

FNSB Roads Plan: Public Comment Tracker, May-June 2022 (May Draft Corridor Maps-Specific)							
Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
28	5/31	Email	Gary	Newman		(image attached) As I recall from past meetings, Esro Road off Chena Hot Springs Road (28) was previously shown as and needs to be listed as 'further study' and not a required corridor. It doesn't appear to be so labeled in the most recent mapping. The ground conditions can't stand more traffic, particularly as climate change is having more of an impact to drainage, settling and overflow from several drainages from the east of Esro Road. As well, the extension of Esro that goes beyond the end-of-road turnaround toward the GCI Earth Station should be eliminated for the technical and security reasons I mentioned at a previous meeting, shown here in blue. The route up Sattley Drive to connect Tungsten Subdivision with Gilmore Trail is far more likely. I would add that the ground in that blue area is horrible with ice lenses/permafrost melting. The crossing of Steele Creek with all the winter overflow is not something to be taken lightly either for constructability and maintainability. There are enough poor ground conditions on Esro Road, no need to add more. It might look good on paper, but field conditions dictate otherwise. Please pass these comments onto the team.	Corridor 28 has been maintained in the Road Plan as a Minor Collector due to its importance for alternate and emergency access and connectivity for the adjacent neighborhoods. Without this connection, Esro Rd residents only have one way of ingress and egress on a cul-du-sac that is beyond the Title 17 maximum length of 1,320 ft.
38	5/19	Paper Form	Mike, Dave, Nathan, Donna	(blank)		In my backyard; no real purpose; all privately owned lots. Already have Borealis - duplicative; don't want traffic. Road on top of road - don't want traffic because we maintain the road and it's terrible.	Corridor 38 has been removed and replaced by corridor 404 based on public comments. 404 follows existing Boreal Heights (which does not currently have legal public right-of-way) to achieve the Amanita to Hopper Creek connection.
44	6/22	Paper form	Nathan	Johnson		Amanita Road Corridor Plan 44-to-310 indicates the current location of Amanita Rd. This is Trespass! Please relocate corridor 44-310 to indicate Amanita Road within the section line easement. The section line easement is 100 ft wide at this location.	Corridor 44/310 has been maintained in its current location due to existing driveways obtaining access from Amanita Rd. Siting the corridor on the section line easement (SLE) is further complicated by the existing utility infrastructure that runs along it. However, if during the subdivision process the landowner(s) propose re-aligning the corridor to the SLE, this would be theoretically possible <i>if the road can be proven to meet Title 17 road design standards and achieve the same intent of the connection shown in the Road Plan.</i>
44	5/19	Paper Form	Mike, Dave, Nathan, Donna	(blank)		Steep hill - high grade	Corridors 310 and 44 have been maintained in the plan because Amanita Rd does not have legal public access and is not built to Title 17 road design standards. Inclusion of these corridors in the plan can help obtain legal public access and bring Amanita up to standard when these parcels subdivide.
44	5/19	Printed comments	(blank)	(blank)		Keep road on section line easement	Corridor 44/310 has been maintained in its current location due to existing driveways obtaining access from Amanita Rd. Siting the corridor on the section line easement (SLE) is further complicated by the existing utility infrastructure that runs along it. However, if during the subdivision process the landowner(s) propose re-aligning the corridor to the SLE, this would be theoretically possible <i>if the road can be proven to meet Title 17 road design standards and achieve the same intent of the connection shown in the Road Plan.</i>
44	6/26	Email	Ruslan	Grigoriev		My name is Rus and I live at 1070 Amanita Rd. I pay out of pocket and put in labor for the year round road maintenance here. The road is narrow, with unsafe steep hill (17% grade), and has limited spots for passing. The dramatic increase in atv traffic this year has led to unsustainable traffic, high silica dust, road damage, trash, and multiple safety concerns from our neighbors due to speeding atvs. We use the road to walk our children and dogs to access trails. Making Amanita Rd an access rd is not a good idea.	Corridors 310 and 44 have been maintained in the plan because Amanita Rd does not have legal public access and is not built to Title 17 road design standards. Inclusion of these corridors in the plan can help obtain legal public access and bring Amanita up to standard when these parcels subdivide.
64	5/19	Open House				Road 64 would not open up any land other than very wet	Corridor 64 is being maintained in the Road Plan update due to its benefits for connectivity on the borough's road network. A connection between Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension could decrease vehicle miles travelled for many in the borough. Corridor Criteria: Connectivity/VMT, out-of-direction travel. Connectivity/Small Gap Closures. Access/Emergency & Essential Services (cutting down response time).
69	6/26	Email	Ben	Kennedy	Road Commissioner, Our Subdivision	As a Road Commissioner for Our Subdivision I am opposed to the proposed extension of Line Drive #69 due to concerns that road would further extend into known permafrost wetland areas and would be difficult to maintain.	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/25	Email	Bobbie	Ritchie	Homeowner	Further, project 69 creates additional impacts on more sensitive wetland habitats in the Goldstream Valley, many of which border lands protected within the Goldstream Valley Greenbelt by the state and the Interior Alaska Land Trust. Hopefully additional properties along Goldstream Creek will be protected in the future, increasing watershed, habitat, and wildlife values of the entire area. Road developments in this permafrost rich area are problematic, nearly always being expensive to build and maintain, all the while diminishing the value of adjacent wetland areas.	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenance (Economic/Feasibility).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
69	6/25	Web Form	Bobbie	Ritchie		<p>(Part 1)</p> <p>I live on the corner of Black Sheep Lane and Line Drive so corridor 69 and 295 will directly affect me for a variety of reasons. I apologize for sending in these comments so late but many in our neighborhood, including me, were unaware of this proposal until this week when a neighbor alerted the neighborhood residents.</p> <p>If I had started researching this issue sooner I would have verified which map is the more accurate, yours that shows O'Brien St. ending north of TL 2317 TIN R2W or the map on the propertysearch.fnsb.gov website that shows O'Brien St. going all the way south to the proposed corridor 69. Since I don't know the correct termination of O'Brien St. I will make comments for both situations when I reference corridor 69.</p> <p>So first, I will discuss the extension of Line Drive or Corridor 69.</p> <p>When I bought my 2 parcels adjacent to Line Drive there was a road and utility easement mentioned on each deed which I believe continues north on Line Drive for at least a few of the parcels shown on corridor 69. By extending the corridor as shown on your map, it will either end at Goldstream Creek or a bridge would have to be built across it. If the borough envisions the corridor continuing onto the other side of the creek and up to O'Brien Rd, I think it is disingenuous to not show it now so we can see it is a through road rather than just a road through TL 2705 TIN R2W.</p> <p>Because it is not shown on your map, I will first limit my comments to only include the corridor as shown. The only parcel that the new corridor will serve without a bridge across Goldstream Creek is a parcel owned by the State of Alaska. I believe that parcel's greatest value would be to include it within the Goldstream Valley Greenbelt. This area is used by not only me, but by my neighbors and the larger community. I think if you visited this state parcel you will see the limited value as a subdivision and the greater value as open space available to everyone in the community. It seems like the State of Alaska granted a lease to the Alaska Gasline Development Corporation in 2012 (001925-0) and amended it in 2017 (009267-0) so the possibility of it being added to a greenbelt may be slim; leaving it as vacant land then is preferred. So, unless the road corridor is intended for gas line access, which I hope is not the case, it doesn't seem to be necessary.</p> <p>If the intention is to connect Line Drive to O'Brien St., I have other concerns. The first one would be a through road cutting through the existing Goldstream Valley Greenbelt. From the number of people who have contributed to the Interior Alaska Land Trust to secure either outright purchase of the land or conservation easements, you can appreciate the value associated with the greenbelt corridor. A new road through it would diminish that value substantially.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/25	Web Form	Bobbie	Ritchie		<p>(Part 2)</p> <p>Second, the cost of a bridge across Goldstream Creek seems very excessive for the use it would probably get.</p> <p>Third, our neighborhood is a cohesive group of households that know each other and plan neighborhood activities, including work parties on the roads. With through access from Goldstream Rd. we would lose the neighborhood feel as well as the ability of the Road Service Area to maintain the road which is sometimes marginal at best. I'm also concerned about the safety of our neighbors walking on the roads and the effect of a through road on our neighborhood watch efforts.</p> <p>Finally, another important concern of mine and the other property owners on Black Sheep Lane is the maintenance of that road as well. Black Sheep Lane is a private road approximately ¼ mile long that goes from Sheep Creek Rd to Line Drive. Being a private road, road service money is not used for either maintenance or road improvements, but because the road accesses Sheep Creek Rd, many neighbors as well as their water and fuel delivery trucks use this private road. The added monetary burden for those of us living on Black Sheep Lane, and paying for upkeep of the road, would be prohibitive if even more traffic were regularly using the road.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69		Email	Sarah	Campbell		<p>(Part 1)</p> <p>I appreciate the information about the Team's justification for the two possible FNSB roads in our neighborhood (69 and 295). I would like to offer more data about the environment of our neighborhood.</p> <p>"Our Subdivision" and adjacent properties comprise about 40 separate housing units, most of which are modest dwellings, many built on permafrost. We are a discreet neighborhood with a limited, stable population whose members cooperate. We have had a road service area, "Our Service Area," for about forty years including only Line Drive, Home Run and Hafele Road. Line Drive is the main feeder for the neighborhood and is built on saturated soils underlain by permafrost. A couple of service area projects have stabilized limited portions of Line Drive with geotextile and large rock. Despite this costly work, additional areas of this road continue to fail each year due to traffic and thawing permafrost.</p> <p>The service area ends at Hafele Road and the continuation of Line Drive from there north into Goldstream Valley is a private road. This was a deliberate decision by the property owners of the four cabins on the north side of the hill because the cost of construction of a road to FNSB standards through saturated soil was prohibitive. FNSB road 69 extends this private road into the valley where the ground is mostly lake in the summer. The continuation of this alignment on the north side of the valley across Goldstream Creek is O'Brien Road, where the soils are equally poor, if not poorer. Cabins on that road have major problems with overflow all winter. With global warming taking a greater toll on soil in the Arctic and Subarctic, it makes little sense to encourage "alternate access" through a bog. Better to upgrade a major thoroughfare like Sheep Creek than add roads that are sure to fail.</p> <p>Our Service Area is challenged to maintain the roads we have, and would be unable to raise the funds to support roads through such problematic ground. Don says that the service area model may be replaced someday. It is unknown what this new program might be, since FNSB does not have road authority. I want to record that we like the service area concept and find it workable as currently configured.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenance (Economic/Feasibility).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
