the APHCC on Thursday April 16th. Your comments were direct and kept the comments on track.

I am in favor of this direct route but as you could tell, some of my neighbors are fanatical about the trails, woods or wilderness. A few years ago it was going to disrupt the various lakes, or dog play area. Their bottom line was no development in that area, come hell or high water.

Your comments that it is UAA & APU land and it will be developed sometime in the next 10 years was good. I think folks envisioned it park land. The university will need that land to grow. The location of the proposed arena will make the corner of Bragaw/APU Drive very congested and not having a direct road to Northern Lights Blvd. impossible to move traffic quickly. I remember other boulevards had problems, A/C Couplet (crossing the creeks near 20th). Lake Otis Parkway south of Tudor, and 15th Ave. but they are good roads, move the traffic and landscaping keeps them from being industrial looking.

Hope your Summer walking and testing the area gives lots of positive data.

Thanks again for keeping us informed.

ID: 02 4/22/2009 11:48:56 PM

Please add me to your email on updates for this project.

ID: 03 5/1/2009 1:51:37 PM

Surely, surely you can't be planning to demolish the last good green space in Anchorage? Please keep me posted, so I can howl very loudly back -- although experience suggests that once developers decide to pave things over, "public comment" is pro forma and the pavers roll on no matter what we say. But we will try. So please keep me posted. Thanks!

ID: 04 5/5/2009 4:53:24 PM

I am not in favor of extending Bragaw Road south to connect to Elmore Road. This would bisect wetlands that need to be preserved to maintain Anchorage's wild character. Pushing that road through the wetlands and forested area would also fundamentally disrupt the essential continuity and connectedness of the U-Med district.

A better option would be to upgrade the UAA Drive access to Providence Drive and/or connect Providence Drive/University Drive to Wesleyan Drive.

In the very short term we need to put a right turn lane on West Campus Drive turning north onto Lake Otis Parkway near Lake Otis Elementary. At peak hours when students are let out of class and UAA employees leave work for lunch or the end of the day, West Campus Drive backs up to the North Parking Lot and the West Parking Lot becomes impossible to exit. If you want to allow easier northbound access out of the U-Med district, this is it!!! And pretty cheap to do.

ID: 06 5/6/2009 7:36:54 PM

The possibility of a northern access to the U-Med District from North Lights Boulevard is very welcome to me. I drive to Providence to work every day and experience the back-ups that can occur. Additionally, better bike travel and pedestrian access in that area is needed. Thank you for your efforts to study this busy corridor. It may also help to alleviate some of the tortuous Tudor Road traffic. It is my opinion that Tudor Road is a street to avoid at all costs. There is often no way to merge onto Tudor from a side street. Other cities have "access roads" which allow on and off traffic to access the small businesses along busy thoroughfares. One city that has done this quite well is Columbus, Ohio. Once again, good luck on your research.

ID: 07 5/8/2009 11:35:36 PM

Please don't push through Bragaw to Elmore. I don't want another road that will diminish another wild area. Improve existing roads and intersections, ea. UAA drive, if you need better access to the U-Med district. Thanks

ID: 08 5/11/2009 9:54:11 AM

Please do not extend Bragaw south of Northern Lights. These trails are part of the excellent trail system in Anchorage and are free in cost for all.

ID: 09 5/11/2009 9:54:40 AM

Do not extend Bragaw south of Northern Lights. It is not necessary and is major recreation area year around.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

ID: 10 5/11/2009 9:55:13 AM

I have received a few of your brochures about the meeting for the access to U-Med. Viewed the web page and there is nothing there to indicate what your intent to construct for an access.

Bike trail, walkway, tram, railroad, roads ???

I would like to walk into the meeting and have a basic understanding of exactly is being proposed for construction what it is you want to construct what you don't want to construct or if there is to be any construction period.

From the flyers it sounds as if this is going to be a meet and greet circle jerk

ID: 100.0 10/4/2009 1:32:01 PM

One of the main things that sets Anchorage aside from other US cities is its city parks and green areas. Instead of cutting our parks up, bit by bit, and turning Anchorage into some featureless Texas city, we should leave our parks alone and fix the bigger problems, namely H2H and Tudor&Lake Otis. If we fix these problems we can keep our parks the way they are. As an example, why not put Lake Otis in a tunnel under Tudor or Tudor as an overpass over Lake Otis. The same with H2H ... get rid of the lights! Take learnings from how some cities actually manage to improve traffic flow (e.g. Oslo, Norway) without ruining all the green areas and parks. Keep Anchorage green!

ID: 101.0 10/17/2009 2:59:39 AM

Regarding the question of how to extend Bragaw Street to connect to Elmore Road, I think there's an option that no one may have considered yet, and that would be to build the road connection below ground level, deep enough so the new road might have a reinforced concrete roof built over it, which would then be covered with 4 to 6 feet of earth. Thus, the road would be a "buried throughway", such that after the road is constructed, a roof built over it, and the roof then buried, and replanted, the UAA/UPA property would retain its completely natural appearance, as seen from above ground. This would be more costly than simply laying in a road at ground level, and there would surely be many engineering challenges to be dealt with; but it would seem to achieve the goals of all the various factions discussing this connector road.

ID: 102 10/21/2009 12:07:06 PM

please just link bragaw and elmore road as straightly as possible. Many of us have been hoping for this for many years. And do it write the first time so it's built to handle the load and we don't have to go back and put in more lanes and make changes to the work. It's the one route that will bless the greatest number of citizens. If you go this route, when it is all done I will take all of you guys down the new road to costco and it will be hot dogs and soda on me.

ID: 11 5/11/2009 4:07:10 PM

East-west traffic on Northern Lights is already bad. Will this bring more traffic onto Northern Lights? The intersection of Bragaw and Northern Lights is already dangerous and overly congested. How are you going to keep that intersection from becoming worse? It's now very hard to get out of East High if you have to turn left onto Bragaw. How are you going to keep that from becoming an impossible situation? It's even hard to turn left from Bragaw into East High.

It would be nice if the plan would provide tunnels for the ski trails so that they would not be interrupted by a road.

ID: 12 5/12/2009 5:52:04 PM

I have two primary concerns. The first is that presently, as well as in the foreseeable future, the need for additional road infrastructure at this location is not justified. To satisfy the purpose of moving people from any part of town to another the municipality needs an efficient and reliable public transportation system. There is an additional need for more efficient use and maintenance of the existing road system that would also satisfy the stated purpose of decreasing traffic pressure and congestion far more effectively than building another new road. My second comment pertains to the trail system that will ultimately be bisected by the road that is likely to be constructed. Those of us who currently live in this area rely on the connectivity of the trail system to access the areas being studied; schools, parks, medical facilities, retail areas, etc. Any new infrastructure should include bridges/tunnels to allow the free flow of non-motorized traffic through all areas where this is currently possible.

ID: 13 5/12/2009 6:29:49 PM

This wooded area is a beloved recreation area for people in the neighborhood. There are many unofficial trails that are used in this area.

I bike to UAA every day, and the UAA campus is designed very poorly for bikers and pedestrians. When I commute to UAA by Bike, I much prefer to ride away from auto traffic.

ID: 14 5/14/2009 12:01:14 PM

While I believe that there should be a route connecting Elmore to Bragaw, I have a very difficult time with the idea of any road cutting through the trails of APU or Goose lake.

The trails provided behind APU and around Goose Lake are one of very few trail systems that are of easy access to the public. Yes, there is Kincaid, Russian Jack and a few others, but the location of these trails are I believe in a prime and easily accessible location to the public. Having a road cut through these trails, in my mind, is not such a good idea.

It is unclear to me where the proposed road would start and end, however, I do not support any road plan that would cut through any part of these scenic, relaxing wooded trails.

ID: 15 5/18/2009 4:26:32 PM

It appears to me that you have so narrowly defined the problem that you want to guarantee there is only one reasonable answer – put Bragaw through. By restricting all focus to traffic only from northeast Anchorage, any solution that might benefit access from north or northwest at some expense to those from northeast will be severely discounted compared to those that strictly favor traffic from northeast. In addition you make it clear that a goal is to reduce traffic on Lake Otis, Boniface, Northern Lights and Tudor (this is clearly stated in your project literature). So what is left other than Bragaw?

By predefining your solution through so many restrictions you have severely undermined the credibility of your effort. It is hard to imagine that there is any reason to participate.

I have heard this comment from others as well.

ID: 16 5/18/2009 5:26:08 PM

Please add me to the list to receive updates on this project.

ID: 17 5/18/2009 7:20:02 PM

I'd like to know when there are projects updates. I may comment on the purpose & need statements.

ID: 18 5/19/2009 4:14:26 AM

I am opposed to any project that will cut through the existing area under consideration. It will be senseless to even begin studying the possibility of a short-cut to the U-Med area until after the Lake Otis & Tudor intersection has been completed. There are so many alternatives to building new roads. Let's look at improving public transportation, trip consolidation, educating the public about avoiding peak travel times for non-essential travel, etc. The solution is not building more roads and destroying one of the last remaining "natural" spaces in the Anchorage Bowl. Let's find alternatives.

ID: 19 5/19/2009 8:34:10 AM

I would like to get updated e-mails on this process.

ID: 20 5/19/2009 10:50:43 AM

This road would be very detrimental to the area as a whole. While it may relieve some traffic, the solution is a band-aid to a larger problem, and most importantly does not take into account non-motorized users of the park it will destroy. It will also create a highway setting near a large high-school, where students are walking and have been in accidents as pedestrians in the past. I live in this neighborhood because of the parks, do not wish to have a thoroughfare nearby, and hope to keep the "campus" feel by leaving the area alone. Many people, including the university students access the trails for recreation, commuting and team practice. The nearby high school also does the same. It would be a shame to destroy one of the last decent parks in the city. Goose Lake is frequented by families, and a new road would be detrimental to the lake and wetlands in the area. There has to be other alternatives that help relieve the congestion. Putting a parking area on Tudor/Muldoon and having a reliable shuttle. Encouraging biking/walking to work with incentives is much cheaper than building and maintaining a road. These are just a few options. This city encourages driving as an only option but this is not an ultimate solution. Make the area non-motorized, and have a park and shuttle from another area. This would leave the area feeling like a campus, encourage healthy habits, and safety for pedestrians.

