

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
15	1/21/2023	Web Form	Dan	Reichardt		<p>Shelly – I want to make sure that you have received a copy of my detailed comments I submitted to Don Galligan which especially relate to Route 15 on the Roads Plan. I also would like to request a copy of the "Folder" that relates to analysis of Route 15, if it's meant to be public information.</p> <p>We met with Don and Bryant and Patrick at the FNSB offices, and it was a very informative discussion. I understand that a 4-page comment isn't really what the public comment tracker has been designed to incorporate. You will use your judgement regarding how to deal with that, but I would really appreciate if the committee was given the opportunity to consider my comments.</p> <p>The meeting at the FNSB really clarified in my mind that my core disagreement with the Roads plan is a flawed Selection Criteria – specifically the criteria regarding access. While I understand that there is support from various stakeholders for Alternate Routes and Multiple Access Points, those features of an alignment can be in stark contrast to values that other stakeholders have to discourage non-local traffic from passing through their neighborhood and to live on roads that have the character of bringing one into wilderness as opposed to passing through wilderness. Analysis of alignments should seek to balance these values, and the balance should be affected by local community opinion.</p> <p>To be specific, I think the Selection Criteria fails to consider three key issues:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The cost, danger and other harms caused by funneling non-local traffic through a road service area road or orphan road. 2.The ways in which a specific alignment through a parcel privileges certain development plans within that parcel over other potential development plans. For example, if you agree that building Route 15 would encourage dense subdivision of TL-103, you need to evaluate whether a decision has been made to prefer such dense subdivision, as opposed to mixed density. If such a decision hasn't been made, that should count against the proposed alignment. 3.Neighborhood preference for a partially disconnected road network with dead ends. I understand that well educated community planners are taught the value of an interconnected "mesh" approach to roads, and the points in favor of it are valid. But, a selection criteria should balance that desire against neighborhood preferences. The existing criteria doesn't allow for such consideration. <p>I know it's the 11th hour, but I really don't think this Roads Plan can proceed to completion without re-evaluating alignments in light of the above issues. I now recognize that most of my detailed comments (attached below) are pretty much dead-on-arrival, because the selection criteria doesn't recognize the harms I perceive as harms worth balancing against.</p> <p>Thank you for all your hard work, as well as the team's willingness to meet with us and have an informative discussion.</p>	<p>Corridor 15 is a planned corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that has been realigned in the plan update. Corridor 15 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. The corridor has been realigned based on an engineering analysis to better align with topography and to address community input about potential conflicts with the O'Conner Creek and Cranberry trail systems. Since alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone, developers can work with the FNSB during the platting and subdivision process to adjust corridor alignments to better match underlying terrain and align with development plans, as long as the alternate alignments achieve the same objectives for connectivity and access as the original planned corridor.</p>
15	1/17/2023	Web Form	Dan	Reichardt		<p>Don: I appreciate you inviting myself, along with others, to a meeting on Friday to discuss our concerns about the FNSB Roads Plan. I've written some of my thoughts as follows, because I think the meeting might be more productive if we've provided more detail prior to meeting. I want to comment that the below letter, or memo... whatever we want to call it, may sound strident and uncompromising. My intent is to be the opposite of that, however I want to be transparent about what my thoughts are, and they aren't always equivocal. Nobody else is at all obligated to see this the way I see it, I just want to make my case. I wish I had found a way to make my points more succinctly, but I guess reading these sorts of diatribes is what they pay you the big bucks for. At the meeting let's talk about the points I bring up that you find salient, and I have no need to drone on about the parts that you don't think have any traction.</p> <p>Also, I want to make clear that I'm just speaking for myself. I'm pleased to be invited to the same meeting as Bob, Paul and Mary Lee, but I haven't run these comments by them for review at all and don't want to hijack their thoughts.</p> <p>Dan Reichardt's Detailed Comments on the Draft Fairbanks North Star Borough Roads Plan In elaboration of my previously submitted comments about the Draft FNSB Roads Plan, I have three main points I want to make, summarized as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The entirety of Route 15 should be eliminated <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a.It is redundant to other routes b.It bisects TL-3602 and TL2503 in a way that disconnects the buildable portions of those lots from the unsuitably steep portions c.It encourages relatively dense development of these lots, in contrast to the 2005 Regional Comprehensive Plan which encourages variable densities of these lots. d.It will route a lot of eastbound traffic on the existing Pandora Spur Road through the existing Red Leaf/Pandor intersection, which is a dangerous, blind intersection. 2.The Roads Plan should ensure that the next lot down the road has appropriate access, but beyond providing safe and efficient access to the next lot, the alignment of roads within a lot should be dictated by the particular development plan the lot owner wishes to pursue, with concurrence from the Borough. In consideration of that principal: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a.The portion of Route 234 that passes through the UA owned TL-1903 should be eliminated b.The entirety of Route 272 should be eliminated 3.I want to make a general, philosophical point that is maybe not actionable, but informs other comments. This Roads Plan shows a bias against large lots and dead-end roads. Such decisions are beyond the purview of the Roads Committee, and you should avoid making decisions that tip the scales in that direction. 	<p>Corridor 15 is a planned corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that has been realigned in the plan update. Corridor 15 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. The corridor has been realigned based on an engineering analysis to better align with topography and to address community input about potential conflicts with the O'Conner Creek and Cranberry trail systems. Since alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone, developers can work with the FNSB during the platting and subdivision process to adjust corridor alignments to better match underlying terrain and align with development plans, as long as the alternate alignments achieve the same objectives for connectivity and access as the original planned corridor.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
15	1/17/2023	Web Form	Dan	Reichardt		<p>Elimination of Route 15</p> <p>Route 15 extends from the end of Pandora (colloquially, Pandora Spur Road), through a privately owned large lot with a single residence (TL-104), runs north through FNSB owned TL-103, passes north through the center of FNSB owned TL-3602 and passes mostly through the center of FNSB owned TL-2503 before merging with Route 293 and continuing onwards to Old Murphy Dome Road as Route 293.</p> <p>In terms of providing access to developable lots, Route 15 is entirely redundant to routes 217 and 293. It is possible that my overlays were imprecise and Route 293 fails to provide access to TL-2503, in which case Route 293 should either be diverted slightly westwards, or a short spur road should be added to access TL-2503 from Route 293.</p> <p>1.Access to TL-104</p> <p>a.If the Private Property Owners of TL-104 choose to subdivide and further develop their lot, they have existing platted access from the end of the Pandora Spur as well as constructed access from Penrose.</p> <p>b.I can't imagine that these property owners are happy about the idea of a road passing through the center of their property, just because they might want to carve out a small lot on the edge of their property for somebody in the future. The roads committee should definitely be in discussion directly with those property owners, but I would imagine that Route 15 is a very strong disincentive to any future subdivision by those property owners. Is such a disincentive the intention of the roads committee?</p> <p>2.Access to TL-103</p> <p>a.FNSB owned TL-103 has been identified as having portions desirable for residential development along its southern property line, along its eastern property line in the southern third of the lot and in its northeastern corner.</p> <p>i.The southern portion is best accessed from Route 217 and the northeast corner is best accessed from existing right-of-ways in the Vista Gold Subdivision (Orange Leaf and Green Leaf Roads). While you might be able to make an argument that Route 15 is a good way to access the southeastern area that is suitable for development, it's far more likely that a developer would simply extend route 217 north to access those desirable building lots.</p> <p>ii.One of the most likely ways to develop TL-103 is to subdivide it to have 4 to 8 lots on or near the southern property line, accessed from route 217, 3 to 6 lots in the northeast corner (accessed from Vista Gold) and a 60 to 100 acre lot in the center of TL-103, accessed from route 217, with a significant conservation easement attached to much of that larger lot. An aggressive developer would double or triple the number of lots in the south and northeast, resulting in smaller large lot. Route 15 would degrade the value of that large central lot by passing traffic through the center of it, thereby encouraging denser development – contrary to the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p>Corridor 15 is a planned corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that has been realigned in the plan update. Corridor 15 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. The corridor has been realigned based on an engineering analysis to better align with topography and to address community input about potential conflicts with the O'Conner Creek and Cranberry trail systems. Since alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone, developers can work with the FNSB during the platting and subdivision process to adjust corridor alignments to better match underlying terrain and align with development plans, as long as the alternate alignments achieve the same objectives for connectivity and access as the original planned corridor.</p>
15	1/17/2023	Web Form	Dan	Reichardt		<p>3.Access to TL-3602</p> <p>a.As identified by the 2005 Comprehensive Plan, the portion of TL-3602 that is desirable for residential development is a North-South swath through the center of the lot, which any developer is going to access from Vista Gold Subdivision using platted easements for Green Leaf and Orange Leaf Roads and not from either Route 15 or Route 293. Although it is not identified as such in the comprehensive plan, Route 293 also accesses land that is marginally suited for development and there is some land to the west of the identified swath that is suitable. All this land will be accessed from Vista Gold. b.Route 15 is way over to the west at the top of a very steep (20%) slope. None of the land to the west of Route 15 is suitable for residential development, due to steep slopes, so I really don't see it's value other than as a way to cut a couple minutes off of one's commute from Western Fairbanks to Vista Gold Subdivision, by connecting to Sky Flight via Route 217. When you weigh the harm this route presents to the highly valued Cranberry and East Ridge Trail Systems and attached wild land versus the slight reduction in commute time, I don't think you can justify this route.</p> <p>c.Parts of TL-3602 will be subdivided into highly desirable residential lots, specifically because of it's proximity to the undevelopable land on the western slope of the lot. It's highly likely that a developer will use some of this steep land to turn small residential lots into large forested lots, while putting the rest of this sloped land into a conservation easement. Placing a road between houses and this hillside reduces the desirability of those lots. Why is the borough trying to force a developer to plat such a harmful road?</p> <p>d.If the borough does require that the Route 15 be platted so close to the top of this steep slope, this will put a lot of pressure on the developer to place lots on both sides of the road, even though the lots to the west will be undesirable, as its unusual to plat a lot that is bisected by a road. By placing this pressure on the developer to plat more lots in an unsuitable area the Borough is encouraging dense development in an area that the Comprehensive Plan has identified that variable densities should be encouraged. You have a responsibility to encourage variable densities on this lot. Is Route 15 serving that purpose? I don't think so.</p>	<p>Corridor 15 is a planned corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that has been realigned in the plan update. Corridor 15 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. The corridor has been realigned based on an engineering analysis to better align with topography and to address community input about potential conflicts with the O'Conner Creek and Cranberry trail systems. Since alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone, developers can work with the FNSB during the platting and subdivision process to adjust corridor alignments to better match underlying terrain and align with development plans, as long as the alternate alignments achieve the same objectives for connectivity and access as the original planned corridor.</p>
15	1/17/2023	Web Form	Dan	Reichardt		<p>4.Access to TL-2503</p> <p>a.Route 15 does pass through the portion of TL-2503 identified as high value residential land, but it's not necessary. Route 293 also gets pretty close to that same portion of the lot, and is probably more likely to be built. I acknowledge that if Route 15 was previously constructed through parts of TL-3602, and no part of Route 293 had yet been constructed, a developer might choose to use Route 15 as their access to TL-2503. But, if both Route 293 and Route 15 are platted but not constructed, the developer is going to choose Route 293, as it provides a more direct commute.</p> <p>b.While the acreage is smaller than for TL-3602, Route 15 again separates desirable residential land from steep land that is unsuitable for development. Whether this steep land is part of larger lots, or in a conservation easement, homebuyers want that sort of wilderness in their back yard – not on the other side of a collector road.</p> <p>5.Access to lots north of TL-2503</p> <p>a.My ideal number of roads connecting Goldstream to Old Murphy Dome is zero. But, if you are insistent on connecting Pandora to Old Murphy Dome Road, Route 293 accomplishes that. Route 15 merges with Route 293 just north of TL-2503, so Route 15 accomplishes nothing in that regard.</p> <p>6.If Route 15 is developed, I think it is pretty clear that its purpose is not to allow development of the first 4 lots that it accesses – as I've established that those lots can better be developed by alternate access. So, the purpose of Route 15 must be to divert traffic from Vista Gold and future subdivisions away from Redberry Road and through Pandora. This is an awful idea, as the Redberry/Pandora intersection is one of the most unacceptably dangerous intersections I have seen in Alaska. Traffic driving up on Pandora and down on Red Berry are completely blind to each other. The Borough can slightly improve this intersection with some stop signs, but I cannot identify a way to make this intersection safe. The saving grace of this intersection is that 95% of the traffic is on Red Berry and both of the families who live on the Pandora Spur are extremely careful and responsible drivers. I understand that analysis of specific intersections is generally beyond the scope of this roads plan. But, if you cannot identify an affordable way to fix the Pandora/Red Berry intersection (and I can't), it is highly irresponsible to plan for additional traffic to be using the Pandora Spur Road, which will become Route 15.</p>	<p>Corridor 15 is a planned corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that has been realigned in the plan update. Corridor 15 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. The corridor has been realigned based on an engineering analysis to better align with topography and to address community input about potential conflicts with the O'Conner Creek and Cranberry trail systems. Since alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone, developers can work with the FNSB during the platting and subdivision process to adjust corridor alignments to better match underlying terrain and align with development plans, as long as the alternate alignments achieve the same objectives for connectivity and access as the original planned corridor.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
15	1/17/2023	Web Form	Dan	Reichardt		<p>Philosophy of the Roads Plan</p> <p>Next I want to expand this discussion beyond Route 15, which I hope I have convinced you should be abandoned. Let's think about what the philosophy of the roads plan should and shouldn't be. The Roads Plan should not be prescribing road alignments through a lot with a primary purpose of providing access to that lot. The Roads Plan should be ensuring that the next lot down the road has appropriate access, but beyond providing safe and efficient access to the next lot, the alignment of roads within a lot should be dictated by the particular development plan the lot owner wishes to pursue, with concurrence from the Borough. I'll avoid a long discussion, but this dictates that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.The portion of Route 234 that passes through the University of Alaska owned TL-1903 should be eliminated 2.The entirety of Route 272 should be eliminated <p>Bias Against Dead-End Roads and Large Lots</p> <p>I think I've touched on this above, but I want to make sure that we specifically note that I am claiming that this roads plan exhibits a bias against Dead-End Roads and against Large Lots. Such decisions are beyond the purview of the Roads Committee, and you should avoid making decisions that tip the scales in that direction.</p> <p>1.I don't think this bias is justified. I own three lots in Fairbanks that are all at the "end of the road" and that character is precisely what makes these lots desirable to me. I particularly value my large lot at the end of Toboggan Lane, because it gives me room to have a house, a garden, a spot to pee in the woods without anybody seeing me and I still have enough land to allow the neighbors to use trails that cross it.</p> <p>2.The argument is made that we need multiple roads in and out of each subdivision for Emergency Services, but this is a red herring. Our residential firefighters and EMS are glad to have one well maintained road into a housefire that was built to borough standards, and our wildland firefighters are just glad to have a road of any sort. We don't need to be crisscrossing roads through the wilderness just to provide multiple egress points in case of an alien invasion. I don't mean to be rude, but these scenarios where we need multiple egress points to a subdivision are just far fetched in highly irregular.</p> <p>3.What these roads that connect Old Murphy Dome Road to Goldstream Road through multiple subdivisions are doing is much more prosaic. We are encouraging suburban sprawl to march northwards. It is inconvenient to live on Old Murphy Dome Road, but it is also an entirely different lifestyle than living in Goldstream. These collector roads serve to change the character of Old Murphy Dome Road to be more like Goldstream and encourage the intermediate parcels to be developed more like Vista Gold, and less like the large lots that still exist in Goldstream Valley and at the ends of the various existing roads on the hillside. Perhaps somebody wants to make those changes, but as a community we have not decided to do that. We have not updated the Comprehensive Plan to reflect that desire and it's not within the scope of decisions that the Roads Committee should be making.</p> <p>Thank you very much for taking my concerns seriously. I look forward to meeting with you.</p>	<p>Corridor 15 is a planned corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that has been realigned in the plan update. Corridor 15 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. The corridor has been realigned based on an engineering analysis to better align with topography and to address community input about potential conflicts with the O'Conner Creek and Cranberry trail systems. Since alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone, developers can work with the FNSB during the platting and subdivision process to adjust corridor alignments to better match underlying terrain and align with development plans, as long as the alternate alignments achieve the same objectives for connectivity and access as the original planned corridor.</p>
15	1/28/2023	Email	Susan	Faulkner		<p>We are writing to ask that road corridor #15 be taken off the FNSB road plan. This corridor goes through our house, at 2200 Penrose Lane, where we have lived for over 23 years. Planning a corridor through someone's home does not seem reasonable. Please remove road corridor #15.</p>	<p>Corridor 15 is a planned corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that has been realigned in the plan update. Corridor 15 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide as initiated by the owners. If the parcel in question never subdivides, a corridor will not be constructed. In its current alignment, Corridor 15 does not cross the existing residential development on the parcel at 2200 Penrose, and maintains a significant forested buffer between the proposed alignment and existing structures.</p>
15	1/28/2023	Email	Darren	Rorabaugh		<p>We are writing to ask that road corridor #15 be taken off the FNSB road plan. This corridor goes through our house, at 2200 Penrose Lane, where we have lived for over 23 years. Planning a corridor through someone's home does not seem reasonable. Please remove road corridor #15.</p>	<p>Corridor 15 is a planned corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that has been realigned in the plan update. Corridor 15 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide as initiated by the owners. If the parcel in question never subdivides, a corridor will not be constructed. In its current alignment, Corridor 15 does not cross the existing residential development on the parcel at 2200 Penrose, and maintains a significant forested buffer between the proposed alignment and existing structures.</p>
21	1/30/2023	Public meeting sticky note				<p>There are some roads here that make sense joined on existing roads (like #21) but others appear to be redundant for example #13 that parallels another</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan guides development of subdivision roads to ensure that all property owners are granted legal access to their lots. Roads such as Corridor 13 would only be constructed if the lots they cross subdivide, to provide direct access for the new owners of those lots. This also serves to limit the number of driveways directly accessing potentially higher functioning roads such as Old Murphy Dome (classified as a Major Collector to plan for potential future increases in traffic/development).</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
22	2/13/2023	Email	Lisa	Jodwalis		<p>First, a big thank you to all of the planning team for your hard work putting the plan together, seeing it through multiple drafts, and engaging in extensive public participation. My comments specifically address the area of Goldstream Valley bounded by Goldstream Road on the south and Old Murphy Dome on the north. My husband and I have lived in the Waldheim Drive neighborhood since 1985 and have used the local trails and neighborhood paths every year since in all seasons. I see that some alterations were made in the final draft. My concerns are with the designation of ANY roads and subdivisions in an area fraught with landscape challenges. These were identified and commented on by area residents as part of the proposed O'Connor Creek Re- Zone in 2018. The Windy Creek drainage is extremely steep and while the draft Roads Plan shows a relocation to a lower elevation (route 372), it still requires winding routes and steep driveways. The O'Connor Creek drainage has extensive permafrost and thaw and erosion are highly visible. Those of us who are long-term residents can point to the obvious signs, many of which have emerged in just the past 5-10 years. Routes 22 and 375 extend Jones Road north and this is probably unsupportable: Windy Creek at the O'Connor Creek Trail crossing suffered a serious erosion event about 4 years ago that created a gully large and deep enough to drop a school bus into. More evidence of erosion and thaw is common along lower Windy Creek and all along the O'Connor Creek Trail as evidenced by leaning trees, deeper dips, and recent gullying. My greatest concern is that the Roads Plan in general advocates for future development in an area that is increasingly at risk from adverse weather events that make maintenance costs prohibitive for road service areas and make emergency evacuation life-threatening. The last decade and especially the last year have seen extreme weather. The 26 December 2022 rain-on- snow event made the entire neighborhood impassable for 2 weeks. The windstorm of 25 July 2022 dropped well over 20 big spruce and birch on Waldheim Drive. In May 2011 the Moose Mountain Fire came terrifyingly close to residences. Although human-caused, the burned area is still highly flammable and the general area sees many lightning strikes each summer. Adding new roads and residences in the Windy and O'Connor Creek drainages will put people at extreme risk, as these situations were not one-off. Unfortunately, I think that the Borough needs to step back from the current plan and evaluate the long-term risks due to climate warming – increased fires, permafrost thaw, heavy rain and snow, and rain-on-snow – for some of these rural areas where emergency response takes longer. As last December 26 showed us, our community doesn't have the equipment, operators, or budget to maintain quickly deteriorating roads, clear them in a timely fashion, or evacuate residents in medical or wildfire emergencies. I urge the planners and contractors to look at the O'Connor Creek watershed specifically as to suitability for any kind of roads or development. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 22/375 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan in this update. Corridors in the Roads Plan can be adjusted to address topographical issues during the subdivision process if the alternative corridor meets the same intent as the original identified in the plan. The Roads Plan is high-level and long-range plan to identify beneficial connections across the FNSB. At the time of subdivision, on-the-ground survey data will be considered to inform the feasibility of corridors, like 22/375.
28	2/3/2023	Web Form	Joe	Price		<p>Esro Rd is a private road. Why connect it to Amanita? At which mile of the road do you intend to either knock down a significant amount of trees or go through privately owned property?</p>	Thank you for your comments. Both ESRO and Amanita roads are cul-de-sacs that are longer than the FNSB's standard, causing issues for emergency services and resident access. Southern portions of ESRO have gained public right-of-way as adjacent parcels have subdivided. As additional subdivisions occur along the road, more public right-of-way can be obtained. Like all corridors in the Roads Plan, corridor 331 connecting ESRO and Amanita will only be developed as the parcels it crosses or is adjacent to subdivide. Because the FNSB is a second-class borough with limited road powers, landowners/developers construct roads to provide access to their properties when these subdivide, as directed by proposed alignments in the Roads Plan, and per the FNSB's subdivision and platting process as outlined in FNSB Code Title 17.
28	2/7/2023	Email	Sue	Sherif		<p>My first concern is the part of the plan that shows acquiring right-of-way to connect the northern portions of Esro and Amanita Roads off Chena Hot Springs Road. The link theoretically meets the criteria established in the plan to provide alternate methods for emergency service and delivery vehicles on roads that have only one way in and out, but given the nature of the two roads, neither of which is in a formal service area, I can't think that this connection would be 1. economically feasible to build and maintain year round or 2. in rough winter conditions would actually serve this criteria.</p> <p>My second concern is: As the plan clearly states the borough does not have road building or maintenance powers, so I find it ironic that the plan seems to be geared to the proliferation of new roads or connectors that, outside of service areas, will be difficult if not impossible to maintain. The plan glosses over this problem, by outlining the stages of road development, and saying that the new roads can be annexed into existing service areas, but skips the reality of the fact that roads like Amanita that are long, steep, and not up to standards are "orphans" for a reason.</p> <p>Until the Borough addresses this problem, that there is no way to establish new road service areas or compel an existing road service area to expand or the Borough decides it has outgrown its second class status (or the Legislature changes the definition of the powers of a second-class borough), I am puzzled what this exercise in planning for more miles of difficult to maintain roads, like the proposed Esro - Amanita link, is worth.</p> <p>I do appreciate the process that the borough used in developing its proposals, especially the open houses and the interactive maps for public input and also the opportunity to comment now.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan does not promote or trigger road development in any specific areas. Because of the FNSB's second-class status, all subdivision roads are developed by landowners/developers when they subdivide their property. This ensures that all new parcels have legal access. The Roads Plan provides direction on the most logical locations for future road connections. New future road connections, once constructed, would need to be adopted into an existing service area for maintenance based on state law.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
28	2/9/2023	Email	Judie	Triplehorn		<p>ESRO Road is a private road - maintained by the residents and GCI. Aufeis has been a major problem the last few years.</p> <p>The ESRO extension to Tungsten Subdivision which will be borough maintained will cover some pretty rough ground. The permafrost is melting and sink holes are forming in the lowland. Aufeis is also a problem. GCI property will be impacted. Road construction and maintenance will be costly over Steele Creek and tributaries. Extension is not cost effective.</p> <p>Amanita to ESRO - Lammers property This will be a borough road and will have maintenance issues with permafrost and steep slope. Traffic noise and dust would impact residents in homes in Esro subdivisions right on the road. Who will use the road - Amanita residents will use Amanita and Esro residents will use ESRO Great expense to build and maintain - not a good idea.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Both ESRO and Amanita roads are cul-de-sacs that are longer than the FNSB's standard, causing issues for emergency services and resident access. Southern portions of ESRO have gained public right-of-way as adjacent parcels have subdivided. As additional subdivisions occur along the road, more public right-of-way can be obtained. Like all corridors in the Roads Plan, corridor 331 connecting ESRO and Amanita will only be developed as the parcels it crosses or is adjacent to subdivide. Because the FNSB is a second-class borough with limited road powers, landowners/developers construct roads to provide access to their properties when these subdivide, as directed by proposed alignments in the Roads Plan, and per the FNSB's subdivision and platting process as outlined in FNSB Code Title 17.
28	1/26/2023	Public meeting sticky note				Don't extend 28 past 331. Really bad sails makes through traffic at risk.	Thank you for your comment. The connection between ESRO Road and the Tungsten Subdivision is being maintained to provide an additional point in ingress/egress to both neighborhoods.
51	2/6/2023	Email				<p>Good morning. I hope I am connecting with the correct person about the borough road plan. I live at 14.5 mile CHSR and noticed that there is an extension proposed for Heritage Hills Road. There are extensive trail systems to the north of Heritage Hills that have been in use for over 50 years. They are not on the borough trail plan. The extension appeared somewhat general/vague in the proposal but I think it would impact the system of trails back in this area.</p> <p>I would be more than willing to come in with a map to discuss this issue. Thanks so much</p>	Corridor 51 is a connection maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan that extends Heritage Hills Rd northeast across large private and publicly owned parcels. It creates an outer ring surrounding a number of trails to the east and south comprising the Little Chena River-Potlatch Creek trail system (included in the FNSB Trails Plan as category B trails proposed for future dedication). This corridor would only be developed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. A planned road/trail easement or shared corridor could minimize trail impacts.
			Darleen	Masiak			
51	2/8/2023	Email	Darleen	Masiak		<p>Shelley, thank you so much. Three additional questions. Was a soils survey included? (We live in an area that has Minto Loam and has ice lenses so it is a consideration as to whether a soils map was looked at). Someone put in a road on land off of Heritage and it turned into a drainage on the west side of the hill.</p> <p>Where are the subdivisions planned? Concept plan? Where is map of FNSB properties in Corridor 51?</p> <p>How do I address all this thoughts questions to the committee by the 10 February? By having contacted you are they all passed on and somehow acknowledged?</p> <p>Again, thanks for your timely response and that was way more than three questions, so many thanks.</p>	Soils data was considered in the Roads Plan process. The Roads Plan doesn't promote development or subdivisions in any specific area. What it does do is provide forethought to where future road corridors are most feasible and which connections are most needed across the road network. Because the FNSB is a second-class borough with limited road powers, all local roads are developed through the subdivision process. Roads are only developed by landowners/developers at the time of subdivision. The Roads Plan provides direction on where those connections are most needed and most feasible to construct.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
51	2/10/2023	Web Form	Don	Canning		<p>Not sure how to approach this situation. I know the borough has a housing shortage and I think it makes good sense for any government entity to have a well-informed plan to guide its decision making. So I approve of the reasoning behind this roads plan in principle. I also know that I am submitting these comments at the 59th minute of the eleventh hour of a process in which I certainly had many earlier opportunities to research and comment on the borough's proposals. I know that the hasty and irresponsible timing of these comments undermines their influence. At this point, it's this flimsy presentation or nothing.</p> <p>My concern is that one of the proposed corridors - for a "major collector" road would go right past my place only one lot removed. I'm already upset about the unavoidable increase in traffic and noise that would come with such a development. But, for me, the most upsetting aspect of the plan, were it carried out, would be the corridor 51 section (the whole "major collector" section comprises corridors 349, 51 and 320 and would connect Heritage Hills Road with several "minor collectors" in the Two Rivers Road/upper Little Chena logging area). It's a little unclear from the map exactly where corridor 51 would go but it appears that it would at least partly follow what is now a dedicated trail that extends north from Heritage Hills Subdivision along the top of a gentle forested ridge. This trail is used daily by people from this and neighboring subdivisions and it is some of the most beautiful birch and spruce forest in the Tanana Valley (in my opinion). Just seeing these words on paper makes me uneasy because I'm unsure whether stating the areas virtues so plainly would encourage its protection or hasten its doom. But since the roads plan already includes it, I have little choice. I do think that there is great value in setting aside protected areas for recreational use. There has been lots of economic research pointing to the quality of life and economic stimulus value of parks, greenways, national parks and the like and I see no reason why that would be different in this case. The existing trail is a big part of the reason why I continue to live there. And I know the same is true for a number of my neighbors.</p> <p>This is a truly beautiful area. People run dogs, snowmachine, ski, bike, go for walks, pick berries ,hunt and harvest dead trees for firewood and materials from the forest for crafts. And they do so regularly. Punching a road through this area, and the housing construction that would follow such a road, would ruin the character of this patch of forest forever.</p> <p>I am quite certain that the borough has alternatives to address its housing shortage such as changing zoning and using property tax incentives to encourage new construction in areas that are already developed. I, for one, would definitely pay more in taxes in order to subsidize tax incentives in already developed areas.</p> <p>I know that people need homes. But quality of life should also factor into the decisions that will affect our whole community. So much has already been lost - local small businesses driven under by unfair competition from huge national franchises, for instance. Making a stand for quality of life will always involve sacrifice. It always has. Please consider withdrawing corridors 349, 51 and 320 from the roads plan and confine road and residential development to the existing Two Rivers road and the roads branching off from it which have already been constructed for logging. That forest is gone. Please leave the 51 corridor for future generations to enjoy as my friends and neighbors have enjoyed it for years.</p>	<p>Corridor 51 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. The Roads Plan doesn't promote development or subdivisions in any specific area. What it does do is provide forethought to where future road corridors are most feasible and which connections are most needed across the road network. Because the FNSB is a second-class borough with limited road powers, all local roads are developed through the subdivision process. Roads are only developed by landowners/developers at the time of subdivision. The Roads Plan provides direction on where those connections are most needed and most feasible to construct. Through the Roads and Trails planning processes, planned shared road and trail corridors can be conceptualized and developed to preserve existing trails and minimize impacts. The Assembly has final say on when, if, and how FNSB-owned lands, like those surrounding Corridors 349, 51, and 320, are developed. While Assembly members change frequently, the Roads Plan offers a 20-year horizon to guide road development in the most logical manner over the long-term. Subdivisions and land development may occur at any time. The Roads Plan merely guides that development when it does occur.</p>
51	2/6/2023	Email	Darleen	Masiak		<p>Caught me on my computer, good thing.</p> <p>Corridor 51 is of concern. And supposedly the trails are on the borough maps and are part of the Potatch Trail system. Any info would be welcome. I have found it hard to read the map in the proposal because there is no imagery involved, only lines for lot lines. Much of my awareness involves the lakes, ridges, drainages to pinpoint where this corridor 51 actually goes. Is something like that available?</p> <p>In the past, a friend indicated 1996, there was a thought to subdivide some of the land contiguous to corridor 51 but it was finally not moved forward on.</p> <p>My final question is, is that the intent of this corridor?? Thanks again</p>	<p>Large format maps with imagery are available for review on the Roads Plan website, here: https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/01-11-23_FNSBRoadsPlan_RevisedCorridors_byQuadrant.pdf. Like all corridors in the Roads Plan, Corridor 51 would only be developed if the surrounding parcels subdivide. The plan does not promote development in any specific area. The Assembly has final say on when, if, and how FNSB-owned lands, like those surrounding Corridor 51, are developed. The Roads Plan merely guides that development when it does occur. While Assembly members and priorities change frequently, the Roads Plan provides a 20-yr planning horizon and a long-term vision for new road connections in the borough.</p>
51	2/10/2023	Email	Bill	McKee		<p>[There is a photo and map included in the PDF version of this comment]</p> <p>After looking at the plan for a road along Corridor 349/51, I suggest that instead of building a road for wood cutting or for a subdivision, the Borough should improve the recreational trails and create a trail head parking area where the new road would begin on Heritage Road. I have a variety of reasons for making this suggestion.</p> <p>Many of us live here because of our access to the wilderness. In some places people buy property to be close to either the water or a golf course. We chose to buy land close to an established trail system. We originally bought our property on Melan Drive North because we knew that we had access to the trails at the top of Heritage Road. We had been told about the trail plan and that most of these trails were part of that plan. Along with neighbors and the help of Borough trail planners, we put in at least three trails back in the mid to late nineties. Folks from Bote, Pearl, Narrow View, Melan North, and Heritage all got together to create those trails so that we could all use them. Even folks on the south side of Chena Hot Springs Road would use the trail system. People live in this area so that they have access to the trail system whether it be for dog mushing, horse riding, hiking, ATV riding, hunting or other activities. If a parking area and trailhead were to be created, more Borough residents could enjoy this area.</p> <p>This main problem area is about 300 yards from Heritage Road. The land has subsided and has caused a sink hole at least 20' across and 10' deep.</p> <p>There are a couple of reasons that I feel that the road should not be built.</p> <p>The first mile of the proposed road is through some major wetland areas. Along with neighbors, I created a trail along the section line from Heritage Road up to the main ridge trail in 2001. Over these last 22 years we've have to do extensive maintenance on the trail just to make it accessible for walking, ATV's, horses, and dog mushing. It gets very muddy and unusable for vehicular traffic from Breakup until well into the fall.</p> <p>Although there are a few problematic areas, the main bad spot for the road is illustrated in the attached photos. Because of the melting of permafrost over the last few years, we've had to rebuild a walking bridge that we originally built in 2001. The following photos show that area. I've spoken with neighbors who build roads for a living and they think that a road through this area would be cost prohibitive.</p> <p>All one needs to do is take a look at Dusty Trail, the road that is only 100 yards up the hill and parallels the proposed road. It is barely used during the spring and summer because it's continually muddy.</p> <p>Heritage Road was rebuilt a few years ago because it was always a muddy and rutted because of fuel and water trucks. We wonder what the impact of increased wood cutting truck traffic will do to that road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan doesn't promote development or subdivisions in any specific areas. Rather, it provides a plan for logical future connections to guide road development when subdivisions do occur. The Assembly has final say if and when FNSB-owned lands are sold and developed. Assembly members and priorities change frequently, whereas the Roads Plan has a 20-yr planning horizon and long-term vision for future connections. Corridor 349/51 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. Through the Roads and Trails planning processes, a shared road/trail corridor can be planned to minimize trail impacts should these road corridors ever be developed.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
51	2/10/2023	Email	Bill	McKee		<p>During Mayor Sampson's second term a plan was drawn up to create the subdivision that is by Two Rivers School. According to that plan, after the 16 parcels were sold by the school, the next subdivision would be above that and along the wood cutting road. The area that is being suggested for a subdivision was the LAST area that was to be subdivided. Has that plan from the late nineties been researched? So, instead of spending money on a problematic road into an area that is enjoyed by Two Rivers residents, I'd like for you to consider these recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Improve the trail system, promote it, and make it available to all in Borough residents. 2.Purchase the 40 acre parcel at the beginning of the proposed road and turn it into a trail head, similar to the trail head that was constructed on Two Rivers Road. 3.Passable foot bridge/or ATV bridge over the biggest gullies 4.Add the first mile up to the Borough recreational trail plan. <p>My questions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Has anyone done soil samples along that proposed road? •Would a road service area be created •Would it become part of the Heritage Road Service Area? <p>I would be willing to give committee members/ board members a tour of the trail system either by snow machine or dog sled so that members could see these trails and the impact that a road would have on the area.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan doesn't promote development or subdivisions in any specific areas. Rather, it provides a plan for logical future connections to guide road development when subdivisions do occur. The Assembly has final say if and when FNSB-owned lands are sold and developed. Assembly members and priorities change frequently, whereas the Roads Plan has a 20-yr planning horizon and long-term vision for future connections. Corridor 349/51 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. Through the Roads and Trails planning processes, a shared road/trail corridor can be planned to minimize trail impacts should these road corridors ever be developed.
