

1) Overall, how much do you travel on the stretch of Seward Highway that runs between Anchorage and Girdwood?

| | | Degrees combined | | Full scale | | | | | | Base | n= |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------|--------|-----|
| | | Over 10 times | 10 times or less | More than 10 times a year | 5 to 10 times a year | 2 to 4 times a year | Once a year | Less than once a year | Never | | |
| TOTAL | | 40% | 60% | 40% | 26% | 26% | 6% | 1% | 0% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 46% | 54% | 46% | 25% | 24% | 3% | 1% | 0% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 40% | 60% | 40% | 25% | 27% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 27% | 73% | 27% | 28% | 29% | 12% | 2% | 1% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 51% | 49% | 51% | 16% | 31% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 55% | 45% | 55% | 24% | 18% | 3% | 0% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 41% | 59% | 41% | 25% | 29% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 31% | 69% | 31% | 24% | 27% | 12% | 5% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 19% | 81% | 19% | 42% | 25% | 12% | 0% | 1% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 43% | 57% | 43% | 26% | 27% | 3% | 1% | 0% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 37% | 63% | 37% | 27% | 25% | 10% | 1% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 37% | 63% | 37% | 12% | 45% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 21% | 79% | 21% | 33% | 33% | 11% | 1% | 1% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 60% | 40% | 60% | 20% | 17% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 18% | 36% | 33% | 0% | 12% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 66% | 34% | 66% | 14% | 20% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 33% | 67% | 33% | 28% | 29% | 8% | 1% | 1% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 69% | 31% | 69% | 20% | 10% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 23% | 77% | 23% | 7% | 37% | 7% | 25% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 34% | 66% | 34% | 33% | 25% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 37% | 63% | 37% | 28% | 27% | 7% | 1% | 0% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 59% | 41% | 59% | 15% | 22% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 45% | 55% | 45% | 10% | 36% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 55% | 45% | 55% | 22% | 20% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 35% | 65% | 35% | 27% | 28% | 8% | 1% | 1% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 34% | 66% | 34% | 36% | 17% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

1) Overall, how much do you travel on the stretch of Seward Highway that runs between Anchorage and Girdwood?

| | | Degrees combined | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------|-------|-----|
| | | Over 10 times | 10 times or less | More than 10 times a year | 5 to 10 times a year | 2 to 4 times a year | Once a year | Less than once a year | Never | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 36% | 64% | 36% | 27% | 24% | 12% | 1% | 0% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 34% | 66% | 34% | 29% | 32% | 4% | 2% | 0% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 47% | 53% | 47% | 23% | 22% | 6% | 1% | 1% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 39% | 61% | 39% | 26% | 26% | 7% | 1% | 1% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 40% | 60% | 40% | 27% | 27% | 6% | 1% | 0% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 48% | 52% | 48% | 21% | 23% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 40% | 60% | 40% | 26% | 26% | 6% | 1% | 0% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 59% | 41% | 59% | 26% | 7% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 13% | 87% | 13% | 18% | 52% | 7% | 0% | 10% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 43% | 57% | 43% | 25% | 26% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 40% | 60% | 40% | 28% | 26% | 5% | 1% | 0% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 35% | 65% | 35% | 23% | 31% | 9% | 2% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 31% | 69% | 31% | 27% | 19% | 17% | 0% | 5% | 5.5% | 28 |

2) Do you primarily travel on the Seward Highway in the winter months, summer months, or year-round?

| | | Winter months | Summer months | Year-round | Unsure | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | | | | | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 4% | 48% | 47% | 1% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 2% | 51% | 47% | 0% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 4% | 20% | 74% | 2% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 7% | 58% | 33% | 3% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 3% | 47% | 51% | 0% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 4% | 36% | 58% | 2% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 5% | 49% | 45% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 1% | 52% | 45% | 2% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 5% | 61% | 32% | 2% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 5% | 42% | 52% | 1% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 2% | 54% | 42% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 3% | 25% | 71% | 0% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 4% | 63% | 31% | 2% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 0% | 14% | 86% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 5% | 56% | 38% | 1% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 1% | 21% | 77% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 32% | 60% | 7% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 8% | 39% | 53% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 3% | 51% | 44% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 3% | 35% | 61% | 1% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 23% | 44% | 34% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

2) Do you primarily travel on the Seward Highway in the winter months, summer months, or year-round?

| | | Winter months | Summer months | Year-round | Unsure | Base | n= |
|--|--|---------------|---------------|------------|--------|-------|-----|
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 3% | 38% | 59% | 0% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 4% | 51% | 43% | 2% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 56% | 44% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 5% | 46% | 47% | 1% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 5% | 54% | 40% | 2% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 3% | 44% | 53% | 1% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 3% | 49% | 47% | 1% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 5% | 46% | 48% | 1% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 57% | 43% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 4% | 48% | 46% | 1% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 0% | 43% | 57% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 9% | 36% | 55% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 5% | 45% | 49% | 0% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 3% | 47% | 48% | 2% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 2% | 55% | 43% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 2% | 59% | 32% | 8% | 5.5% | 28 |

3) Do you primarily travel on the Seward Highway for work or recreation?

| | | Work | Recreation | Both | Unsure | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------|------------|------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | | | | | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 4% | 78% | 17% | 2% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 3% | 80% | 16% | 1% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 6% | 56% | 31% | 7% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 5% | 84% | 10% | 1% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 3% | 78% | 19% | 0% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 4% | 72% | 24% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 10% | 71% | 16% | 3% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 2% | 82% | 13% | 3% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 3% | 88% | 6% | 3% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 7% | 71% | 20% | 2% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 1% | 85% | 13% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 7% | 63% | 29% | 1% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 2% | 87% | 8% | 2% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 0% | 95% | 5% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 1% | 90% | 7% | 1% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 8% | 63% | 27% | 2% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 90% | 0% | 10% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 3% | 81% | 15% | 2% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 5% | 78% | 15% | 2% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 1% | 72% | 26% | 1% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 5% | 81% | 15% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

3) Do you primarily travel on the Seward Highway for work or recreation?

| | | Work | Recreation | Both | Unsure | | |
|--|--|------|------------|------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | | | | | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 1% | 81% | 15% | 2% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 5% | 77% | 17% | 1% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 56% | 44% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 4% | 78% | 16% | 2% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 3% | 80% | 16% | 2% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 5% | 77% | 17% | 1% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 5% | 79% | 15% | 2% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 4% | 76% | 18% | 2% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 84% | 16% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 4% | 79% | 15% | 2% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 9% | 54% | 36% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 79% | 13% | 8% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 3% | 80% | 16% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 5% | 76% | 17% | 3% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 9% | 72% | 17% | 2% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 3% | 85% | 12% | 0% | 5.5% | 28 |

4) When you travel on the Seward Highway, are you typically going to a destination between Anchorage and Bird Flats, or are you just traveling through?

| | | Between Anc/Bird Flats | Traveling through | Both | Unsure | Base | n= |
|--------------------------------|------------------|---------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|-----|
| TOTAL | | 7% | 74% | 16% | 2% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 5% | 69% | 24% | 2% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 22% | 71% | 4% | 3% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 5% | 88% | 5% | 2% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 6% | 62% | 28% | 4% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 6% | 71% | 23% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 7% | 81% | 9% | 3% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 4% | 92% | 3% | 2% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 13% | 80% | 5% | 1% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 9% | 74% | 15% | 3% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 6% | 75% | 17% | 2% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 6% | 68% | 23% | 3% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 8% | 79% | 11% | 2% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 16% | 56% | 13% | 14% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 6% | 80% | 12% | 2% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 8% | 70% | 20% | 2% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 88% | 12% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 5% | 87% | 5% | 3% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 8% | 75% | 14% | 2% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 7% | 66% | 25% | 2% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 7% | 85% | 7% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |

(question continued on next page)

4) When you travel on the Seward Highway, are you typically going to a destination between Anchorage and Bird Flats, or are you just traveling through?

| | | Between Anc/Bird Flats | Traveling through | Both | Unsure | | |
|--|--|------------------------|-------------------|------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | | | | | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 8% | 64% | 26% | 2% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 7% | 79% | 12% | 2% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 53% | 34% | 13% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 8% | 76% | 11% | 4% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 8% | 76% | 14% | 2% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 7% | 73% | 19% | 1% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 10% | 76% | 13% | 0% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 6% | 75% | 15% | 4% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 57% | 36% | 6% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 8% | 75% | 16% | 2% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 7% | 78% | 13% | 1% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 7% | 61% | 19% | 13% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 6% | 75% | 17% | 2% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 7% | 74% | 17% | 2% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 8% | 80% | 7% | 5% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 21% | 61% | 12% | 6% | 5.5% | 28 |

5) Overall, when it comes to safety, how would you describe travel on the Seward Highway?

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------|-----------|--------|------------|----------------|---------|---------------------|----------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Safe | Average | Hazardous | Unsure | Very safe | Generally safe | Average | Generally hazardous | Very hazardous | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 21% | 32% | 46% | 0% | 3% | 18% | 32% | 36% | 10% | 0% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 21% | 32% | 47% | 0% | 3% | 17% | 32% | 40% | 7% | 0% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 27% | 35% | 37% | 1% | 3% | 24% | 35% | 28% | 8% | 1% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 18% | 31% | 50% | 0% | 1% | 17% | 31% | 32% | 18% | 0% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 23% | 33% | 43% | 0% | 4% | 19% | 33% | 37% | 6% | 0% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 13% | 35% | 52% | 0% | 1% | 12% | 35% | 41% | 11% | 0% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 18% | 31% | 51% | 0% | 2% | 16% | 31% | 42% | 9% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 23% | 36% | 41% | 0% | 4% | 19% | 36% | 35% | 6% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 29% | 27% | 44% | 0% | 4% | 25% | 27% | 28% | 16% | 0% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 24% | 30% | 46% | 0% | 2% | 22% | 30% | 34% | 12% | 0% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 18% | 36% | 46% | 0% | 3% | 14% | 36% | 37% | 9% | 0% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 19% | 27% | 54% | 0% | 4% | 14% | 27% | 43% | 11% | 0% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 23% | 36% | 41% | 0% | 2% | 21% | 36% | 31% | 10% | 0% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 28% | 39% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 28% | 39% | 22% | 11% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 20% | 37% | 43% | 0% | 2% | 19% | 37% | 32% | 10% | 0% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 21% | 27% | 52% | 0% | 4% | 17% | 27% | 42% | 10% | 0% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 23% | 52% | 24% | 0% | 0% | 23% | 52% | 12% | 12% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 20% | 24% | 55% | 0% | 11% | 10% | 24% | 44% | 11% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 21% | 33% | 46% | 0% | 3% | 19% | 33% | 35% | 11% | 0% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 20% | 31% | 48% | 1% | 2% | 18% | 31% | 40% | 8% | 1% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 32% | 32% | 36% | 0% | 0% | 32% | 32% | 25% | 10% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 23% | 34% | 42% | 0% | 3% | 21% | 34% | 32% | 11% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 22% | 33% | 45% | 0% | 3% | 18% | 33% | 35% | 11% | 0% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 15% | 29% | 56% | 0% | 2% | 14% | 29% | 48% | 7% | 0% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 39% | 32% | 29% | 0% | 0% | 39% | 32% | 19% | 10% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 13% | 36% | 52% | 0% | 3% | 10% | 36% | 44% | 8% | 0% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 24% | 32% | 44% | 0% | 3% | 21% | 32% | 33% | 11% | 0% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 22% | 17% | 61% | 0% | 0% | 22% | 17% | 61% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

5) Overall, when it comes to safety, how would you describe travel on the Seward Highway?

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------|-----------|--------|------------|----------------|---------|---------------------|----------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Safe | Average | Hazardous | Unsure | Very safe | Generally safe | Average | Generally hazardous | Very hazardous | Unsure | Base | n= |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 13% | 26% | 61% | 0% | 1% | 12% | 26% | 42% | 18% | 0% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 30% | 38% | 33% | 0% | 5% | 25% | 38% | 30% | 3% | 0% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 18% | 43% | 38% | 0% | 0% | 18% | 43% | 34% | 4% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 20% | 31% | 49% | 0% | 3% | 17% | 31% | 38% | 11% | 0% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 34% | 49% | 17% | 0% | 4% | 30% | 49% | 15% | 3% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 40% | 29% | 31% | 0% | 0% | 40% | 29% | 23% | 7% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 21% | 36% | 44% | 0% | 3% | 18% | 36% | 37% | 7% | 0% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 20% | 31% | 50% | 0% | 3% | 17% | 31% | 37% | 13% | 0% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 25% | 28% | 45% | 2% | 4% | 21% | 28% | 30% | 15% | 2% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 29% | 27% | 44% | 0% | 0% | 29% | 27% | 35% | 9% | 0% | 5.5% | 28 |

6) If you could change one thing about the highway to improve safety, what would that be?

