

HANDOUTS

Comments on Resolution 26-01

Brian O'Connor
7080 West Knox Drive
Wasilla, AK 99654
Alpenglow Properties LLC

MSB Planning Commission
Ordinance OR-26-021

Dear Planning Commission Members,

I oppose OR-26-021 because it would weaken protections for drinking water, erosion control, and neighborhood quality of life by removing the Comprehensive Plan requirement for gravel removal.

The first of many is our ground/drinking water. Without oversight and protections, our drinking water will be drastically affected by gravel/earth removal. The water table changes with improper ground removal, which deletes or reroutes well water used by many Alaskans in the Matanuska- Susitna borough. Many homes rely on well water for their home. Also, the water runoff from improperly planned gravel removal can have many contaminants that could adversely affect our struggling salmon population. Many lakes and streams in the MatSu have salmon returns and salmon fry that grow up here.

Secondly, erosion control would not have oversight. Gravel removal near or within neighborhoods poses erosion and sediment risks that can affect homes, infrastructure, and public spaces. A Comprehensive Plan provides a framework to design and enforce erosion control measures and to plan for slope stability, drainage, and post-extraction restoration.

Lastly, as mentioned earlier, many potential gravel sites are near or within neighborhoods. The impact to our neighborhoods can be extremely detrimental. Increased noise, traffic, and heavier axle loads can degrade quality of life and strain local roads not engineered for such use. The Comprehensive Plan helps anticipate and mitigate these impacts through land-use coordination, transportation planning, and public engagement. The noise alone that is associated with earth removal can cause property values to drop, loss of quality of life and health issues. Some communities are strained as it is with vehicle traffic. Adding additional traffic from earth moving could put these communities to the breaking point and push others into strain. Also, many small communities do not have roads engineered for heavy axle weights. The increased axle weight on a road that has not been engineered to withstand the strain will fail prematurely and putting the community in a position of having to pay for either road repair or increased vehicle maintenance.

Our salmon, our drinking water, our structural stability of our homes, our peace of living should not be in jeopardy because an individual wants to remove a little "red tape" placed by the people to protect the people so that they can make it less costly and less of a hassle to move earth. All of our "neighboring" states (Washington, Oregon, Idaho, California) require a

Comprehensive Plan before removing earth. In fact, some states require much more research and planning to be added to the Comprehensive plan than what we currently require. I am asking the board to please uphold the current rules to require a Comprehensive Plan for earth/gravel removal at the current load and yardage limit. Do not allow any changes to be made. Again, my voice is to NOT support the OR 26-021.

Thank you,

Brian O'Connor

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Assembly,

My name is Steve Rudd, and I am a resident of the Rainbow Heights Subdivision and a member of the Meadow Lakes Community Council. I am writing to express my strong opposition to Assemblymember Max Sumner's proposed Ordinance OR26-021.

This ordinance proposes removing Section 17.30.060, which requires that a community's Comprehensive Plan be considered when reviewing a Conditional Use Permit for gravel extraction. Eliminating this requirement is deeply concerning for residents in our area and across the borough.

The Comprehensive Plan exists to ensure that development decisions reflect the safety, character, long-term vision, and input of the communities they impact. Removing this requirement effectively dismisses the role of community planning and public participation in decisions that can permanently affect our neighborhoods.

Residents of Meadow Lakes have already experienced the importance of this protection. When a gravel pit was proposed on Mental Health Trust land near Sylvan, the community voiced legitimate concerns about safety, property values, environmental impacts, and the overall character of the area. Because the Comprehensive Plan was considered as part of the Conditional Use Permit review, those concerns were able to be heard and weighed appropriately.

If Ordinance OR26-021 passes, it would remove an important safeguard and significantly weaken the ability of residents to ensure that industrial activities such as gravel pits are evaluated in the context of the communities surrounding them.