69		Email	Sarah	Campbell		<p>(Part 2)</p> <p>While Goldstream Valley is problematic for auto access, it is a wonderful winter recreation area. The valley trail (also known as the "three lakes trail" due to its summer condition!) allows walkers, runners, skiers, bicyclists, dog mushers and snow machines to travel from Sheep Creek Road to Fox, crossing only one busy road (Ballaine). Goldstream Creek, Line Drive, the Sheep Creek bike trail and Miller Hill Road offer a wonderful winter network of trails used extensively by the locals. These areas are well suited for recreation and roads would encroach on this use.</p> <p>All the above comments are directed to FNSB Road 69, but apply equally to FNSB Road 295. This brand new alignment beyond the current end of Hafele Road will be entirely on the north side of the hill, through mostly swampy ground. It will intersect both Lawlor Road Extension and Miller Hill Road and both are rutted and slippery on the north side of the hill. Most private land along this route already obtains access from an established road and driveway.</p> <p>A portion of the Equinox Marathon Trail runs through a wooded section of this potential ROW. In addition to runners, this route is also used by walkers, hikers, bicyclists, horses, skiers, dog teams and snow machines. An adjacent road would compromise the safety of these recreationists throughout the year, again encroaching on an existing use.</p> <p>In summary, I take issue with these potential roads providing any decent alternate access (AR) or emergency services (EES) due to existing substandard roads and new roads with a high potential for failure. Since we have fewer than 100 units in our neighborhood, we do not need multiple access (MA). The property to be accessed is inappropriate for development (NE) due to wetlands and poor soils (WFPS). Existing use is primarily recreational and any road work would be incompatible with that use (COMP). As a former employee in AKDOT's Construction Section, I contend that construction in these areas is NOT reasonably feasible (FEA) due to poor soils and wetlands. I respectfully request that these rights of way be eliminated from the FNSB plan. The recreational potential far exceeds the need to further encourage building on poor ground.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/26	Web Form	Cathy	Turner		<p>I am writing to oppose proposed road corridors #69 and # 295. These proposed road extensions meet very few of the criteria, and considering the great cost to build and maintain these roads, the cost (both social and financial) would far outweigh the benefit. I hope that you will consider more carefully my concerns with these road extensions and remove them from the proposed future plan.</p> <p>Access: The proposed road does not provide an alternate route or additional access to existing residential areas (there are no residential areas beyond where Line Drive currently ends). There is no expected future development in this area either.</p> <p>Connectivity: This road extension meets none of these criteria.</p> <p>Social: The proposed road would cross and interfere with a heavily used recreational corridor enjoyed by many citizens—dog mushers, snow machines, skiers, bikers, and walkers.</p> <p>Environment: The land in the proposed area is a wetland with extensive permafrost, ponds, a large creek, and extremely poor soil. As stated above, it also conflicts with trails currently used by residents and would disrupt wildlife habitat.</p> <p>Economic: This road is definitely not feasible because of the type of land it is to be built on (see above comments related to land type).</p> <p>Geometry: There is a steep grade drop off at the end of Line Drive that must be greater than 10%.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/26	Email	Dan	O'Neill	Former land use and environmental planner, resident off Line Drive for 43 years	<p>This proposal strikes all of us who live here as , well, absurd. You propose to facilitate the construction of a road down into the bottom of Goldstream Valley, through the sort of black spruce bog that swallows roads, build an expensive bridge over the creek, and then trend on up out of the bog toward the north. Do you have any idea what sort of road construction problems and expense and long-term maintenance that would impose? I do. I've worked building roads. My wife does. She worked for decades with Alaska's DOT building roads. And who will maintain this bog road? Our Service Area? Pardon us if we oppose FNSB facilitating expensive roads and leaving us to figure out how to maintain them. We note that the sort of development likely to be constructed in the middle of a bog will not be the sort that is likely to contribute much via the mil rate going to the service area, while at the same time saddling us with the worst stretches of roads to maintain in order to reach those structures. That strikes me as antithetical to good planning.</p> <p>It's as if FNSB looked at a property map, and not a topographic one. As if the Borough might have drawn a road across the Grand Canyon because it noticed a gap in connectivity, oblivious to the construction feasibility and maintenance costs.</p> <p>Moreover, the need for such a connecting road is nonexistent. Sheep Creek Rd. already provides parallel and faster access.</p> <p>You argue that the area to be served is "expected to be developed." I think you are quite mistaken, but in any case, you seem unaware that by designating a right-of-way now, you foster this hypothesized development. You are not so much addressing needs as you are nudging future development in a certain direction. It is a direction the local residents oppose, and for good reason.</p> <p>It's a bit unsettling that we residents must point out to planners that the residential development of permafrost wetlands is generally unwise (compromised foundations, frost jacking, non-percolating soil, no septic, incompetent base material for roads) and should not be encouraged. A far better use for such land is as open space, animal habitat, recreational space, especially when it features a watercourse and historic trails (the old Tanana Valley Railroad grade). Goldstream Creek is now a wonderful winter recreational corridor that would be diminished by such a road and bridge, all to shave a couple minutes off a few people's drive time. This represents a serious land use conflict. We don't see the wisdom in this sort of planning.</p> <p>City planners in San Francisco once proposed (and began to construct) an elevated freeway that would wrap around the city's waterfront from the Bay Bridge to the Golden Gate Bridge. It would have ruined such world-class views and amenities as the Ferry Building, the Embarcadero, Fisherman's Wharf, North Beach, Aquatic Park, the Marina Green, a yacht harbor, and a Civil War-era fort at the mouth of the bay. San Franciscans rose up in "The Freeway Rebellion" and stopped it mid-span. They said there were more important things about their city to save than a few minutes of automobile drive time. And because of sensibilities like that San Francisco remains one of the most beautiful and most visited cities in the world.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
69	6/25	Email	Larry & Elizabeth	Freeman (L) & Belknap (E)		<p>General Comments: Corridors 69 and 295 are bad ideas and we strongly object to them being in the FNSB Road Plan. Both are extensions onto saturated permafrost Fairbanks Loess on north facing slopes with active thaw subsidence and year-round standing water.</p> <p>Both interact, cross, or overlay trails in the Borough Trails Plan, in particular the Equinox Marathon Trail and the Goldstream/Tanana Valley RR winter trail.</p> <p>Line Drive and Hafele Avenue are currently in "Our Road Service District", maintenance is done on a timely basis and managed efficiently. If Hafele becomes a through road, would the road service district shoulder the extra maintenance caused by through travelers?</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>
69	6/25	Email	Larry & Elizabeth	Freeman (L) & Belknap (E)		<p>Corridor 69:</p> <p>Does lie within Section-line road corridor, but beyond the current extent of the privately maintained Mare's Tail Lane, accesses highly saturated, shallow permafrost bottom land characterized by sedge tussocks, dwarf black spruce and winter ice overflow. This extension of Line Drive northward would substantially expand road length to the existing service area; road length that would be built on extremely poor soils and would have excessive maintenance costs. The increased tax base of the service district would be minimal because of the poor development quality of the land.</p> <p>This corridor as proposed crosses two branches of the major east-west Goldstream winter recreation trail (Historic Tanana Valley Railroad) This would create a road crossing on a trail heavily used by mushers, ski-jorers, winter bicyclists and other users.</p>	<p>Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenance (Economic/Feasibility).</p>
69	6/25	Email	Janlee	Irving		<p>I am a resident off Line Drive in Our subdivision, and have been for almost 37 years.</p> <p>The potential plan to extend Line Drive or Hafele Avenue are very confusing to me. A Line Drive extension would go straight into Goldstream valley. This means serious wetland habitat-- very much inaccessible all summer (for environmental reasons), and very much accessible and well-used all winter by skiers, bicyclists, mushers, walkers, runners, and snowmachiners. Fairbanks needs this area of trails close to town, and already accessible from many points.</p> <p>As it is, Line Drive becomes a mass of soft lumps in the spring as the permafrost reminds us all of its presence. To add more traffic would make it impassable. Emergency vehicles would not be able to help people in need, fight fires, etc etc.</p> <p>Hafele Avenue is a short road that is a part of the Equinox Marathon trail. It could connect to Miller Hill Extension/Lawyer roads only in a nightmare scenario. If you have not driven those roads, you have no idea of how poorly maintained they are. These are private roads, driven on by few vehicles. Heavy traffic would require widening, raising.... basically starting from scratch.</p> <p>Without trying very hard, I can come up with several roads around town that are not properly maintained. Herreid Road could be used to alleviate the traffic for Pearl Creek school, but is now barely passable. Bonanza Trail leads to the homes of hundreds of people and is a morass of soft humps. St Patrick Rd falls apart every spring.</p> <p>We shouldn't build more roads on our unstable ground when we can't care for what we have.</p>	<p>Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenance (Economic/Feasibility).</p>