| | | More lanes, 4-lane | Widen road | More passing zones/lanes | More police/enforcement | Lighting | Divided highway, middle barrier | More cautious drivers | Rockfall mitigation | Lower speed limits | More pull-offs | Better maintenance/plowing | Straighten road | Build a bridge | No changes needed | Separated bike lane/path | Enhanced signage | Less construction | Guardrails | Miscellaneous | Unsure | Base | n= | |
|--|--|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|--------------------|----------------|----------------------------|-----------------|----------------|-------------------|--------------------------|------------------|-------------------|------------|---------------|--------|--------|------|----|
| TOTAL | | 21% | 12% | 9% | 7% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 9% | 100.0% | 496 | |
| Borough | Anchorage | 19% | 12% | 11% | 6% | 4% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 10% | 57.9% | 287 | |
| | Kenai Pen. | 19% | 12% | 4% | 10% | 7% | 4% | 7% | 7% | 5% | 0% | 6% | 2% | 2% | 4% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 6% | 15.4% | 76 | |
| | Mat-Su | 26% | 13% | 8% | 8% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 6% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 8% | 26.7% | 132 | |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 17% | 11% | 9% | 8% | 6% | 3% | 2% | 5% | 2% | 5% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 4% | 14% | 26.6% | 126 | |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 20% | 9% | 8% | 8% | 10% | 5% | 4% | 6% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 9% | 24.5% | 116 | |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 17% | 18% | 4% | 1% | 7% | 9% | 5% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 6% | 7% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 12.9% | 61 | |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 32% | 21% | 5% | 3% | 0% | 4% | 5% | 1% | 5% | 2% | 1% | 5% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 10% | 15.7% | 74 | |
| | 65+ yrs old | 17% | 9% | 17% | 9% | 0% | 3% | 6% | 4% | 10% | 7% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 6% | 20.4% | 97 | |
| Gender | Male | 23% | 13% | 9% | 7% | 5% | 5% | 3% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 7% | 51.3% | 253 | |
| | Female | 19% | 11% | 9% | 7% | 5% | 4% | 5% | 4% | 5% | 6% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 4% | 10% | 48.7% | 240 | |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 16% | 12% | 9% | 8% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 4% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 4% | 6% | 40.5% | 201 | |
| | 10 times or less | 24% | 12% | 9% | 7% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 10% | 59.5% | 295 | |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 11% | 24% | 7% | 0% | 14% | 6% | 0% | 8% | 3% | 12% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 3% | 3.8% | 19 | |
| | Summer months | 25% | 12% | 11% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 10% | 47.6% | 236 | |
| | Year-round | 17% | 11% | 7% | 10% | 6% | 6% | 6% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 8% | 47.4% | 235 | |
| | Unsure | 45% | 12% | 0% | 9% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 23% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 10% | 1.2% | 6 | |
| Reason for travel | Work | 18% | 11% | 7% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 5% | 0% | 0% | 9% | 4% | 0% | 9% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 15% | 4.2% | 21 | |
| | Recreation | 23% | 13% | 10% | 7% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 7% | 77.3% | 384 | |
| | Both | 14% | 9% | 6% | 8% | 8% | 8% | 4% | 7% | 2% | 4% | 5% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 2% | 10% | 16.8% | 83 | |
| | Unsure | 18% | 16% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 0% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 40% | 1.6% | 8 | |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 20% | 10% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 17% | 11% | 2% | 6% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 5% | 7% | 7.3% | 36 |
| | Traveling through | 20% | 13% | 10% | 8% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 10% | 74.5% | 369 | |
| | Both | 21% | 9% | 7% | 6% | 6% | 10% | 9% | 4% | 5% | 3% | 6% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 6% | 15.8% | 78 | |
| | Unsure | 38% | 19% | 6% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 10% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 | |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 21% | 10% | 7% | 8% | 4% | 8% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 8% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 2% | 5% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 5% | 7% | 24.9% | 123 | |
| | Rarely/Never | 21% | 13% | 10% | 7% | 5% | 3% | 4% | 5% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 9% | 73.7% | 365 | |
| | Unsure | 30% | 17% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 10% | 0% | 17% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 27% | 1.5% | 7 | |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 23% | 7% | 6% | 2% | 6% | 0% | 5% | 5% | 6% | 6% | 5% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 3% | 1% | 0% | 3% | 14% | 21.2% | 105 | |
| | Average | 16% | 11% | 9% | 8% | 7% | 3% | 4% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 4% | 16% | 31.8% | 158 | | |
| | Hazardous | 23% | 15% | 10% | 9% | 3% | 8% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 1% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 46.7% | 232 | |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 | |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 23% | 11% | 9% | 8% | 3% | 5% | 4% | 6% | 4% | 6% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 3% | 4% | 46.7% | 232 | |
| | Medium priority or less | 19% | 14% | 8% | 8% | 6% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 3% | 13% | 47.2% | 234 | |
| | Unsure | 19% | 8% | 12% | 0% | 11% | 2% | 6% | 0% | 9% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 6% | 17% | 6.1% | 30 | |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 22% | 13% | 10% | 7% | 5% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 8% | 91.2% | 452 | |
| | Oppose | 10% | 0% | 2% | 11% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 10% | 6% | 1% | 0% | 8% | 6% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 9% | 24% | 6.0% | 30 | |
| | Unsure | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 23% | 13% | 17% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 5% | 4% | 2.8% | 14 | |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 18% | 9% | 10% | 8% | 6% | 5% | 5% | 4% | 3% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 8% | 42.6% | 211 | |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 20% | 18% | 8% | 7% | 4% | 5% | 3% | 6% | 5% | 5% | 1% | 4% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 9% | 41.3% | 205 | |
| | No recreation if added costs | 32% | 7% | 10% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 4% | 2% | 5% | 0% | 5% | 5% | 0% | 3% | 1% | 3% | 1% | 11% | 10.5% | 52 | |
| | Unsure | 32% | 3% | 7% | 8% | 3% | 2% | 12% | 5% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 3% | 5.6% | 28 | |

7) In general, how would you prioritize Seward Highway Safety improvements compared to other DOT projects?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Top/High priority | Medium priority or less | Unsure | The top priority | A high priority | A medium priority | A low priority | Not a priority at all | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 47% | 47% | 6% | 9% | 38% | 37% | 9% | 1% | 6% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 45% | 46% | 9% | 8% | 37% | 36% | 9% | 1% | 9% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 45% | 53% | 2% | 12% | 33% | 43% | 9% | 1% | 2% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 53% | 46% | 2% | 10% | 43% | 36% | 8% | 1% | 2% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 33% | 55% | 12% | 9% | 24% | 43% | 11% | 1% | 12% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 46% | 51% | 4% | 9% | 37% | 42% | 8% | 1% | 4% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 47% | 50% | 3% | 9% | 38% | 42% | 8% | 0% | 3% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 53% | 44% | 3% | 8% | 45% | 37% | 5% | 2% | 3% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 60% | 35% | 5% | 10% | 51% | 27% | 8% | 0% | 5% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 46% | 49% | 5% | 9% | 37% | 38% | 11% | 1% | 5% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 48% | 45% | 7% | 9% | 39% | 37% | 6% | 1% | 7% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 46% | 47% | 7% | 13% | 33% | 39% | 8% | 0% | 7% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 48% | 47% | 5% | 7% | 41% | 37% | 9% | 1% | 5% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 37% | 63% | 0% | 11% | 26% | 50% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 48% | 45% | 7% | 7% | 41% | 36% | 8% | 1% | 7% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 47% | 47% | 5% | 11% | 36% | 37% | 9% | 1% | 5% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 48% | 52% | 0% | 0% | 48% | 52% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 54% | 46% | 0% | 11% | 43% | 42% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 48% | 46% | 7% | 9% | 39% | 38% | 7% | 1% | 7% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 43% | 51% | 6% | 11% | 32% | 32% | 19% | 0% | 6% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 45% | 55% | 0% | 7% | 38% | 49% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 61% | 39% | 0% | 13% | 48% | 30% | 7% | 2% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 48% | 47% | 5% | 9% | 40% | 37% | 9% | 1% | 5% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 40% | 46% | 14% | 11% | 29% | 37% | 8% | 0% | 14% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 8% | 75% | 16% | 0% | 8% | 75% | 0% | 0% | 16% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 43% | 51% | 6% | 9% | 34% | 43% | 6% | 1% | 6% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 49% | 46% | 6% | 9% | 40% | 35% | 10% | 1% | 6% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 27% | 47% | 27% | 17% | 10% | 47% | 0% | 0% | 27% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

7) In general, how would you prioritize Seward Highway Safety improvements compared to other DOT projects?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|-------------------|-------------------------|--------|------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------|-----------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Top/High priority | Medium priority or less | Unsure | The top priority | A high priority | A medium priority | A low priority | Not a priority at all | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 29% | 66% | 5% | 2% | 27% | 42% | 20% | 4% | 5% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 38% | 54% | 8% | 6% | 32% | 45% | 9% | 0% | 8% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 62% | 33% | 5% | 14% | 48% | 30% | 3% | 0% | 5% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 50% | 44% | 6% | 9% | 41% | 37% | 7% | 0% | 6% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 14% | 79% | 7% | 4% | 10% | 39% | 35% | 5% | 7% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 22% | 78% | 0% | 17% | 4% | 58% | 7% | 13% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 47% | 45% | 8% | 9% | 38% | 36% | 8% | 1% | 8% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 46% | 51% | 3% | 7% | 39% | 40% | 10% | 1% | 3% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 46% | 50% | 4% | 13% | 32% | 37% | 13% | 0% | 4% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 60% | 29% | 11% | 17% | 43% | 29% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 5.5% | 28 |

Next, thinking about your past experiences on the Seward Highway, I'd like you to assign a letter grade to various aspects of the highway. What letter grade, that being A, B, C, D or F, would you give it for:

8) The condition of the road itself

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------|------------------|---------|--------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 63% | 35% | 2% | 16% | 47% | 26% | 7% | 2% | 2% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 68% | 30% | 2% | 20% | 48% | 23% | 6% | 1% | 2% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 52% | 44% | 4% | 10% | 41% | 34% | 10% | 0% | 4% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 58% | 40% | 2% | 11% | 47% | 30% | 7% | 4% | 2% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 70% | 27% | 2% | 13% | 57% | 20% | 5% | 3% | 2% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 68% | 31% | 1% | 26% | 42% | 24% | 6% | 2% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 60% | 40% | 0% | 15% | 45% | 26% | 12% | 2% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 50% | 47% | 3% | 15% | 36% | 40% | 6% | 1% | 3% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 61% | 35% | 4% | 12% | 50% | 26% | 9% | 0% | 4% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 60% | 38% | 2% | 14% | 46% | 26% | 9% | 3% | 2% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 66% | 32% | 3% | 19% | 47% | 27% | 5% | 0% | 3% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 66% | 34% | 1% | 17% | 48% | 24% | 7% | 2% | 1% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 61% | 36% | 3% | 15% | 45% | 28% | 7% | 1% | 3% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 65% | 35% | 0% | 12% | 52% | 27% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 60% | 37% | 3% | 14% | 46% | 31% | 6% | 1% | 3% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 66% | 33% | 1% | 19% | 47% | 22% | 8% | 3% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 66% | 34% | 0% | 12% | 54% | 34% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 45% | 55% | 0% | 10% | 35% | 31% | 14% | 10% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 63% | 35% | 2% | 17% | 46% | 28% | 5% | 1% | 2% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 65% | 31% | 3% | 17% | 48% | 18% | 12% | 2% | 3% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 67% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 67% | 22% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |

(question continued on next page)

Next, thinking about your past experiences on the Seward Highway, I'd like you to assign a letter grade to various aspects of the highway. What letter grade, that being A, B, C, D or F, would you give it for:

8) The condition of the road itself

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------|--------|------------|-----|-----|-----|----|--------|-------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 68% | 24% | 8% | 15% | 53% | 19% | 5% | 0% | 8% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 61% | 38% | 1% | 17% | 44% | 29% | 7% | 2% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 68% | 28% | 4% | 14% | 54% | 21% | 7% | 0% | 4% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 60% | 34% | 6% | 10% | 49% | 19% | 16% | 0% | 6% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 71% | 28% | 1% | 19% | 52% | 22% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 60% | 37% | 2% | 15% | 45% | 28% | 8% | 1% | 2% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 56% | 27% | 17% | 17% | 39% | 10% | 17% | 0% | 17% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 83% | 15% | 2% | 33% | 49% | 11% | 4% | 0% | 2% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 65% | 33% | 3% | 12% | 52% | 29% | 4% | 0% | 3% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 52% | 46% | 2% | 11% | 41% | 32% | 10% | 3% | 2% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 53% | 46% | 2% | 11% | 42% | 33% | 10% | 3% | 2% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 73% | 25% | 2% | 22% | 51% | 20% | 5% | 0% | 2% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 60% | 31% | 8% | 10% | 50% | 31% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 63% | 35% | 2% | 15% | 48% | 26% | 7% | 2% | 2% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 72% | 27% | 1% | 35% | 37% | 27% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 39% | 61% | 0% | 5% | 34% | 35% | 26% | 0% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 64% | 35% | 1% | 16% | 48% | 27% | 6% | 2% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 65% | 33% | 2% | 16% | 50% | 25% | 7% | 0% | 2% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 47% | 52% | 1% | 18% | 29% | 35% | 11% | 6% | 1% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 62% | 25% | 13% | 15% | 47% | 17% | 8% | 0% | 13% | 5.5% | 28 |

9) Safe access to trails and scenic pullouts

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------|--------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 46% | 50% | 4% | 14% | 32% | 33% | 13% | 4% | 4% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 44% | 52% | 4% | 13% | 31% | 32% | 15% | 5% | 4% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 54% | 40% | 6% | 15% | 39% | 27% | 10% | 3% | 6% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 46% | 53% | 1% | 14% | 32% | 37% | 13% | 3% | 1% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 47% | 48% | 6% | 21% | 26% | 30% | 11% | 7% | 6% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 45% | 53% | 2% | 14% | 31% | 31% | 16% | 6% | 2% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 54% | 44% | 2% | 9% | 45% | 34% | 8% | 2% | 2% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 51% | 46% | 3% | 17% | 34% | 35% | 9% | 2% | 3% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 41% | 56% | 3% | 7% | 34% | 35% | 20% | 1% | 3% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 50% | 46% | 4% | 15% | 35% | 29% | 14% | 3% | 4% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 43% | 54% | 3% | 13% | 30% | 36% | 13% | 5% | 3% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 47% | 51% | 2% | 18% | 29% | 33% | 12% | 6% | 2% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 46% | 50% | 5% | 11% | 35% | 32% | 15% | 3% | 5% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 46% | 54% | 0% | 6% | 40% | 35% | 19% | 0% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 45% | 52% | 3% | 9% | 36% | 35% | 14% | 4% | 3% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 48% | 47% | 5% | 20% | 28% | 30% | 13% | 5% | 5% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 19% | 81% | 0% | 0% | 19% | 69% | 12% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 55% | 40% | 5% | 20% | 35% | 37% | 0% | 3% | 5% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 46% | 51% | 3% | 13% | 32% | 33% | 15% | 3% | 3% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 45% | 53% | 3% | 16% | 28% | 32% | 9% | 11% | 3% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 68% | 13% | 19% | 0% | 68% | 7% | 6% | 0% | 19% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 50% | 43% | 7% | 25% | 25% | 20% | 18% | 5% | 7% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 47% | 50% | 3% | 13% | 34% | 33% | 13% | 3% | 3% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 39% | 59% | 2% | 11% | 28% | 38% | 14% | 7% | 2% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 56% | 27% | 16% | 13% | 43% | 17% | 0% | 10% | 16% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