Local comprehensive plans represent the collective voice and long-term vision of the people who live in these areas. Eliminating their consideration in Conditional Use Permit decisions undermines both community planning efforts and public trust in the process.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge the Planning Commission and the Assembly to reject Ordinance OR26-021 and preserve the requirement that Comprehensive Plans be considered when reviewing Conditional Use Permits for gravel operations.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Steve Rudd - Resident, Rainbow Heights Subdivision & Member, Meadow Lakes
Community Council

Opposition to Ordinance OR 26-021.

From Breanna Kaiser <mymothunder@gmail.com>

Date Thu 3/12/2026 1:39 PM

To MSB Planning Commission <msb.planning.commission@matsugov.us>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL - CAUTION: Do not open unexpected attachments or links.]

Dear Planning Commission,

I am writing to express my opposition to Ordinance OR 26-021. A community's Comprehensive Plan represents months of careful work, public input, and thoughtful consideration about the future of the area. Removing the requirement to consider that plan when reviewing a Conditional Use Permit for something as impactful as a gravel pit undermines the purpose of having a Comprehensive Plan at all. Gravel pits have significant effects on nearby communities, including impacts to roads, water, air quality, and overall quality of life. Decisions of that magnitude should absolutely remain consistent with the goals and protections outlined in a community's Comprehensive Plan.

For these reasons, I respectfully urge you not to advance or approve Ordinance OR 26-021.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Breanna

Dear Members of the Planning Commission and Assembly,

I am writing as a resident of the Meadow Lakes community to express my concern regarding Ordinance OR26-021.

The proposal to remove Section 17.30.060, which requires consideration of the Comprehensive Plan when reviewing Conditional Use Permits for gravel operations, is troubling. Comprehensive Plans exist to protect the long-term interests of communities and to ensure that development decisions align with the character, safety, and goals of the areas they affect.

Removing this requirement would significantly weaken the role of community planning and reduce the ability of residents to have meaningful input on developments that can dramatically change the landscape of our neighborhoods.

Industrial activities such as gravel pits have far-reaching impacts, including heavy truck traffic, dust, noise, and potential environmental concerns. These impacts should always be evaluated within the context of the surrounding community and its Comprehensive Plan.

The recent experience with the proposed gravel operation near Sylvan demonstrated how important this process is for residents who are directly affected.

For these reasons, I strongly encourage the Planning Commission and the Assembly to reject Ordinance OR26-021 and maintain the protections that currently exist for community planning.

Thank you for considering the voices of the residents who live in and care deeply about these communities.

Respectfully,

Rylee Rudd

OR 26-021

OR 26-021

From CATHY TEICH <cathyt@mtaonline.net>

Date Fri 3/13/2026 1:58 PM

To MSB Planning Commission <msb.planning.commission@matsugov.us>; Lonnie McKechnie <lonnie.mckechnie@matsugov.us>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL - CAUTION: Do not open unexpected attachments or links.]

Please do not approve OR 26-021. This would strip the Comprehensive Plans throughout the Borough of any meaning. These plans have require a tremendous amount of work, time, and energy. It would basically eliminate the requirement that Comprehensive Plans be considered when a Conditional Use Permit for gravel is being reviewed.

Gravel pits drastically impact communities.

I would sincerely appreciate your disapproving OR 26-021.

Thank you,
Cathy Teich



1210 N Kim Drive, Suite B, Meadow Lakes, Alaska 99623
Phone: 907-232-2845 - Email: info@mlccak.org - Website: www.mlccak.org

March 11, 2026

Mat-Su Borough Planning Commission
350 East Dahlia Ave
Palmer, Alaska 99645
Care of Clerk Lonnie McKechnie, lonnie.mckechnie@matsugov

The Meadow Lakes Community Council membership would like to submit the following comments regarding the upcoming proposed ordinance regarding gravel extraction regulations.

We would like to support the continued consideration of comprehensive plans for gravel extraction and all other conditional use permit applications, as well as for major development projects. We ask that you do not approve permits that are in direct conflict with comprehensive plans.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Camden Yehle".

