

**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
1	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	general	I really like the readability and formatting of the document.	Thank you.	No change requested
2	Judith	Ritenburgh	Trapper Creek Community Council	general	Fund walking and biking paths in trapper creek from school to public library and community park!	Unfortunately, the study area for the Plan does not extend to Trapper Creek, but this comment is noted for consideration for other MSB projects or future safety assessment/needs outside of the Expanded Core Area.	No change recommended
3	Esther	Huddleston	Resident	general	In the Safe Street for All, the Comprehensive Plan extends the core area past Houston. There were 4,802 crashes total in the Mat Su Borough from 2018-2022. Motor vehicles were involved at 78% of the crashes, Motorcycles were at 15%, pedestrians were at 4% (30 pedestrian crashes total), bicycle crashes were at 3% (22 bicycle incidents), and ATVs were the least percentage with 9 accidents total, and one of the ATV accidents was a fatality. Safe Streets for All wants to spend \$160,000 of tax payer's money to install Non-Motorized signs throughout the Mat Su Borough and to have an ATV campaign. The Safe Streets for All wants to add bicycle paths on both sides of the road system and has no plans to create a multi-use trail systems on one side of the road for ATV and snowmobile usage. A survey for Safe Streets for All showed that the majority of the people who participated in the survey supports a multi-use trail system.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•We will clarify in Chapter 1 that the Mat-Su 'Expanded Core Area' is a study area for the plan, which includes the city limits of Houston, Palmer, and Wasilla, and is not a proposal to change the boundary of the Mat-Su Core Area</li> <li>• To clarify, the crash numbers listed in this comment are citing percentages for motor vehicles, motorcycles, bicycles, and pedestrians as a breakdown of fatal and serious injury crashes (216 total), not total crashes (4,802).</li> <li>• The "No Motor Vehicle Signs" on pathways (page 83) was a steering committee recommendation to increase awareness of state laws about motorized vehicles' prohibited use on facilities intended for non-motorized users.</li> <li>• The ATV campaign mentioned (SP13, page 111) is intended to promote safe use of ATVs: "Evaluate the feasibility of a local ATV and snowmachine safety program, working with local dealerships and trail rider group(s.) Focus on education and outreach for safe and legal ATV and snow machine operations."</li> <li>• There are no specific recommendations for bicycle paths on both sides of the road system except in one place along Bogard between Wasilla-Fishhook and N. Crusey, which has Wasilla Middle and High on each side of the road, and along Arctic Avenue where paths or sidewalks already exist on both sides of the road. The plan's Safety Toolkit, page D20, recommends planning for ATV trail space in new road designs.</li> <li>• We understand the concern that ATV trail use needs may not be emphasized enough in plan recommendations, and are amending projects #6, Hollywood Road Safety Improvements to include consideration for ATV trail use, as well as Project #9, Vine Road Separated Path.</li> </ul>	Clarify in Chapter 1 that the Expanded Core Area is not a proposed boundary change and is a study area, inclusive of the cities of Houston, Palmer and Wasilla. Change Projects #6 and #9, Vine Road and Hollywood Road to note consideration is needed for ATV trail use space on one side of the road.
4	Esther	Huddleston	Resident	91, 83	The Safe Streets for All Comprehensive Plan wants to eliminate all ATV usage from the Glenn Highway to Clark-Wolverine Road (pg. 91). The Safe Streets Plan also, wants to create a non-motorized task force (pg.83, B 85, 212/312). The extended core area heavily targets ATV and snowmobile usage in the Safe Streets for All; however, ATVs have the least accidents in the 4 year period. Safe Streets for All wants to add smaller roundabouts throughout the Mat Su Borough; which isn't tractor trailer friendly. Another issue with smaller sized roundabouts brings disadvantages to vehicles not in the dominate flow of traffic; therefore, making it impossible during rush hour to enter into the small roundabout and it creates frustration with drivers on the road. Safe Streets for All wants bicycle lanes in the road ways and this creates a danger between vehicles and bicyclist, takes away room from the road system, during winter months and drivers are unable to see the bicycle lanes because of snow and ice in the roads. Pages of Interest in the Safe Streets for All Comprehensive Plan Pg. 21, 30, 35, 36, 55, 62, 64, 65 (bike lanes), 67, 81, 82, 91, 111, 170/312 (pg. 41), 190/312 (pg. 63), 193/312 (pg. 64), 206/312 (pg. 77), 207/312 (pg. 78), 208/312 (pg. 79), 209/312 (pg. 80), 212/312 (pg. 83), 247/312 (pg. 4), 262/312 (pg. 19), 305/312 (pg. 1)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The text states a recommendation for a "Supplemental plan for access management and non-motorized facility needs from Glenn Highway to Clark-Wolverine Road, or other eastern boundary as determined by DOT&amp;PF and the City of Palmer." Nothing on this page discusses eliminating ATV usage.</li> <li>• Regarding creation of a non-motorized task force, this is not a recommendation of this Plan, this was included in a summary of other plans reviewed. This was a recommendation of the 2023 MSB Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</li> <li>• The plan is not recommending limiting ATV use where they are legally allowed to operate. The plan acknowledges the user conflicts between the different modes of travel (ATV, vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian) and offers a recommendation in the Safety Toolkit (page D20) to make specific considerations for ATV use in new roadway design projects.</li> <li>• Regarding the roundabouts, it is accurate that roundabouts are shown as a proven Safety Countermeasure in the plan, and that there are some proposed as projects. However, there is no recommendation to make new or existing roundabouts smaller. One mini roundabout is proposed on Green Forest Drive for traffic calming (Pages 101-102), but is a local residential road, and mini-roundabouts would not be appropriate for more major/higher volume roads with truck traffic. The size roundabouts should be designed for are unique to the location, and, as noted in the plan (Page D-16), need to consider freight movements in the area for the design vehicle. They also need to account for anticipated future design traffic volumes so they have adequate capacity. We are proposing to make the mini-roundabout bigger (modern roundabout size) at Bogard and Seldon (Page 85). Important considerations for roundabout design are also discussed in Appendix D, Safety Toolkit (Page D16) and actual crash data at a few Mat-Su roundabouts are discussed on Pages B47 and B48.</li> <li>• Regarding bicycle lanes proposed on Arctic Avenue (pages 90/91), we understand your concern specific to Alaska winter conditions and are taking that under advisement. They do provide a space adjacent to traffic (just like a road shoulder) that is usable for at least half the year, and some cyclists feel safer with this dedicated space even if it is not separated as a path because it removes conflicts with slower moving pedestrians and younger bicyclists. There are ways to build more separation into them to address the vehicle/pedestrian conflict concern that can be considered.</li> </ul>	No change recommended.