9) Safe access to trails and scenic pullouts

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------|--------|------------|------|-----|-----|-----|--------|-------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 34% | 60% | 6% | 9% | 25% | 38% | 15% | 6% | 6% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 50% | 47% | 3% | 15% | 35% | 31% | 13% | 3% | 3% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 56% | 44% | 0% | 17% | 39% | 27% | 0% | 17% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 66% | 28% | 5% | 25% | 42% | 19% | 8% | 2% | 5% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 49% | 48% | 3% | 12% | 37% | 34% | 12% | 1% | 3% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 35% | 62% | 3% | 10% | 25% | 38% | 17% | 7% | 3% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 38% | 60% | 2% | 8% | 30% | 37% | 18% | 5% | 2% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 54% | 41% | 5% | 20% | 34% | 30% | 9% | 2% | 5% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 51% | 41% | 8% | 8% | 43% | 18% | 15% | 8% | 8% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 46% | 52% | 3% | 13% | 33% | 34% | 14% | 4% | 3% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 57% | 34% | 9% | 30% | 27% | 19% | 12% | 2% | 9% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 40% | 39% | 21% | 8% | 32% | 34% | 5% | 0% | 21% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 46% | 52% | 2% | 14% | 32% | 32% | 15% | 5% | 2% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 45% | 51% | 4% | 13% | 33% | 35% | 14% | 2% | 4% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 54% | 40% | 6% | 27% | 27% | 28% | 8% | 4% | 6% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 43% | 47% | 10% | 0% | 43% | 28% | 7% | 13% | 10% | 5.5% | 28 |

10) Arriving to your destination without delay

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------|--------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 44% | 54% | 2% | 11% | 34% | 35% | 14% | 5% | 2% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 45% | 53% | 1% | 12% | 33% | 37% | 12% | 4% | 1% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 50% | 46% | 3% | 17% | 34% | 29% | 14% | 3% | 3% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 39% | 60% | 1% | 5% | 34% | 33% | 17% | 10% | 1% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 45% | 53% | 3% | 10% | 34% | 37% | 9% | 7% | 3% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 44% | 55% | 1% | 8% | 37% | 33% | 17% | 5% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 43% | 57% | 0% | 9% | 35% | 33% | 17% | 7% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 45% | 55% | 0% | 16% | 29% | 36% | 16% | 3% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 46% | 53% | 1% | 15% | 31% | 35% | 15% | 3% | 1% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 44% | 54% | 3% | 10% | 34% | 34% | 13% | 6% | 3% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 45% | 54% | 1% | 12% | 33% | 35% | 15% | 4% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 45% | 55% | 0% | 11% | 34% | 34% | 15% | 6% | 0% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 44% | 53% | 3% | 11% | 33% | 35% | 13% | 5% | 3% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 67% | 33% | 0% | 9% | 58% | 20% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 41% | 56% | 2% | 9% | 32% | 37% | 15% | 4% | 2% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 45% | 53% | 1% | 13% | 32% | 34% | 12% | 7% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 58% | 42% | 0% | 0% | 58% | 28% | 14% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 47% | 53% | 0% | 5% | 42% | 32% | 13% | 8% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 45% | 53% | 2% | 10% | 35% | 35% | 14% | 4% | 2% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 41% | 57% | 2% | 13% | 28% | 33% | 16% | 8% | 2% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 53% | 47% | 0% | 32% | 21% | 31% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 52% | 42% | 7% | 15% | 36% | 20% | 21% | 1% | 7% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 43% | 56% | 1% | 12% | 31% | 38% | 13% | 5% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 48% | 50% | 2% | 4% | 44% | 30% | 13% | 7% | 2% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 47% | 47% | 6% | 5% | 43% | 10% | 36% | 0% | 6% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

10) Arriving to your destination without delay

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------|--------|------------|-----|------|-----|-----|--------|-------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 51% | 47% | 2% | 11% | 40% | 34% | 11% | 3% | 2% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 42% | 56% | 2% | 11% | 31% | 35% | 15% | 6% | 2% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 40% | 60% | 0% | 0% | 40% | 43% | 0% | 17% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 64% | 33% | 3% | 24% | 41% | 26% | 7% | 0% | 3% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 51% | 46% | 2% | 10% | 41% | 37% | 9% | 1% | 2% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 31% | 69% | 1% | 6% | 25% | 37% | 21% | 10% | 1% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 38% | 61% | 1% | 8% | 30% | 41% | 14% | 6% | 1% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 51% | 47% | 2% | 15% | 37% | 29% | 13% | 4% | 2% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 40% | 51% | 8% | 0% | 40% | 32% | 15% | 4% | 8% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 43% | 56% | 1% | 10% | 33% | 36% | 14% | 5% | 1% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 58% | 42% | 0% | 20% | 38% | 28% | 11% | 3% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 49% | 23% | 28% | 12% | 37% | 10% | 13% | 0% | 28% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 50% | 47% | 3% | 11% | 39% | 32% | 12% | 4% | 3% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 37% | 62% | 1% | 9% | 28% | 42% | 15% | 5% | 1% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 45% | 53% | 2% | 17% | 28% | 24% | 20% | 9% | 2% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 50% | 48% | 3% | 8% | 42% | 31% | 14% | 3% | 3% | 5.5% | 28 |

11) Accommodating to pedestrians and bikes

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------|--------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 23% | 68% | 9% | 9% | 15% | 17% | 25% | 26% | 9% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 24% | 66% | 10% | 9% | 15% | 15% | 24% | 27% | 10% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 26% | 67% | 7% | 8% | 18% | 16% | 32% | 19% | 7% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 21% | 73% | 6% | 9% | 12% | 22% | 23% | 28% | 6% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 24% | 59% | 17% | 7% | 16% | 14% | 18% | 27% | 17% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 20% | 71% | 8% | 9% | 11% | 15% | 23% | 33% | 8% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 26% | 72% | 2% | 10% | 16% | 12% | 30% | 29% | 2% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 28% | 72% | 0% | 13% | 15% | 26% | 25% | 21% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 22% | 72% | 6% | 7% | 15% | 21% | 34% | 17% | 6% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 26% | 66% | 7% | 11% | 16% | 19% | 25% | 23% | 7% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 20% | 70% | 10% | 7% | 14% | 15% | 26% | 29% | 10% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 27% | 66% | 7% | 14% | 13% | 14% | 19% | 33% | 7% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 21% | 70% | 10% | 6% | 15% | 19% | 29% | 21% | 10% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 23% | 73% | 4% | 10% | 13% | 19% | 38% | 16% | 4% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 21% | 72% | 7% | 4% | 17% | 21% | 24% | 27% | 7% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 26% | 63% | 11% | 13% | 13% | 13% | 25% | 25% | 11% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 19% | 56% | 24% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 32% | 68% | 0% | 13% | 19% | 15% | 29% | 25% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 19% | 73% | 8% | 6% | 13% | 19% | 28% | 26% | 8% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 39% | 47% | 15% | 20% | 18% | 9% | 12% | 25% | 15% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 32% | 49% | 19% | 0% | 32% | 18% | 20% | 10% | 19% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 33% | 59% | 8% | 11% | 22% | 12% | 32% | 15% | 8% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 22% | 72% | 6% | 9% | 13% | 17% | 27% | 28% | 6% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 26% | 54% | 19% | 8% | 18% | 14% | 16% | 24% | 19% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 17% | 56% | 27% | 0% | 17% | 38% | 8% | 10% | 27% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

11) Accommodating to pedestrians and bikes

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------|--------|------------|------|-----|-----|-----|--------|-------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 19% | 76% | 5% | 5% | 14% | 18% | 20% | 37% | 5% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 25% | 66% | 9% | 10% | 15% | 17% | 27% | 23% | 9% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 17% | 13% | 70% | 0% | 17% | 0% | 13% | 0% | 70% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 31% | 55% | 14% | 15% | 16% | 19% | 25% | 12% | 14% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 26% | 68% | 6% | 7% | 18% | 20% | 30% | 18% | 6% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 18% | 74% | 8% | 7% | 11% | 14% | 22% | 38% | 8% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 18% | 75% | 8% | 4% | 13% | 16% | 29% | 30% | 8% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 30% | 61% | 9% | 14% | 16% | 18% | 23% | 20% | 9% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 13% | 68% | 19% | 2% | 11% | 13% | 13% | 42% | 19% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 23% | 68% | 8% | 9% | 15% | 17% | 26% | 25% | 8% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 32% | 58% | 10% | 16% | 16% | 11% | 10% | 36% | 10% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 80% | 20% | 0% | 0% | 21% | 15% | 44% | 20% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 23% | 72% | 5% | 8% | 15% | 16% | 25% | 31% | 5% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 21% | 67% | 12% | 8% | 13% | 17% | 26% | 24% | 12% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 36% | 59% | 5% | 17% | 19% | 24% | 17% | 18% | 5% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 17% | 62% | 21% | 3% | 14% | 8% | 33% | 21% | 21% | 5.5% | 28 |

12) Overall safety

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|---------|--------|------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|--------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 39% | 60% | 1% | 8% | 32% | 37% | 18% | 5% | 1% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 42% | 56% | 1% | 9% | 33% | 36% | 17% | 3% | 1% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 43% | 55% | 3% | 7% | 36% | 38% | 11% | 5% | 3% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 30% | 70% | 0% | 4% | 26% | 37% | 23% | 9% | 0% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 51% | 47% | 3% | 8% | 42% | 25% | 17% | 5% | 3% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 36% | 64% | 1% | 6% | 29% | 37% | 20% | 7% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 35% | 65% | 0% | 6% | 30% | 43% | 16% | 6% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 35% | 65% | 0% | 12% | 23% | 47% | 16% | 2% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 36% | 64% | 0% | 8% | 28% | 41% | 19% | 4% | 0% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 39% | 59% | 2% | 7% | 33% | 36% | 16% | 7% | 2% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 39% | 60% | 0% | 8% | 31% | 36% | 20% | 4% | 0% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 38% | 62% | 0% | 8% | 29% | 38% | 19% | 6% | 0% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 40% | 58% | 2% | 7% | 33% | 36% | 17% | 5% | 2% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 46% | 54% | 0% | 7% | 39% | 39% | 15% | 0% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 40% | 58% | 1% | 7% | 34% | 34% | 19% | 5% | 1% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 38% | 61% | 1% | 9% | 29% | 38% | 18% | 5% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 23% | 77% | 0% | 0% | 23% | 65% | 0% | 12% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 41% | 54% | 5% | 9% | 32% | 21% | 21% | 12% | 5% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 38% | 61% | 1% | 8% | 30% | 39% | 18% | 4% | 1% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 42% | 56% | 2% | 6% | 36% | 30% | 18% | 8% | 2% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 60% | 40% | 0% | 0% | 60% | 22% | 18% | 0% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 36% | 62% | 3% | 7% | 28% | 45% | 6% | 11% | 3% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 40% | 60% | 1% | 9% | 31% | 37% | 18% | 5% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 37% | 61% | 2% | 2% | 35% | 32% | 25% | 4% | 2% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 48% | 46% | 6% | 0% | 48% | 26% | 21% | 0% | 6% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

12) Overall safety

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|---------|--------|------------|------|-----|-----|-----|--------|-------|-----|
| | | A, B | C, D, F | Unsure | A | B | C | D | F | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 27% | 71% | 2% | 5% | 21% | 47% | 21% | 3% | 2% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 43% | 56% | 1% | 8% | 35% | 34% | 16% | 6% | 1% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 66% | 34% | 0% | 27% | 40% | 0% | 34% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 82% | 16% | 2% | 26% | 56% | 14% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 50% | 48% | 2% | 4% | 46% | 45% | 3% | 0% | 2% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 12% | 88% | 0% | 2% | 10% | 41% | 36% | 11% | 0% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 28% | 72% | 0% | 4% | 23% | 36% | 26% | 10% | 0% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 51% | 47% | 2% | 11% | 40% | 36% | 11% | 1% | 2% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 37% | 55% | 8% | 6% | 30% | 40% | 15% | 0% | 8% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 38% | 61% | 1% | 7% | 31% | 38% | 18% | 5% | 1% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 58% | 42% | 0% | 11% | 47% | 26% | 11% | 5% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 38% | 49% | 13% | 12% | 25% | 19% | 23% | 7% | 13% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 37% | 62% | 2% | 7% | 29% | 40% | 16% | 6% | 2% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 41% | 58% | 1% | 7% | 34% | 33% | 21% | 4% | 1% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 42% | 58% | 0% | 9% | 33% | 39% | 13% | 6% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 35% | 62% | 3% | 7% | 28% | 31% | 25% | 6% | 3% | 5.5% | 28 |

13) The Alaska Department of Transportation is in the planning phase of a major road improvement project for the Seward Highway between Anchorage and Bird Creek. The overall project goals are to make improvements to decrease severe accidents and provide safe places for recreational activities along this travel corridor. In general, do you support or oppose this project?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------|--------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Support | Oppose | Unsure | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 91% | 6% | 3% | 60% | 31% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 92% | 5% | 3% | 61% | 32% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 86% | 9% | 5% | 54% | 32% | 7% | 2% | 5% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 92% | 6% | 2% | 61% | 31% | 2% | 4% | 2% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 93% | 6% | 1% | 53% | 40% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 91% | 7% | 2% | 61% | 30% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 89% | 3% | 8% | 55% | 33% | 2% | 1% | 8% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 93% | 6% | 1% | 64% | 28% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 92% | 6% | 2% | 67% | 26% | 4% | 1% | 2% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 90% | 7% | 3% | 55% | 35% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 92% | 5% | 2% | 64% | 28% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 90% | 9% | 1% | 58% | 33% | 4% | 5% | 1% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 92% | 4% | 4% | 61% | 31% | 4% | 0% | 4% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 93% | 0% | 7% | 69% | 24% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 93% | 5% | 2% | 60% | 32% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 90% | 7% | 3% | 59% | 31% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 58% | 42% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 87% | 13% | 0% | 46% | 41% | 0% | 13% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 93% | 4% | 3% | 62% | 31% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 85% | 13% | 2% | 58% | 27% | 9% | 4% | 2% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 86% | 0% | 14% | 35% | 51% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 91% | 6% | 3% | 69% | 23% | 6% | 0% | 3% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 92% | 6% | 2% | 59% | 32% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 92% | 5% | 3% | 55% | 36% | 5% | 0% | 3% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 81% | 4% | 16% | 76% | 5% | 4% | 0% | 16% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