51	2/9/2023	Email	Melissa	Rouge		<p>[A map is included in the email of comment]</p> <p>This red line goes over the main recreational trail for this whole area. My neighbors and I groom it and maintain it extensively for dog mushing, skiing, snow machines, hiking, horse back riding and more. To turn this beautiful trail into a road for cars would be tragic. There are no other trails that are year round usage and connect to all the main trails in the area.</p> <p>Thanks for your consideration,</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan doesn't promote road development or subdivisions in any specific areas. Rather, it provides a plan for logical future connections to guide road development when subdivisions do occur. Through the Roads and Trails planning processes, a shared road/trail corridor can be planned to minimize trail impacts should these road corridors ever be developed.
64	2/21/2023	Web Form	Karey	Crocker		<p>My name is Karey Crocker my property address is 725 Miller hill Rd. I do not support the comprehensive road plan. This would effect my property negatively for if this was to happen not only will I be paying more property taxes but continue paying for private road repair that would double or possibly triple do to more traffic. Also I would have to pay for to subdivide my property and as for any medical vehicle using the private road in the winter there are 2 steep hills that turn to solid ice. On the first hill coming from Fairbanks a man riding a 4 wheeler this summer died. Most likely from the combo of its steepness and large dirt brims and lack of proper ditches and pot holes. I can not in good conscious support adding more traffic to our private road without the road being started from Yankovic then make it's way down Millerhill rd. To the bridge. I have many other concerns as well. This would not help my family but would add more financial burdens to us. My truck ware and tare on my truck from miller hill rd. is running about \$5000.00 a year. That just shocks, transmission repairs and headlights tail lights and blinker lights going out constantly from pot holes. I've got rid of 2 vehicles do to this road messing up the transmission and oil pans.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network.
64	1/21/2023	Email	Rodney	Guritz		<p>Connecting Miller Hill to Miller Hill Extension is a terrible idea. Half of the traffic in Goldstream would see this as a shortcut and use it to get to town. This traffic appropriately uses Ballaine and Sheep Creek currently. If Miller Hill were to be connected, it would become another one of the failed shortcut "minor connectors" that ends up destroyed by excessive traffic. Think Trice Road between Ballaine and Goldstream (since terminated, due to this very issue), or Herreid Road between Ballaine and Auburn. This road would be a nightmare to maintain, with all the permafrost and poor drainage on the north side of Miller Hill. There would also be an increased risk of dangerous collisions at the trail crossing near the end of Miller Hill. I also understand this route cuts through a conservation easement. It is not likely to ever be built, and it should not be built. I strongly urge the FNSB to remove this route from the roads plan.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Trail conflicts can be mitigated through coordinated trail and road planning during the subdivision and platting process.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	2/10/2023	Email	Amy	Marsh		<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed FNSB road plan. These comments are directed at Route 64, which would connect Miller Hill and Miller Extension. I submitted similar comments during the last comment period. I am strongly opposed to such a connector. This is an extremely personal issue for me because I live at the bottom of Miller Hill Road along Goldstream Creek and my driveway would be part of the ROW for this project. This project would be devastating for me; it would transform my property from being a peaceful place on a creek filled with wildlife to being immediately along a shortcut road filled with speeding cars. As much as I love my property, my best case scenario if this connector happened would be having my property bought out by the borough so that I am not stuck living in a worthless place.</p> <p>That said, I think there are more than personal reasons why this is a bad idea. Our current section of Miller Hill is not in a road service area and is privately maintained by a few residents. It swallows rock and gravel and passability is a constant concern for part of the year. We spend considerable money on the road just keeping it passable for fire trucks, and my mechanic could tell you how much I've spent on CV boots, shocks, and general suspension parts for my truck. If this road were to be connected, maintenance would have to be taken over by the borough. This road would become a shortcut route for those who do not live in the immediate area, and there is no way that even a road service could cover those costs. The road would require a major upgrade, a bridge, and then constant maintenance to keep the road going over the lowest permafrost areas of Fairbanks. These days the borough barely has money to keep up with plowing and I don't see how adding another major route would help things.</p> <p>While I understand that a shortcut would be tempting, it would be adding another route up and over a hill, and there is a similar route over Ballaine Hill not very far away on the other end of Yankovich Road. There are already two ways around the loop of the valley, and I believe this is sufficient. The property in Goldstream Valley is also largely already subdivided, and I don't see that there would be a massive population increase in the valley over the current population. This is hardly a region of traffic jams, and I don't think there is a capacity issue that requires a new road.</p> <p>I believe the best use of this low lying valley is the current use: as a riparian corridor, as a green space for recreation, and as a bit of open land in the midst of our growing population. All winter long I see a steady trickle of trail users going down my driveway to cross Goldstream Creek and continue to trails on the other side. These are the kinds of spaces that get easily swallowed up by "progress" and are irreplaceable.</p>	<p>Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Trail conflicts can be mitigated through coordinated trail and road planning during the subdivision and platting process.</p>
64	2/10/2023	Email	Pamela	Miller	Arctic Audubon Society	<p>First, on behalf of Arctic Audubon Society, we wish to request an additional month for public comment as this plan is complex to review. The plan also still includes a number of very controversial corridors which would degrade open space, important trails, wildlife habitats and fresh water bodies, and environmental quality of neighborhoods and the FNSB. The environmental quality of the land itself is important for current and future residents of the FNSB to have a healthy and clean place to live into the future.</p> <p>In our review of public interest features of the plan, as well as from the standpoint as landowners of the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, we request better consideration and identification of existing greenspace, trails, recreational use, and land suitability for roads such as wetlands, permafrost melt, and other conflicts. Another feature to consider is how new roads into certain areas could affect Dark Skies, so important for aurora viewing -- a unique feature of our northern city so important for winter enjoyment of residents and travelers alike.</p> <p>It would be very useful to consider existing and proposed greenspaces, parks large or small neighborhood places, nature reserves and conservation areas and to show those on the maps. For example, in the Goldstream area, citizen concerns have resulted in conservation of lands such as Blueberry Preserves https://interioraklandtrust.org/land-and-projects/blueberry-preserves/ and Goldstream Valley Greenbelt https://interioraklandtrust.org/land-and-projects/goldstream-valley-greenbelt/. Despite extensive comments about the quality of life, trails, and open space in the Goldstream Valley, the January 2023 Draft Roads Plan still contains proposed Road 64 (connecting Miller Hill Road and Miller Hill Extension through extensive wetlands and important open space with trails), as well as Rd 295 which may conflict with the trail network.</p> <p>Due to the proximity and potential effects of road traffic on the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, we would like to see proposed connector Road 331 be changed to Future Study from Minor Collector.</p>	<p>Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Trail conflicts can be mitigated through coordinated trail and road planning during the subdivision and platting process. The Roads Plan is going out for another rounds of public review during Summer 2023. Both roads and Comprehensive Trails Plan trails have been and will continue to be shown on the Roads Plan maps. The Roads Plan and Trails Plan are being developed by two different consultant planning teams, RESPEC/Agnew Beck and R&M, respectively, who have been coordinating throughout these parallel planning processes by sharing data and information, coordinating on planned trail and road corridors and hosting shared public events. The Corridor Descriptions document indicates which corridors are from the 1991 Plan (noted as "Existing" or "Realigned") and which are new with the 2022 plan update ("New"). Early iterations of the Roads Plan maps did indicate which corridors were from the 1991 Plan or new, but the planning team decided to simplify the symbology for the public meetings to improve readability of the maps, which already display a lot of complex information. Comment trackers with responses from the planning team will be posted on the Roads Plan website once they are complete.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	2/10/2023	Email	Pamela	Miller	Arctic Audubon Society	<p>The FNSB could take additional steps -- including an additional review draft of the FNSB Roads Plan -- which would improve understanding of the full implications of the roads plan, as well as public ability to review the plan, especially given that the same consultant is carrying out the FNSB Trails Plan and the FNSB Roads Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Overlay of existing trails and proposed trails from the Trails plan with existing and proposed roads in the FNSB Draft Roads Plan (GIS map overlays both online and in print). •Full depiction of all the proposed Road corridors -- This needs to include the "New Road" corridors shown in this document on the detailed map, https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/01-16-23_FNSBRoadsPlan_FullDraftwithRevisedCorridors.pdf and listed AND any "Old" corridors which would still be in effect from the 1991 Plan. •It would be very helpful to know which are New road proposals, and which are existing from the 1991 plan, and for these to be depicted differently as they have different terms and status. •It is unclear how the Draft Corridor Descriptions Document provided for the Jan 21, 2023 Open House https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/23y01m16d-FNSB-Roads-Plan-Corridor-Descriptions_DRAFT.pdf are addressed by the maps. The corridor descriptions still do not sufficiently address why certain loops are needed, how public comment was addressed or ignored, and in most cases, the nature of the land qualities or existence of trail crossings which could affect neighborhood land qualities or road building costs and challenges (e.g. wetlands, etc). •While the "Comment Tracker" is provided, https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FNSBRoadsPlan_CommentTracker_Sept-Oct_2022.pdf, how those comments were actually addressed is less clear, especially since some road corridor numbers were changed from the earlier draft. It would be helpful to show in that chart, how the comments were addressed. <p>We appreciate this opportunity to comment.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Trail conflicts can be mitigated through coordinated trail and road planning during the subdivision and platting process. The Roads Plan is going out for another rounds of public review during Summer 2023. Both roads and Comprehensive Trails Plan trails have been and will continue to be shown on the Roads Plan maps. The Roads Plan and Trails Plan are being developed by two different consultant planning teams, RESPEC/Agnew Beck and R&M, respectively, who have been coordinating throughout these parallel planning processes by sharing data and information, coordinating on planned trail and road corridors and hosting shared public events. The Corridor Descriptions document indicates which corridors are from the 1991 Plan (noted as "Existing" or "Realigned") and which are new with the 2022 plan update ("New"). Early iterations of the Roads Plan maps did indicate which corridors were from the 1991 Plan or new, but the planning team decided to simplify the symbology for the public meetings to improve readability of the maps, which already display a lot of complex information. Comment trackers with responses from the planning team will be posted on the Roads Plan website once they are complete.
64	1/21/2023	Public meeting sticky note	Deborah	Ryan		Wetlands should not be connected historic trails, already increased pressure for mult of new development on small acreage. School bus stops. 25 miles an hour, they go 70. Don't need shortcut. Light pollution/noise.	Thank you for your comment. Corrido 64 is being maintained in this update from the 1991 Roads Plan due to the benefits it can have in the future for resident and emergency services access and reductions to overall vehicle miles travelled.
70	2/2/2023	Email	Jeanie	Cole		Might be better access to Smallwood Creek regarding terrain than #79/362, Sunstead Ave includes a switchback already.	Thank you for your comment. The Roads planning team and Steering Committee will take this suggestion into consideration.
71	2/2/2023	Email	Jeanie	Cole		Might be better access to Smallwood Creek regarding terrain than #79/362, Sunstead Ave includes a switchback already.	Thank you for your comment. The Roads planning team and Steering Committee will take this suggestion into consideration.
79	2/2/2023	Email	Jeanie	Cole		The portion of route 79 from the 1/8 corner of sections 22/27 to John Cole Road is not needed. The dedicated portion of the easement on the north edge of TL 2702 would provide adequate access if this 39 acre parcel is subdivided and also to TL 27-25. Also this parcel has access from Foxboro Lane and Chena Hot Springs Road. Parcel TL-2214 has access via Sunstead Ave. That and the adjacent parcel to the west belong to a family and if subdivided would likely remain with the siblings. Who would use the current access. There is also a dedicated easement to the NW corner of TL-2725.	Corridor 79 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. It provides access to large unsubdivided parcels to the north and connects into planned corridors 362 and 70 for future public access should the area develop. Provides access to TL-2203, TL-2214, and TL-2215 via Corridor 362.
79	1/25/2023	Public meeting sticky note				CHSR - existing parcels 40 acres near CHSR. 363 goes up into someone's house. There is access to promote parcels . Not borough standards. Very Steep. 9 miles hill is really, really steep.	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 79 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan because it will provide legal public access to several lots that are currently accessed by trespass roads.
151	2/1/2023	Paper Form				Not feasible due to terrain	Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
151	1/24/2023	In Person	Joe	Durrenberger		From Natalie: I spoke with Mr. Joe Durrenberger and other neighbors in-depth at the open house about Corridors 366 (Ida connection) and 151 (Taroka connection). Joe had a specific question about whether there is any public interest, such as an easement, in the portion of Taroka that crosses his property, TL-2906. He is asking about this because in his search of FNSB data available online, and his own property documents, he hasn't been able to verify any existing easements or other public interest for the road. I've attached a screen snip from the GIS and additional documentation he provided at the meeting. I know George is out, but are there others at CP who might be able to help us research and answer this question?	Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
151	1/23/2023	Paper Form	Joe	Durrenberger		Taroka Drive runs through TL-2906. AS the property owner of TL-2906. I have looked for and never found any indication that there is an easement or ROW for Taroka across our property. Taroka Drive, as a public road, begins at the far lot line of TL02957 after traversing TL-2923, 2906 and 2957 and was created as part of the subdivision of the land beyond TL-2923. My understanding, talking to residents who live further down Taroka is that use of Taroka across TL-2906 and the others is basically an allowed use with no formal authorization. My understanding also is that the 2906 landowner at the time of subdivision agreed to this unauthorized use subject to the condition that there be no connection between Taroka and any development along Becker Ridge. As property owners of TL-2906, we intend to hold to that condition unless there is a public interest access allowance across our property we are not aware of. The only public access we are aware of affecting TL-2906 can be found in a State of Alaska, Dept of Highways Notice of Utilization in Book 179 Page 182 Serial # 65-4234 dated 9 June 1965 and applies to Chena Ridge Road.	Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
151	2/3/2023	Paper Form	Mark	Bertram		We request Corridors 366 and 151 be removed from the road plan for the following reasons: A great majority of residents on both Ida Lane and Taroka are against proposed corridors 366 and 151. The proposed corridors are not feasible and exceed 20% grade in many areas. Both Taroka and Ida Lane are substandard roads, designed for light traffic and not appropriate to connect to the proposed minor collectors 366 and 151. Water drainage on Ida Lane and Taroka do not meet Title 17.56.140 requirements, adverse road conditions do not meet Title 17.56.12083 requirements. Both Taroka and Ida Lane width and shoulder requirements are not met under Title 17.56.080 and 17.56.00. The intersection of Ida Lane and Taroka is about 25 degrees and violates Title 17.56.100 for angle minimum and sight distance. I request borough engineers evaluate suitability for 366 and 151. Note I have also submitted comments separately pertaining to Corridor 366. The purpose this comment submission was to also comment on Corridor 151.	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivides. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
151	2/3/2023	Email	Bruce	Ha		I just had a look at the proposed roads labeled 151, and 366 on the map at https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/01-11-23_FNSBRoadsPlan_RevisedCorridors_byQuadrant.pdf Bringing any additional traffic onto Taroka would pose significant risk of injury and property damage to drivers, pedestrians, and the residents in the area. Taroka Drive was never meant to handle large amounts of traffic and is especially hazardous for the uninitiated where it connects to Chena Ridge Road for the following reasons: 1. The final portion of Taroka between Ida Lane and Chena Ridge Road is very steep. This becomes especially hazardous during the winter. Because of the limited amount of traffic that currently uses the road, vehicles with a minimum of all wheel drive are usually able to maintain traction on the snow. However, if Taroka becomes overused, the snow will become compacted until it will eventually turn into hard packed ice. If the use becomes so great that cars end up idling on the slope waiting for their turn to enter Chena Ridge, the heat from their engine and mufflers will melt the top layer creating the sorts of super slick conditions found at the larger intersections in town. This would be very dangerous on the steep incline. 2. There is no leveled off area at the bottom of Taroka. There is no area where drivers have an opportunity to regain traction if the conditions caused by overuse cause their vehicle to slide down the steep slope. They will end up sliding into the turning radius of cars turning left from Chena Ridge, or even onto Chena Ridge Road itself. The traffic on Chena Ridge is often travelling at 55 miles per hour. 3. The final 20 feet for traffic turning right when leaving Taroka is exceptionally steep, and because of the hairpin geometry, there is a steep sideways banking twist. For vehicles with stiff suspensions or long wheelbases, this causes the tires on opposing corners to begin lifting up off of the ground, severely limiting traction. For this reason, the residents understand from experience that this must be approached very SLOWLY, being especially mindful of any traffic that might be attempting to turn left onto Taroka. 4. The hairpin geometry of the intersection will entice uninitiated, lazy, or hasty drivers turning left onto Taroka from Chena Ridge to cut to the inside corner of the turn. This will be especially enticing to drivers that don't want to come to a stop if traffic is coming downhill on Chena Ridge. Uninitiated drivers travelling in either direction on Chena Ridge, might want to enter Taroka quickly. If it turns out that the driver coming down Chena Ridge is intending to enter Taroka instead of continuing down Chena ridge, at the same time a driver is attempting a left in time to beat the downhill driver, the results could be catastrophic.	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivides. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
151	2/10/2023	Email	Tim	Coahran		<p>I am writing in opposition to two proposed roads in my neighborhood (within the Becker Ridge Road Service Area): numbers 151 & 366. These have been argued and defeated repeatedly in the past, and have been considered impractical to build because of steep terrain.</p> <p>The proposals would connect our existing tiny mud & gravel roads, Taroka and Ida, to the much larger arterial - Becker Ridge Road. This would create a slightly shorter route between the city and a large portion of the Cripple Creek area. We reasonably expect that it would immediately become a through corridor, and dump heavy traffic loads onto our existing little roads, which are nowhere near capable of handling such. Our roads were "grandfathered" and are far from compliant with today's Title 17 road building standards. There is a steep icy (shaded) drop into a nonstandard intersection with the busy Chena Ridge arterial. This is already a traffic hazard, and would become much worse.</p> <p>Also, if I understand correctly, part of the land traversed by Taroka doesn't even belong to the Borough.</p> <p>The heavy traffic of proposed roads 151 & 366 would destroy the quiet character of our neighborhood - which is the reason I bought my home here in the first place. They would cut through pristine forest where local residents hike and recreate.</p> <p>Many of the local residents do not want more roads. If these could be recharacterized as non-motorized trails, there might be broader support.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
151	2/10/2023	Email	James	Foelsch		<p>[several photos are included in the email message of this comment]</p> <p>We have lived on Taroka road for over 30 years. It as an unsafe (4 wheel drive required) road most of the year and it takes knowledge and skill to navigate it. There are several blind corners, no shoulders, no guard rails and is at the widest 18' (See Stuzmann Engineering report 2007) which reduces dramatically during the winter months when it is often one lane. I, and my neighbors, know the rules of the road and stop and pull over when passing another vehicle. We also require water and fuel trucks to deliver services which makes it even more of a safety hazard.</p> <p>This is what Taroka Road looked like this past winter (courtesy of Jane Hannah) ...</p> <p>The failed culvert at the beginning of the road resulted in a hole that was the entire width of the road and at least a foot deep. It was very difficult to slowly go through it and still have enough power to get out of the other side. I had to take my van in to have the front end repaired as a result.</p> <p>This was the top of the hill leading to another 16% grade one lane road ...</p> <p>Page 17 of the Comprehensive Roads Plan FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan: Official Maps and Policies states that future road corridor selection would:</p> <p>""Be reasonable/feasible to construct"</p> <p>""Road grade- have a road grade <10%"</p> <p>""Intersection grade- have an intersection grade <4% or 6% for through-road"</p> <p>What Jane outlined in her response to you is correct. It is clearly evident that neither Taroka Dr or Ida Ln can handle additional traffic if the proposed "minor collector roads 155 and 366" were constructed as outlined. The data will show that the roads are not reasonable or feasible and road grades are greater than 16% on Taroka and Ida, not the <10% that the policies require.</p> <p>There are several facts about Taroka Road that we would like to reiterate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The start of Taroka Road is a 16% grade. School buses stop at the bottom of it and most of the winter it is very difficult to go slow enough to not slide down onto Chena Ridge Road. A very dangerous situation! Only one car at a time can go down the hill and in the event that a car is coming up the hill we wait before going down to Chena Ridge Road. We have also not been able to power up the hill without sliding and have ended up sideways on numerous occasion, especially if trying to make the 120 degree hairpin turn coming from down Chena Ridge Road. 2. Then comes the intersection of Ida Road. It is a blind intersection from both sides with Ida having a stop sign. We on Taroka know to slow to a stop and look behind us before continuing down the hill because sometimes the cars coming down Ida either don't or can't stop at the sign due to icy conditions. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
152	2/11/2023	Email	James	Foelsch		<p>3. Around the next blind corner is the culvert problem ... a dangerous hazard.</p> <p>4. The next section starts the 10.7% - 15.5% downhill to the switchback where "151" would intersect with Taroka. This was washed out to a one lane road due to bad drainage and is still not fixed. 5. The remainder of the road to the bottom of the hill has a measured 16.6 grade that is very difficult to climb and must be done at maximum speed or your vehicle will not make it through the switchback - the very point where "151" would intersect. Many cars have not made the turn and end up sliding backward off the edge of the road - the very point where "151" would intersect.</p> <p>6. FNSB code 17.60.130, Right-Of-Way-Trafficway Width requires a minor collector to be a minimum of 20' with 2' minimum shoulders. Taroka Drive is 14'-18' wide in the summer months and often one lane in the winter months. There is no shoulder either side the entire length of the road. Both roads do not meet borough code and should not be connected to "minor collector roads 151 & 366"</p> <p>7. The entirety of Taroka Drive and Ida Road would have to be upgraded before any connection could be made and therefore this is not reasonable or feasible. Is the road grade 10% and the intersection road grade <4% or 6% for a through-road?</p> <p>The answer is no. Taroka Dr begins at Chena Ridge with a short, steep, dangerous 16% grade which then intersects with Ida Ln at a blind curve. The hill on Taroka Dr which would connect to "minor collector road 151" was measured by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 to have roadgrades of 15.5% on the north side of the switchback and 16.6% on the south side of the proposed intersection which violates both the road grade and intersection policies. The connection of "minor collectors 151 and 366" is dangerous and an extreme hazard to both Ida Ln and Taroka Dr residents.</p> <p>In addition, Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are not FNSB platted borough roads where they intersect each other and Chena Ridge Rd. The Comprehensive Road Plans map that was sent to my home announcing the proposed new corridors does not have Taroka Dr and Ida Ln connecting to Chena Ridge Rd at all. The map shows the proposed minor collector roads connecting to Taroka Dr and Ida Ln and then simply ending with no further connection to any road on the map. I would appreciate legal clarification of this area of your road map.</p> <p>In conclusion, Becker Ridge Rd is classified as a "major collector". Proposed roads "151 and 366" are classified as "minor collectors" and Chena Ridge Road is classified as "arterial". These roads would be connected by way of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln which are not borough platted roads and don't meet any requirements in terms of road width, shoulders, road grade, intersection grade or road condition. This road planning is a serious hazard to residential health and well being.</p> <p>We oppose the proposed "minor collector roads 151 and 366" for the safety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents. We submit that roads 151 and 366 be officially removed from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan.</p> <p>We also formally request a community meeting to discuss the proposed plans.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
151	2/10/2023	Email	Carolyn	Foelsch		<p>[several photos are included in the email message of this comment]</p> <p>We have lived on Taroka road for over 30 years. It as an unsafe (4 wheel drive required) road most of the year and it takes knowledge and skill to navigate it. There are several blind corners, no shoulders, no guard rails and is at the widest 18' (See Stuzmann Engineering report 2007) which reduces dramatically during the winter months when it is often one lane. I, and my neighbors, know the rules of the road and stop and pull over when passing another vehicle. We also require water and fuel trucks to deliver services which makes it even more of a safety hazard.</p> <p>This is what Taroka Road looked like this past winter (courtesy of Jane Hannah) ...</p> <p>The failed culvert at the beginning of the road resulted in a hole that was the entire width of the road and at least a foot deep. It was very difficult to slowly go through it and still have enough power to get out of the other side. I had to take my van in to have the front end repaired as a result.</p> <p>This was the top of the hill leading to another 16% grade one lane road ...</p> <p>Page 17 of the Comprehensive Roads Plan FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan: Official Maps and Policies states that future road corridor selection would:</p> <p>"Be reasonable/feasible to construct"</p> <p>"Road grade- have a road grade <10%"</p> <p>"Intersection grade- have an intersection grade <4% or 6% for through-road"</p> <p>What Jane outlined in her response to you is correct. It is clearly evident that neither Taroka Dr or Ida Ln can handle additional traffic if the proposed "minor collector roads 155 and 366" were constructed as outlined. The data will show that the roads are not reasonable or feasible and road grades are greater than 16% on Taroka and Ida, not the <10% that the policies require.</p> <p>There are several facts about Taroka Road that we would like to reiterate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The start of Taroka Road is a 16% grade. School buses stop at the bottom of it and most of the winter it is very difficult to go slow enough to not slide down onto Chena Ridge Road. A very dangerous situation! Only one car at a time can go down the hill and in the event that a car is coming up the hill we wait before going down to Chena Ridge Road. We have also not been able to power up the hill without sliding and have ended up sideways on numerous occasion, especially if trying to make the 120 degree hairpin turn coming from down Chena Ridge Road. 2. Then comes the intersection of Ida Road. It is a blind intersection from both sides with Ida having a stop sign. We on Taroka know to slow to a stop and look behind us before continuing down the hill because sometimes the cars coming down Ida either don't or can't stop at the sign due to icy conditions. 3. Around the next blind corner is the culvert problem ... a dangerous hazard. 	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
152	2/11/2023	Email	Carolyn	Foelsch		<p>4. The next section starts the 10.7% - 15.5% downhill to the switchback where "151" would intersect with Taroka. This was washed out to a one lane road due to bad drainage and is still not fixed.</p> <p>5. The remainder of the road to the bottom of the hill has a measured 16.6 grade that is very difficult to climb and must be done at maximum speed or your vehicle will not make it through the switchback - the very point where "151" would intersect. Many cars have not made the turn and end up sliding backward off the edge of the road - the very point where "151" would intersect.</p> <p>6. FNSB code 17.60.130, Right-Of-Way-Trafficway Width requires a minor collector to be a minimum of 20' with 2' minimum shoulders. Taroka Drive is 14'-18' wide in the summer months and often one lane in the winter months. There is no shoulder either side the entire length of the road. Both roads do not meet borough code and should not be connected to "minor collector roads 151 & 366"</p> <p>7. The entirety of Taroka Drive and Ida Road would have to be upgraded before any connection could be made and therefore this is not reasonable or feasible. Is the road grade 10% and the intersection road grade <4% or 6% for a through-road?</p> <p>The answer is no. Taroka Dr begins at Chena Ridge with a short, steep, dangerous 16% grade which then intersects with Ida Ln at a blind curve. The hill on Taroka Dr which would connect to "minor collector road 151" was measured by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 to have roadgrades of 15.5% on the north side of the switchback and 16.6% on the south side of the proposed intersection which violates both the road grade and intersection policies. The connection of "minor collectors 151 and 366" is dangerous and an extreme hazard to both Ida Ln and Taroka Dr residents.</p> <p>In addition, Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are not FNSB platted borough roads where they intersect each other and Chena Ridge Rd. The Comprehensive Road Plans map that was sent to my home announcing the proposed new corridors does not have Taroka Dr and Ida Ln connecting to Chena Ridge Rd at all. The map shows the proposed minor collector roads connecting to Taroka Dr and Ida Ln and then simply ending with no further connection to any road on the map. I would appreciate legal clarification of this area of your road map.</p> <p>In conclusion, Becker Ridge Rd is classified as a "major collector". Proposed roads "151 and 366" are classified as "minor collectors" and Chena Ridge Road is classified as "arterial". These roads would be connected by way of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln which are not borough platted roads and don't meet any requirements in terms of road width, shoulders, road grade, intersection grade or road condition. This road planning is a serious hazard to residential health and well being.</p> <p>We oppose the proposed "minor collector roads 151 and 366" for the safety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents. We submit that roads 151 and 366 be officially removed from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan.</p> <p>We also formally request a community meeting to discuss the proposed plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
151	2/9/2023	Email	Glenna	Gannon		<p>I am writing to submit my concerns regarding the proposed roads: 151 and 366 from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan.</p> <p>As a resident of Taroka Drive, I have several concerns regarding the safety and feasibility of the proposed roads. Taroka drive and Ida lane are small, and extremely steep roads with poor road conditions and receive little regular road service throughout the year. These roads were NOT designed to nor would they be able to support the increased traffic from Beck Ridge. Residents of this neighborhood do not wish to have increased traffic routed through our quiet neighborhood which would endanger those of us who use the road for walking with our families and pets.</p> <p>It is unclear why the borough is proposing two major road construction projects in a steep area that also contain a major water drainage for the converging ridge-lines. There is no community or emergency responder (safety agencies) call for this development, and, arguably it would be more disruptive to existing neighborhoods, and create more dangerous and unsafe road conditions locally. Furthermore, why these two large road projects are being proposed while there is the potential to spend a fraction of that development cost purchasing rights to, and developing a small connector corridor between Becker Ridge and North Becker Ridge roads as a way to create access to Chena Ridge (if this is absolutely necessary) is a less expensive and safer route option given the natural terrain.</p> <p>Ultimately, Becker Ridge road is classified as a "major collector". The Proposed roads "151 and 366" are classified as "minor collectors" and Chena Ridge Road is classified as "arterial". These larger roads would be connected by way of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln which are not borough platted roads and don't meet any requirements in terms of road width, shoulders, road grade, intersection grade or road condition. These proposed roads not only present major financial undertaking to construct, but would introduce serious hazard to residential health and well being.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose the proposed development of "minor collector roads 151 and 366" for the safety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents and those who would use these roads to access Chena Ride/ Becker Ridge. I submit that roads 151 and 366 be officially removed from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan, and would like to formally request a community meeting to discuss the proposed plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
151	2/7/2023	Email	Bruce	Ha		<p>My name is Bruce. I live on Taroka Drive. My neighbor Jane said that we might be able to have a community meeting if we request one, so this is my Request.</p>	<p>Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
151	2/9/2023	Email	Michael	Kwasinski		<p>I feel the dead end road Taroka Dr should not be connected to other roads because it is unsafe for people not familiar with the dangers of Taroka Drive because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are 3 areas of Taroka Dr that are very steep and would not be allowed any more. I believe they are over 19% grade. 2. The first steep area is at the entrance from Chena Ridge Rd and is a very steep uphill that can't be negotiated in winter with anything other than 4 wheel drive. When leaving Taroka Dr., one must wait at the top of that grade to make sure there is no car at the bottom of the grade waiting to merge into Chena Ridge Rd Traffic. Once started downhill there is sometimes no way to stop because of the steepness and slippery conditions. In fact sometimes it is difficult or impossible to prevent sliding into Chena Ridge Dr. and hoping there is no traffic. Residents of Taroka Dr. know this but strangers to the road would not. Opening the road would greatly increase the traffic on Taroka Dr. 3. The other 2 steep areas on Taroka Dr. are also dangerous. They cannot be negotiated in winter many times in the winter. If a car does not make it to the top of the grade, the driver tries to back up downhill which many times results in the car going off the steep edge and rolling down the hill. <p>In summary Takoka Dr is a safety issue if it is opened up to the general public by connecting it to other roads in the area.</p>	Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
151	2/9/2023	Email	William	Montano		I would agree with mark 366 151 hould be eliminated	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
151	2/9/2023	Email	Ryan	Nenaber		<p>I would like to request a community meeting concerning the plan to connect Taroka Dr. to Becker Ridge.</p> <p>I recommend that before any taxpayer money is spent on this portion of the plan, or any other portion, that:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) permission should be secured from landowners; 2) easements should be verified and gained where they do not exist; 3) the terrain should be walked and seen in person. <p>I do not support a road connecting Becker Ridge to Taroka Drive. Recommendations #s 1 and 2 have not been achieved. My assumption is that # 3 has not been achieved either because there is not a safe way to connect Taroka and Becker Ridge due to the terrain.</p>	Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
151	2/10/2023	Email	Scott	Collier-Sanuki		<p>Thank you for leading public involvement for the FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan. We did not participate in the Community Open House held on January 21, 2023, as we werer not aware of it until afterwards and wish it had been advertised more widely to the public and all who would be affected.</p> <p>We are writing to you because we oppose the proposed two Minor Collectors: #151 and #366. The former connects Becker Ridge Rd to Taroka Drive, which runs below our property, and the latter connects Becker Ridge Rd to Ida Drive, which runs above our property. The two small, ill maintained, difficult roads then merge just before Taroka Drive meets Chena Ridge Rd. As they are, these two roads are dangerous and so problematic that USPS mail carriers refuse to deliver mail and packages. Any delivery person would say that it is one of the worst roads, if not the worst, in the area. In fact, Taroka Dr. is only 15ft wide in places, and does not even meet the FNSB Code's requirement of 20ft width with minimum shoulder of 2ft for minor collectors.</p> <p>Please do not make the condition of Taroka Dr. and Ida Dr. worse than they are by funneling yet more traffic onto them. If there is a need for Becker Ridge Road to connect to Chena Ridge Road, the borough would definitely want to consider re-opening the connecting area between Becker Ridge Road and North Becker Ridge Road. They are much wider and safer roads than Taroka Dr. The Comprehensive Roads Plan seems to indicate that this connection is already a Major Collector; however, it is currently not a through road. There is no traffic access between Becker Ridge Rd and North Becker Ridge Rd, and in fact North Becker Ridge Rd is posted 'No Trespassing' near the entrance from Chena Ridge Rd., blockng any part of it from public use.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit. The FNSB GIS data does show the lack of connection between Becker Ridge Road and North Becker Ridge Road as a dashed instead of solid black line. This symbology did not transfer well to the scale of the large printed maps available online and at the January public meeting. The undeveloped section between Becker Ridge and North Becker Ridge Road is plated as a public right-of-way but is yet 'unconstructed.'