5	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	7	Page 7: Please redo the graphs- these appear to show more crash reduction than the actual very slight improvement of a couple of crashes over a 5 year rolling average. Conflicts visually to the page 12 graphs and the graphs in the appendices.	Agree	Graphic will be adjusted or trend line removed.
6	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	13	Page 13: Consider adding an arrow to (street) locations named on the map to make it clear where these are occurring	Agree	Listed roads will be labeled.

**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
7	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	15	Page 15 Consider changes out the moose visual to a multicar visual as moose crashes seem to be far lower than the multicar crash situation and may lead to misunderstanding the types of crashes to advocate for funding towards mitigation.	Agree	Icons will be changed.
8	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	15	Page 15: In general, are these statistics over representative when compared with statewide or other statistics? For example, are these age groups tracking with the age of the population in the MSB or are these higher?	The plan reflects estimated population data given the custom boundary of the MSB Expanded Core Area, which doesn't adhere to municipal or census tract boundaries. Age ranges represented for contributing unit drivers are 13 through 87. Also, age ranges for people 25-34 is a preset from the crash data. We did not define these age ranges, but identified the most affected single age for all crashes and serious crashes.	No change recommended.
9	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	23	Page 23: What is "Active monitoring" for red light running? Enforcement? Reviewing crash data?	We can change "Active monitoring" to "camera monitoring for red light running." Boulder's practice is enforcement, but camera monitoring at a minimum, to show the extent of a problem, which gives decision makers information. Then, there is the option to proceed to automatic enforcement if laws in the jurisdiction allow.	Change text to read "camera monitoring for red light running"
10	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	23	Page 23: What is "Explore a change?" look like for an action item.	This table is not a recommendation/action list, it is a compilation of safety strategies from peer cities reviewed, which set the stage for recommendations in Ch 6-8.	No change recommended
11	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	22	Page 22: I recommend tying the above graphs from AK crash patterns to which strategies listed in the national best practices and peer review section would target our crash patterns. Right now, I wouldn't know how these strategies will help MSB with their crash reduction goals through targeted investments. For example, there are relatively very few signalized intersections in the MSB to warrant a strategy of "active monitoring redlight running." The crash data doesn't mention anything regarding overrepresentation of crash history at signalized intersection that involved red light running	This table is not a recommendation/action list, it is a compilation of safety strategies from peer cities reviewed, which set the stage for recommendations in Ch 6-8.	No change recommended
12	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	23	Table 3, Page 23: I recommend more robust review of infrastructure change recommendations. For example, the crash data for pedestrian crashes showed they happened at night and where no lighting was present yet there is no discussion about increase roadway lighting	This table is not a recommendation/action list, it is a compilation of safety strategies from peer cities reviewed, which set the stage for recommendations in Ch 6-8.	No change recommended
13	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	23	Table 3, Page 23: Leading pedestrian intervals will also require Audible Pedestrian Signals (PROWAG requirement) and therefore there are some infrastructure costs associated (not just signal timing adjustments). Also should be implemented with no-turn on red.	This table is not a recommendation/action list, it is a compilation of safety strategies from peer cities reviewed, which set the stage for recommendations in Ch 6-8. The project team included this in our Safety Toolkit and the APS requirement is addressed. Costs for implementation were acknowledged in Parks Highway Corridor Project #1 (Page 75). We defer to DOT&PF on no right on red on Parks. The new signals going in on Main Street (and new Yenlo signal) may be a good time to evaluate all of this. However, we will add "consider using in conjunction with no turn on red light" under "Things to Keep in Mind" for this strategy in our Safety Toolkit (page D7)	No change to this page, but will add recommendation for no turn on red will be carried to the Safety Toolkit, in Appendix D.
14	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	23	Table 3, Page 23: Adding right turn pockets at signalized intersections in an urban area are not necessarily better for non-motorized crashes and may exacerbate the crash pattern documented in the previous section regarding drivers failing to yield to non-motorized users.	This table is not a recommendation/action list, it is a compilation of safety strategies from peer cities reviewed, which set the stage for recommendations in Ch 6-8. However, we agree and VRU concerns were addressed in Safety Toolkit under 'things to consider' for dedicated turn lanes (page D14). We will add "At signalized intersections, consider whether right turn lanes will reduce safety for vulnerable road users due to motorist's failure to yield" to this Toolkit recommendation.	No change recommended on this page, but mentioned changes will be made to the Safety Toolkit.