Camden Yehle
Meadow Lakes Community Council Secretary



OR 26-021

From Wright@mtaonline.net <wright@mtaonline.net>

Date Sun 3/15/2026 5:21 AM

To MSB Planning Commission <msb.planning.commission@matsugov.us>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL - CAUTION: Do not open unexpected attachments or links.]

I am requesting that you do not approve this ordinance.

Pamela Wright
907-354-0109
413 W Faith Road
Wasilla, Alaska 99654

CORRESPONDENCE & INFORMATION



November 30, 2025

Kelsey Means, HDL Alaska (via email)

Re: Draft Engstrom Road to Trunk Road Corridor Route Selection Report

Thank you for the opportunity to review the subject report. We appreciate the public outreach. The North Lakes Community Council (NLCC) submits the following comments and we look forward to further discussion with your team and with the Borough Public Works and Planning folks as they prepare a recommendation to the Borough Assembly for a final decision on the route selection.

To cut to the chase, the NLCC still strongly believes that the “Southern Route” offers the best value (cost, schedule, quality) road and traffic safety infrastructure solution to Borough residents and taxpayers.

The Southern Route is the most cost effective by far and could be implemented in a much shorter time frame than any of the Northern Route options. Implementation of the Southern Route connection will significantly improve the traffic congestion problems in the Fishhook Triangle, particularly in combination with these other Borough and DOT projects already underway:

- North Engstrom to Tex Al Connection project (MSB)
- Tex Al to Tex Al Extension project (MSB)
- Bogard / Engstrom / Green Forest Roundabout project (DOT).

The Southern Route connector would also offer significant traffic safety improvements along the most heavily trafficked section of Bogard Road between Engstrom and Trunk. The Southern Route connector would replace Bogard Road as the primary access point for trucking associated with the large Central Gravel Products operation in this area.

The State DOT and the Mat-Su Borough, with significant input from the community, invested heavily to study the dangerous Bogard - Seldon Corridor and recently adopted a Corridor Access Management Plan (CAMP) outlining many principles and strategies to improve traffic safety. A Southern Route connector would be entirely consistent with the vision described in the approved CAMP.

We believe that the HDL Route Selection work must move forward quickly to finalize the analysis and provide Borough decision makers the information they need to make a timely “best value” decision. Such a decision weighs cost, schedule, and quality. We offer the following recommendations in each category as you finalize your analysis:

1. Cost Analysis: More accurately describe and characterize cost comparisons between the options. Consider these facts:
 - a. The Southern Route is less than ½ the overall length of the northern route.
 - b. The Kircher family has indicated a willingness to sell necessary ROW.
 - c. The Central Gravel Products property owner has offered to sell ROW from his property to the MSB and to have the ROW totally on his side of his northern property boundary, thereby eliminating the need for any ROW purchase from the Havemeister family.
 - d. The Central Gravel Products property owner has offered to construct the new road bed from Engstrom to Trunk, less the work associated with the final D1, paving, and any bridge construction.
 - e. The Lohmann-Olson family (property owner significantly impacted by the Northern Route options) has clearly indicated to the Borough that they have no interest in selling ROW across their undeveloped property.
 - f. There are other property owners who strongly object to ROW across their properties being used for residential and agricultural / livestock grazing along the Northern Route.
 - g. The environmental characteristics and challenging topography of the Northern Route options will significantly drive up construction costs as compared to the Southern Route conditions.
 - h. With multiple stream crossings and fish habitat along the Northern Route, the cost of environmental mitigation measures should be described.

2. Schedule Analysis: More accurately describe the timelines associated with a Southern Route versus Northern Route decision. The community deserves the safety improvements this project delivers in the most timely manner possible. The final Route Selection Report should outline schedule comparisons considering the following:
 - a. The engineering for the Southern Route will be significantly less involved than the engineering for any of the Northern Route options. Explain this difference in the report.
 - b. As described above, the complexity of ROW acquisition for any Northern Route option will drive significant schedule impacts when compared to the Southern Route option. The report should describe and quantify this schedule impact.
 - c. The construction phase of the project will be significantly shorter for the Southern Route option. In large part this is because of the willingness of the Central Gravel Products owner to construct the road base. The construction of the Southern Route can be accomplished in a single season. Given the nature of the environment and topography, the Northern Route options would likely take over two seasons.