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
151	2/10/2023	Email	Yoko	Collier-Sanuki		<p>Thank you for leading public involvement for the FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan. We did not participate in the Community Open House held on January 21, 2023, as we were not aware of it until afterwards and wish it had been advertised more widely to the public and all who would be affected.</p> <p>We are writing to you because we oppose the proposed two Minor Collectors: #151 and #366. The former connects Becker Ridge Rd to Taroka Drive, which runs below our property, and the latter connects Becker Ridge Rd to Ida Drive, which runs above our property. The two small, ill maintained, difficult roads then merge just before Taroka Drive meets Chena Ridge Rd. As they are, these two roads are dangerous and so problematic that USPS mail carriers refuse to deliver mail and packages. Any delivery person would say that it is one of the worst roads, if not the worst, in the area. In fact, Taroka Dr. is only 15ft wide in places, and does not even meet the FNSB Code's requirement of 20ft width with minimum shoulder of 2ft for minor collectors.</p> <p>Please do not make the condition of Taroka Dr. and Ida Dr. worse than they are by funneling yet more traffic onto them. If there is a need for Becker Ridge Road to connect to Chena Ridge Road, the borough would definitely want to consider re-opening the connecting area between Becker Ridge Road and North Becker Ridge Road. They are much wider and safer roads than Taroka Dr. The Comprehensive Roads Plan seems to indicate that this connection is already a Major Collector; however, it is currently not a through road. There is no traffic access between Becker Ridge Rd and North Becker Ridge Rd, and in fact North Becker Ridge Rd is posted 'No Trespassing' near the entrance from Chena Ridge Rd., blocking any part of it from public use.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit. Thank you for your comments. The FNSB GIS data does show the lack of connection between Becker Ridge Road and North Becker Ridge Road as a dashed instead of solid black line. This symbology did not transfer well to the scale of the large printed maps available online and at the January public meeting. The undeveloped section between Becker Ridge and North Becker Ridge Road is platted as a public right-of-way but is yet 'unconstructed.'</p>
151	2/6/2023	Email	Jane	Hannah		<p>[Several photos are included in the email message of this comment] I am writing in opposition to proposed "minor collector roads 151 and 366".</p> <p>Page 17 of the Comprehensive Roads Plan FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan: Official Maps and Policies states that future road corridor selection would: **"Be reasonable/feasible to construct" **"Road grade- have a road grade <10%" **"Intersection grade- have an intersection grade <4% or 6% for through-road"</p> <p>It was helpful talking to Natalie and Patrick at the informational meeting on 1/23/23. As promised, I have attached the Taroka Dr photos #1-14 that I took in 2007 and was showing Natalie and Patrick at the meeting. Photos #15-18 were taken on Taroka Dr in winter 2022 which clearly depict the total deterioration of the roadbed during the last 15 years and the dangerous driving conditions residents face. Ida Lane is in similar poor condition as well.</p> <p>It is clearly evident that neither Taroka Dr or Ida Ln can handle additional traffic if the proposed "minor collector roads 155 and 366" were constructed as outlined. The data will show that the roads are not reasonable or feasible and road grades are greater than 16% on Taroka and Ida, not the <10% that the policies require.</p> <p>A description of the photos follows: #1. This photo is taken from Chena Ridge Rd at the start of Taroka Dr. This hill is a 16% grade and difficult to power up during winter conditions with 4wheel drive and winter tires. Both Taroka Dr and Ida Ln exit to Chena Ridge Rd on this hill and require 4wheel drive most of the year. #2. This photo shows the same hill looking down onto Chena Ridge. The school bus stop is dangerously located at the bottom of this steep hill at the stop sign with a very short landing. In addition, traffic approaching Taroka Dr from Chena Pump Rd must make a 120 degree left turn around the corner at high speed to power up the hill successfully on the deteriorated soft roadbed in summer and the ice in winter. #3. This photo shows the blind approach down to Chena Ridge. Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents know to stop and wait at the top of this hill and visually scan the Chena Ridge curve for oncoming traffic before continuing. If traffic is seen on Chena Ridge or making the turn onto Taroka Dr, we know to yield to the coming traffic. Residents frequently slide down the hill onto Chena Ridge Rd due to the steep grade and icy conditions. It is often impossible to stop at the stop sign.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
152	2/7/2023	Email	Jane	Hannah		<p>#4. This photo shows Ida Lane intersecting with Taroka Dr at the top of the hill. There is a stop sign now at the end of Ida Ln. This is a hazardous totally blind intersection and residents of Ida Lane have to physically slowly inch onto Taroka Dr before they can see if the road is clear because of the opposing slope of Taroka Drive and the angle of the intersection. This is an extremely dangerous intersection.</p> <p>#5 and #6. These photos show the Ida Lane intersection taken from Taroka Dr as it approaches Chena Ridge Rd. The steep grade of Ida Ln is visible on the left in photo #5 in front of the house. The blind intersection is clearly apparent due to the steepness of Ida Lane and the angle of the intersection. These photos portray the wooden stakes across the road which measure the width of Taroka Dr at only 15ft with no shoulders whatsoever as one approaches this Ida Lane intersection. In the winter, the roadway width is much narrower due to snow banks.</p> <p>#7 and #8. These photos depict the blind curve on Taroka Dr adjacent to the Ida Ln intersection. The road sign is visible in photo #8. This curve becomes flooded during breakup or heavy rain which narrows the roadway to one lane.</p> <p>#9 and #10. Taroka Dr is measuring 15ft 9in at the driveway of 1592 Taroka Dr. Wooden stakes with measuring tape are visible just beyond the driveway in photo #9.</p> <p>#11. This photo shows two cars passing each other on a dry roadbed. In winter months Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are both one lane roads. Cars on both roads must stop and pull over at driveways to pass one another along the entire length of both roads. Water trucks and fuel trucks frequent both roads and are a serious hazard all year long.</p> <p>#12. The start of the downhill where Taroka Dr would connect with proposed "minor collector 151". The road grade has been measured by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 as 10.7% to 15.5% as Taroka Dr approaches the switchback. The road width was measured at 18 ft at the start of the downhill narrowing to 14 ft at the switchback where "151" would intersect. The road then continues downhill with a measured 16.6% grade and a width as narrow as 14ft. In winter months the residents who must drive from the south up this grade must power around the corner at approx 20 mph to continue up the hill. It is at this very point that "151" would intersect. It would be impossible to yield at the proposed intersection without sliding back down the hill. There are no guard rails at any point on Taroka Dr and cars have slid over the edge of this hill. A State Trooper refused to respond to a car that had slid off the road over the edge, saying there was no guard rail and the road was too dangerous to respond to the accident.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
153	2/1/2023	Paper Form				Not feasible due to terrain	Corridor 153 is being maintained in the plan update and is a corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments during the subdivision and platting process to address terrain.
153	2/8/2023	Email	Jane	Hannah		<p>#13 and #14. This is the view from the switchback looking up at the top of the steep grade. The stake measurement in photo #13 measures the width at 17ft 5in. No shoulders.</p> <p>#15-18. These photos depict the condition of Taroka Dr in 2022 in winter conditions.</p> <p>*The first photo shows the blind curve with flooding reducing the roadway to one lane as described in photo #8. A car needed to be towed out of the overflow. Mail service to Taroka Dr was halted for a week as the road was deemed too dangerous.</p> <p>*The second photo shows the 16.6% grade on the downhill after the switchback. As clearly seen, the roadbed has deteriorated from the 2007 photos and is now mud and sand. 4wheel Drive is necessary year round to navigate this hill which is often one lane. The road width by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 was measured as 14 feet before the pictured mailbox.</p> <p>*The third photo shows the one lane road conditions and deteriorated roadbed that is now sand and mud with no remaining topcoat or gravel.</p> <p>*The fourth photo shows the road damage from winter runoff on the hill where the proposed "minor collector 151" would intersect at the switchback.</p> <p>In summary, are proposed roads "minor collector 151 and 366" reasonable and feasible? The photos, data and residents testimony show they are not. A similar proposed road connecting to Taroka was deemed impossible in 2007 "and engineering data has shown that this connection cannot be safely constructed without reconstructing the entirety of Taroka Dr". The photos demonstrate that the roadbed on Taroka Dr has deteriorated significantly since 2007. Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are dangerous roads navigated by residents who know each other and the intricacies of the road, so we drive slowly and cautiously. Being one lane much of the year due to snow banks and mud, we know to pull over to pass at driveways and we yield to traffic navigating the hills. Water trucks and fuel trucks frequent the road and are hazardous with the limited road traffic at present. Neither road can handle additional traffic. In addition, Taroka Drive and Ida Ln are too narrow with no shoulders. FNSB code 17.60.130, Right-of-Way -Trafficway Width requires a minor collector to be a minimum width of 20 ft with 2 ft minimum shoulders. Taroka Dr as documented in photos is 14-18 feet wide in the summer months and often one lane in winter months. There is no shoulder on either side the entire length. Both roads currently do not meet borough code and therefore should not be connected to "minor collector roads 151 and 366". The entirety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln would have to be upgraded before any connection could be made and therefore this is not reasonable or feasible. Is the road grade 10% and the intersection road grade <4% or 6% for a through-road? The answer is no. Taroka Dr begins at Chena Ridge with a short, steep, dangerous 16% grade which then intersects with Ida Ln at a blind curve.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
154	2/9/2023	Email	Jane	Hannah		<p>The hill on Taroka Dr which would connect to "minor collector road 151" was measured by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 to have roadgrades of 15.5% on the north side of the switchback and 16.6% on the south side of the proposed intersection which violates both the road grade and intersection policies. The connection of "minor collectors 151 and 366" is dangerous and an extreme hazard to both Ida Ln and Taroka Dr residents.</p> <p>In addition, Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are not FNSB platted borough roads where they intersect each other and Chena Ridge Rd. The Comprehensive Road Plans map that was sent to my home announcing the proposed new corridors does not have Taroka Dr and Ida Ln connecting to Chena Ridge Rd at all. The map shows the proposed minor collector roads connecting to Taroka Dr and Ida Ln and then simply ending with no further connection to any road on the map. I would appreciate legal clarification of this area of your road map.</p> <p>In conclusion, Becker Ridge Rd is classified as a "major collector". Proposed roads "151 and 366" are classified as "minor collectors" and Chena Ridge Road is classified as "arterial". These roads would be connected by way of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln which are not borough platted roads and don't meet any requirements in terms of road width, shoulders, road grade, intersection grade or road condition. This road planning is a serious hazard to residential health and well being.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose the proposed "minor collector roads 151 and 366" for the safety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents. I submit that roads 151 and 366 be officially removed from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan.</p> <p>I also formally request a community meeting to discuss the proposed plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
171	2/10/2023	Web Form	Ariane	Glover		<p>171 (SE) is described in the Corridor Descriptions Document, but I don't see 171 on any of the maps in the plan. I would anticipate it should be on Map 02S 02E, correct?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Corridor 171 is immediately adjacent to Corridor 172 in 02S 02E. It runs north and south along Keeney Road. Because of the scaling on the Roads Plan maps included with the Plan, the label did not show up.</p>
172	2/10/2023	Web Form	Ariane	Glover		<p>Thank you for including Corridor 172 between Keeney and Champion. Currently not maintained or serviced, the poor road quality and lack of snow removal makes it difficult to use year round. Without maintenance or snow removal, it forces residents out to the Richardson Hwy to access Keeney Rd., requiring a U-turn on the highway, if coming from North Pole, in order to be in the southbound lane to make the turn. Access from Champion would be much safer, not having to make a U-turn on the highway or a right turn onto Keeney where there is no turn-lane to exit with cars following at speeds of 60+ mph.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. No change identified.</p>
194	2/2/2023	Email	Jeanie	Cole		<p>Perhaps extending 194 north to 46 would be a better access to the large parcels and state land in Smallwood area than #362?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comment. The Roads planning team and Steering Committee will take this suggestion into consideration.</p>
205	1/21/2023	Email	Rodney	Guritz		<p>I'm shocked that part of Old Murphy Dome Road doesn't have a ROW and pleased to see this in the plan. However the plan should reflect that part of OMD in between the McCloud and Hattie Creek subdivisions is not a major collector (even if it has an easement for such) - it's an unmaintained dirt road used as only a trail in the winter and barely used by 4WD vehicles in the summer.</p>	<p>The portion of OMD road between McCloud and Hattie Creek subdivisions has a roadway easement designating it as a public road. While it is not currently functioning as a major collector, if large adjacent parcels subdivide in the future, it could begin functioning more as a collector as development and traffic increase. Designating OMD as a major collector ensures that direct lot access (driveways) will be minimized so that the road can function safely in the future.</p>
205	1/21/2023	Email	Rodney	Guritz		<p>I'm shocked that part of Old Murphy Dome Road doesn't have a ROW and pleased to see this in the plan. However the plan should reflect that part of OMD in between the McCloud and Hattie Creek subdivisions is not a major collector (even if it has an easement for such) - it's an unmaintained dirt road used as only a trail in the winter and barely used by 4WD vehicles in the summer.</p>	<p>The portion of OMD road between McCloud and Hattie Creek subdivisions has a roadway easement designating it as a public road. While it is not currently functioning as a major collector, if large adjacent parcels subdivide in the future, it could begin functioning more as a collector as development and traffic increase. Designating OMD as a major collector ensures that direct lot access (driveways) will be minimized so that the road can function safely in the future.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
251	2/10/2023	Email	Cindy	Williams		<p>New Corridor 251: Connects Musk Ox subdivision to Ski Boot Hill This proposed corridor turns most of the length of my quarter-mile driveway into a through road. I oppose this road - for its impacts and costs, its potential dangers to my family, and its effect on the neighborhood. Its impacts would affect our quality of life, that of our neighbors, and that of trail users from throughout Fairbanks.</p> <p>Potential Impacts: The potential impacts to my family and my property include a new, hazardous exit from my very steep uphill driveway to a heavily travelled road, and increased drainage damaging to my house from along the new road.</p> <p>The potential impacts to the neighborhood are alterations to the character of the quiet, rural neighborhood, and loss of the popular and heavily used trails along this corridor.</p> <p>The potential impacts to Musk Ox subdivision involve the safety and maintenance of Moose Trail and the safety of cars exiting from Eldorado Rd to Ballaine Road. Two unsafe corners on Moose Trail will require massive alteration for increased traffic.</p> <p>Feasibility: Moose Trail is a low traffic road built to the needs of the subdivision. Additional traffic would exacerbate safety issues that are not easily fixable in the current rights of way. There are two dangerous corners along Moose Trail, near the junction with Eldorado and at Meadow Mouse. In addition, the exit from Eldorado onto Ballaine is already dangerous. It requires patience even with current traffic. Traffic to and from Pearl Creek Elementary School floods this intersection mornings and afternoons. Sight distances are poor, poorer in winter. Traffic heading north on Ballaine comes fast over the crest just before Eldorado.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all corridors in the plan, Corridor 251 would only be developed if the parcels it crosses or is adjacent to subdivide. The corridor has been realigned to better follow contours and provide a significant wooded buffer between the road corridor and Skyline Ridge Trail. There are existing roadway easements from the end of Moose Trail heading east and then north to connect into the east-west section of the corridor that links up with Ski Boot Hill, making a portion of this corridor feasible by following the existing easements. The portion heading east and then north from the end of Moose Trail appears feasible to construct to FNSB standards (<10% grade) based on the underlying topography, which shows about a 5% grade.
251						<p>Any cost of upgrading Moose Trail for heavier traffic needs to be borne by the property developer or subdivider. Simply appending any subdivided area to the Musk Ox Road Service Area (RSA) would not be sufficient to cover these costs. This is because road improvements would precede development and sales, and precede RSA taxes on developed parcels (if they did join the RSA). Would there be enough new RSA taxpayers to support road improvement costs?</p> <p>Compatibility with existing uses and borough plans: The trail along this corridor is heavily used, by skiers, snowshoers, snowmachiners, mushers, runners, cyclers, walkers, dogwalkers, horse riders, and berry pickers. I've used the trail for 25 years. My husband has used it for 50 years. It is part of the FNSB Trails Plan, and connects the Skarland trails to the borough trail to Skyline Ridge Park. It's used for race routes each year. It's an important link that I want to remain pleasant and natural. I want it to remain a trail, not a route or a road.</p> <p>Communications and Geometry: If this corridor (251) is to be developed, I and other neighboring landowners will need close communication with the borough to ensure the road design includes driveways that maintain adequate sight distances, good corner visibilities, level intersection approaches and optimum intersection angles. We will also need communication to ensure that changed drainage patterns won't damage existing structures.</p>	
254	2/1/2023	Paper Form	Carl	Kretsinger		The proposed trail shows an extension between my property and the property of my neighbor to the west of me. There is no easement through this area and I would be against having through traffic through my property. Another consideration is that most of Old John Trail is a private road with exclusive use easements.	Corridor 254 would only be developed if the parcels it crosses or is adjacent to are subdivided by the owners.
273	2/1/2023	Paper Form	Bruce	Bridwell		Opposed. This proposed connector creates access from/to Old Murphy Dome that adds significant vehicle traffic to the privately maintained Moose Mtn road service area. Additionally this creates a conflict with the quiet we have on the trail.	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor.
273	1/29/2023	Web Form	Tracie	Curry		Corridor 273 overlaps a high volume recreational trail that is used in all seasons by people throughout the borough. I strongly oppose corridor 273 due to the negative impact it would have on the character and use of the existing trail.	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
273	1/22/2023	Email	Greg	Grajew	GMC RSA Commissioner	<p>As we discussed, here are my comments as one of the Road Service Commissioners for the Goldstream Moose Creek (GMC) subdivision. Our Service Area covers 11.8 miles with around 500 residents spanning Moose Mtn. and tributaries as well as down Spinach Creek: Hardluck, Photon, Keystone and Frenchman.</p> <p>If the main effort of this "plan" is to provide alternate exits for single egress roads, the proposed 273 and 372 "minor collector" as mentioned in the map below do not provide any alleviation for us should our main "escape" route down Moose Mtn. be blocked. I don't know where the other end of 273 terminates but FYI the Old Murphy Dome Road is not maintained in winter. If you propose that in 20 years this may change, the way off this mountain would be what? 20 miles to Fox, a proposed link up to 372 down an imaginary tie-in to Coyote Trail or Jones Road? Both of those roads are in bad shape, not to mention that to accomplish this you would need to traverse existing hiking trails, private lands, GVEA power lines and right of way, permafrost and at the end, those roads are no more capable of handling the proposed increase traffic than we can. Minor collector 372 ending at the cul de sac on Monteverde East will saturate it while providing no alleviation to residents requiring an alternate "escape route" should Moose Mtn. be blocked.</p> <p>Given current resources (yearly budget), we barely manage to maintain the roads in our service area. We currently have around 111 households on Moose Mtn. and tributaries, representing 57.2% of all residents in our service area.</p> <p>Our primary concern is safety and maintaining these roads accessible year round. The proposal to, down the road, plan on adding more houses (that will then have to be included in an as yet TBD Service Area) not to mention the road destruction incurred by heavy equipment coming up Moose Mtn., and Monteverde East to "lay" these roads make it untenable for this Service Area. Personally I don't see adding 50 or more homes to our existing service area feasible. Additionally, should the proposed new subdivision be in another service area, we wouldn't get any compensation for the increase road use. I'm not sure what the general Road Commissioners consensus would be, but personally, I'm not interested in doubling my workload especially since I see no benefit for the residents of Monteverde East nor our Service Area.</p> <p>My conclusion is that this plan provides absolutely no benefits to our Service Area, from either a safety, road service manageability or quality of life approach and I'm therefore against this proposal as what concerns "minor collector" 273 and 372.</p>	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 273 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of additional road miles.
273	1/21/2023	Email	Rodney	Guritz		<p>This road is not likely to ever be built and would be a huge detriment to the neighborhood if it were. It is the current route of an existing, popular all-season multi-use trail (see Moose Ridge Trail in the comprehensive trails plan). The route goes through private property owned by Moose Mountain that is not likely to be subdivided as long as there is an operating ski hill. The trails plan notes that if a road was developed through this corridor, the trail would be re-routed. However, re-routing the trail and placing a road next to it would destroy the character of the trail, regardless of any small vegetative buffer. Moose Ridge Trail is an extremely popular all-season, multi-use trail cutting across wild undeveloped land with expansive views; it should remain this way if further development in the area is pursued. There are other routes that would achieve the same goal without the same detriment.</p> <p>While route 273 would represent an alternate route out of the neighborhood in case of natural disaster, developing this route would greatly increase pressure on Moose Mountain road, which is already dangerous and heavily trafficked, particularly during weekends while the ski hill is operating. It will not improve emergency services access to Moose Mountain subdivisions. Net benefit to safety would be negative. Further, most of this route travels a high ridge through a ~10-year old burn. While the views are great, the land is steep, sparsely vegetated, and not ideal for residential development. There are grades on this trail that exceed the 10% allowable, so this route as drawn is not even practical, and would require re-routing at time of subdivision. The current value of this trail greatly outweighs any potential road through this corridor. I strongly urge the FNSB to remove this route from the roads plan.</p>	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process.
273	2/4/2023	Email	Linda	DeFoliart		<p>This runs along a ridge that has a beautiful trail going out to Old Murphy Dome Rd. I was told by Bryant that the trail is in the Master Trails Plan. The ridge it runs along is rather narrow and I don't see how a road could be added and maintain the essence of that trail. The trail is very popular and fairly heavily used year round by mushers, skiers, walkers, fat-bikers, mountain bikers, snow-machiners, four-wheelers, you name it. I understand the Borough wanting to develop property but please consider the comments of the people who live here and use these roads every day.</p>	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor, as noted in the Trails Plan. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process.
