



AMATS: Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection
 Planning & Environmental Linkage Study
 State Project No.: CFHWY00550
 Federal Project No.: 0001653

Draft PEL Comments and Responses

August 2026

This planning document may be adopted in a subsequent environmental review process in accordance with 23 USC 168 Integration of Planning and Environmental Review and 23 CFR 450 Planning Assistance and Standards.

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by DOT&PF pursuant to 23 USC 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated April 13, 2023, and executed by FHWA and DOT&PF.

Prepared for:

Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities

Prepared by:

HDR, Inc.

582 E. 36th Avenue, Suite 500

Anchorage, AK 99503

907-644-2000 Phone | 907-644-2022 Fax

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
189	Michael Schoder	In summary I am concerned about the evaluation processes for this PEL Study as well as the recommended proposed Alternative selection of Alternative 5 (Fairview Bypass). My concerns and objections are focused on the impacts to the lands of the Merrill Field Airport, the FAA requirements for airport operations, Alaska Regional Hospital, and the Anchorage Fire Station. No. 2 for the portion of Alternative 5 route between the Glenn Highway / Airport Heights intersection and 15th Avenue / Debarr Road. These entities are significant stakeholders, and it appears that they have had little to no notification and involvement in the PEL Study and the impacts of Alternative 5 greatly affect the safety, operations and accessibility. Merrill Field (MRI) is a well-established (95 years of operations and first public airport in Alaska) airport that has been developing to ensure safety for the flying and non-flying public and is increasingly growing in capacity and operations as the Anchorage International Airport long term development moves focus to support of Air Carrier (airlines) and Air Cargo operations. In a recent (2025) Economic Impact study, it was shown that MRI is the 2nd busiest airport in the state, and brings an economic output of \$241.5 million dollars to the Anchorage economy and is the hub of transportation by General Aviation commuter, air-taxi and non-commercial flights to over 150 public airports and numerous other individuals and communities in Alaska.(See information at MRI Economic Benefit video) MRI has issued FAA mandated Master Plan planning documents to guide the development of the airport and basis of funding/construction of Airport improvements, and the proposed Alternate 5 routing raises many concerns with continued operations of MRI in compliance with FAA mandated operations and impacts to millions of dollars of FAA Airport Improvement Project (AIP) improvements. The current MRI Masterplan (MFMP) (MRI 2016 Master Plan can be found at: Merrill Field Master Plan) is underway of a ten-year update and although many of the concerns and conflicts I will raise were outlined in the current MFMP finalized in 2016. The 2026 MFMP update will provide additional important information that should be considered in this PEL Study that in my opinion significantly affects the impacts, costs and reasonableness of the routing through the MRI airport lands. Similarly, the Alaska Regional Hospital as a MRI neighbor benefits from a direct connection from Medical Evacuation (Medivac) flights to the emergency trauma and care the hospital provides. MRI/ARH connection is one of the handful of locations in the country that benefit from direct “taxi-up” delivery of patients from Medivac patients, and the Alternative 5 route would sever that service and connection, at a time when Alaska Regional Hospital is moving towards obtaining a Level 3 Trauma Center status. Similarly, the Anchorage Fire Department Fire Station 2 and co-located Fire Training Center currently has a very rapid response time to medical or fire emergencies at MRI and surrounding commercial areas north of the Glenn Highway as well as to the Mountain View, Airport Heights and Fairview neighborhoods, that may have not been fully evaluated as to the impact of the routing of the Alternative 5 proposal. Commenter Background I have been a resident of Anchorage since 1970, learned to fly at MRI in 1973, have kept a personal airplane at MRI since 1975, and through appointment by four Mayor’s administration served 14 years on the Municipality of Anchorage Airport Aviation Advisory Commission (MAAAC). I am a retired Professional Land Surveyor with 50 years of surveying, right-of-way, and remote sensing experience, including being the ADOT&PF Southcentral Region Locations Chief for 3 years. During the period between 1984 and 1985 I was the responsible Land Surveyor in charge of the vacation of all property lines, easements, and rights-of-ways and replatting of the lands owned by MRI. I presently am the representative of one of the leaseholds at MRI that has a hangar condominium type development. I lived in the Airport Heights and Eastchester neighborhoods adjoining MRI for many years, including years when the Anchorage Landfill on MRI lands was open, and during the landfill closeout. I am commenting here as an individual with a personal concern for seeing that MRI continues to operate as a great, safe and properly operating general aviation airport for the next generations forthcoming. Specific Comments Why the ADOT&PF and it’s consultant HDR did so little coordination, communication and outreach with MRI	1. The PEL team has met with the current airport manager on multiple occasions as well as meetings with previous airport managers. The airport manager is also a member of an advisory committee that has been convened over the four years the study has been underway. Similarly, Alaska Regional Hospital has been a member or the study's Community Advisory Committee. We have also met separately with that stakeholder. Based on this comment and others, the PEL team met with the Anchorage Fire Department, Solid Waste Services, and FAA. If projects from the PEL move forward, additional coordination will occur with these entities during the environmental and design processes. 2. The PEL team did consult the MRI Airport Master Plan. The proposed Fairview Bypass largely avoids current or planned operating areas and stays outside the current fenceline. The exception is where the alignment would cross the medevac taxiway. Based on this comment and others, and discussions with MRI, the PEL is recommending that the medivac taxiway cross over the parkway on a bridge, which would allow the continued operation of the taxiway to be unimpeded by the roadway traffic. 3. Because the Airport Master Plan update has not begun, the PEL can't take into consideration the recommendations from that document. However, DOT&PF will continue to coordinate with MRI to try to coordinate future parkway design with the airport plan update. 4. Based on this comment and others, and discussions with MRI, the PEL is recommending that the medivac taxiway cross over the parkway on a bridge, which would allow the continued operation of the taxiway to be unimpeded by the roadway traffic. 5. The PEL team has met with the current airport manager on multiple occasions as well as meetings with previous airport managers. The airport manager is also a member of an advisory committee that has been convened over the four years the study has been underway. Similarly, Alaska Regional Hospital has been a member of the study's Community Advisory Committee. We have also met separately with that stakeholder. Based on this comment and others, the DOT&PF met with the Anchorage Fire Department, Solid Waste Services, and intends to meet with FAA. If projects from the PEL move forward, additional coordination will occur with these entities during the environmental and design processes. 6. The PEL team has met with the current airport manager on multiple occasions as well as meetings with previous airport managers. The airport manager is also a member of an advisory committee that has been convened over the four years the study has been underway. Similarly, Alaska Regional Hospital has been a member or the study's Community Advisory Committee. We have also met separately with that stakeholder. Based on this comment and others, the PEL team met with the MAAAC. If projects from the PEL move forward, additional coordination will occur with the MAAAC during the environmental and design processes. 7. Based on this comment and others, the DOT&PF will be meeting with FAA. Additional coordination with FAA will occur if projects from the PEL move forward for environmental approval and final design. 14. Based on this comment and others, and discussions with MRI, the PEL has changed its recommendations and is now recommending that the medivac taxiway cross over the parkway on a bridge, which would allow the continued operation of the taxiway to be unimpeded by the roadway traffic - including access to MRI by AFD if they need it. Conceptual renderings have been added to the PEL to help depict what this crossing would look like.

