

Seafarer Loop

From: Richard Cline <clinerac312@alaska.net>
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2012 9:39 PM
To: Bruce Shellenbaum
Subject: Fw: Municipality of Anchorage - Proposed Fire Station #9 - Site Selection Study - Information

Answers from Heath. Post to the web if you think other outside out group would want this information. Thanks Rich

From: [Landon, Heath E.](#)
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2012 12:17 PM
To: 'Richard Cline'
Cc: 907rob@gmail.com ; baldridge@coffman.com ; cfoerster@gci.net ; cindyjdawson@gmail.com ; dawsonrsd@acsalaska.net ; [Dianne Holmes](mailto:DianneHolmes) ; dshellenbaum@yahoo.com ; fishman@gci.net ; [Hal](#) ; izzylee95@yahoo.com ; jjewell@gci.net ; karenarnoldak@gmail.com ; ljtweit@hotmail.com ; madhatters13@hotmail.com ; merry_carlson@hotmail.com ; [APD Neighborhood Crime Watch](#) ; [Paul](#) ; pentecostm@hotmail.com ; rob@northernprintinginc.com ; sandra.lemke@acsalaska.net ; [Shelly Nuss](#) ; suebee1@gci.net ; superior@alaska.net ; [Tom Liverance](#) ; tqlml@gci.net
Subject: RE: Municipality of Anchorage - Proposed Fire Station #9 - Site Selection Study - Information

Mr. Cline,

I did not return to the office until Tuesday. Please accept my apology for the delayed response. It is my pleasure and my job to do my best to facilitate the most open and honest communication with the community. I certainly understand and respect the concerns with this project. The community feedback is extremely valuable to the success of the process. Thank you, for the time you have taken to review and provide your feedback along the way. Deputy Chief Drozdowski and I intend to try to get back to the area and be able to talk one-on-one with more residents prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing on October 1, 2012. I will do my best to provide more notice, as soon as, we are able to schedule a date.

In regard to Site #18, the Planning and Zoning Commission receives the complete Site Selection Study for review. The study contains information regarding all 23 originally considered sites, including Site #18. Please understand I have no preference for any particular site over another. My goal has been to answer the questions and provide the most accurate information possible. Site #18 is not viable with the funds currently allocated to this project. There seems to be some confusion/miscommunication around the need for a traffic light for Site #18. Therefore, for discussion purposes let us assume the light is NOT needed for this site. The development costs for Site #18 remain prohibitive. The \$5,000,000 State Legislative Grant along with the required \$1,000,000 match from the Municipality simply do not provide enough funds to acquire, develop and build a new Fire Station #9 on Site #18.

I know the 4-minute response maps can be a bit confusing, but the data has been reviewed in detail, drive-tests were also conducted to verify the data. Again, none of the sites are perfect, but the proposed/recommended Site #19 seems to have the greatest potential to provide the most meaningful and positive impact to the largest number of residents based on the critical Location/Response Time variable. This variable truly cannot be underestimated as it can mean life or death. Seconds do count when responding to someone in need of critical care.

We are very early in the process. The specific design of the building will not happen until after the Planning and Zoning Commission approves the site. Therefore, we do not have blue prints available. However, a Facility Site Plan Review of the specific site is required later in the process. This review goes before a public hearing and provides the opportunity for public comments and feedback. Additionally, the PLI zoning has substantial setback requirements for the building from the property lines, requires significant "Visual Enhancement" landscaping and limits the size of the building to 35% of the lot size.

Thank you again for your extremely valuable feedback.

Sincerely,

Heath Landon, Project Manager

Capital Projects

Office: (907) 343-8256

Cell: (907)529-0429

Fax: (907) 249-7452

From: Richard Cline [mailto:clinerac312@alaska.net]

Sent: Friday, August 31, 2012 8:10 AM

To: Landon, Heath E.