13) The Alaska Department of Transportation is in the planning phase of a major road improvement project for the Seward Highway between Anchorage and Bird Creek. The overall project goals are to make improvements to decrease severe accidents and provide safe places for recreational activities along this travel corridor. In general, do you support or oppose this project?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--------|--------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Support | Oppose | Unsure | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 92% | 4% | 4% | 64% | 28% | 2% | 2% | 4% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 91% | 7% | 2% | 58% | 33% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 85% | 9% | 5% | 45% | 41% | 7% | 2% | 5% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 89% | 9% | 2% | 46% | 42% | 5% | 4% | 2% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 96% | 2% | 2% | 76% | 20% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 97% | 2% | 1% | 81% | 16% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 85% | 10% | 5% | 40% | 45% | 5% | 5% | 5% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 93% | 7% | 0% | 53% | 40% | 7% | 0% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 94% | 3% | 3% | 66% | 28% | 2% | 1% | 3% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 92% | 6% | 2% | 56% | 36% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 75% | 19% | 5% | 40% | 35% | 12% | 8% | 5% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 91% | 4% | 5% | 76% | 15% | 4% | 0% | 5% | 5.5% | 28 |

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important. Here is the list. What is most important to you? And which is next on your list...?
 (Shown as % ranked 'Most important')

| | | Enhancing highway safety for all users | Ensuring reliable travel | Creating separated bike and pedestrian pathways | Minimizing environmental impacts | Improved scenic and recreational pull-offs | Base | n= |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|--------|-----|
| TOTAL | | 54% | 18% | 12% | 8% | 8% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 53% | 17% | 13% | 10% | 7% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 48% | 21% | 11% | 8% | 11% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 60% | 18% | 11% | 5% | 6% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 55% | 14% | 13% | 13% | 4% | 26.1% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 51% | 24% | 8% | 10% | 7% | 23.3% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 52% | 17% | 17% | 8% | 6% | 12.3% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 54% | 21% | 13% | 3% | 9% | 14.9% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 56% | 13% | 13% | 5% | 13% | 19.4% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 54% | 20% | 12% | 5% | 8% | 51.0% | 255 |
| | Female | 53% | 16% | 12% | 11% | 7% | 48.6% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 50% | 19% | 14% | 10% | 8% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 57% | 17% | 11% | 7% | 8% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 57% | 17% | 16% | 10% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 56% | 17% | 12% | 7% | 8% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 52% | 19% | 13% | 9% | 7% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 58% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 9% | 1.2% | 6 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important. Here is the list. What is most important to you? And which is next on your list...?
 (Shown as % ranked 'Most important')

| | | Enhancing highway safety for all users | Ensuring reliable travel | Creating separated bike and pedestrian pathways | Minimizing environmental impacts | Improved scenic and recreational pull-offs | Base | n= |
|--|-------------------------|--|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|-------|-----|
| Reason for travel | Work | 61% | 18% | 15% | 0% | 6% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 55% | 16% | 13% | 8% | 8% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 49% | 23% | 9% | 11% | 8% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 13% | 74% | 7% | 0% | 6% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 53% | 26% | 6% | 5% | 9% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 55% | 19% | 12% | 6% | 7% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 50% | 11% | 16% | 14% | 8% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 37% | 22% | 5% | 36% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 44% | 14% | 25% | 12% | 5% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 56% | 20% | 8% | 7% | 9% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 44% | 24% | 11% | 14% | 7% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 55% | 16% | 15% | 7% | 6% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 58% | 17% | 11% | 6% | 9% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 61% | 16% | 10% | 5% | 7% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 48% | 20% | 15% | 11% | 6% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 46% | 14% | 6% | 12% | 22% | 6.0% | 30 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important. Here is the list. What is most important to you? And which is next on your list...?
 (Shown as % ranked 'Most important')

| | | Enhancing highway safety for all users | Ensuring reliable travel | Creating separated bike and pedestrian pathways | Minimizing environmental impacts | Improved scenic and recreational pull-offs | Base | n= |
|--|--|--|--------------------------|---|----------------------------------|--|-------|-----|
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 55% | 18% | 12% | 8% | 8% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 50% | 18% | 13% | 17% | 2% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 30% | 21% | 26% | 12% | 10% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 53% | 12% | 17% | 9% | 9% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 57% | 21% | 8% | 8% | 6% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 46% | 27% | 11% | 7% | 9% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 49% | 30% | 10% | 3% | 9% | 5.5% | 28 |

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Enhancing highway safety for all users | | | | | Base | n= |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--|-----|-----|-----|----|--------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| TOTAL | | 54% | 22% | 14% | 8% | 2% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 53% | 25% | 13% | 8% | 2% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 48% | 22% | 18% | 10% | 1% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 60% | 18% | 13% | 7% | 2% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 55% | 23% | 12% | 7% | 2% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 51% | 26% | 13% | 9% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 52% | 24% | 11% | 13% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 54% | 28% | 13% | 3% | 2% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 56% | 13% | 21% | 7% | 3% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 54% | 24% | 12% | 7% | 3% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 53% | 21% | 16% | 9% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 50% | 25% | 15% | 8% | 2% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 57% | 20% | 13% | 8% | 2% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 57% | 16% | 5% | 14% | 9% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 56% | 22% | 15% | 7% | 1% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 52% | 24% | 13% | 9% | 3% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 58% | 24% | 18% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 61% | 18% | 10% | 2% | 9% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 55% | 22% | 13% | 7% | 2% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 49% | 23% | 17% | 11% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 13% | 61% | 16% | 10% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Enhancing highway safety for all users | | | | | Base | n= |
|--|-------------------------|--|-----|-----|-----|----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 53% | 26% | 8% | 8% | 5% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 55% | 20% | 15% | 7% | 2% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 50% | 29% | 13% | 7% | 0% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 37% | 30% | 5% | 22% | 6% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 44% | 29% | 9% | 16% | 2% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 56% | 21% | 16% | 5% | 2% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 44% | 23% | 15% | 11% | 7% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 55% | 19% | 16% | 9% | 1% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 58% | 24% | 12% | 6% | 0% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 61% | 19% | 15% | 4% | 1% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 48% | 27% | 12% | 11% | 3% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 46% | 14% | 26% | 14% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 55% | 22% | 14% | 8% | 2% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 50% | 16% | 23% | 7% | 5% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 30% | 52% | 0% | 18% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Enhancing highway safety for all users | | | | | Base | n= |
|------------------------------------|--|--|-----|-----|----|----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 53% | 20% | 15% | 9% | 2% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 57% | 23% | 13% | 7% | 1% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 46% | 28% | 19% | 6% | 1% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 49% | 28% | 8% | 9% | 7% | 5.5% | 28 |

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Ensuring reliable travel | | | | | Base | n= |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| TOTAL | | 18% | 31% | 19% | 17% | 15% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 17% | 30% | 19% | 16% | 18% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 21% | 34% | 17% | 19% | 9% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 18% | 33% | 21% | 17% | 12% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 14% | 32% | 21% | 18% | 14% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 24% | 37% | 17% | 9% | 12% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 17% | 25% | 27% | 18% | 13% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 21% | 30% | 19% | 14% | 16% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 13% | 28% | 15% | 23% | 21% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 20% | 35% | 17% | 15% | 13% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 16% | 27% | 22% | 18% | 17% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 19% | 33% | 16% | 17% | 14% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 17% | 30% | 21% | 16% | 15% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 17% | 33% | 10% | 13% | 28% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 17% | 31% | 22% | 15% | 15% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 19% | 32% | 17% | 18% | 14% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 33% | 24% | 33% | 10% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 18% | 40% | 5% | 30% | 7% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 16% | 31% | 20% | 17% | 16% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 23% | 35% | 21% | 11% | 10% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 74% | 6% | 7% | 13% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Ensuring reliable travel | | | | | Base | n= |
|--|-------------------------|--------------------------|-----|------|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 26% | 40% | 10% | 16% | 9% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 19% | 30% | 18% | 18% | 15% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 11% | 38% | 28% | 9% | 15% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 22% | 15% | 18% | 25% | 20% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 14% | 20% | 21% | 20% | 24% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 20% | 35% | 18% | 16% | 12% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 61% | 39% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 24% | 29% | 18% | 14% | 14% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 16% | 29% | 19% | 22% | 13% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 17% | 34% | 19% | 14% | 16% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 16% | 37% | 15% | 17% | 15% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 20% | 25% | 24% | 17% | 14% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 14% | 33% | 15% | 14% | 24% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 18% | 31% | 20% | 16% | 15% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 18% | 51% | 7% | 16% | 8% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 21% | 20% | 0% | 22% | 36% | 2.7% | 14 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Ensuring reliable travel | | | | | Base | n= |
|------------------------------------|--|--------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 12% | 29% | 16% | 21% | 22% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 21% | 34% | 21% | 14% | 10% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 27% | 35% | 20% | 11% | 7% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 30% | 24% | 25% | 11% | 9% | 5.5% | 28 |

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Creating separated bike and pedestrian pathways | | | | | Base | n= |
|-----------------------------|------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| TOTAL | | 12% | 17% | 19% | 21% | 30% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 13% | 17% | 19% | 20% | 31% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 11% | 16% | 22% | 20% | 30% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 11% | 18% | 20% | 24% | 28% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 13% | 15% | 17% | 19% | 37% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 8% | 14% | 11% | 27% | 40% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 17% | 18% | 28% | 22% | 15% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 13% | 16% | 25% | 9% | 36% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 13% | 25% | 22% | 24% | 15% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 12% | 15% | 20% | 22% | 31% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 12% | 20% | 18% | 20% | 30% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 14% | 12% | 19% | 19% | 36% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 11% | 20% | 20% | 22% | 27% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 16% | 14% | 37% | 31% | 2% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 12% | 19% | 18% | 23% | 29% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 13% | 15% | 20% | 18% | 35% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 33% | 0% | 55% | 12% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 15% | 22% | 21% | 14% | 28% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 13% | 18% | 20% | 22% | 27% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 9% | 10% | 13% | 22% | 47% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 7% | 23% | 53% | 0% | 16% | 1.6% | 8 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Creating separated bike and pedestrian pathways | | | | | Base | n= |
|--|-------------------------|---|-----|-----|-----|------|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 6% | 14% | 26% | 20% | 33% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 12% | 20% | 19% | 21% | 27% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 16% | 5% | 14% | 19% | 45% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 5% | 6% | 41% | 23% | 25% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 25% | 23% | 17% | 15% | 20% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 8% | 15% | 21% | 23% | 33% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 10% | 0% | 40% | 51% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 11% | 17% | 20% | 19% | 34% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 15% | 21% | 16% | 19% | 29% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 11% | 14% | 22% | 24% | 30% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 10% | 16% | 26% | 22% | 26% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 15% | 18% | 13% | 19% | 35% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 6% | 21% | 18% | 29% | 27% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 12% | 18% | 19% | 21% | 30% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 13% | 8% | 15% | 17% | 47% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 26% | 10% | 46% | 18% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Creating separated bike and pedestrian pathways | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Base | n= |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 17% | 22% | 21% | 20% | 21% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 8% | 12% | 21% | 20% | 39% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 11% | 17% | 12% | 25% | 34% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 10% | 16% | 13% | 31% | 30% | 5.5% | 28 |

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Minimizing environmental impacts | | | | | Base | n= |
|-----------------------------|------------------|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| TOTAL | | 8% | 13% | 17% | 27% | 35% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 10% | 14% | 19% | 26% | 31% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 8% | 13% | 16% | 25% | 38% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 5% | 11% | 11% | 29% | 44% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 13% | 17% | 21% | 24% | 25% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 10% | 10% | 18% | 30% | 32% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 8% | 18% | 8% | 14% | 53% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 3% | 18% | 14% | 34% | 32% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 5% | 7% | 15% | 29% | 44% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 5% | 13% | 16% | 27% | 39% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 11% | 14% | 17% | 27% | 30% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 10% | 15% | 16% | 24% | 35% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 7% | 13% | 17% | 28% | 35% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 10% | 4% | 19% | 25% | 42% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 7% | 12% | 17% | 28% | 36% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 9% | 16% | 17% | 26% | 33% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 18% | 0% | 12% | 70% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 0% | 3% | 16% | 38% | 43% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 8% | 13% | 16% | 28% | 35% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 11% | 18% | 22% | 18% | 31% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 6% | 33% | 62% | 1.6% | 8 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Minimizing environmental impacts | | | | | Base | n= |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------------------|------|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 5% | 9% | 36% | 25% | 25% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 6% | 15% | 14% | 26% | 38% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 14% | 9% | 19% | 33% | 24% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 36% | 8% | 8% | 6% | 41% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 12% | 16% | 27% | 18% | 27% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 7% | 12% | 13% | 30% | 38% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 30% | 17% | 17% | 36% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 14% | 9% | 15% | 28% | 34% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 7% | 18% | 14% | 28% | 33% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 6% | 12% | 19% | 25% | 37% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 5% | 14% | 14% | 28% | 39% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 11% | 12% | 19% | 26% | 32% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 12% | 18% | 17% | 23% | 31% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 8% | 14% | 16% | 26% | 36% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 17% | 10% | 15% | 41% | 17% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 12% | 13% | 23% | 0% | 52% | 2.7% | 14 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Minimizing environmental impacts | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Base | n= |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 9% | 13% | 17% | 23% | 37% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 8% | 14% | 17% | 29% | 31% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 7% | 7% | 12% | 31% | 44% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 3% | 20% | 14% | 28% | 36% | 5.5% | 28 |

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Improved scenic and recreational pull-offs | | | | | Base | n= |
|-----------------------------|------------------|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|--------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| TOTAL | | 8% | 16% | 31% | 28% | 18% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 7% | 14% | 30% | 30% | 18% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 11% | 15% | 26% | 26% | 21% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 6% | 20% | 35% | 24% | 15% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 4% | 13% | 29% | 32% | 22% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 7% | 12% | 42% | 25% | 14% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 6% | 16% | 26% | 33% | 19% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 9% | 8% | 29% | 39% | 15% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 13% | 26% | 27% | 16% | 18% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 8% | 14% | 36% | 29% | 13% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 7% | 18% | 27% | 26% | 23% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 8% | 15% | 33% | 32% | 12% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 8% | 16% | 29% | 25% | 21% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 0% | 34% | 30% | 18% | 19% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 8% | 16% | 29% | 27% | 20% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 7% | 14% | 33% | 30% | 16% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 9% | 0% | 49% | 23% | 18% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 6% | 16% | 48% | 16% | 14% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 8% | 16% | 31% | 26% | 19% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 8% | 14% | 28% | 38% | 12% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 6% | 10% | 18% | 44% | 22% | 1.6% | 8 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Improved scenic and recreational pull-offs | | | | | Base | n= |
|--|-------------------------|--|-----|-----|------|-----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | | |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 9% | 11% | 21% | 31% | 28% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 7% | 15% | 33% | 27% | 17% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 8% | 18% | 25% | 32% | 16% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 42% | 28% | 22% | 8% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 5% | 13% | 26% | 31% | 25% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 9% | 17% | 33% | 26% | 15% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 44% | 43% | 13% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 7% | 21% | 32% | 29% | 11% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 6% | 12% | 35% | 22% | 25% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 9% | 16% | 28% | 31% | 16% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 7% | 14% | 31% | 29% | 19% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 6% | 17% | 32% | 28% | 17% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 22% | 14% | 25% | 20% | 18% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 8% | 16% | 30% | 28% | 18% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 2% | 15% | 41% | 19% | 24% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 10% | 4% | 32% | 42% | 12% | 2.7% | 14 |