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		management and its MRI stakeholders is somewhat of a mystery to me as it is certainly a significant stakeholder to the evaluation of Alternatives for the current Seward to Glenn Connection PEL Study (PEL Study). I was informed by the MRI Airport Manager that there were a couple of brief meetings with him, but prior to the last PEL Study meeting on October 21 his understanding was that the plan for Alternate 5 would not come through the airport property as shown in the very vague conceptual plans in Attachment A of the PEL Study report. You can confirm the level of coordination with MRI Management, and they too may be submitting comments about the PEL Study recommended alternatives. I do know that the PEL Study team did not attend any quarterly MRI User Group meetings, monthly MAAAC meetings or provide any specific study project meeting for the MRI Leaseholders or users as I attend those meetings and am on the MRI communication lists. I am wondering if the PEL Study team had meetings and consultation with the FAA Alaska	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Medivac Aircraft Access to Alaska Regional Hospital Without preliminary conceptual design detailed information being included in the PEL Study document, it’s not clear on how the medivac aircraft from MRI could continue to deliver life critical patients to the Alaska Regional Hospital (ARH) with the proposed alignment in Alternate 5 severing the taxiway Quebec that now serves as a “taxi up” facility to the ARH Emergency Rooms. I too attended the October 21 public meeting and there were poster boards there showing Alternative 5 with a taxiway gate across the proposed highway alignment. In general gates on taxiways are a bad ideas as they can and have failed at critical times, and with only one gate there a medivac aircraft would be stopped short of ARH with potentially life-critical patient. Then what, an aircraft taxi across four lanes of traffic? That’s not going to work. How is the security fencing into the MRI Airport Operations Area going to be maintained for an on-grade crossing? Going deeper underground with the road and trying to maintain grade and weight bearing load for a taxiway on top of a submerged road sounds like a big engineering and construction challenge at well. Or is ARH just going to find out that if this project goes forward they will have lost direct access by medivac aircraft? Again, the FAA AIP grant assurances will demand payment for the loss of investment of making this part of MRI function for the well-being of the public. Corporate leadership from ARH came to the October 2025 MAAAC meeting and explained their efforts and expenses to fully develop ARH into a Level 3 Trauma facility with direct connections to Medivac flights, certainly that should be investigated as to their plans and the potential impacts of having it cutoff or significantly disrupted by the proposed Alternate 5 Fairview Bypass recommendations. Anchorage Fire Department Response Similar to the ARH issue, the alignment of the PEL Study Level 2 recommendations for Alternate 5 would sever a direct connection to MRI from AFD Fire Station 2 that now has a direct access to MRI down Taxiway Quebec, or through gate entrance onto Merrill Field Drive from the Fire Station. This allows very quick emergency response to the airport for first responders on call to medical and fire emergencies on the airport. It’s similar to other airports have a Crash, Fire, Rescue station built on airport for airport emergencies. Additionally, the response routes to the Commercial areas north of Glenn/5th Avenue, and Mountain View neighborhoods, and potentially Airport Heights and Fairview are potentially disrupted with the corridor plans for Alternate 5 adjacent to the AFD Fire Station and Training Facility. Have any of these safety and conflict issues been investigated and addressed in the study and identified with the downsides of the Alternate 5 impacts? Construction Concerns on Airport Operations If the project proceeds as recommended, there will be significant need to coordinate the Construction activities that could cause an effect on the airport operations. Work in the RPZs and near taxiways and parking areas will need full coordination with Airport Management and FAA Air Traffic Control (ATC). Work in the RPZs will likely require a suspension of operations of aircraft on the effected runway. Notice to Air Operations (NOTAMs) will have to be effectively managed to provide notice of the construction operations that require runway or taxiway closures. There will be a great concern by the MRI airport users, particularly commercial operators of long closures or delays. This concern is so significant that recent projects have only been approved under an accelerated schedule and during the night hours to minimize impacts to the airport operations. Landfill Section 2.8.9 of the 2016 MFMP provides a good history and major issues summary of the closed Anchorage Landfill area on MRI, including Figure 2-19 showing estimated Trash Depths. MRI has been following the recommendations for landfill closure from SWS for Airport Improvement Projects and has worked with the FAA, Engineers, and Contractors to construct compatible airport facilities that could be built without “unearthing” the underlying decaying unclassified solid waste.⁴ In short, the SWS closure plan was: don’t uncover it, keep as much as possible of the landfill cover permeable so that methane can vent, construction on top could be done with dynamic compaction of the decaying solid waste, mitigate issues with migrating	this comment and others, the PEL team has met with Solid Waste Services. Additional coordination with SWS will occur if projects from the PEL move forward for environmental approval and final design. Details on the potential impacts of crossing the edge of the landfill will be addressed during the environmental review process. 18. The PEL team has conducted a considerable public and agency outreach effort, and has included MRI management, MOA Planning, MOA traffic and all affected community councils, elected officials, and many other groups. A chronology of the outreach efforts can be found in Appendix C to the PEL. If projects move forward for environmental approval or final design, additional coordination will occur. Because this is a planning study, the detailed engineering requested by the commenter has not been completed, however, conceptual renderings of the alignment have been added to the PEL to help depict what it could look like. 19. This proposed routing would move the connection through other residential areas and would require significant private property acquisition. Moving the interstate/national highway system traffic through other residential areas was examined on other alignments was found to be unacceptable.