273	1/21/2023	Email	Rodney	Guritz		<p>This road is not likely to ever be built and would be a huge detriment to the neighborhood if it were. It is the current route of an existing, popular all-season multi-use trail (see Moose Ridge Trail in the comprehensive trails plan). The route goes through private property owned by Moose Mountain that is not likely to be subdivided as long as there is an operating ski hill. The trails plan notes that if a road was developed through this corridor, the trail would be re-routed. However, re-routing the trail and placing a road next to it would destroy the character of the trail, regardless of any small vegetative buffer. Moose Ridge Trail is an extremely popular all-season, multi-use trail cutting across wild undeveloped land with expansive views; it should remain this way if further development in the area is pursued. There are other routes that would achieve the same goal without the same detriment.</p> <p>While route 273 would represent an alternate route out of the neighborhood in case of natural disaster, developing this route would greatly increase pressure on Moose Mountain road, which is already dangerous and heavily trafficked, particularly during weekends while the ski hill is operating. It will not improve emergency services access to Moose Mountain subdivisions. Net benefit to safety would be negative. Further, most of this route travels a high ridge through a ~10-year old burn. While the views are great, the land is steep, sparsely vegetated, and not ideal for residential development. There are grades on this trail that exceed the 10% allowable, so this route as drawn is not even practical, and would require re-routing at time of subdivision. The current value of this trail greatly outweighs any potential road through this corridor. I strongly urge the FNSB to remove this route from the roads plan.</p>	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor, as noted in the Trails Plan. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
273	1/19/2023	Paper Form	William	Hao Jr		Increased traffic on Moose Mountain Rd. creates a safety hazard. The Goldstream Moose Creek Service Area cannot accommodate it. This will divert attention from roads in the Spinach Creek Subdivision.	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 273 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
273	1/22/2023	Email	Felix	Krause	road commissioner	My name is T.-Felix Krause. For 21 years I have lived at 3655 Keystone Road (99709) and currently I am serving as a road commissioner of this subdivision. With much concern I have followed the newest "Future Road Corridor"-Plan that FNSB is proposing. I do not know if you are aware that the maintenance of Moose Mountain Road (collector road) has been a point of contention for many years. Moose Mountain Road has very steep sections as well as sections with reduced sight visibility. In addition, the road has very steep embankments with dangerous unprotected drop-offs and no shoulder. Although the service area has spent a substantial part of its budget maintaining and upgrading this road, those expenses just were enough to keep the road from "falling apart". What do I mean by "falling apart"? Due to its steep sections and weak subbase every year washing-board patterns make the driving difficult. In addition pot holes open up, the fast flowing run-off washes out the road and takes away the surface layer. In other, not so steep sections, we encounter reappearing mud holes. As of now the neighbors have put up with this less than ideal situation but any more traffic generated by road extensions 273 & 372 will break the delicate and fragile balance that we have tried to achieve in the last years. Until now the neighbors mostly have been willing to live with a mostly substandard road. It is hard to imagine that in the future, when the roads are being extended and the traffic flow increases, the road service area will be able to keep up with maintenance and safety of Moose Mountain Road any longer! If the FNSB is willing to pave Moose Mountain Road and install guard rails I could see a feasible way forward. Otherwise we will be creating a sore and never healing wound, no matter how much bandages we/you stick on. thank you for your consideration	Corridor 273 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 273 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
273	2/8/2023	Email	Briana	Franz		I am writing to state I am against the proposed road plan, specifically #273 and #372. These roads will significantly impact the recreational trail system used by hikers, skiers, walkers, dog mushers, bikers, and snow machines . Building a road here would destroy the value of these trails used year round by local residents. Furthermore, I am also concerned with the ability for moose mountain to be able to sustain increased traffic volume of these added roads. Moose mountain already has difficulty sustaining the level of traffic it receives. Not only is the road quality a concern but the safety of those driving it as well. Moose mountain is a narrow and steep road that sees vehicles going off the road both to the up and downhill sides of the mountain. Increased traffic will create increased risk for accidents to both residents and skiers using the buses for recreation. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor, as noted in the Trails Plan. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 273 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
273	2/9/2023	Web Form	Stephanie	Wight		I am writing to state that I am against the proposed road plan, specifically #273 and #372. These roads will significantly impact the recreational trail system used by hikers, skiers, walkers, dog mushers, bikers, and snow machines . Building a road here would destroy the value of these trails used year round by local residents. Furthermore, I am also concerned with the ability for moose mountain to be able to sustain increased traffic volume of these added roads. Moose mountain already has difficulty sustaining the level of traffic it receives. Not only is the road quality a concern but the safety of those driving it as well. Moose mountain is a narrow and steep road that sees vehicles going off the road both to the up and downhill sides of the mountain. Increased traffic will create increased risk for accidents to both residents and skiers using the buses for recreation. Road #273 and #372 would negatively impact current residents on moose mountain. Thank you for your time and consideration.	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor, as noted in the Trails Plan. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 273 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
273	2/7/2023	Email	Kristy	Howk		As a resident of Moose Mountain community, I strongly oppose the design of Collector Roads 273 and 372. As mentioned in other comments, I'm concerned about the safety on our narrow roads which have no shoulders. It is very steep, slippery in the winter months and was not built for through traffic. As it is now, it can be treacherous passing large delivery trucks hauling water and fuel not to mention the ski buses each weekend during winter. Presently, cars and buses have been sliding into the ditches trying to avoid each other. With an increase in through traffic and with the probability of increased traffic speeds and unfamiliarity with local conditions a real safety issue will most likely arise. Presently the local residents enjoy a peacefulness with low traffic where they can walk their children and pets on the road and local drivers are aware and drive slowly. The drivers realize that those walking have no where to get out of their way with no shoulders on the roadway. To build a through road through an existing quiet neighborhood is asking for trouble. Something FNSB should not be encouraging. Another issue that impacts our neighbors as well as others is 273 on the public use trails. A road and a trail would hardly coexist on the same ridge. The proposed collector road has steep grades and heavy drifting which would be very expensive to maintain. We all enjoy this space that we can easily access for recreation and enjoying nature. I would like to see collector 273 and 372 removed from the Comprehensive Roads Plan.	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor, as noted in the Trails Plan. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 273 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
273	2/7/2023	Email	Murray	Howk	Commissioner, Goldstream Moose Creek Service Area	<p>In regards to the the Draft FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan connectors 273 and 372 all Road Commissioners contacted from the Goldstream Moose Creek Service Area strongly apposed to the two minor connectors #'s 273 and 372 within our service area.</p> <p>* If developed as designed #273 and #272 will put an unnecessary burden on our limited budget. Through traffic congestion would substantially degrade Moose Mountain and Monteverde roads, creating increased washboarding, pot holes and snow removal on such a steep incline. These problems exist presently. Contractor call outs to repair this increased damage are very expensive.</p> <p>* Safety. Moose Mountain roads narrow width is barely adequate, especially in the winter with steep grades. Due to contractor delays Moose Mountain roads become narrower in winter. The roadway's width is easily compromised with snow berms crowding the center line during winter storms. Downhill traffic must pull over, giving way to ski buses, fuel and water trucks which often have to chain up to access the top of the hill. Buses and cars routinely slide into the steep ditches.</p> <p>* Crime. While not usually considered in road construction design, at present, Moose Mountain enjoys a very low crime rate, which we believe is directly related to not having a connector through road. Anyone considering crime probably knows that there is no outlet and force them to backtrack with a greater chance of being identified.</p> <p>* Public use trail. Increased use of the major public use trail system located on #273, needs careful consideration. This trail system is used by ski, bike, hiking, snowmachining and dog sledding. A connector road must use this same ridge that is presently used for these activities. Parking at the trail head presently uses the existing private road at the top of Moose Mount Rd. This is becoming more of an issue. In winter this trail traditionally requires Old Murphy Dome Road to remain unplowed. If developed a portion of this trail system would be lost.</p> <p>*A better use of the land. Instead of pushing ahead with #273 and #372 a green belt in place of road connectors would make more sense. All borough residents could then benefit from a relatively wild area as it is now. Every parcel of borough land does not need a road running through it.</p>	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor, as noted in the Trails Plan. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 273 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
273	2/10/2023	Email	Eleanor	Boyce		<p>I am Eleanor Boyce, property owner and resident in the Moose Mountain neighborhood of Goldstream Valley. The following comments are in response to the 01-16-2023 draft of the FNSB road plan. Some relevant public comments from the previous round are cited below.</p> <p>2. Safety and maintainability considerations [proposed corridors 273, 372]</p> <p>Moose Mountain Road is very narrow with steep drop offs (Kris Howk), and is graded between 8-10% from the intersection at the base to the top of the mountain and can be dangerous to vehicles without chains or studs during spring freeze/thaw cycles (Roger Evans). Increased traffic on it would create a possible safety hazard for the public and land owners (Kris Howk). As I personally own a 4WD vehicle with good traction and studded tires, I find Moose Mountain road to be adequately maintained - by which I mean, for half the summer we deal with washboard and dust, and year-round we experience delays in grading and snow clearing due to limited maintenance funds (understandable) and the FNSB-procured contractor not having adequate staff/equipment to respond promptly. These road conditions persist from year to year despite having a team of engaged, dedicated road commissioners, and are representative of many hillside roads in Goldstream Valley which have similar grades and approaches to maintenance. Any mid-winter freezing rain event (and these are likely to be more frequent in future due to climate change) may require chaining up even a 4WD, studded-tire vehicle until the contractor is available to spread gravel. Added traffic will make Moose Mountain road less safe and more difficult to maintain even to its current standard. I would argue that the page 17 FNSB Future Road Corridor Selection Criteria category "Economic: Feasibility" should not only require that a road be reasonable/feasible to construct, but also that it be reasonable/feasible to maintain.</p>	Corridor 273 follows the existing Moose Mtn service road and will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide in the future. The parcels it crosses currently comprise Moose Mtn ski area. Road and trail conflicts can be addressed during the subdivision and platting process through a planned shared road and trail corridor, as noted in the Trails Plan. It is likely feasible to construct to FNSB road standards given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 273 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
274	2/1/2023	Paper Form	David	Sullivan		How and when will the existing home owners be notified of the subdivision development is proposed? Will the home owners be allowed questions and comments?	The Roads Plan doesn't promote development or trigger subdivision or road development in any specific areas. Rather, it guides road connections when landowners decide to subdivide. Title 17 requires that adjacent property owners be notified of proposed subdivision activity.
275	2/1/2023	Paper Form	David	Sullivan		How and when will the existing home owners be notified of the subdivision development is proposed? Will the home owners be allowed questions and comments?	The Roads Plan doesn't promote development or trigger subdivision or road development in any specific areas. Rather, it guides road connections when landowners decide to subdivide. Title 17 requires that adjacent property owners be notified of proposed subdivision activity.
281	1/25/2023	Web Form	Ben	Raevsky		<p>my name is Ben Raevsky I have a property at 417 Hawkeye downs. I am fully in favor of improving/adding roads in the Fairbanks area. However, putting in a road in areas such as mine gives me concerns that the borough is developing property that should be the responsibility of the landowner to develop. Why should our property tax dollars be spent to benefit landowners who do not have the motivation to put in roads themselves? I completely understand that the more developed property the property tax comes in However, that specific area has very unstable ground due to permafrost which would make it a poor place to build new homes or roads (I know because I have been waiting for the permafrost to melt and settle on my property for 5+ years) Even if someone did buy the properties along the road those properties will not be very valuable and will be in a constant state of maintenance. This new road will have yearly maintenance issues that the borough doesn't handle with its existing roads. One example, every spring Jones Road near Ivory Jacks turns into a semi liquid pothole swamp and is only occasionally managed. Jones road is south facing and would have less permafrost and more sun exposure by comparison. Improving Hawkeye Downs would be a benefit to my property and its value and connecting it to another neighborhood would give me an alternate road to evacuate from should an emergency occur and would be a benefit. However, I don't believe the borough is currently capable of maintaining that road as an acceptable thoroughfare for egress. Developing plans to maintain/improve our current road system instead of creating more responsibilities that the borough already doesn't manage would be a better use of both time and money.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, corridor 281 extending Hawkeye Downs to Calder Creek would only be developed if the property owners of the parcels that the corridor crosses decide to subdivide. As a second-class borough with limited road powers, the FNSB does not construct or maintain roads. Roads are developed by property owners/developers when they decide to subdivide through the platting process. The Roads Plan offers orderly direction about where these new connections would be most beneficial and feasible, but does not trigger and road development, until landowners decide to subdivide. This way, the plan ensures that property owners are able to legally access their properties through planned corridors.
293	1/16/2023	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>I was just taking a quick look at the FNSB road plan (I won't be able to make the Saturday open house). I live in the neighborhood that has Red Berry, Pine Wood and Green Leaf Roads. I noticed that one of the possible minor collectors (#293) takes off from the Red Berry/Pine Wood intersection. That will traverse a slope that is covered in black spruce and is probably a prime permafrost area. A couple of informal foot trails in that area have sunk deep into the mat. A better route would be from the end of Green Leaf (uphill). That seems to have much better soils. I'm no expert in these things, so take my advice with a big grain of salt, but I thought I should mention it.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan team took a closer look at the alternative connection to Green Leaf. The 1991 Roads Plan did have a proposed corridor connecting into Green Leaf and heading northward, but this was removed due to its redundancy with proposed Corridors 15 and 293 and its conflicts with the proposed O'Connor Creek East trail. Since all of these potential corridors cross one large public FNSB-owned parcel, alternatives that meet the same intent of Corridor 293 could be considered at the time of subdivision if on-the-ground investigations (survey data) indicate that its current alignment is impractical due to permafrost or other issues.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	2/10/2023	Email	Pamela	Miller	Arctic Audubon Society	<p>First, on behalf of Arctic Audubon Society, we wish to request an additional month for public comment as this plan is complex to review. The plan also still includes a number of very controversial corridors which would degrade open space, important trails, wildlife habitats and fresh water bodies, and environmental quality of neighborhoods and the FNSB. The environmental quality of the land itself is important for current and future residents of the FNSB to have a healthy and clean place to live into the future.</p> <p>In our review of public interest features of the plan, as well as from the standpoint as landowners of the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, we request better consideration and identification of existing greenspace, trails, recreational use, and land suitability for roads such as wetlands, permafrost melt, and other conflicts. Another feature to consider is how new roads into certain areas could affect Dark Skies, so important for aurora viewing -- a unique feature of our northern city so important for winter enjoyment of residents and travelers alike.</p> <p>It would be very useful to consider existing and proposed greenspaces, parks large or small neighborhood places, nature reserves and conservation areas and to show those on the maps. For example, in the Goldstream area, citizen concerns have resulted in conservation of lands such as Blueberry Preserves https://interioraklandtrust.org/land-and-projects/blueberry-preserves/ and Goldstream Valley Greenbelt https://interioraklandtrust.org/land-and-projects/goldstream-valley-greenbelt/. Despite extensive comments about the quality of life, trails, and open space in the Goldstream Valley, the January 2023 Draft Roads Plan still contains proposed Road 64 (connecting Miller Hill Road and Miller Hill Extensive through extensive wetlands and important open space with trails), as well as Rd 295 which may conflict with the trail network.</p> <p>Due to the proximity and potential effects of road traffic on the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, we would like to see proposed connector Road 331 be changed to Future Study from Minor Collector.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 295 has been removed from the Roads Plan based on public input and an in-person site visit by the planning team to verify challenging topography and on-the-ground conditions (utilities conflicts, low ground/wetlands).
295	2/10/2023	Email	Pamela	Miller	Arctic Audubon Society	<p>The FNSB could take additional steps -- including an additional review draft of the FNSB Roads Plan -- which would improve understanding of the full implications of the roads plan, as well as public ability to review the plan, especially given that the same consultant is carrying out the FNSB Trails Plan and the FNSB Roads Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Overlay of existing trails and proposed trails from the Trails plan with existing and proposed roads in the FNSB Draft Roads Plan (GIS map overlays both online and in print). •Full depiction of all the proposed Road corridors -- This needs to include the "New Road" corridors shown in this document on the detailed map, https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/01-16-23_FNSBRoadsPlan_FullDraftwithRevisedCorridors.pdf and listed AND any "Old" corridors which would still be in effect from the 1991 Plan. •It would be very helpful to know which are New road proposals, and which are existing from the 1991 plan, and for these to be depicted differently as they have different terms and status. •It is unclear how the Draft Corridor Descriptions Document provided for the Jan 21, 2023 Open House https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/23y01m16d-FNSB-Roads-Plan-Corridor-Descriptions_DRAFT.pdf are addressed by the maps. The corridor descriptions still do not sufficiently address why certain loops are needed, how public comment was addressed or ignored, and in most cases, the nature of the land qualities or existence of trail crossings which could affect neighborhood land qualities or road building costs and challenges (e.g. wetlands, etc). •While the "Comment Tracker" is provided, https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FNSBRoadsPlan_CommentTracker_Sept-Oct_2022.pdf, how those comments were actually addressed is less clear, especially since some road corridor numbers were changed from the earlier draft. It would be helpful to show in that chart, how the comments were addressed. <p>We appreciate this opportunity to comment.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 295 has been removed from the Roads Plan based on public input and an in-person site visit by the planning team to verify challenging topography and on-the-ground conditions (utilities conflicts, low ground/wetlands).
309	2/7/2023	Web Form	Amy	Tippery		<p>Please consider this an entry for the formal public comment session which ends on February 10, 2023. I am a property owner on Smallwood Trail and see that the planned upgrade #309 (page 24, map index 01N 02E) intends to extend Smallwood Trail as a minor collector class road with Hopper Creek, which is indicated to be an existing road on the index map. I must point out that Hopper Creek does not exist at this time, though it is designated as a road corridor in the FNSB tax parcel geodatabase. For many years, neighbors have been petitioning the Borough to designate this section labeled #309 (currently an unmaintained path) as a recreational trail. Currently and traditionally, it is frequented by snowmachiners, mushers, hikers, trappers and cyclists year-round, and maintained by these user groups. Many petitions from neighbors and user groups to the FNSB Parks and Recreation Department resulted in the Borough placing 'no highway vehicle' signs on the trail as this use is incompatible with keeping the trail in usable shape. It has taken effort by many in these user groups to respectfully and kindly educate the public on the inaccessibility of this section of trail for heavier vehicles as it is very steep and the alignment does not allow for switchbacks for safety or to ensure the trail surface is not easily eroded by traffic. For years, many efforts by neighbors to keep the trail restricted to recreational use has created an expectation that the Borough would see its importance to the CHRIS Road and Two Rivers community as a recreational connector to trail systems in the east and north. Around 2020, the Borough placed signage at the trailhead designating it as the 'Yo-yo Trail' with additional signage to remind users not to bring wheeled vehicles on the trail during winter months (so as to maintain the trail in usable shape for skiers and mushers), and that the trail was not for road vehicles. We are now disappointed to see the divisions of the Borough are not interfacing to share information on these segments and their importance to user groups as tourism, recreation and the natural environment are balanced with future development.</p> <p>After these years of interfacing with the Borough to remind it of how important this trail is to neighbors and user groups from the Fairbanks and North Pole areas, we now have the prospect of taking it out of the recreational system entirely with this proposal. Not only would the conversion from recreational trail to connector road deplete the user groups of this resource, but the resources themselves in the area are sensitive to development. Between spring 2018 and 2020, Alaska Department of Fish and Game surveyed for salmonids in Smallwood Creek, which is a tributary of the Little Chena, an anadromous stream. Further surveys are planned for Smallwood Creek as well as e-DNA sampling since the spawning habitat it represents is significantly important to the Greater Yukon Chinook population.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, Corridor 309 would only be developed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. The Roads Plan is a long-range planning document that does not direct development, but plans for road connections should development occur. The trail that Corridor 309 follows to reach Hopper Creek is designated in the FNSB Trails Plan as the Smallwood Creek Loop and is proposed for dedication as a Category A trail. Since the trail and proposed corridor are documented in the FNSB Trail and Roads Plans, respectively, a planned shared trail and road corridor can be planned for and developed in the future to minimize trail impacts, should subdivision occur.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
310	2/8/2023	Web Form	Amy	Tippery		<p>Additionally, it may not be known to the planning committee who compiled the Roads Plan, but the section of Smallwood Trail from the top of the hill to the current cul-de-sac is not designated as collector, but as a pioneer access road with no shoulder designations and an easement of only 40 feet. It is not designed to serve more than 10 residential lots. It is therefore not logical to create a collector road beyond that section, with no other current entry point and no residences to serve beyond that point, with larger capacity than pioneer access. Even upgrading it to this pioneer access designation would be impractical because there is a length limit of 1,320 feet for a pioneer access road and the end of Smallwood Trail is currently at that limit.</p> <p>Due to the above reasons, I would like the Borough to change option #309 in the current draft Road Plan and either upgrade the last section of Smallwood Trail to connector status with proper easement and shoulders in preparation for later upgrades to the east, or simply delete the planned #309 upgrades from the plan as they would diminish the value and use of the trail currently enjoyed by the neighborhood and user groups in the larger Fairbanks Community.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please respond to this email with a verification that these comments have been submitted to the public record.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, Corridor 309 would only be developed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. The Roads Plan is a long-range planning document that does not direct development, but plans for road connections should development occur. The trail that Corridor 309 follows to reach Hopper Creek is designated in the FNSB Trails Plan as the Smallwood Creek Loop and is proposed for dedication as a Category A trail. Since the trail and proposed corridor are documented in the FNSB Trail and Roads Plans, respectively, a planned shared trail and road corridor can be planned for and developed in the future to minimize trail impacts, should subdivision occur.
309	2/9/2023	Email	Thomas	Baring		<p>I oppose two proposed corridors in the Comprehensive Roads Plan: numbers 309 and 362. These proposed corridors are on the North-facing slope and side of Little Chena Prong, an area of black spruce, peat bogs, and permafrost. This is fragile terrain on which development and road construction should be avoided. Roads here will be expensive to build properly. They will also create an unnecessary, long-term borough expense given the challenge of maintenance. The roads themselves, coupled with the assumed construction of structures, will inevitably cause melting of ice lenses, formation of sinkholes and slumps, and altered drainage patterns, all of which will be costly, and possibly impossible, to repair. Given that they're on the North facing slope, they'll almost certainly be worse than Chena Hot Springs Road, over the hill to the South.</p> <p>The borough should save itself the headaches and perennial expenses by removing corridors 309 and 362 from the comprehensive plan and leaving this terrain to the moose, mushers, snowmachiners, and trappers.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my input.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB Roads Plan does not promote or trigger subdivision or road development. Rather, it guides the placement of roads should landowners decide to subdivide and develop their property. The parcels that proposed corridors 309 and 362 cross are both privately and publicly (DNR) owned. The FNSB cannot limit private property owners or public agencies from developing their land as they see fit. As a second-class borough through its comprehensive planning, platting, and land use powers, the FNSB can direct where road connections should be sited to ensure access to property owners and develop a logical and connected road network, if and when landowners subdivide.
310	2/4/2023	Web Form	Carolyn	Thomas		<p>I own 10 acres on Amanita Road, intersected by the road. In no way will I ever consider allowing the borough to develop my land as an access to Esro/Hopper Creek/Smallwood Trail (#s 310, 331 &404). I have no intention of subdividing.</p> <p>There is no sewer, water or natural gas infrastructure out here and no prospect of seeing such in the future. Residents rely on well or hauled water, septic tanks, outhouses and various fuel sources. Adding access so the borough can sell land for subdivision development is not in the best interest of the residents of Amanita Rd or the land itself. The land is fragile as evidenced by an increasingly deep drainage on the southeast corner of my lot that trapped a moose calf 2 years ago, and an enormous sinkhole, summer of 2022 on the property adjacent to my northeast corner.</p> <p>We are already threatened by the prospect of mining in an area roughly 1/2 mile from our homes.</p> <p>Amanita Rd has already been negatively impacted by the recently published Trails Plan, non-residents with off road vehicles abusing the road residents maintain, endangering pedestrians and animals as they pass, ignoring posted speed warnings.</p> <p>It is my understanding that once developed, the roads in a Secondary Borough fall under the responsibility of a Rural Service Area, and the landowners would carry the burden of additional taxes to support the RSA. Amanita Road has numerous rental tenants who would not necessarily be impacted by increased property taxes.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment, but again, I will not ever allow road development through my land.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridor 310 crosses or are adjacent to never subdivide, public right-of-way for the road would not be obtained. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road has documented issues for both emergency services and resident access due to the sub-standard condition of the road.
310	2/6/2023	Email	Tom	Duncan	ME, PE Holaday-Parks Inc	<p>I would also like to add further comments to my Feb. 3 comments below.</p> <p>-Upon reflecting on the FNSB GIS website it appears there is already a connection to Hopper Creek road intended or planned via Smallwood direct</p> <p>-Also it looks like there could be another option to connect via John Kalinas road off of Smallwood.</p> <p>We would suggest the FNSB investigate these options of connecting to Hopper Creek as again we are not in favor of connecting via Amanita nor Boreal Hts.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 309 connecting Smallwood to Hopper Creek and a connection between John Kalinas and Hopper Creek do not address the above-standard cul-de-sac length of Amanita, as corridors 331 and 404 do.
310	2/9/2023	Email	Bert	Thomas		<p>I am contacting you over concern of the FNSB Comp. Road Plan as it pertains to Amanita Road. I live at 887 Amanita Rd, TL 2445. I have to wonder how much research has gone into the proposals. Amanita Rd traverses through my property as a prescriptive easement at best. There is no right of way or easement on my property in regards to the road due to the patent date. There is a Golden Valley easement only. Amanita Rd is approximately forty feet inside my property line; same with TL 2458 directly south of my property. I believe the same situation may be true with some other lots to the south and to the north. I have no intention of allowing the road to be widened, etc. as it passes through my property. I am against developing Amanita Road and connecting other roads to Amanita. The people that live on Amanita maintain the road monetarily and with labor. We have already seen a tremendous increase in traffic of ATVs, 4 wheelers, side by sides, dirt bikes etc.; that have no respect for the property owners here. I have seen caravans (groups of as many as 10 or 12 at a time) in spring and summer. Some of these vehicles are traveling at high rates of speed creating huge dust plumes and tearing up the road without regard for the safety of the residents here. I attribute this abuse of the road we maintain and live on the FNSB Trails plan. We never had a problem until that plan was highly publicized. We do not need more traffic on what should be a peaceful road. I was told by a former resident who used to coordinate the maintenance of Amanita Rd that the FNSB had told him on numerous occasions that the FNSB would never develop Amanita due to the grade and easement restrictions. This needs to be carefully considered.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridor 310 crosses or are adjacent to never subdivide, public right-of-way for the road would not be obtained. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road has documented issues for both emergency services and resident access due to the sub-standard condition of the road.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
310	2/6/2023	Web Form	David	Wolfe		My wife and I are against establishing roadways #331, #310, and #404. #310 - Amanita and #404 - Boreal Heights Lane are private roads the residents maintain. These two roadways are narrow and usually one vehicle wide. Emergency vehicles would have no problem navigating them. Still, we are concerned about added traffic and pollution from dust in the summer and keeping the road open during the winter with more snow. We do NOT want these roadways coming into this area. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridors 331 and 404 cross or are adjacent to never subdivide, the roads will not be developed. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access.
310	2/6/2023	Web Form	Donna	Wolfe		My wife and I are against establishing roadways #331, #310, and #404. #310 - Amanita and #404 - Boreal Heights Lane are private roads the residents maintain. These two roadways are narrow and usually one vehicle wide. Emergency vehicles would have no problem navigating them. Still, we are concerned about added traffic and pollution from dust in the summer and keeping the road open during the winter with more snow. We do NOT want these roadways coming into this area. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridor 310 crosses or are adjacent to never subdivide, public right-of-way for the road would not be obtained. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road has documented issues for both emergency services and resident access due the sub-standard condition of the road.
310	2/10/2023	Email	Donna	Wolfe		Boreal Heights Lane is a private road upgraded and maintained by the residents who live on Boreal Heights Lane. My husband and I are against connecting this road, 404, to Dark Hollow and Hopper Creek roads. We bought property in this area because we wanted privacy, clean air, and quiet living. We enjoy having only one way in and out of our neighborhood, this keeps crime down and people who have no reason to be in the area out. It's interesting that the FNSB has chosen this time to start opening this area up to subdividing, when Avidian Gold, and most likely Fort Knox, are planning extensive gold mining all over this area. It would be unconscionable for the FNSB to sell property without informing buyers about the planned gold mining. Amanita is also upgraded and maintained by residents. The FNSB wants to put these roads - who is going to maintain them? I'm against widening Amanita, 310, or having more traffic on it. I am also against putting in a road from Esro, 331, and connecting it to Amanita, 310. Who is going to maintain this road, and is this road being put in to benefit the mining companies? The timing seems a bit suspicious. We don't need anymore traffic on Amanita or Boreal Heights Roads I'm also against any road going behind my property. Please leave our beautiful, quiet neighborhood alone!	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridor 310 crosses or are adjacent to never subdivide, public right-of-way for the road would not be obtained. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road has documented issues for both emergency services and resident access due the sub-standard condition of the road.
331	2/2/2023	Web Form	Robin	Dale Ford		I live on Amanita Rd. and would like to express my opposition to the FNSB Proposed Roads #331 and #404. Neither of these corridors serves the residential neighborhood in the Amanita and Esro Rd. area. With the increased mining exploration and activity near this area, I am very suspicious of the motives for these corridors. BTW, Esro Rd. is a private road.	Amanita road is currently a public road and cul-de-sac that is longer than the FNSB's road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridors 331 and 404 address the cul-de-sac length issue by providing additional ingress/egress connections from Amanita Rd to Esro Rd and to future Hopper Creek.
331	2/3/2023	Web Form	Amber	Masters		I was reading over this roads plan. I understand that proposed roads may not be constructed if land is not subdivided? Right? I live on Amanita and my main concern is who will maintain the additional roads in this plan? Will the addition of the two new roads connecting Amanita be landowners' responsibility? Why go through the expense to create more problematic potentially orphan roads? It seems the road plan and the RSA are in contrast to one another. But maybe I am missing something... it does not appear Amanita is in the MPA in the RSA.	Proposed corridors in the Roads Plan will only be developed if the parcels they cross or are adjacent to subdivide. For corridors 331 and 404 that connect to Amanita Rd, these roads would need to be adopted into an existing RSA for road maintenance. New residences along these corridors would contribute tax funds to the RSA for the maintenance of the new and existing road miles in the RSA.
331	2/4/2023	Web Form	Carolyn	Thomas		I own 10 acres on Amanita Road, intersected by the road. In no way will I ever consider allowing the borough to develop my land as an access to Esro/Hopper Creek/Smallwood Trail (#s 310, 331 &404). I have no intention of subdividing. There is no sewer, water or natural gas infrastructure out here and no prospect of seeing such in the future. Residents rely on well or hauled water, septic tanks, outhouses and various fuel sources. Adding access so the borough can sell land for subdivision development is not in the best interest of the residents of Amanita Rd or the land itself. The land is fragile as evidenced by an increasingly deep drainage on the southeast corner of my lot that trapped a moose calf 2 years ago, and an enormous sinkhole, summer of 2022 on the property adjacent to my northeast corner. We are already threatened by the prospect of mining in an area roughly 1/2 mile from our homes. Amanita Rd has already been negatively impacted by the recently published Trails Plan, non-residents with off road vehicles abusing the road residents maintain, endangering pedestrians and animals as they pass, ignoring posted speed warnings. It is my understanding that once developed, the roads in a Secondary Borough fall under the responsibility of a Rural Service Area, and the landowners would carry the burden of additional taxes to support the RSA. Amanita Road has numerous rental tenants who would not necessarily be impacted by increased property taxes. Thank you for the opportunity to comment, but again, I will not ever allow road development through my land.	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridor 310 crosses or are adjacent to never subdivide, the road will not be developed. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access.
331	2/3/2023	Email	Tom	Duncan		First 331 as shown on the map does not appear to match the description on page 24. This route per the map appears to connect amanita and ESRO, not amanita and Boreal hts as indicated on 24. Second – can you please provide the purpose or reasons for extending this road from amanita to ESRO?	Thank you for your comments. The planning team has verified the error on page 24 and will make that correction in the next iteration of the plan. The purpose of Corridor 331 is to address both ESRO and Amanita being cul-de-sacs longer than the FNSB's road standards allow, causing concerns for resident and emergency services access. Corridor 331 provides an alternate point of ingress/egress for both areas.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
331	2/6/2023	Web Form	David	Wolfe		My wife and I are against establishing roadways #331, #310, and #404. #310 - Amanita and #404 - Boreal Heights Lane are private roads the residents maintain. These two roadways are narrow and usually one vehicle wide. Emergency vehicles would have no problem navigating them. Still, we are concerned about added traffic and pollution from dust in the summer and keeping the road open during the winter with more snow. We do NOT want these roadways coming into this area. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridors 331 and 404 cross or are adjacent to never subdivide, the roads will not be developed. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access.
