GOVERNMENT HILL COMMUNITY COUNCIL



c/o Community Councils Center• 1057 West Fireweed Lane, Suite 100 Anchorage, AK 99503

Jody Sola, President
Margy Hughes, Vice President
Peggy Wilcox, Secretary
Zoe Lowery, Treasurer
Bob French, FCC Representative
Belinda MacIntire, Ron Clark, Pete Murphy At-Large Board Members

Government Hill Community Council Resolution Regarding the ADOTPF 2024 Seward-Glenn PEL Resolution 2024-002

WHEREAS the Government Hill community is directly affected by the changes as set forth in the linking the Seward and Glenn highways as presented at our March 21, 2024, meeting; and

WHEREAS the proposed plans potentially reroute the ingress and egress to the Don Young Port of Alaska affecting the Port, Ship Creek area, the A-C Couplet bridge, and the Eastside of Government Hill; and

WHEREAS it is premature to evaluate alternatives because the PEL does not include any modeling to show the effects of the different alternatives on other roads. Each of the different alternatives will affect traffic along the "A-C Couplet", "I St-L St Couplet/Minnesota", 15th Avenue, Bragaw, Lake Otis, as well as Muldoon Road, and Boniface Parkway, which are outside of the "Study Area". Many of these alternatives may prove not to be "feasible" because of adverse impacts to other transportation corridors; and

WHEREAS Government Hill's Richardson Vista Apartments was purchased by a private outside entity and renamed North Pointe Apartments about 15 years ago. Twenty years ago, Panoramic View Apartments (270 units) and North Pointe Apartments (411 units) combined represented the most densely populated residential housing in the state. These two complexes were and may still be the densest section 8 housing in Alaska. This is likely a fact of which many highway planners and engineers working on project design are/were unaware; and

WHEREAS any new port access routes must include full amenities for nonmotorized users. The low income residents here who are living in a federally defined food desert <u>USDA ERS - Documentation</u>, as well as our residents who opt for non-motorized commuting between Government Hill and downtown, use the pedestrian sidewalks and bike lanes to access to groceries and services not available in our neighborhood. If a new port access route is deemed for commercial use only, then federal funds that would have been allocated for non-motorized corridors need to be used to construct *SAFE* separated pathways into and out of the Government Hill neighborhood along existing roads and bridges; and

WHEREAS a fundamental flaw with the PEL is that costs are not evaluated. The costs of any of these alternatives are like or larger than all the rest of the current yearly AMATS projects. Costs such as buying and demolishing housing and businesses, dealing with the hazardous materials in the Merrill Field Landfill, digging the depressed roadways, or building viaducts over wetlands are not considered. Since the Muni and the State do not have a "magic pot" of money, the real world requires that we balance new projects with repair and maintenance needs while being fiscally constrained; and

GOVERNMENT IDLL COMMUNITY COUNCIL

WHEREAS because of the assumed enormous costs of these alternatives, we must include interim plans in the PEL process. Each of the alternatives must be able to be constructed in many phases, otherwise they are not achievable. Having "lines on a map" in this PEL means that there will be *NO* investment in any properties covered by or near those "lines" for years to come. Fairview cannot continue to be economically blighted and split by hazardous roads for the 30 to 50 years that this project will take to be built. The need to improve safety and livability in Fairview is *NOW*, not 30 to 50 years from now; and

WHEREAS the Chester Creek-Ship Creek Trail connector is critical to preserve in any alternative, as this is a life-safety issue that affords protection and quality of life for non-motorized commuters and recreators. Also, it would enhance the values of business and residential properties in the area; and

WHEREAS the "Existing Port Connection" shown in Figure 2 of the Study Area is misleading, as it does not include the fact that a significant portion of the traffic to and from the Port goes directly to the rest of Anchorage, including many warehouses along the "A-C Couplet" in mid and south Anchorage. Truck traffic using the "I-L Couplet/Minnesota" does not just travel out the Glenn Highway or down the Seward Highway. The quantities and proportions of port truck traffic along different routes was known and documented by HDR in their past work for the Knik Arm Crossing and should be included in the PEL; and

WHEREAS alternative D is a massive interchange at Airport Heights and East 6th. This intersection serves as an unofficial entrance to the city when entering from the north, and an interchange here would destroy any hope of improving that entrance. Likewise, this same intersection serves as a primary entrance to Mt. View. This proposed interchange could inflict irreparable harm to the Mt. View neighborhood in the form of reduced buffers, increased noise, light pollution, and additional barriers for nonmotorized travel. The proposed new port access shown in Alternative D would create noise impacts for the east side of Government Hill, particularly Panoramic View residents and Northpointe Bluff homeowners. It will also irreversibly alter the character of the Ship Creek Trail, which is a recreational gem that currently offers seclusion and wildlife in the heart of downtown; and

WHEREAS, while the "Pedestrian and Bicycle Study" and other crash data show significant safety issues with the current conditions, the existing pedestrian and bicycle usage is likely diminished from what it could be, because the Ingra-Gambell couplet is known as a hazardous area; and

WHEREAS, in a time when a major topic of discussion in Anchorage is the homeless problems, all the proposed alternatives will demolish significant numbers of homes, including many that would be classified as low-cost housing. The ADN in the 3-24-2024 article stated that between 133 to 568 housing units could be removed, depending on the alternative. All the alternatives will reduce available housing and make the homelessness problem worse without a lot of spending to build new housing in Fairview, and to also re-build the businesses "taken" by the new roads. There is no indication of Municipal, State, or Federal funding. The existing "road blight" will be exacerbated if it is left to "private capital" to do that re-development; and

WHEREAS "Reducing Conflicting Travel Functions" and "Promote Social Equity and Economic Development" in the "Purpose and Needs" Statements are conflicting. Increasing vehicle traffic mobility (i.e. speeding up traffic) will negatively affect Fairview's livability and quality of life for all "At-Grade" alternatives; and

WHEREAS the "Interim Alternative" as described in the ADN's 2-24-2024 article appears to promote redevelopment and safety in the Fairview Core by reducing speed and improving pedestrian and bicycle options. That, along with existing planned improvements (not specifically listed, but included in the "No-Build" option) will need to be incorporated into designs for whatever alternative is chosen, so that it doesn't end up demolishing newly built amenities; and

GOVERNMENT HILL COMMUNITY COUNCIL
Established 1915 • Anchorage's First and Oldest Neighborhood

WHEREAS Government Hill Residents approve of the stated goals to "Improve local travel, livability and economic development" and to "Improve Nonmotorized travel and Livability", not all the proposed alternatives appear to adequately promote those goals; and

WHEREAS the residents of Anchorage are being asked how much they willing to forego our needed new infrastructure, along with repairs and maintenance, to save Chugiak/Eagle River and Mat-Su residents 10 minutes on their way to dip-net on the Kenai, or 10 minutes on their commute into downtown; now

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the Government Hill Community Council is **OPPOSED** to all the Proposed Alternatives (and their variants) in the PEL as presented, and instead support the "Interim" Alternative, also called the Metropolitan Transportation Plan 2050.

Motion passed unanimously.

Votes:

___12__Yea ___0__Nay___0_Abstain

Signed:

Jody Sola, President Dated: April 7, 2024