Thanks! Sarah Heck

ID: 21 5/19/2009 8:28:43 PM

I am very concerned that we are jumping the gun with this project. Though it is not titled the Bragaw extension project it obviously is and giving it a more benign/different name makes it much more difficult for citizens to identify the project. Hence limiting public process. I strongly urge our city, with state involvement, as necessary, to look at land use before starting another multi million dollar road project. I work at Providence and do not find congestion to be bothersome. We need to look at identifying land use and how to decrease the number of cars at the most crowded times. The goal is decrease congestion and move PEOPLE more efficiently. There are many alternatives to achieve this other than more roads. One example would be for the UAA to have Fridays as a normal scheduled class day. Most all of classes currently are offered only M-Th. If this 4 day traffic is divided over 5 days it would decrease the congestion. Please study everything not just feasibility of a road. It is time with think outside of the roads only box. Thank you for your time. Melonie Rieck, twenty plus years Anchorage citizen

ID: 22 5/19/2009 10:32:45 PM

Please send me updates.

ID: 23 5/19/2009 10:58:12 PM

I am VERY against any new road in the u-med area. My husband and I chose to live in this area because of the access to parks/trails. Its ridiculous to think this area has a traffic problem. I commute to the APU campus from the East High area every day and can see no problem with traffic. Please preserve the trails and come up with an alternate plan/ new road free plan if increased access is the goal.

ID: 24 5/19/2009 11:08:29 PM

My wife and I live just north of the wonderful green space between Bragaw and Elmore. We chose to live in this part of town almost entirely because of the access to the university trail system. We ski, bike run walk and commute using human power through this area. It will be ruined if a road goes through. Enhancing existing roads, carpooling, enhancing public transport and using human powered transportation are all viable methods to preserve what makes anchorage such a beautiful livable city. We shouldn't need to drive out of town to enjoy open spaces in AK. Don't destroy this green area!

ID: 25 5/20/2009 10:26:18 AM

I was unable to attend last night's meeting. Can I get a copy (or link) to information provided at the meeting.

ID: 26 5/20/2009 10:57:38 AM

I am vehemently opposed to putting a road through UAA. Why are we betting our future on only what is best for vehicle drivers? Why can't we design an area that is more mass transit/walking friendly? Use Boniface not Bragaw.

ID: 27 5/20/2009 10:59:40 AM

Submitted via comment form: Where students walk across UAA Drive between the Science Bldg. and the Engineering Bldg., they create horrible traffic congestion around 5 p.m. An inexpensive and simple solution would be a walk-don't walk traffic light that only works during the 15-minute passing time between classes. If traffic, then students had lights stopping them, then letting them proceed, it would be a big help for vehicular traffic. I know what a problem it is, because I work on campus there.

ID: 28 5/20/2009 11:01:56 AM

submitted via comment form: Build a light rail system. Now we can get the money from Fed. Run major thorough fare N & S-E-W then have small bus feeder system. Next toll road from the valley to pay for wear and tear.

ID: 29 5/20/2009 11:03:00 AM

submitted via comment form: send pdf of all the boards.

ID: 30 5/20/2009 11:08:10 AM

submitted via email: Please go the extra mile to inform the public about future meetings. Share cost estimates for all options, including van-pooling, shared ride programs and biking along with more roads. How do we calculate these elsewhere? When engaging the public, please be honest about the elephant in the room: the stated goal of elected Muni politicians is to connect Elmore and Bragaw. That's the story, I dare say. Tell the public how we define "problems" and "solutions" in standards specific to comparable cities of similar populations, not "Anchorage only" perspectives.

ID: 31 5/20/2009 11:16:56 AM

submitted via comment form: 1. Both most immediate community councils, Rogers Park and U-Med, passed resolutions unanimously opposed this project. 2. Both UAA and APU student bodies oppose it. 3. APU regents support for commercial development - this does not in any way justify this project. 4. The impact on East High School would be horrific. 5. EMS personnel deny (unofficially) that current access to Providence is severely impeded by present roads. 6. As a physician, the statement that current roadways cause unnecessary delays is absolutely specious. I have not encountered these so-called delays. 7. As a progressive city, Anchorage should explore all state of the art transit modes other than private vehicle. 8. These wooded boreal forest and wetlands are perhaps the greatest legacy of both UAA and APU. APU is a member of the EcoLeague Consortium of colleges-as such this project is crass hypocrisy on its part. 9. These lands are key wetlands and integral to a contiguous east-west ecosystem and habitat. 10. This ecosystem is and has been a major recreational for east Anchorage residents, and UAA, APU, East high, Wendler MS, and several elementary schools. It also serves as an excellent and broad spectrum natural laboratory. 11. Current street upgrades to Piper and 40th satisfy these concerns.

ID: 32 5/20/2009 11:19:35 AM

Submitted via comment form: If by any unfortunate circumstances, Bragaw (Elmore) St is extended from No. Lights to Providence Dr, it will be extremely critical to design ski and bike trails. This area is highly used for recreation. I personally am strongly against an extension through this area. I'm glad to see some additional alternatives to extending Bragaw-hope one of those is selected.

ID: 33 5/20/2009 12:12:11 PM

I hope this gets done. It would be great people to by pass mid town to get to places. It would ease up a lot of traffic!

ID: 34 5/20/2009 3:07:49 PM

submitted via comment form: Against any new access to U-Med from the North. Reasons: 1. More neighborhood noise and traffic; 2. East High School already has more busy streets than any other Anchorage High School-neighborhood. 3. Ruin of a primary mental health area in Anchorage, especially the original city. 4. If Bragaw Street or Elmore Street goes thru Elmore Street should be extended to Potter Marsh first. 5. If U-Med area employs 10% of Anchorage work force, what % of Anchorage population lives within 2 miles of U-Med district and this should be known. 6. Right-of-way should be taken from U-Med district equal to park land taken. 7. U-Med district business should have to replace park land of equal value and strategic importance. 8. Must conserve moose habitat in the area. 9. U-Med area is prime recreational area for area residents, very important for many. 10. What will happen to residence neighborhoods when U-Med grows enough to occupy all its land-will neighborhoods be partially or totally condemned to give U-Med more room. Having lived here over 40 years I see that as a real scary proposition. Will local housing taxes be cut to make up for the decrease value of those neighborhoods? 11. Shove mass transit down U-Med districts throats. Make parking lots away with mass transit to U-Med.

ID: 35 5/20/2009 3:13:35 PM

Submitted via comment form: What the real problem? It would never occur to me to drive thru UAA or Providence/APU to get somewhere else. Only use Providence Dr, UAA Drive, 36th east of Lake Otis if I am going to UAA or APU or the hospital. If its internal traffic, it needs an internal fix. I have no problem getting from my home in NE Anchorage to either or any hospital or to UAA. The question or the difference between the traffic count in July vs. Sept. (non-school/school yr) needs an answer. More public transit! Spend money there not on auto!

ID: 36 5/20/2009 3:16:21 PM

Submitted via comment form: I oppose any disruption of the wooded area shared by APU & UAA. A unique aspect of life in Anchorage is the intact areas of wild woodlands in the heart of the city-Bicentennial Park and the APU-UAA woodlands. Since UAA Drive is already a paved corridor, I find expanding this corridor much more expeditious and certainly less disruptive approach than establishing a new paved corridor.

ID: 37 5/20/2009 3:20:38 PM

Submitted via comment form: If a road is built to connect Elmore to Bragaw, the recreational trail system on the APU & UAA undeveloped lands should retain its connectivity with the parks-University Lake & Goose Lake. Trail bridges are far more preferable than tunnels or underpasses.

ID: 38 5/20/2009 3:37:03 PM

As the U-med district is a green community, and a large number of people commute by bike and bus in the area (including myself), I think tax dollars may be most wisely spent on smart growth/transit and friendly development and better bike path signage.

I am nervous about a loss of quality to the existing paths and woods to the north of the UAA/APU campus and about adverse impacts of development to wildlife and tree habitat and to the experience of trail users. I am worried about the "if you build it they will come" truth that creating easier car access will encourage further growth in people driving to the U-Med area and choosing to live where they cannot easily commute by bus or bike. I am worried that disadvantaging bus and bike traffic, relatively, will disadvantage those who cannot drive for whatever reason, and will lead to a more obese, diseased population (which will ironically need the hospital more!). I am worried that existing streets and bike trails in Anchorage are not properly maintained as it is, and more streets will just add to the problem. Improvements to the existing bike infrastructure could go a long way to helping. The U-Med district is blessed in being accessibly by paths that do not follow or cross roadways at grade. This encourages cycling among Anchorageites, who generally don't want to battle cars. However, improvements such as better signs to let new commuters know which paths to take to get where they are going and better bike ways (36th avenue sidewalks are bike paths, but are obstructed with many ill-placed obstacles and poor crossings) would go a long way to encourage even more bike traffic.

Please evaluate if a road does more harm than good, and if path improvements, transit improvements, and better land-use and development decisions could lead to a more favorable outcome.

Thanks.

ID: 39 5/21/2009 12:55:17 PM

I appreciate the public involvement in the initial planning stages of this project. I hope your desire to look at all alternatives is sincere. I would like to register my objection to the idea of northern access to the U-Med District. The reason for my objection is threefold. The first is that despite the argument of traffic demand and congestion in the U-Med area and your claim that the access points are all "over capacity", only one of the roads leading into the University or the U-Med area are projected to run over capacity, UAA Drive. The others (University Dr and Bragaw) are projected to meet the level of service demands according to the 2025 LRTP. Why not look to improve existing access, UAA Drive? The second reason I object to additional northern access is the increased traffic that will run past East High School, hardly creating a better atmosphere for children to walk, ride their bikes to school. Already the number of pedestrian accidents in that area of some of the higher in the city. The third reason for my objection is that despite numerous existing reports (Area wide Trails Plan and the Anchorage Bowl Strategic Plan that relay the importance of maintaining existing tracts of open space, the State is considering dividing it. Please consider those plans in your planning efforts, I saw no mention of them. Thank you for your early public involvement. I hope your consideration of alternatives is sincere. Please consider improvements to existing infrastructure before creating new infrastructure that will add even more expense to an already strained budget.