331	2/6/2023	Web Form	Donna	Wolfe		My wife and I are against establishing roadways #331, #310, and #404. #310 - Amanita and #404 - Boreal Heights Lane are private roads the residents maintain. These two roadways are narrow and usually one vehicle wide. Emergency vehicles would have no problem navigating them. Still, we are concerned about added traffic and pollution from dust in the summer and keeping the road open during the winter with more snow. We do NOT want these roadways coming into this area. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridors 331 and 404 cross or are adjacent to never subdivide, the roads will not be developed. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access.
331	2/10/2023	Email	Pamela	Miller	Arctic Audubon Society	<p>First, on behalf of Arctic Audubon Society, we wish to request an additional month for public comment as this plan is complex to review. The plan also still includes a number of very controversial corridors which would degrade open space, important trails, wildlife habitats and fresh water bodies, and environmental quality of neighborhoods and the FNSB. The environmental quality of the land itself is important for current and future residents of the FNSB to have a healthy and clean place to live into the future.</p> <p>In our review of public interest features of the plan, as well as from the standpoint as landowners of the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, we request better consideration and identification of existing greenspace, trails, recreational use, and land suitability for roads such as wetlands, permafrost melt, and other conflicts. Another feature to consider is how new roads into certain areas could affect Dark Skies, so important for aurora viewing – a unique feature of our northern city so important for winter enjoyment of residents and travelers alike.</p> <p>It would be very useful to consider existing and proposed greenspaces, parks large or small neighborhood places, nature reserves and conservation areas and to show those on the maps. For example, in the Goldstream area, citizen concerns have resulted in conservation of lands such as Blueberry Preserves https://interioraklandtrust.org/land-and-projects/blueberry-preserves/ and Goldstream Valley Greenbelt https://interioraklandtrust.org/land-and-projects/goldstream-valley-greenbelt/. Despite extensive comments about the quality of life, trails, and open space in the Goldstream Valley, the January 2023 Draft Roads Plan still contains proposed Road 64 (connecting Miller Hill Road and Miller Hill Extensive through extensive wetlands and important open space with trails), as well as Rd 295 which may conflict with the trail network.</p> <p>Due to the proximity and potential effects of road traffic on the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, we would like to see proposed connector Road 331 be changed to Future Study from Minor Collector.</p>	Corridor 331 connecting Amanita and ESRO roads is being maintained in the Roads Plan. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 331 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Corridor 331 was proposed due to both Amanita and ESRO existing as cu-de-sacs longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 331 provides both areas with an alternate point of ingress/egress. The Roads Plan itself does not trigger development of this or any road, but rather guides road siting based on planning and engineering analysis for if and when landowners decide to subdivide. The Roads Plan is going out for another rounds of public review during Summer 2023. Both roads and Comprehensive Trails Plan trails have been and will continue to be shown on the Roads Plan maps. The Roads Plan and Trails Plan are being developed by two different consultant planning teams, RESPEC/Agnew Beck and R&M, respectively, who have been coordinating throughout these parallel planning processes by sharing data and information, coordinating on planned trail and road corridors and hosting shared public events. The Corridor Descriptions document indicates which corridors are from the 1991 Plan (noted as "Existing" or "Realigned") and which are new with the 2022 plan update ("New"). Early iterations of the Roads Plan maps did indicate which corridors were from the 1991 Plan or new, but the planning team decided to simplify the symbology for the public meetings to improve readability of the maps, which already display a lot of complex information. Comment trackers with responses from the planning team will be posted on the Roads Plan website once they are complete.
331						<p>The FNSB could take additional steps -- including an additional review draft of the FNSB Roads Plan -- which would improve understanding of the full implications of the roads plan, as well as public ability to review the plan, especially given that the same consultant is carrying out the FNSB Trails Plan and the FNSB Roads Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Overlay of existing trails and proposed trails from the Trails plan with existing and proposed roads in the FNSB Draft Roads Plan (GIS map overlays both online and in print). •Full depiction of all the proposed Road corridors -- This needs to include the "New Road" corridors shown in this document on the detailed map, https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/01-16-23_FNSBRoadsPlan_FullDraftwithRevisedCorridors.pdf and listed AND any "Old" corridors which would still be in effect from the 1991 Plan. •It would be very helpful to know which are New road proposals, and which are existing from the 1991 plan, and for these to be depicted differently as they have different terms and status. •It is unclear how the Draft Corridor Descriptions Document provided for the Jan 21, 2023 Open House https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/23y01m16d-FNSB-Roads-Plan-Corridor-Descriptions_DRAFT.pdf are addressed by the maps. The corridor descriptions still do not sufficiently address why certain loops are needed, how public comment was addressed or ignored, and in most cases, the nature of the land qualities or existence of trail crossings which could affect neighborhood land qualities or road building costs and challenges (e.g. wetlands, etc). •While the "Comment Tracker" is provided, https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/FNSBRoadsPlan_CommentTracker_Sept-Oct_2022.pdf, how those comments were actually addressed is less clear, especially since some road corridor numbers were changed from the earlier draft. It would be helpful to show in that chart, how the comments were addressed. <p>We appreciate this opportunity to comment.</p>	

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
331	2/10/2023	Email	Donna	Wolfe		<p>Boreal Heights Lane is a private road upgraded and maintained by the residents who live on Boreal Heights Lane. My husband and I are against connecting this road, 404, to Dark Hollow and Hopper Creek roads. We bought property in this area because we wanted privacy, clean air, and quiet living. We enjoy having only one way in and out of our neighborhood, this keeps crime down and people who have no reason to be in the area out. It's interesting that the FNSB has chosen this time to start opening this area up to subdividing, when Avidian Gold, and most likely Fort Knox, are planning extensive gold mining all over this area. It would be unconscionable for the FNSB to sell property without informing buyers about the planned gold mining.</p> <p>Amanita is also upgraded and maintained by residents. The FNSB wants to put these roads - who is going to maintain them? I'm against widening Amanita, 310, or having more traffic on it.</p> <p>I am also against putting in a road from Esro, 331, and connecting it to Amanita, 310. Who is going to maintain this road, and is this road being put in to benefit the mining companies? The timing seems a bit suspicious. We don't need anymore traffic on Amanita or Boreal Heights Roads</p> <p>I'm also against any road going behind my property.</p> <p>Please leave our beautiful, quiet neighborhood alone!</p>	<p>Corridor 331 connecting Amanita and ESRO roads is being maintained in the Roads Plan. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 331 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Corridor 331 was proposed due to both Amanita and ESRO existing as cu-de-sacs longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 331 provides both areas with an alternate point of ingress/egress. The Roads Plan itself does not trigger development of subdivisions or roads, but rather guides road siting based on planning and engineering analysis for if and when landowners decide to subdivide their property.</p>
331	2/10/2023	Email	Darla	Theisen		<p>Any chance on reviewing the 331 and 404 proposed rds. How would they be laid out? How to travel on them. Is this in the overflow and sloughing areas?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Corridors 331 and 404 have been sited based on analysis of detailed aerial imagery, lidar, and topographical data. At the time of land subdivision, on-the-ground survey data will also be considered to develop the exact alignment and design of these roads. At that time, adjustments can be made to address topography and other challenging conditions, as long as the alternative alignments meet the same intent as the original corridors identified in the plan.</p>
349	2/10/2023	Email	Bill	McKee		<p>[There is a photo and map included in the PDF version of this comment]</p> <p>After looking at the plan for a road along Corridor 349/51, I suggest that instead of building a road for wood cutting or for a subdivision, the Borough should improve the recreational trails and create a trail head parking area where the new road would begin on Heritage Road. I have a variety of reasons for making this suggestion. Many of us live here because of our access to the wilderness. In some places people buy property to be close to either the water or a golf course. We chose to buy land close to an established trail system. We originally bought our property on Melan Drive North because we knew that we had access to the trails at the top of Heritage Road. We had been told about the trail plan and that most of these trails were part of that plan. Along with neighbors and the help of Borough trail planners, we put in at least three trails back in the mid to late nineties. Folks from Bote, Pearl, Narrow View, Melan North, and Heritage all got together to create those trails so that we could all use them. Even folks on the south side of Chena Hot Springs Road would use the trail system. People live in this area so that they have access to the trail system whether it be for dog mushing, horse riding, hiking, ATV riding, hunting or other activities. If a parking area and trailhead were to be created, more Borough residents could enjoy this area.</p> <p>This main problem area is about 300 yards from Heritage Road. The land has subsided and has caused a sink hole at least 20' across and 10' deep. There are a couple of reasons that I feel that the road should not be built. The first mile of the proposed road is through some major wetland areas. Along with neighbors, I created a trail along the section line from Heritage Road up to the main ridge trail in 2001. Over these last 22 years we've have to do extensive maintenance on the trail just to make it accessible for walking, ATV's, horses, and dog mushing. It gets very muddy and unusable for vehicular traffic from Breakup until well into the fall. Although there are a few problematic areas, the main bad spot for the road is illustrated in the attached photos. Because of the melting of permafrost over the last few years, we've had to rebuild a walking bridge that we originally built in 2001. The following photos show that area. I've spoken with neighbors who build roads for a living and they think that a road through this area would be cost prohibitive. All one needs to do is take a look at Dusty Trail, the road that is only 100 yards up the hill and parallels the proposed road. It is barely used during the spring and summer because it's continually muddy. Heritage Road was rebuilt a few years ago because it was always a muddy and rutted because of fuel and water trucks. We wonder what the impact of increased wood cutting truck traffic will do to that road.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan doesn't promote development or subdivisions in any specific areas. Rather, it provides a plan for logical future connections to guide road development when subdivisions do occur. The Assembly has final say if and when FNSB-owned lands are sold and developed. Assembly members and priorities change frequently, whereas the Roads Plan has a 20-yr planning horizon and long-term vision for future connections. Corridor 349/51 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. Through the Roads and Trails planning processes, a shared road/trail corridor can be planned to minimize trail impacts should these road corridors ever be developed.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
349	2/10/2023	Email	Bill	McKee		<p>During Mayor Sampson's second term a plan was drawn up to create the subdivision that is by Two Rivers School. According to that plan, after the 16 parcels were sold by the school, the next subdivision would be above that and along the wood cutting road. The area that is being suggested for a subdivision was the LAST area that was to be subdivided. Has that plan from the late nineties been researched? So, instead of spending money on a problematic road into an area that is enjoyed by Two Rivers residents, I'd like for you to consider these recommendations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.Improve the trail system, promote it, and make it available to all in Borough residents. 2.Purchase the 40 acre parcel at the beginning of the proposed road and turn it into a trail head, similar to the trail head that was constructed on Two Rivers Road. 3.Passable foot bridge/for ATV bridge over the biggest gullies 4.Add the first mile up to the Borough recreational trail plan. <p>My questions are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •Has anyone done soil samples along that proposed road? •Would a road service area be created •Would it become part of the Heritage Road Service Area? <p>I would be willing to give committee members/ board members a tour of the trail system either by snow machine or dog sled so that members could see these trails and the impact that a road would have on the area.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan doesn't promote development or subdivisions in any specific areas. Rather, it provides a plan for logical future connections to guide road development when subdivisions do occur. The Assembly has final say if and when FNSB-owned lands are sold and developed. Assembly members and priorities change frequently, whereas the Roads Plan has a 20-yr planning horizon and long-term vision for future connections. Corridor 349/51 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. Through the Roads and Trails planning processes, a shared road/trail corridor can be planned to minimize trail impacts should these road corridors ever be developed.
349	2/10/2023	Web Form	Nina	Ruckhaus		I do not agree with making Heritage Hills a road for regular cars. It is a unique location used for dog mushing training, bird hunting, and recreation that would be a great loss to residents if it were to experience further traffic.	Thank you for your comments. Like all corridors in the plan, Corridors 349 and 51 near Heritage Hills would only be developed if and when the adjacent or traversed parcels are subdivided by the landowners. Corridor 349/51 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. Through the Roads and Trails planning processes, a shared road/trail corridor can be planned to minimize trail impacts should these road corridors ever be developed.
362	2/2/2023	Email	Jeanie	Cole		Extension of John Cole Road over the hill to Smallwood Creek. It looks like the easement runs right through the house at the top of the hill. Also the route likely gets into wetland areas at the NW end. John Cole is quite steep at the top end. John Cole provides access to PAN 219801and PAN 219819 in the event these parcels were subdivided. #70 would provide alternative access to these parcels from Buffalo/Foxboro and Nine Mile Hill. Although Nine Mile Hill road is very steep.	Corridor 362 provides access to large undivided parcels to the north. Follows contours to avoid mapped wetlands, though small adjustments to address terrain can be made at the time of platting and subdivision based on survey. Current access to parcels with PAN 219801and PAN 219819 appears to be via trespass roads, so Corridor 362 would provide legal public access should they subdivide.
362	2/9/2023	Email	Thomas	Baring		<p>I oppose two proposed corridors in the Comprehensive Roads Plan: numbers 309 and 362. These proposed corridors are on the North-facing slope and side of Little Chena Prong, an area of black spruce, peat bogs, and permafrost. This is fragile terrain on which development and road construction should be avoided. Roads here will be expensive to build properly. They will also create an unnecessary, long-term borough expense given the challenge of maintenance. The roads themselves, coupled with the assumed construction of structures, will inevitably cause melting of ice lenses, formation of sinkholes and slumps, and altered drainage patterns, all of which will be costly, and possibly impossible, to repair. Given that they're on the North facing slope, they'll almost certainly be worse than Chena Hot Springs Road, over the hill to the South.</p> <p>The borough should save itself the headaches and perennial expenses by removing corridors 309 and 362 from the comprehensive plan and leaving this terrain to the moose, mushers, snowmachiners, and trappers.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my input.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB Roads Plan does not promote or trigger subdivision or road development. Rather, it guides the placement of roads should landowners decide to subdivide and develop their property. The parcels that proposed corridors 309 and 362 cross are both privately and publicly (DNR) owned. The FNSB cannot limit private property owners or public agencies from developing their land as they see fit. As a second-class borough through its comprehensive planning, platting, and land use powers, the FNSB can direct where road connections should be sited to ensure access to property owners and develop a logical and connected road network, if and when landowners subdivide.
366	2/1/2023	Paper Form				Not feasible and disruptive to existing housing	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivides. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 366 does not cross existing residential structures on the parcel, and would only be constructed if those owners decided to subdivide.
366	1/23/2023	In Person	Joe	Durrenberger		From Natalie: I spoke with Mr. Joe Durrenberger and other neighbors in-depth at the open house about Corridors 366 (Ida connection) and 151 (Taroka connection). Joe had a specific question about whether there is any public interest, such as an easement, in the portion of Taroka that crosses his property, TL-2906. He is asking about this because in his search of FNSB data available online, and his own property documents, he hasn't been able to verify any existing easements or other public interest for the road. I've attached a screen snip from the GIS and additional documentation he provided at the meeting. I know George is out, but are there others at CP who might be able to help us research and answer this question?	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivides. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
366	2/6/2023	Email	Katy	Bertram		<p>To: Shelly Wade, Public Involvement Lead, Fairbanks North Star Borough Roads Plan From: Ida Lane Parcel Residents (Ida Lane addresses 3465, 3526, 3530, 3547, 3560, and 3563) Subject: Comments on Corridor 366 We request that Corridor 366 be removed from this and all future road corridor planning processes for reasons listed below: 1. Corridor 366 (SW) realigns the 1991 Road Plan Corridor 146 to connect Ida Lane to Kazan stub. Kazan stub is a short connector to the major collector Becker Ridge Road. Ida Lane is a substandard Local 2 ~ 1,800 foot residential road that encompasses 12 residential lots (9 occupied). Ida Lane meets the residential lot requirement for a Local 1 residential road but exceeds the length requirement of 1,350 feet (FNSB Title 17.56.070). Traffic on Ida Lane is very light due to its sparse resident population.</p> <p>Ida Lane includes a cul-de-sac for emergency vehicle use. A 26.5 foot radius cul-de-sac is located at the terminus of Ida Lane at 3560 Ida Lane (Neva First Block Lot 5). The cul-de-sac was inspected and approved by Chena Goldstream Fire Chief Willard in 2003. It can be used to ingress/egress for large trucks including fire trucks. A clause is included in the 2003 replat of 3560 Ida Lane that provides the cul-de-sac space for emergency vehicle use.</p> <p>The uphill grade of Ida Lane is approximately 10% for the first 1,500 feet of the road; the remaining 300 feet are above 20% uphill grade (Picture Ida B). The 20% uphill grade is often ice covered or muddy and poses a dangerous, narrow traverse for any vehicle. Drivable surface is very narrow and, incorporating a 2 foot shoulder, ranges from 14 to 18 feet (Picture Ida A). A 100 foot guard rail runs parallel to the 20% uphill grade (Picture Ida B). Since the guard rail prevents shoulder use the drivable surface from guard rail to opposing ditch is 16 feet. The guard rail configuration is also located on the 20% + uphill grade. Downhill traffic must traverse at slow speeds in this stretch to maintain control in adverse weather conditions. Uphill traffic must travel at high speeds to make it to the top of the grade. Year-round adverse road conditions often do not allow 2-way traffic on Ida Lane which violates Title 17.56.120B3.</p> <p>Downhill traffic yields to uphill traffic during winter snow and summer wet conditions. Water drainage on Ida Lane is marginal and does not meet Title 17.56.140 requirements due to lack of appropriate culverts and ditching. Culverts that do exist have been damaged by graders and pose an above ground driving safety hazard to vehicles due to their location on narrow stretches (Picture Ida C). Tons of gravel are flushed annually each spring from Ida and Taroka roads onto Chena Ridge Road which creates a driving hazard on Chena Ridge Road (Picture Taroka G).</p> <p>Ida Lane can be described as substandard because it does not meet Title 17.56.080 or 17.56.100 requirements for road width and available 2 foot shoulder, nor geometrics and profile requirements with regard to gradient. Despite the unsafe condition of the road local residents (and vendor fuel and water trucks) understand the location of hazards and usually can traverse without incident. However, the existing condition of Ida Lane does not allow it to be a viable, or safe option to support increased traffic associated with connection to the proposed minor collector Corridor 366.</p>	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivides. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
366	2/6/2023	Email	Katy	Bertram		<p>2. The justification for Corridor 366 states it is proposed as a connector from Ida Lane through large tracts with potential to subdivide and it closes a small gap in the road network. This justification is weak and not practical for the following reasons: -The largest lot along Corridor 366 with potential to subdivide is 57 acre Raven Forrest 1st Add Block, Lot A. This lot also includes proposed Corridor 151, a connector from Taroka. It is redundant, appears biased and a waste of tax dollars to have two corridors passing through and serving one lot. -Corridor 366 parallels Becker Ridge Road for its entire length with a range of distances between the two road from 550 ft to 900 ft. These short distances highlight that the gap between Becker Ridge Road and Corridor 366 is very small and little is gained by routing access to Raven Forest Lot A through Corridor 366. Instead access to Raven Forest Lot A should be from Kazan Stub, Becker Ridge Road since Becker Ridge Road is a well maintained major collector unlike substandard Local 2 roads Ida Lane and Taroka. -The terrain between Neva First Block Lots 4 and 5 and Becker Ridge Road (in effect Corridor 366) ranges from 10-27% uphill grade. I walk my dog on this gradient daily and can vouch that it exceeds 20% in many portions. A simple calculation from elevation change and distance made on google earth indicates grade up to 27%. This grade is common along the course of Corridor 366. FNSB planner Don Galligan (1/25/23 pers. comm.) indicates that an engineering assessment of the grade for Corridor 366 has not been conducted but will be necessary to determine the actual grades of Corridor 366. We agree and request that the assessment be conducted during this planning process because we suspect uphill grades will be above 20% and disqualify Corridor 366 from consideration.</p> <p>3. Safety issues are present at the Ida Lane and Taroka intersection. A traffic control sign review was conducted in 2013 by FNSB (Schmetzer 2014). The two roads intersect at an angle of approximately 25 degrees (Picture Ida Taroka F). Ida Lane meets the intersection at an average downgrade of 6 percent; Taroka meets the intersection at an average upgrade of about 7 percent. Both approaches to the intersection have banked and sight restricted horizontal curves. Of concern is the sight distance from each approach which is blocked due to roadway geometry, the grades, and dense vegetation in the summer and snow berms in winter. In 2014 a stop sign and pre-approach stop sign were placed on Ida Lane and a pre-approach yield sign was placed on Taroka to address the situation. However, the blind approach intersection configuration continues to present a safety hazard due to the slope and angle of the merging roads. The current configuration violates intersection angle minimums and sight distance requirements in Title 17.56.100. Increased traffic posed by adoption of both proposed Corridors 366 and 151 will decrease safety at the Taroka/Ida Lane intersection.</p> <p>In closing, we request that Corridor 366 be removed from consideration in current and future planning processes for the reasons stated above.</p> <p>[Letter has photos and descriptions; full letter here: https://www.dropbox.com/s/f4oy678xxlpc89/Jan-Feb23_FNSBRoadsPlan_011623Maps_Comment_Bertram%26All.msg?dl=0]</p>	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivides. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
366	2/3/2023	Email	Bruce	Ha		<p>I just had a look at the proposed roads labeled 151, and 366 on the map at https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/01-11-23_FNSBRoadsPlan_RevisedCorridors_byQuadrant.pdf</p> <p>Bringing any additional traffic onto Taroka would pose significant risk of injury and property damage to drivers, pedestrians, and the residents in the area. Taroka Drive was never meant to handle large amounts of traffic and is especially hazardous for the uninitiated where it connects to Chena Ridge Road for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The final portion of Taroka between Ida Lane and Chena Ridge Road is very steep. This becomes especially hazardous during the winter. Because of the limited amount of traffic that currently uses the road, vehicles with a minimum of all wheel drive are usually able to maintain traction on the snow. However, if Taroka becomes overused, the snow will become compacted until it will eventually turn into hard packed ice. If the use becomes so great that cars end up idling on the slope waiting for their turn to enter Chena Ridge, the heat from their engine and mufflers will melt the top layer creating the sorts of super slick conditions found at the larger intersections in town. This would be very dangerous on the steep incline. 2. There is no leveled off area at the bottom of Taroka. There is no area where drivers have an opportunity to regain traction if the conditions caused by overuse cause their vehicle to slide down the steep slope. They will end up sliding into the turning radius of cars turning left from Chena Ridge, or even onto Chena Ridge Road itself. 3. The traffic on Chena Ridge is often travelling at 55 miles per hour. 3. The final 20 feet for traffic turning right when leaving Taroka is exceptionally steep, and because of the hairpin geometry, there is a steep sideways banking twist. For vehicles with stiff suspensions or long wheelbases, this causes the tires on opposing corners to begin lifting up off of the ground, severely limiting traction. For this reason, the residents understand from experience that this must be approached very SLOWLY, being especially mindful of any traffic that might be attempting to turn left onto Taroka. 4. The hairpin geometry of the intersection will entice uninitiated, lazy, or hasty drivers turning left onto Taroka from Chena Ridge to cut to the inside corner of the turn. This will be especially enticing to drivers that don't want to come to a stop if traffic is coming downhill on Chena Ridge. Uninitiated drivers travelling in either direction on Chena Ridge, might want to enter Taroka quickly. If it turns out that the driver coming down Chena Ridge is intending to enter Taroka instead of continuing down Chena ridge, at the same time a driver is attempting a left in time to beat the downhill driver, the results could be catastrophic. 	<p>Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivides. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
366	2/3/2023	Email	Bruce	Ha		<p>their momentum to make it up that first steep portion. It is almost impossible for two wheel drive vehicles to make it up that steep portion in the winter without using momentum to make it. Aside from the obvious risks associated with relying on momentum to make it up, the road is not banked in such a way that would do anything to prevent drivers who attempt to use too much momentum from sliding off the edge. I don't believe that any of the residents of Taroka use two wheel drive vehicles during the winter because they understand the limitations and don't want to rely on momentum to make it up.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 6. Because the orientation of Taroka is in such alignment with Chena Ridge Road, from the top of the steep slope, it may appear to uninitiated drivers that Chena Ridge Road is actually a continuation of Taroka. Even if drivers are able to see any signage warning of an intersection, because of the visual alignment, they might assume that any other traffic is supposed to yield the right of way and allow them to continue straight onto Chena Ridge. 7. For residents who are familiar with the road, who have learned the particular limitations and risks with the road, who understand the importance of yielding to an oncoming neighbor in various scenarios, and who have the appropriate vehicles and possibly even tire chains if needed, they can usually navigate the road in all but the worst conditions (wash outs). But all of their understanding, caution, and preparations might be of no use if Taroka becomes an overused, icy, slick thoroughfare with uninitiated drivers led there by Google Maps. <p>I invite you to take this list of concerns and visit Taroka Drive and see for yourself what I am trying to explain here. A good look around is more valuable than a thousand words. Taroka was never designed to be a connector. Whatever benefits might be gained by having another way out of Taroka, they are far outweighed by the additional risks. The funds that would be needed to make roads 151, and 366 would be far better spent on improving the well documented existing deficiencies that currently exist on Taroka Drive.</p>	<p>Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivides. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
366	1/22/2023	Email	Sharon	McLeod		<p>Regarding Number 366 on that map, I am curious about the terrain that road covers. Is it an existing road that serves houses already built, or is it going to serve vacant land?</p>	<p>Like all proposed corridors in the plan, Corridor 366 would only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide. If that does occur, it would provide access to those new developable lots. The Roads Plan team completed an engineering analysis of the topography that Corridor 366 crosses, and the corridor is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment based on on-the-ground survey data during the platting process.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
366	2/10/2023	Email	Tim	Coahran		<p>I am writing in opposition to two proposed roads in my neighborhood (within the Becker Ridge Road Service Area): numbers 151 & 366. These have been argued and defeated repeatedly in the past, and have been considered impractical to build because of steep terrain.</p> <p>The proposals would connect our existing tiny mud & gravel roads, Taroka and Ida, to the much larger arterial - Becker Ridge Road. This would create a slightly shorter route between the city and a large portion of the Cripple Creek area. We reasonably expect that it would immediately become a through corridor, and dump heavy traffic loads onto our existing little roads, which are nowhere near capable of handling such. Our roads were "grandfathered" and are far from compliant with today's Title 17 road building standards. There is a steep icy (shaded) drop into a nonstandard intersection with the busy Chena Ridge arterial. This is already a traffic hazard, and would become much worse.</p> <p>Also, if I understand correctly, part of the land traversed by Taroka doesn't even belong to the Borough.</p> <p>The heavy traffic of proposed roads 151 & 366 would destroy the quiet character of our neighborhood - which is the reason I bought my home here in the first place. They would cut through pristine forest where local residents hike and recreate.</p> <p>Many of the local residents do not want more roads. If these could be recharacterized as non-motorized trails, there might be broader support.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
366	2/10/2023	Email	James	Foelsch		<p>[several photos are included in the email message of this comment]</p> <p>We have lived on Taroka road for over 30 years. It as an unsafe (4 wheel drive required) road most of the year and it takes knowledge and skill to navigate it. There are several blind corners, no shoulders, no guard rails and is at the widest 18' (See Stuzmann Engineering report 2007) which reduces dramatically during the winter months when it is often one lane. I, and my neighbors, know the rules of the road and stop and pull over when passing another vehicle. We also require water and fuel trucks to deliver services which makes it even more of a safety hazard.</p> <p>This is what Taroka Road looked like this past winter (courtesy of Jane Hannah) ...</p> <p>The failed culvert at the beginning of the road resulted in a hole that was the entire width of the road and at least a foot deep. It was very difficult to slowly go through it and still have enough power to get out of the other side. I had to take my van in to have the front end repaired as a result.</p> <p>This was the top of the hill leading to another 16% grade one lane road ...</p> <p>Page 17 of the Comprehensive Roads Plan FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan: Official Maps and Policies states that future road corridor selection would:</p> <p>"Be reasonable/feasible to construct"</p> <p>"Road grade- have a road grade <10%"</p> <p>"Intersection grade- have an intersection grade <4% or 6% for through-road"</p> <p>What Jane outlined in her response to you is correct. It is clearly evident that neither Taroka Dr or Ida Ln can handle additional traffic if the proposed "minor collector roads 155 and 366" were constructed as outlined. The data will show that the roads are not reasonable or feasible and road grades are greater than 16% on Taroka and Ida, not the <10% that the policies require.</p> <p>There are several facts about Taroka Road that we would like to reiterate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The start of Taroka Road is a 16% grade. School buses stop at the bottom of it and most of the winter it is very difficult to go slow enough to not slide down onto Chena Ridge Road. A very dangerous situation! Only one car at a time can go down the hill and in the event that a car is coming up the hill we wait before going down to Chena Ridge Road. We have also not been able to power up the hill without sliding and have ended up sideways on numerous occasion, especially if trying to make the 120 degree hairpin turn coming from down Chena Ridge Road. 2. Then comes the intersection of Ida Road. It is a blind intersection from both sides with Ida having a stop sign. We on Taroka know to slow to a stop and look behind us before continuing down the hill because sometimes the cars coming down Ida either don't or can't stop at the sign due to icy conditions. 3. Around the next blind corner is the culvert problem ... a dangerous hazard. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
367	2/11/2023	Email	James	Foelsch		<p>4. The next section starts the 10.7% - 15.5% downhill to the switchback where "151" would intersect with Taroka. This was washed out to a one lane road due to bad drainage and is still not fixed.</p> <p>5. The remainder of the road to the bottom of the hill has a measured 16.6 grade that is very difficult to climb and must be done at maximum speed or your vehicle will not make it through the switchback - the very point where "151" would intersect. Many cars have not made the turn and end up sliding backward off the edge of the road - the very point where "151" would intersect.</p> <p>6. FNSB code 17.60.130, Right-Of-Way-Trafficway Width requires a minor collector to be a minimum of 20' with 2' minimum shoulders. Taroka Drive is 14'-18' wide in the summer months and often one lane in the winter months. There is no shoulder either side the entire length of the road. Both roads do not meet borough code and should not be connected to "minor collector roads 151 & 366"</p> <p>7. The entirety of Taroka Drive and Ida Road would have to be upgraded before any connection could be made and therefore this is not reasonable or feasible. Is the road grade 10% and the intersection road grade <4% or 6% for a through-road?</p> <p>The answer is no. Taroka Dr begins at Chena Ridge with a short, steep, dangerous 16% grade which then intersects with Ida Ln at a blind curve. The hill on Taroka Dr which would connect to "minor collector road 151" was measured by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 to have roadgrades of 15.5% on the north side of the switchback and 16.6% on the south side of the proposed intersection which violates both the road grade and intersection policies. The connection of "minor collectors 151 and 366" is dangerous and an extreme hazard to both Ida Ln and Taroka Dr residents.</p> <p>In addition, Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are not FNSB platted borough roads where they intersect each other and Chena Ridge Rd. The Comprehensive Road Plans map that was sent to my home announcing the proposed new corridors does not have Taroka Dr and Ida Ln connecting to Chena Ridge Rd at all. The map shows the proposed minor collector roads connecting to Taroka Dr and Ida Ln and then simply ending with no further connection to any road on the map. I would appreciate legal clarification of this area of your road map.</p> <p>In conclusion, Becker Ridge Rd is classified as a "major collector". Proposed roads "151 and 366" are classified as "minor collectors" and Chena Ridge Road is classified as "arterial". These roads would be connected by way of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln which are not borough platted roads and don't meet any requirements in terms of road width, shoulders, road grade, intersection grade or road condition. This road planning is a serious hazard to residential health and well being.</p> <p>We oppose the proposed "minor collector roads 151 and 366" for the safety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents. We submit that roads 151 and 366 be officially removed from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan.</p> <p>We also formally request a community meeting to discuss the proposed plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