15	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	25	Table 4, page 25: Very supportive of all these items!	Thank you. While these aren't specific recommendations/action items, all of them are incorporated in some manner in Ch 6-8 recommendations.	No change requested
16	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	31	Page 31: Great summary of public comments. Top 5 all are non-motorized related. How do the action items be reflective of the public request? I think the action items show increased infrastructure, but comfort and accessibility of the increased infrastructure will still need to be addressed in order to make people feel safe using the facilities.	Thank you. We believe that we have addressed comfort and accessibility in infrastructure recommendations and with Toolkit recommendations. One example is Swanson Avenue Complete Streets, which recommends wider sidewalks, even though sidewalks exist on both sides of the road currently.	No change requested
17	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	36	Page 36: Re: Alaska Traffic Manual and school zones. We are in the throes of updating the ATM so now is a great time to address this! Please send any details you have directly to me and I can share those with the ATM rewrite team.	Noted and shared with MSB Public Works	No change requested
18	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	36	Page 36: School zone crashes during school drop off and pick up times are not showing up in severe crash data analysis. I recommend clarifying that these concerns are congestion related and not a safety hazard. Instead, circulation and site selection need to be coordinated with the roadway authority to better address queueing and traffic congestion during drop off/pick up times. When schools choose to expand, this has a direct impact on congestion for the road authority.	This will be shared with MSB Public Works as a member of MSB Safe Routes to School team. These are presented as conclusions from discussions with the Safety Action Plan Team, so we don't want re-word their statements even if they are based in opinion.	No change recommended this page. We can add a clarification to address this concern on page 61 to include Safe Routes to School ("What's already working") planning and that continued growth/school expansions have impacts to the road network just as any other development.

**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
19	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	46	Page 46, Figure 27: Appreciate focused approach to the highest impact locations	Thank you.	No change requested
20	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	50	Page 50: Consider defining clearly "Vulnerable Populations" for this context. Vulnerable Road Users is a specific term by FHWA, so we want to distinguish this definition from VRU	We have defined VRUs within the plan (page 73 provides a definition, and in more detail in Appendix C, C3.) We had a specific risk profile developed just for VRUs (Appendix C). We believe this addresses the VRU definition (taken from the Strategic Highway Safety Plan.)	No change recommended
21	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	54	Page 54: Recommend removing the term "reduce congestion" from the bulleted list. Congestion is not a symptom of a safety concern, and in fact some congestion in urban areas is a safer for slower operational speeds. Reducing congestion is not a safety funding eligible action item.	Will remove. Note, no plan recommendations are trying to suggest congestion mitigation as a means of safety improvements.	Remove "Reduce congestion" from goals list carried forward from other plan reviews.
22	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	54	Page 54: Consider rewording bullet that states "improve pedestrian and vehicle connections adjacent to the glenn highway" not sure what this is recommending...	Agree	Will reword (from City of Palmer Comprehensive Plan) to: "improve pedestrian and vehicular links between east and west side of the Glenn Highway."
23	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	55	Page 55 re: other plan key findings for installing more pedestrian crossing infrastructure: As an FYI, unless this is only suggesting grade separated bridge/tunnel crossings, marked crosswalks will need to be compliant with the ATM. It is HEAVILY limited based on roadway speeds and volumes so integrating a network approach with speed limit reductions, roadway diets, etc will be necessary to meet this goal.	Noted, thank you.	Will review plan recommendations to make note as appropriate where Alaska Traffic Manual warrants need review prior to implementation.
24	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	71	Page 71: I really like this visual and layout! Isn't the risk factor for VRU crashes supposed to be at 35MPH, not 45MPH (same for page 73)? There is international data, and more recent national data, indicating that risk dramatically increases beyond the 50/50 chance of survival at 35MPH and higher	While we agree speeds slower than 45 mph present a VRU risk, this risk profile was selected as part of systemic analysis and aligns to what are considered high speed roadways. In hindsight, we agree we should have profiled any road over 35 mph as a risk for VRUs for the systemic analysis. However, only four of 52 recorded VRU crashes occurred on roads posted at 35 mph or 40 mph, so specific to MSB Expanded Core Area, we believe we still accurately captured the VRU risk profiles, and do not believe the resultant VRU priority list would have changed significantly.	No change recommended
25	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	94	Page 94, Hollywood Road Safety Improvements: Recommend speed reduction as well if the desire is to provide separated pathway and users will need to cross the road to access the pathway.	Agree	Will add 'if separated path built, evaluate a speed limit reduction to consider users crossing the roadway.' Will carry same comment to Vine Road project.
26	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	101	Page 101, Green Forest Drive Improvements: Is it suggesting the separated pathway and C&G would only add \$1M to existing project budget? I recommend relooking at that cost	Yes. This is within the range of a planning level estimate and will need more detailed review with design specifics. With adjustments where appropriate, we have generally assumed \$600k/mile for a separated path and \$141/SY for 6" thick concrete sidewalk, plus additional for curb ramps, C&G and drainage. MSB advised a recent path constructed in the area (E. Nelson Road) was \$400k/mile, and we found \$141/SY for sidewalk (which would be about \$500k in this case) was the highest price in a range of recent sidewalk construction projects in Anchorage. This is about a mile long, so costs should be covered by \$1M which also includes adding a mini roundabout (cost of that assumed low), in conjunction with a road reconstruction project already happening.	No change recommended
27	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	107	Page 107, Local Road Speed Management Plan (Area Wide): I support including DOT roads too if MSB requests. Comprehensive look at networks and roadway classifications to adjust as development has increased is a great!	Noted, thank you. The intent is for this project to focus on roads functionally classed as local, and DOT has some of those. The reason being is they don't have the volume or the crashes generally, but we needed a way to acknowledge the high extent of road network they make up.	No change requested
28	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	110	Page 110: I see demonstration projects are listed, but there wasn't discussion about where or in what priority those would be implemented. I fully support just curious if those were included in the cost estimates and project lists, or if those are separate action items outside this plan.	We don't have any specific demonstration projects recommended, but some of the projects in Ch 7 may be good candidates, like Swanson Avenue Complete Streets. Will discuss with MSB or remove from Implementation Matrix.	Project team will discuss with MSB or remove mention.