(question continued on next page)

14) Next I'm going to read a list of broad goals for the project. Please rank them in terms of what you think is most important...

| | | Improved scenic and recreational pull-offs | | | | | | |
|------------------------------------|--|--|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|-----|
| | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | Base | n= |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 9% | 16% | 31% | 27% | 18% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 6% | 17% | 28% | 30% | 19% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 9% | 13% | 38% | 27% | 14% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 9% | 12% | 40% | 22% | 18% | 5.5% | 28 |

15) Part of the project proposal is to add a separated non-motorized pathway to connect Anchorage to the Bird to Gird trail. How often would you anticipate that you would use the non-motorized pathway?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------|------------|--------------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Frequent/Occasional | Rarely/Never | Unsure | Frequently | Occasionally | Rarely | Never | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 25% | 73% | 1% | 6% | 19% | 31% | 42% | 1% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 35% | 63% | 2% | 10% | 25% | 35% | 27% | 2% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 4% | 95% | 1% | 0% | 4% | 25% | 70% | 1% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 15% | 85% | 0% | 1% | 14% | 25% | 60% | 0% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 35% | 62% | 4% | 10% | 24% | 34% | 27% | 4% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 30% | 69% | 1% | 6% | 24% | 32% | 36% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 22% | 78% | 0% | 0% | 22% | 33% | 45% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 25% | 74% | 1% | 9% | 16% | 35% | 39% | 1% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 10% | 90% | 0% | 4% | 5% | 24% | 67% | 0% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 21% | 79% | 0% | 5% | 17% | 28% | 50% | 0% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 29% | 69% | 3% | 8% | 21% | 34% | 35% | 3% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 35% | 64% | 1% | 12% | 23% | 30% | 34% | 1% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 19% | 80% | 2% | 3% | 16% | 31% | 48% | 2% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 21% | 79% | 0% | 0% | 21% | 27% | 52% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 20% | 78% | 2% | 3% | 17% | 38% | 40% | 2% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 31% | 67% | 1% | 10% | 21% | 24% | 43% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 86% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 7% | 93% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 26% | 67% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 26% | 73% | 1% | 7% | 19% | 32% | 40% | 1% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 23% | 73% | 4% | 5% | 19% | 29% | 44% | 4% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 32% | 68% | 0% | 0% | 32% | 0% | 68% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 28% | 72% | 0% | 14% | 14% | 21% | 51% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 21% | 77% | 1% | 5% | 16% | 32% | 45% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 42% | 55% | 3% | 8% | 34% | 29% | 25% | 3% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 20% | 72% | 8% | 0% | 20% | 37% | 35% | 8% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

15) Part of the project proposal is to add a separated non-motorized pathway to connect Anchorage to the Bird to Gird trail. How often would you anticipate that you would use the non-motorized pathway?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | |
|--|--|---------------------|--------------|--------|------------|--------------|--------|-------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Frequent/Occasional | Rarely/Never | Unsure | Frequently | Occasionally | Rarely | Never | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 15% | 83% | 2% | 2% | 13% | 31% | 52% | 2% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 28% | 72% | 1% | 5% | 23% | 35% | 37% | 1% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 28% | 70% | 2% | 9% | 19% | 28% | 42% | 2% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 23% | 76% | 1% | 5% | 18% | 34% | 42% | 1% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 27% | 71% | 1% | 6% | 21% | 29% | 42% | 1% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 27% | 67% | 6% | 18% | 9% | 22% | 45% | 6% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 25% | 73% | 2% | 6% | 19% | 34% | 39% | 2% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 17% | 83% | 0% | 11% | 6% | 4% | 79% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 37% | 63% | 0% | 0% | 37% | 0% | 63% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 36% | 63% | 1% | 10% | 26% | 34% | 30% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 19% | 80% | 1% | 4% | 15% | 33% | 47% | 1% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 1% | 99% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 17% | 81% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 37% | 53% | 10% | 9% | 28% | 19% | 33% | 10% | 5.5% | 28 |

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

16) Rock and ice fall mitigation

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 74% | 14% | 11% | 1% | 53% | 21% | 14% | 5% | 6% | 1% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 75% | 14% | 9% | 1% | 54% | 21% | 14% | 4% | 6% | 1% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 68% | 11% | 20% | 1% | 49% | 19% | 11% | 10% | 10% | 1% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 74% | 15% | 9% | 2% | 52% | 22% | 15% | 5% | 4% | 2% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 78% | 18% | 3% | 0% | 49% | 29% | 18% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 73% | 14% | 12% | 1% | 49% | 24% | 14% | 8% | 3% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 76% | 17% | 7% | 0% | 64% | 12% | 17% | 5% | 2% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 71% | 13% | 14% | 3% | 51% | 20% | 13% | 6% | 8% | 3% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 68% | 9% | 19% | 4% | 51% | 17% | 9% | 3% | 17% | 4% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 69% | 17% | 13% | 2% | 44% | 24% | 17% | 5% | 8% | 2% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 78% | 12% | 9% | 1% | 62% | 17% | 12% | 5% | 4% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 75% | 15% | 10% | 0% | 50% | 24% | 15% | 7% | 4% | 0% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 73% | 14% | 11% | 2% | 54% | 19% | 14% | 4% | 7% | 2% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 82% | 8% | 7% | 3% | 43% | 39% | 8% | 5% | 2% | 3% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 76% | 13% | 10% | 1% | 57% | 19% | 13% | 5% | 5% | 1% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 71% | 16% | 12% | 1% | 49% | 22% | 16% | 6% | 7% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 55% | 27% | 18% | 0% | 45% | 10% | 27% | 0% | 18% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 84% | 3% | 13% | 0% | 49% | 35% | 3% | 6% | 8% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 73% | 14% | 11% | 2% | 53% | 21% | 14% | 5% | 6% | 2% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 72% | 17% | 11% | 0% | 52% | 20% | 17% | 6% | 5% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 71% | 10% | 19% | 0% | 64% | 7% | 10% | 7% | 11% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 67% | 12% | 21% | 0% | 53% | 14% | 12% | 6% | 15% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 74% | 13% | 12% | 1% | 53% | 20% | 13% | 6% | 6% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 76% | 20% | 3% | 1% | 52% | 24% | 20% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 67% | 29% | 4% | 0% | 28% | 39% | 29% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 78% | 10% | 9% | 2% | 55% | 23% | 10% | 7% | 2% | 2% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 72% | 15% | 12% | 1% | 52% | 20% | 15% | 4% | 7% | 1% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 73% | 27% | 0% | 0% | 43% | 30% | 27% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

16) Rock and ice fall mitigation

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 64% | 21% | 14% | 1% | 47% | 17% | 21% | 6% | 8% | 1% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 74% | 15% | 8% | 3% | 54% | 21% | 15% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 77% | 11% | 11% | 1% | 54% | 23% | 11% | 4% | 7% | 1% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 77% | 11% | 10% | 2% | 58% | 19% | 11% | 3% | 7% | 2% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 69% | 17% | 13% | 1% | 47% | 22% | 17% | 7% | 5% | 1% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 82% | 16% | 2% | 0% | 55% | 27% | 16% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 75% | 14% | 11% | 1% | 54% | 21% | 14% | 5% | 6% | 1% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 55% | 24% | 22% | 0% | 29% | 25% | 24% | 10% | 12% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 81% | 5% | 0% | 14% | 67% | 13% | 5% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 78% | 10% | 11% | 0% | 54% | 24% | 10% | 6% | 5% | 0% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 72% | 16% | 11% | 2% | 53% | 19% | 16% | 5% | 6% | 2% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 67% | 21% | 12% | 0% | 48% | 19% | 21% | 3% | 9% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 61% | 22% | 9% | 8% | 44% | 17% | 22% | 3% | 7% | 8% | 5.5% | 28 |

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

17) Additional passing lanes

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 70% | 15% | 14% | 1% | 49% | 21% | 15% | 5% | 9% | 1% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 70% | 16% | 13% | 1% | 47% | 23% | 16% | 5% | 8% | 1% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 57% | 17% | 24% | 2% | 39% | 19% | 17% | 9% | 15% | 2% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 78% | 11% | 8% | 2% | 61% | 18% | 11% | 3% | 5% | 2% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 74% | 16% | 9% | 1% | 50% | 24% | 16% | 4% | 5% | 1% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 70% | 13% | 16% | 1% | 50% | 19% | 13% | 6% | 10% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 64% | 21% | 14% | 1% | 41% | 23% | 21% | 4% | 10% | 1% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 72% | 14% | 13% | 1% | 45% | 27% | 14% | 4% | 8% | 1% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 69% | 11% | 18% | 2% | 54% | 16% | 11% | 6% | 12% | 2% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 73% | 13% | 13% | 0% | 49% | 24% | 13% | 4% | 9% | 0% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 67% | 17% | 14% | 2% | 49% | 18% | 17% | 6% | 8% | 2% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 69% | 13% | 17% | 1% | 47% | 22% | 13% | 7% | 10% | 1% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 71% | 16% | 12% | 2% | 50% | 21% | 16% | 4% | 8% | 2% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 77% | 16% | 7% | 0% | 55% | 23% | 16% | 2% | 5% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 73% | 17% | 8% | 2% | 51% | 22% | 17% | 2% | 7% | 2% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 66% | 13% | 20% | 1% | 47% | 20% | 13% | 9% | 11% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 76% | 24% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 65% | 9% | 26% | 0% | 47% | 18% | 9% | 15% | 11% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 70% | 15% | 13% | 2% | 50% | 20% | 15% | 5% | 9% | 2% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 75% | 14% | 11% | 0% | 50% | 25% | 14% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 71% | 7% | 21% | 0% | 7% | 64% | 7% | 0% | 21% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 65% | 20% | 10% | 4% | 52% | 13% | 20% | 1% | 9% | 4% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 72% | 13% | 14% | 1% | 51% | 22% | 13% | 6% | 8% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 63% | 20% | 16% | 2% | 41% | 22% | 20% | 4% | 12% | 2% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 75% | 16% | 8% | 0% | 49% | 27% | 16% | 0% | 8% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 66% | 10% | 22% | 2% | 44% | 22% | 10% | 8% | 14% | 2% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 72% | 16% | 11% | 1% | 51% | 21% | 16% | 4% | 7% | 1% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 83% | 17% | 0% | 0% | 53% | 30% | 17% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

17) Additional passing lanes

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|------|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|------|-----|--------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 63% | 17% | 19% | 1% | 46% | 17% | 17% | 6% | 14% | 1% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 69% | 17% | 13% | 2% | 44% | 26% | 17% | 6% | 7% | 2% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 75% | 12% | 12% | 1% | 55% | 20% | 12% | 4% | 7% | 1% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 77% | 11% | 10% | 1% | 53% | 24% | 11% | 6% | 5% | 1% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 67% | 15% | 17% | 1% | 47% | 20% | 15% | 5% | 12% | 1% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 49% | 36% | 16% | 0% | 40% | 8% | 36% | 4% | 12% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 72% | 15% | 12% | 1% | 50% | 22% | 15% | 5% | 7% | 1% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 54% | 15% | 31% | 0% | 38% | 15% | 15% | 10% | 21% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 55% | 0% | 45% | 0% | 47% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 45% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 65% | 16% | 18% | 1% | 45% | 20% | 16% | 9% | 8% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 78% | 13% | 9% | 1% | 52% | 25% | 13% | 2% | 7% | 1% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 62% | 21% | 16% | 0% | 50% | 13% | 21% | 2% | 14% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 76% | 7% | 13% | 3% | 59% | 17% | 7% | 2% | 11% | 3% | 5.5% | 28 |

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

18) Widening the highway to four lanes

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 66% | 16% | 17% | 1% | 48% | 19% | 16% | 5% | 11% | 1% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 64% | 18% | 16% | 1% | 44% | 20% | 18% | 5% | 12% | 1% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 55% | 18% | 27% | 1% | 39% | 15% | 18% | 14% | 13% | 1% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 77% | 11% | 12% | 0% | 60% | 17% | 11% | 2% | 10% | 0% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 63% | 20% | 16% | 1% | 42% | 20% | 20% | 7% | 9% | 1% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 66% | 15% | 17% | 1% | 52% | 14% | 15% | 5% | 12% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 69% | 16% | 16% | 0% | 51% | 18% | 16% | 2% | 14% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 71% | 13% | 16% | 0% | 42% | 29% | 13% | 6% | 10% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 66% | 18% | 15% | 1% | 51% | 15% | 18% | 3% | 12% | 1% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 66% | 18% | 16% | 0% | 47% | 20% | 18% | 6% | 10% | 0% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 66% | 15% | 18% | 1% | 49% | 17% | 15% | 5% | 13% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 61% | 19% | 19% | 1% | 40% | 21% | 19% | 5% | 14% | 1% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 70% | 15% | 15% | 0% | 53% | 17% | 15% | 5% | 10% | 0% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 78% | 11% | 12% | 0% | 62% | 16% | 11% | 4% | 8% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 72% | 14% | 14% | 0% | 54% | 18% | 14% | 5% | 9% | 0% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 59% | 20% | 20% | 1% | 40% | 19% | 20% | 6% | 14% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 72% | 0% | 18% | 10% | 48% | 24% | 0% | 18% | 0% | 10% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 51% | 29% | 20% | 0% | 40% | 11% | 29% | 13% | 7% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 69% | 15% | 16% | 0% | 50% | 18% | 15% | 5% | 11% | 0% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 59% | 21% | 19% | 1% | 39% | 20% | 21% | 5% | 13% | 1% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 56% | 14% | 23% | 7% | 23% | 32% | 14% | 0% | 23% | 7% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 69% | 16% | 15% | 0% | 56% | 13% | 16% | 11% | 4% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 66% | 17% | 16% | 0% | 48% | 19% | 17% | 5% | 11% | 0% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 61% | 15% | 23% | 1% | 43% | 18% | 15% | 5% | 18% | 1% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 82% | 0% | 12% | 6% | 47% | 34% | 0% | 12% | 0% | 6% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 59% | 16% | 23% | 1% | 42% | 18% | 16% | 5% | 18% | 1% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 68% | 17% | 14% | 0% | 50% | 19% | 17% | 6% | 9% | 0% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 66% | 17% | 17% | 0% | 44% | 22% | 17% | 0% | 17% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