ID: 40 5/22/2009 3:16:45 PM

The U-Med district/campuses are a park-like jewel in the midst of urban Anchorage. Preserving that character (wooded land, recreational space, trails, SLOW traffic) should be a priority.

Increasing traffic flow is not a service to the city. If emergency access is needed, put in an emergency vehicles only lane on existing roads.

In particular, I am opposed to new thru-routes that bisect U-Med either N to S or E to W.

ID: 41 5/24/2009 10:30:46 AM

Hi,

I'm a professor at Alaska Pacific University, a regular (4 out of 5 days/week) bicycle commuter, and an Anchorage resident (I live near Valley of the Moon). I am writing to provide my strong support for a northern access alternative that does NOT include development of a transit corridor directly between Bragaw and Elmore on the APU/UAA property north and west of the APU campus. This area, which includes extensive bicycle and ski trails, is an important resource for the community in several ways, all of which will be degraded by a Bragaw/Elmore connection: 1) the area contains extensive wetlands, as shown in your own map. The values of wetlands generally, and in this area specifically, are well documented; 2) the ski and bicycle trails provide critical access for commuters like myself, but also a recreational resource for residents and workers alike in the U-Med district and surrounding areas. The attractiveness of this region for continued job growth and property values is in part dependent upon such amenities; 3) APU and UAA faculty (including myself) use this wetland / forested region for field trips and small research projects on a regular basis. The value of this site for such work would be strongly compromised by the construction of a major travel artery through the area.

In summary, I'd like your process to give strong consideration to other transportation alternatives that avoid bisecting the valuable green space between Bragaw and Elmore. Thanks for the chance to comment.

Mike Loso

ID: 42 5/25/2009 11:08:45 AM

The study is tasked with the presumption that there is a "problem" with achieving motor vehicle access from Northern Lights Blvd and north to the University campus and Providence hospital. The study should have a no-action alternative, in the same way that an Environmental Impact Study has "no-action" as an alternative. The study should not presume that punching in or expanding a road is "needed" and the only issue is where. The institutional stakeholders who's mission might be better served by more or wider roads leading their way have a different interest than the diverse recreational users of the area and the residents. If one doesn't assume the institutions' interests are more important than residents' and park goers and skiers, bikers, walkers and low impact folks in general, then the impact will be assessed more accurately.

The idea that the hospital needs a road from the north for emergencies is weak. If the route from Northern Lights is too long, go north to Regional hospital. Bringing out the "safety" card to bolster the conclusion that a road is needed, to me, illustrates the bias toward building something. If UAA wants better access from the north, let them do it along their own "UAA drive". Widen it, install a roundabout, a shuttle lot on the north side of campus, etc.

The left turn south from Northern lights onto UAA Road is bad in the am, but there are traffic and intersection solutions, I expect, that can address that, short of a new road.

In sum: First preferred" no action; second, expand UAA drive; third, no action.

Thanks, Mike Kreger

ID: 43 5/25/2009 4:13:14 PM

I believe planning for the U-Med District must consider the Anchorage Pathway Loop as one of its priorities. The Anchorage Pathway Loop is a strategic plan for connecting and prioritizing trail routes within the municipality of Anchorage.

This plan, which is now in its 20th year of debate and construction, will connect the Chester and Campbell Creek pathways to Kincaid Park and the coastal trail through UAA Campus. The central priority of this proposal is to build a safe and effective transportation system for school and work commuting while creating several circular routes for athletic events.

I believe building a pathway connecting the south fork of the Chester Creek to the Chester Creek Trail through UAA campus must be considered a top priority when considering a transportation plan for the U-Med District.

This section of pathway will provide the most direct commuter link to downtown Anchorage from UAA Student Housing, Providence Hospital, UAA Sports Complex, and the King Career Center. This section of pathway is also an important link in completing the Anchorage Pathway Loop.

By following the criteria of the Anchorage Pathway Loop proposal we will be combining school routes, transportation, recreation and a world class tourist destination all in one package.

Hopefully the planning process for the U-Med District will help to fund the design and engineering for extending the south fork of the Chester Creek trail through UAA campus.

Chair, Anchorage Pathway Loop

ID: 44 5/26/2009 6:18:41 PM

There seem to be two opposing forces. There are those that want direct northern access, and those that want trails and wildlife to be undisturbed. The only "fix" that makes both happy is to do something that may be expensive, but will meet the requirements of all the major parties. A raised road from Elmore to Bragaw that would allow trails and wildlife to cross below unimpeded would seem to work. I would expect such a raised road to be significantly more expensive than a surface street, but there is no other solution that I see that can possibly solve both issues.

Oh, and as for some of the smaller groups that just hate roads because they increase traffic, they should realize that more roads with better placement actually reduce traffic. Access to East will be improved, not hindered, with Bragaw/Elmore connected because a smaller percentage of traffic will be turning traffic, and turning traffic is the least efficient in terms of cars per second of green light. This will help more people get to and from East by allowing more direct access. And for environmental concerns, more well placed roads means fewer miles traveled which leads to less fuel burned, thus helping the environment.

I am an APU alumnus, and I know the sentiment there was greatly against a through road adjacent to the university. However, I think it would be best for Anchorage to have the connection, and the universities should work to see how that connection could be made and be least intrusive to the area, such as having the road be a raised road to allow trails and wildlife to wander freely below.

ID: 45 5/26/2009 6:59:35 PM

submitted via comment form: The attempt to bisect the U-Med area is a violation of the land use/neighborhood plan. It is NOT needed as a critical connection between Tudor and Northern Lights even though it was evident Elmore was an attempt to provide a "set up" for it. This project does not follow any context sensitive design standards or you would not be here. To disrupt the internal flow of U-Med traffic is totally unnecessary and unwanted. There is already the 48th Avenue bisect of FNBP and that will connect to other roads. There is NO reason to destroy this employment center with any road. It is a violation of 2020 and the U-Med land use plan. There is no need to try to convince us that faster ER service is needed. Do not disrupt this employment and recreation area, drop it. The traffic in the U-Med area is not congested. No need has been demonstrated. Improvements to projects already provide access. The LRTP does not show this needed access.

ID: 46 5/27/2009 9:27:09 AM

My main concern about this reconnaissance study is the timing of the meetings. Approximately 12,000 full and part-time students attend UAA. Those students started finals week about April 22, 2009 with commencement scheduled May 3. The first time I saw the announcement for the meetings in the Green & Gold was on May 5, 2009. I know it was not in the Green & Gold on May 4, as I have that in my email. Green & Gold does not run an announcement, take it out and then run it again, so I suspect that the announcement was sent out AFTER students had already finished finals and graduated. There are, as a result, 12,000 people who regularly drive to the U Med District who may not have received notification of these meetings.

Assuming that there was an announcement earlier in the week, students pay little attention to anything other than writing papers and finals during the week before finals and finals week. Finally, once they have finished finals or graduated, they move on to their summer job or leave the State, resulting in few who would have been motivated to attend these meetings. Although students can voice their opinions in late August/early September, by then the choices will have been narrowed down to those that appear to be supported by the people DOWL has already spoken to. Without the input of these 12,000 people, I do not believe that DOT has a valid or legitimate sample of the opinions of the majority of the people who drive in to this area. I would request that the comment period be extended to mid-September, and another public meeting held in early September so that UAA students have an opportunity to attend. Otherwise, DOT is missing the opinions of the majority of people who actually use these roads on a regular basis.

My other comment is that the Purpose & Need statement is too narrow. Also, DOT should work with the major landowners potentially directly impacted to help shape the P&N statement – that would primarily be the University under the proposed plan.

ID: 47 5/28/2009 5:57:19 PM

Thanks to the team for doing such a thorough job on prior work and soliciting comments from the public. I would like a couple things to be considered: widening or other work on UAA Drive, and shuttle bus service for events such as games at the Sports Center.

ID: 48 5/31/2009 1:32:25 PM

Point 1: A northern access road from Bragaw into U-med would NOT improve traffic flow.

- A. Moving from a 3-way to a 4-way traffic stop would increase the amount of time spent at a stop light at the Bragaw intersection.
- B. Increasing traffic here would be more dangerous to East High students, bicycle commuters, skiers, and walkers using the trails near this intersection.
- C. Putting a northern access here would interfere with commuters accessing the highway via Bragaw, commuters heading toward midtown from the east side of town in the morning, and return commuters from the evening.

Point 2: Improving the UAA drive access would alleviate current problems without creating new ones.

- A. Widening UAA drive to accommodate 2 lanes of traffic, plus an "emergency vehicles only" lane would eliminate traffic congestion at UAA and Northern Lights. Two turn lanes from Northern Lights would also help. This would eliminate congestion for commuters heading to the highway or to and from mid-town
- B. Staggering UAA class start and end times would also alleviate most traffic problems as this intersection is almost empty when UAA is not in session, indicating most of the problem is that everyone is trying to get to class and leave class at the same times.

ID: 49 5/31/2009 1:33:06 PM

Went to one of your meetings: thanks! and some thoughts:

- Consider Boniface. It's 4 lanes wide and VERY lightly traveled between Northern Lights and Tudor.
 - Building more roads creates MORE traffic, and more traffic jams, not fewer.
 - Consider hub parking and shuttle service. Continuing to expand car traffic continues to put carbon molecules into the air and fat cells into the humans.
 - The uninterrupted green swath in the middle of Anchorage, with trails and animal habitat, represents crucial quality of life for future generations. PLEASE keep it for the kids. . . and for their kids.
- THANK YOU!

ID: 50 6/1/2009 12:26:50 PM

Please do not extend Bragaw south of Northern Lights. We must keep Anchorage a livable city and its nature is the major draw for tourism. We are, after all, Alaska Wild! Please send me updates of the project. Thank you.

ID: 50 6/1/2009 12:26:50 PM

Please do not extend Bragaw south of Northern Lights. We must keep Anchorage a livable city and its nature is the major draw for tourism. We are, after all, Alaska Wild! Please send me updates of the project. Thank you.