69	6/26	Email	Nathan	Turner		<p>I am requesting that you not move forward with the proposed road corridors #69 and # 295 in the Line Drive / Sheep Creek area. My family and I have maintained a residence in the area for 20 years now, and are in agreement with the others who live in this area that these proposed changes will not only fail to bring any benefits to those who have long lived in this in this neighborhood, but will actually negatively impact our neighborhood in a number of ways. There seems to be no upside to such development other than to "fill in the road map" in an area that otherwise enjoys the benefit of roadless recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenance (Economic/Feasibility).</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
69	6/26	Email	Nathan	Turner		<p>Line Drive has recently been extensively rebuilt after years of degraded quality. Neighbors would often get stuck in the middle of the road for the first half of the summer and several of us who live in the area would volunteer our own time and equipment to make repairs or tow neighbors from "the hole in the road". We finally were able to contract this out to be rebuilt - but it is little more than a single lane access to properties in this dead-end neighborhood. Through-access will require widening of line drive for safety and practical reasons if the proposed extensions go through, and this burden should not again fall on our neighborhood.</p> <p>Line Drive is one of the hard-to-find areas where neighbors often walk their dogs in the evening, visit with one another, and neighboring children can safely ride their bikes and play due to the limited nature of local traffic. If the extensions go through, you will be ending one of these ever-decreasing opportunities for friendly and interactive neighborhoods.</p> <p>Line Drive is already a dusty road, prone to potholing. Increased traffic will make a real mess of air quality for many of us due to many people who would choose to drive the route for the novelty of it, rather than any real necessity that would justify construction of the extensions.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenence (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/24	Email	Martha	Reynolds		<p>I am writing to comment on several corridors on the draft map that are in the part of the Borough where I live and recreate. Mostly I am objecting to proposed corridors which would connect two neighborhoods by replacing trails at the end of their road systems with roads. These connections do not benefit anyone. No one from the greater Fairbanks area will drive all the way to the end of the neighborhood roads to then drive back through another complex of neighborhood roads. We already have connector roads for that purpose. The residents of the neighborhood don't benefit either, unless they happen to have very close friends in the other area who they visit often. Most residents would just lose recreational trails.</p> <p>69 - this road extends Line Drive 1/2 mile north. The land through which it would go is black spruce and shrub permafrost wetlands. It would not provide access to good land for building on, and I see no positive purpose served by this proposed corridor.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenence (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/26	Email	Sarah	Campbell		<p>I appreciate the information about the Team's justification for the two possible FNSB roads in our neighborhood (69 and 295). I would like to offer more data about the environment of our neighborhood.</p> <p>"Our Subdivision" and adjacent properties comprise about 40 separate housing units, most of which are modest dwellings, many built on permafrost. We are a discreet neighborhood with a limited, stable population whose members cooperate. We have had a road service area, "Our Service Area," for about forty years including only Line Drive, Home Run and Hafele Road. Line Drive is the main feeder for the neighborhood and is built on saturated soils underlain by permafrost. A couple of service area projects have stabilized limited portions of Line Drive with geotextile and large rock. Despite this costly work, additional areas of this road continue to fail each year due to traffic and thawing permafrost.</p> <p>The service area ends at Hafele Road and the continuation of Line Drive from there north into Goldstream Valley is a private road. This was a deliberate decision by the property owners of the four cabins on the north side of the hill because the cost of construction of a road to FNSB standards through saturated soil was prohibitive. FNSB road 69 extends this private road into the valley where the ground is mostly lake in the summer. The continuation of this alignment on the north side of the valley across Goldstream Creek is O'Brien Road, where the soils are equally poor, if not poorer. Cabins on that road have major problems with overflow all winter. With global warming taking a greater toll on soil in the Arctic and Subarctic, it makes little sense to encourage "alternate access" through a bog. Better to upgrade a major thoroughfare like Sheep Creek than add roads that are sure to fail.</p> <p>Our Service Area is challenged to maintain the roads we have, and would be unable to raise the funds to support roads through such problematic ground. Don says that the service area model may be replaced someday. It is unknown what this new program might be, since FNSB does not have road authority. I want to record that we like the service area concept and find it workable as currently configured.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenence (Economic/Feasibility).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
69	6/26	Email	Sarah	Campbell		<p>While Goldstream Valley is problematic for auto access, it is a wonderful winter recreation area. The valley trail (also known as the "three lakes trail" due to its summer condition!) allows walkers, runners, skiers, bicyclists, dog mushers and snow machines to travel from Sheep Creek Road to Fox, crossing only one busy road (Ballaine). Goldstream Creek, Line Drive, the Sheep Creek bike trail and Miller Hill Road offer a wonderful winter network of trails used extensively by the locals. These areas are well suited for recreation and roads would encroach on this use.</p> <p>All the above comments are directed to FNSB Road 69, but apply equally to FNSB Road 295. This brand new alignment beyond the current end of Hafele Road will be entirely on the north side of the hill, through mostly swampy ground. It will intersect both Lawlor Road Extension and Miller Hill Road and both are rutted and slippery on the north side of the hill. Most private land along this route already obtains access from an established road and driveway.</p> <p>A portion of the Equinox Marathon Trail runs through a wooded section of this potential ROW. In addition to runners, this route is also used by walkers, hikers, bicyclists, horses, skiers, dog teams and snow machines. An adjacent road would compromise the safety of these recreationists throughout the year, again encroaching on an existing use.</p> <p>In summary, I take issue with these potential roads providing any decent alternate access (AR) or emergency services (EES) due to existing substandard roads and new roads with a high potential for failure. Since we have fewer than 100 units in our neighborhood, we do not need multiple access (MA). The property to be accessed is inappropriate for development (NE) due to wetlands and poor soils (WFPS). Existing use is primarily recreational and any road work would be incompatible with that use (COMP). As a former employee in AKDOT's Construction Section, I contend that construction in these areas is NOT reasonably feasible (FEA) due to poor soils and wetlands. I respectfully request that these rights of way be eliminated from the FNSB plan. The recreational potential far exceeds the need to further encourage building on poor ground.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/20	Email	William	Schneider		I want to register my strong objection to any extension of Line Drive or Hafele Road, both located in Our Subdivision. I am a resident and enjoy the fact that our subdivision does not have thru roads. This has been a factor in making this a coherent community. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/26	Web Form	Yvette	Lancaster	Developer	The corridors fail to meet the standards of the criteria set forth in the Boroughs analysis. While I could go through line by line it would only serve to make a cumbersome and long message. If the comprehensive plan is to be effective it also needs to contain goals that are achievable. The goals need to reflect the voice of the people. I would like to go on record as opposed to both Line Drive and Hafele and encourage that they be removed from this plan. Again, a basic review of the criteria supports this position. Thank you for hearing my comments. Yvette.	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/26	Web Form	(blank)	(blank)		<p>Project #69 Line Drive Extension,</p> <p>I have studied your Corridor Selection Criteria and it appears you are ignoring the fact that this project violates every consideration and guideline questions on your form. The Line Dr extension is like the bridge to nowhere. The proposed Road extension has no purpose as it will only cross wetlands, permafrost and end in swampy areas that are not suitable for building houses, let alone a roadway. I have walked this area and I understand why there are no houses or people living in this uninhabitable area. Your study should include viewing and hiking of the area of the proposed extension. It would not be feasible to put a road accessing this swampy area.</p> <p>It is a waste of the Boroughs time and money to build and maintain these unnecessary and detrimental roads.</p>	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/21	Email	Richard and Marlys	Henderson		We own property adjacent to Line Drive. If Line Drive (project #69) is extended the road will cross wet lands. Army Corps of Engineer would probably need to permit it. The University of Alaska is doing methane research on our property in the wet lands, close to the proposed road. The land seems as if it would not be suitable for a sustainable road, unless the borough is committed to maintaining it regularly. A bridge would also be required to cross Goldstream. The beginning cost would be expensive, but the continual maintenance of roads crossing wet and boggy land would extend the cost exorbitantly. Are you thinking this would be a part of Our Subdivision Service area and the service area would be responsible for its maintenance. As of now we live beyond the end of the maintained service area at the intersection of Line Drive and Hafele Drive. There are no other homes except for one dry cabin with property adjacent to Mare's Tail (the name given to Line Drive extension toward Goldstream presently. Since the land is unsuitable for building, no home owners are asking for access. We seriously question the feasibility of this project. In addition the road would run beneath a long established runway landing strip. As for project \$295 extension of Hafele Drive, we wonder if you would be able to gain access for a road since the Hay Field, we believe, is in a Nature Conservancy. Again there is very little home ownership through the lands that would extend Hafele Drive. We personally feel that these monies could be better used to upgrade and regularly maintain roads in the Goldstream and Murphy Dome areas.	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/21	Email	Colin	Campbell		I'm a resident of this neighborhood (I live off Black sheep lane) and am writing to voice my strong objection to extending Line drive or Hafele. With the melting permafrost we are already having a lot of difficulty with maintaining our roads at their current traffic levels. Extending either of these roads to make them a thru road would exponentially increase traffic and surely degrade the road quality significantly. Another factor for me buying and building in this neighborhood was the fact it did not have highly trafficked through roads. Thank you for your consideration.	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).