**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
29	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	D5	Page D5: Speed management tool kit is great! I don't recall seeing any of the treatments in the project specific recommendations...narrow lanes, speed feedback signs, in locations where non-motorized user infrastructure is being added/enhanced. Consider calling out these treatments to show that speed risk and non-motorized user facilities need to be done in conjunction.	Thank you, we agree and will work some of these in. The project team would like to avoid being overly prescriptive in the specific project recommendations, but your other comments have us considering where we should make some specific comments about recommended speed limit reductions, or opportunities in the short term for narrower lanes such as the upcoming resurfacing projects for Church, Hollywood and Vine. That would be a perfect time to re-stripe to 11-ft lanes at no additional cost.	Project team will incorporate treatments from speed management toolkit where appropriate.
30	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	D7	Page D7: I didn't see medians or refuge islands recommended, did they make the cut?	They did, see Parks Highway Corridor Project #1 (page 75) and Westpoint/Crusey Project #4, page 83	No change recommended
31	Anna	Bosin	DOT&PF	F	Page F: I didn't see the public comment appendix. Not that I need to, just saying it may be missing?	This is a placeholder for the final plan to incorporate public comments on the draft. Public comments will be incorporated after the close of the public comment period, January 19, 2025.	No change recommended
32	Jerry	Henry		General	I see no point in wasting more money on new garbage.It's about time you fix the roads that should have been fixed 10 years ago.For instance Horizon dr off of kgb, was told it was going to be fixed last year as the road is falling apart.2 of your road repair guys came out and tossed 3 shovel full of asphalt into 2 holes and called it good when the road is absolute shables there.You paved twilight because it was a bus route, well starlight and polaris are also busy routes.I wonder which one of you own property on Twilight.It's never about fixing what the majority needs it's what pads your pockets or does favors for your friends.I am sick of the absolute (expletive) you people say we need but actually don't. We need our damn roads fixed!	Thank you for your comment. We recommend contacting the Road Service Area 17 (Knik) board, or attending their next meeting.	No change recommended
33	Jim	Mills	Point MacKenzie Community Council		Great work but I wish that the project team had taken the KGB survey to at least the intersection of KGB and Point MacKenzie Rd and preferably to Mile 8 of Point MacKenzie Rd. Much of the traffic that flows down KGB originates from the two correctional facilities plus local residents. The Point MacKenzie Community Council is also in the beginning stages of coming up with suggestions on road safety. If there any want that we can include that work with the project teams work?	Thank you for your comment. The intersection of KGB and Point MacKenzie Rd to mile 8 of Point MacKenzie road is unfortunately outside the project study area for this plan. However, this comment is noted for consideration for other MSB projects or future safety assessment/needs outside of the Expanded Core Area.	No change recommended
34	Jim	Mills	Point MacKenzie Community Council		At the December 12, 2024 PM Community Council Meeting, Sarah Angol, the Superintendent of the Goose Creek Correctional Facility and Harry Moore, the Superintendent of the Point MacKenzie Correctional Farm discussed Point MacKenzie Road safety concerns. Several possibilities were suggested to increase road safety: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increase Alaska State Trooper enforcement</li> <li>• Create rumble strips along the centerline and edges of roadway</li> <li>• Install radar speed monitoring at several locations along the roadway</li> <li>• Make Point MacKenzie Rd. a safety corridor which will double fines for speeding and other driving infractions.</li> <li>• Install Report Every Dangerous Driver Immediately (REDDI) signs</li> <li>• Install reflectors along the entire length of the road to delineate the edges of the roadway</li> <li>• Create several pull-out locations when reconstructing Point MacKenzie Road such that vehicles can pull over to let vehicles pass</li> </ul>	Thank you for your comments. Your requests for Safety Corridor designation is noted. The MSB CSAP advocates for increased enforcement (see Table 7: Safe Speeds - SSA Recommended Policies and Practices for MSB Expanded Core Area on page 63 and Table 19: Enforcement Performance Measures on page 118). Rumble strips and speed monitoring are included in Appendix D, Safety Toolkit, and Chapter 6: Policy & Process Changes, respectively.	No change recommended.
35	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	General	The membership supports adoption of the following specific recommendations (cut and pasted below) that are in and around the Meadow Lakes community. There was one recommended addition shown at the end of the list. We also appreciate the comprehensive approach of the document as a whole.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended
36	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	75	#1 Parks Highway Corridor (Church Road to Seward Meridian Parkway), pg. 75 o A comprehensive look at access in the corridor is necessary to understand the operational considerations of various access management methods, including partial or full restriction of access and development of parallel access roads. Short-term improvements at 10 signalized intersections in this corridor would benefit pedestrians.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended
37	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	77-78	#2 Safe, Equitable Walking Routes to School (Area Wide), pg. 77-78 o Meadow Lakes Elementary: Add path along east side of Pittman Road between Zehnder Circle and Meadow Lakes Loop. o Houston Middle and High Schools: Build a path connecting Pepper Street to the school parking lot. o Construct a separated pathway along Hawk Lane for Houston Middle and High Schools.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended

**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
38	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	87	#6 Vine Road Separated Path, pg. 87 o Construct a separated pathway on the west side of Vine Road as a continuation of the proposed Vine Road: KGB to Hollywood Road project.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended
39	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	89	#7 Seldon Road and Church Road Intersection Improvements, pg. 89 o Roundabout and add intersection lighting. Accommodate crosswalks on the south side of the intersection to connect pathways.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended
40	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	97	#11 E. Seldon Road Safety Improvements (Windy Bottom Road to Lucille Street & Wasilla-Fishhook Road to Bogard Road), pg. 97 o Initiate a project to reconstruct Seldon Road between Bogard Road and Wasilla-Fishhook Road, and from Lucille Street to Church Road. Construct left-turn lanes at Schrock Road, Tait Drive, and Northgate Place, as recommended in the Bogard-Seldon Corridor Access Management Plan. Add lighting and a separated pathway between Wasilla-Fishhook Road and Bogard Road. o Add pedestrian lighting on the path from Church Road to Windy Bottom Road.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended
41	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	105	#15 Big Lake Road Intersection Improvements, pg. 105 o Add lighting and right- and left-turn lanes to up to three intersections for increased conspicuity. Suggested intersections include Shotgun Drive, Kenlar Road, Birch Lake Drive, Beaver Lake Road, and Pedro Pio Drive.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended
42	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	107	#16 Local Road Speed Management Plan (Area Wide), pg. 107 o Prepare a supplemental plan focused on local roads that are identified for needing traffic calming, in accordance with a policy for establishing when traffic calming is warranted.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended
43	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	51	Equitable Distribution of Safety Investments, pg. 51 o Expanding local transit operators. o Expanding commuter/service providers.	Thank you for your support.	No change recommended
44	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	51	One item we recommend adding to page 51 Equitable Distribution of Safety Investments, Recommendations is "adding additional signage for existing park and ride lots."	Agree. There may be restrictions through the MUTCD/Alaska Traffic Manual with the extent/distance from the park and ride that signs can be placed, but we can make this general recommendation.	Will add "consider additional directional signs where appropriate to guide road users to existing park and ride lots" to Safety Investment Recommendations on page 51.
