

## FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
1.	08-17-05		The <b>Project Objectives</b> should be to 1.) Make Northbound left turn and through traffic only so you can cut down the entrance traffic to the neighborhood. 2.) Calm traffic. 3.) Create better school/pedestrian crossings and pathways. Clear the vegetations from the existing sidewalks. 4.) Preserve trees and plant material. The <b>Project Evaluation Criteria</b> should ask if 1.) Are we discouraging cut through traffic? 2.) Do people automatically show down? 3.) Do people know they are entering a neighborhood? 4.) Is the road/trail easier and cheaper to maintain?
2.	08-17-05		The <b>Project Objectives</b> should be to 1.) Have an overall reduction in daily traffic averages for Fireweed Lane and LaTouche. 2.) An overall reduction in speed and posting for residential speeds on a 1300 foot street to 25 mph. 3.) STOP the cut through traffic. 4.) Impose traffic-calming measures. 5.) Enhance and preserve access to property on Fireweed and LaTouche. 6.) Preserve property boundaries and existing ROW. 7.) Create a safe environment for walkers, bikers, school kids. The <b>Project Evaluation Criteria</b> should ask if 1.) Is there a traffic count reduction of 50% - 75% during peak hours? 2.) Posted speed limits are 25mph and posted crosswalks exist. 3.) Is there an increase in pedestrian use and safety measures? 4.) Is there an improved ability to cross the road to park trails and the school? 5.) Is it aesthetically pleasing?
3.	08-17-05		The <b>Project Objectives</b> should be to 1.) Minimize storm water runoff and maximize infiltration with bio-swales. 2.) Juneau Street storm water drainage downhill erosion. 3.) South sidewalk from Juneau Street to around corner to 27 <sup>th</sup> not needed. 4.) Bio-swales along Fireweed and LaTouche possible – they are bio-swales now with no flooding issues. 5.) Narrow the streets; consider 10' to 12' lanes to really slow traffic. 6.) Watch other lanes into the neighborhood when construction commences. 7.) Consider curving streets a bit to decrease traffic speeds. 8.) Consider making a traffic count this summer that will show time traffic counts for cut through versus residential traffic. The <b>Project Evaluation Criteria</b> should ask if 1.) There is no net increase in storm water runoff from roads. 2.) There is decreased traffic to residential (local) levels. 3.) The traffic is slowed to 25mph.
4.	08-17-05		Would like to see curb and sidewalk on the east side of LaTouche from 27 <sup>th</sup> to Bannister. The west side of LaTouche could use sidewalk from 27 <sup>th</sup> to Bannister. Reducing traffic speed on LaTouche is a must!
5.	08-17-05		The <b>Project Objectives</b> should be to 1.) Improve sight distance at all intersections. 2.) Improve condition of pedestrian facilities. 3.) Look at traffic flow at LaTouche and Northern Light Blvd. and Benson. 4.) Look at sight distance at Fireweed/Karluk. 5.) Eliminate path on north and east sides where there are no side streets. The <b>Project Evaluation Criteria</b> should ask if 1.) Is safety put first? 2.) Did traffic slow down? 3.) What is the property owner impact and access?

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
6.	08-17-05		<p>The <b>Project Objectives</b> should be to 1.) Slow traffic through the neighborhood. 2.) End existing sidewalk (Swd Hwy to Juneau) at Juneau. No more sidewalks on that side of the street except from 27<sup>th</sup> to Northern Lights. 3.) Put in crosswalk across Fireweed on Juneau. Put in crosswalk across LaTouche on 27<sup>th</sup>. 4.) Narrow Fireweed and LaTouche with verticals and protruding curbs. 5.) Better lighting all around. 6.) Nice landscaping with swales or what is necessary for drainage. The <b>Project Evaluation Criteria</b> should ask if 1.) Is traffic slowed? 2.) Is the area better lighted? 3.) Are there crosswalks (possibly one with lights) for school kids, elderly and are all drivers alerted? 4.) Is drainage addressed if or where there is a problem?</p>
7.	08-17-05		<p>The <b>Project Objectives</b> should be to eliminate cars and trucks from using the roads in and around “Fireweed Manor” as a short cut during rush hour. The <b>Project Evaluation Criteria</b> should ask if there is a normal traffic flow for a housing area of the size of Fireweed Manor?</p>
8.	08-17-05		<p>The <b>Project Objectives</b> should be to 1.) Provide safe thoroughfare for pedestrians, cyclists, and vehicles. 2.) Preserve existing trees and vegetation. 3.) Minimize volume of storm water runoff that reaches Chester Creek as surface water. 4.) Improve storm water runoff quality. 5.) Reduce (or do not increase) existing “footprint” of paved surfaces. 6.) Improve aesthetics by burying overhead transmission lines. 7.) Keep costs in line with benefits and use savings for social programs. The <b>Project Evaluation Criteria</b> should ask if 1.) The number and speed of vehicular traffic has been reduced. 2.) The number of trees has been preserved. 3.) If there has been an analysis conducted of the pre and post project hydrology? 4.) If there has been a measurement of the pre and post project square footage amount of pavement? 5.) If there are cost estimates, bid prices, and final project costs and compare them as the project progresses.</p> <p>***I heartily endorse the idea of making this a demonstration project for Low Impact Development. It is half that way already, as the south and parts of the west side of the streets drain to well-vegetated swales.</p> <p>***If you can integrate a redesign of the outfall channel on the Juneau Street alignment north of this project area, it would be a great neighborhood benefit.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
9.	08-17-05		Thank you for the project walk through with residents. It was very informative and was a great opportunity to express our concerns and ideas. I have a couple of additional comments: 1.) Street lights one or two blocks away from our house on the south end of Redwood Street shine into our house, very unnecessary and annoying. Please provide for lighting that is “shaded” and only illuminates the roadway targeted. 2.) Please consider stop signs at Fireweed and Juneau Street where pedestrians cross for access to the Chester Creek trail and at LaTouche and 27 <sup>th</sup> where there is a school crossing for Rogers Park Elementary. These would increase the safety for pedestrians and slow traffic down through the area much better than a raised intersection or other traffic calming devices. Thank you.
10.	9-22-05		The goal of any good project is to improve the overall situation. If pass through traffic is a problem at Fireweed/Bannister/LaTouche, then the solution “overall” is not to slow traffic down even further. The ideal solution is to improve and speed up the flow at Seward Highway, and then the pass through problem goes away. Please, this area needs help with drainage. The neighborhood also has more population than most people like to admit. Maybe we should limit autos to 1 per family, too.
11.	9-22-05		Traffic backs up at Bannister to Juneau Street.
12.	9-22-05		1.) Keep or make lanes 12 feet wider or smaller to help reduce traffic speeds with 3 foot or less curb and gutter or none – should be ditches (swales). 2.) Form a right hand lane on LaTouche to NLB to eliminate 2 <sup>nd</sup> lane on the east side. 3.) Utilize Anchorage 2020 and new Title 21 standard guidelines to include swales and narrow lanes less than or equal to 10 feet wide. 4.) Consider round “mini roundabouts” in middle of road at intersections that slow traffic – not used as roundabouts though. 5.) Make speed 25 mph with calming measures using Low Impact Development Techniques. 6.) Address pedestrian crossing across Fireweed at New Seward Hwy. 7.) No roundabout at LaTouche/Fireweed – cannot make traffic go slower. 8.) When constructing ensure traffic does not go through.