69	6/20	Email	Terrance	Gacke		I'm writing to express my opposition to any road extensions or developments for Line Drive or Hafele Ave. I specifically purchased my property because of the dead end nature of the roads in this neighborhood. Connecting them to other roads will bring more traffic from Yankovich and Miller Hill trying to save 2 minutes of time getting to Goldstream. Please remove these 2 proposed extensions from the borough list. Thank you.	Corridor 69 has been removed based on public feedback and not sufficiently satisfying the corridor criteria. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input: local residents strongly oppose the corridor; inclusion would not address community feedback. Access: does not provide alternative access. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: crosses challenging wetland terrain that would pose difficulties for road construction and maintenenance (Economic/Feasibility).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
84	5/19	Paper Form	Debbie	Eberhardt		Remove. Eberhardt Rd and Funk Rd corridor 360 (I think). This is "Trust Property."	Corridor 84 and 360 have been removed from the plan based on public comments and failure to satisfy several corridor criteria: Social/Public Input: inclusion does not address community feedback, public comments do not support the corridor. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: potential challenges with road construction and maintenance due to poor ground conditions.
117	5/27	Email	Seth	Adams		Hi friends, For some reason the online comment form wouldn't work for me. I also missed the open house due to a conflict. I'd like to comment on 361 and 117. That corridor is over an existing trail. I used to live in (and still own and rent out) a cabin at the end of Northridge (which weirdly is not labeled on the map), and so I know that that trail is not heavily used since access is inconvenient. Turning that particular trail into a road wouldn't be so bad, and would shorten the drive for my tenant and everyone else living on Northridge and Dragline Dr. However, that trail is part of a fantastic trail network that I strongly feel deserves maximum protection both for its value as trails and also a historical structure - the FE Ditch trails are down there. They currently suffer from private property issues near Guinevere, but otherwise it's a fantastic trail network that is way under-used. If a road were ever built at 361/117 I would strongly suggest that there be a provision for a trailhead (that would provide access from Chena Ridge to State Land adjacent to the Isberg Rec Area.) and that the remaining trails in that area be protected as trails. Thanks for all your hard work!	Thank you for your comments. A connection in this area would only be built should the parcels it crosses subdivide. To protect the area's trail network and mitigate impacts, a shared trail and road corridor could be developed at the time of subdivision. This corridor has been maintained in the plan based on satisfying the following criteria: Access/Alternate Routes, Access/Emergency & Essential Services, Connectivity/Small Gap Closures, and Connectivity/Vehicle Miles Travelled. The planning team attempted to balance these positive criteria with concerns about trail conflicts (Environment/Recreation). The team ultimately decided that the corridor should remain in the plan due to its benefits for access and connectivity, and since design decisions could mitigate potential trail and road conflicts.
185	6/23	Web Form	Virginia	Supanick		Message: After review of the draft plan for the SW Quadrant and New Corridor 185 (connects Allen Adale to Haman St), I wish to express my concerns as a resident located on Haman St. Why do all roads need to connect? We currently have experienced increased traffic (many drivers are already speeding) on our dead-end street over the last 4 years due to ongoing construction and new homes. Connecting Haman to Allen Adale will only increase this traffic creating even more dust and safety concerns for children at play and the horses stabled on our street. Additionally, much of the traffic observed on Haman St includes recreational vehicles with some riders driving recklessly. Increased traffic, increased dust and increased safety concerns will impact the quality of life for all residents in neighborhood. If this corridor is approved, what improvements will be made to minimize dust and reduce speed? As a concerned homeowner, I chose this street with safety in mind as a dead-end / cul de sac is appealing to many homeowners. Essentially, this proposed corridor will inevitably turn into a throughway for passersby versus enhancing safety/easibility to the residents on Haman St. Thank you for taking the time to read my concerns and I hope this information will be considered.	Corridor 367 (formerly 185) has been removed based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that verified the connection would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of less than 10% grade.
185	5/19	Paper Form	Miho	Aoki		The west side of the new plan includes an unconstructed area of Haman Street, The area connecting the new plan and the unconstructed area of Haman is very steep. We are concerned because if the road gets constructed, it'll affect our property (which is very small). We own lot 4 of Koponen homestead.	Corridor 367 (formerly 185) has been removed based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that verified the connection would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of less than 10% grade.
203	5/18	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Proposed Road corridor 203: This would extend Rebel Way, a platted but unimproved and unmaintained road in the southwestern portion of the Lincoln Creek subdivision, across State Land and a portion of the Tanana Valley State Forest and connect it to Cache Creek Road around mile 7. The map indicates that the extension would cross very steep slopes to the north of Cache Creek Road, including a slope just above the Cache Creek Birch Mile 7 timber sale (NC-1580-F). How was this corridor proposed and what is the justification for including it in the plan? Proposed road corridor 203 and 270: We'd like more information on how the two corridors were proposed and why they were included in the plan including specific information on the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who proposed the extension of Rebel and the construction of Gettysburg Roads? Were the proposals for extending Rebel and constructing Gettysburg made independently or together? Did the DNR provide any input regarding building new roads into the Tanana State Forest? Are either of the proposed roads related to timber sales? What is the justification for two new road corridors that join the western end of the Lincoln Creek subdivision to Cache Creek Road? How did the planning team address the potential issues with building new roads across steep slopes and in areas with thawing permafrost such as erosion, slumping, and increased cost to maintain roads built in areas prone to erosion? Did the planning team consider if building new roads in this area is compatible with the FSNB sustainability and climate action plan goals? Did the planning team consider how increased traffic in the Lincoln Creek subdivision would affect local residents and costs of maintaining the subdivision roads? Aside from the postcards and various public notices on the radio, in the newspaper, and on the FSNB web site, did the planning team reach out to residents of the Lincoln Creek subdivision regarding the new corridors? Did the planning team meet with the Keystone Road Service Area (RS) road commissioners to discuss how extending Rebel Way and constructing Gettysburg Road would impact existing roads and road maintenance in the RSA? Did the planning team take into consideration the condition of Reconstruction Road and Cache Creek when it decided to include corridors 203 and 270 into the plan? This includes consideration of the seasonal access issues along the western end of Reconstruction and along Cache Creek Road past Papp Road during winter and during break-up season. Did the planning team discuss improvements to Reconstruction Road and Cache Creek Road to provide year-round access to Gettysburg Road and Rebel Way? 	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Overall, we are strongly opposed to corridor 203 and corridor 270, both in the NW Quadrant. Neither corridor 203 or corridor 270 meet the evaluation criteria used by your committee (see below) and both corridors are inconsistent with the Fairbanks North Star Borough's Regional Comprehensive Plan that designated much of the area that these corridors transect as Preferred Forest Land. Further, we find no evidence that the establishment of corridors 203 or 270 "encourage and support the FNSB and developers working together to develop a road system that protects the health, safety, and well-being of the community". Thus, we recommend that corridor 203 and corridor 270 be removed from the plan.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Brief description of Proposed Road corridor 203: This corridor would extend Rebel Way, a platted but unimproved and unmaintained road in the southwestern portion of the Lincoln Creek subdivision, across State Land and a portion of the Tanana Valley State Forest and connect it to Cache Creek Road around mile 7. The map included in the draft roads plan indicates that the extension would cross very steep south-facing slopes adjacent and north of Cache Creek Road, including a steep slope just above the Cache Creek Birch Mile 7 timber sale (NC-1580-F).	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Access: While both corridor 203 or 270 could provide alternative routes to enter and exit the Lincoln Creek Subdivision, access via both corridors would increase vehicle miles traveled to access a year-round maintained road (Murphy Dome Road). Currently there are two roads that provide access to the Lincoln Creek Subdivision; Sherman Road, via Cache Creek Road, and Abraham Road, which joins Murphy Dome Road. Using either corridor 203 or 270 would actually require more vehicle miles, since it would require driving either 5 or 7 miles along Cache Creek Road to enter the subdivision. Further, using either corridor 203 or 270 would increase travel time since Cache Creek Road is a twisty single-land gravel and mud forestry road that is frequently used by forestry trucks. Further, Cache Creek Road is not maintained past mile 4 in winter; thus, any gain in access for emergency services via corridors 203 or 270 would require that Cache Creek Road be maintained year-round. Thus, extending 203 and 270 to approximately miles 5 and 7 of Cache Creek Road does not provide effective ingress and egress for the Lincoln Creek subdivision in case of emergencies and for essential service delivery. We understand that both corridors could provide access to future subdivisions in the area, but we believe that promoting a new subdivision in that area is irresponsible and is not consistent with the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Connectivity: Neither 203 or 270 decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT) or out-of-direction travel (see above), or close small gaps in the existing road network. Rather, both 203 and 270 would increase overall VMT and out of direction travel since both would provide access to Cache Creek Road near miles 5 and 7 (see item 1). Further, corridors 203 and 270 would connect one unmaintained road, Reconstruction, with one seasonally maintained road, Cache Creek. Thus, neither corridor closes a gap, but rather simply joins two unmaintained roads.