3. Quality Analysis: In this context, a “quality” decision must consider the degree to which a route option meets the desired outcomes and actually solves traffic congestion problems now, and into the future. The final Route Selection Report should offer comparisons that consider the following:
 - a. Traffic Analysis, Modeling, & Engineering - there are excellent tools available for predicting traffic levels and driver behaviors, but it is still a “prediction” and not an exact science. While it may seem logical that selecting one of the Northern Routes would offer better traffic flows, we believe it would be wise to construct the Southern Route, and the other projects described above, and then step back and evaluate whether and when a future Northern Route connector is warranted after traffic flows and driver behaviors can be observed.
 - b. Only the Southern Route directly addresses Bogard Corridor risk mitigation with a serious reduction in gravel truck traffic. Removing gravel truck traffic from the most congested section of Bogard Road and moving it to a new Southern Route Connector (designed with left turn lanes for Central Gravel Products access), is a significant reduction in risks to the community.
 - c. Future development / tax revenue benefits: a decision to construct the Southern Route alternative results in excellent transportation infrastructure in an area that will very likely see growth in commercial property and residential property development. We would expect the demand for commercial property and/or multi-family residential property in the vicinity of the Bogard / Trunk roundabout will grow much more quickly than on any of the Northern Route options as those properties support agricultural production and owners have expressed significant opposition to further development.

The NLCC is aware of mixed public input on route selection. We acknowledge there are some residents along Engstrom Road who favor a North Route Connection. Our organization and membership have been studying this project for some time and our broader community based recommendations have been vetted with our membership more than once. We believe that public support will swing significantly away from any Northern Route alternative once the project schedule is more fully communicated and once the impact to the taxpayers due to project costs are more transparent. Approval of this letter at our November, 2025 NLCC Meeting was by a 91% vote.

Thank you again for the opportunity to provide suggestions. By addressing these issues more thoroughly in the final report, we believe the decision makers will have the information they need. We hope you find the NLCC input helpful.

Please feel free to reach out to us if you have any questions.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Rod D. Hanson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Rod" being the most prominent.

Rod D. Hanson
President, North Lakes Community Council
board@nlakes.cc 907-841-8735

cc via email: Tom Adams, MSB Public Works
Cole Branham, MSB Projects
Alex Strawn, MSB Planning
Lonnie McKechnie, MSB Clerk (for distribution to the Assembly)
NLCC Board



Rod Hanson <rod@nlakes.cc>

Engstrom to Trunk Connector - Proposed Southern Route

1 message

Jade CGP <jade@centralgravelproducts.com>

Wed, Jan 21, 2026 at 11:43 AM

To: Tom Adams <Tom.Adams@matsugov.us>

Cc: Alex.Strawn@matsugov.us, Lonnie.McKechnie@matsugov.us, Rod Hanson <rod@nlakes.cc>

Dear Tom et. al.

I would like to go on record with my opinion regarding the proposed Southern Route - Engstrom to Trunk Connector.

As I am sure everyone knows, we have recently purchased the 80 acres that used to be the Havemeister Dairy. We are more than willing to discuss and negotiate the proposed route being entirely located on our property, joining with the backside of Kircher property, thus having no impact on Bob & Franci Havemeister's adjoining parcel. In the past Kircher has been amenable to discussing this route as well, and we surmise nothing has changed regarding that. We are willing to facilitate discussion with Kircher when the time comes.

If a reasonable agreement can be reached we are willing to collaborate with MSB on the design and construction of the basic road base using materials and equipment if available from our pit.

Once constructed we would consider using access to the connector as our primary entrance/exit for traffic into and out of the gravel pit.

Please feel free to distribute/share this email with any interested parties. If you have additional questions or would like to discuss this further please do not hesitate to contact me.