Cc: 907rob@gmail.com; baldridge@coffman.com; cfoerster@gci.net; cindyjdawson@gmail.com; dawsonrsd@acsalaska.net; Dianne Holmes; dshellenbaum@yahoo.com; fishman@gci.net; Hal; izzylee95@yahoo.com; jjewell@gci.net; karenarnoldak@gmail.com; ljtweit@hotmail.com; madhatters13@hotmail.com; merry_carlson@hotmail.com; APD Neighborhood Crime Watch; Paul; pentecostm@hotmail.com; rob@northernprintinginc.com; sandra.lemke@acsalaska.net; Shelly Nuss; suebee1@gci.net; superior@alaska.net; Tom Liverance; tqmlml@gci.net

Subject: Re: Municipality of Anchorage - Proposed Fire Station #9 - Site Selection Study - Information

Heath

Thanks for your reply, you have been very helpful in help us understand this project. I just got word that you are out of your office until Sept 9 and sorry to interrupt your time off but we are trying to understand more about this Fire station that will affect our family's that are living in this area.

I know and understand that site 18 would be somewhat more taxpayer's dollar invested but still think it should be included to make this long term fire station location a fair and equal overall study without bias so the Zoning and the Assembly would know about it and could make a fair decision on this as they are the one to have the final word as I understand it. How can they make a educated decision on site 18 when they do not have as much of the information as this study has on the other 3 sites?(12-23-19) I know your emails have been against site 18 and wonder if the Zoning and Assembly will have any information on site 18, other than what they hear in our 3 minutes of time we get to talk at the Public Hearing, to help them make a good and fair judgment decision.

With all due respect, your answer for the traffic light at Old Seward and DeArmoun makes no sense as going east from site 18 would not require going to the Old Seward and if this light was needed to go south, it would be needed for site 19 as well. . Also I did a map overlay of Appendix B to find what I quoted in my last email the response time to the south of DeArmoun to the Rabbit Creek and pass Potter Marsh area which I assume you are calling southeast was very poor (60 responses and only 5 with a 4 minute response time.) and my point was that site 18 made the response time faster to that area.

As some of us miss you last time when you came to Seafarer I would like to have you come again to meet some of us that did not get the word in time.

The size of this fire station that is described in the site selection study seems that it is going to be this large building which includes staff space and living quarters plus a hose drying TOWER; inside climbing wall and equipment for rope rescue training exercises that the Anchorage Fire Department will be in and using for a very long time.

I would like to see the building blue prints for this size of building that is being planned to be built on site 19 if it selected. The study indicates that there is NO height restrictions in the AMC for structures located within the PLI district so I assume that this hose tower and climbing wall could be as high or higher than the hose tower on the fire station in downtown Anchorage on 4th avenue.

We got an email from Frances from Zoning that a request has been ask for to change the hearing date from Sept 10 to Oct 1 . We need to know ASAP if this has been confirmed so as not to confuse the people that want to present their testimony. When will we know?

Thanks for your time Richard Cline

From: [Landon, Heath E.](#)
Sent: Wednesday, August 29, 2012 1:35 PM
To: 'Richard Cline'
Cc: lindsay_williams@legis.state.ak.us ; 'Ritter, Michelle' ; 'Hickok, Tanya' ; Potter, Timothy ; [McLaughlin, Francis D.](#) ; [Tom Liverance](#)
Subject: RE: Municipality of Anchorage - Proposed Fire Station #9 - Site Selection Study - Information

Mr. Cline,

Thank you again for the opportunity to follow up with you regarding the site selection process for the Proposed New Fire Station #9. I will do my best to address as many of your concerns as possible. Our intent and goal is to facilitate the most open and honest communication with the community.

Traffic Light at Old Seward and DeArmoun:

As I understand, because Site #18 ultimately reduces the efficiency of the 4-minute coverage area as described in the previous email. In order to maximize the already reduced 4-minute coverage area from Site #18, Old Seward becomes a much larger factor. The light to break traffic at DeArmoun and Old Seward would play a significant roll in maximizing the response time for this site. This is not necessary for Site #19 as the majority of the calls and response would be to the east of the site.