ID: 51 6/1/2009 12:57:37 PM

Having seen the evolution of the growth patterns surrounding the UMED District I believe it is in the best interest of the city to extend Bragaw to Elmore primarily for public safety reasons. Emergency access in and out of the region and secondly to ease traffic congestion. The direct route will be of less of an impact on usable land but maybe cost more because of fill. Winding through APU hard stand would impact significant hard stand. Keep it simple a straight shot with a multi use bridge or tunnel beneath the road across from Northern Lights and East High School.

ID: 52 6/1/2009 1:54:22 PM

Extending Bragaw to Elmore will do nothing more than create another high speed shortcut for North/South traffic. More people would use it to pass through than will to access the U/Med district. Improving UAA Drive and the intersection with N. Lights Blvd. would serve the same purpose without destroying the woodlands and wetlands in the area. Many of us use this area year round and feel the benefits Anchorage receives from its current state outweigh the limited gains from putting a road through it. Especially when improving UAA Drive, an existing road on better soil, would provide the necessary access without destroying the area.

ID: 53 6/1/2009 5:57:26 PM

I am concerned that the current Alaska Department of Transportation's U-Med Northern Access Reconnaissance study is disenfranchising an essential group of stakeholders: namely, the thousands of students, faculty and staff of the University of Alaska, Anchorage. Please consider expanding the time for public comment so that members of the UAA community can participate fully in the planning process. Optimally, the initial public comment process should be extended to mid-September to incorporate the views of the UAA community.

Additionally, I worry that the scope of the study is ultimately too narrow. I would like to see a "no action" option on the table. Without such an option, I fear we are answering the question, "Which road should we build?" instead of the more appropriate question, "How can we best move people in the U-Med District?" This broader question can better meet the needs of the campuses of the U-Med district and the people who use it.

Please consider expanding the scope of the study to include a "No Action" option and lengthening the public comment period so that the largest stakeholders can participate.

ID: 54 6/1/2009 6:27:55 PM

It seems mis placed to have the comment period about something that would effect UAA and APU when most of the student body is off of campus. I hope that you will extend the comment period to September 2009 so that those who use this area the most would be able to be the most assistance. Also, the way this comment period is set up is a false dichotomy. I would hope that the DOT would add a "No-Action" option. There are greater options out there that don't involve a larger road system that are simply not being included. Thank you.

ID: 55 6/1/2009 6:42:58 PM

Concerned about the timing of the public review relative to UAA's schedule. I am hopeful transit/non-motorized solutions receive equal consideration to road solutions.

ID: 56 6/1/2009 6:47:19 PM

I only recently became aware of this project/study and was really disappointed to see the public meetings had already passed. I lived on campus this past year and will be spending a lot of time in the U-Med district for the next several years.

I think that it would be really beneficial to getting a good cross-section of users if you extended the public comment period and had a few public hearings on-campus, while school was in session so that there were students around. Summer is the one part of the year when I am not on campus at least 5 days a week, and I think that many other students are in the same situation.

Finally I would like to address the matter of the study, Northern Access to the district. I sincerely request that you consider options other than opening up another access route to the area. I think that the entire district could well be better served by increase public transit and/or consideration of alternate means of transportation like bicycles. The capacity of the area is in many ways exceeded already and making it more accessible is not the solution, reducing the demand would both help to clear congestion as well as having holistic benefits to the community.

Sincerely,
Drew Cason

ID: 57 6/1/2009 9:04:52 PM

the project sounds interesting however it doesn't look like the public opinion is fully respected as the majority of the UAA community will be able to provide helpful input while in fall session. Please extend the public process until September-October and include a "no action " option

ID: 58 6/2/2009 2:21:12 AM

Could we consider leaving things as they are? Could we consider allowing additional input from University students who will be returning in the Fall and will be impacted by these projects?

ID: 59 6/2/2009 11:42:24 AM

I am very much for the extension from Northern Lights to Elmore as long as it is done in a way that is sensitive to the bike and ski paths now in existence. I think it can be done as shown by the two pedestrian/ski overpasses that already exist at Northern Lights and Tudor. Either the road could be elevated or the trails. A lot of people apparently are not cognizant of the amount of traffic and subsequent accidents that occur at the intersection of Northern Lights and UAA drive. Any emergency vehicle coming from Northern Lights and Bragaw has to go through what is essentially a residential/UAA area to get to Providence. A direct route connecting Providence from Northern Lights is the best solution for that problem. It would also be a boon for students crossing from the West side of the campus to the East side. Here's a vote for a commonsense solution.

ID: 60 6/2/2009 12:23:47 PM

I am disappointed in this plan. The U-Med district is relatively unique in the muni that it is NOT overrun by cars screaming through. Increasing the ability for cars to scream through the U-Med will come at a direct cost for pedestrians, bikers, runners, skiers, students and wildlife. Lets set aside this district to have a pedestrian preference.

ID: 61 6/2/2009 4:54:57 PM

I have commuted in the vicinity of the medical district to the UAA campus (via Tudor and Northern Lights) - by car and by bike - for several years. This includes travel along UAA drive between Northern Lights and Providence Dr.

First, the traffic around the district is NOT that bad even at peak times. Further peak times don't last that long and traffic in this corridor is very moderate at most times except for peak times. Traffic at peak times in this zone (which doesn't last long) is similar to moderate traffic in most urban areas around the country.

Second, the monetary costs of a new road (even if, particularly if, funded by the lower 48) would clearly exceed the benefits of reducing minimal congestion during short peak driving times. Note that the new road would not provide access to residential or commercial property but would simply be a corridor from the medical district to Northern Lights - the primary purpose of which is to reduce minimal congestion.

Third, an additional cost that must be considered is disruption of natural areas / a great trail system. This disruption would be unfortunate and would yield few direct benefits to the current and future citizens of Anchorage.

ID: 62 6/2/2009 10:23:41 PM

The U-Med area will not have decreased traffic congestion with the creation of a connection between Elmore and Bragaw. This will only increase the traffic in the area, not decrease it.

Also, many of the important stake holders, the students of UAA and APU, are away on summer vacation. It would be unfair and dishonest to finish the public comment period while the students of these institutions are away.

Also, please consider a no action option in the planning process. It is important to consider that no action on this particular road connection may be the best particular option. Preserving the land of two of Alaska's finest educational institutions is important to the Anchorage community.

Please extend the public comment period to September 30, 2009, 30 days after the start of UAA. Also please consider a no action option.

Thanks

ID: 63 6/3/2009 3:15:52 PM

This study needs to collect and provide facts and not rely on anecdotes or generalizations. Such facts must include:

Facts About Traffic - Statements about need, including traffic congestion and safety/accident rates, have to be supported by facts/numbers. In other words, what are the actual numbers of vehicles entering and leaving the U-Med District from different points at different times of day at different times of the year? What kinds of accidents have occurred, when, why? What are the traffic delays - how long, when, where?

Other Ways of Accessing U-Med - What are the other forms of transportation used to get in and out of the U-Med area? How many cyclists, walkers, bus users, etc.? Where do they travel (access points/travel corridors)? When (primarily morning/late afternoon/constant all day)?

Trail/Recreational Use - Proposed actions may affect trail and/or recreational use; therefore, data must be collected as part of this study on: the number and type of trail/recreational users in the area and on each potentially affected trail; timing of use; purpose of use (e.g., commuting/recreation/family outing), and so forth.

As for alternatives, consider future trends and needs. At this point in the conversation my own bias is that a new road will just be a temporary stop-gap measure as traffic continues to increase. I think it's imperative to look at alternative transportation into and out of U-Med that relies on other methods of access rather than primarily the private vehicle (e.g., buses, bikes, walking). Consider how improving the bus system across Anchorage would also help to conveniently move more people in and out of U-Med.

ID: 64 6/3/2009 3:22:43 PM

It would be a shame to create a road through the well-used trail system between UAA and APU. This trail system is one that makes Anchorage a special place and the university area attractive to students, faculty and staff. Please seriously consider expanding existing roads rather than creating a new road to alleviate traffic congestion. I also request that public comment be held at the university during the fall/spring school year rather than over the summer. The nearly 15,000 students who attend UAA -- and who will be most impacted by this road -- will not have an opportunity to comment unless this is done.

ID: 65 6/3/2009 10:42:35 PM

As a midtown resident who bikes, walks and skis around UAA, APU, and Goose Lake, I am shocked at the prospect of more asphalt and fewer trees in our neighborhood. If you need to expand and upgrade existing roads, such as UAA drive, do so. But please don't put any new roads through the only existing natural area in our neighborhood!

Sincerely,
Nick Rothman

ID: 67 6/4/2009 5:40:59 PM

Received via letter: Although we now live in Homer, we lived in Anchorage for twenty five years and are very familiar with the need for the Bragaw extension. I was a professor at APU, taught at UAA, worked at the Borough building on Tudor Road at Bragaw, and worked in the Transit building on Tudor at Bragaw. I've also been very active in various community organizations in Anchorage. I've always felt the need for the Bragaw extension - the 'missing link' described by Frank Tecca, former MOA traffic engineer. But I'm very much aware of the objections raised by the environmental community. There is a solution which lends itself to the slightly rolling terrain - a slightly depressed road, heavily landscaped with pedestrian bridges. This would be slightly more expensive than some alternatives, but would be a real asset to the area. And as most road location decision, the great majority of the citizens would benefit, while a small minority who oppose any road in any location would learn to live with it (and use it).

ID: 68 6/4/2009 5:45:26 PM

Please extend the comment period until October 2009 or later for faculty and students that are not here at this time. The deadline for June will exclude important commentary that these absent people might provide.

Do not take away the trails, wildlife. Wetlands and creeks must be accommodated and protected.

ID: 69 6/8/2009 9:40:04 AM

I live on E 15h Avenue between Kinnikinnik and Sunrise. One of the most important amenities in this area is access to the University complex of open space and trails. If this block of forest and wetland is bifurcated, its integrity and values would be lost. I use this area throughout the year for jogging, trail biking and skiing. It is an island in the urban sprawl and traffic.