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		subsurface methane and leachate into the water table, and avoid leasing public occupied buildings over the old landfill. Although the PEL Study Level 2 report has some very lightly worded concerns with “operating adjacent to the Merrill Field Landfill” and possible discovery of Hazardous materials, it in my opinion really undermines the huge obstacles of construction in this area. As Figure 2-19 in the 2016 MFMP shows, the Alternative 5 alignment is planned to be routed through 10-40 feet of decomposing solid waste up to 40 to 100 years old, that was unsupervised of what was dumped from 1930-1957, and probably minimally supervised from when the City Anchorage took it over until the late 1970s, and likely no real alternatives to hazardous waste recovery or recycling up through when it was closed. In my view this a “Pandora’s Box” to remain unopened with high probability that if a wide corridor unearthed by excavation could turn into some real unexpected disaster of mitigating what has been exposed. The few times that I have witnessed excavation into the buried cover (installation of additional storm sewer infrastructure and grading back the cover along the side slopes on the North side of E. 15th Avenue) it was highly aromatic with possibly toxic fumes, runaway decomposition leachate, and very difficult to perform normal construction procedures. What are the possible difficulties in construction if this goes forward? Possible large methane release out of the remaining decaying solid waste creating a toxic atmosphere next to a hospital, Fire Station and Training Center, Airport runway and parking ramp, nearby neighborhoods? A haul out of the excavated solid waste to test it all and classify for hazardous materials and then proper disposal of the toxic and non-toxic solid waste? What special permitting, engineering and construction work will need to peel the waste out and replace a suitable containment of the adjoining remaining waste? Just at a 30,000 foot level look, who the heck thinks putting a major transportation facility to connect two highways through a 100-year-old landfill with unknown content is a good and reasonable idea with little or no risk? What if it all blows up in construction? I personally don't think doing testing with testholes will reveal what fully lies beneath the surface in the proposed corridor, but a full excavation will be very risky operation and reveal of the extent of the issues. However, proceeding to design, permitting approval and construction for this section in the closed landfill could have catastrophic environmental and health impacts from the landfill issues. Keep the old landfill buried. SWS and MRI have systems, monitoring and reporting in place to identify any issues, and to keep the public safe. COMMENTER RECOMMENDATIONS I would recommend that the decision maker for approval of the Draft PEL Level 2 Report remand the Study Group to do specific outreach and seek comment from the critical MRI stakeholders. This may include at least MRI Airport Management, MRI User Group community, FAA Alaska Region Airports Division, the MOA MAAAC advisory commission, Alaska Air Carriers Association, MOA Solid Waste Services, MOA Fire Department, Emergency Response leaders for Alaska Regional Hospital, and MRI Leaseholders and Tie Down clients at a minimum. A more detailed conceptional plan for the Alternative 5 proposed alignment and grade between the Glenn Highway and East 15th Avenue would be helpful to facilitate outreach and further comments by others. One suggested possibility I thought o f and do not know if it was included in the PEL Study is to revise the area of concern of transiting through Merrill Field would be to move the connection point to the Glenn Highway east from Airport Heights Drive, and route connection to DeBarr Road possibly southerly to the west of the Home Depot site, then jog easterly around the Aspen Suites Hotel to connect to the four lane Northway Drive to continue southerly to join Debarr Road. Alternatively, improvements of the Glenn Highway/Bragaw interchange and routing traffic down Bragaw to connect with Debarr Road. Either of these two changes to the Alternative 5 design would move the highway-to-highway connection easterly of Merrill Field to avoid the conflicts and issues that have been commented on in this response. Thank you for the consideration of my comments and look forward to the Study Group responses to them. I am available to discuss these comments should you have questions. Reference:	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		The MFMP is a comprehensive document that during its preparation involved all the MRI stakeholders, the FAA Airports Division, AMATS, Municipality of Anchorage Planning, FAA Air Traffic Control, Alaska Regional Hospital, AFD, Neighborhood Community Councils, as well as the general public. My comments are going to reference some of the sections I see pertinent to the impacts of the proposed Alternate 5 route on or adjoining the MRI airport, but I would suggest that the MFMP be reviewed in full by the PEL Study team before issuing the PEL Level 2 Screening and Recommendations report as well as do the stakeholder outreach to MRI users. Attached to this comment letter are a few sections out of the 2016 MFMP to provide context to my comments and concerns. Attached to my comments is a good summary of what the risks of landfill excavations in closed landfills and the required regulations and processes required from an AI ChatGPT inquiry.	
187	Dave Gardner	Project Manager Galen Jones & the Seward Glenn project team, I am transmitting to you for your information and use the Resolution passed at our Airport Heights Community Council December meeting, plus the previous Resolution from our February meeting for reference. Efforts continue to get these approved Resolutions posted to the Federation website and make them available to the public, but what with the Holidays this is taking some time, and so now sending them your way ASAP as you have asked. Sincerely, Dave Gardner AHCC Member-at-Large AIRPORT HEIGHTS COMMUNITY COUNCIL RESOLUTION 2025-2 A RESOLUTION REGARDING THE SEWARD TO GLENN CONNECTION PLANNING AND ENVIRONMENTAL LINKAGES STUDY LEVEL 2 DRAFT ALTERNATIVE REPORT WHEREAS, the Seward to Glenn Connection Planning and Environmental Linkages Study has a defined boundary in the northern area of the Anchorage bowl, including a significant portion within the Airport Heights Community Council boundary. WHEREAS, Airport Heights Community Council has a vested interest in this study directly as part of the study area and indirectly as residents of Anchorage that use the transportation system to get to work, school, food, health care, and other important activities. WHEREAS, the Seward to Glenn Connection Planning and Environmental Linkages Study has drafted a Level 2 Screening and Recommendations Report October 2025 for public review and comment; WHEREAS, Airport Heights Community Council residents have passed three previous resolutions regarding this planning effort (Resolution 2022-01 and Resolution 2024-3 and Resolution 2025-1); WHEREAS, the remaining and now recommended "parkway design" alternative 5 follows essentially the same route as the fatally flawed highway Alternative C presented in early 2024, and thus we remain concerned about unacceptably high impacts; WHEREAS, Parkway Alternative C, now called Alternative 5, would increase traffic, road noise, and light pollution adjacent to the Eastridge neighborhood, Penland Mobile Home Park and Charter Circle Town Square Manor multi-family housing in our community. Reduce air quality and cause adverse health effects within 2,000 feet of the roadway including two ASD elementary schools, Northstar Hospital & the Alaska Regional Hospital campus, including the many medical services buildings & providers, and the on-site Tanaina Preschool & outdoor playground, which we view as unacceptably high impacts relative to any benefit received from this alternative; WHEREAS, the phasing scheme proposed for Bypass Alternative 5 would begin by reducing travel lanes and capacity through Fairview, followed by re-alignment of the Seward Highway to turn east at 5th Avenue, directing bypass traffic onto DeBarr Road to Airport Heights Drive, and back to the Glenn Highway, for an extended period, years possibly, before the technically difficult and expensive leg through the former City landfill can be designed, funded and constructed, exposing the Airport Heights neighborhood to increased and protracted levels of traffic noise and air pollution;	Your opposition for the project Alternative 5 and support for Alternatives 2 and 3 will be included in the project record.

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		WHEREAS, the2050 MTP and MTP+, now Alternatives 2 & 3, Traffic Sensitivity Tests highlighted that the current system has ample capacity to handle traffic that may shift from Gambell and Ingra to other routes if the 2050 MTP or MTP+ alternatives are implemented; WHEREAS, the 2050 MTP and MTP+, Alternatives 2 & 3, would balance traffic flow with community needs, as it restores connectivity to Fairview by narrowing Ingra and returning Gambell to a community "main street" environment. It would also mitigate the harm caused by high-speed, high-volume traffic by reducing speeds, thus reducing deadly crashes as well as the currently pervasive highway noise. The alternative is based on projects that were proposed by the comm1mity and selected by AMATS for inclusion in the 2050 MTP. As such, these projects explicitly represent the will of the community in how this corridor should be reimagined. The vehicular traffic demand reduction strategies identified in the MTP+ alternative would benefit the entire comm1mity, regardless of other roadway changes; WHEREAS, as previously stated, we should ensure sufficient funding for pavement preservation and winter maintenance of the infrastructure we already have before adding any more lane miles, tunnels, bridges, and facilities to our transportation system, as proposed in the highway and parkway alternatives; WHEREAS, the Fairview Community Council, in partnership with NeighborWorks Alaska, received a Reconnecting Communities Grant from tile federal government to do more in-depth work on solutions to make the community whole and The Reconnecting Fairview project is on-going; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Airport Heights Community Council continues to stand with the Fairview neighborhood to ensure a solution that reconnects the community and mitigates decades-long past and existing harms caused by the two one-way four-lane roads and two one-way three-lane roads that were intentionally built through the neighborhood; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Airport Heights Community Council continues to oppose Alternative 5, due to significant impacts on nearby parklands, hospitals, schools, affordable housing and family friendly neighborhoods, and does particularly oppose any work significantly increasing traffic, road noise and associated air pollution on DeBarr Road and Airport Heights Drive, and Lake Otis Parkway, prior to construction and completion of the Merrill Field Parkway Bypass (Proposed Phase 4) segment. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Airport Heights Community Council continues to support the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan and MTP+, Alternatives 2 & 3, for the Seward to Glenn Connection Planning and Environmental Linkages Study, which would better balance community needs, local connectivity, and vehicle traffic flow, preserve residences, businesses, and parks, reduce vehicle traffic noise, improve air quality, and reduce vehicular traffic demand; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that with all the resulting negative and destructive impacts to the recreational use and livability to the adjacent neighborhood, the Airport Heights Community Council continues to vigorously oppose any and all options and alternatives that would direct construction of a new high volume National Highway System Bypass roadway adjacent to Sitka Park, hospitals, schools and multi-family housing or would fail to mitigate the negative impacts of the high-speed, high-volume vehicle traffic through the Fairview neighborhood, including a parkway or highway. THIS RESOLUTION WAS APPROVED by the Airport Heights Community Council on December 18, 2025 by a vote of: FOR 17 , AGAINST O, ABSTAIN O.	
183	John Whitlock	Subject: Airport Heights Community Council Request for Time Extension Galen Jones, Project Manager The Airport Heights Community Council is requesting a time extension for submitting comments regarding the October 2025 Level 2 Recommendation Report. The Airport Heights Community Council will potentially be significantly impacted by the proposed new Bypass Parkway. Our Community Council is expected to need more time to fully evaluate and review the latest proposal and conclude formal approval of a Resolution. It is anticipated that a Resolution can be approved at the next regularly scheduled Council meeting December 18, 2025. Let me know if you have questions and thank you for your consideration.	Mr. Gardner – Thank you for reaching out. We will gladly accept official comments from the community councils past the comment period deadline of November 21. I do encourage you to get the resolution submitted as early as possible to ensure the team has adequate time to evaluate and consider the feedback in the revisions being made toward delivery of the final PEL study documents in January. Should we look for it around December 19? In the meantime, the team would like to offer to meet with your executive committee to review the draft recommendation, discuss any concerns you might have and, hopefully, clarify any misconceptions. Do you have a regularly scheduled meeting we might attend? Alternatively, we could offer up some dates and times when I and other key team members are available.