Viability of Site #23 and Site #12:

Site #23 and Site #12 remain options. None of the sites are perfect. They all have challenges. However, the goal is to maximize the 4-minute response coverage area with minimal coverage overlap. This goal strives to guarantee the best possible service for the entire community. Additionally, the goal maximizes efficiencies for AFD resources and ultimately attempts to use the taxpayer's dollar as wisely as possible. Site #23 and Site #12 simple have their own, unique challenges as does the recommended Site #19 as described and detailed in the Site Selection Study. The reason for elimination of site #18 is first and

foremost because it does NOT maximize the 4-minute response time and secondarily the development cost as described in detail in my previous email show this site as unrealistic based on the available funds.

Planning and Zoning Commission Information:

The Planning and Zoning Commission receives the complete Site Selection Study for review. The Site Selection Study contains information regarding all 23 originally considered sites including Site #18.

Site #18 and Proposed/Recommended Site #19 Comparison:

On the surface, Site #18 and Site #19 appear to be comparable, but the details simply show they are not. The larger populated areas currently outside the 4-minute coverage area are to the east and southeast of Site #19. Site #18 shifts the response coverage window further west toward the Turnagain Arm. This does NOT allow the most efficient response to the areas on the far eastside of the 4-minute response window. The Appendix B maps can be a bit confusing, but if you look at the “red” areas in relation to Site #19, meaning zero to 20% of the calls are currently being reached within 4 minutes. The majority of those calls are east and southeast of Site #19. So Site #19 puts the farthest east and southeast areas in the “red” within a 4-minute response window. If you move the window to Site #18 this drops off the outer edges of the farthest east and southeast areas and leaves them beyond the 4-minute response area. As you review, please consider the intersections at Seward and DeArmoun with the overpass, this ultimately slows response, along with the distance to Site #18. These variables add additional time to the extremely valuable response time. Seconds count when responding to someone in need of critical care. This truly can mean the difference in life or death. Then secondarily, the costs to develop Site #18 are simply prohibitive as detailed in previous emails.

Safety Concerns:

Your concerns regarding children’s safety and traffic are valid and understood. There are others who feel a fire station actually increases safety for the students and encourages more careful driving in the area. Additionally, if the community desires and the trail along Lake Otis to the school were paved, this will increase the safety for children walking to school.

Funding:

The funds for the proposed fire station are provided by a \$5,000,000 State Legislative Grant. The Grant requires the Municipality of Anchorage to provide \$1,000,000 in matching funds. Therefore, if a new site is approved, the discussion regarding the existing site has been the possibility of selling the existing property to offset the \$1,000,000 matching requirement. Ultimately, if you have a site with over \$4,000,000 in development costs, (i.e. Site #18) there are no funds remaining to build the actual station.

Thank you for your time and consideration and thank you again for your extremely valuable feedback.

Sincerely,

Heath Landon, Project Manager

Capital Projects

Office: (907) 343-8256

Cell: (907)529-0429

Fax: (907) 249-7452

From: Richard Cline [mailto:clinerac312@alaska.net]

Sent: Sunday, August 26, 2012 9:12 PM

To: Landon, Heath E.

Cc: lindsay_williams@legis.state.ak.us; 'Ritter, Michelle'; 'Hickok, Tanya'; Potter, Timothy; McLaughlin, Francis D.; Tom

Liverance

Subject: Re: Municipality of Anchorage - Proposed Fire Station #9 - Site Selection Study - Information

Heath

Thank you for the up date of information for both site 18 & 19. This has been very helpful and being a businessman for 27 years makes this information easier to follow and understand but it still brings up some questions.

I still feel that site 18 should be brought back into the equation to compete and make a fair site selection process for several reasons and I will try to address each one of my concerns .

