



Hillside District Plan
Workshop Series 2
Summary of Public Comment
Transportation & Trails Discussions
Land Design North

Transportation

- Policy vs. Politics - Getting needed road projects or solutions on the list is one thing, but getting them funded and done is a political problem – e.g. DeArmour Rd
- Developers **MUST** be required to provide needed infrastructure
- What are road standards and cost burdens for subdivisions? Local service areas are being made to bear externalized cost burdens when new developments use their roads as feeders and collectors.
- Build adequate roads first and only **THEN** allow new development
- Now developers only meet infrastructure needs “**INSIDE**” their subdivision; e.g., by connecting to a road that does not exist, or building subdivisions which burden roads not designed as connectors. This is wrong. Developers should also deal with their impacts **OUTSIDE** the subdivisions, especially to the transportation system (but also drainage).
- A solution is needed with a system wide approach -- especially for feeder roads. One idea is to have developers pay bond money up front to upgrade access roads outside the development that are impacted by the subdivision (e.g. MOA would hold bond \$ from several developments and then do road upgrades that serve the area and overall network)
- Road ownership and maintenance are too splintered among different entities (State, MOA, LRSAs). It would be an excellent idea for all roads to be under only one—the situation “cries out for one common, efficient solution.”
- Transportation is a big issue on the hillside (speeding, inadequate collectors, poor network connections, difference in road standards and maintenance). For public safety we need to change our approach and policy to roads.
- There are questions about road projects now funded and designed (O’Malley upgrade – what is it – how many lanes)? Our decisions depend on what is going on in the entire road network. Are MOA and the state working together to figure this out (they seem to be at cross purposes)?
- Public transit– develop a schedule and options that work for residents (why 6am?)
- Issue to study: If MOA took it all over all road activities (LRSAs, STATE) what would cost be? What economies of scale achieved? There is a transparency of cost issue that is unclear. Can you study for us cost differences from what we pay now,

plus what we would pay then, and what we pay compared with people inside ARDSA? Kind of like the tax figures on a national level (for every \$ of tax Alaska, or Illinois give, they get back \$x in services).

- In options for consolidating services we still need the local ability to control (this is a good aspect of the LRSAs)
- The State needs to fund road improvements
- Make road near Goldenview Middle School (Goldenview Drive) a safety zone (flashing lights, etc.)
- Intersection of Vosikof & Kasilof – sharp corner needs visibility improvement (mirror)
- Mountain Park LRSA
 - Cap at 1.3 mil?
 - How would city do that?
- Look at widening Goldenview Drive
- Can LRSAs have speed bumps? Yes according to Lance Wilbur from traffic, but you can't use the "shopping mall variety" that are designed for 5 mph. You have to have one that allows traffic to go the speed limit and safely cross the bump (e.g. at 25 mph). Also, speed bumps cannot be placed on dirt roads because they move and are not safe. If an ARDSA wants to buy a speed bump, the traffic department will help locate them, etc.
- Sultan Drive – was a state road, and then they "dropped it". Now the MOA won't chip in or take responsibility, and the state is not taking responsibility. What can we do?
- We have no amenities (lights, curb, paved road). Our property tax is going up, what for? Clarify tax equity and disconnect – I pay taxes too – why does it matter where I live?
- Another LRSA or non-LRSA affects us when they don't maintain their roads
- Last year annexation law proposed so users who drive on LRSAs (and tear them up) can be made to pay – it didn't pass (Fairbanks legislator raised it)
- How create solution – Birch & Abbott –
- What are funding options for road improvements?
- Take over state roads given their condition
- If a road is in bad shape MOA won't want to take over
- Mil rates/tax bill – how does this break down? We want to only pay for what get?
- Option of bonding would require a vote of Anchorage bowl, and Hillside residents. Maybe 2 new consolidated rural road service areas (like Eagle River) make sense –
 - What does this take to make happen?
- Goldenview change of authority last election – from LRSA to rural road service area
- LRSAs can only plow, drainage ditches, and grade – not capital projects. Now there is a fine line between maintenance and "serious maintenance" (e.g., capital projects that are called maintenance projects)
- Major state road projects are "parked" (O'Malley) because of serious decline in funding at the federal level (50 million down to 20 million in 1 year)
- Vote main arterials into ARDSA except that snow clearing within 24 hours is a big deal – with LRSAs, people pay for quick turn over. ARDSA has 72 hour snow clear

Trails

- There should be a Master Plan for connectivity of “wild” trails and greenbelts for the entire hillside (we’ll lose this if we just let developers to put sidewalks along their roads). On the other hand, in urban areas, it is fine to use roadside trails and sidewalks.
- No trails on private lands or Section 36 should be shown ON ANY Hillside District Map!!!! For example, in the Fernwood, Northfield area is a trail in a wet area that should not be used. Also, the Section 36 plat requirements include not mapping trails.
- Getting kids to school and maintaining links between subdivisions is important for keeping kids safe and out of roads. For example Goldenview Park is missing a trail link and now kids ride bikes on the street a lot further since the houses block access.
- Maintenance should be done as a system
- Security and trash are big issues associated with Chugach users
- There is a scarcity of parking for Chugach Access (upper Huffman, Soldotna drive snowmobile trailer parking area)
- Snowmobilers are a stakeholder too (legal access into Chugach in one location in Anchorage hillside, although snow conditions are often not workable).
- New subdivisions should be required to extend the APRSA boundary around the property if they are not within it.
- Option 1 – Expanding ARDSA has no political chance (the MOA doesn’t want it and Hillside doesn’t want it)
- Option 2 – This could be a good idea, and might be acceptable if residents had some control over priorities and costs. It would be great to find out from Eagle River how this has worked and the costs.
- Option 3 –
 - Problems with this are that even if you tell homeowners’ associations that they are not liable, they still know they could get dragged into court which would be expensive and time consuming. An insurance option paid with public funds might help this.
 - Policy 57 of the Anchorage 2020 Plan requires that “existing housing” be maintained. This could be applied to trails through subdivisions.
- The APRSA boundary map is misleading and is being misconstrued by Anchorage Assembly members
- Private property is now being torn up by hikers, 4 wheel users, etc. – take private “trails” off maps. What are options for property owners in dealing with trespass and these impacts?
- Trails need to be publicly maintained
- It is a “back door” approach to build trails and then make taxpayers pay to maintain them
- Trails should be developed around drainages and wildlife corridors (can you inventory these?)
- Some residents have a strong interest in connecting Potter Marsh with the coastal trail, a chugach access trail, and working to make the area “economical” for the city by attracting tourists (use TLC center, Rabbit Hutch area) and avoiding increased development

General Comments

- There is a basic assumption in this meeting and in 2020 that growth is to be encouraged– but we like it the way it is. Like the Romans lets stop growth so we can keep things the way we like them, not become a satellite city.
- Community councils are already working on solutions, but what is our relationship to MOA Planning, Assembly, P&Z – political realities
- A lot of people want things as they are