Regards,

Jade

Central Gravel Products

(907) 745-4044

jade@centralgravelproducts.com

www.centralgravelproducts.com

The content of this email is confidential and intended for the recipient specified in message. Please do not share this message without the consent of the sender.



North Lakes Community Council

3060 Lazy Eight Ct #2 PMB 449
Wasilla, AK 99654

March 4, 2026

Lonnie McKechnie, Borough Clerk (via email)

Re: Joint Assembly / Planning Commission Meeting - March 10, 2026
Engstrom Road to Trunk Road Corridor Route Selection Report

Following a recent conversation with the MatSu Borough Manager, the NLCC is requesting that you forward a copy of this letter to the Assembly and Planning Commission members in advance of their joint meeting on March 10, 2026. We have reviewed the Public Works Presentation and the Resolution from the Transportation Advisory Committee. We believe the joint body would benefit by more clearly understanding the nature of public comments as they consider any feedback they may provide to Public Works at this important meeting.

The administration assured us they are not requesting a decision from the Assembly on March 10th, and that an ultimate decision on route selection will be made after the Draft Route Selection Report is finalized.

The NLCC has been providing community input on this project from the beginning. We fully support the East-West connection of Engstrom and Trunk roads to relieve traffic congestion in the Fishhook Triangle. We strongly encourage public input to be fully considered and addressed before Public Works makes a final recommendation on the route.

The Borough's long range plans envision both a Northern and Southern connection. At this point in time, the "Southern Route" offers the lowest cost, shortest schedule, and least environmental impact. It directly addresses the safety concerns of significant gravel truck operations on the most congested section of Bogard Road. The Engstrom North Connector and the Tex Al to Tex Al Connector projects that are already underway will provide much improved East-West connections on the northern end of Engstrom and the residential growth in that area. A Southern Route connection will support future residential and commercial growth in the Trunk / Bogard "node" area.

We provided detailed feedback and recommendations on the Draft Route Selection Report in a November 30, 2025 letter (see attached).

Property owners along the Southern and Northern routes have also submitted their comments. They express strong objections to providing ROW agreements for the Northern route. In contrast, property owners along the Southern route have expressed a willingness to engage in good faith ROW negotiations and the owner of Central Gravel Products has offered to construct the road minus final surface (paving) and bridge construction. (see attached).

The NLCC is hopeful that the comments, concerns, and recommendations from our community will be fully considered. The Final Route Selection Report must present an accurate assessment and relative scoring of project criteria and a recommendation that properly balances cost, schedule, environmental, and safety considerations.

For those wishing to understand the involvement and position of the NLCC in more detail, please visit our <https://www.nlakes.cc> website. This project is referenced under "HOT TOPICS" on the home page.

If anyone would like to further discuss our perspective, please feel free to contact me directly.

Regards,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Rod D. Hanson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Rod" being the most prominent.

Rod D. Hanson
President, North Lakes Community Council
board@nlakes.cc 907-841-8735

cc via email: Mike Brown, MSB Manager
 Tom Adams, MSB Public Works
 Alex Strawn, MSB Planning
 NLCC Board

Attachments: November 30, 2025 Letter to HDL Alaska on the DRAFT report
 January 21, 2026 Central Gravel Products Email

Public comment for 3/17 general meeting

From Karen <krc.korsmo@gmail.com>

Date Thu 3/12/2026 7:11 PM

To MSB Planning Commission <msb.planning.commission@matsugov.us>

[EXTERNAL EMAIL - CAUTION: Do not open unexpected attachments or links.]

RE: RS 26-019/IM 26-050 Resolution supporting joint marketing effort between the Borough and TECC for promotion and development of data centers...

I am writing to state my opposition to this proposed resolution, which to my understanding has been vetoed by Mayor DeVries but could be overturned at the March 17th meeting. I am in support of the veto and urge the assembly not to entertain the idea of data centers in the Matsu.