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Request submitted by Dave Gardner, Airport Heights Community Council Board Member and Seward Glenn Connection Special Committee Member	Thanks so much for your interest in the study. We look forward to connecting with you. Best regards, Galen Jones and the Seward to Glenn Connection PEL Study Team
167	Mackenzie Pope on behalf of Senator Loki Tobin	Dear Director Holland, Thank you for providing another opportunity to comment on the final PEL report. My comments again reflect my personal experience living near the transportation corridor and my extensive engagement with the neighborhoods I represent. The department has advanced some positive recommendations in this PEL Study, such as taking Highway connections off the table and advancing Fairview’s neighborhood priorities for Gambell, Hy	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		uncertainties, this process could again cause disruption and disinvestment to harm our communities. The woonerf street on Hyder, increased trail connectors, reducing motorized lanes with added nonmotorized infrastructure, and the decreased speeds on high conflict roads are all ideas supported by the community. These beneficial investments should be pursued without continuing or relocating the negative impacts of the corridor. I am grateful for the amount of public engagement opportunities the PEL study team has put forward for the community. However, if staff do not meaningfully incorporate comments received, or make these unwieldy documents easy to understand, then the efficacy of hosting these open houses is squandered. Many of the public comments spoke in support of alternatives which had already been screened out. This confusion speaks to the need for clearer guidance and demystifying this process even further for the public to make the best use of their feedback and expertise. There were opportunities to provide clear explanations and details of project aspects (e.g. sidewalk widths, clear/interactive maps, criteria and scoring values) which would have provided more transparency and clarity to residents looking to engage with this process. With Gratitude,	benefits but would continue to route substantial regional traffic through the neighborhood. For that reason, the strategy also included evaluation of a lower-speed, parkway-style regional connection. <i>2. “I wholeheartedly disagree that the Fairview Bypass option is the strongest option. Alternative 5 is unrealistic, disregards key community input, and introduces new project elements in the final comment period (regarding the Port connection). [...] The Screening document also downplays the negative impacts significant relocations and construction impacts would have on the Fairview neighborhood.”</i> The Department appreciates your concerns regarding the feasibility of the recommended Fairview Bypass, including relocations, construction impacts, and the revised Port connection presented during the draft PEL review. These issues informed the refinement of the recommendations. Potential relocations, construction impacts, community effects, and environmental considerations were evaluated at a planning level and would receive substantially more detailed analysis during future environmental review and design if individual projects advance. The purpose of the PEL process is to identify potential issues early so they can be avoided, minimized, or better understood before project-specific decisions are made. The Department will continue working with affected property owners, residents, businesses, and agencies to reduce impacts wherever practical. Your comments regarding the revised Port connection were also carefully considered. Following additional public and stakeholder feedback during the draft PEL review, the Final PEL Report no longer recommends the specific Port connection concept presented in the draft report. Instead, it recommends a future reconnaissance-level engineering study begin as soon as possible to evaluate potential Port access improvements independently from the Seward to Glenn Connection PEL using a broader geographic scope. This approach recognizes the importance of freight mobility while acknowledging that additional study is warranted before recommending a specific connection. The Department recognizes that major transportation improvements require balancing community impacts and transportation benefits. The recommended implementation strategy emphasizes phased implementation, allowing community-priority improvements to advance independently while preserving flexibility as needs, funding opportunities, and priorities evolve. <i>3. “In order to align with the Reconnecting Fairview effort for a unified approach, the PEL Study should advance the neighborhood priorities first. These priorities include immediate lane reductions on Gambell and Ingra Streets, and short-term projects for the Hyder Street Pedestrian Boulevard and improved transit services. Medium-term projects should include the final reconstruction for Gambell and Ingra Streets [...]. If future growth demand is realized, then that may justify a larger project like the Bypass, that could be revisited and advanced in the long-term, but it should not precede the neighborhood priority projects. [...]”</i> The Department appreciates your emphasis on advancing neighborhood-priority improvements as early as practical. Throughout the PEL Study, the project team heard consistent support for improvements such as lane reductions, the Hyder Pedestrian Boulevard, enhanced transit service, safer pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and improved neighborhood connectivity. These priorities directly influenced the recommended implementation strategy. Accordingly, the implementation plan recommends several community-priority projects advance independently of a future regional connection. Early projects include the Hyder Pedestrian Boulevard, complete streets improvements, lane reductions, trail connections, and other neighborhood enhancements intended to improve safety and livability. Transit improvements can also be introduced incrementally as service levels and funding permit. The Department agrees that future Port access improvements warrant additional study. Following draft PEL review comments, the Final PEL Report no longer recommends a specific Port connection

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
			and instead recommends a reconnaissance-level engineering study to evaluate potential improvements in coordination with ongoing planning efforts. The primary question considered in developing the implementation sequence was when additional lane reductions on Ingra and Gambell Streets could occur while maintaining the performance of the broader transportation network. Based on the traffic analysis completed during the PEL, the Department concluded that substantial additional lane reductions would likely require an alternative route for regional traffic to avoid shifting congestion and traffic diversion to adjacent neighborhoods. For that reason, the implementation strategy recommends advancing neighborhood improvements early while preserving flexibility to evaluate a future regional connection. <i>4. “I also want to raise the fiscal impracticality of both Alternatives 4 and 5. This final report should give local and state leaders clear guidance on how to alleviate concerns around this corridor. If the suggestions are far from anything we will be able to program and fund, the study will not provide meaningful guidance for decisionmakers to make informed transportation policy or project investments in the years to come.”</i> The Department appreciates your concern regarding the fiscal practicality of the recommended improvements. One objective of the PEL was to develop recommendations that could be implemented over time rather than identifying a single project requiring full funding before benefits are realized. Accordingly, the recommended implementation plan is organized as a series of independent projects with standalone utility that can advance incrementally as funding becomes available while providing flexibility to respond to changing needs, community priorities, and future funding opportunities. Alternative 4 was not recommended for advancement because of several significant implementation challenges identified during the PEL study, including its inability to be phased into projects with independent utility, restrictions on hazardous materials transportation, higher long-term operations and maintenance requirements, and high construction costs. The recommended implementation strategy avoids these challenges by emphasizing projects that provide meaningful benefits independently while preserving flexibility for future decision-makers. This phased approach provides a more practical framework than relying on a single large capital project. <i>5. “Alternatives 2 and 3 which reflect the projects and improvements adopted by the 2050 Metropolitan Transportation Plan much more effectively speak to the purpose and need. Both of these alternatives need further refinement, with more accurate and comprehensive data to incorporate realistic future travel demand (our population projects are declining), to assess the freight impacts and traffic volume diversion into nearby neighborhoods. I would also like to see better transit data to accurately reflect how additional transit would affect traffic volumes.”</i> The Department appreciates your recommendation to continue refining Alternatives 2 and 3 and agrees that continued analysis of travel demand, freight movement, transit service, and changing regional conditions will remain important as future projects advance. Planning studies rely on the best information available at the time they are conducted, and future environmental review and design will provide opportunities to refine forecasts and evaluate project performance. The Department also agrees that Alternatives 2 and 3 include valuable improvements. Many elements of those alternatives—including lane reductions, complete streets improvements, transit enhancements, and neighborhood connectivity projects—have been incorporated into the recommended implementation strategy. The principal difference identified during the PEL was that Alternatives 2 and 3 would continue to route substantial regional traffic through Fairview. While they provide meaningful community benefits, the technical analysis indicated they would not fully address the long-standing impacts