13.	9-22-05		Please put the bike trail on the north side of Fireweed with a vegetated buffer to the street. This way everyone going to Juneau Street to bike to the Chester Creek trails won’t have to cross Fireweed. Then you tear up Juneau Street with the storm drain, consider a bike trail to connect the Chester Creek trails. Thanks.
14.	9-22-05		1.) Lower speed limits to 25 mph. 2.) Incorporate Low Impact Design endorsed by Rogers Park Community Council. 3.) Support under grounding Glenn Highway/Seward Highway to Northern Lights Blvd and Seward Highway. 4.) Commit Knik Arm bridge funds to under grounding and covering. 5.) Vegetated islands at Juneau St, 26 <sup>th</sup> Ave, and 27 <sup>th</sup> Ave.

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
15.	9-22-05		In at least one alternative, consider low impact development for storm water runoff and drainage. Curb and gutter are no longer the only option!
16.	9-22-05		I appreciate this open public process planning Municipal improvements. The presenter’s professionalism impressed me and as a neighborhood resident I feel confident that the project team will consider numerous options. Best wishes as you continue your work. Thank you for your efforts.
17.	9-22-05		Traffic calming – need treatment at intersections Juneau/Fireweed and Fireweed/LaTouche to slow the traffic and promote safe pedestrian crossing. Landscaping – north side of street is sunny. This is where people will want to walk. Make is pedestrian and bike friendly and beautiful.
18.	9-22-05		1.) These two roads desperately need some traffic calming and slowing. They’re used as a cut-through now. The only way to reduce the amount of cut-through traffic is to make it so that driving on Fireweed/LaTouche is slower and less convenient than sticking to the main routes of New Seward/Benson. The way to make this happen is to use methods to slow traffic – chokers, chicanes, etc. These have been used to great effect in other cities, including Anchorage, and should be a focus of at least one of the alternatives studied here. 2.) Be creative in your solutions (the community will try to help). I understand there are standards in place, but I also know that many “standards” are in fact more like guidelines and can be adjusted if a better answer is found. 3.) Great job on the web page for this project! A lot of good detailed information and follow up to the meetings you’ve already held. Thanks! 4.) Really talk to ML&P and try hard to get them to agree to put the lines underground with this project – we’ll do our best to talk to them, too. 5.) On the web page, please paste links or references to studies that have been done about traffic calming measures and their effects on a.) Emergency vehicle passage, b.) Effects on cut-through traffic. 6.) Thank you for including the Juneau Street drainage issue with this project.

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
19.	9-22-05		<p><b>Vision:</b> A street that slows traffic and deters cut-through traffic “organically”. A street that ties together residents from both sides. A street that serves well for another 40 years. Some suggestions to obtain this vision: * Separated sidewalks with trees in the buffer between sidewalk and roadway. * Landscaped medians at both entrances. * Leave existing, wonderfully functional, Y intersection of LaTouche and Fireweed unchanged. * Improve drainage and protect sidewalks with curb and gutter throughout. <b>Some detail suggestions:</b> * Regrade intersections of LaTouche/26<sup>th</sup> and LaTouche/27<sup>th</sup> to eliminate extreme cross slope on crosswalks (very dangerous when icy). *Use distance from Seward Hwy to first residences (the width of the buffer strip) to decelerate cars. * Tune up LaTouche and Northern Lights Blvd intersection (perhaps westbound right turn only lane). *Use concrete for sidewalks and pathways (it is less road like, resists root penetration, and with existing good soils will last 30 years). *Soften Fireweed/Seward Hwy intersection. It is a harsh place to be a pedestrian. One out of the box idea would be to widen Fireweed to the north to allow room for a landscaped center median. Since there is no straight through traffic, the westbound lane could be shifted to the north. * Consider vehicle lane striped as narrow as 10 feet, with a shoulder providing additional space needed for larger vehicles, maneuvering, snow storage, etc. * Try not to use negative measures (speed bumps, humps, chicanes, etc.) * Consider less than standard 8 feet for pathway (with bike lanes provides, 6 feet should be sufficient for pedestrian traffic involved). * Find alternative to curving sidewalks and pathways in and out at intersections (pedestrians can watch out for themselves and bikes will be on shoulder). <b>Juneau Street Storm Drain:</b> * Treat storm water at end of pipe. Consider use of existing low lying ground at base of hill for treatment of base flow and first flush with culvert for overflow (see Chester Creek 206 report). * MOA grooms Hill in winter. (This hill allows track setter to make a loop in this area). It is also used as the local sledding hill. Consider these uses when regarding after construction. * At end of Juneau Street – replace the steel guardrail with berm and wood bollards, pave to the end of the road, and protect neighborhood apple tree.</p>
20.	9-22-05		<p>I attended the 9/19 meeting, and just have a few comments that I wanted to pass on: *Any attractive landscaping that you can do (and that could be maintained) would be appreciated. The route serves as the major gateway to the neighborhood, and it would be nice to have a more attractive entry. *I agree that some kind of signs indicating drivers do not need to stop as they enter to go north on the Seward Highway would be helpful. *I've recently seen several drivers crossing the Seward Highway from the most southern lane (right turn only lane) on Fireweed. This is pretty scary for those traveling north on the highway taking what appears to be a safe right on a red onto Fireweed going east. They might be flukes, but it might be worth checking accident data to see if any clearer sign is needed so drivers know crossing the highway is only allowed from the left/north eastbound lane on Fireweed. *For a driver going north on LaTouche from</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p>36th, the Benson and NL lights are poorly timed. Often I end up getting through one light and find myself trapped between Benson and NL. * I agree that making the right-hand southbound lane on LaTouche a right-turn only might be a good idea to avoid right-turning cars getting stuck at a red light behind cars going through the intersection. * There was some discussion of how LaTouche goes from two to one lane northbound after crossing NL. It is awkward and somewhat dangerous that if you are in that right lane you need to enter the left lane briefly to make the right turn onto 27th. Whatever is done, I would like to continue to have some way to bypass the northbound traffic taking a left onto NL. Either extending the right lane all the way to 27th (and making that lane right-turn only) or making the left lane south of the NL intersection a left-turn only lane would work. *I regularly see drivers northbound on LaTouche south of the NL intersection taking a left on a red light. A sign clarifying that this is not a legal turn would be helpful. *Thanks for your work on the project.</p>
21.	9-22-05		<p>Thank you so much for the public scoping last night at Rogers Park Elementary School regarding the Fireweed Lane/LaTouche Street Upgrade Project. I have a few comments for the project: (1) South bound on LaTouche making right hand turn onto Northern Lights. Recommend dedicating the right hand lane as a "right hand turn only" lane. (2) Turning off Northern Lights Blvd. onto LaTouche (northbound). Widen right hand turn lane to accommodate traffic pattern. Currently, vehicles making a right hand turn past the church swerve into the left hand lane before turning right due to the fact that the right hand turn lane "chokes" down towards the left hand lane.</p>
22.	9-22-05		<p><b>The Project Objectives</b> should be to 1.) Make Southbound left turn lane from the Seward Highway and through street from Fireweed not allowed so you can cut down the entrance traffic to the neighborhood. I think in the long run this would speed up traffic on the Seward highway.</p> <p>Do away with through traffic from both sides of LaTouche. This way drivers can only turn right. This too would speed traffic on Northern Lights and Benson, since it would take away two lights. 2.) Create better school/pedestrian crossings and over pathways that can handle bike traffic (no stairs) over NL. Create a nice bike lane on LaTouche so you can easily get to the Chester Creek trail. <b>The Project Evaluation Criteria</b> should ask if 1.) Are we discouraging cut through traffic? 2.) Are the trails easier to get to and our children safer going to school. 3) Did the commuters see some improvement on NL and the Seward Highway? 4.) Is the neighborhood truly a neighborhood and not a racetrack.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
23.	9-22-05		I feel that access from Fireweed Lane must be maintained for the houses to the south of Fireweed (26 <sup>th</sup> Ave addresses). Almost all of the houses along this stretch have gates in their backyards that can only be accessed from Fireweed. I personally have an oversized 2-car garage that can only be accessed from Fireweed. As for the typical roadway section on Fireweed, I believe it should be as small as possible with continued pedestrian facilities on the north. As for pedestrian facilities on the south side, I don't feel they are needed. However, if they are installed the storage of snow in the winter needs to be considered because that is where the snow is currently stored. I also wanted to state that I see no reason to install a roundabout at the intersection of Fireweed/Bannister/LaTouche; the three-way stop is more adequate.