I also question the need for another access road. UAA Drive already provides access from Northern Lights Blvd. According to my watch, it is scarcely 45 seconds, at normal traffic speeds, to reach UAA Drive from the intersection of Bragaw and North Lights. Also, people traveling from south Anchorage north on Elmore already can access the Glenn Highway via Boniface. So, I don't see the benefit.

Also, I am concerned that connecting or promoting more traffic on Bragaw will bring even more cut-through traffic onto E 15th Avenue. Just today, I watch a driver cut-through the neighborhood, running every stop sign and driving at least 10 miles over the speed limit. I see similar behavior several times a day in front of my house with drivers cutting between Airport Heights or Lake Otis and Bragaw. Connecting Bragaw with Elmore will only cause more of this behavior unless barricades are put up blocking access through the neighborhood streets.

I also am concerned that neighborhoods are being sacrificed for connectivity. More big, broad boulevards promote traffic, noise and congestion where it didn't exist before. In fact, I believe the atrocious behavior of Anchorage drivers is fostered by these big, broad roads, and is indirectly responsible for the injuries and fatalities to motorists, pedestrians and bicyclists. I work in mid-town and I can say that this town is hostile to pedestrians--crossing the street across these multi-lane road is putting you life in the hands of another.

During the recent mayoral campaign, I heard Eugene, Oregon cited as a model city. I lived in Eugene, attending the university there. I also did an internship with the City of Eugene Planning Department. I can say with first-hand experience that Eugene puts neighborhood integrity and quality of life first. The town is designed to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists and mass transit on most streets, except outlying ones. Green spaces are recognized for the value they bring in promoting a livable community. Eugene is actually difficult to drive across, speeds are slow and there are lots of stop signs and traffic lights, but the neighborhoods are good for people and children. I would like to see Anchorage, put values, like safe neighborhoods and open spaces, at the forefront above high speed connectivity.

ID: 69a 6/8/2009 9:40:04 AM

One of the most important amenities in this area is access to the University complex of open space and trails. I use this area throughout the year for jogging, trail biking and skiing. It is an island in the urban sprawl and traffic.

ID: 70 6/8/2009 10:37:24 AM

As you can see, I work at UAA, have done so for twenty years. I live nearby, east of East High. I drive to work in the winter (Northern Lights to UAA Drive) and bike to work in the summer (through the woods).

As a bicyclist and cross-country skier, I don't want to see any changes in the woodsy areas used by many people and home to many plants and animals who have a right to exist, too.

As a driver using UAA Drive, I see no traffic problem, even though I use that route at the high-traffic times. So people might have to wait through a light twice. Big deal! We should disrupt/destroy good things just so that they won't have to wait five minutes on the way to work or home? Widening UAA Drive could probably be done with little disturbance to the surroundings and seems like the best idea to me.

I also know that putting in a light for pedestrians who obstruct traffic flow on UAA Drive is almost a must. Students crossing outdoors, instead of using the spine overhead, can stop traffic dead for minutes at a time. If they, too, had to wait for a light, then traffic there during rush hour could flow better.

Thank you for considering my opinions on this issue which is of much concern to me. I see this as a quality of life issue: Do we pander to drivers, or do we reset our priorities to value other things just as much?

ID: 70a 6/8/2009 10:37:24 AM

As a bicyclist and cross-country skier, I don't want to see any changes in the woodsy areas used by many people and home to many plants and animals who have a right to exist, too.

ID: 71 6/15/2009 2:49:53 PM

Dear DOT,
As a resident in Airport Heights who works at ANTHC, I am highly aware of the fact that when driving it is necessary to go around the central area of trees and wildlife in order to access the U-Med District. However, I consider that a good thing. Please do not build roads through the trails- we will lose trail connectivity and greatly decrease opportunities for walking and biking. I current bike to work, and am glad that it is almost as fast to bike as it is to drive because I go straight through the trails. We should be encouraging more physical activity, not make it easier for people to use cars. If emergency access to the hospitals is truly an issue, please first expand existing roads rather than cut through the middle of this green area.

I regret that I was unable to attend the May 19th open house, but would like to ask that my comments be included in the public scoping that you are conducting.

Thank you very much.

ID: 72 6/16/2009 11:12:54 AM

I am concerned about the proposed changes to the road system in the U-Med district. I attend classes at UAA and work on the ANTHC campus, so use this area a lot to commute from west Anchorage and recreate. I commute both by bike and car. When traveling by car I have no problems. I actually appreciate having a slower route through the area as I believe that keeps the roads safer for the students and bike commuters. I also use a bike to commute and move around campus when taking classes. It is already difficult enough to get through campus by bike and I am afraid that more roads will make it even more dangerous even if bike access is considered during construction. I am especially concerned about the Elmore extension to Northern Lights. I know many people who are anticipating that roadway so they can drive quickly downtown from their home in south Anchorage. They are expecting a 45 MPH semi-highway. This will not be safe for students walking and riding around campus! Additionally, I do not want to lose any more recreational space in east Anchorage. I grew up in the area and I currently work there. We have already lost a significant part of Bicentennial Park to new roads, may lose part of Russian Jack Park to golf expansion, and no longer have easy access to the military tank trail system. What else should east Anchorage have to lose? The UAA and APU trail system is used for skiing, walking, running, biking, as well as playing with dogs. Let's try and keep some part of Anchorage wild. For some of us, that's why we live here. Thank you for considering my comments

ID: 72e 6/16/2009 11:12:54 AM

The UAA and APU trail system is used for skiing, walking, running, biking, as well as playing with dogs. Let's try and keep some part of Anchorage wild.

ID: 73 6/16/2009 1:18:02 PM

I live and work (at the Alaska Native Medical Center) in this district. I am against expanding Bragaw through the UAA/APU campus complex. As can be seen by the aerial photo you provided, a road through this area would completely bisect the University resulting in destruction of a beautiful area and requiring students and faculty to cross a busy road to go back between campuses. As an alternative, I would suggest expanding Elmore to a 4 lane road all the way to Abbott Loop, as that would improve flow from South Anchorage into U Med district and expanding Piper to 4 lane road.. Also, making better access from northern lights blvd through road in from of King Center would help route persons to UAA. Thank you for allowing me to comment

ID: 74 6/17/2009 5:24:04 PM

Please keep me updated re: access to U-Med district. Upgrading /enlarging the already present northern access from N. Lights to Providence and the Universities seems like an obvious solution to the congestion problem. Thank you.

ID: 75 6/18/2009 11:15:05 AM

I strongly oppose building a road to extend Elmore through UAA/APU land. I have lived on Wesleyan Drive for 23 years and have driven Northern Lights on most days. It does not appear to me that the need for additional access outweighs the green space we have in the middle of town. My husband and I and friends use that land frequently, skiing, hiking, and biking. It is one of the reasons we enjoy living in Anchorage.

We were told that punching this road in would help to promote safety along UAA drive. My suggestion is that you improve or widen that road instead of demolishing the woods and trails south of Elmore. We were told that student safety was at issue, but there is a bridge across UAA Drive. The students just need to use it.

I personally have not seen that Northern Lights is excessively busy, even during rush hour, nor have I seen that traffic backs up excessively as it turns onto UAA Drive.

I also oppose any effort to punch through 36th or Tudor Centre Drive to go through the College Gate neighborhood. There are already numerous other construction projects going on that should help relieve the pressure on the U-Med district - Pipe, Martin Luther King Dr., Wright St., etc.

Please don't destroy our green space and quality of life to save a few minutes of driving time.

ID: 76 6/18/2009 12:41:40 PM

I work at UAA and live in the U- med area West of UAA and Providence.

Hospital. It is essential that access be improved in this area as both institutions continue to grow. Also, the APU area continues to grow with commercial/educational development, and the Alaska Native Medical Center is a large complex south of APU and East of the UAA Residence Halls. It is critical that excellent access be provided to Providence Hospital in the event of emergencies and medical issues. UAA faculty staff and students need good access from all directions for many reasons, e.g.

student work schedules (many students work part/full time), meetings that faculty attend in the community off campus, the fact that UAA has all its student services offices at University Center, and the Aviation Complex at Merrill Field.

I personally have no problem with the Bragaw Street Extension (it has been discussed as long as I can remember), but consideration needs to be taken to retain as much of the green area as possible. Bike paths should be part of the plan.

This issue reminds me of the discussion when the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail was built. There was huge opposition, but it is now considered an asset to the city of Anchorage (see the Municipality of Anchorage Parks and Recreation Website).

ID: 77 6/18/2009 12:52:14 PM

Submitted via letter: I am writing to submit public comments in regard to the scoping process for the U-Med District. I have used the trail system between UAA, APU and Goose lake almost every day since 1988 and have been a student at UAA and APU. My first comment requests that the deadline be extended until September 30, 2009 so that students have an opportunity to comment during the scoping process. Students will be profoundly impacted by all of the proposed alternatives. In the may 19 public presentation, one of the reasons used to justify building an additional road through the U-Med district was the high usage of the area by employees and students. Yet, the deadline for submission of public comments forecloses the ability of the majority of UAA and APU students to respond since the semester ended within days of the public presentation. The comment period is a critical step to attain legitimacy of the project in the eyes of the public. For these reasons, the deadline should be extended.

Second, DOWL has limited the option available for the U-Med district by not including a "no-action" alternative. Given the history of planning and zoning of the U-Med District by the Municipality of Anchorage and the repeated decision to leave the area protected, the failure to include the "no-action" alternative is a blatant refusal to acknowledge the Municipality's prior decisions. In 2003, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended to permanently protect the wetlands area designated as "Class A wetlands". I oppose any reclassification or re-delineation of this wetlands area and any additional road access through the U-med District and request that you add the "no-action" alternative to the scoping process.

ID: 78 6/18/2009 1:57:08 PM

The most recent data available, "The Annual Traffic Volume Report for 2005-2007" shows flat or declining traffic levels in the U-Med area. For example, the junction of UAA Drive and Northern Lights Blvd. showed 9480 cars per day in 2005, 9049 cars per day in 2006, and 9090 cars per day in 2007. Similar numbers are consistent with other intersections throughout the U-Med area. The study does not break down the number of cars at different times of the day, but my casual observation as a 23 year resident of the neighborhood is that the busiest use at UAA Drive and Northern Lights Blvd. is limited to less than an hour per day.