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
			associated with existing National Highway System and Interstate Highway System routing through the neighborhood. The recommended implementation strategy combines the community-priority improvements advanced through Alternatives 2 and 3 with continued evaluation of a lower-speed regional connection. This approach reflects both the technical analysis completed during the PEL and input received from community members, stakeholders, partner agencies, and elected officials. 6. <i>“By selecting one parkway alternative that likely cannot be built due to fiscal constraints and future growth uncertainties, this process could again cause disruption and disinvestment to harm our communities. The woonerf street on Hyder, increased trail connectors, reducing motorized lanes with added nonmotorized infrastructure, and the decreased speeds on high conflict roads are all ideas supported by the community. These beneficial investments should be pursued without continuing or relocating the negative impacts of the corridor.”</i> The Department agrees that the community-priority improvements identified throughout the PEL process (e.g., Hyder Pedestrian Boulevard, complete streets, trail connections, lane reductions, lower posted speeds, enhanced transit service, and other neighborhood investments) provide meaningful benefits and should be advanced. Consequently, they are included in the recommended Alternative 5 implementation plan regardless of whether a future regional connection advances. Regardless of whether additional PEL recommendations are incorporated into future transportation plans, projects in the adopted Metropolitan Transportation Plan would continue to advance through the normal planning and programming processes. The PEL recommendations build on those improvements by identifying additional opportunities to reduce community impacts and improve transportation system performance. Based on the technical analysis completed during the PEL, the Department concluded that fully transforming Ingra and Gambell Streets into neighborhood-serving corridors while maintaining regional transportation functions will likely require continued investment in community-priority improvements and evaluation of an alternative route for regional traffic. The intent is not to relocate impacts from one neighborhood to another, but to reduce the long-standing impacts of regional traffic on Fairview while maintaining broader transportation network functionality. 7. <i>“I am grateful for the amount of public engagement opportunities the PEL study team has put forward for the community. However, if staff do not meaningfully incorporate comments received, or make these unwieldy documents easy to understand, then the efficacy of hosting these open houses is squandered. Many of the public comments spoke in support of alternatives which had already been screened out. This confusion speaks to the need for clearer guidance and demystifying this process even further for the public to make the best use of their feedback and expertise. There were opportunities to provide clear explanations and details of project aspects (e.g. sidewalk widths, clear/interactive maps, criteria and scoring values) which would have provided more transparency and clarity to residents looking to engage with this process.”</i> The Department sincerely appreciates your recognition of the study’s extensive public engagement efforts and your thoughtful feedback regarding opportunities to improve the clarity and accessibility of the planning process. We agree that meaningful public involvement depends not only on providing opportunities for participation, but also on presenting information in a way that is understandable, transparent, and useful to community members. Throughout the PEL Study, the project team worked to refine both the alternatives and public engagement processes in response to community feedback. Screening criteria were developed and revised through public input, alternatives evolved substantially over the course of the study, and

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
			many recommendations in the Final PEL Report reflect ideas and priorities raised by residents, stakeholders, partner agencies, and elected officials. While not every recommendation and public comment align, community input played a significant role in shaping the final recommendations. The Department also recognizes that planning studies of this scale can be difficult to navigate as alternatives evolve and technical information becomes more detailed. We appreciate your suggestions regarding maps, graphics, project descriptions, evaluation criteria, and other communication tools and will continue looking for opportunities to improve future planning and project development efforts. Project-specific details such as sidewalk widths, roadway cross sections, landscaping, and other design features will be developed during subsequent environmental review and design. Those future phases will include additional technical analysis as well as robust public and agency engagement to ensure that affected communities continue to shape project development and design decisions. The Department greatly appreciates the time, effort, and local knowledge contributed by you, Fairview residents, community organizations, partner agencies, and other stakeholders

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		as Express because it seems to be defined differently than the next bullet of UMED Rapid Transit of 10 minute headways) say it will add 5 buses, which to us means an additional 13 operators. a. This will be added into the TOTM – 2025 Project lists that will be prioritized later this winter. 6. Our RideShare program has roughly 90% of users going from MSB to JBER. Doubling this doesn’t take many single occupancy vehicles off of the Seward/Glenn study area. PTD is okay with this goal, with the understanding that it may not have the impacts as desired in the study area. a. Increasing subsidies for C-ER residents to make it more worth it for them economically to commute to Anchorage might be an alternative worth exploring. 7. Peer agencies that went fare	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		January 2025, Open House #5 and shown as Parkway Alt C&D #2, which connects along Whitney Road and Viking Drive. I understand that the Parkway Alt C&D #2 was the favored route by the Alaska Trucking Association from the Open House #5 version of the PEL. General Comment #2: All of the current cost estimates are questionable, and likely grossly underestimated, for many reasons touched upon in these comments. General Comment #3: The overall feasibility of the route is questionable, as the PEL has not fully coordinated with other impacted entities, notably the Alaska Railroad (AKRR), and even within DOTPF, as the impacts of Option 5 on the proposed Knik Arm Crossing have apparently also not been considered in this PEL. General Comment #4: The effects of the multiple phases of Option 5 when implemented are largely unknown and/or poorly modeled.	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Alternate routes that don't impact parkland exist (Viking/Whitney route among others) and are also likely to be much less costly than the proposed Port Connection of Option 5. Port Comment #3: The Port Connection alignment between Viking Drive and Commercial Drive similarly has a very steep hill. If it follows the current grade, that would have a 13 percent grade. Far steeper than recommended for typical truck routes. Port Comment #4: The Port Connection alignment currently shows five significant grade changes, as discussed above. The repeated uphill, downhill, curves at the grade changes, bridges, etc. all mean that the proposed route will be significantly more hazardous for trucks in icy weather than the Viking/Whitney route. Again, traffic modeling is questionable due to these factors. Port Comment #5: Sunset Park and the East Bluff Greenbelt and the bluff extending east from Government Hill had some of the worst ground failures in Anchorage from the 1964 earthquake. See attached files called Air-Force-Post-From-West.JPG, and Pg18-Landslides-Great-AK-Quake-Stan-Cohen.PDF. The Bootlegger Cove Clay that caused the ground failures in the 64 quake are still present, and are closer to liquefaction due to the many year-round springs that are located at a level about 15 to 20 feet above the railyard level along the south side of the Government Hill Bluff. Visible debris from the former Government Hill school, playground, houses and fencing, etc. are present in the proposed route, and according to people with metal detectors, the underground portion of Sunset Park is filled with debris from the former Government Hill School. That debris will include asbestos and lead containing materials, metal, concrete, asphalt, etc. as all of those materials are currently visible at the surface. Excavation in Sunset Park and the East Bluff Greenbelt will be more expensive due to those materials. The necessary retaining wall at the Government Hill bluff will also face challenges due to the springs, and controlling glaciation and water runoff. Port Comment #6: The East Bluff Greenbelt sees large number of bears as they follow salmon in Ship Creek, hit the railyards, and move into the adjacent greenbelt as their "wildlife corridor". Moose also commonly use the Greenbelt as their homes and movement corridor. Impacts to wildlife and prevention of wildlife/vehicle accidents along with displacement of wildlife will need to be considered and mitigated. Port Comment #7: The proposed route from the Port, which passes underneath the A-C couplet bridge, connects to the Loop Road at a nearly blind intersection. Trucks pulling a double trailer merging onto Loop Road would not be visible from northbound traffic on the A-C Bridge until after the corner. That would be highly unsafe in the current configuration, and will require a re-design. Thanks again for including these comments in the public record. Bob French	
138	Tyrone Neel	Hi Tyrone Neel here. I left a comment in the comment section. Here are the pictures I was referring to. The red are the tracks to be bypassed. The green are possible routes for the traffic going over the tracks. The yellow would be a softening of the corner from Ocean Dock to Whitney. Thanks for your time. From Tyrone's phone	The suggested routes are not feasible. The green route is drawn right over the top of a primary rail line in and out of the Port. The road would need to be at least 23.5 feet in the air over the tracks. There is insufficient room for the road to climb up and over the tracks given the grade limitations for trucks, which is 5%. Difficulty making the turn at Whitney and 6th Avenues is a known issue and may have merit.
126	Charles Barnwell	Subject: Comments on the Seward to Glenn Hwy PEL Study I am not an Anchorage resident anymore, but have family living in the Airport Heights neighborhood; and I am a 55 year former resident of Anchorage. My comments below are based on my past residency in Anchorage, as well as my background in planning and GIS: 1. I see this Study as one that will help heal the planning mistakes of Anchorage's past 60 or more years. Old	Your support for the project is noted and will be included in the project record.