Communities are proven to be significantly impacted by data centers. Due to the cooling mechanism, these centers use significant amounts of fresh water and have been associated with increased risk of water bankruptcy, as well as water pollution. This also requires a vast supply of electricity, the cost of which becomes the burden of local residents. There is substantial light and noise pollution - brightness comparable to that of a football stadium and noise comparable to jet engines taking off on a runway.

Data centers have also become a symbol that governing bodies put profit over people. Please keep this proposal vetoed.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Karen Clement

<https://www.lincolnst.edu/publications/land-lines-magazine/articles/land-water-impacts-data-centers/>

Lonnie McKechnie

From: jack morgan <akJacksons@outlook.com>
Sent: Thursday, March 5, 2026 8:59 AM
To: Lonnie McKechnie
Subject: Engstrom to Trunk connection
Attachments: Engstrom trunk road letter 2.pdf

[EXTERNAL EMAIL - CAUTION: Do not open unexpected attachments or links.]

Good morning Lonnie,

I am Jack Morgan, a property owner affected by the proposed Engstrom to trunk Routes, I will be unable to attend the meeting on the 10Th so I'm asking that you please forward this letter to all Assembly Members and all Planning Commission Members before that meeting on March 10, 2026

Thank you in advance

Jack Morgan
907-414-2514
Akjacksons@outlook.com

To whom it may concern,

The Morgan Family resides at the old DeArmound farm which includes parcels 18N01E23D006, 18N01E23D004, and 18N01E24C006. We write today to express our deepest disapprobation with the proposed Engstrom to Trunk Northern Routes.

Upon viewing all the proposed routes connecting Engstrom to Trunk we cannot understand the extreme push for a route that is almost guaranteed to be a legal, environmental and financial disaster for the Borough, especially when compared to the Southern Route.

The northern routes have a significantly higher cost, as well as environmental impact. The steep terrain would require 100s of tons of earth to be moved, severely impacting the local wildlife and fish populations in and around Wasilla creek. A large portion of our land is raw wooded and brushy space that is ideal for moose and other animals. A road through it would decimate their habits and even further reduce the populations in an area already severely deforested.

The further potential impact on existing property owners is just another thing added to the long list of reasons why the northern routes are a bad idea. Our land was purchased by my great grandparents Harold and June DeArmound and has been in the family ever since, in that time it has already been subject to evisceration when Trunk Road was expanded, another road funneling in even more traffic would destroy the natural beauty not only visually but through noise and air pollution. What once was a quaint and secluded family farm would become nothing better than a shopping center parking lot. We have no plans for commercial or residential development of our property. We actively use the property for agriculture and intend to continue this for the foreseeable future. Our story is not unique.

In summary, the Morgan family is 100% opposed to any northern connection from Engstrom to Trunk, we are not open to a ROW settlement, and we are willing to fight to keep what we have whole.

November 29, 2025

Lohmann – Olson Family, LLLP
Patricia Sindt, General Partner
13379 560th Ave.
Story City, IA 50248

Via email: kmeans@hdlalaska.com

Kelsey Means
HDL Engineering Consultants LLC
1617 S. Industrial Way, Suite 3
Palmer, AK 99645

Mayor Edna DeVries
Tom Adams, Public Works
Cole Branham, Public Works
Matanuska-Susitna Borough
350 East Dahlia Avenue
Palmer, AK 99645-6488

RE: Draft Engstrom Road to Trunk Road Corridor Route Selection Report
Review Comments

Dear Kelsey, Mayor DeVries, Tom, and Cole:

This letter is a summary of our review of the October 2025 draft Engstrom Road to Trunk Road Corridor Route Selection Report prepared by HDL Engineering Consultants LLC. We previously met and corresponded with Borough staff and expressed our concerns regarding the proposed North Route and impacts on our property.

Our family (Lohmann-Olson Family LLLP) owns 245 acres of agricultural use property located along significant portions of the North Route. This land has been in our family for three generations, since my pioneer grandfather, Arthur Olson, homesteaded in 1915. It is our intent to maintain the land for agricultural use and wildlife habitat.