45	Camden	Yehle	Meadow Lakes Community Council	98-99	A member asked why the section of Seldon Road from Lucille Street to Wasilla-Fishhook appears to be missing.	The proposed project on Seldon addresses gaps of Seldon not already addressed by planned DOT&PF projects. See DOT&PF STIP project 34243.	No change recommended
46	Adam	Bradway	DOT&PF	12	Fatal and serious injuries appear to be switched on this graph.	Good catch, thank you.	Figure 9 will be adjusted to switch the legend.
47	Adam	Bradway	DOT&PF	63	"Systematically install low-cost safety countermeasures at priority locations identified in the MSB CSAP and throughout the region." Why only low-cost countermeasures. Shouldn't all countermeasures be on the table?	The intent was to incorporate low-systemic countermeasures (as identified in Safety Toolkit, Appendix D). System-wide application is the idea, to do as appropriate over time (for example, wider edge lines, rumble strips, enhanced curve delineation, as operating funds permit or as opportunities arise in capital projects.) Of course, all countermeasures are on the table, but we are trying to assign realistic timelines and relative priorities so are not presuming everything can be done quickly/all at once.	Change text to "systemic" and phrase accordingly on pages 63, 110, 112, and 114

**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
48	Adam	Bradway	DOT&PF	79	SRTS plan exists. Do you mean update, or implement SRTS plan?	The narrative on page 77 preceding says "The MSB, MSB School District, and DOT&PF have a working group that regularly meets to discuss and prioritize recommended school walking routes, but they do not have outside resources to support this work. Additional support would help keep walking route maps current and provide regular updates to priority lists for capital project needs. The MSB has been funding all SRTS projects through its TIP program since exhausting the SRTS funding offered through DOT&PF." Short term recommendation is "Supplemental plan to sustain and build the SRTS program for a three-year period" so acknowledges it is an ongoing effort. The intent is to support the working group's work with more resources, particularly given the SAPT's desire to have consistency among school zones, and the pending updates to the Alaska Traffic Manual section for school zones. The last update was in 2017.	Re-word page 77 narrative to be clear the short term recommendation is a supplemental plan, and that an SRTS plan exists but is an ongoing effort.
49	Adam	Bradway	DOT&PF	83-84	RRFB is probably spelled out somewhere in the plan but not here. I would assume most readers will skip right to the projects, so it is probably worth spelling out at least once on these pages.	Agree, it is an unfamiliar term to most.	Spell out Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon on all projects where recommended in Chapter 7.
50	Adam	Bradway	DOT&PF	88	Vine road KGB to Hollywood road pathway is funded.	Thank you, we missed this change from original STIP to Amendment 1	Page 88, remove ", however it is not currently funded."
51	Adam	Bradway	DOT&PF	91-92	No discussion of pedestrian crossings. There is currently a striped crossing at Academy Charter, but crossings will likely need more infrastructure, RRFB, ped island, signal or roundabout. Please add more guidance/information on solutions if you can. Thanks.	After follow-up, we understand you'd like more narrative on considerations that may be in play for these crossings, particularly warranting conditions for RRFBs. We will adjust.	Review all projects (and this one, 91-92) with potentially warranting condition requirements and adjust narrative summaries.
52	Josh	Rupe	Resident	general	It seems to me is that all this will do is limit the responsible drivers and not do anything to address the real problem lately which is cell phones in the drivers seat. Finding ways to use the government to limit speeds, photographically traffic intersections, make atv users be licensed is just a typical government approach to raise taxes with zero results. This entire plan seems like a waste of money and will not fix any issues. Sounds like we are headed towards Californification which we all just recently learned is not a great path!	Thank you for your comment. Many of the proposed countermeasures provided in the Safety Toolkit have been shown to reduce fatal and serious injury crashes, as well as improve overall safety on the roadway.	No change recommended.
53	Gary	Gudz	Resident	general	Off-road vehicles have always been a means of transportation in the matsu valley. I am 100% against banning any use of the vehicles in any part of the matsu. This is Alaska not California quit trying yo take away alaskans rights.	Thank you for your comment. The plan is not recommending limiting ATV use where they are legally allowed to operate. The plan acknowledges the user conflicts between the different modes of travel (ATV, vehicular, bicycle, and pedestrian) and offers a recommendation in the Safety Toolkit (page D20) to make specific considerations for ATV use in new roadway design projects. In response to this concern, we are also noting consideration for ATV space on two projects, Vine and Hollywood Roads	Change Projects #6 and #9, Vine Road and Hollywood Road to note consideration is needed for ATV trail use space on one side of the road.