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		(image attached) Social: b. Balance maintenance needs with access and safety goals. The draft roads plan did not include ways to address current maintenance needs that could effectively and efficiently provide emergency and essential services access needs in the Lincoln Creek subdivision. Instead, the draft roads plan focused on identifying new corridors and we believe that this was a major oversight. Currently, many of the roads in the Lincoln Creek subdivision are defined as "constructed roads" in the FNSB GIS system. However, many of these "constructed" roads are actually pioneer roads that are poorly drained single lane roads with no improvements (no gravel base, no drainage, no grading, no culverts). In most cases, these roads, including Reconstruction Road that would be used as the primary connecting road for both corridor 203 and 270, are impassable for many weeks during spring break up (see Figure 1). Even one large vehicle, such as an ambulance or fire truck, trying to drive on these roads during spring break up can cause significant damage to the road. Additionally, these roads are not plowed by the RSA during winter; they are plowed by the community members who need to access their homes. We realize that the drafts road plan did not incorporate measures to meet emergency services and access needs on existing roads, but we think that it would be more effective for the FNSB to address how to improve existing roads so they provide year-round access for community members rather than propose new road corridors that do not increase access or improve access to emergency service. Overall, we feel that it is irresponsible for the FNSB to proposed new roads when the existing roads, including one identified as the primary connecting road for two new corridors, do not meet the overall goals of improving access and emergency services for community members. Figure 1. Examples of roads defined as "constructed" in FNSB GIS system. The left photo shows typical early spring conditions along the northern portion of Emancipation Road. The center and right photos show typical early spring conditions along the westernmost portion of Abraham Road.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Social: c. Avoid encroachment and conflicts with existing uses. Extending 203 and 270 suggests that public lands currently managed by the Alaska DNR and included in the Tanana Valley State Forest would be transferred to private ownership. This would result in the loss of public lands, thus restricting use on these lands to private land owners. This loss of access is not consistent with the goals of the FNSB roads plan or the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan. This will result in the loss of traditional and existing uses of this section of the Tanana Valley State Forest including hunting, hiking, berry picking, skiing, etc. in the corridor 203 and 270 corridors and lands adjacent to the corridors. This would have direct negative impacts on many of the residents of the Lincoln Creek subdivision who live in this area specifically because of its proximity to the Tanana Valley State Forest and the opportunities it provides for outdoor activities. The original public notice that promoted the establishment of the Lincoln Creek subdivision specifically mentioned the adjacent Tanana State Forest and forestry land, but it did not include any mention of the potential of transferring portions of this public land to private ownership for future subdivisions and those lands are currently designated as Preferred Forestry Land by the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan. Further, one of the primary justifications for the current project to improve Cache Creek Road and replace the Fortune Creek Bridge was to improve access to public lands in the area. Thus, transferring current public lands to private ownership, as implied by the two proposed corridors is inconsistent with continuing to provide for public access in the area. Also, please note that the grant to complete the current Cache Creek Road improvements does not cover future maintenance costs.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		(image attached) Be compatible with existing FNSB plans. Both corridor 203 and 270 are incompatible with the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan that designates most of the areas transected by these corridors as Preferred Forest Land and with the Tanana Valley State Forest Plan (Figure 2). Figure 2. Screenshot from Fairbanks North Star GIS Regional Comprehensive Plan that shows that most of the area in corridors 203 and 270 transect public lands designated as Preferred Forest Lands.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Social: e. Potential for increased degradation of existing and new trails and roads. Establishing these corridors could lead to the construction of pioneer roads in associated with future development. This in turn could lead to increase use of motorized recreational vehicles that will have a negative impact on the local community and lead to further degradation of local trail conditions, particularly during spring break up and during autumn after heavy rainfalls (Figure 3). Figure 3. The photo above shows the westernmost portion of Abraham Road after two heavy vehicles, Jeeps, drove along the road during spring break up in May 2020. The deep ruts resulting from driving on the soft mud road have caused further road damage. The drivers camped about ½ mile to the west of the photo location, leaving behind deep ruts along the road and garbage.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Social: f. Increasing risk of human-caused wildfires and bear-human conflicts. We are concerned about increased risk of human-caused wildfires and human-bear interactions caused by increased access into the western portion of the Lincoln Creek subdivision. Non-community members that recreate in this area often leave behind unattended fires and trash. We are very concerned that increasing access in this area would lead to more human-caused wildfires and more conflicts with bears drawn to trash left behind by out-of-community users. Further, promoting development of residential areas in areas of the FNSB that are at high risk of wildfire, that is implied in the plan along corridors 203 and 270, without concurrent planning and efforts to increase resiliency to wildfires (i.e., building sustainable firebreaks) is irresponsible. Promoting future development in areas at high risk of wildfires is irresponsible and should be avoided.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Environment: Substantial portions of routes 203 and 270 traverse steep terrain across areas with discontinuous permafrost and poorly drained soils. Further, portions of 203 and 270 would impact existing recreational use of portions of the Tanana Valley State Forest (see item 3 above). Further, both corridors transect areas that are designated as Preferred Forest Land in the current Fairbanks North Star Borough Regional Comprehensive Plan.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		(image attached) Economic: The costs to construct and maintain roads in corridors 203 and 270 would be very high due to the steep terrain, discontinuous permafrost, and poor soils. Removing existing cover from these areas would result in further degradation of soils and increased thawing of permafrost, ultimately leading to slumping and other erosion problems. Constructing roads within both 203 and 270 would be challenging, requiring specific and costly measures to mitigate erosion, slumping, and general degradation due to use and changes in landforms and loss of cover. The many proposed deep contouring vees across this steep terrain will be subject to winter overflow and glaciating, as currently happens along many sections of Cache Creek Road. Further, heavy rainfall will cause erosion and loss of road surface, as currently seen along existing subdivision roads and most sections of Cache Creek Road (see Figure 4 below). Thus, it is not reasonable to construct roads in this area due to the extremely high costs of both constructing and maintaining new roads within corridors 203 and 270. (The current project to repair Cache Creek Road, estimated at between \$1,000,000 to \$2,500,000, http://dnr.alaska.gov/parks/designconstruct/bidadvert/cacheecreek/cacheecreekbiddocs.pdf , provides some insight into the cost of maintaining roads in this area.) Figure 4. Example of severe erosion along eastern portion of Cache Creek Road. Note that this section of Cache Creek Road was improved several years ago, but funds were not available to do routine annual road maintenance. A new grant will bring improvements but the grant does not cover future maintenance costs.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Geometry: Both 203 and 270 traverse steep terrain and would most likely require multiple switch backs and/or steep grading. Overall, the topography along both corridors is not conducive to road building due to very steep terrain, poor soils, and discontinuous permafrost.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
203	5/25	Email	Helene Genet and Benoit Pignon			We oppose the proposition of road extension 203 and 270 connecting Rebel road and Gettysburg road to Cache Creek road respectively. The low traffic in this area doesn't justify creating new access road between Cache Creek and the Lincoln ridge subdivision, when Sherman road already serves this purpose. As stated above, Lincoln ridge subdivision is a small, quiet neighborhood with very low traffic, and the Cache creek road provide access for a very small number of residents, recreational activities and logging activities. As such, Sherman road provide ample access between the two areas, without requiring additional access. Again, we would rather encourage directing these funds toward proper maintenance of the existing roads, rather than creating new once of minimal use.	Corridor 203 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
206	5/19	Open House				Look at photos as better choice. Krause, Schiewer	Corridors 206 and 381 have been removed from the plan based on public comments and engineering analysis which has shown that the topography is likely too steep (>25%) for feasible road construction and maintenance. Corridor Criteria: Economic/Feasibility.
