



Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan

Steering Committee (SC) Meeting #9 – NOTES

October 26, 2022, 4-6 pm

Steering Committee Members:

Transportation

- Jackson Fox, FAST Planning (*absent*)
- Randi Bailey, DOT&PF (*absent*)
- Judy Chapman, DOT&PF
- Ryan Hilton, FNSBSD Transportation (*absent*)

Local Government

- Jimi Cash, FNSB Assembly
- Chris Guinn, FNSB Planning Commission
- Randy Pitney, FNSB Platting Board
- Danny Wallace, City of North Pole (*absent*)
- Robert Pristash, Fairbanks City Engineer (*absent*)
- Jerry Colp, City of Fairbanks

Road Service Area

- Erin Anderson, Murphy RSA
- Alan Skinner, Vue Crest RSA (*absent*)

Surveyor

- Steve Lowry, 3 Tier Alaska
- Nils Degerlund, Degerlund Engineering

Fire/EMS

- Chief Scott Learned, Steese Fire Department

State

- Colin Craven, Department of Natural Resources (*absent*)
- Bruce Sackinger, Department of Natural Resources (*absent*)
- Nathan Belz, University of Alaska Fairbanks

Developer

- Gary Newman, Northwest Public Power Association

Business

- Aaron Welterlen (*absent*)

Military

- Alexa Greene, Eielson Air Force Base
- John Weinberger, Ft. Wainwright (*absent*)

FNSB Technical Staff:

- Kellen Spillman, Community Planning Department (Project Manager)
Don Galligan, Community Planning Department
- George Stefan, Platting Division

Project Consultants:

- Respec: Patrick Cotter (Contractor Project Manager), Natalie Lyon
- Agnew::Beck Consulting: Shelly Wade (Public Involvement Lead)

Meeting Summary

Objectives

Share and gather Steering Committee input and support for:

- Process and progress-to-date.
- Public comments on the Public Review Draft and select corridors for further consideration.
- Next steps and Steering Committee role.
- Review of last few months: After the community open houses in May, the project team summarized and brought recommended changes to the Steering Committee in July. The public review draft was then developed and launched in September for a 30-day comment period. We received approximately 330 public comments on the Sept 2022 public review draft. Many of those commenters had not participated in the process previously. It's going to take more time to wrap up project and more conversations with the community and our original schedule will be extended. It's a positive development to have more community members involved in the process now.

Update on Stakeholder Engagement & Plan Development Schedule

Draft & Final Plan = Proposed Policy Framework (Vision, Goals, Strategies, Actions) + Proposed Corridors + Proposed Functional Classification Maps

- September 22, 2022 – October 21, 2022
 - Public Review Draft released for 30-day comment period
- October 26, 2022
 - Steering Committee Meeting #9
- November 2022
 - Outreach to do further education and get clarity on plan purpose and to discuss stakeholder concerns on specific corridor – 1-on-1 chats, small group discussions, virtual and in-person open houses (postcard mailout).
 - Further analysis of specific corridors where we need clarity on potential technical issues, etc.
- December 2022/January 2023
 - Final edits to Roads Plan
 - *Final Steering Committee meeting?*
- January/February 2023
 - Adoption process – Planning Commission, Platting Board, Assembly

Summary of Public Review outreach and public comments

Every comment has been entered into a comment tracker the team is using to understand public's concerns and respond to each comment. They will be packaged and shared as an appendix to the final plan.

Presentation & Discussion on REVISED DRAFT Future Road Corridors Maps (NOTE: see also 10-26-22 guiding slides)

Corridor 95 – Two Rivers

Proposed direction forward: Remove from plan

- No section line easement
- Lake Trout provides property access
- Adjacent residential development is already subdivided

Corridor 156 – North Pole

Proposed direction forward: Remove portion east of El Paso and maintain portion west of El Paso to Bethany

- Lots to east already subdivided
- Existing residential development on east end
- Large industrial/gravel pit lots could subdivide in the future
- Maintained portion provides alternate access to Midland/El Paso/Sinclair neighborhoods

Corridor 295 – Yankovich/Miller Hill/Hafele

Proposed direction forward: Remove from plan

- Many public comments, mostly opposed to this option
- Did more outreach on this alternative, including a neighborhood public meeting and site visit
- Concerns included poor soils, wetlands, and permafrost, overlapping trail easement, intersection grades, and restrictions on large Youth Services parcels
- Steering Committee comments:
 - Tim Sprout at DOT provided additional information about the existing public ROW.