**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
54	Tabitha	Nardini	Resident	general	<p>Why are you moving the core area boundary? How come you don't have multi use trails in the plan when survey results states the majority wanting multi use trails? Why are you spending \$160,000 non motorized signs and campaign when you aren't providing multi use trails for ATVs? More people ride ATVs, then bike, or walk. How come you put the bike path on the ATV trail? Utility companies use ATVs and snowmobiles to maintain their power lines. Why are you putting bike lanes in the road when we have 78% motor vehicle crashes? You can't even see the stripes in the road majority of the year, plus icy roads. Why do you put in smaller roundabouts when they cause the most accidents. How come you don't enlarge the roundabouts to separate all of the cars from all directions, so cars don't collide? What's the ATV task force?</p>	<p>• This plan is not changing the core area boundary. We will clarify in Chapter 1 that the Mat-Su 'Expanded Core Area' is a study area for the plan, which includes the city limits of Houston, Palmer, and Wasilla, and is not a proposal to change the boundary of the Mat-Su Core Area • The plan's Safety Toolkit, page D20, recommends planning for ATV trail space in new road designs, and we are making changes, based on public input to add that ATV trail space needs to be considered on both the Hollywood Road (Project #6) and Vine Road (Project #9) projects • The "No Motor Vehicle Signs" on pathways (page 83) was a steering committee recommendation to increase awareness of state laws about motorized vehicles' prohibited use on facilities intended for non-motorized users. The plan's Safety Toolkit, page D20, recommends planning for ATV trail space in new road designs. • We understand the concern that ATV trail use needs may not be emphasized enough in plan recommendations, and are amending projects #6, Hollywood Road Safety Improvements to include consideration for ATV trail use, as well as Project #9, Vine Road Separated Path. cts. • Regarding the roundabouts, it is accurate that roundabouts are shown as a proven Safety Countermeasure in the plan, and that there are some proposed as projects. However, there is no recommendation to make new or existing roundabouts smaller. One mini-roundabout is proposed on Green Forest Drive for traffic calming (Pages 101-102), but is a local residential road, and mini-roundabouts would not be appropriate for more major/higher volume roads with truck traffic. The size roundabouts should be designed for are unique to the location, and, as noted in the plan (Page D-16), need to consider freight movements in the area for the design vehicle. They also need to account for anticipated future design traffic volumes so they have adequate capacity. We are proposing to make the mini-roundabout bigger (modern roundabout size) at Bogard and Seldon (Page 85). Important considerations for roundabout design are also discussed in Appendix D, Safety Toolkit (Page D16) and actual crash data at a few Mat-Su roundabouts are discussed on Pages B47 and B48. • Regarding bicycle lanes, your concern for them in winter conditions is noted. They do provide a space adjacent to traffic (just like a road shoulder) that is usable for at least half the year, and some cyclists feel safer with this dedicated space even if it is not separated as a path because it removes conflicts with slower moving pedestrians and younger bicyclists. There are ways to build more separation into them to address the vehicle/pedestrian conflict concern that can be considered. • Regarding creation of a non-motorized task force, this is not a recommendation of this Plan, this was included in a summary of other plans reviewed. This was a recommendation of the 2023 MSB Bicycle and Pedestrian Plan.</p>	<p>Clarify in Chapter 1 that the Expanded Core Area is not a proposed boundary change and is a study area, inclusive of the cities of Houston, Palmer and Wasilla. Change Projects #6 and #9, Hollywood Road and Vine Road to note consideration is needed for ATV trail use space on one side of the road.</p>
55	Ken	Huckeba			<p>This is decarbonization re-branded as safety. Not one dime should be allocated to global decarbonization initiatives until even one pot hole exists. The DOT is not the parks and welfare department.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This plan is a Comprehensive Safety Action Plan to reduce serious injuries and fatalities on the roadway. It is not a plan to reduce carbon emissions.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>
56	David	Zimmer			<p>This plan is a good idea and a good start to making the Mat-Su Borough a more livable place. The focus of my comment is on improving safety for pedestrians and bicyclists on Engstrom Road particularly near Bogard Road. There is an increasing number of bicycles and pedestrians using the Bogard Road-Engstrom Road intersection. A roundabout is planned to be built here by D.O.T. Their plan does not include a safe passage for cyclists and pedestrians. Engstrom Road has no useable shoulder. To compound this, the owners of the Havemeister dairy are planning to turn the property into a commercial gravel pit and operate large gravel carrying trucks all day. Their permit application contains no provision whatsoever for pedestrian and cyclist safety along their property. It is imperative to build a path with a barrier for pedestrians and cyclists to pass safely by this 150+ acre property along Bogard and Engstrom Roads.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The proposed Bogard/Engstrom roundabout (DOT HSIP Project CFHWY00453) will provide marked crossing opportunities for bicycles and pedestrians that do not exist currently. The other surrounding area of Bogard was not included as a plan recommendation because there are also DOT plans to address it. STIP Need ID 34342/CFHWY01234: Bogard Road Safety and Capacity Improvements "will upgrade Bogard Road between Grumman Circle and Trunk Road to an arterial highway standard to address safety and capacity issues. The full project length is Bogard Road from Trunk Road to Grumman Circle" and will include a raised median and separated pathway. Your concern regarding Engstrom is noted for the MSB ans as well as concerns with the pending development.</p>	<p>In Project #11, E. Seldon, note other pending projects in Bogard/Seldon corridor and consider on narrative for Bogard project as well</p>
57	Janice	Taxpayer		general	<p>With the growing numbers of "covid vaccine-injured" people and migrants from other countries moving to the Mat-Su Borough, there are more accidents due to medical conditions and lack of knowledge about the U.S. rules of the roads and/or lack of skill to drive on snowy/icy roads. This SS4A plan, which I refer to as Nazi "Secret Service" for ALL plan is not the answer to our problems. Mat-Su Borough needs to refuse this government money. We gave up rights due to 9-11-2001 "terrorism." We gave up rights during the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. We gave up rights during the 2021-to-now plandemic. This plan is a false sense of security that is grooming MSB residents for 15-20 minute cities. No Thank You! Globalist Agendas are being destroyed around the world and they should not be allowed here in Alaska.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. This plan is a Comprehensive Safety Action Plan to reduce serious injuries and fatalities on the roadway.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>
