

September 14, 2015
A Resolution Regarding
Northern Access to the University and Medical District
Draft Design Study Report (DDSR) under review by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC)

Whereas:

1. The PZC is required to evaluate the DDSR in accordance with MOA 21.03.190(B)4,
2. The DDSR violates the currently adopted U-Med District Framework Master Plan (last amended by the MOA in 2011) provisions for the recommended Integrated Campus approach, since it does not maintain the integrity of the central east/west ski trail over or under the proposed street (p. 42), might not maintain the integrity of the ski trail along Northern Lights, does not provide a landscaped median and separated pathways on each side of the street (p. 34), and north access is not in the current plan (p. 45),
3. The DDSR does not include an evaluation of the safety hazards the proposed road will cause along Bragaw Street due to increased traffic from the road (especially near East High School), and costs to accommodate cut-through traffic
4. The DDSR does not include necessary safety features due to inadequate budget (trail overcrossing at the project mid-point and mid-point roundabout which would act to slow traffic),
5. The DDSR and the project's previous work violate Title 21 and the State of Alaska Preconstruction Manual requirements to evaluate all feasible alternatives to accomplish the project purpose and need (it did not evaluate improving perimeter roads and intersections),
6. The DDSR does not include an updated alternatives evaluation of all feasible alternatives: the project's previous alternatives evaluation (in the 2011 Reconnaissance Report) was based on a four-lane road, whereas the current road is a two-lane road (significantly reducing its effect on traffic delay),
7. Project purpose and need is in violation of BLM land patent, which restricts land use to "school purposes only" - not to relieve traffic congestion on surrounding arterial roads and to move goods and people within the District.
8. The DDSR cost estimate may be inadequate to account for removal of organic materials, replacement with suitable fill, conflicts with underground utilities, and resolving ROW issues,
9. The DDSR ignores the resolution made by the Watershed and Natural Resources Commission, by not providing a design which deters moose from crossing the roadway,
10. The DDSR indicates that the preferred alternative is not least environmentally damaging (p. 19 and 45) and the Corps of Engineers can only grant a permit for the Least Environmentally Damaging and Practicable Alternative,
11. The DDSR depicts a road alignment which could potentially add pollutant-containing road runoff (such as oil and road salt in winter sanding material) into Chester Creek and thus will be in conflict with numerous provisions of the Chester Creek management plan (which is designed to protect this important anadromous fish stream and provide runoff buffering capacity to reduce flooding).

Therefore, be it resolved that Rogers Park Community Council respectfully requests the Planning and Zoning Commission to deny or reject the application and request that the project management team revise and resubmit a plan that addresses the noted deficiencies.