18) Widening the highway to four lanes

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 62% | 20% | 17% | 1% | 39% | 23% | 20% | 2% | 15% | 1% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 56% | 27% | 16% | 1% | 31% | 25% | 27% | 9% | 8% | 1% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 76% | 8% | 17% | 0% | 64% | 12% | 8% | 5% | 12% | 0% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 76% | 14% | 11% | 0% | 57% | 18% | 14% | 4% | 7% | 0% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 60% | 17% | 22% | 1% | 40% | 20% | 17% | 7% | 15% | 1% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 41% | 35% | 22% | 2% | 30% | 11% | 35% | 6% | 16% | 2% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 69% | 17% | 14% | 1% | 49% | 19% | 17% | 5% | 9% | 1% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 38% | 12% | 50% | 0% | 22% | 17% | 12% | 16% | 34% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 48% | 8% | 44% | 0% | 48% | 0% | 8% | 0% | 44% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 61% | 19% | 19% | 1% | 41% | 20% | 19% | 6% | 13% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 71% | 15% | 13% | 0% | 54% | 17% | 15% | 6% | 8% | 0% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 62% | 9% | 27% | 1% | 48% | 14% | 9% | 7% | 21% | 1% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 77% | 16% | 4% | 3% | 53% | 24% | 16% | 0% | 4% | 3% | 5.5% | 28 |

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

19) Widening shoulders

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 70% | 16% | 13% | 1% | 43% | 27% | 16% | 8% | 5% | 1% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 73% | 15% | 12% | 1% | 44% | 28% | 15% | 8% | 3% | 1% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 56% | 22% | 22% | 0% | 34% | 22% | 22% | 9% | 12% | 0% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 73% | 17% | 11% | 0% | 46% | 26% | 17% | 6% | 4% | 0% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 74% | 13% | 12% | 1% | 39% | 35% | 13% | 7% | 5% | 1% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 76% | 14% | 8% | 2% | 49% | 27% | 14% | 6% | 2% | 2% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 62% | 27% | 12% | 0% | 41% | 21% | 27% | 9% | 3% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 59% | 24% | 17% | 0% | 31% | 28% | 24% | 8% | 9% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 72% | 13% | 15% | 0% | 50% | 22% | 13% | 10% | 5% | 0% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 66% | 17% | 17% | 0% | 36% | 30% | 17% | 10% | 7% | 0% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 74% | 16% | 9% | 1% | 51% | 23% | 16% | 6% | 3% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 71% | 13% | 15% | 1% | 43% | 27% | 13% | 10% | 5% | 1% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 70% | 18% | 12% | 0% | 43% | 27% | 18% | 7% | 5% | 0% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 61% | 12% | 28% | 0% | 41% | 19% | 12% | 20% | 7% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 77% | 16% | 7% | 0% | 48% | 29% | 16% | 4% | 3% | 0% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 64% | 17% | 18% | 1% | 38% | 26% | 17% | 11% | 7% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 67% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 48% | 19% | 33% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 56% | 19% | 26% | 0% | 30% | 26% | 19% | 18% | 7% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 72% | 16% | 12% | 1% | 44% | 28% | 16% | 7% | 5% | 1% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 68% | 18% | 14% | 0% | 44% | 25% | 18% | 8% | 5% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 57% | 18% | 25% | 0% | 32% | 25% | 18% | 19% | 6% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 60% | 18% | 22% | 0% | 43% | 17% | 18% | 9% | 13% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 70% | 17% | 12% | 1% | 44% | 26% | 17% | 8% | 4% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 76% | 12% | 11% | 2% | 40% | 36% | 12% | 7% | 4% | 2% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 64% | 8% | 28% | 0% | 49% | 15% | 8% | 20% | 8% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 69% | 15% | 16% | 1% | 44% | 24% | 15% | 10% | 6% | 1% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 70% | 17% | 12% | 1% | 43% | 28% | 17% | 7% | 5% | 1% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 78% | 22% | 0% | 0% | 51% | 27% | 22% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

19) Widening shoulders

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 54% | 20% | 25% | 1% | 32% | 21% | 20% | 16% | 9% | 1% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 67% | 22% | 10% | 1% | 40% | 28% | 22% | 7% | 3% | 1% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 79% | 11% | 9% | 0% | 50% | 29% | 11% | 5% | 4% | 0% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 82% | 9% | 9% | 0% | 53% | 30% | 9% | 7% | 2% | 0% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 57% | 24% | 18% | 1% | 32% | 24% | 24% | 10% | 8% | 1% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 78% | 17% | 3% | 2% | 53% | 25% | 17% | 0% | 3% | 2% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 73% | 16% | 11% | 1% | 45% | 28% | 16% | 7% | 4% | 1% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 46% | 30% | 24% | 0% | 22% | 24% | 30% | 14% | 11% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 40% | 0% | 55% | 5% | 35% | 5% | 0% | 26% | 28% | 5% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 69% | 15% | 15% | 1% | 41% | 29% | 15% | 10% | 5% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 72% | 18% | 10% | 1% | 46% | 25% | 18% | 5% | 6% | 1% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 67% | 17% | 15% | 0% | 36% | 31% | 17% | 12% | 3% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 72% | 16% | 12% | 0% | 53% | 19% | 16% | 12% | 0% | 0% | 5.5% | 28 |

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

20) Dividing sections of the highway with concrete barriers

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 44% | 24% | 29% | 3% | 24% | 21% | 24% | 12% | 16% | 3% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 46% | 24% | 26% | 4% | 25% | 21% | 24% | 12% | 14% | 4% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 40% | 16% | 42% | 2% | 17% | 23% | 16% | 18% | 24% | 2% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 44% | 27% | 25% | 4% | 25% | 19% | 27% | 10% | 16% | 4% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 45% | 24% | 27% | 5% | 20% | 24% | 24% | 11% | 16% | 5% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 51% | 19% | 24% | 6% | 29% | 22% | 19% | 14% | 10% | 6% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 45% | 19% | 34% | 1% | 19% | 27% | 19% | 9% | 25% | 1% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 32% | 31% | 35% | 1% | 18% | 14% | 31% | 16% | 20% | 1% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 43% | 29% | 28% | 1% | 26% | 17% | 29% | 13% | 15% | 1% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 49% | 21% | 29% | 1% | 25% | 24% | 21% | 12% | 17% | 1% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 40% | 26% | 28% | 6% | 23% | 17% | 26% | 12% | 16% | 6% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 41% | 23% | 32% | 4% | 24% | 16% | 23% | 12% | 19% | 4% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 47% | 24% | 26% | 3% | 24% | 24% | 24% | 12% | 14% | 3% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 37% | 43% | 20% | 0% | 22% | 15% | 43% | 8% | 11% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 48% | 24% | 25% | 4% | 24% | 24% | 24% | 12% | 14% | 4% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 42% | 22% | 32% | 3% | 24% | 18% | 22% | 12% | 20% | 3% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 12% | 23% | 55% | 10% | 12% | 0% | 23% | 55% | 0% | 10% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 52% | 10% | 39% | 0% | 46% | 6% | 10% | 2% | 37% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 45% | 25% | 27% | 3% | 23% | 22% | 25% | 12% | 14% | 3% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 42% | 21% | 34% | 3% | 25% | 17% | 21% | 14% | 20% | 3% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 46% | 7% | 39% | 7% | 6% | 41% | 7% | 24% | 15% | 7% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 40% | 29% | 31% | 0% | 30% | 10% | 29% | 15% | 16% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 45% | 24% | 27% | 3% | 24% | 21% | 24% | 12% | 15% | 3% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 45% | 16% | 34% | 5% | 25% | 19% | 16% | 11% | 24% | 5% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 36% | 30% | 27% | 6% | 0% | 36% | 30% | 19% | 8% | 6% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 42% | 24% | 28% | 6% | 21% | 22% | 24% | 17% | 10% | 6% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 45% | 24% | 29% | 2% | 24% | 20% | 24% | 11% | 19% | 2% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 70% | 13% | 0% | 17% | 44% | 27% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 17% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

20) Dividing sections of the highway with concrete barriers

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|------|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 40% | 25% | 34% | 2% | 17% | 23% | 25% | 14% | 20% | 2% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 37% | 25% | 34% | 4% | 15% | 22% | 25% | 15% | 19% | 4% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 51% | 23% | 22% | 4% | 33% | 18% | 23% | 10% | 12% | 4% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 50% | 25% | 21% | 3% | 31% | 19% | 25% | 8% | 14% | 3% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 38% | 23% | 35% | 4% | 19% | 19% | 23% | 17% | 18% | 4% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 47% | 15% | 33% | 5% | 8% | 39% | 15% | 16% | 17% | 5% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 45% | 24% | 27% | 3% | 24% | 21% | 24% | 12% | 15% | 3% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 35% | 8% | 54% | 2% | 23% | 13% | 8% | 17% | 37% | 2% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 34% | 33% | 21% | 12% | 7% | 27% | 33% | 13% | 8% | 12% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 45% | 29% | 22% | 4% | 25% | 20% | 29% | 9% | 13% | 4% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 44% | 18% | 35% | 3% | 23% | 22% | 18% | 17% | 18% | 3% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 44% | 24% | 30% | 2% | 25% | 19% | 24% | 7% | 23% | 2% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 42% | 25% | 26% | 7% | 24% | 18% | 25% | 10% | 16% | 7% | 5.5% | 28 |

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

21) Creating a paved bike and pedestrian pathway

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 40% | 23% | 36% | 0% | 23% | 18% | 23% | 19% | 18% | 0% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 47% | 20% | 33% | 0% | 28% | 19% | 20% | 20% | 14% | 0% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 39% | 22% | 38% | 1% | 15% | 23% | 22% | 18% | 19% | 1% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 28% | 30% | 42% | 0% | 16% | 12% | 30% | 18% | 25% | 0% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 41% | 16% | 43% | 0% | 22% | 19% | 16% | 24% | 19% | 0% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 34% | 28% | 38% | 1% | 16% | 17% | 28% | 22% | 15% | 1% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 48% | 21% | 30% | 0% | 28% | 20% | 21% | 11% | 20% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 38% | 25% | 36% | 0% | 22% | 16% | 25% | 21% | 16% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 44% | 25% | 32% | 0% | 27% | 17% | 25% | 14% | 18% | 0% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 32% | 27% | 41% | 1% | 18% | 14% | 27% | 18% | 22% | 1% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 49% | 19% | 32% | 0% | 27% | 22% | 19% | 20% | 13% | 0% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 40% | 21% | 39% | 0% | 24% | 16% | 21% | 20% | 19% | 0% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 41% | 24% | 35% | 1% | 21% | 19% | 24% | 18% | 17% | 1% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 44% | 39% | 17% | 0% | 21% | 23% | 39% | 8% | 10% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 45% | 20% | 35% | 0% | 24% | 21% | 20% | 20% | 14% | 0% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 37% | 23% | 40% | 0% | 22% | 15% | 23% | 18% | 22% | 0% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 10% | 60% | 30% | 0% | 0% | 10% | 60% | 18% | 12% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 41% | 24% | 35% | 0% | 37% | 4% | 24% | 10% | 25% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 42% | 22% | 36% | 0% | 24% | 19% | 22% | 20% | 16% | 0% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 33% | 26% | 40% | 1% | 15% | 18% | 26% | 17% | 22% | 1% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 28% | 41% | 31% | 0% | 13% | 15% | 41% | 7% | 24% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 34% | 11% | 52% | 3% | 25% | 9% | 11% | 25% | 27% | 3% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 42% | 23% | 35% | 0% | 24% | 18% | 23% | 18% | 17% | 0% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 41% | 24% | 35% | 0% | 18% | 23% | 24% | 19% | 16% | 0% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 8% | 31% | 55% | 6% | 8% | 0% | 31% | 29% | 26% | 6% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 66% | 17% | 17% | 1% | 41% | 25% | 17% | 7% | 9% | 1% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 32% | 24% | 43% | 0% | 16% | 15% | 24% | 23% | 21% | 0% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 34% | 36% | 30% | 0% | 17% | 17% | 36% | 30% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

21) Creating a paved bike and pedestrian pathway

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 30% | 27% | 43% | 1% | 15% | 15% | 27% | 21% | 22% | 1% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 50% | 23% | 27% | 0% | 22% | 27% | 23% | 15% | 12% | 0% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 39% | 21% | 40% | 0% | 26% | 12% | 21% | 21% | 19% | 0% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 43% | 24% | 33% | 0% | 28% | 15% | 24% | 20% | 14% | 0% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 38% | 21% | 40% | 0% | 18% | 21% | 21% | 18% | 22% | 0% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 40% | 25% | 33% | 2% | 22% | 18% | 25% | 15% | 18% | 2% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 41% | 23% | 35% | 0% | 23% | 18% | 23% | 19% | 16% | 0% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 29% | 16% | 55% | 0% | 20% | 8% | 16% | 17% | 38% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 42% | 12% | 39% | 7% | 18% | 24% | 12% | 10% | 29% | 7% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 56% | 24% | 19% | 0% | 32% | 24% | 24% | 13% | 6% | 0% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 31% | 22% | 47% | 0% | 16% | 15% | 22% | 24% | 23% | 0% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 17% | 22% | 61% | 0% | 10% | 7% | 22% | 18% | 43% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 34% | 23% | 40% | 3% | 22% | 12% | 23% | 24% | 16% | 3% | 5.5% | 28 |

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

22) Improved scenic and recreational pull-offs

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 41% | 34% | 25% | 0% | 18% | 23% | 34% | 16% | 9% | 0% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 44% | 33% | 23% | 0% | 20% | 23% | 33% | 17% | 6% | 0% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 39% | 30% | 32% | 0% | 13% | 26% | 30% | 15% | 17% | 0% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 36% | 39% | 24% | 0% | 15% | 21% | 39% | 14% | 10% | 0% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 34% | 37% | 27% | 1% | 15% | 20% | 37% | 18% | 9% | 1% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 48% | 31% | 20% | 0% | 18% | 30% | 31% | 14% | 6% | 0% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 42% | 26% | 31% | 0% | 24% | 19% | 26% | 15% | 17% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 44% | 42% | 13% | 0% | 18% | 26% | 42% | 7% | 7% | 0% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 36% | 30% | 33% | 0% | 17% | 19% | 30% | 24% | 9% | 0% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 34% | 36% | 30% | 0% | 16% | 18% | 36% | 18% | 12% | 0% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 48% | 33% | 19% | 1% | 19% | 28% | 33% | 14% | 5% | 1% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 43% | 31% | 26% | 1% | 20% | 23% | 31% | 14% | 12% | 1% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 39% | 36% | 24% | 0% | 16% | 23% | 36% | 18% | 7% | 0% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 29% | 20% | 51% | 0% | 4% | 26% | 20% | 39% | 12% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 43% | 35% | 22% | 0% | 21% | 23% | 35% | 16% | 5% | 0% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 38% | 34% | 27% | 1% | 16% | 22% | 34% | 14% | 12% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 74% | 14% | 12% | 0% | 10% | 64% | 14% | 12% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 13% | 42% | 44% | 0% | 0% | 13% | 42% | 22% | 22% | 0% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 42% | 34% | 24% | 0% | 18% | 24% | 34% | 16% | 8% | 0% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 43% | 33% | 24% | 0% | 22% | 21% | 33% | 14% | 9% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 40% | 31% | 29% | 0% | 15% | 25% | 31% | 0% | 29% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 28% | 34% | 38% | 0% | 12% | 16% | 34% | 28% | 9% | 0% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 41% | 34% | 24% | 0% | 17% | 24% | 34% | 16% | 8% | 0% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 47% | 31% | 22% | 0% | 23% | 24% | 31% | 12% | 10% | 0% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 35% | 36% | 29% | 0% | 16% | 18% | 36% | 20% | 8% | 0% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 50% | 31% | 18% | 0% | 22% | 28% | 31% | 14% | 4% | 0% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 37% | 35% | 28% | 0% | 16% | 21% | 35% | 17% | 10% | 0% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 66% | 34% | 0% | 0% | 34% | 32% | 34% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |

(question continued on next page)

Next I'm going to read a list of specific improvements that are being considered. For each, please tell me how important you think it is to include in the project plan.