Corridor 273 – Moose Mountain

Proposed direction forward: Keep in plan

- Comments included concerns about trail conflicts and additional traffic
- Reasoning to keep in plan include ability to separate trail and road through a planned shared corridor
- Single egress for Moose Mountain
- Access to large parcels with potential to subdivide in the future. Our team is not advocating for that - it is at the will of the mayor, assembly, and state DNR – but we have to give it consideration.
- Continuing discussions with Moose Mountain owners

Corridors 15 & 217 – North of Goldstream Rd

Proposed direction forward: Keeping in plan with revisions, including shifting away from existing trails

- Many comments received
- 1991 plan had several corridors in this area
- Includes a robust trail system
- Several borough and state parcels in area; state DNR has expressed immediate interest in subdividing some of its parcels in that area. Borough previously had interest in selling some of its land.
- Steering Committee comments:
 - How does this affect the airfield? This would not run across the airfield and team did not find any conflict with the airfield.

Corridor 28 – Esro Road/Amanita

Proposed direction forward: Keep in plan with revisions

- Public concerns include it's a private and but well maintain by neighborhood association, potential conflict with GCI Earth Station, poor soils, creek crossing, and future mining exploration and safety
- Team suggests maintaining all of 28 w/Tungsten subdivision or maintain 28 up to existing turnaround w/o Tungsten connection
- Some public comments thought the interest in this plan was to expand mining operations or explorations but the plan is premised on subdivision purpose. Both state and Alaska Mental Health Yyust have parcels in that area.
- Steering committee – Ground potential near starred locations are poor; settled, would be difficult to maintain

Corridor 64 – Goldstream Valley, Miler Hill/Miller Hill Ext.

Proposed direction forward: Asking Steering Committee to discuss

- This plan generated most public comments; most recent comments were mostly against this connection because of Land Trust conservation property, trail conflict, loss of habitat, permafrost, wetlands, poor soils, and traffic/neighborhood character.
- Options include Removing Corridor 64 or maintain is and shift away from trust land.
- Team is looking for input from steering committee.
- Steering Committee comments:
 - With poor soil, it's mostly wildlife habitat. As the community grows it's going to be important habitat land.
 - This could cut response time significantly for fire response to that area.
 - It would score well on DOT&PF funding opportunities because of the importance emergency response and drive time.
 - The difficult ground conditions is going to make this extension difficult to maintain.
 - It's easier to leave this on the plan now than to remove. Conditions may change over the years to make it a more favorable.
 - Wise to keep accepting input especially on this corridor.

Corridor 251- Ski Boot Hill/Musk Ox Subdivision

Proposed direction forward: Keep in the plan

- This was not originally included in 1991 plan
- Comments from recent comment period mostly opposed for concerns with Skyline Ridge Trail, increased traffic, road maintenance, safety concerns, and other recreational impacts.
- Team thinks it's important to keep because of large CIRI parcels that are likely to develop in the future, regardless of what roads plan says and because a planned corridor can help create a logical connection when land is developed, and plan ahead to preserve and accommodate existing trails.
- Options include shifting north-south portion slightly east into large parcel to align with existing roadway easement and shift ridge east-west portion to lower contour line, further east connection with Ski Boot to provide buffer between road and trail.
- Steering Committee comments –
 - This would make a connection that provide better access for emergency response.
 - I like the road connection for the possible future development.
 - It's a good connection as long as consideration is given to trail access and maybe provide a parking area to avoid parking along the road.
 - Te: Trails. Skyline Ridge Trail is a long connection. When CIRI subdivides, we've been expecting a road alignment might take over that ridge line and Title 17 allows flexibility to re-align the trail.
 - Could 251 be shifted north on the far side of the trail to follow the ridge even better?
 - Response: We did look at a potential alternative connection off of Pika, but that was potentially too steep to meet FNSB standards. Could be looked at again, with other alignments. It gets very steep on that north side.
 - Support keeping in plan because it's easier to keep in than to remove and miss the opportunity.

Discussion

- Comment tracker can be made available to Steering Committee, but it is a working document.

Next Steps

- Team will send slides and comment tracker to Steering Committee; notes from this meeting will be shared as well.

- Team continuing to communicate community and stakeholders.
- There may be another “final” Steering Committee meeting in early 2023 – TBD.
- Team is compiling sheet about what was removed from the plan through the process.