24.	9-22-05		1.) The first priority - "traffic calming and reduction of cut through vehicles". 2.) Pedestrian crossing at intersection of Juneau Street and Fireweed Lane. Basically people walking north or south on Juneau St. and crossing Fireweed Lane. 3.) Pedestrian crossing form north side of Fireweed Lane, walking east or west and crossing Seward Hwy (poor intersection for people). 4.) Mandatory stop at Fireweed/LaTouche/Bannister – NO roundabout. 5.) Improve intersection at LaTouche and Northern Lights – make right turn only for vehicles traveling south on LaTouche (far right lane).
25.	10-20-05		1) Narrow Fireweed and LaTouche and add a 'round-about' at the Fireweed/LaTouche intersection. Narrow streets would allow for buffers and snow storage between cars and sidewalks on both sides. Sidewalks on both sides of the streets would increase pedestrian safety - especially at the Fireweed/LaTouche intersection. The sidewalk on the north side of Fireweed will connect directly to Juneau Street and the park. The roundabout would serve the dual purpose of facilitating and calming traffic flow at the intersection. This should also reduce traffic noise. 2) Convert the westernmost southbound lane on LaTouche between Northern Lights and Fireweed to right-turn only at the NL/LaT intersection. Currently, at red lights motorists wishing to turn right on red are held up by the southbound traffic in that lane. By converting the lane to right-turn only all southbound traffic would need to be in the inside lane. Ideally, a third lane would be added west of the centerline of LaTouche north of NL Blvd: a left lane south to left-only lane on Benson, a middle southbound lane intended for thru traffic and a right-turn only lane. 3) Design speed humps and bumps along the project corridor that effectively calm automobile and small truck traffic while not slowing access by larger emergency response vehicles. 4) Improve surface drainage along Fireweed. 5) Bury overhead utilities along the project corridor to the greatest extent possible.  ***Not a part of the LaTouche/Fireweed concern BUT we need a sidewalk along Bannister. This is the busiest through street in the neighborhood and it's very dangerous to walk the dog, esp. in the winter.

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
26.	10-20-05		<p>Just a quick note to highlight some items from last night's advisory committee meeting, after having some time to think about it. Enjoyed the meeting and look forward to the next one.</p> <p>1) We did not discuss traffic calming, which was the number one item of concern for the community! What I have heard folks talking about are: * chokers at Juneau St. and 27th, as these are also places people cross the street often, so cars should slow down. * raise pavement at above areas and at intersection of Fireweed/LaTouche *Steve's or Bill's idea Monday for same intersection, essentially putting in a median area. *Arch at New Seward and Fireweed. *Speed limit 25 mph. *Slightly curving streets. *I will read the traffic calming protocols, but discussion on these aspects would be good.</p> <p>2) Compared to the road section that exists currently, the minimum standards are still wider than the existing road. Questions: *Can curb and gutter count as part of the shoulder? I have heard this from other designers as a potential. *I don't think having large shoulders are necessary for bike traffic, especially when we have a multi-use trail. My vote is for minimum. *I will visit these other roads you mentioned and check them out.</p> <p>3) Juneau storm drain thoughts: <b>Small Sed Pond</b> *With a OGS device on top of the hill, the need of a small sediment pond at the bottom of the hill is questionable, as the OGS would retain what the pond would have captured (larger particles), and the pond would be too small to entrain finer particles. In my view it serves little purpose, and my wife pointed out the safety issues of a pond near where kids play. I think maintenance of the OGS is easier too, as maintenance of our sediment ponds has been quite slow, even slower than OGS maintenance. But the shallowness and length of a pond at the foot of the hill -- I think you will find it provides little water quality treatment above what the OGS already provides and costs could be spent on something else.</p> <p><b>Juneau Ditch</b></p> <p>It may pay to look at an option where the entire ditch is directed across the slope toward the desired wetland treatment past the soccer field. That gives the elevation necessary to get it there, if survey shows area too flat below near soccer fields. That means that all runoff goes to the wetlands, and calculations would be necessary to see if the wetland could handle the flows, overflow culverts under Chester trail, and potential vegetation changes in the wetland. Alternatively, the large +10-year events can head down and out the original way under soccer fields, as Brad stated. Agencies will ask about calculations for wetland</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p>treatment. In an ideal world, enough source infiltration would be identified within the storm drain basin that one could balance it against what the wetland could realistically handle. I will always be a proponent of source infiltration, because it decreases the amount of end-of-pipe treatment and impacts to the creek. It does require maintenance, but so does all our infrastructure. I am most interested in the peak and volume control of runoff.</p> <p><b>Swales</b></p> <p>I see your issues with access across swales, and looking at final elevations will help too. I am not a proponent of putting culverts in all these backyards, though I think there still are opportunities in some parts of the road to have swales that treat water through a cut in the curb, and/or naturally overflow into a side street gutter. It would be great to see up to 50% of the new road treated this way. It would help this discussion to give some criteria to go by for these swales - based on last night you looked at (let me know if I was wrong):</p> <p>3:1 side slopes                  2 ft. deep preferred for some storage if necessary                  1 ft. would work if storage wasn't a concern</p> <p>Curbs or not okay.</p> <p>These are estimates? Some actual calculations for amount of road treatable would also help these conversations, and comparisons to bioswale DCM criteria (and MOA LID criteria) to see what minimums are really needed.</p> <p>I imagine we will be advisory voting on to swale or not to swale soon, so these thoughts and calculations would be helpful, as well as minimum swale road section and potential locations. If there are real engineering issues against using swales, please bring them up. Ultimately, the community themselves may not want swales, and want something different, like more trail or sidewalk.</p> <p><b>Trails/Sidewalks</b></p> <p>I would recommend no sidewalk on the south side of Fireweed or west side of La Touche to 27th. Between 27th and Benson there should be a trail on the west side. A multi-use trail on the north and east sides would be great.</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> Thanks for your notes on the CAC meeting. Below are my responses to your comments.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
----------------	---------------	------	---------