As indicated to the Borough staff and Mayor, our preference is the South Route.

The following are our draft report review comments and suggestions:

1. Project Cost

The draft report does not include quantitative project cost comparisons of the three alternatives. The North Route will have significantly greater cost than the South Route due to several factors, including:

- a. Longer North Route road (1.9 miles vs. less than one mile for South Route)

- b. Significantly greater earthwork costs for North Route due to very steep terrain
- c. Significant greater cost of right-of-way acquisition for the North Route (The gravel pit owner on the South Route alignment is a willing right-of-way seller. We and other land owners along portions of the North Route are not willing sellers.) The Route Evaluation Matrix – Table 2 indicates “fair” ROW cost for both the North and South Routes. We think this is an error. We suggest the ROW cost be classified as “poor” for the North Route and “good” for the South Route.

We suggest that the report include a detailed project cost opinion for each alternative route including construction, right-of-way, and environmental impact costs.

2. Impacts on Existing Property Owners

The draft report does not include detailed discussion of the impacts on existing property owners along the alternative routes. The North Route will adversely impact the property and homeowners along Heaton Road. These property owners selected the location for quiet enjoyment of the serene, undeveloped, and agricultural use area. On the other hand, the property owners along the South Route have sold their property for gravel pit operations. We expect that the Borough would offer significant compensation to the homeowners along the North Route for the impacts on their properties. The impact of the South Route on the property owners will be minimal. The report includes discussion of the benefits for future residential development, but fails to discuss the impacts on current residents and landowners adjacent to the proposed routes.

We suggest that the report be expanded with details of impacts on property owners and include a section in Table 2 – Route Evaluation Matrix that considers the impacts on the current residents and property owners adjacent to the routes.

3. Gravel Pit Traffic and Cooperation of Gravel Pit Owner

The draft report does not adequately discuss the traffic situation at the new gravel pit area. This is a serious shortcoming because it appears that South Route provides significant benefits for traffic at the gravel pit. The South Route can be constructed much sooner than the North Route and thereby provide improvements in the gravel pit access soon. We understand that the gravel pit operator requested the South Route due to gravel pit access considerations. We also understand that the gravel pit owner has offered to work with the Borough on reasonable right-of-way purchase and assistance with roadbed earthwork construction. This cooperative relationship between the gravel pit owner and the Borough is not adequately discussed and considered in the draft report.

We suggest that the report be expanded with more detailed discussion and consideration of the gravel pit operations including:

- Impacts of South Route on traffic safety and convenience at the gravel pit
- Desire of the gravel pit operations for the South Route
- Potential significant reduction in South Route project cost due to cooperation of the gravel pit owner in right-of-way acquisition and roadbed construction by the gravel pit owner

- Shorter implementation schedule for the South Route than the North Routes with significant improvements in traffic safety and gravel pit access in shorter time period than the North Routes.

4. Environmental and Wildlife Impacts

The discussion of the Northern Routes mentions anadromous stream crossings of “Wasilla Creek and tributary to Cottonwood Creek.” It fails to mention the recent (2025) anadromous designation of the tributary to Wasilla Creek located along the Northern Route 1, north of Wasilla Creek. The draft report fails to discuss the details of the tributary to Cottonwood Creek. The Northern Route passes through the natural spring that is the headwater of this tributary. The impacts of the road construction on this spring and shallow aquifer should be evaluated.

The draft report does not include a discussion of the impacts on wildlife. There are fewer and fewer large contiguous tracts of wildlife habitat in the valley. The North Route will probably disrupt current wildlife movement, including moose. We expect that there will be significant issues with moose crossing along the North Route and subsequent impact on the moose population on our adjacent properties. The South Route has already been disturbed by the gravel pit operations and the impact of the South Route construction on wildlife would be minimal in comparison with the impact of the North Routes.

It appears the environmental impact of the North Route is significantly greater than the South Route impact. We agree with the “poor” rankings of the Table 2 – Route Evaluation Matrix for the North Route environmental factors, but the extent of environmental impacts is not adequately discussed or considered.

