



Fairbanks North Star Borough

COMPREHENSIVE ROADS PLAN Steering Committee

fnsbroadsplan.com

Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Steering Committee (SC) Kickoff Meeting – NOTES

April 8th, 2021; 3:30 – 5:30 pm

Participants

- Steering Committee Members:
 - Transportation
 - Jackson Fox, FAST Planning
 - Randi Bailey, DOT&PF
 - Ryan Hinton, FNSB Transportation
 - Local Government
 - Chris Guinn, FNSB Planning Commission
 - Randy Pitney, FNSB Platting Board
 - Andrew Ackerman, City of Fairbanks
 - Bill Butler, City of North Pole
 - Road Service Area
 - Erin Anderson, Murphy RSA
 - LJ Evans, Ester Lump RSA
 - Clint Meyer, Goldstream Moose Creek RSA (formerly)
 - Sig Strandberg, Mountain View RSA
 - State
 - AJ Wait, Department of Natural Resources
 - Surveyor
 - Steve Lowry, 3 Tier Alaska
 - Nils Degerlund, Surveyor/Engineer
 - Developer
 - Gary Newman
 - Fire/EMS
 - Chief Scott Learned, Steese Fire Department
 - Other
 - Aaron Welterlen, Water or Fuel Delivery
 - Nate Belz, UAF Civil Engineering
- FNSB Technical Staff:
 - Brittany Smart, Mayor's Office (Co-Project Manager)
 - Kellen Spillman, Community Planning Department (Co-Project Manager)
 - Melissa Kellner, Community Planning Department
 - Todd Boyce, Community Planning Department
 - George Stefan, Community Planning Department
 - Bryant Wright, Parks and Recreation
 - Floyd Sheesley, Public Works
- Project Consultants:
 - PDC Engineers: Patrick Cotter (Contractor Project Manager), Natalie Lyon
 - Agnew::Beck Consulting: Shelly Wade (Public Involvement Lead), Molly Mylius

Summary of Discussion by Topic and Slide Number

Project Overview and Purpose – Slides 1-45

Team introductions, land acknowledgement, review of project and meeting purpose, outline meeting guidelines. Additional information on what the Roads Plan does and does not do, additional background on the 1991 Roads Plan and how it has been used, and specific case studies/examples.

- No discussion.



- Question (in chat): Will the plan include right-of-way (ROW) acquisition where established roads already exist without dedicated ROW? E.g., Amanita Road, ESRO Road.
 - Response (in chat): This is going to be a good discussion point as we get into specifics with the update, but it is very possible. Amanita Road and ESRO Road are both included in the current 1991 Plan.

What Have We Learned So Far? – Slides 46-59

The project team shared highlights from the existing conditions report, other relevant planning efforts underway in the FNSB, and themes from a series of interviews with Steering Committee members.

- Slide 47 (in chat): What’s an “orphan road?”
 - Answer: a road without maintenance authority, that has been built but is not maintained. Orphan roads are a known issue with roads that exist outside Road Service Areas in FNSB.
- Slide 47 and 48 (in chat): Why are the number of Road Service Area (RSA) miles different between slides 47 and 48?
 - Answer: Slide 47 includes all RSA roads (767 miles); Slide 48 only includes RSA roads within the FAST Planning Metropolitan Organization (MPO) boundaries (497 miles).
- Slide 47: What is the difference between a private and an orphan road?
 - Answer: most of the private road mileage in this chart are roads on military bases.
- Slide 56: We are experiencing flooding issues on Ester and Doe Ray Roads in the Chena Hot Springs area. It is a private road with a volunteer association that maintains it; we’ve found this is cheaper than an RSA, even if not all residents contribute.
- Slide 56: The 1991 Plan shows a road going through my residential area and connecting to lands owned by the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority (AMHTA) that will likely be used for mining. The AMHTA land is zoned General Use 1 (GU-1). If the heavy mining moves forward, this appears to present a conflict with the intended minor collector classification of the residential segment of road. Road classifications should consider adjacent land uses, and zoning decisions should consider impacts to upstream and downstream access and transportation corridors.
- Slide 58 (in chat): “I suggest that a handout be provided as a part of the plan describing Takings, de facto Takings, compensations and the role of regulations such as this Comprehensive Road Plan, and zoning and their role in how property is acquired/dedicated as road rights of way.”

Public Involvement Plan – Slides 60-64

The planning team shared an overview of the proposed public involvement approach and timeline.

- Slide 61 and 62: additional public involvement strategies to consider:
 - The Steering Committee could help get the word out on local social media networks via Facebook community groups and Next Door neighborhoods.



- Write a community perspective piece in the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner.
- Slide 63: ensure alignment with other relevant planning efforts underway. Want them to support one another and avoid conflicting recommendations. It will also be important to coordinate on public involvement to take advantage of opportunities and minimize planning fatigue.
 - Relevant overlapping projects include:
 - Comprehensive Trails Plan: <https://www.fnsbtrailsplan.com/>
 - Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (CEDS): <https://fnsbceds.com/>
 - FAST Planning Road Service Area (RSA) Expansion Plan: <https://fastplanning.us/projectsandprograms/>
 - Land Suitability Analysis
 - In the case of the FNSB Comprehensive Trails Plan, this could include meeting with the Trails Advisory Commission (TAC), or even just meeting with the planning team.
- Slide 63: ensure we are telling the story of why this planning effort needs to happen now and how it will be utilized.
- Slide 64: Target Audiences. Recommended additions:
 - Add Matanuska Telephone Association (MTA) and AlasConnect; they both run fiber through Fairbanks.
 - Work with community associations such as Ester Community Association to help get the word out. Ester has two public meetings annually, usually in April and again in September or October. The fall meeting will hopefully be in person. They are typically well attended.
 - Response: since the Planning Team does not have the resources to attend all community association meetings, we hope to use the connections and relationships of Steering Committee members to help spread the word, report on progress and collect input via these localized groups.

Next Steps – Slide 67-69

The Planning Team revisited the schedule and immediate next steps, and shared contact information for the key project contacts. Steering Committee members were encouraged to get in touch with additional thoughts, questions and comments following the meeting.

The FNSB also reminded the group of the origins of the project funding. This project, along with the Comprehensive Roads Plan and Land Suitability Analysis, are being funded by a grant from the Department of Defense via the Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation (OLDCC), former Office of Economic Adjustment (OEA). OLDCC funds are available for communities who are experiencing impacts due to staffing, basing and expansion/reduction efforts at adjacent military bases (in this case, expansion at Eielson Air Force Base). A previous OLDCC-funded planning effort, the [Eielson Regional Growth Plan](#), identified specific recommendations to accommodate anticipated growth, which included the need to update relevant FNSB plans.