366	2/10/2023	Email	Carolyn	Foelsch		<p>[several photos are included in the email message of this comment]</p> <p>We have lived on Taroka road for over 30 years. It as an unsafe (4 wheel drive required) road most of the year and it takes knowledge and skill to navigate it. There are several blind corners, no shoulders, no guard rails and is at the widest 18' (See Stuzmann Engineering report 2007) which reduces dramatically during the winter months when it is often one lane. I, and my neighbors, know the rules of the road and stop and pull over when passing another vehicle. We also require water and fuel trucks to deliver services which makes it even more of a safety hazard.</p> <p>This is what Taroka Road looked like this past winter (courtesy of Jane Hannah) ...</p> <p>The failed culvert at the beginning of the road resulted in a hole that was the entire width of the road and at least a foot deep. It was very difficult to slowly go through it and still have enough power to get out of the other side. I had to take my van in to have the front end repaired as a result.</p> <p>This was the top of the hill leading to another 16% grade one lane road ...</p> <p>Page 17 of the Comprehensive Roads Plan FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan: Official Maps and Policies states that future road corridor selection would:</p> <p>"Be reasonable/feasible to construct"</p> <p>"Road grade- have a road grade <10%"</p> <p>"Intersection grade- have an intersection grade <4% or 6% for through-road"</p> <p>What Jane outlined in her response to you is correct. It is clearly evident that neither Taroka Dr or Ida Ln can handle additional traffic if the proposed "minor collector roads 155 and 366" were constructed as outlined. The data will show that the roads are not reasonable or feasible and road grades are greater than 16% on Taroka and Ida, not the <10% that the policies require.</p> <p>There are several facts about Taroka Road that we would like to reiterate:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The start of Taroka Road is a 16% grade. School buses stop at the bottom of it and most of the winter it is very difficult to go slow enough to not slide down onto Chena Ridge Road. A very dangerous situation! Only one car at a time can go down the hill and in the event that a car is coming up the hill we wait before going down to Chena Ridge Road. We have also not been able to power up the hill without sliding and have ended up sideways on numerous occasion, especially if trying to make the 120 degree hairpin turn coming from down Chena Ridge Road. 2. Then comes the intersection of Ida Road. It is a blind intersection from both sides with Ida having a stop sign. We on Taroka know to slow to a stop and look behind us before continuing down the hill because sometimes the cars coming down Ida either don't or can't stop at the sign due to icy conditions. 3. Around the next blind corner is the culvert problem ... a dangerous hazard. 	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
367	2/11/2023	Email	Carolyn	Foelsch		<p>4. The next section starts the 10.7% - 15.5% downhill to the switchback where "151" would intersect with Taroka. This was washed out to a one lane road due to bad drainage and is still not fixed.</p> <p>5. The remainder of the road to the bottom of the hill has a measured 16.6 grade that is very difficult to climb and must be done at maximum speed or your vehicle will not make it through the switchback - the very point where "151" would intersect. Many cars have not made the turn and end up sliding backward off the edge of the road - the very point where "151" would intersect.</p> <p>6. FNSB code 17.60.130, Right-Of-Way-Trafficway Width requires a minor collector to be a minimum of 20' with 2' minimum shoulders. Taroka Drive is 14'-18' wide in the summer months and often one lane in the winter months. There is no shoulder either side the entire length of the road. Both roads do not meet borough code and should not be connected to "minor collector roads 151 & 366"</p> <p>7. The entirety of Taroka Drive and Ida Road would have to be upgraded before any connection could be made and therefore this is not reasonable or feasible. Is the road grade 10% and the intersection road grade <4% or 6% for a through-road?</p> <p>The answer is no. Taroka Dr begins at Chena Ridge with a short, steep, dangerous 16% grade which then intersects with Ida Ln at a blind curve. The hill on Taroka Dr which would connect to "minor collector road 151" was measured by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 to have roadgrades of 15.5% on the north side of the switchback and 16.6% on the south side of the proposed intersection which violates both the road grade and intersection policies. The connection of "minor collectors 151 and 366" is dangerous and an extreme hazard to both Ida Ln and Taroka Dr residents.</p> <p>In addition, Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are not FNSB platted borough roads where they intersect each other and Chena Ridge Rd. The Comprehensive Road Plans map that was sent to my home announcing the proposed new corridors does not have Taroka Dr and Ida Ln connecting to Chena Ridge Rd at all. The map shows the proposed minor collector roads connecting to Taroka Dr and Ida Ln and then simply ending with no further connection to any road on the map. I would appreciate legal clarification of this area of your road map.</p> <p>In conclusion, Becker Ridge Rd is classified as a "major collector". Proposed roads "151 and 366" are classified as "minor collectors" and Chena Ridge Road is classified as "arterial". These roads would be connected by way of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln which are not borough platted roads and don't meet any requirements in terms of road width, shoulders, road grade, intersection grade or road condition. This road planning is a serious hazard to residential health and well being.</p> <p>We oppose the proposed "minor collector roads 151 and 366" for the safety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents. We submit that roads 151 and 366 be officially removed from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan.</p> <p>We also formally request a community meeting to discuss the proposed plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>
366	2/9/2023	Email	Glenna	Gannon		<p>I am writing to submit my concerns regarding the proposed roads: 151 and 366 from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan.</p> <p>As a resident of Taroka Drive, I have several concerns regarding the safety and feasibility of the proposed roads. Taroka drive and Ida lane are small, and extremely steep roads with poor road conditions and receive little regular road service throughout the year. These roads were NOT designed to nor would they be able to support the increased traffic from Beck Ridge. Residents of this neighborhood do not wish to have increased traffic routed through our quiet neighborhood which would endanger those of us who use the road for walking with our families and pets.</p> <p>It is unclear why the borough is proposing two major road construction projects in a steep area that also contain a major water drainage for the converging ridge-lines. There is no community or emergency responder (safety agencies) call for this development, and, arguably it would be more disruptive to existing neighborhoods, and create more dangerous and unsafe road conditions locally. Furthermore, why these two large road projects are being proposed while there is the potential to spend a fraction of that development cost purchasing rights to, and developing a small connector corridor between Becker Ridge and North Becker Ridge roads as a way to create access to Chena Ridge (if this is absolutely necessary) is a less expensive and safer route option given the natural terrain.</p> <p>Ultimately, Becker Ridge road is classified as a "major collector". The Proposed roads "151 and 366" are classified as "minor collectors" and Chena Ridge Road is classified as "arterial". These larger roads would be connected by way of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln which are not borough platted roads and don't meet any requirements in terms of road width, shoulders, road grade, intersection grade or road condition. These proposed roads not only present major financial undertaking to construct, but would introduce serious hazard to residential health and well being.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose the proposed development of "minor collector roads 151 and 366" for the safety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents and those who would use these roads to access Chena Ride/ Becker Ridge. I submit that roads 151 and 366 be officially removed from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan, and would like to formally request a community meeting to discuss the proposed plans.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
366	2/6/2023	Email	Jane	Hannah		<p>[Several photos are included in the email message of this comment] I am writing in opposition to proposed "minor collector roads 151 and 366".</p> <p>Page 17 of the Comprehensive Roads Plan FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan: Official Maps and Policies states that future road corridor selection would: *"Be reasonable/feasible to construct" *"Road grade- have a road grade <10%" *"Intersection grade- have an intersection grade <4% or 6% for through-road"</p> <p>It was helpful talking to Natalie and Patrick at the informational meeting on 1/23/23. As promised, I have attached the Taroka Dr photos #1-14 that I took in 2007 and was showing Natalie and Patrick at the meeting. Photos #15-18 were taken on Taroka Dr in winter 2022 which clearly depict the total deterioration of the roadbed during the last 15 years and the dangerous driving conditions residents face. Ida Lane is in similar poor condition as well. It is clearly evident that neither Taroka Dr or Ida Ln can handle additional traffic if the proposed "minor collector roads 155 and 366" were constructed as outlined. The data will show that the roads are not reasonable or feasible and road grades are greater than 16% on Taroka and Ida, not the <10% that the policies require. A description of the photos follows: #1. This photo is taken from Chena Ridge Rd at the start of Taroka Dr. This hill is a 16% grade and difficult to power up during winter conditions with 4wheel drive and winter tires. Both Taroka Dr and Ida Ln exit to Chena Ridge Rd on this hill and require 4wheel drive most of the year. #2. This photo shows the same hill looking down onto Chena Ridge. The school bus stop is dangerously located at the bottom of this steep hill at the stop sign with a very short landing. In addition, traffic approaching Taroka Dr from Chena Pump Rd must make a 120 degree left turn around the corner at high speed to power up the hill successfully on the deteriorated soft roadbed in summer and the ice in winter. #3. This photo shows the blind approach down to Chena Ridge. Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents know to stop and wait at the top of this hill and visually scan the Chena Ridge curve for oncoming traffic before continuing. If traffic is seen on Chena Ridge or making the turn onto Taroka Dr, we know to yield to the coming traffic. Residents frequently slide down the hill onto Chena Ridge Rd due to the steep grade and icy conditions. It is often impossible to stop at the stop sign.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
366	2/9/2023	Email	William	Montano		I would agree with mark 366 151 should be eliminated	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
366	2/10/2023	Email	Scott	Collier-Sanuki		<p>Thank you for leading public involvement for the FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan. We did not participate in the Community Open House held on January 21, 2023, as we were not aware of it until afterwards and wish it had been advertised more widely to the public and all who would be affected.</p> <p>We are writing to you because we oppose the proposed two Minor Collectors: #151 and #366. The former connects Becker Ridge Rd to Taroka Drive, which runs below our property, and the latter connects Becker Ridge Rd to Ida Drive, which runs above our property. The two small, ill maintained, difficult roads then merge just before Taroka Drive meets Chena Ridge Rd. As they are, these two roads are dangerous and so problematic that USPS mail carriers refuse to deliver mail and packages. Any delivery person would say that it is one of the worst roads, if not the worst, in the area. In fact, Taroka Dr. is only 15ft wide in places, and does not even meet the FNSB Code's requirement of 20ft width with minimum shoulder of 2ft for minor collectors.</p> <p>Please do not make the condition of Taroka Dr. and Ida Dr. worse than they are by funneling yet more traffic onto them. If there is a need for Becker Ridge Road to connect to Chena Ridge Road, the borough would definitely want to consider re-opening the connecting area between Becker Ridge Road and North Becker Ridge Road. They are much wider and safer roads than Taroka Dr. The Comprehensive Roads Plan seems to indicate that this connection is already a Major Collector; however, it is currently not a through road. There is no traffic access between Becker Ridge Rd and North Becker Ridge Rd, and in fact North Becker Ridge Rd is posted 'No Trespassing' near the entrance from Chena Ridge Rd., blocking any part of it from public use.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
366	2/10/2023	Email	Yoko	Collier-Sanuki		<p>Thank you for leading public involvement for the FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan. We did not participate in the Community Open House held on January 21, 2023, as we were not aware of it until afterwards and wish it had been advertised more widely to the public and all who would be affected.</p> <p>We are writing to you because we oppose the proposed two Minor Collectors: #151 and #366. The former connects Becker Ridge Rd to Taroka Drive, which runs below our property, and the latter connects Becker Ridge Rd to Ida Drive, which runs above our property. The two small, ill maintained, difficult roads then merge just before Taroka Drive meets Chena Ridge Rd. As they are, these two roads are dangerous and so problematic that USPS mail carriers refuse to deliver mail and packages. Any delivery person would say that it is one of the worst roads, if not the worst, in the area. In fact, Taroka Dr. is only 15ft wide in places, and does not even meet the FNSB Code's requirement of 20ft width with minimum shoulder of 2ft for minor collectors.</p> <p>Please do not make the condition of Taroka Dr. and Ida Dr. worse than they are by funneling yet more traffic onto them. If there is a need for Becker Ridge Road to connect to Chena Ridge Road, the borough would definitely want to consider re-opening the connecting area between Becker Ridge Road and North Becker Ridge Road. They are much wider and safer roads than Taroka Dr. The Comprehensive Roads Plan seems to indicate that this connection is already a Major Collector; however, it is currently not a through road. There is no traffic access between Becker Ridge Rd and North Becker Ridge Rd, and in fact North Becker Ridge Rd is posted 'No Trespassing' near the entrance from Chena Ridge Rd., blocking any part of it from public use.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
366	1/22/2023	Public meeting sticky note	Kathy	Bertram		Own 6 acres, no intention of subdividing. Back onto Becker Ridge. Literally runs through our house and has been there for 60 years. Extremely steep. Ida - less than 20 feet wide - minor collectors into dirt road? Why?	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 366 would only be constructed if the owners of that parcel decide to subdivide. It does not currently cross the existing residential structure on the parcel as aligned in the plan. Corridor 366 is feasible to construct given adjustments based on survey data during the subdivision process, based on an engineering analysis.
366	1/23/2023	Public meeting sticky note	Mark	Bertram		Own 6 acres, no intention of subdividing. Back onto Becker Ridge. Literally runs through our house and has been there for 60 years. Extremely steep. Ida - less than 20 feet wide - minor collectors into dirt road? Why?	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 366 would only be constructed if the owners of that parcel decide to subdivide. It does not currently cross the existing residential structure on the parcel as aligned in the plan. Corridor 366 is feasible to construct given adjustments based on survey data during the subdivision process, based on an engineering analysis.
366	1/24/2023	Public meeting sticky note	Dave	Ferree		Becker Ridge - Ridge of BLM land should not be developed roads. Residents currently maintain the road - can't candle the additional traffic. BLM has not done anything to maintain. Slow development - If these routes were in RSA then that would change the game ...	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 366 would only be constructed if the owners of that parcel decide to subdivide. It is likely feasible to construct given adjustments based on survey data during the subdivision process, based on an engineering analysis. If developed, the road would need to be adopted into an existing service area for road maintenance, which would also bring additional revenue into the adopting RSA as new homes are developed.
369	2/9/2023	Email	Jane	Hannah		<p>The hill on Taroka Dr which would connect to "minor collector road 151" was measured by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 to have roadgrades of 15.5% on the north side of the switchback and 16.6% on the south side of the proposed intersection which violates both the road grade and intersection policies. The connection of "minor collectors 151 and 366" is dangerous and an extreme hazard to both Ida Ln and Taroka Dr residents.</p> <p>In addition, Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are not FNSB platted borough roads where they intersect each other and Chena Ridge Rd. The Comprehensive Road Plans map that was sent to my home announcing the proposed new corridors does not have Taroka Dr and Ida Ln connecting to Chena Ridge Rd at all. The map shows the proposed minor collector roads connecting to Taroka Dr and Ida Ln and then simply ending with no further connection to any road on the map. I would appreciate legal clarification of this area of your road map.</p> <p>In conclusion, Becker Ridge Rd is classified as a "major collector". Proposed roads "151 and 366" are classified as "minor collectors" and Chena Ridge Road is classified as "arterial". These roads would be connected by way of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln which are not borough platted roads and don't meet any requirements in terms of road width, shoulders, road grade, intersection grade or road condition. This road planning is a serious hazard to residential health and well being.</p> <p>I vehemently oppose the proposed "minor collector roads 151 and 366" for the safety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln residents. I submit that roads 151 and 366 be officially removed from the FNSB Road Corridor and Functional Classification Plan.</p> <p>I also formally request a community meeting to discuss the proposed plans.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
367	2/7/2023	Email	Jane	Hannah		<p>#4. This photo shows Ida Lane intersecting with Taroka Dr at the top of the hill. There is a stop sign now at the end of Ida Ln. This is a hazardous totally blind intersection and residents of Ida Lane have to physically slowly inch onto Taroka Dr before they can see if the road is clear because of the opposing slope of Taroka Drive and the angle of the intersection. This is an extremely dangerous intersection.</p> <p>#5 and #6. These photos show the Ida Lane intersection taken from Taroka Dr as it approaches Chena Ridge Rd. The steep grade of Ida Ln is visible on the left in photo #5 in front of the house. The blind intersection is clearly apparent due to the steepness of Ida Lane and the angle of the intersection. These photos portray the wooden stakes across the road which measure the width of Taroka Dr at only 15ft with no shoulders whatsoever as one approaches this Ida Lane intersection. In the winter, the roadway width is much narrower due to snow banks.</p> <p>#7 and #8. These photos depict the blind curve on Taroka Dr adjacent to the Ida Ln intersection. The road sign is visible in photo #8. This curve becomes flooded during breakup or heavy rain which narrows the roadway to one lane.</p> <p>#9 and #10. Taroka Dr is measuring 15ft 9in at the driveway of 1592 Taroka Dr. Wooden stakes with measuring tape are visible just beyond the driveway in photo #9.</p> <p>#11. This photo shows two cars passing each other on a dry roadbed. In winter months Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are both one lane roads. Cars on both roads must stop and pull over at driveways to pass one another along the entire length of both roads. Water trucks and fuel trucks frequent both roads and are a serious hazard all year long.</p> <p>#12. The start of the downhill where Taroka Dr would connect with proposed "minor collector 151". The road grade has been measured by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 as 10.7% to 15.5% as Taroka Dr approaches the switchback. The road width was measured at 18 ft at the start of the downhill narrowing to 14 ft at the switchback where "151" would intersect. The road then continues downhill with a measured 16.6% grade and a width as narrow as 14ft. In winter months the residents who must drive from the south up this grade must power around the corner at approx 20 mph to continue up the hill. It is at this very point that "151" would intersect. It would be impossible to yield at the proposed intersection without sliding back down the hill. There are no guard rails at any point on Taroka Dr and cars have slid over the edge of this hill. A State Trooper refused to respond to a car that had slid off the road over the edge, saying there was no guard rail and the road was too dangerous to respond to the accident.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
368	2/8/2023	Email	Jane	Hannah		<p>#13 and #14. This is the view from the switchback looking up at the top of the steep grade. The stake measurement in photo #13 measures the width at 17ft 5in. No shoulders.</p> <p>#15-18. These photos depict the condition of Taroka Dr in 2022 in winter conditions.</p> <p>*The first photo shows the blind curve with flooding reducing the roadway to one lane as described in photo #8. A car needed to be towed out of the overflow. Mail service to Taroka Dr was halted for a week as the road was deemed too dangerous.</p> <p>*The second photo shows the 16.6% grade on the downhill after the switchback. As clearly seen, the roadbed has deteriorated from the 2007 photos and is now mud and sand. 4wheel Drive is necessary year round to navigate this hill which is often one lane. The road width by Stuzmann Engineering Assoc in 2007 was measured as 14 feet before the pictured mailbox.</p> <p>*The third photo shows the one lane road conditions and deteriorated roadbed that is now sand and mud with no remaining topcoat or gravel.</p> <p>*The fourth photo shows the road damage from winter runoff on the hill where the proposed "minor collector 151" would intersect at the switchback.</p> <p>In summary, are proposed roads "minor collector 151 and 366" reasonable and feasible? The photos, data and residents testimony show they are not. A similar proposed road connecting to Taroka was deemed impossible in 2007 "and engineering data has shown that this connection cannot be safely constructed without reconstructing the entirety of Taroka Dr". The photos demonstrate that the roadbed on Taroka Dr has deteriorated significantly since 2007. Taroka Dr and Ida Ln are dangerous roads navigated by residents who know each other and the intricacies of the road, so we drive slowly and cautiously. Being one lane much of the year due to snow banks and mud, we know to pull over to pass at driveways and we yield to traffic navigating the hills. Water trucks and fuel trucks frequent the road and are hazardous with the limited road traffic at present. Neither road can handle additional traffic. In addition, Taroka Drive and Ida Ln are too narrow with no shoulders. FNSB code 17.60.130, Right-of-Way -Trafficway Width requires a minor collector to be a minimum width of 20 ft with 2 ft minimum shoulders. Taroka Dr as documented in photos is 14-18 feet wide in the summer months and often one lane in winter months. There is no shoulder on either side the entire length. Both roads currently do not meet borough code and therefore should not be connected to "minor collector roads 151 and 366". The entirety of Taroka Dr and Ida Ln would have to be upgraded before any connection could be made and therefore this is not reasonable or feasible. Is the road grade 10% and the intersection road grade <4% or 6% for a through-road? The answer is no. Taroka Dr begins at Chena Ridge with a short, steep, dangerous 16% grade which then intersects with Ida Ln at a blind curve.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 366 will only be developed if the parcels it crosses are subdivided by the property owners. Based on an engineering analysis and site visit, 366 is feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments to alignment during the subdivision and platting process. Corridor 151 has been removed from the plan due to topographical challenges and feasibility concerns brought up by the community and verified through engineering analysis and a site visit.
372	2/1/2023	Paper Form	Bruce	Bridwell		This is not preferred but does make sense to create additional second way out of the Moose Mtn residential area. Perhaps another route following the trail from Monte Verde cul-de-sac to Waldheim might make sense.	A connection between the end of Monteverde and the Waldheim cul-de-sac was considered but would be too steep in grade to meet FNSB road standards. Corridor 372 is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
372	1/22/2023	Email	Greg	Grajew	GMC RSA Commissioner	<p>As we discussed, here are my comments as one of the Road Service Commissioners for the Goldstream Moose Creek (GMC) subdivision. Our Service Area covers 11.8 miles with around 500 residents spanning Moose Mtn. and tributaries as well as down Spinach Creek: Hardluck, Photon, Keystone and Frenchman.</p> <p>If the main effort of this "plan" is to provide alternate exits for single egress roads, the proposed 273 and 372 "minor collector" as mentioned in the map below do not provide any alleviation for us should our main "escape" route down Moose Mtn. be blocked. I don't know where the other end of 273 terminates but FYI the Old Murphy Dome Road is not maintained in winter. If you propose that in 20 years this may change, the way off this mountain would be what? 20 miles to Fox, a proposed link up to 372 down an imaginary tie-in to Coyote Trail or Jones Road? Both of those roads are in bad shape, not to mention that to accomplish this you would need to traverse existing hiking trails, private lands, GVEA power lines and right of way, permafrost and at the end, those roads are no more capable of handling the proposed increase traffic than we can. Minor collector 372 ending at the cul de sac on Monteverde East will saturate it while providing no alleviation to residents requiring an alternate "escape route" should Moose Mtn. be blocked.</p> <p>Given current resources (yearly budget), we barely manage to maintain the roads in our service area. We currently have around 111 households on Moose Mtn. and tributaries, representing 57.2% of all residents in our service area.</p> <p>Our primary concern is safety and maintaining these roads accessible year round. The proposal to, down the road, plan on adding more houses (that will then have to be included in an as yet TBD Service Area) not to mention the road destruction incurred by heavy equipment coming up Moose Mtn., and Monteverde East to "lay" these roads make it untenable for this Service Area. Personally I don't see adding 50 or more homes to our existing service area feasible. Additionally, should the proposed new subdivision be in another service area, we wouldn't get any compensation for the increase road use. I'm not sure what the general Road Commissioners consensus would be, but personally, I'm not interested in doubling my workload especially since I see no benefit for the residents of Monteverde East nor our Service Area.</p> <p>My conclusion is that this plan provides absolutely no benefits to our Service Area, from either a safety, road service manageability or quality of life approach and I'm therefore against this proposal as what concerns "minor collector" 273 and 372.</p>	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of additional road miles.
372	1/21/2023	Email	Rodney	Guritz		Like 273, development of this route would put undue pressure on Moose Mountain and Monteverde Road, which as stated for 273 is a safety issue. Moose Mountain cannot sustain a dramatic increase in traffic without widening and other improvements, at great expense. Route 372 must either cross steep grades or wrap around northeast facing slopes. Connections to Waldheim, Jones, or Old Murphy Dome may not be practical. However, at least this route does not conflict with a popular trail.	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
372	2/4/2023	Email	Linda	DeFoliart		<p>I hike extensively in this area and a lot of this terrain seems unsuitable for a sustainable road. For example you have Windy Creek and O'Connor Creek with slopes that, from the vegetation, appear to be underlain with permafrost. My concern here is the quality of the area roads. Ivory and Jones Rd are terrible during break-up and much of the summer - it lasts for months and at times are barely drive-able with anything but a high-clearance 4WD. After a snowfall, it can take a few days for these roads to be plowed. I don't know if the problem is money or if M&M Construction is spread too thinly. But I don't see how adding more roads and more traffic is going to do anything but make this already sketchy situation intolerable. I would need to see absolute figures and get assurances from our road commissioner that what you propose is feasible and won't make the current situation any worse. From the comments Greg Grajew (Moose Mt road commissioner) made during the open house, he has the same concerns I do.</p> <p>I understand the Borough wanting to develop property but please consider the comments of the people who live here and use these roads every day.</p>	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
372	1/21/2023	Email	Rodney	Guritz		Like 273, development of this route would put undue pressure on Moose Mountain and Monteverde Road, which as stated for 273 is a safety issue. Moose Mountain cannot sustain a dramatic increase in traffic without widening and other improvements, at great expense. Route 372 must either cross steep grades or wrap around northeast facing slopes. Connections to Waldheim, Jones, or Old Murphy Dome may not be practical. However, at least this route does not conflict with a popular trail.	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
372	1/19/2023	Paper Form	William	Hao Jr		Increased traffic on Monteverde Rd. creates a safety hazard. Goldstream Moose Creek Service Area cannot accommodate it. This will divert attention from roads in the Spinach Creek Subdivision.	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
372	1/22/2023	Email	Felix	Krause	road commissioner	<p>My name is T.-Felix Krause. For 21 years I have lived at 3655 Keystone Road (99709) and currently I am serving as a road commissioner of this subdivision. With much concern I have followed the newest "Future Road Corridor"-Plan that FNSB is proposing.</p> <p>I do not know if you are aware that the maintenance of Moose Mountain Road (collector road) has been a point of contention for many years. Moose Mountain Road has very steep sections as well as sections with reduced sight visibility. In addition, the road has very steep embankments with dangerous unprotected drop-offs and no shoulder. Although the service area has spent a substantial part of its budget maintaining and upgrading this road, those expenses just were enough to keep the road from "falling apart". What do I mean by "falling apart"? Due to its steep sections and weak subbase every year washing-board patterns make the driving difficult. In addition pot holes open up, the fast flowing run-off washes out the road and takes away the surface layer. In other, not so steep sections, we encounter reappearing mud holes.</p> <p>As of now the neighbors have put up with this less than ideal situation but any more traffic generated by road extensions 273 & 372 will break the delicate and fragile balance that we have tried to achieve in the last years. Until now the neighbors mostly have been willing to live with a mostly substandard road. It is hard to imagine that in the future, when the roads are being extended and the traffic flow increases, the road service area will be able to keep up with maintenance and safety of Moose Mountain Road any longer!</p> <p>If the FNSB is willing to pave Moose Mountain Road and install guard rails I could see a feasible way forward. Otherwise we will be creating a sore and never healing wound, no matter how much bandages we/you stick on.</p> <p>thank you for your consideration</p>	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.
372	2/8/2023	Email	Briana	Franz		<p>I am writing to state I am against the proposed road plan, specifically #273 and #372. These roads will significantly impact the recreational trail system used by hikers, skiers, walkers, dog mushers, bikers, and snow machines . Building a road here would destroy the value of these trails used year round by local residents.</p> <p>Furthermore, I am also concerned with the ability for moose mountain to be able to sustain increased traffic volume of these added roads. Moose mountain already has difficulty sustaining the level of traffic it receives. Not only is the road quality a concern but the safety of those driving it as well. Moose mountain is a narrow and steep road that sees vehicles going off the road both to the up and downhill sides of the mountain. Increased traffic will create increased risk for accidents to both residents and skiers using the buses for recreation.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles. Trail and road conflicts in this area can be mitigated through a planned shared trail/road corridor, as also noted in the Trails Plan.
372	2/9/2023	Web Form	Stephanie	Wight		<p>I am writing to state that I am against the proposed road plan, specifically #273 and #372. These roads will significantly impact the recreational trail system used by hikers, skiers, walkers, dog mushers, bikers, and snow machiners . Building a road here would destroy the value of these trails used year round by local residents.</p> <p>Furthermore, I am also concerned with the ability for moose mountain to be able to sustain increased traffic volume of these added roads. Moose mountain already has difficulty sustaining the level of traffic it receives. Not only is the road quality a concern but the safety of those driving it as well. Moose mountain is a narrow and steep road that sees vehicles going off the road both to the up and downhill sides of the mountain. Increased traffic will create increased risk for accidents to both residents and skiers using the buses for recreation. Road #273 and #372 would negatively impact current residents on moose mountain.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration.</p>	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles. Trail and road conflicts in this area can be mitigated through a planned shared trail/road corridor, as also noted in the Trails Plan.
372	2/7/2023	Email	Kristy	Howk		<p>As a resident of Moose Mountain community, I strongly oppose the design of Collector Roads 273 and 372. As mentioned in other comments, I'm concerned about the safety on our narrow roads which have no shoulders. It is very steep, slippery in the winter months and was not built for through traffic. As it is now, it can be treacherous passing large delivery trucks hauling water and fuel not to mention the ski buses each weekend during winter. Presently, cars and buses have been sliding into the ditches trying to avoid each other. With an increase in through traffic and with the probability of increased traffic speeds and unfamiliarity with local conditions a real safety issue will most likely arise.</p> <p>Presently the local residents enjoy a peacefulness with low traffic where they can walk their children and pets on the road and local drivers are aware and drive slowly. The drivers realize that those walking have no where to get out of their way with no shoulders on the roadway. To build a through road through an existing quiet neighborhood is asking for trouble. Something FNSB should not be encouraging.</p> <p>Another issue that impacts our neighbors as well as others is 273 on the public use trails. A road and a trail would hardly coexist on the same ridge. The proposed collector road has steep grades and heavy drifting which would be very expensive to maintain. We all enjoy this space that we can easily access for recreation and enjoying nature.</p> <p>I would like to see collector 273 and 372 removed from the Comprehensive Roads Plan.</p>	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles. Trail and road conflicts in this area can be mitigated through a planned shared trail/road corridor, as also noted in the Trails Plan.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
372	2/7/2023	Email	Murray	Howk	Commissioner, Goldstream Moose Creek Service Area	<p>In regards to the the Draft FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan connectors 273 and 372 all Road Commissioners contacted from the Goldstream Moose Creek Service Area strongly apposed to the two minor connectors #'s 273 and 372 within our service area.</p> <p>* If developed as designed #273 and #272 will put an unnecessary burden on our limited budget. Through traffic congestion would substantially degrade Moose Mountain and Monteverde roads, creating increased washboarding, pot holes and snow removal on such a steep incline. These problems exist presently. Contractor call outs to repair this increased damage are very expensive.</p> <p>* Safety. Moose Mountain roads narrow width is barely adequate, especially in the winter with steep grades. Due to contractor delays Moose Mountain roads become narrower in winter. The roadway's width is easily compromised with snow berms crowding the center line during winter storms. Downhill traffic must pull over, giving way to ski buses, fuel and water trucks which often have to chain up to access the top of the hill. Buses and cars routinely slide into the steep ditches.</p> <p>* Crime. While not usually considered in road construction design, at present, Moose Mountain enjoys a very low crime rate, which we believe is directly related to not having a connector through road. Anyone considering crime probably knows that there is no outlet and force them to backtrack with a greater chance of being identified.</p> <p>* Public use trail. Increased use of the major public use trail system located on #273, needs careful consideration. This trail system is used by ski, bike, hiking, snowmachining and dog sledding. A connector road must use this same ridge that is presently used for these activities. Parking at the trail head presently uses the existing private road at the top of Moose Mount Rd. This is becoming more of an issue. In winter this trail traditionally requires Old Murphy Dome Road to remain unplowed. If developed a portion of this trail system would be lost.</p> <p>*A better use of the land. Instead of pushing ahead with #273 and #372 a green belt in place of road connectors would make more sense. All borough residents could then benefit from a relatively wild area as it is now. Every parcel of borough land does not need a road running through it.</p>	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles. Trail and road conflicts in this area can be mitigated through a planned shared trail/road corridor, as also noted in the Trails Plan.
