

**Provide additional comment below:**

I am totally opposed to these projects. (Reference comment 2)

I'm all for any road that gets the traffic off of S. Paddock Dr. but it would be great if homes of people and animals weren't affected. Good luck!! (Reference comment 3)

- 1) Oppose intent to close off access to Old Mat Rd to Fairview residents.
- 2) Oppose roundabouts. Rude drivers & snow. They suck in Anchorage, they will suck here.
- 3) Why should private property and \$ make money for Rex Turner? Who is getting paid? We don't want this as a community. His bad planning not my problem.
- 4) Ruin our property values & way of life by creating tacky subdivision in lieu of farmland. Not Valley values. "These subdivisions will happen", so what gets destroyed? Who is buying these homes in this economy? Let's build a school, then think of the road access. Oops. Railroad in the way. Let's screw everyone else. (Reference comment 4)

Where is the money coming from for any of this? They should not be using present road maintenance funds. (Reference comment 5)

Bike/pedestrian trails need to be considered on all new roadways. (Reference comment 7)

What is the timeline on this? We know Nelson to Trunk must be open before new school opens. Maybe school opening should be delayed so responsible alternatives can be done wisely. (Reference comment 8)

My Suggestion:

Phase I – Nelson East at-Grade

Phase II – Trunk Road

Phase III – Nelson extension to Seward-Meridian

This gives three access points to the area. Can be done over 5 years. (Reference comment 10)

As the transportation supervisor for the school district, I feel the Trunk Road access is the most critical. The west end of Nelson would be best to connect to either Fairview Loop or Fireweed (frontage road) by going through the gravel/block company. This places the access point closer to the center of the school boundary and will provide the best flow for buses and parents coming from north of the Parks Hwy. Most will have to cross the Parks at Hyer Rd. (Reference comment 12)

Take a look at aligning the new road with the proposed ARRC alignment, in effect creating one combined corridor. At least the part by the school, so that it goes behind (north of) the school. This will make a shorter, straighter route for the roadway through-traffic, and make the school access more pedestrian friendly. Instead of having one barrier on either side of the school, in effect creating a pedestrian island with a school on it, please consider placing the two barriers together, so that crossings can be

**Provide additional comment below:**

accomplished with a single signal and crosswalk/ped bridge, etc., in the future. I think in the short and long run it is safer and more cost effective. It would also make this neighborhood more attractive to young families, when their children can safely walk to school. The impact is a replat of the lots, which currently have their back to the railroad tracks, and some resizing of other lots. Possibly some right of way costs too, but i think pretty minimal in comparison to the road cost savings. As far as I know though, these lots are undeveloped and not individually owned. (Reference comment 16)

I am a resident of Garden Terrace. At this point we are the main route for entrance to the Ranch Subdivision. This has been a very frustrating situation because of the increased traffic flow and the knowledge that that subdivision is not even done growing.

I have three elementary-age children and I do have concerns for their safety if they go by Abby Blvd. because of the traffic, and the lack of attention paid to the speed limit.

I have attended other meetings and am very aware that the Borough is working to figure out a solution to the traffic problem.

My concern comes from a sign I saw on Fairview Loop today, by Crane (?) Rd (up the hill from the railroad tracks, at the 90 degree turn.) The signs seem to be in protest to the extension coming through that area. It states increased traffic (100 cars an hour and buses, which I believe at this point is a bit exaggerated.) I would imagine if Nelson went through this area that intersection would probably end up being reworked, and safer.

I personally think this would be a GOOD solution because of less involvement with the railroad tracks, and the problems with the distance between tracks and Fairview Loop at the Valley Concrete crossing.

I am all for the Trunk Rd south extension, as I have seen it in previous mailings. I was not able to get onto the planning website for more project info.

I do not feel that our subdivision should continue to carry all the traffic on our own, and the sooner this situation is resolved, and a main exit road is being built (Nelson Rd), the better. Thank you. (Reference comment 17)

I received a phone call this afternoon from a homeowner who lives at Lot 1, Block 2, Fairview East Subdivision (SE corner of Linlu Lane and Fairview Road Extension). She wanted to know which specific environmental codes/laws/regulations the Borough must follow to construct the proposed Fairview/Nelson Connector. She said she had talked with several people at the Borough recently and wasn't getting very good responses. I explained the project was not federally funded and therefore the NEPA process was not required; I also suggested the DOT Environmental Checklist was not a requirement but was being prepared as a component of this project.