217	6/23	Web Form	Gina	Graham		Message: I am writing in regards to proposed corridor 217, that would connect the eastern end of Skyflight Ave. to an extended Pandora. My concerns include: 1) More traffic on Cordes and Skyflight will wear out our roads faster, particularly where the road construction was subpar. 2) Cordes and Skyflight are not constructed to be 35mph roads. When roads get longer, they tend to get posted to be faster, and that would require a good deal of work on these roads. 3) The current culdesac at the end of Skyflight is not in the right of way completely. It is on Private property. That should be fixed if this road extension goes through. 4) Better adherence to water management standards and the inclusion of snow dumps need to be in new road builds. All of them. Thanks for your time and attention.	Corridor 217 has been maintained in the plan due to its importance for providing new access to parcels to the north and west of the Skyflight airstrip with a high likelihood of development. The corridor has been realigned slightly to the west based on public feedback to avoid impacting private parcels.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
217	6/24	Email	Martha	Reynolds		<p>I am writing to comment on several corridors on the draft map that are in the part of the Borough where I live and recreate. Mostly I am objecting to proposed corridors which would connect two neighborhoods by replacing trails at the end of their road systems with roads. These connections do not benefit anyone. No one from the greater Fairbanks area will drive all the way to the end of the neighborhood roads to then drive back through another complex of neighborhood roads. We already have connector roads for that purpose. The residents of the neighborhood don't benefit either, unless they happen to have very close friends in the other area who they visit often. Most residents would just lose recreational trails.</p> <p>217 - this corridor connects Skyflight with Pandora. Similar to other comments above, these roads are the end of their neighborhood road systems. Neither neighborhood would benefit from the connection, and both would lose the existing trail system that is in the same corridor.</p>	Corridor 217 has been maintained in the plan due to its importance for providing new access to parcels to the north and west of the Skyflight airstrip with a high likelihood of development. The corridor has been realigned slightly to the west based on public feedback to avoid impacting private parcels.
217	6/18	Landowner Notes	Colin	Craven	DNR Land Sales	<p>Skyflight Ave Area</p> <p>North and west of Goldstream Road and just north of Skyflight Ave is 70 acres within Sections 1 and 12 of F1N2W that DNR Land Sales has long planned for a subdivision. The draft road corridors show a connection extending Skyflight Ave to the north, through private property, through DNR land, then through FNSB land to connect to the Pandora Drive Road network. This connection makes sense and ideally is what DNR would want for an access route. However, I'm not aware of a legal access route over private property that would make this possible.</p> <p>Does the FNSB have a legal access corridor for this Skyflight Ave extension secured? Or instead is the FNSB hoping that the private property owner(s) between the existing Skyflight Ave ROW and DNR land will subdivide to create the need for dedicating the access corridor? If the latter is the case, this seems very unlikely to happen considering the size of the parcels, existing development patterns, and the lack of interest most property owners have in routing a new road through their property.</p> <p>If DNR were to pursue development of these 70 acres, we would be using the access route from the middle of the Skyflight Ave "plateau" along a section line easement crossing the airstrip northward, as this legal access corridor exists, has been used for platting purposes previously, and (while not ideal) is practical to develop. Unless FNSB Community Planning has the Skyflight Ave extension access secured, DNR Land Sales sees the proposed Skyflight Ave extension route as a potential hindrance, as during our eventual subdivision platting we could be required to dedicate a ROW corridor that would likely remain stranded while still platting and perhaps developing the actual road corridor into and through our 70-acre property.</p>	Corridor 217 has been maintained in the plan due to its importance for providing new access to parcels to the north and west of the Skyflight airstrip with a high likelihood of development. The corridor has been realigned slightly to the west based on public feedback to avoid impacting private parcels.
217	6/25	Landowner Notes	Colin	Craven	DNR Land Conveyance Section	The specific property of concern is the O'Connor Creek East area where DNR owns 70 acres northwest of Skyflight Avenue within Sections 1 and 12 of F1N2W (FNSB tax lots 1203 and 1207). The combined effect of the proposed road and trail corridors within this property would encumber a significant fraction of the property with road rights-of-way and trail easements.	Corridor 217 has been maintained in the plan due to its importance for providing new access to parcels to the north and west of the Skyflight airstrip with a high likelihood of development. The corridor has been realigned slightly to the west based on public feedback to avoid impacting private parcels.
217	6/25	Landowner Notes	Colin	Craven	DNR Land Conveyance Section	<p>Comprehensive Roads Plan</p> <p>The public review draft of the Roads Plan shows a corridor connecting Skyflight Avenue to Pandora Drive. This would be an excellent road corridor if there were legal access across private property connecting Skyflight Avenue and DNR land. Unless the FNSB has secured legal access across this private property, it is a road corridor that is not likely to be realized. DNR has tentative plans for the subdivision with access based on section line easements due to the lack of legal access across private property, as described above. When DNR would prepare for platting the subdivision, we would be placed in the difficult situation of dedicating an access route for development originating from the section line easements while also dedicating the proposed Roads Plan corridor that is likely to remain incomplete.</p> <p>DNR has had recent experience with platting a subdivision that had a road corridor specified by the existing Comprehensive Roads Plan. DNR platted the Two Ponds Subdivision with a major collector road corridor routed through the subdivision departing from an existing pioneer road that could have served as a local road for subdivision parcel access. This rerouting came with significant expense for design costs to meet FNSB requirements, all for the larger goal of providing continuing access to lands west of the subdivision. Now in the draft Roads Plan update, this continued route has ended at the Two Ponds Subdivision, meaning that DNR's investment for the FNSB's platting requirements of an ongoing collector road was an unneeded expense and complication. DNR does not wish to repeat this experience with unnecessarily dedicating road rights-of-way that likely will never be realized in the O'Connor Creek East area.</p>	Corridor 217 has been maintained in the plan due to its importance for providing new access to parcels to the north and west of the Skyflight airstrip with a high likelihood of development. The corridor has been realigned slightly to the west based on public feedback to avoid impacting private parcels.
224	7/12	Letter	Biren	Pavelsky		<p>Dear folks: re: proposed road extension from Emancipation to Murphy Dome Rd., Keystone Service Area. I've lived in Keystone SA since 1983 and have spent many years as a road commissioner. By far the best capital improvement for Keystone in terms of number of residents forward would be to improve Abraham extension and Reconstruction extension so they are maintainable. I regard the proposal that would connect Emancipation to Murphy Dome Rd as unnecessarily expensive initially and as a maintainance burden on the service area. I have an interest in keeping the tract in questions recreational, i.e., undeveloped.</p>	Corridor 224 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that revealed the corridor would likely be too steep to construct to FNSB Title 17 road design standards. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input, Economic/Feasibility, Geometry/Road Grade.