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		neighborhoods (albeit Anchorage is not old compared to many U.S. cities) were affected spatially and otherwise by the 1964 Earthquake (I lived in Anchorage at that time). The 1961 Comprehensive Plan considered the integrity of the local neighborhoods in the Fairview and Airport Heights areas. However, the 1964 earthquake reconstruction caused building of the Ingra/Gambell corridor we see today which bisected the old Fairview neighborhood and led to its current broken state. There were other post-Quake projects that disrupted pre-Quake neighborhoods. So, it is pleasing to see in this Study efforts to try to preserve neighborhood integrity, and in the case of Fairview restore it in part. Mountainview also is considered. 2. This Study is exceptionally well organized, considers all alternatives, and is presented utilizing great graphics, and based on GIS analysis, e.g. the effects of routing on traffic on the area roads. Very nicely done. 3. There are other components of the Study which I support and commend as follows: * The interchanges with the Glenn Highway are big improvements for routing traffic to the Port area. * The Pedestrian Boulevard proposal will complete the Loop and beyond that help connect the Airport Heights and Fairview areas to downtown, and to the south as well. * The proposed Sub-Area Plan is a good idea allowing focus on this part of Anchorage and the ability of community residents to participate. * The Fairview Greenway * The depressed corridor along 15th which will greatly improve safety in the area, as well as walkability. Yes, it will add cost to the project, but provide important benefits to the neighborhoods. * The Fairview Corridor Plan makes sense and I like the emphasis on it being led by neighborhood community groups. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Charles E. Barnwell	
119	Mackenzie A Barnwell	Hello, I am writing to strongly oppose Option 5. Fairview Bypass as a transportation route to connect the Seward and Glenn highways. This proposed route would intersect the Airport Heights neighborhood, a predominantly family-oriented neighborhood full of young children, dog walkers, and friendly neighbors. Building the Fairview Bypass would add heavy highway traffic through this neighborhood, one of the oldest standing neighborhoods in the city. Other transportation routes that could be pursued would have less of an impact on families like mine that live in Airport Heights. I see no reason why Option 5 would be pursued in lieu of the other proposed options that would not have as negative an impact on a family neighborhood. Thank you for considering my comment. -Mackenzie Barnwell	Your opposition to the project is noted and will be included in the project record.
112		Can you provide a list of project team members and contact information on the project home webpage? Also please provide the following in reply: 1.) Who are the DOT&PF team members managing the study in cooperation with Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS). 2.) Who are the AMATS team members? 3.) Please list the current engineering firm contracted for design study and managing team members Thanks	A list of team members can be found at the beginning of the PEL Report. AMATS and others who have been involved in providing input to the study are also listed.
160	NeighborWorks Alaska	Re: Seward to Glenn Highway Connection PEL Draft Study Report & Level 2 Screening Report	Dear Mr. MacKenzie,