I suggested to her that we are completing field surveys and will study the alignment and its potential environmental impacts over the winter. She seemed to be focused on the wetlands north of her property. I suggested we had scientists in the field last week to conduct a preliminary investigation and expected to properly identify and/or delineate wetlands after the alignment was determined. She was certain there were wetlands because they showed upon the Borough's GIS maps; I tried to explain those maps didn't necessarily mean wetlands (as defined by U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

**Provide additional comment below:**

[USCOE] exist, but I don't think she understood my point. However, the preliminary investigation did suggest there may be wetlands along the planned corridor; whether those require a Section 404 Department of Army permit has yet to be determined.

Ms. Swan thought it a conflict of interest the consultant is able to define wetland boundaries; I suggested to her the USCOE could accept and/or reject mapped boundaries as part of the permitting process. She suggested she would be contacting USCOE and the Assembly to discuss this project. (Reference comment 19)

I received a call this morning from a property owner regarding the Trunk Road South extension. He owns Grizzly Espresso and believes his property will be impacted by the project. He had received our mailer. He is currently working in Dillingham and wanted us to fax or email a drawing/sketch to him to show how his property would be impacted. He owns 1.5 acres in the area and has entrances and exits onto both cul-de-sacs in the area -- Valley Circle and Whiting Circle. He wanted to know if we were going to put in one of those "crazy circles." I informed him that we were planning on including a roundabout. He said he drove them in Bermuda. He thinks the way we design them in Alaska is wrong -- too small. He appreciated the mailer and knowing that the project was under way. He has been aware of Mr. Turner's (The Ranch) plans for six years. He said he and his lawyer still think the project is to Mr. Turner's advantage and that Turner even states so on his web site. (Reference comment 20)

Too bad this all can't wait till railroad is realigned and Seward-Meridian is extended. Effectiveness of all these is contingent upon R.R. realignment and Seward-Meridian extension. Will Fairview Loop extend to Old Mat Road and Seward-Meridian? (Reference comment 22)

You should use factually correct information. Lots in a master plan are not lots. Can any of these be platted w/o the new access? Lots to be under an elevated RR grade are not useable lots. You are overstating by 900+ lots. (Reference comment 23)

The Ranch has had its master plan for over 25 years. It has always had an access problem. The growth that you raise as a problem can only occur if you put in a new access. Will this project to bail out the Ranch delay currently needed projects? (Reference comment 24)

I'm on the RSA board for Fairview Loop. I was at the meeting this month and have this to say. I firmly believe that the best way to approach the traffic problem is to build the Seward Meridian Road first then the Trunk Road extension. When the Seward Meridian is built, build it the right way, with wide intersections and stop and go lights. You can then close off the rail crossing at Fairview and the Matanuska Rd. There are only two families down there. The road then becomes a borough road. That way all traffic that now crosses the rails would go to the Parks. Even the folks that live on the Fairview end. Then with the Trunk Road being built the right way also. You have in one way solved the traffic problem. Look at the drawings and you'll see what I mean. Also the Railroad can then build their new route without any unforeseen problems. Thank You. (Reference comment 26)

1) The first item that I would like to address is the corrections necessary to accurately

**Provide additional comment below:**

reflect the negative (CONS) aspects of the Nelson Road Extension, (Alternative # 8).

The following items need to be added.