I would like to offer a couple of suggestions that would help to avoid 'punching' any more new roads through our Anchorage greenbelts:

1) I propose that the busiest hour(s) of the day be designated as 'car pool only', meaning two or more persons per car be allowed to drive onto UAA, APU, and Providence grounds. For the people that do not find it convenient to car pool, we should explore a park and ride program with existing UAA shuttle buses being used to transport people from the parking lot to the campus. This only applies to 1 hour or so per day. The rest of the time, single driver cars would be permitted. This should also appeal to people interested in cutting down on air pollution and fossil fuel usage, as the number of cars would be decreased.

2) Consider modifying hospital and university work schedules to stage cars into the area. I believe that work and class start times could be staggered by as little as 30 minutes to have a huge impact on traffic levels.

Building more roads is definitely not the answer at this point. One only has to look at the new east/west road at the junction of Elmore and 48th (Martin Luther King Blvd.) to get an idea what the proposed Elmore extension or other new proposed roads will look like! Don't you think we should try to be more efficient in our road usage before we punch new roads across our park lands?

In addition, please update your public comments section. The list is only current as of a month ago. Thanks.

ID: 79 6/18/2009 3:29:52 PM

I am writing you on behalf of the Anchorage Citizens Coalition regarding tomorrow's deadline for public comment regarding the proposed U-Med Northern Access road.

I would like to respectfully request an extension to the June 19th deadline. Could we discuss the possibility of allowing ACC to submit comment sometime further into July?

There is an amount of research and discussion needed in order to be able to provide substantive, quality, and productive comment on the proposed project. We would very much like to provide you with the most useful information, and we're all so busy that it's difficult to gather so quickly! (I'm sure you can relate...)

ACC is also concerned that students at both UAA and APU are amidst summer break, and are thus less inclined to be informed and able to comment on the project. ACC would be willing to help coordinate comments from University students to be submitted in the Fall, if this is something you're able to work with. As students are a significant stakeholder group, we would be very appreciative of this opportunity.

Generally, the summer months in Anchorage are precious and many residents are busy celebrating solstice, and generally easing off of work and civic activities. An extension at least into July, preferably August, would allow ACC to consult our membership and try to gain additional feedback for our comments.

Please let me know if I can provide any other information or be of any help

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the U-Med Northern Access Study. While I do not live or work in the area, I travel to the U-Med district on a fairly regular basis for my husband or my own medical purposes. And, on occasion, we attend events at the UAA campus.

I have always felt that this area is a very special part of town - and despite the increased medical and university development, it has managed to retain its aesthetic character: natural wooded areas, creek greenbelt, nice landscaping, access roads that function, yet retain a sense of "neighborhood," rather than the feeling of a "major or minor arterial."

I attended the public scoping meeting May 19 and thought there were some good suggestions that the study should consider, including the following:

☐ Identify traffic sources: What percentage of traffic through the U-Med District is created by workers, students, and patients coming into and out of the area - and what percentage of traffic is generated internally - people going from one part of the medical or university campus to the other. To address the latter, an efficient, circulating bus service could significantly reduce vehicle traffic within the U-Med district area. And, identify what percentage (if any) are traveling through the area, without their destination being medical or university related. As a side note, while having no knowledge of future use regarding the undeveloped parcel of land at the southeast corner of Lake Otis and 36/Providence, it seems that fairly large parcel could be evaluated as a "park and ride" area, so that vehicles stop at this point and enter the heart of the U-Med district via public transportation, thus reducing vehicle traffic within the Providence Dr. area.

☐ Retain the natural, open space that contains important recreational and wildlife habitat areas. As the entire Anchorage bowl develops, it is essential we as a community preserve the remaining natural areas that make our city special. Since there is a large natural open space remaining within the U-Med District - in particular the northern areas of APU and UAA land - northern access should not destroy or segregate it.

☐ Evaluate impacts of a northern access to east/west Northern Lights traffic flow: I was traveling east to west on Northern Lights through the area the other day and realized how well that road functions because there are minimal access points that inhibit traffic flow.

It's amazing how far you can travel without having to stop at a light. And when you do get to Bragaw and UAA Drive intersections, because traffic isn't four-way, you can fairly quickly go through the light sequence and once again, be on your way. Inserting a northern access point into NL from the U-Med district - either at one of those existing intersections or a new one, would likely alter this efficiency and that should be evaluated as part of this study

ID: 80f 6/18/2009 3:40:50 PM

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the U-Med Northern Access Study. While I do not live or work in the area, I travel to the U-Med district on a fairly regular basis for my husband or my own medical purposes. And, on occasion, we attend events at the UAA campus.

I have always felt that this area is a very special part of town - and despite the increased medical and university development, it has managed to retain its aesthetic character: natural wooded areas, creek greenbelt, nice landscaping, access roads that function, yet retain a sense of "neighborhood," rather than the feeling of a "major or minor arterial."

I attended the public scoping meeting May 19 and thought there were some good suggestions that the study should consider, including the following:

☐Identify traffic sources: What percentage of traffic through the U-Med District is created by workers, students, and patients coming into and out of the area - and what percentage of traffic is generated internally - people going from one part of the medical or university campus to the other. To address the latter, an efficient, circulating bus service could significantly reduce vehicle traffic within the U-Med district area. And, identify what percentage (if any) are traveling through the area, without their destination being medical or university related. As a side note, while having no knowledge of future use regarding the undeveloped parcel of land at the southeast corner of Lake Otis and 36/Providence, it seems that fairly large parcel could be evaluated as a "park and ride" area, so that vehicles stop at this point and enter the heart of the U-Med district via public transportation, thus reducing vehicle traffic within the Providence Dr. area.

☐Retain the natural, open space that contains important recreational and wildlife habitat areas. As the entire Anchorage bowl develops, it is essential we as a community preserve the remaining natural areas that make our city special. Since there is a large natural open space remaining within the U-Med District - in particular the northern areas of APU and UAA land - northern access should not destroy or segregate it.

☐Evaluate impacts of a northern access to east/west Northern Lights traffic flow: I was traveling east to west on Northern Lights through the area the other day and realized how well that road functions because there are minimal access points that inhibit traffic flow.

It's amazing how far you can travel without having to stop at a light. And when you do get to Bragaw and UAA Drive intersections, because traffic isn't four-way, you can fairly quickly go through the light sequence and once again, be on your way. Inserting a northern access point into NL from the U-Med district - either at one of those existing intersections or a new one, would likely alter this efficiency and that should be evaluated as part of this study

ID: 81 6/18/2009 4:50:49 PM

I would like to oppose the extension of Bragaw (Elmore) into the U Med district. Areas surrounding universities are typically protected.

I work at a U-Med hospital, take classes part-time at UAA, and live in the area. I am strongly opposed to this extension.

ID: 82 6/19/2009 11:18:13 AM

True, Anchorage is growing at an exponential rate, the U-Med District does get very congested a select hours of the day, and a solution to this problem must be developed but, that solution does not have to involve destroying a communities trail system. The impact of punching a road through the University Lake recreation area does not just affect the residents of College Gate. It also impacts the hospital and university employees who bring their dogs to work and walk them during their lunch break, the patients and visitors of the hospital who receive a refreshing break from the sickness filled air in a peaceful walk around the lake, the 100 members of the East High Cross Country ski and running teams who use the trail system on a daily basis, and the soccer teams who come from around Anchorage to use the soccer fields. Taking out a portion of the park for a road is comparable to deciding to turning the coast trail into a freeway in its influence on the community. Rather than conquer the growing traffic issues in Anchorage with new roads that, with the predicted growth of Anchorage, will undoubtedly require expansion further imposing on the citizen's parks and will make a small impact on traffic flow, we should turn to alternate solutions such as perfecting Anchorage's public transportation system and making bike paths and ski trails even more commuter friendly. This solution is good exercise for the people, good for the environment, and good for reducing congestion on the roads. Thank you for taking my opinion into consideration!

Oh brother! This road won't go away. I know that extending Bragaw through the campus has been voted down numerous times, but it just keeps coming back. It is so sad to watch the Campbell track being ripped apart in the name of reducing traffic. We can't get those woods back and there are other solutions to getting into the U-Med. If we did a park and ride with regular shuttles I'm sure people would use it. The trails in UAA/APU have been in use longer than I've been alive and are vital to the running and ski programs for both Wendler and East high and UAA. The trails and wooded spaces add to the character of the University. It is a treat to have this gem of a park within our city. A 2003 East area transportation survey showed that 60.5 % of the area residents thought proximity to woods, having parks, trails and open space and scenery were the best characteristics of Anchorage. Only 47% of our residents thought traffic and transportation issues were our biggest problem. I don't believe that this has changed. In fact, our feelings have no doubt intensified, as we watch the rape of the Campbell tract.

Another factor to consider is how speeding Elmore traffic straight through to Northern Lights would affect traffic near East high. This is already a congested mess two times a day. Adding more traffic to this intersection would present a hazard to school kids.

As a runner, skier, biker, orienteer, I beg you to find another option. You will never be able to build enough roads or parking garages to sate some people. We need to look for new solutions.

Submitted by letter: Our family has lived on the north side of the U-Med District for 28 years. We frequently drive the roads in this area and are frequent, year round users of the APU-UAA trail system. Any transportation projects in the U-Med area should protect the UAA-APU trail system and minimize impacts on the adjacent green, open space. We strongly oppose building a thoroughfare connecting Bragaw Street to Elmore Road through this area. There are numerous ways to improve local traffic in this area that would have minimal impact to trails and open space.

The tract of undeveloped UAA, APU and municipal parkland that lies north of the Universities is one of the greatest assets in East Anchorage. The trail system that runs through this area is used extensively by skiers, bikers, walkers, dog mushers (including both the Fur Rendezvous and Iditarod races), and high school and college summer and winter sports teams. The large green space also provides habitat for moose, birds and other wildlife. This large undeveloped tract makes both campuses, as well as the adjacent hospitals, feel like they are in a relatively quiet, Alaska setting rather than the middle of a big city.