58	Michael	Crume	Resident	general	<p>We need better roads &amp; less mass transit. When I go to Anchorage I don't have an extra 3hours(5hours total) for a 2 hour pickup using mass transit. If a rail service is added, need more parking at the rail yards so folks can get to work in South Anchorage</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. Access to transit provides mobility options for people who choose to ride the bus for convenience, to save money, because of a disability, or simply do not have access to a vehicle. The Safe Streets for All program recognizes that access to safe, reliable transportation options helps to improve the safety and health of a community. This plan recommends adding small, incremental increases to transit facilities and providers over time.</p>	<p>No change recommended.</p>
59	Rod	Hanson	North Lakes Community Council	general	<p>The North Lakes Community Council (NLCC) appreciated the earlier opportunity to provide comments in the planning process. We were very pleased to see that over 100 residents from our community council took the opportunity to review and provide input!</p>	<p>Thank you for your participation and support.</p>	<p>No change requested.</p>

**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
60	Rod	Hanson	North Lakes Community Council		It is clear that the planning team took our input seriously. A great example is the section in the updated draft that specifically addresses the need for a "Local Road Speed Management Plan". We strongly support the recommendation to create such a plan and consider traffic calming potential countermeasures such as mini roundabouts, speed humps, speed tables, and more. The plan also includes policy recommendations for evaluating when roads warrant traffic calming and suggests several routes requiring action, including: Serendipity Loop, Hart Lake Loop, Charley Drive, Lakeview Loop, and Cottonwood Loop. The NLCC strongly recommends that each of these routes also include safe pedestrian walkways and lighting at side street intersections. Many of these routes are "shortcuts" between major collector roads and because of the volume of non-local traffic, residents need safer pedestrian features incorporated into improvement projects. The same applies to Engstrom Road.	Thank you for your comment and your support. Your comment about safe pedestrian walkways and lighting at side street intersections for the listed facilities are noted for MSB planning consideration and could be part of a local speed management plan for area roads to help build future recommendations for MSB TIP projects. In addition to developing a process for evaluating the extent to which speeding is a problem, a local road speed management study would need to evaluate what physical changes need to happen for a given roadway, beyond evaluating a change to speed limit (if applicable/appropriate.)	No change recommended.
61	Rod	Hanson	North Lakes Community Council	general	At first glance, the NLCC was quite concerned that the notorious 3-mile section of Bogard Road from Trunk Road to Seldon Road was NOT included in the Priority Locations and Project recommendations. During discussion with planning staff at the Open House on January 16th, we learned that this section of road was indeed considered a high priority location, but that the planning team was assured that there were already existing DOT projects scoped and funded to pursue safety improvements in this area. We suggest this be more clearly stated in the planning document and highlighted in presentations to stakeholders and public story boards. It would be a shame for any stakeholder (or member of the public) to get the impression that nothing further needs to be done in this unsafe corridor. Those DOT projects should also be held to the same standards for transparency and performance reporting that the planning team recommends for other critical safety priorities. Additionally, NLCC would like to ensure the pedestrian walk area between Trunk Road and Seldon-Bogard roundabout is clearly stated in the planning document.	Thank you for your comment. See DOT&PF STIP project 34243 for the area of concern between Lucille and Wasilla-Fishhook (the project is mentioned on lower right corner of this project map, page 99, which we find will be more clear than if we stated on narrative pages.) Also, page 72 mentions in the project priority area methodology that some areas with projects already planned were screened out. if they addressed safety concerns. However, we recognize there is a lot underway in this corridor so will include: STIP Need ID 34342/CFHWY01234: Bogard Road Safety and Capacity Improvements "will upgrade Bogard Road between Grumman Circle and Trunk Road to an arterial highway standard to address safety and capacity issues. The full project length is Bogard Road from Trunk Road to Grumman Circle" and will include a raised median and separated pathway.	In Project #11, E. Seldon, note other pending projects in Bogard/Seldon corridor and consider on narrative for Bogard project as well
62	Rod	Hanson	North Lakes Community Council		At the far West end of this section of Bogard, there is a mini-roundabout connecting Bogard, Seldon and Grumman roads. As noted in the presentation materials at the Open House, there is a plan recommendation to update the unsafe mini-roundabout to a modern roundabout. Although this recommendation appears to be included in the Safe Streets for All Plan, it does not seem to be adequately prioritized. This is a dangerous intersection because traffic flowing east and west does not slow down adequately. The speed limit is shown at 15 mph, but the majority of east and westbound traffic drives through the intersection at over 40 mph. Additionally, there are no provisions for pedestrian crossings in the current configuration. With the convenience store located to the Southeast of the intersection, there is quite a bit of pedestrian traffic crossing in this area from the airport subdivision to the North. The NLCC requests that this project be re-evaluated for a higher prioritization.	Thank you for your concern. We understand this is a high priority for you. As required for the Comprehensive Safety Action Plans, we followed a methodology that developed priority locations. This considered a variety of factors as shown on Page 72 and 73 in the plan, and is discussed in more detail in Appendix C, specifically pages C18, C19 and C20. Please also note page 74 states "(the projects) are provided in ranking order of score, but this is not necessarily what is a required order of implementation. This is particularly true for area-wide recommendations that are multi-location (School Project #2 and Local Speed Management Program #16), and so were not scored collectively. Several priority locations had identical scores." We understand the scoring matrix may not have worked out according to everyone's priority, but hope any mention in the Safety Plan gives project locations a priority consideration. North Lakes Community Council priority for the mini-roundabout noted for future MSB capital improvement planning, in coordination with DOT&PF and MVP as appropriate.	No change recommended.