372	2/10/2023	Email	Eleanor	Boyce		<p>2.Safety and maintainability considerations [proposed corridors 273, 372] Moose Mountain Road is very narrow with steep drop offs (Kris Howk), and is graded between 8-10% from the intersection at the base to the top of the mountain and can be dangerous to vehicles without chains or studs during spring freeze/thaw cycles (Roger Evans). Increased traffic on it would create a possible safety hazard for the public and land owners (Kris Howk). As I personally own a 4WD vehicle with good traction and studded tires, I find Moose Mountain road to be adequately maintained - by which I mean, for half the summer we deal with washboard and dust, and year-round we experience delays in grading and snow clearing due to limited maintenance funds (understandable) and the FNSB-procured contractor not having adequate staff/equipment to respond promptly. These road conditions persist from year to year despite having a team of engaged, dedicated road commissioners, and are representative of many hillside roads in Goldstream Valley which have similar grades and approaches to maintenance. Any mid-winter freezing rain event (and these are likely to be more frequent in future due to climate change) may require chaining up even a 4WD, studded-tire vehicle until the contractor is available to spread gravel. Added traffic will make Moose Mountain road less safe and more difficult to maintain even to its current standard. I would argue that the page 17 FNSB Future Road Corridor Selection Criteria category "Economic: Feasibility" should not only require that a road be reasonable/feasible to construct, but also that it be reasonable/feasible to maintain.</p>	Corridor 372 will only be constructed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. It is feasible to construct to FNSB road standards based on an engineering analysis and given small adjustments to alignment during the platting and subdivision process. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 372 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles. Trail and road conflicts in this area can be mitigated through a planned shared trail/road corridor, as also noted in the Trails Plan.
372	2/13/2023	Email	Lisa	Jodwalis		<p>First, a big thank you to all of the planning team for your hard work putting the plan together, seeing it through multiple drafts, and engaging in extensive public participation. My comments specifically address the area of Goldstream Valley bounded by Goldstream Road on the south and Old Murphy Dome on the north. My husband and I have lived in the Waldheim Drive neighborhood since 1985 and have used the local trails and neighborhood paths every year since in all seasons. I see that some alterations were made in the final draft. My concerns are with the designation of ANY roads and subdivisions in an area fraught with landscape challenges. These were identified and commented on by area residents as part of the proposed O'Connor Creek Re- Zone in 2018. The Windy Creek drainage is extremely steep and while the draft Roads Plan shows a relocation to a lower elevation (route 372), it still requires winding routes and steep driveways. The O'Connor Creek drainage has extensive permafrost and thaw and erosion are highly visible. Those of us who are long-term residents can point to the obvious signs, many of which have emerged in just the past 5-10 years. Routes 22 and 375 extend Jones Road north and this is probably unsupportable: Windy Creek at the O'Connor Creek Trail crossing suffered a serious erosion event about 4 years ago that created a gully large and deep enough to drop a school bus into. More evidence of erosion and thaw is common along lower Windy Creek and all along the O'Connor Creek Trail as evidenced by leaning trees, deeper dips, and recent gullying. My greatest concern is that the Roads Plan in general advocates for future development in an area that is increasingly at risk from adverse weather events that make maintenance costs prohibitive for road service areas and make emergency evacuation life-threatening. The last decade and especially the last year have seen extreme weather. The 26 December 2022 rain-on-snow event made the entire neighborhood impassable for 2 weeks. The windstorm of 25 July 2022 dropped well over 20 big spruce and birch on Waldheim Drive. In May 2011 the Moose Mountain Fire came terrifyingly close to residences. Although human-caused, the burned area is still highly flammable and the general area sees many lightning strikes each summer. Adding new roads and residences in the Windy and O'Connor Creek drainages will put people at extreme risk, as these situations were not one-off. Unfortunately, I think that the Borough needs to step back from the current plan and evaluate the long-term risks due to climate warming – increased fires, permafrost thaw, heavy rain and snow, and rain-on-snow – for some of these rural areas where emergency response takes longer. As last December 26 showed us, our community doesn't have the equipment, operators, or budget to maintain quickly deteriorating roads, clear them in a timely fashion, or evacuate residents in medical or wildfire emergencies. I urge the planners and contractors to look at the O'Connor Creek watershed specifically as to suitability for any kind of roads or development. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	Thank you for your detailed comments. The Roads Plan does not advocate for or discourage development in any specific areas of the borough. Rather, it's purpose is to guide road siting and development in the most orderly fashion to prepare for if and when development does occur. The FNSB Assembly has final say on when, whether, and how FNSB-owned lands, such as the large parcels surrounding Corridors 273 and 372, are developed. The Roads Plan has a horizon of approximately 20 years between updates. While Assembly members frequently, the Roads Plan provides a longer-term planning outlook and vision for future road connections. The goal of the plan is to identify through detailed analysis and community input, the most logical and feasible locations for new future subdivision roads. The Roads Plan does not trigger any road development immediately. As a second-class borough with limited roads powers, all subdivision roads in the FNSB are developed by landowners/developers through the subdivision process to provide access to their newly-created lots.
375	2/1/2023	Paper Form	Bruce	Bridwell		<p>This is not preferred but does make sense to create additional second way out of the Moose Mtn residential area. Perhaps another route following the trail from Monte Verde cul-de-sac to Waldheim might make sense.</p>	A connection between the end of Monteverde and the Waldheim cul-de-sac was considered but would be too steep in grade to meet FNSB road standards. Corridor 375 is a corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that was realigned in this update to better match the underlying topography. It would only be developed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
375	2/4/2023	Email	Linda	DeFoliart		<p>I hike extensively in this area and a lot of this terrain seems unsuitable for a sustainable road. For example you have Windy Creek and O'Connor Creek with slopes that, from the vegetation, appear to be underlain with permafrost. My concern here is the quality of the area roads. Ivory and Jones Rd are terrible during break-up and much of the summer - it lasts for months and at times are barely drive-able with anything but a high-clearance 4WD. After a snowfall, it can take a few days for these roads to be plowed. I don't know if the problem is money or if M&M Construction is spread too thinly. But I don't see how adding more roads and more traffic is going to do anything but make this already sketchy situation intolerable. I would need to see absolute figures and get assurances from our road commissioner that what you propose is feasible and won't make the current situation any worse. From the comments Greg Grajew (Moose Mt road commissioner) made during the open house, he has the same concerns I do.</p> <p>I understand the Borough wanting to develop property but please consider the comments of the people who live here and use these roads every day.</p>	<p>Corridor 375 is a corridor from the 1991 Roads Plan that was realigned in this update to better match the underlying topography. It would only be developed if the parcels that it crosses subdivide. If the parcels surrounding Corridor 375 subdivide and develop in the future, additional residences can be added into the existing service area to provide tax revenue to support the maintenance of existing and additional road miles.</p>
375	2/13/2023	Email	Lisa	Jodwalis		<p>First, a big thank you to all of the planning team for your hard work putting the plan together, seeing it through multiple drafts, and engaging in extensive public participation. My comments specifically address the area of Goldstream Valley bounded by Goldstream Road on the south and Old Murphy Dome on the north. My husband and I have lived in the Waldheim Drive neighborhood since 1985 and have used the local trails and neighborhood paths every year since in all seasons. I see that some alterations were made in the final draft. My concerns are with the designation of ANY roads and subdivisions in an area fraught with landscape challenges. These were identified and commented on by area residents as part of the proposed O'Connor Creek Re-Zone in 2018. The Windy Creek drainage is extremely steep and while the draft Roads Plan shows a relocation to a lower elevation (route 372), it still requires winding routes and steep driveways. The O'Connor Creek drainage has extensive permafrost and thaw and erosion are highly visible. Those of us who are long-term residents can point to the obvious signs, many of which have emerged in just the past 5-10 years. Routes 22 and 375 extend Jones Road north and this is probably unsupportable: Windy Creek at the O'Connor Creek Trail crossing suffered a serious erosion event about 4 years ago that created a gully large and deep enough to drop a school bus into. More evidence of erosion and thaw is common along lower Windy Creek and all along the O'Connor Creek Trail as evidenced by leaning trees, deeper dips, and recent gullying.</p> <p>My greatest concern is that the Roads Plan in general advocates for future development in an area that is increasingly at risk from adverse weather events that make maintenance costs prohibitive for road service areas and make emergency evacuation life-threatening. The last decade and especially the last year have seen extreme weather. The 26 December 2022 rain-on-snow event made the entire neighborhood impassable for 2 weeks. The windstorm of 25 July 2022 dropped well over 20 big spruce and birch on Waldheim Drive. In May 2011 the Moose Mountain Fire came terrifyingly close to residences. Although human-caused, the burned area is still highly flammable and the general area sees many lightning strikes each summer. Adding new roads and residences in the Windy and O'Connor Creek drainages will put people at extreme risk, as these situations were not one-off.</p> <p>Unfortunately, I think that the Borough needs to step back from the current plan and evaluate the long-term risks due to climate warming – increased fires, permafrost thaw, heavy rain and snow, and rain-on-snow – for some of these rural areas where emergency response takes longer. As last December 26 showed us, our community doesn't have the equipment, operators, or budget to maintain quickly deteriorating roads, clear them in a timely fashion, or evacuate residents in medical or wildfire emergencies. I urge the planners and contractors to look at the O'Connor Creek watershed specifically as to suitability for any kind of roads or development.</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. Corridor 22/375 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan in this update. Corridors in the Roads Plan can be adjusted to address topographical issues during the subdivision process if the alternative corridor meets the same intent as the original identified in the plan. The Roads Plan is high-level and long-range plan to identify beneficial connections across the FNSB. At the time of subdivision, on-the-ground survey data will be considered to inform the feasibility of corridors, like 22/375.</p>
382	1/23/2023	Email	Natalie	Howard		<p>My name is Natalie Howard and I have concerns based upon the revised maps with the projected road coming through my property located at Tract A in Section 21, Township I South, Range 3 East, Fairbanks Meridian, according to the amended Supplemental Cadastral Survey Plat filed July 7, 1986 as Plat NO. 86-90. The proposed corridor 382 goes through my property and would completely destroy any value if I choose to subdivide the property. At this time it is at the "Future Study" stage and not yet a part of the comprehensive plan. I am writing today to state my opposition to a road being placed across my property in a manner that corridor 382 is placed. I request all "Future Study" lines be removed from my property.</p> <p>I have concerns for the manner in which this was done. First, a survey was conducted to begin the study for corridor</p> <p>382. Under Alaska Statute 34.65.020 notice must be given to the land owner prior to a survey on their property. This allows access for purposes of determining the locations of existing markers or boundaries. In this case, however, it appears the proposed study (corridor 382) encompassed an even more detailed new survey of my land without notice or permission. This shall also serve as my formal notice that at this time I do not consent to any new survey of my land for this or any other purpose.</p> <p>The proposed comprehensive roads plan states on page 3 that the plan "provides guidance for future road corridors and land access" and it states the plan does not "allow the FNSB to force roads through private property. Road corridor development is developer/owner initiated ONLY at the time of subdivision." This in fact is a false statement. Approval of the comprehensive plan by the assembly is binding - the plan is no longer merely good ideas and guidance (or assembly approval would not be necessary). It becomes a fnsb policy statement. On page 23 the plan goes on to state "road corridors in the plan will only be dedicated on private property at the time that landowners subdivide ... ". At the time a private owner wishes to subdivide they are forced to provide an easement for the proposed corridor or their subdivision request will be rejected (in accordance with fnsb policy). This is not owner or developer initiated ONLY at the time of subdivision. This does not mean a road will be built if a subdivision occurs but it does mean that an easement is required of the landowner to allow subdivision of the land. It is important that we all better understand this process. I happened to hear about the "proposed future study outside of the project area" included in this comprehensive plan that impacts my property via generic postcard last week. I have not initiated any roads on my property and I am not subdividing. I have yet to ascertain how this road plan was initiated on my property.</p> <p>Please note that these written comments support a verbal notice to respect and remember Alaska Trespass Laws (AS 11.46.320-350). Permission must be granted to enter my property. Prior notice must be given before surveying existing boundaries and, additionally, written consent before any new survey or study.</p>	<p>Proposed future study corridor 382 has been realigned so that it primarily crosses public lands. It no longer traverses the private property located at Tract A in Section 21, Township I South, Range 3 East, Fairbanks Meridian. As a future study corridor concept, Corridor 382 indicates a general connection traversing primarily public lands between the Two Rivers and North Pole areas. A more detailed corridor alignment will require additional analysis during a future Roads Plan update before it can be officially included as a Minor or Major Collector in the Roads Plan.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
404	2/2/2023	Web Form	Robin	Dale Ford		I live on Amanita Rd. and would like to express my opposition to the FNSB Proposed Roads #331 and #404. Neither of these corridors serves the residential neighborhood in the Amanita and Esro Rd. area. With the increased mining exploration and activity near this area, I am very suspicious of the motives for these corridors. BTW, Esro Rd. is a private road.	Amanita road is currently a public road and cul-de-sac that is longer than the FNSB's road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridors 331 and 404 address the cul-de-sac length issue by providing additional ingress/egress connections from Amanita Rd to ESRO Rd and to future Hopper Creek.
404	2/3/2023	Web Form	Amber	Masters		I was reading over this roads plan. I understand that proposed roads may not be constructed if land is not subdivided? Right? I live on Amanita and my main concern is who will maintain the additional roads in this plan? Will the addition of the two new roads connecting Amanita be landowners' responsibility? Why go through the expense to create more problematic potentially orphan roads? It seems the road plan and the RSA are in contrast to one another. But maybe I am missing something... it does not appear Amanita is in the MPA in the RSA.	Proposed corridors in the Roads Plan will only be developed if the parcels they cross or are adjacent to subdivide. For corridors 331 and 404 that connect to Amanita Rd, these roads would need to be adopted into an existing RSA for road maintenance. New residences along these corridors would contribute tax funds to the RSA for the maintenance of the new and existing road miles in the RSA.
404	2/4/2023	Web Form	Carolyn	Thomas		I own 10 acres on Amanita Road, intersected by the road. In no way will I ever consider allowing the borough to develop my land as an access to Esro/Hopper Creek/Smallwood Trail (Rts 310, 331 & 404). I have no intention of subdividing. There is no sewer, water or natural gas infrastructure out here and no prospect of seeing such in the future. Residents rely on well or hauled water, septic tanks, outhouses and various fuel sources. Adding access so the borough can sell land for subdivision development is not in the best interest of the residents of Amanita Rd or the land itself. The land is fragile as evidenced by an increasingly deep drainage on the southeast corner of my lot that trapped a moose calf 2 years ago, and an enormous sinkhole, summer of 2022 on the property adjacent to my northeast corner. We are already threatened by the prospect of mining in an area roughly 1/2 mile from our homes. Amanita Rd has already been negatively impacted by the recently published Trails Plan, non-residents with off road vehicles abusing the road residents maintain, endangering pedestrians and animals as they pass, ignoring posted speed warnings. It is my understanding that once developed, the roads in a Secondary Borough fall under the responsibility of a Rural Service Area, and the landowners would carry the burden of additional taxes to support the RSA. Amanita Road has numerous rental tenants who would not necessarily be impacted by increased property taxes. Thank you for the opportunity to comment, but again, I will not ever allow road development through my land.	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridor 310 crosses or are adjacent to never subdivide, the road will not be developed. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access.
404	2/3/2023	Email	Tom	Duncan	ME, PE Holaday-Parks Inc	Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on these proposed road plans. I have commented on these proposed road changes back in 10/21/20 as per below. Please understand it takes a lot of our personal time to reflect on your information and then respond. If you do not receive any attachments please let me know. I have comments on the following areas and have highlighted those on attachment 1 – FNSB MAP I AM NOT IN FAVOR OF EITHER OF THE ROAD ITEMS MENTIONED DIRECTLY BELOW -404 - Most importantly I have comments on 404 as this proposed ROW directly affects me as there is an easement on my property and a portion the road is off of its easement and on my personal property. Furthermore this access is not intended for "public" or for future expansion as it is allowed only for official heirs and assigns	Thank you for your comments. Proposed Corridor 404 would only be developed if the landowners of the adjacent parcels decide to subdivide. It is included in the plan to provide alternate ingress/egress from Amanita, which is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards allow.
404	2/6/2023	Web Form	David	Wolfe		My wife and I are against establishing roadways #331, #310, and #404. #310 - Amanita and #404 - Boreal Heights Lane are private roads the residents maintain. These two roadways are narrow and usually one vehicle wide. Emergency vehicles would have no problem navigating them. Still, we are concerned about added traffic and pollution from dust in the summer and keeping the road open during the winter with more snow. We do NOT want these roadways coming into this area. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridors 331 and 404 cross or are adjacent to never subdivide, the roads will not be developed. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access.
404	2/6/2023	Web Form	Donna	Wolfe		My wife and I are against establishing roadways #331, #310, and #404. #310 - Amanita and #404 - Boreal Heights Lane are private roads the residents maintain. These two roadways are narrow and usually one vehicle wide. Emergency vehicles would have no problem navigating them. Still, we are concerned about added traffic and pollution from dust in the summer and keeping the road open during the winter with more snow. We do NOT want these roadways coming into this area. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridors 331 and 404 cross or are adjacent to never subdivide, the roads will not be developed. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
404	2/10/2023	Email	Donna	Wolfe		<p>Boreal Heights Lane is a private road upgraded and maintained by the residents who live on Boreal Heights Lane. My husband and I are against connecting this road, 404, to Dark Hollow and Hopper Creek roads. We bought property in this area because we wanted privacy, clean air, and quiet living. We enjoy having only one way in and out of our neighborhood, this keeps crime down and people who have no reason to be in the area out. It's interesting that the FNSB has chosen this time to start opening this area up to subdividing, when Avidian Gold, and most likely Fort Knox, are planning extensive gold mining all over this area. It would be unconscionable for the FNSB to sell property without informing buyers about the planned gold mining.</p> <p>Amanita is also upgraded and maintained by residents. The FNSB wants to put these roads - who is going to maintain them? I'm against widening Amanita, 310, or having more traffic on it.</p> <p>I am also against putting in a road from Esro, 331, and connecting it to Amanita, 310. Who is going to maintain this road, and is this road being put in to benefit the mining companies? The timing seems a bit suspicious. We don't need anymore traffic on Amanita or Boreal Heights Roads</p> <p>I'm also against any road going behind my property.</p> <p>Please leave our beautiful, quiet neighborhood alone!</p>	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridor 404 crosses or are adjacent to never subdivide, the road will not be developed. Corridor 404 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access. Corridor 404 can provide an additional ingress/egress point for both residents and emergency services in the future.
404	2/10/2023	Email	Darla	Theisen		Any chance on reviewing the 331 and 404 proposed rds. How would they be laid out? How to travel on them. Is this in the overflow and sloughing areas?	Thank you for your comments. Corridors 331 and 404 have been sited based on analysis of detailed aerial imagery, lidar, and topographical data. At the time of land subdivision, on-the-ground survey data will also be considered to develop the exact alignment and design of these roads. At that time, adjustments can be made to address topography and other challenging conditions, as long as the alternative alignments meet the same intent as the original corridors identified in the plan.
405	1/21/2023	Email	Andria	Bond		Hi, I am not able to attend the meeting today due to illness, but wanted to voice my concern about one portion of the proposed plan. We live in Salcha on Grieme Rd and are concerned about the possible extension of the road. Though not currently on the trails plan to the best of my knowledge, sprint mushing trails have existed here for well over 30 years. It is the reason a number of us in the neighborhood moved here. We've been here about 10 years and are concerned about this road and losing trail access, as it would cross our trail. The neighborhood is already becoming immensely more developed over the last year, so those of us who have invested our lives into living in a location with excellent trails we can access are understandably worried about losing what we have invested so much into. I had been talking with the Parks & Rec department last summer about getting the trails designated and on the map and am hoping to have concrete map data to bring them this spring after gps-ing the system this winter when we can access all the muskeg. We may be just a handful of mushers, but this road would definitely threaten our competitive racing teams viability and our way of life. We train our teams out there from November through April and many traveling mushers also use the trails in race season February-April. Please consider this when making your final decision. Another thing you consider is that whole area is a total swamp and very wet for half of the year. I can't imagine it being cost effective to put a road right there. It would be constantly sinking in.	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 405 connecting Grieme to Johnson Rd will only be constructed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Corridor alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone and can be adjusted during the subdivision and platting process to address trail conflicts and detailed topographical conditions.
405	1/21/2023	Email	Gary	Markley		I'm writing in opposition of the proposed road plan for a subdivision off Grieme road. We moved here specifically for trail access to outdoor activities and super dog mushing skiing trails. This road would cut off our access to these splendid trails and sever our needs for trails. This route is also very wet and swampy and a road would be very costly and upkeep high. Please vote no.	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 405 connecting Grieme to Johnson Rd will only be constructed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Corridor alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone and can be adjusted during the subdivision and platting process to address trail conflicts and detailed topographical conditions.
405	2/1/2023	Email	Margie	Schwartz		<p>That 405 corridor goes thru a lot of very serious wetlands. I can tell you for a fact that most of the houses back there at the end of Grieme has the water table sitting only at 3 feet. They have some serious and chronic septic issues back in there.</p> <p>And I know anything immediately east of Salcha Star is also ID'd as wetlands going north from the base of the hill on the opposite side of Johnson Rd. A few years back, someone must've punched a bore hole or something in the lot across from where Salcha Star goes north off Johnson, and there was enough pressure that it put water across the road and made it hell for people to drive thru in the extreme cold, literally freezing brakes to the point of disabling a vehicle from movement. DOT had to build an ice dam a couple seasons.</p> <p>I'm not sure if Ed Plumb is still with National Weather Service here, but he was one of the guys that did a flyover Salcha during the 2008 floods and took aeriels of that area back in there. I was able to orient the photos for the audience since he wasn't familiar.</p> <p>To be blunt, it sounds like the Borough is indeed pencil-whipping OUT the areas they designated as flood areas with the 2008 update of the flood plain between Boondox and Eielson AFB and the Old Rich through there. That's just a bad idea.</p> <p>To do any construction along that 405 corridor is about as dumb as trying to turn Johnson Road into a real road. The ground is bad, and no one who has property dissected by Johnson Road was ever given a corrective deed or anything. The plat that's for the road is pretty much only a Record of Survey and not an actual road project. No one seems to know when it went from being a military road to being maintained by the State. Nothing else seems to have been documented.</p> <p>Additionally, if Eielson in fact expects to bring in another 54 F-35 aircraft to Eielson (ref the Newsminer), the last place you really want to develop is directly under the damned flight approach. I used to work on F16's, and can tell you the F35s are BY FAR louder than the Falcon ever would be. That said, stick some data collectors out there and do a noise study next summer when Cope T comes to town.</p>	Like all planned corridors, Corridor 405 connecting Grieme to Johnson Rd will only be constructed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Corridor alignments in the Roads Plan are not set in stone and can be adjusted during the subdivision and platting process based on on-the-ground survey data to address trail conflicts and detailed topographical conditions, such as wetlands.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
405	2/2/2023	Email	Margie	Schwartz		<p>With regard to the 405 section of the map some suggestions I may or may not have tossed out there:</p> <p>Deceleration lanes from the south, merge lanes going north for Salcha School- blind corner with a northbound, blind rise. There is also some dangerous passing going over Munson Slough bridge both directions. Johnson Road- Stop sign runners Grieme Road- (since this is also where the community well resides, vehicles merge laden) Stop sign runners Salcha River SP- deceleration lane from the south. Also install a slow moving traffic/merge sign southbound on the north approach of the Salcha River bridge.</p> <p>Deceleration lanes from the north for Stringer/Loop Rd- this is a very bad passing spot, even though the pavement is marked for passing, in both directions. Howell Rd Old Rich Hwy across from Johnson Rd (extend the north merge lane from Johnson Rd to just past Old Rich Rd, if put in)</p> <p>The un-named road that juts north at the end of Grieme used to be where the USAF had its old Marker Beacon for the south approach. It was removed as technology improved and rendered it obsolete. Old Beacon Road would be a good name if (again) that wetland were to be developed. That's a rough hike back in there.</p>	Thank you for these suggestions and identification of concerns. The Roads Plan primarily plans for the location of new subdivision road connections and corridors in the FNSB. It does not identify improvements for state-maintained roads and highways such as the Richardson.
405	2/4/2023	Email	Tom	Duncan	ME, PE Holaday-Parks Inc	<p>404: First I'd like to comment on 404 - I have attached and numbered the attachments: 1.TWO SHEETS - Your FNSB map showing 404 where I highlighted my property 2035 Boreal hts and my neighbors (LOT 1 BLOCK 3 HOPPER CREEK OUT OF TL-1800 SEC 18 T1N-R2E) 2.Aerial photo of easement received from Don Galligan of FNSB in 2020. This shows the easement you have on record. 3.Plat of my property - showing easement and how currently the road is off of its easement 4.Table 3 from FNSB - highlighted items</p> <p>-First we would like to know the intentions of the FNSB for this suggested ROW or the purpose of it.</p> <p>-Before 404 or Boreal heights is considered for ROW to Hopper Creek we would suggest that the ROW be per the previous #38 (corridor 348) as that is the true access to Hopper Creek (between TL 1808 and 1812). Boreal hts ends at 343943 Block 3 lot 1 and there is no direct connection or easements to Hopper creek from the end of boreal hts without going across private property. As you can see from the attachment the proposed ROW goes through the middle of my neighbor's property.</p> <p>-This suggested ROW 404 has an easement that is on my property 2035 boreal hts. See attached 1,2 and 3 mentioned above. As you can see this proposed ROW affect my property as there is an easement on my property, and the current road is not on its correct easement - See attachment 3. It currently crosses a portion of my private property. I would also ask that if this is made an official ROW that the road be put back on its true easement and moved further north at the expense of FNSB</p> <p>-As a property owner I would like to have a discussion with FNSB as I reserve the right to approve making this an official ROW, before it is made a ROW, as access is only for official heirs and assigns for use of this easement and the road currently goes across my private property.</p> <p>-We do not approve this suggested ROW as it is only be used for those who are currently allowed to use it OR who currently have houses or property directly accessed using Boreal hts and can currently access them using highway vehicle only. We do not approve of this suggested ROW to be used for further expansion to access any other properties beyond Boreal Hts, nor to access Hopper Creek or Smallwood, nor be accessed using recreational vehicles nor for recreational purposes (This is currently not a public road ROW)</p>	Thank you for your comments. Proposed Corridor 404 would only be developed if the landowners of the adjacent parcels decide to subdivide. It is included in the plan to provide alternate ingress/egress from Amanita, which is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards allow.
405	1/27/2023	Public meeting sticky note				Powerline running perpendicular to proposed corridor. 15 acres bought in 1979. 70 acres new with Denali would be ok. DNR land sale in Aug - 2,000 acres sulliwood.	Thank you for your comments. The planning team will investigate the utility line conflict. Power lines cross roadways throughout the borough and the State. If going through a road design process there needs to be 20.5 feet of clearance under the lines (Per Alaska Preconstruction Manual Table 1130-1).
Amanita	2/6/2023	Web Form	Donna	Wolfe		My wife and I are against establishing roadways #331, #310, and #404. #310 - Amanita and #404 - Boreal Heights Lane are private roads the residents maintain. These two roadways are narrow and usually one vehicle wide. Emergency vehicles would have no problem navigating them. Still, we are concerned about added traffic and pollution from dust in the summer and keeping the road open during the winter with more snow. We do NOT want these roadways coming into this area. Thank you	Thank you for your comments. Like all proposed corridors in the Roads Plan, if the parcels that Corridors 331 and 404 cross or are adjacent to never subdivide, the roads will not be developed. Corridor 310 is being maintained in the plan because Amanita Road currently exists as a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards, raising issues for both emergency services and resident access.
Amanita	2/10/2023	Email	Darla	Theisen		3.Is there a planned connection between Amanita and Gilmore Trail?	Thank you for your question. In this update of the Roads Plan, there is not currently a connection planned between Amanita and Gilmore Trail. Very early on in the Roads Plan update, a corridor in this area was considered, but was later removed due to topographical challenges and trail conflicts. A future update to the Roads Plan could potentially add a connection here, if there is a need identified for it.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
Becker Ridge	1/22/2023	Email	Sharon	McLeod		<p>I was not able to attend the meeting at the Ken Kunkle Center yesterday, so am submitting my comments to you via email.</p> <p>I'm concerned about the map page that shows Becker Ridge Road, off Chena Ridge and Festival.</p> <p>First: The map shows Becker Ridge going all the way from Cripple Creek Subdivision to Chena Ridge. It does not do that. There's about half a mile that is completely undeveloped and frequently blocked off by owners above the undeveloped area. That full stretch of road is about 2 miles; roughly a mile of from Chena Ridge north road traverses Federal land; the remainder traverses private property.</p> <p>Second: The map completely ignores the name of the road from Chena Ridge to that undeveloped area. That two mile section of road is legally known as North Becker Ridge Road (formerly known as The Old FAA Road). There are several of us who live on North Becker Ridge Road. It is not in a Road Service Area, because the land is owned by the Bureau of Land Management, and the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) has authorized use of roughly the first mile via Air Navigation Site Withdrawal No. 18 and via Public Land Order 874 in 1958 (formerly the Civil Aeronautics Administration). Once upon a time FAA had a contract agreement with first the Alaska Department of Highways and later with Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities to maintain the road. That, however, has not been in force since the early to mid-1980s. Us local residents hire a contractor to take care of hardpack removal in the spring, and everyone pays their allocated share, based on percentage of road driven. I am the informal contractor hiring person and bill payer, and collect money from the remainder of the residents to pay for the work. To be able to travel the road in the winter, a couple road residents use a truck plow, and a Kubota tractor with a blower on the front. FAA rarely does anything. In the summer, we are often on the road doing brushing work and on one occasion, hired a small backhoe to put ditches back in since they had deteriorated so badly that water from spring runoff and seasonal rain was ruining the road surface. The road no longer has a crown and FAA has declined to do any road upgrades to bring it up to its former condition. The fewer people we have driving the road, the less maintenance we have to do out-of-pocket. Hence, the importance – to us, at least – to NOT show North Becker Ridge and Becker Ridge as being connected. Ken Warfel, the original homesteader, predated the CAA and FAA road. A few of us have letters of non-objection from FAA to use the road.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB GIS data does show the lack of connection between Becker Ridge Road and North Becker Ridge Road as a dashed instead of solid black line. This symbology did not transfer well to the scale of the large printed maps available online and at the January public meeting. The undeveloped section between Becker Ridge and North Becker Ridge Road is platted as a public right-of-way but is yet 'unconstructed.'