			<p>Traffic calming options are going to be one of the main topics of CAC Meeting #2. At that meeting DOWL will have drawn up some options of traffic calming measures based on our traffic calming analysis of the corridor. We will include options that the public has suggested provided they are in accordance with the Municipal Traffic Calming Protocol. I think that chokers at Juneau Street and 27th are definite considerations with or without raised intersections in conjunction with the narrowing. Median narrowings at Bannister, a gateway feature at New Seward, and curving the streets will also be considered. I will tell you my initial reaction to curving the street is that I do not believe it will have the desired effect, and that the curvature would have to come at the expense of the buffer between the trail and road. Given the large number of public comments requesting a separated trail, we will be reluctant to eliminate that buffer. DOWL will have a curved road concept for Fireweed drawn up at the next meeting to look at and to see if there are ways of doing it that would minimize impacts on the trail. Due to the school zone on LaTouche Street, we will not likely be considering a curvature of LaTouche. Reducing the speed limit to 25 mph is a question for the Traffic Department. Given the 85th percentile speeds that were measured in the corridors, it is unlikely that reducing the speed will have much effect in the corridor. As I mentioned at the public meeting, a 30 to 32 mph 85th percentile speed is typical of many, if not most, of the 25 mph roads in Anchorage.</p> <p>The road section for the new road will be narrower in some areas and wider in others. The existing road is about 28-30 feet wide at it's narrowest points, but it feels like a much wider road due to the lack of curb and gutter on both sides of the road and the lack of a defined roadway in the large paved area between Juneau Street and Seward Highway. Although we haven't decided on the typical section, we do plan to narrow the approaches to the Seward Highway and to Northern Lights Boulevard. I think that this modification in combination with chokers or something similar will give the feel of a narrower road while still providing adequate pavement width for emergency and maintenance purposes. In response to your questions, the gutter is included in the shoulder width. It is not included in the 3.5 to 5 foot numbers, but from a traffic-engineering standpoint, the 1.5-foot gutter is included in the shoulder width. I hope you understand that we wouldn't have to widen the shoulders much at all to accommodate a bike lane. As discussed at the meeting, the shoulder on the south side would not require any additional widening due to the 7' minimum separation between the traveled way and the sidewalk, and the north shoulder would only be widened 1 foot to make the equivalent of a bike lane compared to the minimum shoulder of 3.5 feet. This is not to say that this is what we will do, but it will be considered, particularly given the public comments received from folks.</p>
--	--	--	--

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p>Thanks for your comments on the Juneau Street storm drain and swales design. I will pass them on to our hydrologist and keep them in mind, as we get deeper into the design.</p>
27.	10-20-05		<p>I have a question on the design of the "W. Fireweed" portion of the entire Fireweed Lane project. If that project incorporates a different type of intersection on W. Fireweed at Gambell/New Seward, what effect will that have on design of this project? More specifically, if that designs calls for a re-alignment of the current turn lane(s) on W. Fireweed on to North Gambell so there is a designated straight through lane to E. Fireweed, what impact will that have on traffic into the neighborhood? (Currently, as you are aware, there is one dedicated left hand turn lane and one left/straight lane, and one right hand only turn lane on the west side of the Fireweed/Gambell intersection.)</p> <p>Any changes to the current configuration could have an impact on flows into Rogers Park. Those wanting to get to Benson from W. Fireweed now predominately turn right on Gambell and left on Benson (as waiting in the long line is not as fast as turning). Changing that pattern may "invite" traffic into the neighborhood to bypass the mess at Gambell/Benson. Even if they widened the double turn lane so that more vehicles can fit into the double turn lane w/o dedicating a straight through lane, that change may make it more attractive for cut through traffic to Benson.</p> <p>Just a thought.</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> Good question. I am not aware of changes to the lane configurations on the west approach to Fireweed/NSH, but we'll find out before the next meeting if anything is being considered. I agree with your assessment though. A dedicated through lane or right/through lane could increase the attractiveness of the Fireweed/LaTouche corridor as a bypass of NSH/Benson. Thanks.</p>
28.	10-20-05		<p>Thanks for your replies, Steve, it helps to get the details. Dave mentioned this weekend that he believed the multi-use trail went west all along Fireweed on the north side of the street – past New Seward, etc. However, to currently get across New Seward, one has to get on the south side of Fireweed to cross. That means crossing again to get on the north side of Fireweed to continue on this new trail west. Hopefully, this can be dealt with, as it is inefficient, and less safe, to be crossing back and forth, unless I am missing something.</p> <p>I guess my thought on the bike trails shoulders stem from college that bike shoulders were used in places that had sidewalks, not multi-use trails, which would be where the bikers would be? I.E. I thought – Why have a multi-use trail and bike shoulders on the same street? Just a thought there, but if it is not much more for a bike shoulder, I won't complain. Especially on the opposite lane from the multi-use trail.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> We will be evaluating the New Seward/Fireweed intersection as part of this project, but it is unlikely that the pedestrian crossing can move to the north side of the intersection. That side of the intersection is wider than the south side due to the free right turn lane lengthened thereby taking green time away from north/southbound traffic on the New Seward Highway. At 50,000+ vehicles a day, you can imagine that we will not be able to make changes that will decrease north/southbound capacity at that intersection. If for no other reason than that we would not want to further encourage people to cut through Fireweed/LaTouche! The Traffic Department has identified one problem that will be addressed at the intersection involving the pedestrian crossing for the east side of the intersection. The pedestrian signal and free right-turn lane are not operating in accordance with current standards. We will be looking at options to resolve this issue, as we get further in the design. Thanks for your comments.</p>
29.	10-20-05		<p>I have lived on E 26<sup>th</sup> Ave for 39 years. I have a double car garage which exits to Fireweed Lane. If the grade remains the same, sidewalk and curb and gutter being put in is fine. However, I will need a curb cut or acceptable entrance to property. Anything else would be totally unacceptable to me. Four out of six lots on this street do have gates. Two of the four residents were out of town at the time of your most recent meeting. I am opposed to the roundabout at the east end of Fireweed.</p>
30.	10-20-05		<p>The project objectives should improve the pavement structure of the pathways and sidewalks. There should be delineation between sidewalk and street. There should be lighting. Also to calm the traffic to the extent possible to discourage some of the cut-thru traffic. The project evaluation criteria should include safety, pedestrian and bike improvements, ease of maintenance, and pavement rehabilitation.</p>
31.	10-20-05		<p>*Thank you for careful, thoughtful planning, and for welcoming and facilitating neighborhood participation.</p> <p>*I agree with many of the previous comments: traffic calming is critical. Too many people use the route as a cut-through. *Please consider all options for making Fireweed Lane and LaTouche people-sensitive roads. It is such a lovely neighborhood, and so many people walk and ride etc. on those streets. It's a chance to demonstrate that our municipal streets need not be ruled by automobiles!! Please consider making the Fireweed Lane to Fireweed Ave intersection (crossing NS Hwy) "softer" and more pedestrian-friendly. In current form, walking west on Fireweed across NS feels like crossing from peaceful place into a war zone. With walk signal, there is barely time for a fit person to cross on foot- what about older or disabled people? And why does walk signal only come on if the button is pressed? It means that if pedestrian arrives even a second after light turns green, he/she is forced to cross against an orange don't walk signal, despite green light! In current form of the intersection, just nipping across the NS hwy to get</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
----------------	---------------	------	---------