1. First, could you explain to me why site 18 has to have a \$2,000,000 Traffic Light at DeArmoun Road and Old Seward to break traffic when site 18 is 1/4 mile from that intersection. What would that purpose be and why would site 19 not need that same traffic light?

2. The two other sites, 23 & 12 had no chance to even be consider in this process because site 23 was to small (not the required 2 1/2 acre site that is needed) and site 12 has soil problems which has 75% Class C Wetland plus site 12 had to be purchase as site 18 would have to be. Both site 23 & 12 could not pass the 4 minute response time for this area. So why not select site 18 that would be a better site than either sites 12 & 23? The reason given in not selecting site 18 as one of the 3 sites looks to be only about the development cost challenges and not about picking a better site for soil condition and the 4 minute response time in which site 18 has. I know this Site Selection Study will go before the Planning and Zoning Commission and they should be given the best sites to be considered and how can they know about site 18 when it was drop off the list and these two other sites that had no chance to even be consider because they are both unsuitable for development for this fire station. To my understanding this process not only has to go though the Planning and Zoning Commission but also to the Anchorage Assembly to be approved and I feel this process should not be a cut and dry process for site 19 and the best sites be given up front to them.

3. These two sites, 18 and 19 are less than 10 to 15 seconds driving time apart, and location and response time going west and south toward Turnagain Arm would be an even faster response with site 18 (you indicated it would be more) to that area. Looking at appendix B of the site selection study, it show that going south to Turnagain Arm, out of 60 calls only 5 were made in the 4 minute response time from station 9 on Huffman Road and going east out of 86 calls, 39 were made in the 4 minute time frame. You say site 18 does NOT maximize the critical 4 –minute response time but how could that be when both of these sites 18 & 19 are so close (10 to 15 seconds driving time apart) together on DeArmoun Road?

4. Lets us think long term as safety minded people, this Fire station is going to be built at what ever location is chosen on DeArmoun Road and will be at that location as long as Anchorage is Anchorage. Building a Fire Station any further south (Potter Marsh Area) would never be, as there is not and never will be land for residential living. Having said this, let us really think of what kind of impact this fire station will have if built on site 19 on the surrounding area that has a (large and will continue to grow and have more children in the years ahead) elementary school K though 6 which these young children will be walking by themselves (as they do now) in front of and on the side of this fire station and what I consider on a narrow road (Lake Otis which you say is not going to be widen) or the path that will be on the fire station side. I have lived in this area for 23 years and have seen these very young children walking in the winter time all bundle up in their warm hooded clothes, not paying attention at what is going on around them, some riding bikes. Site 18 would have none of that foot traffic in front or beside of this fire station if built on site 18, as the sidewalk is on the south side (across the road) of DeArmoun and would not be in front or on the side of this Fire station. Remember safety

(long term safety) should be the issue and not because site 19 is own by MOA and would be a little less costly.

5. Again let us think business minded and consider some the estimated cost amounts that you have search out . I know the purchase price is a estimate but what ever the amount would be, it could be offset with the selling of site 23 that will be sold when the new station is built which then would not take any funds from the projected amount that has been allocated for this fire station building. This additional money would also help with the other cost that you have brought up and some of the unknown ones that has not been identify yet. Why can't this money be used for the purchase of site 18 from the selling of site 23? This is how most business do it when they want to expand and grow.

6. I think I have identified and explained that the Site Selection Study has been biased in the selection process because of the two site 12 & 23 could never meet the known criteria when site 18 should have been selected as one of the 3 final most desirable sites. I say this because reading page 1 of the Site Selection Study, your guide lines for this study, in # 4 & 5 it says Refining the inventory to only suitable parcels and Presenting the 3 most suitable sites. This study failed to do that when they chose the two sites 12 & 23.