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Dear Galen Jones and the PEL team, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the AMATS: Seward Highway to Glenn Highway Connection Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) Study. Below are comments on behalf of NeighborWorks Alaska (NWAK) on the “Level 2 Screening and Recommendations Report DRAFT” and the “Draft PEL Report.” We would like to thank the project team for coordinating efforts over the past few years with NWAK and the Fairview Community Council for the Reconnecting Fairview Corridor Planning effort. For over two years the project team has regularly met with our planning effort to focus on positive strategies and recommendations for a strong future for the Fairview neighborhood. DRAFT PEL STUDY Overall, the Fairview Community Council offers conditional support for the recommended alternative and implementation plan identified in the documents, specifically because this recommendation would re	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		capacities and user experiences. The future growth projections in the Travel Demand Model greatly influence what the Report calls “spillover.” However, as we’ve previously commented, the future medium-growth scenario is not aligned with the Alaska DOL&WD 2022 study that predicts a slight decline in population by 2045. Recognizing this, our questions are: • Given the low (to no?) growth projections of the region, would the Bypass project still be justified? • Does the PEL consider reduction in auto demand resulting from road diets and local mode-shift? • Does the PEL consider any planned increases in transit service, capturing some trips? • What is the benefit-cost of proposed project?	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		• Phasing: We have recommended that the PEL Study advances a range of options for the NEPA process and future design efforts, rather than selecting one alternative. This study should not repeat the errors of the past by selecting one alignment and precluding others based on uncertain future growth scenarios. In this case, the implementation plan can offer phasing strategies to address future uncertainties by starting with the priority projects listed above. • Fairview Bypass: DOT&PF's Recommended Alternative ○ The Fairview Bypass alternative 5 overall offers challenges and opportunities within Fairview. One opportunity is to have the regional traffic routed outside of the Gambell-Ingra Corridor. However, more information is needed to better inform us (and the public) especially regarding: visualizations along 1	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Level 2 Screening and Recommendations Report DRAFT <i>Overall questions regarding this report:</i> • None of the five alternatives appear to do enough to improve non-motorized Level of Traffic Stress (LTS) for 5th and 6th Avenues as all stay at LTS 4 for bicyclists, with only a modest increase to LTS 3 for walking for some alternatives. What were the considerations that prevented further improvements to these corridors? For example, Ingra & 6th Ave. is a hotspot for major and fatal collisions. Both 6th Avenue and 5th Avenue have had several fatalities over the past 10 years. • All of the alternatives appear to worsen or only marginally improve vehicle hours of travel or delay compared to no action except Alternative 3 (transit). Why isn't higher priority placed on Project 11 implementation of the Downtown-Midtown-UMed Rapid Transit	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Sincerely, Jim MacKenzie Executive Director NeighborWorks Alaska	
108	James Nolan	While I want equity for the residents of Fairview, each of these project alternatives seem poorly structured. I see multiple aspects of Alt 5 that could easily be added to other alternatives (such as new bus routes, which do not need a separate highway project). Likewise, the construction of better bikeways and trail access to ship creek has minimal relevance to the contraction of a separate highway. Additionally, the project impact analysis misses large swaths of the neighborhoods affected by the redirected traffic. The project does not include any discussion of the impact on Airport Heights Elementary, a Title I school. As such, the project is claiming to offer equity to Fairview residents without considering the impact to equity of the children at Airport Heights Elementary; Alt 5 would put a highway	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		We are strongly supportive of Alternative 5 and associated plans which will cause less impact on our neighborhood –Airport Heights—and provide a pedestrian boulevard from our area to the Ship Creek area. We are avid bicyclists and look forward to this new boulevard and trail which will complete a Loop from Chester Creek up to Ship Creek and then the Coastal Trail. This will be a wonderful addition to East Anchorage and downtown as well. We also greatly appreciated the various new designs proposed including: -The Fairview Greenway -The depressed corridor along 15th which will greatly improve safety in the area, as well as walkability. -The interchanges with the Glenn Highway are big improvements for routing traffic to the Port area. -The proposed Sub-Area Plan is a good idea allowing focus on this part of Anchorage and the ability of community residents to participate. -Finally, we support the Fairview Corridor Plan and one that is sponsored and led by neighborhood community groups.	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Goal 2: Maintain existing transportation infrastructure: improve, fix and use what we have first? Goal 3: Provide Transportation Choices in how people move around the Municipality * C1: Plan and build infrastructure consistent with mode share targets. 1. Provide a clear plan for the loss of taxable property, commercial property, residential units, and zoned capacity: The Long Range Transportation Strategy (LRTS) calls for preserving taxable property for productive use, or preserving parkland for parkland use. 1. It would be helpful if the project team could provide more information about which residential units are likely to be demolished and where they could be replaced in Anchorage. For context, a residential unit in Fairview may be currently renting for \$1200, with this price reflecting the age of the unit. To remove that unit and	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		would require only \$100 in operating costs every year. Does this include snow plowing, lighting, and any other staffing costs? 3. Provide more information about how whether expanded infrastructure in this project will or will not affect AKDOTs staffing abilities to maintain other existing infrastructure. 2025 LRTS: Goal 2: Maintain existing transportation infrastructure: improve, fix and use what we have first M3: Account for, provide for, and make known the full seasonal cycle of road or path facility needs in design and funding guidelines, on all transportation projects for the lifespan of those projects. 1. Address the comments provided by AMATS staff in their letter dated October 30, 2025: Please include responses to these items in any subsequent PEL materials. 1. This includes basing the model off	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		1. The cost estimates in the Level 2 screening recommendations list a number of costs that do not seem well justified. These include: * Rapid Transit Branding Upgrade: What are the components of this \$1 million dollar cost, and is this necessary for this alternative to be functional? * Park and rides in Chugiak, Birchwood, and Eagle River Is this implementation intended to address traffic moving completely through Anchorage, or traffic originating within the Bowl and moving to other places in the Bowl? For how many drivers is this implementation expected to change travel behavior? Per the 2022 Origin-Destination Study Report<	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		already needs improvements in the form of sidewalks and turn lanes to improve pedestrian safety and to reduce poor driver choices due to poor lane choices. The highway traffic on Airport Heights and Lake Otis will undoubtedly push more cars into the Airport Heights neighborhood streets, which will detrimentally impact the neighborhood. The alternative makes big improvements to Fairview but at the expense of other neighborhoods. I prefer alternatives 3 and 4. Can the Port access still resemble the alternative 5 design, but the Gambell/ Ingra modifications follow alternative 3 or 4? The cut and cover option through Fairview should remain a top alternative, because it effectively mitigates the highway impacts through Fairview and improves the cohesiveness of Fairview without sending the highway’s negative impacts to another neighborhood.	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		• APF thanks the department for removing the previous Parkway Alternative D through the Chester Creek Greenbelt. • The new Port Access Route Phase 1 (project 7) is a new alignment not previously shared with the public. This alignment appears to negatively impact the parks and greenspaces in Government Hill, and therefore the quality of life in that neighborhood. The study should instead ensure the route remains within the Ship Creek industrial area, such as the previous route along Whitney Road. • APF is a partner and fully supports the efforts to Reconnect Fairview led by the Fairview Community Council and NeighborWorks Alaska. The PEL Study should continue to prioritize the goals of this effort to improve safety, connection, and reinvestment into the Fairview neighborhood. • APF supports Fairview’s recommendations for short-term phasing starting with the Gambell & Ingra Couplet Conversion (project 1, as numbered in the draft Implementation Plan, which are already-program	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		in Woodside Park (immediately east of the Seward Highway where it crosses Chester Creek). See page 52 of the Plan. The Plan includes a cost estimate for this work on page 66: 2\$10M+2 * Restoring the North Fork of Chester Creek in Sitka Park (immediately south of 15th Avenue, south of Merrill Field). See page 57. Thank you, David and Diana Evans	
90	Dave Gardner	Subject: Airport Heights Community Council Request for Time Extension Galen Jones, Project Manager The Airport Heights Community Council is requesting a time extension for submitting comments regarding the October 2025 Level 2 Recommendation Report. The Airport Heights Community Council will potentially be significantly impacted	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
88	Judy Robinson	Can you explain how Alternative 5 Fairview Bypass will affect access from my house onto 15th and onto Ingra? I live on Karluk St south of 15th and east of Ingra. It looks like I could only turn east onto 15th from Karluk or Medfra. Will 20th St have access onto the northbound lane of Ingra? Thanks.	Karluk is proposed to continue to go through and have access to and from 15th Avenue (both east and west). Karluk would go over top of the new parkway connection. No change of access at 20th is proposed.
82	Kerry Lynch	Second comment. I want	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		I believe that, as a community, we all recognize an important truth: Alternative 5 cannot—and will not—serve as the final long-term highway-to-highway connection between the Seward Highway and the Glenn/Parks Highway system. Over the next decades, federal standards will continue to raise expectations for what is effectively U.S. Highway No. 1, because these two corridors together form that national route. Ultimately, the connection must: provide a continuous freeway, maintain 65 mph speeds throughout, avoid traffic signals, and offer the shortest, most direct route between major population centers. A configuration within the Anchorage bowl simply cannot meet those federal-level criteria in a permanent, future-ready way. 2. What the True Final Solution Will Look Like If we look ahead 10–30 years, the only realistic and optimal final solution is clear: A Knik Arm bridge providing a direct Seward Highway → Big Lake → Parks Highway connection, continuing toward Houston and north to Fairbanks. Such a link will reduce the overall Seward–Fairbanks route by up to 20 miles, improve travel time, and modernize the entire Highway No. 1 corridor. I am certain the Knik Arm crossing will eventually be built, as population and freight demand continue to rise. When that happens, that bridge—not Alternative 5—will serve as the true ultimate Seward–Glenn/Parks connection. 3. Understanding the Purpose of the Current PEL Study Because of that future reality, I view the current PEL effort in a very practical light: This is an excellent opportunity for Anchorage to use federally funded improvements (90% federal match) to upgrade our internal city transportation system—while still meeting the PEL requirements. If the true final solution (the Knik Arm bridge) were being built today: many of the smaller but important improvements in Alternative 5 would not be funded, or they would eventually require local or state money later, or they would be postponed indefinitely. Instead, under this PEL framework, Anchorage gains significant improvements at a fraction of the cost—including the new proposed road east of Merrill Field over the former landfill site (where, incidentally, many historical artifacts may exist). This is a smart and beneficial use of the federal process. For this reason, I am supportive of most improvements proposed under Alternative 5. 4. One Key Safety Concern: Proposed Roundabout on Ingra Street My only major concern relates to the proposed roundabout in the low section of Ingra Street between Fireweed Lane and 15th Avenue. Why the roundabout design is unsafe:	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Northbound traffic coming downhill from the New Seward/Fireweed intersection will naturally gain speed. A roundabout located at the bottom of a grade will force sudden braking, particularly dangerous on icy winter roads. This configuration is likely to cause frequent bump-to-bump collisions due to sliding and reduced stopping distance. At present, such accidents are relatively rare precisely because the current roadway geometry causes vehicles to slow naturally while climbing uphill toward 15th Avenue. Recommendation: Remove the roundabout from the design and maintain a continuous, non-stop flow through the bottom of Ingra Street, consistent with today’s safe uphill-slowing pattern. This one correction would significantly improve winter safety while preserving the operational benefits of the project. 5. Conclusion Alternative 5 is a valuable and forward-looking set of improvements—but not the final highway-to-highway solution,	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		toward safety on our high-injury corridors to stop the loss of life on our urban streets. We should follow our approved long-range plans and focus on safety, maintenance of (and downsizing) existing infrastructure, and mode shift to achieve affordable transportation and livability goals already envisioned by our community.	