			<p>morning paper at gas station can be a threatening, grim experience. *When crossing NLB northbound on foot, its very dangerous because so many drivers rip left turns from LaTouche onto NLB; they routinely ignore the walk signal and don't yield. I feel like a matador whenever I do this route. Drivers are gunning to get across that awkward pair of lights and onto the main NLB, and pedestrians be damned. And again, why does walking signal default to "don't walk" during green lights, unless the button is pressed in time? Consider addressing this as part of the project? *What about making westbound NLB right lane a right-turn only lane... so many people come through that lane at 45-50 mph; it makes for dangerous entry to residents turning right from LaTouche onto NLB. This is probably outside of your scope, but maybe worth considering. *It's great to see lots of thought in the other comments; seems like neighborhood is pretty well aligned in its desired vision and I look forward to seeing creative solutions from DOWL team.</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> Thanks for attending the first public meeting and thank you for your additional comments on the Fireweed Lane/LaTouche Street project. We will make sure your comments are part of the permanent record and will discuss your comments at the next Citizen's Advisory Committee meetings. We will be carefully evaluating the operations at Fireweed and New Seward Highway, particularly with respect to pedestrian crossings. I'm not sure there is anything that we can do to make it better, but we will work with the Traffic Department on the issues you raised and others. In answer to your questions regarding the pedestrian walk signal, the reason it does not come on every time is because the pedestrian signal walking/clearance time is sometimes longer than the time needed to just clear the cars. So by not initiating a walk signal every cycle, the signal operations are more flexible and able to give greater green time to other movements when there are no pedestrians trying to cross. This maximizes the capacity of the Seward Highway thereby helping to prevent more cut-through of the Fireweed Lane/LaTouche Street corridor. Nevertheless we will be evaluating the pedestrian signal times to see if there are any modifications that could be make to improve pedestrian priority.</p>
--	--	--	--

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
32.	10-20-05		<p>Thanks again for a great public meeting about this project the other night. I submitted comments then, but I have a few more thoughts for you. 1) Would you be able to design the project website to allow submittal of comments right from the site, with the ability to view others' comments (and your responses) as they're submitted? This seems to be what was done on the Piper Street website and it looks like it works well and allows everyone to see all the comments which in turn will lead to more informed discussions. 2) Along the same lines, would you please post the meeting minutes from the CAC? It'd be most helpful to post them at least a couple weeks before the Oct 31 "deadline" for our general comments. If you'd like, I will gladly type up the notes to allow for this kind of quick turn-around. In fact, if you need a volunteer notetaker, consider me (I'm a fast typist and also very quick at getting accurate notes back out the door after meetings). 3) When figuring out what lane widths and other similar traffic standards apply, do you use the average daily traffic volume AS ADJUSTED by subtracting those 44% of the vehicles that are cut-through or make some similar adjustment? This seems the most reasonable thing to do (otherwise, the design is based on a traffic count that is much higher than this particular collector street should be). 4) Are you considering the implications of the Anchorage Transportation Plan (esp. the potential changes to New Seward) when designing the improvements to Fireweed and La Touche? If yes, how will specific elements of the Transportation Plan affect this current project? Thanks!!</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> The following are our responses to your questions.</p> <p>We are handling the website the exact same way that we handled Piper Street. People can go to the website and submit comments. The comments are e-mailed to DOWL and we get them posted. It is not real time, but we typically have them posted within a day or two of when they are submitted. We are posting all of the comments so that people can see what has been submitted.</p> <p>The meeting minutes for all of the public and CAC meetings will be posted on the website. I believe that the minutes for public meeting #1 and the first CAC meeting are now on the website. Thanks for the offer on typing up the meeting minutes. If we need an extra hand we will let you know. Kelly Brown, our Public Involvement Coordinator is tasked with meeting minutes since she has to be at all of the meetings anyways.</p> <p>When we evaluate design criteria that varies based on the average daily traffic, we evaluate that criteria based on the traffic volumes that will be using the road after the project is complete. If we do nothing to prevent the cut-through traffic, then the design ADT must include the cut-through traffic. If we do something to prevent or stop cut-through traffic, then we would subtract them from the volumes. For this project, we are looking at using the minimum allowable widths anyway, so I don't think that excluding the</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p>cut-through traffic would have much effect on the design criteria.</p> <p>We are considering the effects of the Long Range Transportation Plan, particularly the freeway-to-freeway connection, as we evaluate the New Seward Highway/Fireweed intersection. These future plans are far enough off that I am not sure what impact they might have on this project, but it is something to keep in mind.</p> <p>I hope this answers your questions. Thanks for your interest.</p>
33.	10-20-05		<p>When figuring out what lane widths and other similar traffic standards apply, do you use the average daily traffic volume AS ADJUSTED by subtracting those 44% of the vehicles that are cut-through or make some similar adjustment? This seems the most reasonable thing to do (otherwise, the design is based on a traffic count that is much higher than this particular collector street should be). Thanks!!</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> When we evaluate design criteria that varies based on the average daily traffic, we evaluate that criteria based on the traffic volumes that will be using the road after the project is complete. If we do nothing to prevent the cut-through traffic, then the design ADT must include the cut-through traffic. If we do something to prevent or stop cut-through traffic, then we would subtract them from the volumes. For this project, we are looking at using the minimum allowable widths anyway, so I don't think that excluding the cut-through traffic would have much effect on the design criteria.</p>
34.	10-20-05		<p><b>Response to 24:</b> Regarding your reply to Heather's question regarding traffic standards that vary depending on ADT...Feel free to skip the rest of this email if you see no reason why the lanes will be striped anything other than 10 feet wide; please just let me know that's the case. If they may be 11 feet wide, please read on... In the first CAC meeting, I believe we learned that: 1) the PM peak on Fireweed/Latouche is 15 to 17% of ADT 2) the typical for a neighborhood collector is 9 to 11%, and 3) MOA standards require lanes to be striped 11 feet wide if the PM peak is over 15% (whereas they can be striped 10 feet if the PM peak is 15% or lower).