Thank for your Time Richard Cline

From: [Landon, Heath E.](#)
Sent: Friday, August 24, 2012 11:20 AM
To: 'Richard Cline'
Cc: mailto:lindsay_williams@legis.state.ak.us ; [Ritter, Michelle](#) ; [Hickok, Tanya](#) ; [Potter, Timothy](#) ; [McLaughlin, Francis D.](#)
Subject: RE: Municipality of Anchorage - Proposed Fire Station #9 - Site Selection Study - Information

Mr. Cline,

Thank you for the opportunity to follow up with you regarding both the proposed/recommended Site #19 and a formerly considered Site #18. In clarification, there is no indication of needing to widen Lake Otis or having to make any significant modifications to DeArmoun Road. We have discussed the possibility of improving the current walking path from DeArmoun Road to Rabbit Creek Elementary along Lake Otis or possibly some additional trail improvements if the community/residents are in agreement and desire improvements.

Primarily, one of the most important variables considered in the Site Selection Study is Location/Response Time. The Anchorage Fire Department Plan sets forth service level objectives including arrival of a fire pumper within 4 minutes or less to 90% of structure fires, and arrival of a basic life support unit within 4 minutes or less to 90% of code red medical emergencies. Statistics show the difference between a 4 and 6-minute response time can mean life or death for a victim in a medical emergency or a structure fire. A 6-minute response cuts a victim's odds of survival more than in half for medical calls. National statistics show a 6-minute response to a structure fire increases the chances of the fire having fully engulfed the structure of origin and spread beyond to almost 60%. Ultimately, this too can mean life or death to a victim and dramatically increases the safety risks for the firefighters.

None of the sites are perfect, but proposed/recommended Site #19 appears to have the greatest potential to provide the most meaningful and positive impact to the largest number of residents possible. Based on the Site Selection Study, Site #18 dropped out of consideration, not only for development cost challenges, but the site also does NOT maximize the critical 4-minute response time area. If you refer to "Appendix C" of the Site

Selection Study (attached for your convenience) you can see the existing Fire Station #9, 4-minute coverage area in yellow. When you compare it to “Appendix E” (also attached for your convenience) showing the recommended Site #19, 4-minute coverage area you can see the area shaded VERY dark on the southeast section of the coverage area. The majority of this area is currently outside of ANY 4-minute response area. The ability to increase service to the residents who live in those areas could mean the difference in life or death. Site #18 means trading away valuable coverage area to the east and losing even more of the west portion of the coverage area to Turnagain Arm.

The development and acquisition costs, secondarily, eliminated the formerly considered Site #18. We are very early in the process and there is no specific design for any of the sites. Therefore, we can only consider the KNOWN factors. Please see the cost summary below. This only considers availability of water and sewer utilities, accessibility and traffic signals and acquisition and development costs. We know the costs of other utilities and the remaining site selection criteria are minimal for Site #19. All of those checks were NOT done on Site #18, due to prior elimination, but for discussion, we can assume all of these factors are equal between the two sites. I did check with AWWU regarding and confirmed the estimated cost, per linear foot, to extend both water and sewer lines. I tried to be very conservative in my estimates. I included a detailed explanation of the numbers following the summary.

Summary of Site Development Costs (Estimated Only)

Recommended Site #19		Formerly Considered Site #18	
Land Acquisition	\$0	Land Acquisition	\$380,000
Water	\$175,000	Waterline & Easement	\$1,250,900
Sewer	\$20,000	Sewer Line & Easement	\$409,000
Paved Path	\$28,800	Traffic Light	\$2,000,000
Site #19 Total	\$223,800	Site #18 Total	\$4,039,900

Land Acquisition

Recommended Site #19

The parcel is currently owned by the Municipality of Anchorage.

Formerly Considered Site #18

This parcel is not currently listed for sale, but property records show the value at \$380,000. I used this as an estimated acquisition price for the purposes of the summary above.

Water

Recommended Site #19

The nearest main waterline to this site is approximately 250’ from the site located in Seafarer Loop. AWWU confirmed the line has sufficient supply to service a fire station. This would require the State Department of Transportation to grant a Right-of-Way permit to reach the site (Waterline Est. \$175,000 @ \$700 per linear foot). A preliminary meeting with the State Department of Transportation shows no opposition to granting a Right of Way permit to allow a water main extension.