22) Improved scenic and recreational pull-offs

| | | Degrees combined | | | | Full scale | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|-----|---------------------|--------|--------------------|-----|-----|-----|--------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Important (5/4) | 3 | Not important (1/2) | Unsure | Very important (5) | 4 | 3 | 2 | Not at all important (1) | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 37% | 34% | 28% | 1% | 15% | 22% | 34% | 17% | 11% | 1% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 47% | 33% | 21% | 0% | 17% | 30% | 33% | 14% | 7% | 0% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 39% | 35% | 26% | 0% | 20% | 19% | 35% | 17% | 9% | 0% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 42% | 36% | 22% | 0% | 19% | 22% | 36% | 16% | 6% | 0% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 39% | 30% | 30% | 1% | 15% | 24% | 30% | 18% | 12% | 1% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 50% | 48% | 2% | 0% | 27% | 23% | 48% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 43% | 33% | 24% | 0% | 19% | 24% | 33% | 16% | 7% | 0% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 21% | 28% | 51% | 0% | 7% | 14% | 28% | 23% | 28% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 9% | 75% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 9% | 75% | 0% | 16% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 55% | 29% | 16% | 1% | 23% | 32% | 29% | 11% | 4% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 32% | 35% | 33% | 0% | 15% | 17% | 35% | 22% | 11% | 0% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 15% | 51% | 34% | 0% | 8% | 7% | 51% | 11% | 24% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 45% | 33% | 22% | 0% | 20% | 26% | 33% | 19% | 3% | 0% | 5.5% | 28 |

23) Some of the improvements being considered would require rock blasting or placing fill in Turnagain Arm to widen certain areas. In general, would you support or oppose improvements that require rock blasting and placing fill?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------|--------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Support | Oppose | Unsure | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 83% | 12% | 4% | 55% | 28% | 6% | 6% | 4% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 79% | 15% | 6% | 49% | 30% | 7% | 8% | 6% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 85% | 11% | 4% | 58% | 27% | 6% | 5% | 4% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 91% | 7% | 1% | 65% | 26% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 74% | 18% | 8% | 33% | 42% | 10% | 8% | 8% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 84% | 11% | 5% | 53% | 31% | 6% | 5% | 5% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 89% | 11% | 0% | 72% | 17% | 8% | 3% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 84% | 14% | 2% | 60% | 24% | 3% | 11% | 2% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 88% | 8% | 4% | 70% | 17% | 3% | 5% | 4% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 89% | 8% | 4% | 66% | 23% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 77% | 18% | 5% | 44% | 33% | 8% | 9% | 5% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 80% | 15% | 6% | 47% | 33% | 8% | 7% | 6% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 86% | 11% | 3% | 60% | 25% | 5% | 6% | 3% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 84% | 0% | 16% | 55% | 29% | 0% | 0% | 16% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 84% | 13% | 3% | 61% | 23% | 6% | 7% | 3% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 82% | 14% | 5% | 48% | 33% | 7% | 7% | 5% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 73% | 27% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 97% | 0% | 3% | 62% | 35% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 83% | 12% | 5% | 56% | 27% | 6% | 6% | 5% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 78% | 18% | 4% | 47% | 31% | 9% | 9% | 4% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 65% | 35% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 89% | 0% | 11% | 63% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 84% | 13% | 3% | 57% | 27% | 6% | 7% | 3% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 76% | 17% | 7% | 43% | 33% | 10% | 7% | 7% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 84% | 0% | 16% | 39% | 45% | 0% | 0% | 16% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

23) Some of the improvements being considered would require rock blasting or placing fill in Turnagain Arm to widen certain areas. In general, would you support or oppose improvements that require rock blasting and placing fill?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--------|--------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Support | Oppose | Unsure | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 76% | 17% | 7% | 45% | 31% | 9% | 9% | 7% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 86% | 11% | 3% | 58% | 27% | 5% | 6% | 3% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 83% | 0% | 17% | 36% | 47% | 0% | 0% | 17% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 82% | 12% | 5% | 49% | 33% | 5% | 8% | 5% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 76% | 17% | 7% | 43% | 33% | 7% | 10% | 7% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 88% | 9% | 2% | 66% | 23% | 6% | 3% | 2% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 89% | 7% | 4% | 66% | 24% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 79% | 18% | 3% | 47% | 32% | 9% | 10% | 3% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 67% | 13% | 20% | 29% | 38% | 6% | 7% | 20% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 86% | 9% | 4% | 57% | 29% | 6% | 4% | 4% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 44% | 49% | 7% | 25% | 19% | 8% | 41% | 7% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 61% | 34% | 5% | 38% | 23% | 13% | 20% | 5% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 81% | 13% | 6% | 49% | 32% | 7% | 6% | 6% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 87% | 12% | 1% | 62% | 26% | 6% | 6% | 1% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 83% | 14% | 3% | 58% | 25% | 3% | 11% | 3% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 73% | 9% | 19% | 41% | 32% | 3% | 6% | 19% | 5.5% | 28 |

24) When it comes to safe recreational options along the corridor, which of the following statements comes closest to your view (randomized):

- a) Improving and increasing the number of recreational options is important even if it increases the project cost
- b) Maintaining the recreational options that currently exist is important, but the project cost should not be increased to expand or improve recreational options
- c) Recreational options should not be included if they add cost to the project

| | | More recreation, cost increase okay | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | No recreation if added costs | Unsure | Base | n= |
|-----------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| TOTAL | | 43% | 41% | 10% | 6% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 45% | 42% | 7% | 6% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 39% | 41% | 15% | 5% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 39% | 41% | 15% | 6% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 39% | 51% | 4% | 5% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 50% | 37% | 6% | 6% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 44% | 40% | 12% | 4% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 48% | 36% | 14% | 3% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 34% | 43% | 16% | 7% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 39% | 43% | 14% | 5% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 46% | 41% | 7% | 6% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 46% | 41% | 9% | 4% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 40% | 42% | 11% | 6% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 59% | 32% | 6% | 2% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 41% | 41% | 12% | 7% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 44% | 42% | 9% | 4% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 62% | 0% | 38% | 1.2% | 6 |

(question continued on next page)

24) When it comes to safe recreational options along the corridor, which of the following statements comes closest to your view (randomized):

- a) Improving and increasing the number of recreational options is important even if it increases the project cost
- b) Maintaining the recreational options that currently exist is important, but the project cost should not be increased to expand or improve recreational options
- c) Recreational options should not be included if they add cost to the project

| | | More recreation, cost increase okay | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | No recreation if added costs | Unsure | Base | n= |
|--|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| Reason for travel | Work | 29% | 45% | 23% | 3% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 44% | 40% | 10% | 6% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 42% | 43% | 11% | 4% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 20% | 67% | 13% | 0% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 33% | 41% | 11% | 15% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 43% | 41% | 11% | 5% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 47% | 44% | 5% | 4% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 33% | 31% | 22% | 14% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 61% | 31% | 1% | 8% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 37% | 45% | 14% | 4% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 27% | 34% | 0% | 39% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 42% | 38% | 12% | 8% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 47% | 39% | 9% | 5% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 40% | 44% | 10% | 5% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 42% | 40% | 10% | 7% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 41% | 45% | 11% | 3% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 59% | 24% | 7% | 10% | 6.0% | 30 |

(question continued on next page)

24) When it comes to safe recreational options along the corridor, which of the following statements comes closest to your view (randomized):

- a) Improving and increasing the number of recreational options is important even if it increases the project cost
- b) Maintaining the recreational options that currently exist is important, but the project cost should not be increased to expand or improve recreational options
- c) Recreational options should not be included if they add cost to the project

| | | More recreation, cost increase okay | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | No recreation if added costs | Unsure | | |
|--|---------|-------------------------------------|--|------------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | | | | | Base | n= |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 44% | 42% | 9% | 5% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 19% | 43% | 33% | 4% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 44% | 25% | 21% | 10% | 2.7% | 14 |

25) This project would be a significant undertaking. It involves major improvements to twenty miles of highway through challenging terrain, and will take several years to construct. This project is a significant multi-year undertaking to make the highway safer, more reliable, and provide recreational opportunities to the community for decades to come. Given these considerations, do you believe the project is worth the high cost and short-term inconveniences?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | Base | n= |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Worth it | Not worth it | Unsure | Definitely yes, worth it | Probably yes, worth it | Probably no, not worth it | Definitely no, not worth it | Unsure | | |
| TOTAL | | 85% | 11% | 4% | 52% | 33% | 7% | 4% | 4% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 85% | 11% | 3% | 50% | 35% | 8% | 4% | 3% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 79% | 15% | 6% | 44% | 35% | 10% | 5% | 6% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 88% | 9% | 3% | 61% | 27% | 4% | 5% | 3% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 85% | 15% | 0% | 37% | 48% | 11% | 4% | 0% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 88% | 10% | 3% | 55% | 33% | 7% | 3% | 3% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 85% | 12% | 3% | 52% | 33% | 9% | 4% | 3% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 86% | 8% | 6% | 63% | 23% | 2% | 6% | 6% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 82% | 11% | 7% | 58% | 24% | 6% | 4% | 7% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 85% | 12% | 3% | 53% | 32% | 8% | 4% | 3% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 85% | 11% | 4% | 51% | 34% | 6% | 4% | 4% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 84% | 14% | 2% | 48% | 36% | 8% | 6% | 2% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 86% | 10% | 5% | 55% | 31% | 6% | 3% | 5% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 90% | 10% | 0% | 64% | 27% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 88% | 8% | 4% | 58% | 30% | 3% | 4% | 4% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 82% | 15% | 4% | 45% | 36% | 10% | 5% | 4% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 77% | 23% | 0% | 18% | 58% | 23% | 0% | 0% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 85% | 12% | 3% | 60% | 25% | 2% | 9% | 3% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 86% | 10% | 4% | 55% | 32% | 7% | 3% | 4% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 83% | 17% | 0% | 39% | 44% | 10% | 7% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 51% | 14% | 35% | 28% | 23% | 14% | 0% | 35% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 86% | 8% | 6% | 50% | 35% | 7% | 2% | 6% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 86% | 11% | 3% | 54% | 32% | 6% | 5% | 3% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 80% | 15% | 4% | 42% | 38% | 13% | 2% | 4% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 92% | 0% | 8% | 47% | 46% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

25) This project would be a significant undertaking. It involves major improvements to twenty miles of highway through challenging terrain, and will take several years to construct. This project is a significant multi-year undertaking to make the highway safer, more reliable, and provide recreational opportunities to the community for decades to come. Given these considerations, do you believe the project is worth the high cost and short-term inconveniences?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | Base | n= |
|--|--|------------------|--------------|--------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Worth it | Not worth it | Unsure | Definitely yes, worth it | Probably yes, worth it | Probably no, not worth it | Definitely no, not worth it | Unsure | | |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 89% | 9% | 3% | 53% | 36% | 6% | 3% | 3% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 84% | 12% | 4% | 51% | 32% | 8% | 5% | 4% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 87% | 0% | 13% | 53% | 34% | 0% | 0% | 13% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 77% | 19% | 5% | 44% | 32% | 11% | 7% | 5% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 84% | 11% | 5% | 41% | 43% | 6% | 6% | 5% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 90% | 8% | 2% | 62% | 27% | 6% | 2% | 2% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 89% | 7% | 4% | 65% | 24% | 5% | 2% | 4% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 81% | 16% | 3% | 41% | 40% | 9% | 6% | 3% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 85% | 5% | 10% | 31% | 54% | 5% | 0% | 10% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 90% | 7% | 3% | 55% | 35% | 5% | 2% | 3% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 19% | 68% | 13% | 10% | 9% | 28% | 40% | 13% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 58% | 42% | 0% | 33% | 25% | 34% | 7% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 94% | 5% | 1% | 59% | 34% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 83% | 14% | 3% | 47% | 35% | 9% | 5% | 3% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 70% | 24% | 7% | 50% | 20% | 10% | 13% | 7% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 66% | 15% | 19% | 33% | 33% | 15% | 0% | 19% | 5.5% | 28 |