</p> <p>As noted in DOWL's PowerPoint presentation, "cut-through traffic has been a long-standing concern in this corridor." The desire to reduce cut-through traffic has also been expressed in the public comments for this project. Therefore, it appears that a reasonable (and measurable) goal for this project would be to reduce the PM peak to 9 to 11% of ADT and there is no justification to stripe the lanes wider than 10 feet (at least according to the "PM peak vs. width" portion of the MOA standards.) Ten-foot lanes would give you a two more feet to do something creative with the alignment (slightly sinuous?) and/or buffer/path areas. Also, I see that all four alternatives that DOWL presented in the first CAC meeting showed ten-foot lanes. Yes, I do recall some of the objections (if that's the right word) raised in that meeting relative to a</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p>narrow street: "not the solution you may think it is," "in other areas folks advocated narrow and then objected when it was constructed," "no room to park vehicles," etc. Aside from those objections--which honestly didn't seem very persuasive from my admittedly limited perspective--do you see any reason why the lanes may grow to 11 feet during the design process?</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> Thanks for your note. I agree with you that if we install volume control measures on Fireweed/LaTouche and we can convince ourselves and the MOA Traffic Department that the peak hour ADT will drop below 14%, and then we will have no problem using 10-foot lanes. However, if we do nothing to discourage cut-through and the distribution of post-construction traffic is expected to be no different than the current patterns, then we will likely have to use 11 foot lanes. Appended is a copy of the MOA policy on this issue for your review prior to the next CAC meeting. At our next meeting we will be discussing traffic calming measures, so this will be good background for the members to review in preparation for discussing which measures we want to consider.</p> <p>I hope that this answers your questions. Please let me know if you have additional comments.</p>
35.	10-20-05		<p>Steve, this is a "Draft Final Report" from 2003. Was it ever finalized? Or was there some direction that said to consider it the final word? Thanks.</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> John Smith confirmed that this is the most current document and guidance from the MOA.</p> <p><b>Response from MOA:</b> All - I would encourage you to make a "field trip" to Timberlane Drive, Old Klatt to Huffman Road. This collector is striped with 11 ft. lanes the entire length and has a width of 33 ft. from top back of curb to top back of curb. The traffic calming neck down sections have a width of 28 ft. from top back of curb to top back of curb</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
36.	10-20-05		<p>I have looked back at the CIP list to identify the park project on it, as mentioned in the last meeting. It reads as follows, and may or may not be pertinent to the soccer fields or what is done - however, Eastchester Park covers the area from New Seward to Tikishla Park along Chester - so includes the Juneau drain area.</p> <p>Dept - Office of Economic and Community Dev.            Category - Anchorage Parks and Recreation            Eastchester/Sitka Park            Develop site improvement plan and construct picnic shelter, trail connections and facilities.            Bond Funds = \$380k, 2006.</p> <p>So - I assume this is unfunded currently, but slotted to be voted upon...</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> John or Dave, Any insight - looks like a P&amp;R project to me that is subject to Park Bonds approval in April.</p> <p><b>Response from Dave:</b> I put in a call to P&amp;R to confirm, but my understanding is this is future project with no current funding with emphasis on playground and picnic shelter facilities. And that Juneau St. storm drain design and const. work will be okay to continue to proceed independently and ahead of anything that might be done later by P&amp;R at Eastchester Park.</p> <p><b>Response from MOA:</b> Thanks for checking into this Dave. You have the correct assumption.</p>
37.	10-20-05		<p>At the public meeting you said something about why it's doubtful the city will consider reducing the road speed limit from 30mph to 25mph. I'd repeat the reasoning, but can't remember enough specifics; basically, it was along the lines of "it wouldn't make a real difference in how fast people drive." However, my comment is that I think it would make a real difference in how people perceive the area they're driving through and, hence, may make a difference in how fast they drive. A 25mph speed limit would signal clearly that this is a residential neighborhood and people should go slow and take special care. The 30mph speed is the same speed as along the 3-lane section of A Street north of 9<sup>th</sup>, which tells people to slow down some but not to the level as in a residential neighborhood because it's still a commuter street.</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> I understand your perspective and will pass on your comments to the Traffic Department. As I mentioned at the meeting, this is not the consultant's decision since the Traffic Engineer determines speed limits. I do not mean to stifle your comment, but I can give you my opinion that I think it is unlikely that the Traffic Department will change the speed limit. As I mentioned at the public</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p>meeting, my observation of speed analyses on low speed local and collector level streets is that lowering the speed limit to 25 will have little effect, if any, on the speeds in the Fireweed corridor since the 85th percentile speed is already at 31-32 mph. This is the same range that we would expect the 85th percentile speed to be for a road posted at 25 mph. Based on my experience of dozens of speed studies on residential streets in Anchorage, I do not think that you will get the desired results of slower traffic. Physical measures (such as traffic calming) or enforcement would be required to slow the road further. Even if the existing travel speeds were higher, a 30 mph posted speed limit is consistent with MOA criteria for residential collector roadways. It will be hard to make the case that this road should be lower than other residential collectors given the relative few number of driveways, lower volume pedestrian traffic, and relative short road length compared to other residential collectors in town.</p> <p>This is an issue that we can discuss further at the next CAC meeting with the Traffic Engineer (or representative) present. Thanks again for your interest.</p>
38.	10-20-05		<p>It's been a couple weeks and wondered if you have more info to address my hydrology questions from past emailing on the Juneau storm drain, etc. Am interested in what your survey found out, the OGS issue, and whether swales are possible anywhere after looking better at the estimated new road elevations. I can also just call Brad too, just let me know.</p> <p>There has been quite a bit of email traffic on how to reduce traffic speeds and number, and as that is one of the main concerns of the road residents as well as the council, I hope MOA will address it in as much priority as the general road upgrade. We will be working with the council board to formalize this as a council priority in a letter to MOA, and are ready to elevate it as necessary based on next weeks meeting, but I think that it is not a matter of not being incorporated, but how.</p> <p>Please note that this road upgrade is the resident's one shot for the next 20 years or more to address issues that will only increase as our population increases and traffic levels force more people onto our streets to bypass New Seward/Northern Lights intersection. I look forward to seeing DOWL's design for reducing traffic to standard levels.</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> The next update and discussion on these issues will be at the October 27th CAC meeting. We are hoping to have the additional field data reduced and incorporated into the base map by then. Thanks for checking in.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