We suggest that the report be expanded with more detailed discussion of environmental impacts of each alternative including:

- Impact the North Routes on the headwaters of Cottonwood Creek including groundwater hydrology of the natural spring water source
- Impact of the North Route on the tributary to Wasilla Creek, a recently designated anadromous stream
- Impact of the North Route on wildlife habitat and movement including moose
- Potential for increased moose – vehicle collisions with the North Route

5. Aesthetic Impacts

The draft report does not mention the impacts on the natural beauty of the area. The scenic beauty of the Havemeister farm along the South Route has already been impacted with the gravel pit operation. The construction of the South Route will have minor impacts on the scenic beauty of this area. The North Route is an undisturbed area. The grading of the roadway though the rugged terrain would destroy the natural beauty of this property.

We suggest the report be expanded to include the impacts and consideration of aesthetic impacts including:

- Assessment of impacts on the natural beauty of the area
- Review of Borough Comprehensive Plan and policies regarding maintaining natural beauty along roadways

6. Phased Improvements and Evaluation

Completion of the Tex-Al Drive Extension, Engstrom Road North Extension to Tex-Al Drive and the Bogard / Engstrom Green Forest Roundabout should provide significant improvement to the Engstrom Road traffic issues. We believe more prudent approach to the immediate implementation of North Route project approach is:

- Complete construction of these projects currently in the planning process now
- Complete construction of the South Route now – this will provide significant improvement to the gravel pit access issue and can be completed much sooner than the North Route.
- Evaluate the traffic situation after these projects are completed and determine the need for another connector route located further north.

The following table is a summary comparison of the South Route advantages and North Route disadvantages.

	South Route Advantages	North Route Disadvantages
Cost	Shorter length, greater construction and ROW costs, potential for gravel pit owner assistance with construction	Nearly twice length, greater construction cost due to terrain, higher ROW costs due to unwilling sellers
Schedule	Shorter implementation time due to less complex design, ROW acquisition, and shorter length	Longer implementation time due to potential ROW acquisition issues and difficult terrain
Gravel Pit Access	Significant improvement in gravel pit access and traffic safety with much shorter implementation time	Minimal impact on gravel pit access and traffic safety at gravel pit entrance
ROW Acquisition	Willing seller	Multiple unwilling sellers
Impact on Residents	Minimal impact as area already altered by gravel pit operation, residents sold land for gravel pit operations	Significant impact on residents and agricultural land use
Environmental Impacts	Area already disturbed by gravel pit operations	Greater risk to multiple anadromous streams and Cottonwood Creek headwater spring and aquifer
Wildlife Impacts	Minimal additional impacts to already disturbed area	Disrupts wildlife migration and habitat, increases risk of moose – vehicle collisions
Aesthetic Impacts	Scenic value is already impacted by the gravel pit operations	Significant impact on scenic value
Project Phasing	Can be implemented as a first phase of improvements, evaluated after improvements are made before selecting location for additional connector road, if needed	Eliminates opportunity for expediting improvements for gravel pit access and traffic safety. Eliminates opportunity for review of impacts of Engstrom extension to Tex-Al Drive and the Tex-Al Drive extension prior to connector road route selection.

Lohmann-Olson Family LLLP Letter
November 29, 2025
Page 6

The route selection is a very important decision that will impact current residents and future generations. This draft report was the first opportunity for the public to review and comment based on project concept technical details.

We suggest that the Borough staff and HDL Engineering Consultants review and consider these suggestions, revise the draft report, and distribute the draft report for public review and comment. We think the responses to the public comments should be reviewed with the public prior to Borough staff making recommendations to the Assembly.

Thank you for considering these suggestions regarding the Engstrom Road issues and connector route selection.

Please contact me with discussion and questions.

Sincerely,
LOHMANN-OLSON FAMILY LLLP

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Patricia Sindt". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large initial "P".

Patricia Sindt
General Partner
515-290-0274 (Greg Sindt mobile phone)