- Potential wetland impacts. (The area impacted is considered to be a Discharge Slope Ecosystem).
  - Increased permitting timeframe. (If an EIS study is deemed necessary).
  - Lengthy ROW acquisition process anticipated.
  - Not supported by property owners on either side of Linlu Lane.
  - Creates traffic flow congestion at the future Seward Meridian, Fairview/Nelson intersection.
  - Is not consistent with Long Range Transportation Plan, as Fairview Loop is not a suitable corridor for increased East/West traffic volumes.
- 2) Creates a short-term safety hazard by increasing traffic volume over a R/R crossing located right at a poorly designed intersection at Fairview Loop and the Old Mat Road. This condition would exist until Seward Meridian is extended to Fairview Loop in the future. (Reference comment 28)
- 3) Our short-term goals of providing viable access to South Palmer Elementary need to be separated from the long-term transportation issues that need to be addressed as development in this area continues.
- Extending Nelson Road to Fairview Loop at the Valley Block and Concrete entrance with an AT-Grade Crossing, would provide good short term access and would be contained almost entirely on land already platted for this road.
- 4) From a Long Range Transportation planning standpoint, Bill Tuckers' variation (he outlined his route plan at the public comment meeting) on the Nelson Road West Grade Separated Crossing would address the need to separate future traffic flow from the new subdivisions and Fairview Loop traffic while providing a safe, efficient route to access the new school and future homes. This route is similar to Alternative 3, but does not have as much negative impact on developable lots in the Sweeping Vista Subdivision. This route would cost less than the 27.9 million listed for alternative 3, as the ROW north of Fairview Loop would be donated, and with this donation would be the fill necessary for the crossing on the south side of Fairview Loop.
- 5) With all the controversy regarding access from the Northwest why don't we concentrate our time, effort, and resources on developing the Trunk Road end of this project first.
- The Trunk Road extension is more centrally located as an access point according to the School Districts new attendance boundaries.
  - A majority of the ROW is already owned by The Ranch developer.

**Provide additional comment below:**

- Developing the Trunk Road extension first, would allow the necessary time to adequately plan and design a route from the Northwest that truly addresses the long range transportation needs of our community and is in the best interest of the public as a whole.

Thank you for your consideration in these matters. (Reference comment 28)

---

I attended the review recently conducted concerning the proposal for the different routes the Ranch and other subdivisions proposed for the affected area. Following are my comments; I submit a variation to the Nelson Rd. West Grade Separated Railroad Crossing.

Rather than construct a new Nelson Rd south of the existing one which would bypass the proposed railroad track realignment, use the existing Nelson Rd have trestles placed over two intersections where Nelson and the tracks intersect. Extend Nelson west through the proposed Sweeping Vista project to the west side of said subdivision then turn north along proposed route terminating at Fireweed.

This variation will provide Sweeping Vista with 2 ingress and egress routes. This proposal will eliminate placing additional traffic on Fairview Loop, which unless Fairview Loop is redesigned to accommodate the additional traffic will present traffic problems at the intersection of Fireweed and Fairview Loop. (Reference comment 29)

---

Anywhere else on the planet, platting boards require developers to bear the cost of infrastructure improvements necessitated by their developments. Does the MSB Planning Department review subdivision apps? (Reference comment 30)

---

Living just off Fairview Loop I have to drive it every day, and not just me, my wife drives it every day, my oldest daughter drives it every day, my middle daughter drives it four days a week, and my son drives it every day, sometimes on a bus other times in one of our vehicles.

Fairview Loop is one of the most dangerous roads I've driven on. It's too narrow, speed limits too fast, too narrow for walking on or riding a bike, and heaven forbid you breakdown and need to pull your car off of it. So, to add an artery from a 1600 house subdivision to Fairview Loop (which is at least 3200 cars, figuring 2 cars per house) is insane.

My biggest problem is when the project manager told me that there would be less traffic, and that using Nelson would help Fairview Loops' problems. So I have to ask myself, do I look stupid or is there a separate agenda involved that doesn't care what's best for my community?

Lastly, why isn't the developer for the subdivision paying for this? I am one of many out-of work, overtaxed, barely making it members of my community. I can't afford to pay for a multi-million dollar road project. (Reference comment 31)

---

---

*The following is correspondence address to the Mat-Su Borough Manager. The project team was copied on this communication. It has been edited for web posting.*

I have been awaiting a response per your last correspondence (below), but as I have not heard from you as of yet, decided that I had better contact you.