39.	10-20-05		<p>So many questions, so little time! My latest question for you is this one...</p> <p>At the public meeting, I asked whether the sections of Fireweed and LaTouche that are being upgraded are considered collector streets only for the Rogers Park and Fireweed Manor areas or also for the College Village area south of Northern Lights. Your answer was that they are collectors for all three neighborhoods, including College Village.</p> <p>After reading the definition of a collector street, however, (MUNI's August 1996 "Official Streets and Highways Plan"), that answer doesn't seem accurate. A collector is defined as a street that "collects traffic from local streets and then conducts it to arterials..." Given this definition, and because the portions of Fireweed and LaTouche that are being upgraded end at the New Seward and North Lights arterials, then it seems that those sections of Fireweed and LaTouche that are being upgraded are collectors only for Rogers Park and Fireweed Manor. College Village is served by ANOTHER and DIFFERENT section of LaTouche and it's that section that should be considered the collector street for College Village (not the sections we're in the process of upgrading).</p> <p>Thanks for suggesting to look at Timberlane Drive. It has galvanized our original technical committee and the Rogers Park Council Board to seriously evaluate the direction traffic calming in the city is heading. Watching traffic whiz by on it, it seems to have not have lowered traffic speeds at all.</p> <p>We also evaluated Piper St. and Karluk St. and much prefer Karluk street as a example of measures to implement on our project. Our understanding is that Karluk has no significant issues with snow removal or emergency vehicles and that the police would rather MOA roads be narrower also in general. Seems like there should be no problem implementing Karluk measures here.</p> <p>More comments from me:</p> <p>AASHTO guidelines allow for 9- to 12-foot lanes and I hope we can keep the 10-foot lanes as a start to address cut-through and designing the road so that people will drive 25 mph. Comparing other collector streets in Anchorage to ours for traffic speeds isn't the best way to evaluate how fast people will go, since ours are so wide compared to current national recommendations. National statistics indicate that the safest collector streets are between 24 and 28 feet wide from curb to curb in the residential environment, and ASHTO guidelines look at speeds in the 20 to 25 mph range. I realize that the current MOA standard is 33 feet, down from 36 feet a few years ago. Hopefully, Thursday will have some options for a 28-foot wide road, even though this doesn't currently exist in MOA except at Karluk. This width would still allow 2 foot bike shoulders on both sides and could even shrink the footprint enough that chicanes are an option.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p>which would get some curves and keep drivers aware of their environment.</p> <p><b>Response from DOWL:</b> These issues are topics for discussion at the CAC meeting on Thursday so I am not going to address them via e-mail. Having a thorough discussion via e-mail is not the best forum for discussing these issues. -- There are too many issues to think about and too many points of view that would not be included. I just want to make sure that you realize the design decisions are not as simple as you suggest. There are a lot of trade-offs associated with the chicanes and narrow roadways that need to be discussed before jumping to that design. Furthermore, I think if you read the comments from the public that we have received, you will find that although people want traffic calming, there are other priorities that have been expressed by the public/residents that would be compromised by going to the chicane design – particularly with respect to the separation between the road and the trail.</p> <p>We will see you on Thursday. I look forward to the discussion.</p>
40.	3-1-2006	Comment Form	<p>No bike trail on Juneau Street. Would not be used.</p> <p>New access to bike trail through Bannister-Karluk utility easement down to soccer fields.</p> <p>No circle at end of Juneau Street.</p> <p>Snow? Where would it be put on Juneau Street?</p> <p>Extend Juneau Street north to accommodate drainage.</p> <p>Tree set back for commercial and residential traffic.</p>
41.	3-1-2006	Comment Form	<p>No sidewalk/bike trail on Juneau Street.</p> <p>Bike trail down Bannister-Karluk utility easement.</p> <p>Culdesac at end of Juneau means no access for people to drive there and use the system. Can it be more of a rectangle instead to enable parking but still be as small as possible?</p> <p>Alley behind Juneau Street should be upgraded a bit. Becomes a pond at break up time.</p> <p>Who will maintain landscaping?</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
42.	3-1-2006	Comment Form	<p>Signal lights at pedestrian crossings to act as traffic calming and promote safety.                      Recommended underground utilities; safety concern with trees, etc. growing into power lines.                      30 mph = +/- 44 feet per second                      1,000-foot length = +/- 12 seconds                      Will you put driveway access to my backyard at or near the existing gate?                      Will there be additional noise generated by the “raised crosswalk?”</p>
43.	3-1-2006	Comment Form	<p>It is <u>very</u> important to allow turns into the alley north of Fireweed adjacent to New Seward allowing access to lots on west side at Ingra Street. This will impact the “gateway” treatment at Fireweed and New Seward. In general, “gateway” treatments are very good.</p>
44.	3-10-2006	Comment Form	<p>I, James Thorne, of XXXX oppose the current plans for the modification of Fireweed Lane. The thought of running a full-length curb is “unacceptable” to me. I feel that driveway cuts should be installed or mountable curbs to help obtain access to our property for RV and vehicle storage and parking. The MOA has allowed this in a few recent projects.</p>
45.	3-15-2006	E-mail	<p>I regret that my evening has changed and I will not be able to attend. But want to be sure that the status of Fireweed from Seward Hwy to Banister and south to 36<sup>th</sup> is recognized as a collector and therefore should not have traffic slowing additions. Emergency vehicles need to be able to traverse this street as quickly as possible.</p>
46.	3-15-2006	Comment Form	<p>As long-term resident property owner along with seven others on south side of Fireweed Lane mostly having gates to access parking of cars, boats, motor homes, we were told by Mr. Noble, conducting for DOWL, there would be a contiguously built curb along with five-foot sidewalk from Seward Highway to LaTouche. This restricts all property owners from egress or ingress to Fireweed side of their lot. For which they had established usage for many years. I have a two-car garage in yard, heated, and two nice cars in it. My garage would be only storage if I could not use it as built for cars and permit from city before construction. I am unequivocally opposed to present plan for myself and all the other folks involved. I would hope it would be fixed so as we will not be restricted to properties. All I need is usable entry to yard. 40 years this location, 54 years in Alaska.</p>
47.	3-15-2006	Comment Form	<p>I support curb cuts on Fireweed Lane south side so our neighbors living there can continue accessing their backyards. This is only reasonable.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

<b>Comment Number</b>	<b>Date Received</b>	<b>Mode</b>	<b>Comment</b>
48.	3-15-2006	Comment Form	I support curb cuts on Fireweed Lane south side so our neighbors living there can continue accessing their backyards with their vehicles from the street. This is only reasonable.
49.	3-15-2006	Comment Form	I am very much opposed to the plan of not having access to my property off Fireweed Lane. I have had this access to my RV and boat in the rear of my property. This access should not be taken away. Fireweed Lane is not that busy that this access should be taken away.
50.	3-15-2006	Comment Form	I would ask that you reconsider and allow for reduction of the curb to allow access at least for those houses that have established vehicle access.
51.	3-15-2006	Letter	At the meeting on March 15, 2006, DOWL Engineering presented the project scope for this project. It was brought out that the sidewalk on the south side of Fireweed would be extended from the Seward Highway to LaTouche. In additional, a continual curb would also be installed. I would like to point out that there are several homeowners with drive through gates on the south side of Fireweed. This gives them access to their house and in some cases to their garage. I would hope that consideration would be given to giving those homeowners to install cutouts in the curb to allow for drive through.