This block of land is irreplaceable and should not be bisected by a new connector or through roads that are designed to save cross-town commuters a few minutes. Claims that this land will eventually be developed do not justify new roads, except what limited roads may be need to locally access new buildings. During the past 30 years, campus expansion has not significantly intruded upon this green space.

In addition to opposing roads in this area because of the impact on trails and green space, major roads connecting to the north are not necessary and several of the proposals will not improve safety. We frequently drive the roads in the U-Med district, including regular trips to Wendler Middle School and East high School. Based on long-term, personal experience driving in this area, traffic problems occur only in a few very distinct locations and last for relatively short periods of time, usually only one half hour to one hour in the evening rush hour and an even shorter period in the morning. Roads should not be designed to handle a capacity that only occurs for such short periods. In addition, the worst congestion in the area occurs on Tudor Road and Northern Lights (at Lake Otis) in the evening rush hour, and any improvements made to the U-Med area will not significantly reduce congestion on these roads.

Regarding safety, the intersection of northern lights and Bragaw, adjacent to East high School, is already dangerous due to the amount of through traffic mixing with student traffic in the morning and afternoons. Adding more through traffic by connecting a road from the south into this intersection will add to this congestion. Adding a connector from the university area north to the "Pine Street" area is also not going to improve safety, as such a road will intersect Northern Lights on a curve where site distances are limited.

While we oppose a new road connector from the U-Med district to the north, we do offer the following recommendations:

- 1) Future location and design of buildings and parking in the U-Med district should encourage pedestrian traffic within the district and encourage use of mass transit (buses) and other alternative transportation. The original UAA (including the old Community College buildings) were very pedestrian orientated, but more recent construction (such as the dorm complex located at the southern edge of campus) has resulted in an elongated campus that is difficult to navigate on foot. In addition, many of the new buildings require pedestrians to cross streets or parking lots. The campus is simply not well designed for pedestrian traffic. New construction should be located to encourage pedestrian traffic, thereby reducing auto traffic within the U-Med district. We recently visited several much larger campuses (Universities of Washington and Oregon, Oregon State) and these campuses are far more pedestrian friendly. By comparison to UAA, the Providence Hospital complex has grown significantly but all buildings wisely remain within easy walking distance (and are all connected);
- 2) Any new road construction should accommodate, and ideally improve, the existing trails system north of campus;
- 3) Bicycle commuting should be encouraged by better maintaining existing trails and by improving bike routes on campus. While there is a good bike trail system to the U-Med district via Chester Creek and other trails, once you get to the UA campus bicyclists must often share the roadways with vehicles. Most of the campus is very poorly designed for bicycle use.
- 4) Bragaw Street in front of East High School should be a "school zone" from 6:30 a.m. to 8:00 a.m. as there are many pedestrians and turning vehicles entering the school and through traffic on Bragaw often seems oblivious to this.
- 5) The intersection of northern lights and UAA Drive should be improved, particularly the flow of traffic from westbound Northern Lights into UAA Drive, where the slope and the gradient make the left turn especially difficult in winter.
- 6) The intersection of Providence and Elmore (at the entrance to APU) is inefficient and dangerous. Most traffic using this intersection is making a turn and must stop, hence slowing traffic, and cars entering APU from Providence Drive must turn across this traffic flow. Perhaps the entrance to APU could be relocated further south and the current intersection replaced by a curve.
- 7) Encourage employers to stagger work and class schedule hours more to relieve the peak congestion – particularly between 4 and 5 p.m. The relatively few major employers in the U-Med district create unique opportunities to effectively coordinate shifts.

I believe that the project is continuing to move forward when, in fact, there seem to be ways to improve traffic without antagonizing the public. Clearly, internal roads and drives that serve the universities themselves ought to be left in their hands because it is their property. The ADOT&PF and MOA and its consultants should withdraw from this contentious matter, which does not seem to have facts supporting the need, nor does it seem to have public support, and it really doesn't pass the "red face test" of being a good idea.

ID: 86 6/27/2009 2:00:51 PM

Serious and well-thought out alternatives of improved public transit and improved pedestrian and bike access need to be developed and seriously considered. Additionally, alternatives of vehicle transportation around instead of through the area must be developed and seriously considered. The effects of decreased safety (especially for women and children) and security on pedestrians, and non-motorized transportation and recreationists cannot be effectively mitigated. The cumulative effects to the natural character of the area and to the non-motoring public from bisecting Far north bicentennial, the new streets parallel to Tudor and the increasing build-up of roads in natural vegetation and non-vehicle corridors and park areas must be thoroughly evaluated and mitigated by finding alternatives other than expanded roads through the campuses.

ID: 87 8/5/2009 8:52:29 AM

I am strongly opposed to the current road proposal that bisects the University land between Northern Lights and Tudor. The trail system that currently connects the Campbell Creek Trail system to the Chester Creek Trail system would be irreparably destroyed along with the high quality wildlife habitat that currently exists.

The DOT's "connectivity" mission is out of control and is quickly turning Anchorage into one large, motorhead speedway. Pedestrians, bicyclers, commuters and all users of the trail system find in the U-Med district an urban refuge away from the road madness that has unfortunately been forced upon us, even in our neighborhoods by the constant widening of the streets, as sanctioned by the DOT.

The intersection at Lake Otis and Tudor, combined with the Elmore extension and the Martin Luther King Jr. extension will ease any "perceived" north/south traffic, thereby making any road extensions through the U-Med district unnecessary.

ID: 88 6/18/2009 10:45:24 AM

1. Please put DOWL/HKM contract scope of work and all related documents on the project website – these must be part of the public record. Please make these easily accessible so that the public can see DOWL/HKM's "starting point" on this project. Include all of the documents that define their scope of work and all documents that are referenced in their SOW, such as documents by previous consultants, the Municipality of Anchorage, or the State of Alaska.
2. Re-classifying wetlands - we understand that part of the DOWL/HKM scope is to verify or re-determine the limits of Class A wetlands. We expect that DOWL/HKM is, or will be, under considerable pressure to revise the extent of the Class "A" wetlands to be as small as possible, so that extending the road shown in the 2025 LRTP (between Mosquito Lake and KSKA/KAKM) would be less expensive. We believe that additional oversight of this particular task might be prudent and suggest that a third-party consultant, under direct contract with the ADOT and not the prime consultant, be retained to peer review the wetlands delineation methods and results.
3. Trail overpasses vs. tunnels/underpasses vs. at-grade crossings – when you identify potential road alternatives, please address how all existing trails will cross roads and include the cost of trail overpasses in your construction cost estimates. Most trail users, including ourselves, prefer trail overpasses to the other alternatives. Trail underpasses seem to inevitably collect glass, are slow to be filled with snow for skiing in early winter, slow to be cleared of snow for biking in springtime, subject to flooding, and attractive to vagrants (who sometimes use them as bathrooms and sleeping quarters). At-grade crossings are not suitable for ski trails.
4. "Moose" fences along road alternatives, or not – we hope that part of DOWL/HKM's scope is to evaluate the need for "moose" fences along the potential road extensions, and we hope that the roads can be configured so that no such fences are required. The existing fences along Elmore are extremely aesthetically offensive and, in our admittedly non-expert opinion, likely unnecessary.
5. Include the "no action" alternative – in the May 19, 2009 public presentation, someone asked whether the "no action" alternative was going to be included in the "reconnaissance" study. We recall that the DOWL/HKM responded that the "no action" alternative would not be included as a potential alternative in the current work. We don't recall the reason, but we believe that the "no action" alternative should be one of the potential alternatives included in the current study.
6. Coordination with H2H – please be sure that your traffic studies include the effects of the alternatives proposed to be considered in the Highway-to-Highway project.
7. Evaluation of changes in Level of Service - Also please be clear about how you will evaluate the changes in levels of service for the various potential alternatives considered in the U-Med project. The graphic you presented at the May 19, 2009 public presentation paints a grim picture of the current (2002) "level of service" of various intersections in the region: 11 of the 16 intersections have LOS E or F. The future (2025) scenario is similarly congested. So, for example, if one of your alternatives improves a handful of intersections from F to E, and changes one or two intersections from D to F (such as Northern Lights/Benson), would you consider that a benefit? It is hard to imagine that any of the alternatives will have a significant and lasting positive effect on LOS.
8. Please look around the country for similar situations – it might be worthwhile looking around the U.S. for cities with large tracts of popular undeveloped university land that have faced similar development pressures. If there are any such areas, how have the issues been resolved?

ID: 89 9/10/2009 1:04:31 AM

September 9, 2009

DowlHKM grant holder representative-

As residents of the municipality of Anchorage, specifically at the interface between Takishla Park and Airport Heights, our sense of place, our quality of life will be impacted by any decision made (including no decision).

As such, it is incumbent on us to make sure that we provide input, hopefully influencing the outcome of the project. We'll state up front that we have a basic disagreement with the assumption that more development needs to occur. Too much has already preceded intelligent planning, and has already reduced potentially intelligent options.

Given that "we can't go back", our preferred alternative would be one that: 1)Avoided fragmentation of natural habitat; 2)Avoided impacting wildlife corridors; 3)Avoided impacts to wetlands; 4)Didn't introduce new noise; and 5)Retained high air and water quality standards.

Our additional concerns are: 6) that no (or the fewest) developed recreational trails, facilities are impacted by intersection or proximity of new or upgraded roadways; 7) that this project maintains recreational possibilities of undeveloped lands; 8)that additional recreational trails (pedestrians, bikers, x-c skiers, etc.) are developed in concert with project, both filling in existing voids and anticipating needs resulting from project.

Our preferred alternative would be providing new and improved East/West access, which could avoid impact to wetlands, involve the least disturbance and fragmentation, by using existing developed areas (APU lands to East, Northeast connecting with Northern Lights at very Northeast corner; or to Southeast portion of university exiting at Tudor Center Drive. This would be in concert with the upgrading of Tudor Road from New Seward Highway to Glenn Highway, to a six lane divided/sound-proofed highway standard.