26) Taking everything into consideration, do you support or oppose this project?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------|------------------|--------|--------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|--------|-----|
| | | Support | Oppose | Unsure | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Unsure | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 90% | 8% | 1% | 56% | 34% | 4% | 4% | 1% | 100.0% | 500 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 90% | 9% | 1% | 55% | 35% | 6% | 3% | 1% | 58.2% | 291 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 88% | 10% | 3% | 46% | 42% | 4% | 6% | 3% | 15.3% | 76 |
| | Mat-Su | 92% | 7% | 1% | 63% | 29% | 1% | 6% | 1% | 26.5% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 88% | 12% | 1% | 39% | 49% | 9% | 2% | 1% | 27.2% | 131 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 90% | 8% | 2% | 60% | 30% | 2% | 5% | 2% | 24.2% | 116 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 93% | 7% | 0% | 62% | 32% | 3% | 4% | 0% | 12.8% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 90% | 9% | 1% | 66% | 24% | 2% | 7% | 1% | 15.5% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 92% | 6% | 2% | 63% | 29% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 20.2% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 92% | 7% | 1% | 54% | 38% | 4% | 3% | 1% | 51.2% | 255 |
| | Female | 88% | 10% | 2% | 58% | 30% | 5% | 5% | 2% | 48.8% | 243 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 87% | 11% | 2% | 50% | 37% | 5% | 5% | 2% | 40.2% | 201 |
| | 10 times or less | 92% | 7% | 1% | 60% | 33% | 4% | 3% | 1% | 59.8% | 299 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 100% | 0% | 0% | 57% | 43% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 91% | 7% | 1% | 59% | 32% | 4% | 3% | 1% | 47.8% | 239 |
| | Year-round | 89% | 10% | 1% | 53% | 35% | 5% | 5% | 1% | 47.3% | 236 |
| | Unsure | 90% | 0% | 10% | 43% | 47% | 0% | 0% | 10% | 1.2% | 6 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 87% | 9% | 3% | 69% | 18% | 0% | 9% | 3% | 4.2% | 21 |
| | Recreation | 91% | 7% | 1% | 58% | 33% | 4% | 3% | 1% | 77.6% | 388 |
| | Both | 86% | 14% | 0% | 45% | 41% | 6% | 7% | 0% | 16.6% | 83 |
| | Unsure | 93% | 0% | 7% | 28% | 65% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 91% | 5% | 3% | 54% | 38% | 5% | 0% | 3% | 7.5% | 37 |
| | Traveling through | 91% | 8% | 1% | 59% | 32% | 3% | 5% | 1% | 74.5% | 372 |
| | Both | 87% | 11% | 3% | 47% | 40% | 11% | 0% | 3% | 15.7% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 96% | 0% | 4% | 27% | 70% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 2.4% | 12 |

(question continued on next page)

26) Taking everything into consideration, do you support or oppose this project?

| | | Degrees combined | | | Full scale | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|--------|--------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------|--------|-------|-----|
| | | Support | Oppose | Unsure | Strongly support | Somewhat support | Somewhat oppose | Strongly oppose | Unsure | Base | n= |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 90% | 8% | 2% | 55% | 34% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 25.2% | 126 |
| | Rarely/Never | 90% | 9% | 1% | 55% | 35% | 5% | 4% | 1% | 73.4% | 367 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 87% | 13% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1.5% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 84% | 15% | 1% | 45% | 40% | 8% | 6% | 1% | 21.1% | 105 |
| | Average | 89% | 10% | 1% | 44% | 44% | 3% | 7% | 1% | 32.4% | 162 |
| | Hazardous | 94% | 4% | 1% | 69% | 26% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 46.3% | 232 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 95% | 3% | 2% | 74% | 21% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 47.2% | 236 |
| | Medium priority or less | 86% | 14% | 1% | 40% | 46% | 6% | 7% | 1% | 46.8% | 234 |
| | Unsure | 88% | 12% | 0% | 37% | 51% | 12% | 0% | 0% | 6.0% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 95% | 3% | 1% | 60% | 35% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 91.3% | 456 |
| | Oppose | 21% | 75% | 4% | 5% | 16% | 30% | 45% | 4% | 6.0% | 30 |
| | Unsure | 66% | 34% | 0% | 19% | 48% | 26% | 7% | 0% | 2.7% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 95% | 4% | 1% | 63% | 32% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 42.6% | 213 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 90% | 9% | 1% | 53% | 37% | 6% | 3% | 1% | 41.5% | 207 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 76% | 24% | 0% | 45% | 31% | 8% | 16% | 0% | 10.4% | 52 |
| | Unsure | 83% | 7% | 10% | 41% | 42% | 4% | 3% | 10% | 5.5% | 28 |

27) And what is the main reason you oppose this project?

| | | Other more important projects | Costs will be high | Impact on environment/ beauty | Too much construction already | Not needed, other options | Too much focus on recreation | | |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|--------|----|
| | | | | | | | | Base | n= |
| TOTAL | | 24% | 30% | 19% | 13% | 10% | 3% | 100.0% | 38 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 28% | 26% | 28% | 14% | 0% | 3% | 55.6% | 21 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 16% | 31% | 0% | 8% | 45% | 0% | 19.3% | 7 |
| | Mat-Su | 21% | 39% | 14% | 14% | 7% | 6% | 25.1% | 10 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 10% | 46% | 20% | 10% | 13% | 0% | 32.4% | 12 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 43% | 22% | 17% | 0% | 10% | 8% | 22.5% | 8 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 44% | 0% | 0% | 44% | 12% | 0% | 11.2% | 4 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 21% | 31% | 21% | 9% | 10% | 9% | 17.1% | 6 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 19% | 19% | 33% | 22% | 7% | 0% | 16.8% | 6 |
| Gender | Male | 21% | 61% | 5% | 8% | 3% | 3% | 42.0% | 16 |
| | Female | 27% | 8% | 30% | 16% | 16% | 3% | 58.0% | 22 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 30% | 38% | 13% | 3% | 12% | 4% | 50.7% | 19 |
| | 10 times or less | 18% | 22% | 25% | 23% | 8% | 3% | 49.3% | 19 |
| Time of year traveling | Summer months | 23% | 12% | 30% | 28% | 4% | 4% | 46.7% | 18 |
| | Year-round | 25% | 46% | 10% | 0% | 16% | 3% | 53.3% | 20 |
| Reason for travel | Work | 0% | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5.1% | 2 |
| | Recreation | 27% | 19% | 27% | 18% | 4% | 5% | 65.0% | 25 |
| | Both | 22% | 42% | 6% | 5% | 25% | 0% | 29.9% | 11 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5.2% | 2 |
| | Traveling through | 16% | 34% | 18% | 13% | 14% | 4% | 74.7% | 29 |
| | Both | 33% | 23% | 27% | 16% | 0% | 0% | 20.1% | 8 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 41% | 0% | 31% | 29% | 0% | 0% | 16.6% | 6 |
| | Rarely/Never | 21% | 36% | 17% | 10% | 12% | 4% | 83.4% | 32 |

(question continued on next page)

27) And what is the main reason you oppose this project?

| | | Other more important projects | Costs will be high | Impact on environment/beauty | Too much construction already | Not needed, other options | Too much focus on recreation | Base | n= |
|--|--|-------------------------------|--------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------------|-------|----|
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 24% | 34% | 24% | 13% | 5% | 0% | 35.6% | 14 |
| | Average | 19% | 28% | 14% | 21% | 19% | 0% | 39.5% | 15 |
| | Hazardous | 32% | 29% | 20% | 0% | 5% | 13% | 24.9% | 10 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 0% | 44% | 30% | 0% | 7% | 20% | 16.7% | 6 |
| | Medium priority or less | 33% | 31% | 12% | 18% | 7% | 0% | 73.7% | 28 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 57% | 0% | 43% | 0% | 9.6% | 4 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 9% | 27% | 18% | 27% | 11% | 9% | 37.4% | 14 |
| | Oppose | 29% | 32% | 23% | 5% | 11% | 0% | 55.1% | 21 |
| | Unsure | 65% | 35% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7.5% | 3 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 45% | 14% | 10% | 25% | 6% | 0% | 18.9% | 7 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 28% | 24% | 20% | 11% | 17% | 0% | 43.1% | 16 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 11% | 52% | 17% | 4% | 6% | 10% | 32.8% | 12 |
| | Unsure | 0% | 0% | 62% | 38% | 0% | 0% | 5.2% | 2 |

**28) If you were talking to the planners of this project, what's the number one question about this project that you would want to know the answer to?
(among 8% who oppose the project on the previous question)**

| | | How long will it take? | How much will it cost? Who's paying? | How will construction impact travel? Timing? Delays? | How will it be safer? Is safety really the priority? | What are environmental impacts? | Is this the best project to spend money on? | Will it be 4-lane? | Where is the project plan? | Will it improve recreation access? | Why? Do we really need this? | Why don't you build a bridge? | What will speed limits be? | Does it include lighting? | Will bikes be accommodated? | Is this long-term fix? Future demand considered? | Will the public be involved? | Miscellaneous | Unsure | Base | n= |
|--|--|------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|---------------------------------|---|--------------------|----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------|---------------|--------|--------|------|
| TOTAL | | 25% | 13% | 11% | 7% | 6% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 4% | 15% | 100.0% | 491 |
| Borough | Anchorage | 24% | 9% | 13% | 6% | 8% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 5% | 14% | 57.8% | 284 |
| | Kenai Pen. | 25% | 14% | 13% | 9% | 2% | 4% | 7% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 16% | 15.2% | 75 |
| | Mat-Su | 27% | 20% | 8% | 7% | 5% | 3% | 4% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 15% | 27.0% | 132 |
| Age | 18-34 yrs old | 18% | 11% | 21% | 3% | 9% | 6% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 18% | 26.3% | 124 |
| | 35-44 yrs old | 23% | 10% | 8% | 13% | 8% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 4% | 15% | 24.3% | 115 |
| | 45-54 yrs old | 30% | 13% | 4% | 4% | 8% | 2% | 10% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 3% | 0% | 3% | 0% | 2% | 3% | 7% | 9% | 13.0% | 61 |
| | 55-64 yrs old | 18% | 15% | 13% | 4% | 3% | 4% | 6% | 6% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 4% | 21% | 15.8% | 74 |
| | 65+ yrs old | 37% | 16% | 6% | 8% | 3% | 2% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 6% | 11% | 20.6% | 97 |
| Gender | Male | 27% | 14% | 11% | 6% | 3% | 4% | 7% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 4% | 13% | 50.9% | 250 |
| | Female | 23% | 12% | 12% | 9% | 10% | 4% | 1% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 2% | 3% | 17% | 49.1% | 241 |
| Seward Hwy travel frequency | Over 10 times | 18% | 10% | 14% | 7% | 8% | 5% | 4% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 6% | 12% | 39.8% | 195 |
| | 10 times or less | 30% | 15% | 9% | 7% | 5% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 16% | 60.2% | 295 |
| Time of year traveling | Winter months | 47% | 2% | 5% | 2% | 0% | 13% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 13% | 3.8% | 19 |
| | Summer months | 30% | 17% | 9% | 6% | 5% | 3% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 4% | 14% | 48.0% | 236 |
| | Year-round | 18% | 9% | 14% | 8% | 8% | 4% | 5% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 3% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 4% | 14% | 46.9% | 230 |
| | Unsure | 12% | 28% | 10% | 12% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 38% | 1.2% |
| Reason for travel | Work | 29% | 19% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 9% | 0% | 0% | 13% | 4.1% | 20 |
| | Recreation | 26% | 14% | 10% | 6% | 6% | 4% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 14% | 77.7% | 381 |
| | Both | 20% | 7% | 19% | 11% | 6% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 14% | 16.6% | 82 |
| | Unsure | 7% | 0% | 15% | 16% | 10% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 44% | 1.6% | 8 |
| Travel destination | Between Anc/Bird Flats | 27% | 23% | 13% | 8% | 0% | 3% | 11% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 7.2% | 35 |
| | Traveling through | 27% | 14% | 11% | 7% | 6% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 14% | 74.4% | 365 |
| | Both | 18% | 5% | 11% | 9% | 10% | 6% | 2% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 11% | 18% | 16.0% | 78 |
| | Unsure | 17% | 0% | 10% | 8% | 0% | 0% | 16% | 5% | 0% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 16% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 8% | 10% | 2.4% | 12 |
| Use of new non-motorized path | Frequent/Occasional | 13% | 10% | 14% | 5% | 13% | 5% | 3% | 1% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 2% | 7% | 17% | 25.0% | 123 |
| | Rarely/Never | 29% | 14% | 10% | 8% | 4% | 4% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 13% | 73.7% | 362 |
| | Unsure | 19% | 0% | 19% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 14% | 48% | 1.3% | 7 |
| Current Seward Hwy Safety | Safe | 28% | 10% | 12% | 1% | 3% | 5% | 5% | 1% | 3% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 4% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 4% | 18% | 21.5% | 105 |
| | Average | 21% | 13% | 12% | 9% | 8% | 4% | 3% | 3% | 1% | 2% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 18% | 31.9% | 156 |
| | Hazardous | 26% | 14% | 11% | 9% | 7% | 3% | 4% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 5% | 11% | 46.5% | 228 |
| | Unsure | 100% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0.2% | 1 |
| DOT priority for Seward Hwy improvements | Top/High priority | 32% | 11% | 11% | 9% | 4% | 2% | 4% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 3% | 14% | 46.7% | 229 |
| | Medium priority or less | 19% | 15% | 12% | 6% | 8% | 6% | 5% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 0% | 1% | 0% | 5% | 14% | 47.1% | 231 |
| | Unsure | 19% | 11% | 11% | 2% | 11% | 0% | 0% | 7% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 6% | 6% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 22% | 6.1% | 30 |
| Initial support for major Seward Hwy improvement project | Support | 27% | 11% | 12% | 8% | 6% | 3% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 1% | 4% | 15% | 91.3% | 448 |
| | Oppose | 5% | 30% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 14% | 3% | 7% | 4% | 8% | 3% | 2% | 0% | 2% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 15% | 5.9% | 29 |
| | Unsure | 4% | 25% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 0% | 26% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 13% | 16% | 2.8% | 14 |
| Opinion on recreation improvements | More recreation, cost increase okay | 20% | 9% | 13% | 9% | 10% | 4% | 3% | 2% | 2% | 0% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 4% | 14% | 42.6% | 209 |
| | Maintaining recreation, no cost increase | 32% | 13% | 11% | 6% | 5% | 4% | 3% | 0% | 2% | 1% | 1% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 1% | 1% | 4% | 14% | 41.4% | 203 |
| | No recreation if added costs | 24% | 25% | 6% | 5% | 0% | 4% | 9% | 9% | 1% | 3% | 0% | 4% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 11% | 10.4% | 51 |
| | Unsure | 14% | 16% | 6% | 2% | 0% | 7% | 10% | 6% | 4% | 3% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 0% | 3% | 29% | 5.6% | 28 |