Becker Ridge	1/22/2023	Email	Sharon	McLeod		<p>Third: Showing that North Becker and Becker are connected originated sometime in the early 1980s with Herb Mann who I believe was the head of FNSB Planning back then. Everyone on our road fought it, knowing it would bring trouble – which it has. Because the land is federally owned, it will be quite a long time (50 or more years?) before it will ever be able to be in other governmental or private hands. FAA will have to have changed its aircraft guidance system to do away with the VORTAC at the top of North Becker. That VORTAC governs all air traffic at Fairbanks International Airport, jets and small planes alike. Should FAA do away with the VORTAC, it is a long and arduous process for them to dispose of or re-permit the property in some fashion. And it has been in force, per the federal withdrawals for FAA to use the acreage up here, for 65 years already.</p> <p>In general: I am the only person on the road who has a driveway that circles my house. As such, when someone is misdirected by whatever mapping feature their phones use, I have large vehicles needing to use my driveway so they don't have to back down the entire one to two miles of road, depending on how far they have driven. These have included Alaska Fire Service Forestry tankers when there was a fire a few years ago near the top of Cripple Creek Subdivision, belly dumps loaded with gravel that were also headed to somewhere near the top of Fiddle/Festiva./Ridgeview, a misdirected ambulance, and several private vehicles towing long trailers. Typically, I can hear the backing up or trying to turn around process and go up to the road to let them know they can use my driveway in order to make it back to Chena Ridge. The erroneous mapping needs to be fixed to reflect that the two distinct roads are not connected.</p> <p>Thank you for considering my comments.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB GIS data does show the lack of connection between Becker Ridge Road and North Becker Ridge Road as a dashed instead of solid black line. This symbology did not transfer well to the scale of the large printed maps available online and at the January public meeting. The undeveloped section between Becker Ridge and North Becker Ridge Road is platted as a public right-of-way but is yet 'unconstructed.'
Chena Hot Springs Rd	2/3/2023	Email	Randall	Miller		<p>I would like to opine with regards to the proposed Road Plan in the areas along Chena Hot Springs Rd where I have owned a cabin home for over 45 years.</p> <p>I would specifically like to speak to the proposed roads in T1N1E, T1N2E, and T1N3E, just North of Chena Hot Springs Rd between miles 4 and 16, from Esro Rd to Two Rivers. Much of this forest land is located on North slope and valley land which is an area of continuous and discontinuous permafrost, covered in typical black spruce, and tundra, as well as mixed forest types. This type of land has been shown to be extremely difficult and expensive to build and maintain roads of any type.</p> <p>During a period of progressive global warming which we have witnessed over the last 3 decades there has been increasing melting of the region in which road construction is planned, as noted on the maps of these townships in the proposed plan.</p> <p>In the FNSB we have noted the inability to maintain stable roads in this type of forest soil type. Chena Hot Springs Rd itself is a prime example, as it has required continuous expensive maintenance ever since it was paved in all areas where there is permafrost, notable along little Chena Prong.</p> <p>Unfortunately we do not have the technology, nor the resources to build and maintain roads in this type of forest/soil type. The damage that will be caused in the proposed connectors along the North slope of Little Chena Prong, miles 4-12 of CHSR, and in the Smallwood and Iowa Creek drainages will be irreparable. The cost will be prohibitive, and the danger to the flora and fauna of this once pristine area will be profound.</p> <p>There has been progressive degradation of this area by relatively small logging operations, and recreational disregard of this fragile forest/soil type. To develop roads in this area will be a costly endeavor that will not be sustainable over the next several decades.</p> <p>I request that a moratorium be instituted in all North slope and permafrost valley land along the Chena Hot Springs Rd, until such time that we have the technology, skill, and money to approach such a project with environmental sensitivity and fiscal responsibility.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan plans for future subdivision roads through the platting and subdivision process. It does not trigger any road development until the point in time when a landowner decides to subdivide. Much of the land north of Chena Hot Springs Road on north-facing slopes is already in private ownership. If these owners decide to subdivide and develop their land, the Roads Plan helps ensure access to their property and identifies planned road alignments that are most feasible and have the least potential negative impacts (environmental, maintenance). The Roads Plan cannot direct or limit development in specific areas, but instead provides orderly direction for road development when subdivisions occur.
Ester Dome	1/28/2023	Public meeting sticky note				Develop Ester Dome. It's closer to Town and NOT swamp	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan cannot direct or limit development. Rather, it plans for road connections for the time when landowners decide to subdivide their property. Corridors such as 213 near Ester Dome would only be developed if the parcels it crosses subdivide.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	1/30/2023	Email	Jeanie	Cole		<p>Hi, I am having trouble getting the fillable online comment form to work. When I input my first comment, it populates the same comment into all the lines of the form. If I try over writing the comment on the second line, it erases my previous comment and populates all the lines with my second comment.</p> <p>If I download the form and save it to my desk top, it does the same thing. If I save it as a PDF, it is no longer fillable.</p> <p>Any advice on how to make the form work? I am using a Mac computer.</p>	N/A
General	1/18/2023	Web Form	Beverly	Hormann		<p>First, are any of these proposed connectors to be built when the plan is adopted? It looks to me that most of these connectors are located in existing service areas. What per centage of the proposed connectors are not in service areas? Will proposed connectors built in service areas be financed by the service area itself? Who will pay for connectors not in service areas?</p>	<p>Because the FNSB is a second-class borough, it does not have direct road powers. Roads in the FNSB are developed by those who subdivide land through the subdivision and platting process. Thus, no road development will be immediately triggered when the plan is adopted because road development occurs when an owner subdivides land. Any proposed connections not in existing service areas would need to be adopted into an existing RSA. Proposed connectors in existing service areas are financed by the developer or owner who is subdividing the land, and then long-term maintenance is provided by the RSA, with additional tax revenue provided by new residences along the corridor. Long-term maintenance of connectors outside of existing service areas will be achieved by expanding a nearby service area to include the new roads.</p>
General	2/1/2023					<p>Correct FNSB Eielson AFB Regional Growth Plan Planning and Zoning page 8. Figure 2: Land ownership in the vicinity of Eielson AFB to correctly reflect ownership.</p>	N/A - comment refers to a different plan.
General	2/7/2023	Email	Sue	Sherif		<p>My first concern is the part of the plan that shows acquiring right-of-way to connect the northern portions of Esro and Amanita Roads off Chena Hot Springs Road. The link theoretically meets the criteria established in the plan to provide alternate methods for emergency service and delivery vehicles on roads that have only one way in and out, but given the nature of the two roads, neither of which is in a formal service area, I can't think that this connection would be 1. economically feasible to build and maintain year round or 2. in rough winter conditions would actually serve this criteria.</p> <p>My second concern is: As the plan clearly states the borough does not have road building or maintenance powers, so I find it ironic that the plan seems to be geared to the proliferation of new roads or connectors that, outside of service areas, will be difficult if not impossible to maintain. The plan glosses over this problem, by outlining the stages of road development, and saying that the new roads can be annexed into existing service areas, but skips the reality of the fact that roads like Amanita that are long, steep, and not up to standards are "orphans" for a reason.</p> <p>Until the Borough addresses this problem, that there is no way to establish new road service areas or compel an existing road service area to expand or the Borough decides it has outgrown its second class status (or the Legislature changes the definition of the powers of a second-class borough), I am puzzled what this exercise in planning for more miles of difficult to maintain roads, like the proposed Esro - Amanita link, is worth.</p> <p>I do appreciate the process that the borough used in developing its proposals, especially the open houses and the interactive maps for public input and also the opportunity to comment now.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan does not promote or trigger road development in any specific areas. Because of the FNSB's second-class status, all subdivision roads are developed by landowners/developers when they subdivide their property. This ensures that all new parcels have legal access. The Roads Plan provides direction on the most logical locations for future road connections. New future road connections, once constructed, would need to be adopted into an existing service area for maintenance based on state law.</p>
General	2/8/2023	Email	Bob	Henszey, Ph.D.	Branch Manager, Conservation Planning Assistance, US Fish & Wildlife Service	<p>Hi Shelly, Yes, our FWS Program (Conservation Planning Assistance) would welcome the opportunity to discuss the draft FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. Providing early comments before alignments are finalized is the best way to minimize potential adverse impacts to fish and wildlife. If the FNSB can share the shapefiles for the draft plan, Amy can quickly review the proposed updates for potential concerns. The proposed future plans to extend Lawrence Road to Chena Hot Springs Road is one, but I assume that will have a separate planning process.</p> <p>I helped the FNSB with their recent Land Suitability Analysis update, so I know some of the physical features we look for may be accounted in the proposed road plan, but there are other features we consider when reviewing project plans not included in the FNSB LSA. Some concerns can easily be addressed simply by initiating construction before or after the bird breeding season to avoid affecting birds that have selected a nest site for the breeding season (i.e., they can go elsewhere if not committed to a site for the season).</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. The proposed Future Study Corridor 382 connecting Lawrence to Chena Hot Springs Road would require additional analysis and planning before it becomes a proposed minor or major collector corridor in an update of the Roads Plan. At this time, as a Future Study Corridor, it primarily follows public lands and shows the intent, but not the exact alignment of a potential future planned road corridor.</p>
General	2/1/2023	Web Form	Bill	Witte		<p>Hello Shelly- In reference to an interconnected road network and public safety. Speaking to my neighbors they generally are opposed to an interconnected road system - they mostly want to live at the end long dead end roads. In truth long dead end roads inhibit evacuations and fire response. Fire planners from south central AK and elsewhere, have suggested and established roadway easements which are dedicated to emergency response only. Except during emergency fire responses the roads are gated off from public access. The public has their privacy but an interconnected mesh network of roads is available during an emergency.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments. This is an interesting idea that Community Planning could take into consideration for future Roads Plan updates.</p>
General	1/16/2023	Email	Bill	Witte		<p>Hi Shelly- Reading these on a phone so I might have missed something but what are the thin green lines? Not obvious in the map key but they look like trails? Example below. [Message includes a screenshot of one of the maps]</p>	<p>Yes. Trail alignments from the FNSB's recent Comprehensive Trails Plan update are indicated on the Roads Plan Quadrant maps as thin green lines.</p>

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	2/8/2023	Email	Bob	Henszey		<p>Thanks for the opportunity to meet. Amy, Amal, and I work in the office on Mondays. The rest of the week we telework, but some of us may be able to come to town. If we do a video conference, Amal will need a phone number to call-in. She has poor Internet at home. I'll let the others say when they are available, but I should be available next week at these times:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Monday, 2/13: after 1 pm Tuesday, 2/14: anytime Wednesday, 2/14: anytime but 1-3 pm Thursday, 2/15: 8-12:30 Friday, 2/16: anytime but 10-11 am <p>This is not the first time we have heard of the Comprehensive Roads Plan, but the FWS has not been contacted directly to my knowledge and we have not heard anything since 2021. On Tuesday, October 12, 2021, I spotted an opportunity to comment in the Fairbanks Daily News Miner (see attached flyer). I forwarded that notice to the FWS folks in Fairbanks so they would have an opportunity to comment. However, our team (Conservation Planning Assistance) opted not to comment for the FWS officially. I think our workload was a bit heavy at the time. We prefer to engage early, since that's when plans are more flexible, so we really appreciate the opportunity to meet as the Plan is nearing a final version.</p>	The Roads Plan team met with US Fish and Wildlife Service on 2/14/23 to discuss the agency's input on the corridors proposed in the plan.
General	2/10/2023	Email	Eleanor	Boyce		<p>Comments below refer to the 01-16-2023 FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan</p> <p>I am Eleanor Boyce, property owner and resident in the Moose Mountain neighborhood of Goldstream Valley. The following comments are in response to the 01-16-2023 draft of the FNSB road plan. Some relevant public comments from the previous round are cited below.</p> <p>1.Limited response to previous comments [General] It is clear that the FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan is the product of a tremendous amount of work by your team, and I am grateful for your efforts and for the many opportunities to comment on the plan. However, it does appear that many previous comments are inadequately addressed in the 01-16-2023 draft, which is in conflict with the FNSB Future Road Corridor Selection Criteria category "Social: Public Input" (see page 17). A glaring example: I refer you to Figure 4 on Page 6, which shows a comment, "Awesome idea for a road going through from Miller Hill Road to Miller Hill Extension." As the September-October 2022 round of public input generated ~21 comments specifically addressing proposed road corridor 64, and 19 of those were clearly opposed (plus 1 concerned and 1 skeptical), I find this to be a particular poor choice of public input example. More than being a poor choice, I worry it may be representative of the degree to which the fall 2022 round of public comments has not (or not yet) been incorporated into the FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan. I encourage your team and the steering committee to take as much time as necessary to address the many concerns that have been raised.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads planning team is currently in the process of developing responses to the comments received from the public in fall and winter 2022-2023. Once complete, the comment trackers with responses will be posted on the project website. Corridor 64 is a connection originally planned in the 1991 Roads Plan. Because it has long been planned as a Major Collector, direct access for properties to Miller Hill and Miller Hill Ext has been disallowed to support this potential connection should the parcels it crosses and are adjacent to subdivide in the future. The Roads Plan does not trigger subdivision or road development, but directs road siting based on planning and engineering analysis for if and when landowners decide to subdivide their property. Public input into the corridor has been mixed throughout the Roads Plan process, with both strong support and strong opposition to the proposed road for different reasons.
General	2/10/2023	Email	Eleanor	Boyce		<p>4.Feasibility concerns [28, 31, 36, 64, 69, 72, 73, 94, 251, 273, 279, 287, 295, 372] The fall 2022 round of comments included 43 comments that mentioned concerns about the feasibility of constructing or maintaining proposed corridors due to climate change, grade, permafrost, drainage, etc. I am particularly concerned about the plan for corridor 372 which transects a steep hillside of black spruce. I oppose this corridor and agree with Roger Evans' description of this route as, "a steep, high altitude black spruce permafrost zone, with evidence of slumping showing just above the creek below. A road cut through there would cause excessive thawing, slumping and probably mud flows into the creek."</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads planning team has completed detailed evaluations of feasibility including desktop and GIS data analyses, engineering modelling using InfraWorks for specific corridors, and following up on issues identified by the public through additional reviews and site visits. Many areas of the FNSB pose challenges for road construction due to wetlands, permafrost, and steep grades. The Roads Plan does not and cannot limit development in specific areas. All it does is direct road siting for if and when landowners do decide to subdivide and develop their land. The Roads Plan works to ensure that all landowners will have legal access to their properties. In the absence of the plan, roads could be constructed in locations that have not been thoroughly vetted and analyzed for feasibility or other issues.
General	2/10/2023	Web Form	Ariane	Glover		The draft plan legend in the map shows a pink/salmon color for the minor collector roads, but the actual maps appear to show these connections in gold (as did the previous maps). There seems to be an inconsistency with the colors in the legends/maps that needs to be corrected.	Thank you for your comments. Noted very slight color difference between the key and minor collector lines on maps.
General	2/10/2023	Web Form	Ariane	Glover		Goal 5 should be an integral part of all road development. Safe access for cyclists and pedestrians is critical for residents and healthy communities. Wide shoulders should be planned for, bike lanes or bike paths segregated from roads with safe, necessary connections are critical for commuters who choose not to drive. Rumble strips should be used, as appropriate, when bike paths cannot be segregated from roads. Adequate lighting for the safety of both motorists and non-motorized users is equally important. Routes that connect areas of interest, as well as connections to public transit should be prioritized, particularly between North Pole and Fairbanks to allow North Pole residents a non-motorized or public transit option to travel to Fairbanks. An increase in non-motorized users for commuter and recreational access is important for supporting other Borough priorities, such as healthy air quality and outdoor recreation during both winter and summer seasons. Thank you for including this goal. Please ensure it is considered in all aspects of road plan development and not just as an after-thought.	Thank you for your comments. No change identified.
General	2/10/2023	Web Form	Ariane	Glover		<p>I submitted several comments for the Comprehensive Road Plan Maps through the Online Comment Box submission option. I attempted to use the Fillable Comment Form, but every time I entered a comment, it duplicated it in every open box on the comment form (there seems to be some kind of error with the form...at least on my Safari browser).</p> <p>Anyways, after I submitted comments, I realized I had no confirmation email on what I had submitted or even that it was received (although the comment box said it was sent after I submitted it).</p> <p>Maybe just a suggestion for future plans & public comments, if possible, it would be great if the comment form sent you a confirmation email showing what was submitted for the commenter's records (just in case for some reason it doesn't go through on your end).</p> <p>Looking forward to seeing the outcome of the plan. Thanks to everyone for their hard work on this.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The planning team will consider this for future plans and rounds of public input.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	2/12/2023	Web Form	Leigh	Page		For the 2022 comprehensive road plan will there be another public comment period? Due to my line of work, I was unaware of the situation and didn't find any information in my letterbox. Thank you,	Yes, there will be an additional and final public comment period in Summer 2023.
General	2/13/2023	Web Form	Todd	Boyce		Just back from cruise to New Zealand and Australia. I quickly reviewed the Road Plan revisions and once again did not see that any of my prior suggestions for modification's were included. So, I will not be submitting any for this comment period. As a member of the advisory group, the only time I got feedback was the call-in where the consultant went through all the proposed changes. That answered some of my concerns on why certain segments were omitted, but quite a bit remained unanswered. I may continue to participate if there are future meetings, but did not have time or the inclination to do so before the current comment deadline. I'll be up that way for a few weeks towards the end of this month. Maybe I'll try to set up a brief meeting with you, on this matter, and to shoot the breeze.	Thank you for your comments. At the time of your review, the Roads planning team had not yet integrated edits into the Roads Plan narrative, and was primarily focused on updates to the maps. There will be an additional public review and comment period in Summer 2023.
General	2/10/2023	Email	Darla	Theisen		1.Change the word "orphan" rds. to non government rds.	Thank you for your comment. The term "orphan road" will be maintained in the plan because it is commonly used and understood to refer to such roads without a public maintenance authority.
General	2/10/2023	Email	Darla	Theisen		4.If a proposed corridor is removed from the 1991 plan in the new plan and the corridor has already been dedicated (to follow the 1991 plan) and is not being used as such, upon request by the adjacent landowner(s), the FNSB will sponsor the vacation before the Platting Board. This gets to rectifying a taking that is no longer necessary	Thank you for your comment. This has been added as Action 1.1.B in the Roads Plan.
General	1/29/2023	Public meeting sticky note	Marianne	Stolz		Less Development, more use of what we already have.	Thank you for your comment. The Roads Plan cannot limit or direct development of subdivisions or roads. It serves the purpose of guiding development when landowners do decide to subdivide their properties.
General	1/31/2023	Public meeting sticky note				More green (park)	Thank you for your comment. No change identified.
General/Economic Feasibility	1/21/2023	Email	Ryan	Hunt	surveyor, engineer tech, project manager with 3-Tier Alaska	Shelly, it was nice to connect with you today and share my thoughts on this Comprehensive Roads plan. As I mentioned, I work for 3-Tier Alaska, a Land Surveying, Civil and Environmental Engineering firm, where I have been helping dozens of people every year subdivide parcels of land for 19 years. We serve both small mom and pop parcels and large commercial developments alike. People often call us to subdivide their property, while they typically have their own vision on how that will look and how easy it should be. The first two things I look at are the zoning for minimum area lot sizes and if they are going to conform with the Borough Title 17 subdivision General Road Requirements, which can be tricky to navigate and very hard for a laymen homeowner to understand why this criteria even applies to them and why they have to have an engineer analyze their road that's been there for decades and possibly pay to upgrade it. Now, the new draft Comprehensive Roads Plan is introduced. I have personally worked on a handful of these areas in the past and can honestly say it can be a challenge to tell the landowner they need incorporate this in their plans. In general, it appears most people are hyper focused on where these roads will be. From what I see so far, the Steering Committee Members are doing well at determining practical areas to facilitate the function of getting to certain parts of town effectively and satisfies most of the Focus Areas. What I haven't seen discussed or solved in the report is the Economic Feasibility Plan. On Page 3, there is a statement that indicates this is guidance for the physical road development through FNSBC 17.56.110.A. From my experience, Comprehensive Road Plan ROW often does get dedicated, but the landowner will often find a way to minimize costs and not construct the road in its entirety or try to acquire a variance to this code. Or will often simply not have the funds to comply and just not subdivide at all and maybe build a house where the road is planned to go. I recommend before this Comprehensive plan gets adopted, that the economic portion of this be discussed in length and produce a solid plan that addresses the ROW area given to the public and a fiscal plan to construct the road(s). This largely should be the ultimate goal to the Borough Community to actually build the through road that's proposed and/or construct existing road rights-of-way in the Comprehensive Roads Plan that already exist, instead of putting the burden solely on the property owner that is subdividing. A local commercial loan officer has mentioned that banks are no longer loaning money for large developments and the construction of roads (another interview perhaps). This puts the private landowner without a large savings or even a medium level developer at a huge disadvantage to construct a minor collector at nearly any length, as some engineer estimates value a minimum standard minor collector road at over \$110 a foot. (E.g., 660 feet of road = \$72,600, 1320 feet = \$145,200, etc.) Combine that with the interior road network or connecting ROW that's not built and everything is cost prohibitive to construct.	Thank you for your detailed comments. The Community Planning team will take your suggestions into consideration.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General/Economic Feasibility	1/21/2023	Email	Ryan	Hunt	surveyor, engineer tech, project manager with 3-Tier Alaska	<p>I suggest the following discussion items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementing a standard Developer's Agreement, which includes the sale of lots for obtaining funds for the construction of roads, pending an engineer's estimate or cost analysis. (Similar to the City of North Pole.) - Constructed through roads that benefit the Comprehensive Roads Plan should be granted a tax incentive based on a cost analysis and/or engineer's estimate. (i.e., the quantity of lots using the road cost ratio) - Constructed through roads that benefit the Comprehensive Roads Plan should offer a percentage of the road construction be paid by the borough based on a long-term tax base analysis. - A portion of the constructed Comprehensive Roads Plan Road should be refunded, similarly to GVEA refunding a power pole cost after the development is completed, pending feasibility cost analysis. - ROW already dedicated within the comprehensive road plan should have a long-term tax retention plan to be built in the future or refunded to the constructor over time. <p>I am currently working with the owners that are within corridor No. 34 alignment PAN 282090 (preliminary plat approval shows corridor alignment East of where it's graphically shown, within Section 15.) Also working with owner within corridor No 243, PAN 199117 and have been discussing possible subdivision and constructed road access issues at length.</p> <p>Both landowners have made comments about cost feasibility in those areas. I would be happy to speak to you directly about those areas and interview the landowners for prime examples in attempt to find practical solutions.</p> <p>Thank you for your time. Feel free to contact me anytime to discuss or acquire maps of the above areas mentioned.</p>	Thank you for your detailed comments. The Community Planning team will take your suggestions into consideration.
Haystack Dr	1/31/2023	Email	Paul	Smith		<p>I have reviewed the comprehensive roads plan provided by the borough and am disappointed that nothing seems to be planned for the Haystack community. Over the years the condition of Haystack Drive and Leuthold Drive has continually declined. Yet I never hear any mention of bringing roads back into their original condition. Is this something that is not to be included in this plan?</p> <p>I would also like to bring up that our home is near the very end of Leuthold Drive (1201 Leuthold). The borough has decided this section of road will not be maintained. My family bought this land prior to Leuthold Drive being put in and were told the road would be maintained all the way to the end (past our driveway). As a result, we have spent a great deal of money keeping this section drivable and plan to even put more work into it this summer (having gravel hauled in and heavy equipment work).</p> <p>I also have issues with snow removal. I have difficulty even getting the road commissioner to do snow removal on this section when the rest of Leuthold is graded. This happened again last week when snow removal was done. The road commissioner actually told me he was going to run a grader up this section but it was not done. This doesn't leave me with much faith in the road commissioner's word. I must say that last year the assistant road commissioner (Gage Schutte) finally did snow removal on this section but he has since resigned.</p> <p>This being the first time snow removal was done on these roads this winter they were starting to get narrow. I have done all the snow removal on Leuthold Drive this winter and last winter at a great expense between times when heavy equipment does snow removal so I find it very disappointing that we can't even get any service on our short section of road. There are 5 homes on this section of road so I'm left wondering why we are left out when other roads with only one home are maintained.</p> <p>Sorry for the rant but any help or advice you can provide would be great.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Haystack neighborhood is outside of the current study area for the FNSB Roads Plan. The Roads Plan is primarily focused on identifying the most logical/beneficial locations for future road corridors. The plan does not directly address maintenance provided by the RSA system. FNSB Rural Services would be the appropriate entity to address road maintenance concerns.
Haystack Dr	1/31/2023	Email	Theresa	Smith		<p>I have reviewed the comprehensive roads plan provided by the borough and am disappointed that nothing seems to be planned for the Haystack community. Over the years the condition of Haystack Drive and Leuthold Drive has continually declined. Yet I never hear any mention of bringing roads back into their original condition. Is this something that is not to be included in this plan?</p> <p>I would also like to bring up that our home is near the very end of Leuthold Drive (1201 Leuthold). The borough has decided this section of road will not be maintained. My family bought this land prior to Leuthold Drive being put in and were told the road would be maintained all the way to the end (past our driveway). As a result, we have spent a great deal of money keeping this section drivable and plan to even put more work into it this summer (having gravel hauled in and heavy equipment work).</p> <p>I also have issues with snow removal. I have difficulty even getting the road commissioner to do snow removal on this section when the rest of Leuthold is graded. This happened again last week when snow removal was done. The road commissioner actually told me he was going to run a grader up this section but it was not done. This doesn't leave me with much faith in the road commissioner's word. I must say that last year the assistant road commissioner (Gage Schutte) finally did snow removal on this section but he has since resigned.</p> <p>This being the first time snow removal was done on these roads this winter they were starting to get narrow. I have done all the snow removal on Leuthold Drive this winter and last winter at a great expense between times when heavy equipment does snow removal so I find it very disappointing that we can't even get any service on our short section of road. There are 5 homes on this section of road so I'm left wondering why we are left out when other roads with only one home are maintained.</p> <p>Sorry for the rant but any help or advice you can provide would be great.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Haystack neighborhood is outside of the current study area for the FNSB Roads Plan. The Roads Plan is primarily focused on identifying the most logical/beneficial locations for future road corridors. The plan does not directly address maintenance provided by the RSA system. FNSB Rural Services would be the appropriate entity to address road maintenance concerns.
Leuthold Dr.	2/10/2023	Web Form	Paul	Smith		<p>As I have mentioned in the past, I still don't see any plans for roads in the Haystack community. Don't know what corridor this is but I'm specifically concerned with the very end of Leuthold Drive. Both Leuthold Drive and Haystack have not had any major repairs done in over 10 years. Those of us that live at the very end of Leuthold Drive have had no maintenance done. There are 5 homes on this section of road that pay plenty in taxes. My wife and I own 1175, 1201, and 1225 Leuthold Drive with several other homes on this section of road facing the same problems. Thankfully we did recently get snow removal done on this section. I currently plan to have heavy equipment in here with loads of rock at my own expense to ensure continued access to our homes during this summer. I should not have to do this.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Haystack is outside of the Roads Plan study area. Additionally, the Roads Plan does not plan for road maintenance, but future road corridors and connections. Contacting the FNSB Rural Services Department would be the best option for learning about how to improve road maintenance for your neighborhood.

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, January-February 2023 (January 2023 Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
Old Murphy Dome Rd	2/10/2023	Email	Eleanor	Boyce		5.Error in classification of Old Murphy Dome road between McCall and Hattie Creek [15, 209, 262, 273, 372] I pointed out this error in my September 2022 comment but it was not addressed. The section of Old Murphy Dome Road between McCall and Hattie Creek is incorrectly classified as a current Major Collector. In fact it receives no maintenance aside from emergency summer grading as needed for wildfire response. Instead of being marked here in solid light blue, it should be changed to a dashed red line if you propose it as a future Major Collector. Since that section of road is currently used as a winter trail by mushers, snowmachines and human-powered recreators, an appropriate bypass trail of equivalent grade would need to be constructed in order to convert this stretch into a Major Collector. Please assign it a proposed road corridor number in order to track public input! If this road becomes maintained year-round, I would expect it to be heavily used by traffic from Hattie Creek neighborhoods who must currently drive via Fox. However, this would give some Old Murphy Dome road residents an alternate connection from ridge top to valley (via Spinach Creek Road) that is superior to any of the other proposed corridors (15, 209, 262, 273, 372) because it is already built.	Thank you for your comments. Old Murphy Dome Road is accurately identified as an existing Major Collector in the Roads Plan GIS and maps. In the FNSB, roads are often classified by their future rather than current function, to plan ahead for access management (limiting driveways) for the future when traffic may increase and the road may be upgraded to a higher standard.
Open house	2/1/2023	Email	Margie	Schwartz		Will there also be one for the Salcha area?	Because there are only two proposed corridors in the Salcha area, a Salcha-specific open house was not held. However, all open houses for the plan included maps of the Salcha-area road connections and residents from across the borough were invited to attend.
Prester John	1/14/2023	Web Form	Monte	Landis		North East map. Prester John and true north coordinates. The road connecting the two is King Salmon	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB will verify and correct this issue if needed.
Trails	2/10/2023	Email	Eleanor	Boyce		3.Trail and habitat impacts [4, 15, 20, 21, 31, 34, 36, 64, 69, 95, 191, 204, 209, 213, 217, 251, 255, 262, 273, 279, 287, 293, 295, 327, 331, 372, 375] The fall 2022 round of comments included 147 out of 312 comments with concerns about impacts to established neighborhood trails, and 23 comments regarding the negative impact to greenspace, wetlands or wildlife habitat. The new plan does not appear to address these issues. I would like to echo Karl Kassel's comment that, "Converting a trail to a road is rarely an "upgrade" unless there are alternate trail routes constructed as part of the road project and trail connectivity is maintained," and also call out Josh Horst's comment, "seems like you're simply taking existing trails and making them into roads." In short, this draft fails to take into account numerous comments addressing Selection Criteria categories, "Environmental: Wetlands, flood zones, permafrost, soils" and "Environmental: Recreation/habitat". In particular I opposed the proposed corridors 273 and 372 which disrupt highly used trail systems. I ask the steering committee to review all these corridors and determine which are inconsistent with the siting criteria due to harm caused to recreation/habitat areas, and also which are truly necessary for realistic land development.	Thank you for your comments. Throughout the Roads and Trails planning processes, FNSB staff and the supporting consultant teams have coordinated to address road and trail planning conflicts and issues. Many trail and road conflicts can be addressed proactively through these plans. Opportunities for planned shared road/trail corridors have been identified through these coordinated planning processes as noted in both plans.