72	Mary Mills	Subject: The Seward Glenn roadway connections Hello Traffic Engineers, I really like that Alternative 5 meets "reconnecting Fairview" objectives and cuts down on vehicle traffic on Gambell, Ingra and 5th Ave. I like that the plan is not to build a highway. I like the plan to make a bike-friendly route in this area. I'm concerned about this phrase used to describe the route, "Highest # or relocations" ? How many relocations are there expected	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		include Boniface, Tudor and Muldoon Roads would show that alternative routes bypassing Fairview are already being used and preferred by many travelers now. I do understand that it has been a long-standing DOT goal to “connect” the two Highways, the Seward and the Glenn more directly to each other. And now that DOT recommends that be accomplished with the proposed Alternative 5 alignment, I continue to be a NO on this Alternative 5 (previously option C), both as a question of need and as well as due to traffic and noise impacts to the Airports Heights neighborhood. Alternative 5, both with the initial phases and when fully built out, will encourage more bypass traffic, as well as route port freight traffic headed south, onto the new bypass and down past affordable residential areas, including Penland mobile home Park, Town Square Manor multi	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		to a lasting solution that serves all of our transit and transportation needs. The following are offered in good faith in the spirit of collaboration. Those I do profess that I was supportive of the Parkway AB alternative in its most recent form, I am happy to provide comments on Alternative 5 (formerly C) “Fairview Bypass”. I hope that these concepts will be thorough vetted and incorporated where they make sense. I am always happy to discuss these further should additional information be required. 1) Reducing the existing 5th and 6th Avenues to four lanes is an improvement, but we can do even better. I reference the NACTO Urban Street Design Guide, Transit Corridor (screenshot below). I recommend this concept be adapted to the available right-of-way on 5th/6th between the split on the west side and Airport Heights Drive on the	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		reduces conflicts between buses and personal vehicles. In this regional employment center with high frequency routes, this addition to the plan would be very welcome and productive. 4) With respect to Projects 7 and 8, while great and appropriate care was given to 15th with respect to bridges and caps, I would like to see a similar amount of care given to residents of Mountain View to ensure they have non-motorized access across the proposed freight route. While this road is mostly cutting through industrial lands, which is appropriate, where possible, features that encourage non-motorized and public transit should be incorporated. Additionally, Page 57 “Industrial Streets” shows a 2-lane road with shoulders but no non-motorized facilities. “Port Connection” says there will be sidewalks on both sides. This seems in conflict. Would also appreciate cycling considerations on this route. 5) I appreciate that the Fairview Greenway is situated early in the project.	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		freight and through traffic away from Gambell and Ingra Streets, the recommended plan will reduce traffic volumes, noise, and pollution in Fairview. BUT, unless traffic is reduced, it must go somewhere, and until the project is fully built out, traffic that is diverted from Fairview will end up in other neighborhoods. To reduce the impact on all neighborhoods and minimize traffic management during all phases of project construction, every possible way to reduce traffic should be implemented prior to any new road construction or lane reduction. At an early workshop for this project, numerous traffic reduction ideas were suggested. These ideas should be revisited and the most practical implemented. One low-cost project that should be a no-brainer is to establish an automated toll booth on the Glenn Highway. Increasing the cost of driving will encourage ride sharing, transit, rail, and reduce unnecessary traffic on the Glenn Highway. Dedicate the toll receipts for road maintenance. Traffic management will be one of the most	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		the people I just described (plus, "Muh Parkland! Where will the homeless sleep?!"). But I digress. I like what you guys are trying to do, and appreciate the effort you're putting forth. Moving on from.the jokes, pokes, and praise, I realize the all the Freeway Alternatives are off the table, along with Parkway Alternatives C and D, despite, to me, Options C and D (both Original Recipe and Parkway Alternatives) making the most practical sense in terms of project simplicity, cost, and ease of right-of-way acquisition (Everyone seemed to prefer the options that tunneled all the way under Ingra--nobody's concerned about Fairview residents potentially being displaced at all? Does nobody remember how badly Kelo v. New London soured the American people on the concept of eminent domain?). My two questions on that	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		sees frequent collisions. It is also alongside the only bike and pedestrian pathway to and from the neighborhood. The proposed new freight road also parallels the greenbelt along our neighborhood. In the presentation materials, I didn't see any acknowledgement of these impacts or information on how the impacts might be mitigated. None of the illustrations featured in your presentation of Alternative 5 even mention the changes to Government Hill. Please consider increased engagement with the Government Hill area if Alternative 5 is going to proceed. I'm not necessarily opposed to the Alternative but feel the neighborhood engagement has been lacking given the late-in-the-process introduction of an option with major impacts to this neighborhood, and no acknowledgement of those impacts in your recent presentation materials. While I support the overall objectives of this planning effort, as a Government Hill resident I feel blindsided and alarmed by the change, and the lack of related information on impacts to where I live. <	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		One other thing to consider is that currently, Whitney and Post roads have become a haven for motorcycle and loud car racers. I suppose the long stretches of roads with no stop signs and very little police activity are a magnet for those activities. They are louder than the trains and jets combined! If the proposed road were to go through it wouldn't take long for them to discover this new, longer stretch of even less possibility of being ticketed. Oh joy. A race track right out our back doors. I have some other observations from the prospective of a port worker and commercial hauler. Much of the freight going to Fairbanks either goes on the AK RR or by truck with 2 containers commonly referred to as “doubles” or “sets”. All of the freight going to the rail uses Whitney road because that is where the drop off and pick for the RR is. Just before the intersection of Whitney and Post.	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		How much of Harvard Park will be taken or irreversibly changed if an interchange is built at Curling Club curve (Loop Road)? How will Anchorage’s only curling club facility be able to function in its current location with a proposed new roundabout on Curling Club curve (Loop Road)? Secondary Impacts How would the added noise of several hundred trucks descending Loop Road each day impact the west side of the neighborhood? Could northbound traffic on Ocean Dock Road get backed up with significant truck traffic now entering Ocean Dock from the east? How might such delays along Ocean Dock impact trip times for traffic accessing the port from the south? While the separated nonmotorized trail is a nice gesture, its benefits are greatly overstated in DOT emails and on their conceptual map. The trail does not connect to downtown or midtown,	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		However, I strongly oppose the proposal to construct a roundabout on Loop Road and route port truck traffic up and down the Loop Road hill, connecting to a newly built road between the railroad and the bluff. Routing heavy truck traffic on Loop Road would create several serious and avoidable issues: Safety risks: Loop Road is steep, narrow, and frequently icy during the winter. Placing a roundabout at the steepest curved section represents a major safety hazard. Increased noise impacts: Trucks would need to significantly increase power to climb the hill and would rely heavily on brakes, including loud engine brakes, when descending. This would substantially increase noise pollution directly next to residential areas. Neighborhood intrusion: This plan brings industrial truck traffic unnecessarily close to one of Anchorage’s oldest and most unique neighborhoods, threatening livability and community character. A	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		it only takes a few minutes of a train crossing to back up traffic significantly. The track on the sharp corner at the bottom of the Gov Hill bluff is the worst offender and none of the plans address that one. Would it be feasible (or even possible) to go over all of them? Possibly use the point of the bluff for elevation to feed on to bridges/ramps? The outgoing traffic could feed onto Whitney road and the existing C street bridge. I know there is very limited room between the tracks on ocean dock road and I'm sure it would be an engendering nightmare but just a thought. See pic. Red are the tracks Yellow would be the elevated idea.	
79	Bradford Allen	Subject: Fwd: Port Connection public comment The following is my public comment	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Whereas, the Recommended Alternative will significantly impact the Fairview neighborhood and warrants correspondingly scaled mitigation of negative impacts; and Whereas, proposed highway caps and streetscape connection projects between Ship Creek infrastructure, landscaping, and require additional maintenance; and Whereas, the FVCC supports an implementation and project phasing strategy that prioritizes projects with lower-costs, less impacts to the residential urban environment first, and more immediate transportation improvements, rather than projects that may perpetuate the DOT&PF's inability to follow-through on projects (as seen with the utility undergrounding and lane reduction safety projects) such as the inability to advance a 15th Avenue underground parkway project due to budget constraints or other factors; and Whereas, the FVCC needs to see concrete evidence of DOT&PF's ability to implement all phases	

ID	Sender	Comment	Response
		Therefore, Be it Further Resolved, the FVCC urges the reclassification of the Seward Highway along Gambell and Ingra Streets from 5th to 36th Avenue to a principal arterial, rather than the current overclassification as an Interstate, due to the lack of controlled access and to allow the recommended changes (above) to preserve the livability and connectivity of our neighborhoods; and Therefore, Be It Further Resolved the FVCC requests the PEL Study incorporate recommendations for a partnership between the DOT&PF, the Municipality and the FVCC to develop financing mechanisms and frameworks, such as a Local Improvement District, for operation and maintenance costs along the Gambell-Ingra and 15th Avenue Corridors impacted by development of any upgraded Seward-Glenn Connection; and Therefore, Be it Further Resolved, the FVCC requests the DOT&PF and the Seward to Glenn Highway Connection PEL Study continue working closely with the Reconnecting Fairview planning effort to	