52.	3-15-2006	Comment Form	<p>I have heard from my neighbors that the MOA Fireweed-LaTouche Streets beautification effort, scheduled for completion in 2007, will eliminate ingress and egress from yards bordering Fireweed Lane and LaTouche Street.</p> <p>DOWL Engineering has been quoted as saying that “square” type continuous curbs will be installed on both sides of both streets, eliminating the ability of resident homeowners to enter or exit their yards with vehicles.</p> <p>It would seem like a more reasonable approach would be for the MOA to install the type of curbing that is designed in such a way that vehicles can drive over.</p> <p>I have lived for over 25 years in this neighborhood and I support my friends who wish to exercise their right to keep access to their property.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
53.	3-16-2006	E-mail	<p>I met you last night at the public meeting and we talked a little bit about our driveway and whether we had alleyway access. After the meeting I went home and pulled into the alley and tried to get into the driveway from there. I couldn't do it by driving in forward; I'd either hit the garage or the cement retaining wall. The only way to get in that way is to go to the end of the alley, turn around and come in from the other direction. Needless to say, we'd really, really like to keep our driveway access to Fireweed just like it is now. I really think that the break in the retaining wall next to the alley is just because that's where Solid Waste Services has asked us to put the garbage out, I don't think it was ever intended to be a vehicle access to the driveway.</p> <p>Check it out sometime; I'm sure it'll make more sense if you see it. Our address is XXXX Fireweed.</p> <p>Overall, the information last night was great and it sounds like there are some really neat ideas for the project. Thanks for listening!</p> <p><b>Response:</b> Thanks for attending last night. The lack of curb cut to your driveway was due to way that it is shown on the survey information. I understand your concern and appreciate you bringing it to our attention. I have already looked at your driveway as well as your neighbors and believe that we can design something that will meet your needs. The challenge is dealing with the two driveways and the alley in the middle. I will look at the area in better detail and let you know when we have something to show you.</p> <p>Thanks again for your participation.</p>
54.	3-19-2006	Comment Form	<p>My property a large lot corner of Ingra and Fireweed Lane. I am most upset regarding a possible curb keeping us from the use of our yard, where we sometimes park our motor home. Over 30 years at this location! I am <u>opposed</u> to a curb in front of my gate!</p>
55.	3-21-2006	Comment Form	<p>I was surprised and upset to learn that no allowance has been made to allow vehicle access to our backyards from Fireweed between LaTouche and Seward Highway. For myself it is an inconvenience. I have a double gate and have used it often to provide landscaping and construction access to my backyard. Our yards are too narrow to access it any other way. More importantly, it prevents my neighbor from using his garage – a garage that has allowed him to house his vehicles off the street and avoiding congestion in street parking on E. 26<sup>th</sup> – a positive for the whole neighborhood. I cannot imagine accommodation in the design to allow a driveway access would add significantly to the cost of this project.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
56.	3-27-06	Letter	<p>Thank you for taking the time to present the Fireweed Lane, LaTouche Street upgrade proposed by the Municipality of Anchorage. It appears that many of the issues you tried to address were given thoughtful consideration by DOWL.</p> <p>At the recent public meeting, I learned from the Municipal Project Manager John Smith that a few concerns that I provided were overlooked related to pedestrian safe crossings and secondary property access. In fact, I was told these were already decided and the design would not be changed further. Please take a few minutes to understand my concerns.</p> <p>I know many of my neighbors living on LaTouche Street and Fireweed Lane have primary or established secondary access to their property from those streets, just as I do. However, they most likely will lose their main access or have secondary access restricted to their property because of the curb and other design attributes. For some people, this is the front of their house. I was told by Mr. Smith that, “we will not deviate from the design,” and that “the curb and landscaping were set.” It is my understanding that this project is at the 35% design phase. I disagree with Mr. Smith’s claim that these parameters are “set” if the project is still in its early stages of design.</p> <p>Another issue – safe pedestrian crossings has been addressed on LaTouche and 27<sup>th</sup> Avenue with an elevated, lit crosswalk. Thank you. However, Juneau Street provides direct access to the park and trails for the majority of the city blocks in and around my neighborhood. Again, Mr. Smith assured me it would not even qualify for a crossing sign. I believe this is a complete oversight; the pedestrian traffic at this intersection was not even measured for the design study report publication. I’m beginning to wonder what Mr. Smith’s motivational factors are with this project and if these concerns are truly being addressed by DOWL and then scuttled by the City.</p> <p>Finally, a traffic calming solution was also proposed near the Fireweed and Juneau Street intersection. As you stated at the meeting, this traffic choker proposal has only a 1%- 2% impact on traffic. Are there any other alternatives that can be considered? Have we considered putting a four-way stop intersection at this location?</p> <p>I realize this is a public process and none of us may get everything we want in it. However, my neighbors and I will have to live with the final design for many years to come.</p>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
----------------	---------------	------	---------

57.	3-29-2006	Verbal Record	<p>Couple lives at XXXX E. Fireweed Lane. Specifically bought home because of the circular driveway. Resident has medical problems and can't see to back out into traffic. Had his driveway redone at great expense two years ago, and MOA permit people assured him there were no plans to make any changes to Fireweed.</p>
58.	4-05-2006	Letter	<p>My wife and I purchased and moved into our home at XXXX Fireweed lane in 1982. One of the most important considerations for buying this house was the fact that it had a crescent drive through driveway. This is particularly important because I have a back injury (1951) that resulted in the development of lumbar scoliosis and spinal stenosis. Because of this lower back deformity, the physical act of turning my body around so I can see oncoming traffic is very difficult. I must turn my body from a sitting position and the twisting motion must start at the hip region, thus putting a great deal of pressure in the lower portion of my spine. I have dislocated my back on many occasions from this simple procedure. Besides being extremely painful, it can result in serious disability sometimes lasting for over a month. This is NOT an exaggeration; it is a fact that can be verified by medical records, if so required. Again, that is why a drive through driveway is so important to me. It allows me to back out of the garage, then before having to back into Fireweed Lane traffic, I can stop and turn and drive straight out of the crescent driveway. It should be obvious that this is a necessity, not just a convenience.</p> <p>At the first public meeting on September 19, 2005, I suggested that stop signs be placed on both sides of Fireweed Lane at Juneau Street. At that time, the reaction seemed positive. However, I have learned that at the second meeting on March 15, 2006, that proposal was nullified. The reason given was that motorists might slow down a little, or if they did come to a screeching stop, they would then peel out and speed up to make up the lost time. In my opinion, there is something wrong with this reasoning. If that is a valid excuse, then why <u>any</u> stop signs?</p> <p>There are several reasons that I believe stop signs at Juneau Street are important:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It would slow traffic, especially the "lead foots," of which there are many.</li> <li>2. Juneau Street connects to the Municipal greenbelt and walking and bike trails. During the lunch hour, there are large numbers of runners or walkers coming from the BP building and other parts of our neighborhood. Also, pedestrians walking their dogs. These people are important; however, my main concerns are for the children on bikes, skateboards, rollerblades, etc. True, they are supposed to stop and look both ways before crossing, but that is about as realistic as the "hot rodder" who makes sure <u>no</u> one is crossing. I have observed many "close calls" there.</li> </ol>

**FIREWEED LANE/LaTOUCHE STREET UPGRADE**

Comment Number	Date Received	Mode	Comment
			<p>3. The school buses stop on the south side of Fireweed lane at Juneau Street (in front of our house) to pick up students in the morning, and on the north side of Fireweed Lane and Juneau Street when they let them off in the afternoon. I'm sure that the bus drivers can verify that many times motorists will ignore the flashing light and drive right on by.</p> <p>I understand that many people have requested the speed limit be reduced to 35 mph. The response I hear is: "Most people wouldn't pay attention to the sign anyway." Again, something is very wrong with that reasoning!</p> <p>I realize that camera-monitoring equipment is very expensive, but how does that cost compare to the life or injury of only one child!! I really would <u>not</u> like to hear a Municipal official try to reason that away. If they tried, I believe I would personally lobby to have that person removed from his or her position.</p> <p>I was not able to attend the second public meeting and at this point in time, I have been unable to get a transcript of the proceedings. I have talked to a number of my neighbors who were there. Many, nearly all of them, are very upset about the discussions proposed for the street reconstruction. The main reason for the dissatisfaction has been because the person leading the meeting indicated that possibly with the exception of our property, only one access per property would be allowed, that <u>no</u> access would be allowed along the south side of Fireweed Lane.</p> <p>True, their garages face the street; however, many of these residents, including XXXX who lives to the west next to us, have had access to the back of their properties for winter storage of small trailers, motor homes, boats, etc. Not giving these people access to their properties, in my estimation, defies good reasoning. In fact, I would like to know exactly why <u>this</u> decision is being made. I realize that this project is still in the early planning stage and nothing is written in stone yet. However, from past experience, unless the citizens make their wishes or needs known, no changes will be made.</p> <p>I am looking forward to future meetings where we can openly discuss and show cause for the ideas and plans of both sides.</p>

D58819.Fireweed LaTouche Comments.KLB.050106.nw