63	Rod	Hanson	North Lakes Community Council	78	Another potential for misunderstanding would be the fact that the Shaw Elementary School is not included in the list of disadvantaged school locations. The current road and pedestrian access to Shaw Elementary is inadequate. The School District plans to eventually reset the school boundaries to include portions of the Shaw's Tri Lakes subdivision to the east of the school property. There is a project being developed to connect E. Paradise Lane to E. Foxtrot. It will be important that this connection include safe pedestrian walkways and adequate lighting to allow school children to walk to school from the East. Please assure the final Safe Streets for All Plan includes mention of the importance of this project and safe pedestrian access.	The mentioned project should address vehicle circulation issues at Shaw, which is a Title 1 school, but not in the identified disadvantaged area. This project was likely why the Safe Routes to School working group did not bring it forward.	Will add improvements at Shaw pathway along Foxtrot and both segments of Paradise to project #2.



**MSB CSAP Public Review Draft  
Comment/Response Table**

#	First Name	Last Name	Organization	Page #	Comment	Project Team Response	Proposed Action
64	Rod	Hanson	North Lakes Community Council		NLCC strongly supports the recommended policies and practices as listed in Tables 5-9. We would like to have a higher priority placed on updating development standards for new subdivisions as listed in SP7, SR5, SR7, and SR8. We would also recommend an additional Safe Vehicle policy to modify state standards to reduce current maximum low beam light. Our residents have identified problems with bright lights people installed on many vehicles and the safety hazard that creates for oncoming traffic.	Thank you for your comment. The policies and practices in Tables 5-9 are not prioritized but your priorities for development standards for new subdivisions are noted. SP 7/developer standards was included in Table 11, page 112 as 2-10 year recommendation, but MSB agreed it can be prioritized higher. In regards to reducing current maximum low beam light, this requires a change in state law and while we understand the safety concern, some drivers will feel equally strongly about the safety concern for brighter lights, or "moose lights."	Under safe vehicles, will add action for Safety Working Group to explore what changes to state law would look like for vehicle lighting standards and whether the Department of Public Safety would support a change to administrative code. We will move the mentioned strategies related to subdivisions up to the near term (0-2 years) in Table 11, Page 112.
65	Rod	Hanson	North Lakes Community Council	general	We again appreciate the opportunity to provide feedback and look forward to the next update of the plan and the ultimate approval and acceptance of the plan by State and Local government entities.	Thank you for your support.	No change requested.
66	Karella	Walter	resident	n/a	Concerns regarding the gravel pit going in at 8901 E Palmer-Wasilla Highway between N Midtown Drive and E Westside Drive. Was hoping to speak with someone from the Borough about concerns regarding truck traffic/control.	Thank you for your comment. We will give your comment to Mat-Su Borough Public Works, who can reach out to you.	No change requested.
67	Mike	Buck	Alaska Safe Riders	n/a	Alaska Safe Riders -Offers ATV, Side by Side, and Snowmachine Education - 907.831.0493	Thank you for bringing us your business card. We are excited to see someone offering safe riding classes in the Mat-Su Borough. We will forward this card to Mat-Su Borough Public Works staff.	No change requested.
68	Jamie	Taylor	MSB Public Works	Safety Toolkit	Should footnote 3 refer to Tables 9-24, 9-25, and 9-26? There are also figures that go along with those tables.	Yes. The charts say the same thing as they tables but visualize the information differently. The accompanying text is important too, so will adjust.	Will simplify this reference to generally refer to GB7 Section 9.7.3 "Design Treatments for Left Turn Maneuvers."
69	Jamie	Taylor	MSB Public Works	23	Table 3. Roadside design improvements at curves, "Providing a clear zone of 30 feet from 16.7 feet..."This is confusing - should it say "increasing" instead of "Providing"?	Thanks you for your comment. We agree	Rephrase to read "increase distance to road side features (clear zone area) from 16.7 feet to 30 feet..." per the FHWA countermeasures website.
70	Jamie	Taylor	MSB Public Works	85	#5 Bogard Road Improvements: Recommend and Access Management Plan be done for this portion of Bogard Road	Thanks you for your comment. We agree.	Change per comment, add narrative and cost estimate
71	Jamie	Taylor	MSB Public Works	87	#6 Vine Road - increase shoulder width to 8 feet.	Per follow up, will amend this project to recommend wider shoulder or bicycle path and will include narrative discussion about benefits/challenges with each.	Change per comment
72	Jamie	Taylor	MSB Public Works	91	#8 Arctic Avenue Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements - There is already a crossing at Academy Charter School/Palmer Airport Road. Probably crossing not necessary at Gulkana	Intent was enhancing crosswalk at Academy.	Change per comment to remove Gulkana and clarify enhancements at Academy.
73	Jamie	Taylor	MSB Public Works	93	#9 Hollywood Road Safety Improvements - Add roundabout at Big Lake Road & Hollywood Road (this was in the 2011 Bond Package but didn't happen because there wasn't enough money budgeted.)	Thank you for your comment. We agree	Change per comment, needs narrative discussion and cost estimate.
74	Jamie	Taylor	MSB Public Works	97	#11 Seldon Road Safety Improvements - Add consolidate/eliminate access points as recommended by the CAMP	Thank you for your comment. We agree.	Change per comment.