I do appreciate the changes regarding the January 22 meeting; it would have been highly inappropriate to run the meeting as the Public Works Department had intended prior. Unfortunately, the Mat-Su Borough still failed to correctly and honestly present the situation, and the road propositions. Despite the fact that residents have been attending Assembly meetings, writing letters, and corresponding with the Borough for SIX MONTHS, Mat-Su Public Works employees ignored the majority of cons involved in coming the LinLu/Fairview Loop route when presenting using their main presentation poster on this proposal. After SIX MONTHS of correspondence, Borough employees didn't even cite land owner/residential impacts as a con on the main presentation poster for the LinLu proposed route! I find this level of blatant disregard for the people that have spent so much of their valuable time talking to the Borough about this issue to be utterly astounding, not to mention the disregard for honest and ethical presentation of information to the public.

The obvious misrepresentation of the LinLu route was sadly but certainly NOT the only "stretching of truth" that the MSB presented at the January 22nd Public Meeting. Engineer \_\_\_ was quick to dismiss certain proposed routes as unfeasible, while \_\_\_ talked down condescendingly to upset meeting attendees, insisting that one route was not favored over another. \_\_\_, I've spent enough time corresponding with engineers and employees underneath you to know full well that the Borough is NOT considering all eight of the proposed routes with equal favor. Coming into the meeting with such a claim was an insult to the public's intelligence, and only served to further impress the fact that the Borough is not being forthcoming and completely honest with the public about the South Palmer Elementary School access/Nelson Road Extension.

During a recent Transportation Advisory Board meeting, \_\_\_ gave a brief overview of the January 22 meeting. Though she did mention that there were some heated comments, she made the meeting sound like it was a great community brainstorming session. She failed to mention that the 150 or so residents in attendance, many of whom stood in the back through the presentation because there wasn't near enough seating for everyone, made it overwhelmingly clear that the majority in attendance wanted the Borough to take their proposals and their deals with \_\_\_ and get out of their neighborhoods! The very clear comments that were met with sustained applause from over 100 people should have gotten this message across loud and clear to MSB staff. Interestingly, \_\_\_ didn't say ONE word to the Transportation Advisory Board about the overwhelming response rejecting the proposed road extensions that would go through existing neighborhoods. Is this how the Borough does business?

---

\_\_\_, I have asked for your help in resolving issues pertaining to problems with Borough

---

---

staff. I have talked, even pleaded, with the Public Works department to deal in an ethical and honest manner. As of yet, I have seen no results. It would appear for all intents and purposes that Borough employees, at least those involved in the planning and presenting of road projects, act and work as though they were accountable for nothing, least of all to the public.

Of course, Borough employees ARE accountable, most of all to the public. I don't know what's gone so terribly wrong in the Mat-Su Borough that this seems to have been forgotten, but I do know that some things sorely need to change.

I have several questions that I need answered: Is there some sort of an "audit" that takes place where Borough employees are concerned? If so, who conducts the audit and when was the last time an audit was conducted on departments such as the Public Works Department and the Planning Department? Also, it is my understanding that there was a huge discrepancy between the initial road access estimate presented by the Borough to the Site Selection Committee of the South Palmer School, and the cost estimates being presented now that the school is being built. What sort of investigation has been done as far as this discrepancy is concerned? If none, why not?

I'll be awaiting your response; email is the best way to reach me. (Reference Comment 33)

---

I am a concerned homeowner and want to get on public record opposing the Nelson Road extension through my property. I understand that there has been talk of extending Nelson Road through my property in order to connect to East Linlu Lane and tie into Linlu Lane. I am not interested in any land trade or monies to be relocated in order to accommodate this road route; and especially, when better alternative routes exist.

I purchased this home with a plan for retirement and to have my elderly mom live with me, rather than the alternative of a retirement home. We selected this home and its location because it was NOT near a major road. We have always preferred country living. I love my home because of its location, view and seclusion. My home is a great place where my grand children can play without fear of any road hazards.

In summary, there will be no negotiations with respect to my property what-so-ever. There exist alternative routes that will NOT impact homeowners in the area. Therefore, eminent domain impact will not be justifiable in this case nor even in a legal sense of the matter. If the Mat-Su Borough approaches me, they will get a rude awakening! All rights, as a homeowner, are on my side in this case. (Reference comment 35)

---

As owners' of Lots 8 and 9 Meadow Valley Subdivision we would like to make some comments about the proposed project. Specifically we are concerned about Alternatives 5 and 6.