251	6/24	Email	Martha	Reynolds		<p>I am writing to comment on several corridors on the draft map that are in the part of the Borough where I live and recreate. Mostly I am objecting to proposed corridors which would connect two neighborhoods by replacing trails at the end of their road systems with roads. These connections do not benefit anyone. No one from the greater Fairbanks area will drive all the way to the end of the neighborhood roads to then drive back through another complex of neighborhood roads. We already have connector roads for that purpose. The residents of the neighborhood don't benefit either, unless they happen to have very close friends in the other area who they visit often. Most residents would just lose recreational trails.</p> <p>251 - this corridor connects Moose Trail with Ski Boot Hill Road. This is currently a very popular trail. There is no benefit to the residents of either end of the corridor for the proposed connection, and many would lose recreational access if the road were built. Just as 289 and 33 were removed, this one should also be removed.</p>	Corridor 251 has been maintained in the plan due to the likelihood of development of the parcels that it crosses. Including this corridor in the plan encourages the development of an internally circulating road network and creates alternate access (Corridor Criteria: Access/Alternate Routes and Access/Multiple Access Points) for two adjacent neighborhoods, and future lots, should the parcels subdivide. Trail and road conflicts can be mitigated through design decisions such as a shared trail/road corridor in this area.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
270	5/18	Email		McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Proposed Road corridor 270: This would extend Gettysburg Road, an unconstructed road, in the southwestern portion of Lincoln Creek subdivision, across State Land and connect it to Cache Creek Road around mile 8. The map indicates that the extension would cross steep slopes along a ridge along Cache Creek Road.</p> <p>How was this corridor proposed and what is the justification for including it in the plan?</p> <p>Proposed road corridor 203 and 270: We'd like more information on how the two corridors were proposed and why they were included in the plan including specific information on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Who proposed the extension of Rebel and the construction of Gettysburg Roads? Were the proposals for extending Rebel and constructing Gettysburg made independently or together? Did the DNR provide any input regarding building new roads into the Tanana State Forest? Are either of the proposed roads related to timber sales? What is the justification for two new road corridors that join the western end of the Lincoln Creek subdivision to Cache Creek Road? How did the planning team address the potential issues with building new roads across steep slopes and in areas with thawing permafrost such as erosion, slumping, and increased cost to maintain roads built in areas prone to erosion? Did the planning team consider if building new roads in this area is compatible with the FSNB sustainability and climate action plan goals? Did the planning team consider how increased traffic in the Lincoln Creek subdivision would affect local residents and costs of maintaining the subdivision roads? Aside from the postcards and various public notices on the radio, in the newspaper, and on the FSNB web site, did the planning team reach out to residents of the Lincoln Creek subdivision regarding the new corridors? Did the planning team meet with the Keystone Road Service Area (RS) road commissioners to discuss how extending Rebel Way and constructing Gettysburg Road would impact existing roads and road maintenance in the RSA? Did the planning team take into consideration the condition of Reconstruction Road and Cache Creek when it decided to include corridors 203 and 270 into the plan? This includes consideration of the seasonal access issues along the western end of Reconstruction and along Cache Creek Road past Papp Road during winter and during break-up season. Did the planning team discuss improvements to Reconstruction Road and Cache Creek Road to provide year-round access to Gettysburg Road and Rebel Way? 	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FSNB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Overall, we are strongly opposed to corridor 203 and corridor 270, both in the NW Quadrant. Neither corridor 203 or corridor 270 meet the evaluation criteria used by your committee (see below) and both corridors are inconsistent with the Fairbanks North Star Borough's Regional Comprehensive Plan that designated much of the area that these corridors transect as Preferred Forest Land. Further, we find no evidence that the establishment of corridors 203 or 270 "encourage and support the FNSB and developers working together to develop a road system that protects the health, safety, and well-being of the community". Thus, we recommend that corridor 203 and corridor 270 be removed from the plan.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FSNB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Brief description of proposed road corridor 270: This corridor would extend Gettysburg Road, an unconstructed road, in the southwestern portion of Lincoln Creek subdivision, across State Land and connect it to Cache Creek Road around mile 5. The map indicates that the extension would cross steep slopes as it descends from a ridge adjacent to Cache Creek Road.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FSNB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Access: While both corridor 203 or 270 could provide alternative routes to enter and exit the Lincoln Creek Subdivision, access via both corridors would increase vehicle miles traveled to access a year-round maintained road (Murphy Dome Road). Currently there are two roads that provide access to the Lincoln Creek Subdivision; Sherman Road, via Cache Creek Road, and Abraham Road, which joins Murphy Dome Road. Using either corridor 203 or 270 would actually require more vehicle miles, since it would require driving either 5 or 7 miles along Cache Creek Road to enter the subdivision. Further, using either corridor 203 or 270 would increase travel time since Cache Creek Road is a twisty single-land gravel and mud forestry road that is frequently used by forestry trucks. Further, Cache Creek Road is not maintained past mile 4 in winter; thus, any gain in access for emergency services via corridors 203 or 270 would require that Cache Creek Road be maintained year-round. Thus, extending 203 and 270 to approximately miles 5 and 7 of Cache Creek Road does not provide effective ingress and egress for the Lincoln Creek subdivision in case of emergencies and for essential service delivery. We understand that both corridors could provide access to future subdivisions in the area, but we believe that promoting a new subdivision in that area is irresponsible and is not consistent with the FSNB Regional Comprehensive Plan.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FSNB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Connectivity: Neither 203 or 270 decrease vehicle miles travelled (VMT) or out-of-direction travel (see above), or close small gaps in the existing road network. Rather, both 203 and 270 would increase overall VMT and out of direction travel since both would provide access to Cache Creek Road near miles 5 and 7 (see item 1). Further, corridors 203 and 270 would connect one unmaintained road, Reconstruction, with one seasonally maintained road, Cache Creek. Thus, neither corridor closes a gap, but rather simply joins two unmaintained roads.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FSNB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>(image attached)</p> <p>Social: b. Balance maintenance needs with access and safety goals. The draft roads plan did not include ways to address current maintenance needs that could effectively and efficiently provide emergency and essential services access needs in the Lincoln Creek subdivision. Instead, the draft roads plan focused on identifying new corridors and we believe that this was a major oversight. Currently, many of the roads in the Lincoln Creek subdivision are defined as "constructed roads" in the FNSB GIS system. However, many of these "constructed" roads are actually pioneer roads that are poorly drained single lane roads with no improvements (no gravel base, no drainage, no grading, no culverts). In most cases, these roads, including Reconstruction Road that would be used as the primary connecting road for both corridor 203 and 270, are impassable for many weeks during spring break up (see Figure 1). Even one large vehicle, such as an ambulance or fire truck, trying to drive on these roads during spring break up can cause significant damage to the road. Additionally, these roads are not plowed by the RSA during winter; they are plowed by the community members who need to access their homes. We realize that the drafts road plan did not incorporate measures to meet emergency services and access needs on existing roads, but we think that it would be more effective for the FNSB to address how to improve existing roads so they provide year-round access for community members rather than propose new road corridors that do not increase access or improve access to emergency service. Overall, we feel that it is irresponsible for the FNSB to proposed new roads when the existing roads, including one identified as the primary connecting road for two new corridors, do not meet the overall goals of improving access and emergency services for community members.</p> <p>Figure 1. Examples of roads defined as "constructed" in FNSB GIS system. The left photo shows typical early spring conditions along the northern portion of Emancipation Road. The center and right photos show typical early spring conditions along the westernmost portion of Abraham Road.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Social: c. Avoid encroachment and conflicts with existing uses. Extending 203 and 270 suggests that public lands currently managed by the Alaska DNR and included in the Tanana Valley State Forest would be transferred to private ownership. This would result in the loss of public lands, thus restricting use on these lands to private land owners. This loss of access is not consistent with the goals of the FNSB roads plan or the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan. This will result in the loss of traditional and existing uses of this section of the Tanana Valley State Forest including hunting, hiking, berry picking, skiing, etc. in the corridor 203 and 270 corridors and lands adjacent to the corridors. This would have direct negative impacts on many of the residents of the Lincoln Creek subdivision who live in this area specifically because of its proximity to the Tanana Valley State Forest and the opportunities it provides for outdoor activities. The original public notice that promoted the establishment of the Lincoln Creek subdivision specifically mentioned the adjacent Tanana State Forest and forestry land, but it did not include any mention of the potential of transferring portions of this public land to private ownership for future subdivisions and those lands are currently designated as Preferred Forestry Land by the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan. Further, one of the primary justifications for the current project to improve Cache Creek Road and replace the Fortune Creek Bridge was to improve access to public lands in the area. Thus, transferring current public lands to private ownership, as implied by the two proposed corridors is inconsistent with continuing to provide for public access in the area. Also, please note that the grant to complete the current Cache Creek Road improvements does not cover future maintenance costs.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>(image attached) Be compatible with existing FNSB plans. Both corridor 203 and 270 are incompatible with the FNSB Regional Comprehensive Plan that designates most of the areas transected by these corridors as Preferred Forest Land and with the Tanana Valley State Forest Plan (Figure 2).</p> <p>Figure 2. Screenshot from Fairbanks North Star GIS Regional Comprehensive Plan that shows that most of the area in corridors 203 and 270 transect public lands designated as Preferred Forest Lands.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Social: e. Potential for increased degradation of existing and new trails and roads. Establishing these corridors could lead to the construction of pioneer roads in associated with future development. This in turn could lead to increase use of motorized recreational vehicles that will have a negative impact on the local community and lead to further degradation of local trail conditions, particularly during spring break up and during autumn after heavy rainfalls (Figure 3). Figure 3. The photo above shows the westernmost portion of Abraham Road after two heavy vehicles, Jeeps, drove along the road during spring break up in May 2020. The deep ruts resulting from driving on the soft mud road have caused further road damage. The drivers camped about ½ mile to the west of the photo location, leaving behind deep ruts along the road and garbage.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Social: f. Increasing risk of human-caused wildfires and bear-human conflicts. We are concerned about increased risk of human-caused wildfires and human-bear interactions caused by increased access into the western portion of the Lincoln Creek subdivision. Non-community members that recreate in this area often leave behind unattended fires and trash. We are very concerned that increasing access in this area would lead to more human-caused wildfires and more conflicts with bears drawn to trash left behind by out-of-community users. Further, promoting development of residential areas in areas of the FNSB that are at high risk of wildfire, that is implied in the plan along corridors 203 and 270, without concurrent planning and efforts to increase resiliency to wildfires (i.e., building sustainable firebreaks) is irresponsible. Promoting future development in areas at high risk of wildfires is irresponsible and should be avoided.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		<p>Environment: Substantial portions of routes 203 and 270 traverse steep terrain across areas with discontinuous permafrost and poorly drained soils. Further, portions of 203 and 270 would impact existing recreational use of portions of the Tanana Valley State Forest (see item 3 above). Further, both corridors transect areas that are designated as Preferred Forest Land in the current Fairbanks North Star Borough Regional Comprehensive Plan.</p>	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		(image attached) Economic: The costs to construct and maintain roads in corridors 203 and 270 would be very high due to the steep terrain, discontinuous permafrost, and poor soils. Removing existing cover from these areas would result in further degradation of soils and increased thawing of permafrost, ultimately leading to slumping and other erosion problems. Constructing roads within both 203 and 270 would be challenging, requiring specific and costly measures to mitigate erosion, slumping, and general degradation due to use and changes in landforms and loss of cover. The many proposed deep contouring vees across this steep terrain will be subject to winter overflow and glaciering, as currently happens along many sections of Cache Creek Road. Further, heavy rainfall will cause erosion and loss of road surface, as currently seen along existing subdivision roads and most sections of Cache Creek Road (see Figure 4 below). Thus, it is not reasonable to construct roads in this area due to the extremely high costs of both constructing and maintaining new roads within corridors 203 and 270. (The current project to repair Cache Creek Road, estimated at between \$1,000,000 to \$2,500,000, http://dnr.alaska.gov/parks/designconstruct/bidadvert/cacheecreek/cacheecreekbiddocs.pdf , provides some insight into the cost of maintaining roads in this area.) Figure 4. Example of severe erosion along eastern portion of Cache Creek Road. Note that this section of Cache Creek Road was improved several years ago, but funds were not available to do routine annual road maintenance. A new grant will bring improvements but the grant does not cover future maintenance costs.	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Geometry: Both 203 and 270 traverse steep terrain and would most likely require multiple switch backs and/or steep grading. Overall, the topography along both corridors is not conducive to road building due to very steep terrain, poor soils, and discontinuous permafrost.	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
270	5/25	Email	Helene Genet and Benoit Pignon			We oppose the proposition of road extension 203 and 270 connecting Rebel road and Gettysburg road to Cache Creek road respectively. The low traffic in this area doesn't justify creating new access road between Cache Creek and the Lincoln ridge subdivision, when Sherman road already serves this purpose. As stated above, Lincoln ridge subdivision is a small, quiet neighborhood with very low traffic, and the Cache creek road provide access for a very small number of residents, recreational activities and logging activities. As such, Sherman road provide ample access between the two areas, without requiring additional access. Again, we would rather encourage directing these funds toward proper maintenance of the existing roads, rather than creating new once of minimal use.	Corridor 270 has been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that showed the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades. This decision was also based on corridor criteria. Social/Compatibility: the FNSB Comprehensive Plan's designates this area as Preferred Forest Land, so it is less likely to develop for residential uses. Access/Alternate Routes: this subdivision already has 2 means of ingress and egress.