Formerly Considered Site #18

The nearest main waterline to this site with sufficient supply appears to be approximately 1,700’ from the site located north of Bell’s Nursery. This would also require the negotiation and purchase of an easement across potentially 2 ea. private parcels of land to reach the site (Waterline ONLY Est. \$1,190,000 @ \$700 per linear foot). In reviewing documents I located purchase documents for a 20’ wide easement along DeArmoun at Lake Otis dated 1987, 25 years ago. The easement cost was \$2.03 per square foot in 1987. I assumed the need to

purchase an easement for 1,500' of the waterline and 20' wide using the 1987 cost to be conservative (Water Easement ONLY Est. \$60,900 @ \$2.03 sf).

Sewer

Recommended Site #19

Sewer is located along DeArmoun approximately 25' to reach the site. (Est. \$20,000 @ \$800 per linear foot). No need for easement.

Formerly Considered Site #18

The nearest sewer appears to be located in Innes Circle the street in the residential area to the west of the site approximately 500' to reach the site (Sewer ONLY Est. \$400,000 @ \$800 per linear foot). The sewer would also require the negotiation and purchase of an easement across a private parcel of land. I assumed the need to purchase an easement for 450' of the line and 20' wide, using the 1987 cost (Sewer Easement ONLY Est. \$9,000 @ \$2.03 sf).

Additional Items

Recommended Site #19

Removal and striping of a narrow island in the middle of DeArmoun Road. No other accessibility or traffic signal challenges.

Additionally, we are planning to, at least, be required to include a paved pathway from DeArmoun Road to the existing east/west trail at the school. This will allow children to walk to school on a paved pedestrian facility without having to cross driveways. This would require a paved path of approximately 720' and for assumption purposes 8' wide (Est. \$28,800 @ \$40 per linear foot). I confirmed the estimated cost per linear foot with our Community Development Department.

Formerly Considered Site #18

This site will require the addition of a traffic light at DeArmoun Road and Old Seward to break traffic. In an effort to remain conservative in the cost estimate I assumed a cost of \$2,000,000. This site will also require the removal and striping of a wider section of island in the middle of DeArmoun Road.

I hope this information is helpful. Please feel free to call me directly at 907-343-8256 or email me should you have additional questions or need more information. Thank you again for the extremely valuable feedback.

Sincerely,

Heath Landon, Project Manager

Capital Projects

Office: (907) 343-8256

Cell: (907)529-0429

Fax: (907) 249-7452

From: Richard Cline [mailto:clinerac312@alaska.net]

Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2012 4:57 PM

To: Landon, Heath E.

Subject: Re: Information

Heath If site 18 has development cost over a million dollars, what is site 19 development cost when Lake Otis Road will have to be widen and a sidewalk to the school will or should be done plus a lot of fill will be needed to bring site 19 up to road level. Plus Dearmoun road in front of site 19 will have to be redone so left hand turn for fire truck can go east. Let us all think how this location is will affect the surrounding area with the school right in the traffic pattern of this Fire station. I would like to see the cost evaluation of both sites and be able to compare them. Just to tell me the cost of a million dollars is just words until I can see how that amount was arrived to. Thanks Richard Cline

From: [Landon, Heath E.](#)

Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2012 8:35 AM

To: 'Richard Cline'

Subject: RE: Information

Mr. Cline,

Sorry for the delayed response. I certainly recognize your concerns and realize on the surface Site #18 looks somewhat comparable to the proposed Site #19. However, Dowl HKM has been very thorough in their review of all 23 sites. When you dig into the details of Site #18 the challenges mentioned in the previous email drive the site development costs to well over a million dollar. You would also still have to purchase the land. This would very likely not leave enough money to actually construct the proposed new fire station.

In response to your question related to the original purchase of the recommended Site #19. The property for the proposed site was actually purchased by The Greater Anchorage Area Borough in January 1974. I have requested additional information on the complete purchase documents. I will follow up with you as soon as this is available.