---

We purchased these two lots in 1983 and built our retirement home in preparation for my retirement from the U.S. Army in 1985. We have always treated the two lots as one since neither is much good without the other. Over the past 25 years we have put in

---

---

many improvements, mostly through our own hard work on the home and landscaping. My wife has developed beautiful flower beds over the years and we have always prided ourselves in the way our place looks. We had hoped we could retire here and live out our days in peace; however, we have had to withstand the construction and operation of Northstar Racetrack and the mining of gravel and continuous truck traffic from the Northstar Gravel Pit for several years. Now your Alternative five proposes to take our entire lot 8 and residence because you need twenty feet of our property for fill.

We understand the need for this project and do not object to in principle. If the Borough and State are, in fact, wanting to work with property owners as you say in the introduction to this plan, we believe that some accommodation could be made to spare the taking of our home as described on your Alternative 5. We actually prefer this Alternative with any of the modifications listed below to Alternative 6 which; we believe, could present some dangerous situations, particularly in the winter, with its two roundabouts. Our proposed alternatives are listed below.

1. A slight realignment of the road to the west by approximately 25 ft. would eliminate the need to put fill up to our back door. This alignment could easily mirror the alignment of your Alternative 6 without the roundabouts once you clear the bridge over the Parks Highway.

2. Make the banks of your proposed fill steeper to stop at our property line. This can obviously be done as proven by the steep banks along the Parks and frontage roads at the Trunk road exchange. These banks are obviously much higher and steeper than your proposed fill and cut lines and accommodate daily gravel truck and automobile traffic.

3. Our preferred option. Build a retaining wall 8'-10' tall along our west property line to hold the lateral twenty-five feet of fill. This could be done esthetically and much more economically than purchasing our property. At one time the ridge to our west came almost as far as the proposed fill line and we removed the bottom of it, which was on our property, to get better use of our lot. This was done with very little erosion over the years because of the nature of the ground and the trees on the lot above us. We believe that a retaining wall could accommodate your needs as well as ours for less money.

We have a question regarding the project. What is the status of funding and proposed timetable of the project?

We hope we will be able to work with the Borough to come to a mutual solution. We would invite any of those involved in planning this project to visit us so that you can get a clear picture of the reality on the ground. Please feel free to contact us by email or phone. (Reference comment 36)

---

At the May 20 meeting, when providing the cost estimate for the S. Nelson Road Extension, it will be extremely important to include a cost estimate for improvements to the Old Matanuska Road/Fairview Loop intersection (because according to DOT, it will be the responsibility of MSB to make safety improvements to the intersection). In the winter this particular intersection is already a nightmare! It will be nothing but negligent to dump MORE traffic (including school buses) onto this intersection by extending

---

Nelson Road to Fairview via LinLu Lane. I realize that Lousbury was not hired to study this intersection (Old Mat/Fairview). However, it is too closely linked to the LinLu Lane alignment NOT to be included. Another cost estimate that MUST be included in the Nelson Road Extension Alignment, is the amount of money that will be wasted by the eventual cul de sac of Fairview Loop at the Carson farm (approximately a quarter mile of road built up with a huge amount of gravel will have been wasted when the Seward Meridian overpass is built). At the January Public Meeting, when asked by a number of attendees about these issues, Mr. Adams evasively side stepped the questions. It appeared deceptive to me. (Reference comment 37)

---

Hello,

I just left a voice mail, but thought I would send an email as a back up message... The mailers that went out about the May 20th meeting ("map" invitation) have a big mistake concerning the date, which has the meeting listed as Tuesday, May 20, 2009. Considering the we're comming up to a decision making phase in this process, it seems very important that the community be informed and have the opportunity to add input. I'm afraid there may be confusion as to whether the meeting is on Tuesday or Wednesday night. I realize we're down to the wire, but would it be possible to send out a post-card type mailer with a corrected meeting date? (Reference comment 38)

---

*The following is correspondence address to the Mat-Su Borough Manager. The project team was copied on this communication.*

The general membership of the Knik-Fairview Community Council has asked the Board to forward a letter of objection to the extension of Linlu Lane to connect to Nelson Road. At present there is considerable engineering that would have to done to make a safe intersection with Fairview Loop as it exists. In additon, major costs. There are alternatives available.