Under no circumstance should there be ANY North/South access improvement project, particularly not involving a Bragaw/Elmore connection. This would ADD an entire magnitude more of traffic problems, further impacting an already stressed traffic pattern within the University/Medical district.

To add inevitable traffic from those seeking an alternate route from North Anchorage to South Anchorage, would be 'adding fuel to the fire'.

Thank you for your consideration of these concerns. Please include us in any future opportunities for participation in this essential process.

Don Bertollette/Rhonda Johnson; 3124 Cassius Court; Anchorage AK 99508

ID: 90 9/15/2009 2:19:27 PM

I am an avid user of the trail system that will be affected by any of the proposed roads. My comment is that if a road is considered absolutely necessary all inconveniences should go to the car user. For example, the road should rise over existing trails (tunnel for trail users) and at no point should any trail be detoured to accommodate the road. In addition to existing trails, adequate bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure should be included as part of the road construction. This would include bike lanes, pathways and convenient on/off ramps to the existing trail system. Traffic calming techniques should be employed. Done correctly, traffic circles can provide safe passage for cyclist. This is achieved by creating one lane entrances and only one lane inside the circle coupled with a small diameter. The spokes of the circle should have a wide median to separate opposing traffic. The separating median can also serve the purpose of presenting an obstacle for the driver as he/she approaches the circle forcing a reduction in speed. Good examples of this design can be seen throughout Bend, Oregon. Because speed is managed through appropriate traffic calming, cyclist feel comfortable taking a lane and entering the circle.

The question must be presented, what is the purpose of the road? If it is to present a convenient cut-through for cars, this is a poor excuse to ruin scenic trails enjoyed by many in the summer and winter. If the roads are to provide access to this area there are alternatives. Each of these roads proposed are short. Let us think of the possibility of building infrastructure that would allow people to park their cars and enjoy a nice walking boulevard to their destination. Many cities have closed streets to cars resulting in a thriving commercial district.

Anchorage has an exceptional quality of life. Let's not whittle away at what makes Anchorage special.

ID: 91 9/19/2009 1:25:40 PM

Please let me know when website is updated.

ID: 92 9/22/2009 6:53:17 PM

All updates please

ID: 93 9/24/2009 11:18:23 AM

"Alaska Public Telecommunications, Inc., is extremely concerned at possible impacts on public broadcast operations in the event a U-Med Northern Access project should proceed on land adjacent to our location. Any plan for such a project must include full and careful consideration of the following issues:

"Noise and vibration caused by both construction and operation of a road on adjacent property could greatly affect the quality and delivery of our services to the public. Our building, built in 1991, was designed for lower-level airborne sound suppression, but not geological impacts. It is our current understanding that no one currently in Alaska is qualified to evaluate this impact from an engineering point of view, so a proper examination of such a project must find and employ such expertise. Any road design should give close consideration to a sound-protective wall or earthen berm to protect broadcast services and quality.

"Wetlands adjoining our location will require particular attention in the project. Special wetlands protections had to be engineered into our building project in the 1980s and we presume such issues remain relevant to the route and design of an access project. We also understand that historically there were rare orchids growing in the adjoining wetlands area that should be considered.

"A high-pressure gas line adjoins the western boundary of our leased property. This gas line surely must be accommodated in road design and any possible acoustical mitigation work."

ID: 94 9/24/2009 11:18:58 AM

What about a "cut and cover" extension of Bragaw through the district to Elmore? It would preserve the trail and woody feel and still be a major improvement in moving traffic.

ID: 95 9/24/2009 11:20:13 AM

We live east of the U-Med, and my wife works at ANTHC. We drive Northern Lights Blvd everyday and have to deal with the traffic that is diverted around the U-med district down NLB. Also I am a past-president of the UAA Alumni Association. So I make this comment with two hats on, so to speak. I have two suggestions.

1. do a "cut-and-cover" road from NLB for the Bragaw extension so that the University area is little disturbed. And...
2. NLB needs to be widened to 3 lanes from Lake Otis to Bragaw. Traffic going around the U-Med heading north from Lake Otis to turn onto NLB heading east. This is a two-land road. Northern Lights is lanes up to Lake Otis. Heading east bound, NLB chokes down to two lanes at Lake Otis. Northern Lights Blvd needs to be widened from Lake Otis Pwy to Bragaw to three (3) lanes. Also the east bound third lane on Benson Blvd is a turn lane and is essentially unused from LaTouche St to Lake Otis Pwy because of the choke-down at Lake Otis.

Also we had no notice of this study, or meetings with the Community Council, or direct mailings, but heard about it from Rep Cissna's newsletter. This needs wider notification.

ID: 96 9/28/2009 8:06:24 PM

As a resident of the adjacent Russian Jack neighborhood, former USGS employee (located on APU campus), occasional UAA student (I took a GIS class in Fall 2007 and may take more classes soon) and frequent user of the UAA/APU trails system, I am strongly opposed to extending Bragaw St through the campus area to connect with Elmore for several reasons. Aside from the obvious desire to see the green spaces remain intact for summer and winter enjoyment of all Anchorage residents, as well as vital wildlife habitat, I think the more important issue is one of safety. There are already problems with vehicles driving too fast past East High, causing accidents that put high school students in danger. Adding another direction of traffic through that intersection is not wise, where student safety is concerned. The vehicle traffic on Providence Drive is also what I would consider too fast for the safety of bicyclists and pedestrians on the UAA and APU campuses. Punching Bragaw through would only exacerbate these problems, creating a much more dangerous atmosphere for bike and pedestrian traffic in a location where these modes of transportation are popular and to be encouraged rather than discouraged.

I think one of the best solutions would be to upgrade UAA Drive, which is narrow and has a dangerous approach onto Northern Lights Boulevard. UAA Drive should be widened and the intersection at Northern Lights upgraded to more safely accommodate traffic. This would help alleviate traffic flow while maintaining the college campus green space for the use of both campuses as well as East High and Wendler MS and the general public.

Safety First!

ID: 97 9/29/2009 4:51:41 PM

Gentlemen: This is a short comment today. I am strongly in favor of the extension ie:Northern Access. Traffic needs to be able to quickly move through the area, especially with the new arena being built. We have created several roads that are a pleasure to drive on both visually and efficiently. A St. W.No Lites, and Lk Otis from Tudor to Dowling. Ak. has always been mindful of "dog trails, bike paths, etc. so I have no problem with the new access. S.Iverson

ID: 98 10/1/2009 1:36:39 AM

I live near 20th and Lake Otis. I use the Chester Creek Trail system and the land near Goose Lake, UAA and APU to walk, bike and ski. I would be devastated to have that wonderful open space destroyed by a road cutting Bragaw through from Northern Lights to Tudor. The beauty of Anchorage and its wildlife is one of the main reasons that I moved to Anchorage 23 years ago and one of the main reasons that I chose to live near the Chester Creek Trail and the UAA/APU campuses. If that land was lost, I would not want to live in the area. The value of my home would decrease if this land was not available for recreation.

I have not found that the traffic in the U-Med district is too bad. Destroying this incredible open space is not the answer. The traffic at Lake Otis and Tudor can be bad, so this is a location that needs improvement. Also, Lake Otis, from 20th to DeBarr should be expanded to four lanes. These improvements will greatly improve the traffic flow in and out of the U-Med district, eliminating the need to build a thoroughfare through park land. Within the U-Med district, the traffic should be left as local traffic. The UAA and APU campuses should have green space preserved and not become a metropolis of buildings, cement and roads.

We live in such a beautiful place, so we need to plan for the future by protecting these precious open spaces. Existing roadways can be improved to help relieve the traffic congestion. Please do not destroy the wilderness land near Goose Lake and UAA/APU.

It is highly disappointing to have one more invasive proposal brought forward to extend Bragaw Street through the University of Alaska Anchorage Goose Lake Campus . Each time special interests have sponsored similar proposals over the 30 years since UAA was established, they have been defeated by strong public support committed to defend the university's integrity.

This type of proposal reflects lack of understanding of the public value of higher education. It certainly reflects no appreciation of the great difficulty encountered to bring higher education to Anchorage , let alone successfully build it here. It does not recognize that UAA serves one of the highest public interests in Alaska . UAA provides an accessible, contemporary higher education to more than 60 percent of Alaska 's population. As the primary developer of an educated population, and our future leaders, UAA serves Alaska 's future as an inviolate core value institution.

A university is a cultural and social asset to be developed to meet public needs over the ages. It is also an important economic engine. The communities associated with a great university grow with it and greatly benefit from that growth.

The current "reconnaissance study" is industry code for preliminary design of a controversial project. It is being funded as an unaccountable stealth project out of the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities Commissioner's Office in Juneau , to circumvent 30 years of well-known public opposition in Anchorage . Too much historical perspective is involved to be taken in by misrepresentation. Evasive, irresponsible public funding would not be tolerated in Anchorage .

The UAA Goose Lake campus land holding is recognized to be small in size, for a great university to grow upon over the centuries. Only a small percentage of developable land remains available, much of which is critical wetland. The ADOTPF push involves major, irreversible impacts to the integrity of the institution, the campus landholding, and to the surrounding environment.

This evasive, invasive manipulation is a breach of public trust by both ADOTPF and the Federal Highway Administration, a cooperating partner. Over the years since UAA was established, special interests have repeatedly sponsored similar proposals, each having only superficial justification. Lobbying by business interests has always been at the root of these proposals.

This project represents a serious misunderstanding of the highest public interest and a total lack of public vision. As a core public entity, a university is not to be subjected to casual development whims advanced by special interests. Nor is it to respond to dynamic pressures, which are influenced by large numbers of transient social variables. Vehicular traffic flows represent short-term noise, when related to the great life span of a university.

The strongly held, uncompromising public position of 30 years is that the UAA campus will not be bisected by a high-volume regional roadway like Bragaw Street/Elmore Road, and high-volume regional traffic will not be routed into the midst of UAA. It is not acceptable to cross the UAA campus with such a roadway, nor to widen UAA Drive as an interim measure. Gross insults to the UAA campus like these are unacceptable.

I have long helped to nurture higher education in Anchorage . This unconscionable proposal will be very strongly opposed. Once again!