Again, I appreciate your time and input.

Sincerely,

Heath Landon, Project Manager

Capital Projects

Office: (907) 343-8256

Cell: (907)529-0429

Fax: (907) 249-7452

From: Richard Cline [mailto:clinerac312@alaska.net]

Sent: Friday, August 17, 2012 11:41 PM

To: Landon, Heath E.

Subject: Re: Information

Heath

Thanks for the quick response. I did check out site 18 last night and found it to be a area that does not have the homes that site 19 has, which would be a big plus in that it would not disrupt Family's living in the area. Also this site 18 would not have the foot traffic in front of the Fire Station as the sidewalk is located on the other side of the road.

I also look at site 19 and found that a lot of dirt needs to be purchase and hauled in to bring it up to the road grade at a added cost, also LAKE OTIS PKWY Is going to have added cost to bring it up to specs with some type of sidewalk that will go to Rabbit Creek School so the Kids can stay off of the road.

I find it difficult to understand, when you say site 18 is not for sale and the current owner may or may not be willing to consider a sale. How can any site selection study be done and a site is selected without getting all the answers. Maybe the owner would be glad to sell if they were simply asked. I think I have brought up some very good reason why site 18 should be the top #1 choice and would like to hear why it is not being even considered. Rezoning is not a problem for a Fire Station as I understood last night. Sewer and water is in the area and could not be that big of problem. The hill on site 18 is a plus as the dirt should be sold to make money as fill to some place close, and it could be right across the road.

I think site 19 is the 1st choose because the MOA owns it. Lets think about the homes and people this Fire Station will have a long term affect on and put it where it it will have the least affect on Families. I would like to see the information that you said last night about when the MOA purchase this 9 acres from the person in 1985. Thanks Richard Cline

From: [Landon, Heath E.](#)
Sent: Friday, August 17, 2012 9:48 AM
To: '[Richard Cline](#)'
Subject: RE: Information

Mr. Cline,

It was a pleasure to meet you. I am more than happy to field any questions or concerns you might have. My goal is to help the process as best I can. Site #18, as I understand the challenges, is currently privately owned and not for sale. Therefore, the property would need to be purchased by the Municipality of Anchorage. The current owner may or may not be willing to consider a sale. While the site has good access east and west from DeArmoun and north to south on Old Seward it would require the addition of another intersection to break at DeArmoun and Old Seward. There is also no sewer or water service in the immediate area. This site is also on a hill and would require substantially more dirt work to bring the site to building ready. Additionally, the property is currently zoned R1 and may need to be rezoned to PLI. These variables all add substantial construction costs, ultimately cutting into a large portion of the State Legislative Grant funds provided to replace Fire Station #9. The more money you spend on property acquisition and site development, the less money you have to spend on the actual station and resident services. These variables all limit the funds going to provide items directly affecting the residents (i.e. fire equipment, building finishes, resident desired improvements to the paths, etc.) and could consequently not leave enough funds available to build the actual station.

Thank you for taking the time to attend the Community Council meeting last night. I appreciate the time you spent to review the proposed sites for Fire Station #9. Your input and feedback is extremely valuable to the process. I respect your concerns and welcome any additional questions. Please feel free to contact me anytime.

Sincerely,

Heath Landon, Project Manager
Capital Projects
Office: (907) 343-8256
Cell: (907)529-0429
Fax: (907) 249-7452

From: Richard Cline [mailto:clinerac312@alaska.net]
Sent: Thursday, August 16, 2012 9:57 PM
To: Landon, Heath E.
Subject: Information

Heath Thanks for the good informational meeting last night. I understand this doesn't affect a lot of people as it does my family because of how close my house would be to the fire station. I would like to understand more about # 18 site that is on DeArmoun Road and across the New Seward hwy . I did not

understand what was being said about that #18 site and why it was not being consider any further. Thanks Richard Cline