The Developer of the Ranch Subdivision is at this time proposing an extension of time for their master plat. They also need a second exit from The Ranch to expand the number of houses that they wish to construct over the minimum that they have done so far. What is of note is that they are proposing to take Nelson to Fairview Loop via the proposed plat for the property that Valley Block and Concrete occupies now. This exit would meet the arterial standards required of Title 27. This is the exit that the Borough should be perusing now. I understand that the property owner to the North, represented by B. Tucker, is resistant to the proposal of Public Works to sell the Borough any land, allowing a portion of Fairview Loop to be moved, creating a separation distance between the ARR tracks and Fairview Loop. That separation is not needed. We are aware the railroad does not want more at grade crossings, but this is a grandfathered in one, but without arms or lights. Currently, Fairview Loop has a crossing with lights and arms. What would be the problem to put 3-way arms and lights at a new Nelson intersection with Fairview Loop? You have a Developer ready to construct who can aid in the cost and you would not disturb a 35 year old neighborhood that ends in a cul-de-sac.

Please consider the alternates here before more money and time is wasted on engineering the Linlu extension this winter.

---

*The following is correspondence address to the Mat-Su Borough Planning Director. The project team was copied on this communication.*

---

---

I appreciate the Borough's need to open public access to the South Palmer Elementary School as soon as possible. Any routes planned to cross the railroad tracks require an updated permit from the Alaska Railroad. A formal DOT/PF Approach Road Permit is also required before constructing a new road approach onto a state road or before significantly increasing the traffic levels accessing a state road.

As part of the DOT/PF Approach Road Permit, a Traffic Impact Analysis (TIA) is required which addresses intersection operations at the state road in question. Lounsbury and Associates as already applied for permits and prepared a TIA for the Borough, which addresses the Trunk Road interchange to the east and Fairview Loop Road connections to the west. The TIA needs to be updated to address these comments on any connections to be permitted through DOT/PF.

My comments on the available routes are as follows:

Valley Block Access: For the Valley Block and Abby Boulevard access points, a draft Railroad Diagnostic Team report addresses the railroad crossings and is ready for signature by all agencies. Intersection capacity still needs to be verified through a TIA under a DOT/PF Approach Road Permit. The current draft of the Railroad Diagnostic Team Report depended on the Lounsbury TIA and assumed traffic had two ways in and out of the school. If Valley Block is to be the only connection, vehicle storage will have to be reevaluated in an updated TIA.

Working with the Alaska Railroad, I do not support creating an at-grade railroad crossing at Valley Block with less than minimum storage requirements, especially for a new routes to a school with buses, parents, and residents. Storage may have to be even longer if this is to be the only access. The Federal Railroad Administration's Railroad-Highway Crossing Handbook recommends a minimum of 100 feet of storage between railroad gates on a STOP controlled sidestreet and the main road. This setback will store one school bus and two vehicles. The sidestreet would be widened with shoulders, a left turn lane, and a right turn lane.

To provide less than minimum storage would require a traffic signal and mainline left turn lanes in order to preempt traffic and clear the train tracks. However, in this case a review of daily traffic volumes suggests this location is not close to meeting signal warrants. I do not support a traffic signal that is not warranted as it will be disruptive to mainline traffic all day, and as a signal it will create rear end collisions each year.

I did consider the Borough's request to examine another option to offset minimal storage, such as using gating or stop signs on Fairview Loop Road when a train is present. The goal would be to clear out the new school access road when a train arrives, and to strive for a less costly solution. After consideration, I find too many problems with this concept. Gating designs will not be able to fully block Fairview Loop Road, especially because "escape" routes are needed on two-way roads. Trains which cross during times when there is no sidestreet traffic would also require stopping Fairview Loop Road. The partial gating, and the times of trains are fully expected to lead to "cheaters" who question the gating purpose and go around it. Sidestreet users'

---

---

subject to any uncertainty or confusion as to what other traffic is doing becomes at risk, increasing the potential for a vehicle to be trapped on the tracks. No such triple gating of the crossing and sidestreet is recommended by the Railroad-Highway grade Crossing Handbook. It is an unconventional design. A permanent All-Way Stop is also not warranted on Fairview Loop Road given the unbalanced traffic volumes, and would lead to the same “cheaters’ that a gate system would create.

Abby Boulevard Upgrades. Our Department would have no objection to the use of Abby Boulevard railroad crossing. We understand this access is of concern to neighbors, and that other routes are available. Along with the Railroad, we would recommended added turning lanes, widening, and shoulder upgrades for increased use as outlined in our draft Railroad Diagnostic Team Report.

Fairview Loop Corner Connection [Nelson Road Extension]. This option is supported and a preferred option at or near Linlu Lane. It eliminates the need for the Abby Boulevard railroad crossing, while crating no new at-grade railroad crossings. Combined with a south Seward Meridian extension, this option also provides a more continuous collector system which then allows for the future removal of the Fairview Loop Road railroad crossing. This option reduces the risk of train collisions and appears to be the most cost-effective investment in the long term.

Tucker Access. Our Department is in discussions with Mr. Tucker regarding state right-of-way at the Parks Highway frontage road. We have no objection to a railroad grade-separated collector road from Valley Block, north to the Parks Highway south frontage road called Fireweed Drive. This would fill a gap between Seward Meridian Road and Trunk Road over the long term. However, this alignment would appear to require a significant investment. Instead, it makes more sense to prioritize Seward Meridian Extension south, and a Fairview Loop Corner connection to the west, as higher priority investments for area circulation. These improvements would benefit the Parks Highway as well.

Nelson Road. Our Department has no objections to the use of the Parks Highway frontage road system, and Nelson Road to access the school. This appears to be the most cost-effective and timely solution in the short term. The Traffic Stud would have to be updated and address the North Trunk ramp as well.

South Trunk Extension. Our department ahs no objections to a South Trunk Road extension. This appears to be a logical long-term investment in area circulation. The TIA has to be finalized and address the North Trunk Ramp as well.

Our Department supports the most cost-effective and expedient investment necessary to open the school as long as safety and capacity is addressed. For those options with railroad crossings, we want to build in safety features, not reduce them below FRA recommendations. Since state ownership began in 1985, vehicle-train crashes have been reduced from more than 25 per year to near zero, primarily because out agencies follow safety guidelines and have installed many gated systems and overpasses. This is

---

---

a record we need to work together to maintain.

In conclusion, it appears that Nelson Road may best fit Borough goals. A Fairview Corner Connection and a South Trunk Extension appear to be the best long term Borough investments. I view these will benefit the Railroad, the DOT/PF, and the public as a whole for two reasons:

1. for safety improvements by reducing at-grade railroad crossings in the long term, and providing multiple emergency routes, and
2. For capacity improvements by improving local circulation options to the Parks Highway as the area grows, reducing pressure and circuitous travel on any one part of the Parks Highway.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the needs in this area as it affects state roads. Please submit a revised TIA to our Right-of-Way Section as part of an access permit review once a route is selected. If I can be of further assistance, feel free to call.

---

**5/20/09 meeting comments**

Comments (at this meeting) reveal a basic distrust of government processes. Governments cannot resist a “free” gift. (Reference comment 43)

This information (presented at 5/20/09 meeting) needs to be researched more in-depth and more accurately. This thing needs to be more honestly presented. There needs to be more public meetings before a route is chosen. These routes are not ready to be chosen yet. (Reference comment 47)

Long term — OK to plan. But the pressing issue today is that new school and access to that. That issue should not at this time disrupt rural neighborhoods. I support the Tucker route. Check with the railroad about trading right of way by Hyer Road for other Borough land. (Reference comment 48)

Phases in planning building:

1. Quickest school access — most students’ catchment area Trunk Road Extension
2. Secondary school access where most students come from
3. Anticipate railroad plans — bargain land exchange to obtain Hyer Road corridor
4. East/west extension from Trunk to Fairview, then north to Seward Meridian to include straightening Old Mat/Fairview Loop intersection
5. Plan improvements/upgrades to length of Fairview Loop — longer term east to west. All budget estimates seem low. Lobby Juneau harder for higher priority for our need for \$\$ to address adequate road plan. (Reference comment 49)