272	5/18	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Proposed Road corridor 272: This would create a new road off the southern side of Murphy Dome Road near the western end of Old Murphy Dome Road. The road, as shown on the map, would traverse a very steep hillside and require the removal of existing cover on an unstable hillside. How was this corridor proposed and what is the justification for including it in the plan?	Corridor 272 has been maintained in the plan due to the potential for development of the large south-facing parcels that it crosses. This corridor would provide new direct lot access to subdivided parcels in this area. Like all corridors in the Road Plan, this corridor would only be constructed if the parcels subdivide. The corridor's inclusion in the Road Plan encourages the development of an internally circulating local road network as opposed to additional direct lot access from Murphy Dome Rd. Minimizing the number of intersections and driveways along higher volume and higher speed roads such as MDR increases safety. Analysis has shown that hillslopes along the corridor are less than or equal to 25%, which is similar to other roads that have been constructed in the borough (such as on Chena Ridge).
295	6/26	Email	Ben	Kennedy	Road Commissioner, Our Subdivision	As a Road Commissioner for "Our Subdivision" I am strongly opposed, as are all of our concerned neighbors that have contacted me by phone and email, to extending Hafele Avenue to Miller Hill Road (corridor #295) because it would create a short-cut thorough-fare, routing a relatively high volume of vehicles that currently use Yankovich and Miller Hill Road for travel to and from Goldstream Valley, through our neighborhood via Hafele Avenue and Line Drive. Hafele Avenue and Line Drive are gravel roads constructed over areas of permafrost that are difficult to maintain with only the light volume of current local neighborhood traffic. More importantly, increasing the traffic volume through Our Subdivision—Hafele Avenue and Line Drive, would have substantial adverse impacts to the safety and well-being of neighbor children frequently bicycling on the road, pet owners walking their dogs, and the many recreational runners and bicyclists that use Hafele Avenue and Line Drive to connect to trail systems extending from the University Area to Goldstream Valley. We look forward to working together with the FNSB and local property owners in developing an alternate road system design that would not adversely impact the health, safety, and well-being of our neighborhood and the community. Again, we are strongly opposed to extending Hafele Avenue to Miller Hill Road, proposed corridor #295. Please contact me by phone or email if you have questions or need additional information.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	6/25	Email	Bobbie	Ritchie	Homeowner	I am a landowner whose property fronts Line Drive, which will be affected by proposed road projects 69 and 295. Specifically, development of those projects will increase traffic flow on Line Drive, increase safety-related issues associated with traffic, and reduce the value of existing recreational trails already within these corridors. Line Drive is well constructed and maintained but also showing the less than subtle impacts of frost-heaving. Heavier traffic use will probably exacerbate these impacts.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/25	Email	Bobbie	Ritchie	Homeowner	I am a landowner whose property fronts Line Drive, which will be affected by proposed road projects 69 and 295. Specifically, development of those projects will increase traffic flow on Line Drive, increase safety-related issues associated with traffic, and reduce the value of existing recreational trails already within these corridors. Line Drive is well constructed and maintained but also showing the less than subtle impacts of frost-heaving. Heavier traffic use will probably exacerbate these impacts.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/25	Web Form	Bobbie	Ritchie		With the exception of fewer wetland/terrain issues, my concerns on corridor 295 are similar to the ones on corridor 69 I have listed above: increased through traffic that would affect our neighborhood and our private road, Black Sheep Lane. I assume the reason to add corridor 295 would be to allow more east/west traffic which would exacerbate even more our private road issues. Encouraging more east/west traffic would invite more cars on Black Sheep Lane as a shortcut to Sheep Creek and Goldstream Roads which the road cannot sustain. A few years ago, the road was impassable almost all summer long and residents were parking on Line Drive and walking to their property. The few residents on that road should not be burdened with the extra costs that will come with increased traffic if Hafele Road, corridor 295, is extended.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	6/22	Email	Sarah	Campbell		<p>(Part 1)</p> <p>I appreciate the information about the Team's justification for the two possible FNSB roads in our neighborhood (69 and 295). I would like to offer more data about the environment of our neighborhood.</p> <p>"Our Subdivision" and adjacent properties comprise about 40 separate housing units, most of which are modest dwellings, many built on permafrost. We are a discreet neighborhood with a limited, stable population whose members cooperate. We have had a road service area, "Our Service Area," for about forty years including only Line Drive, Home Run and Hafele Road. Line Drive is the main feeder for the neighborhood and is built on saturated soils underlain by permafrost. A couple of service area projects have stabilized limited portions of Line Drive with geotextile and large rock. Despite this costly work, additional areas of this road continue to fail each year due to traffic and thawing permafrost.</p> <p>The service area ends at Hafele Road and the continuation of Line Drive from there north into Goldstream Valley is a private road. This was a deliberate decision by the property owners of the four cabins on the north side of the hill because the cost of construction of a road to FNSB standards through saturated soil was prohibitive. FNSB road 69 extends this private road into the valley where the ground is mostly lake in the summer. The continuation of this alignment on the north side of the valley across Goldstream Creek is O'Brien Road, where the soils are equally poor, if not poorer. Cabins on that road have major problems with overflow all winter. With global warming taking a greater toll on soil in the Arctic and Subarctic, it makes little sense to encourage "alternate access" through a bog. Better to upgrade a major thoroughfare like Sheep Creek than add roads that are sure to fail.</p> <p>Our Service Area is challenged to maintain the roads we have, and would be unable to raise the funds to support roads through such problematic ground. Don says that the service area model may be replaced someday. It is unknown what this new program might be, since FNSB does not have road authority. I want to record that we like the service area concept and find it workable as currently configured.</p>	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to thorough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/22	Email	Sarah	Campbell		<p>(Part 2)</p> <p>While Goldstream Valley is problematic for auto access, it is a wonderful winter recreation area. The valley trail (also known as the "three lakes trail" due to its summer condition!) allows walkers, runners, skiers, bicyclists, dog mushers and snow machines to travel from Sheep Creek Road to Fox, crossing only one busy road (Ballaine). Goldstream Creek, Line Drive, the Sheep Creek bike trail and Miller Hill Road offer a wonderful winter network of trails used extensively by the locals. These areas are well suited for recreation and roads would encroach on this use.</p> <p>All the above comments are directed to FNSB Road 69, but apply equally to FNSB Road 295. This brand new alignment beyond the current end of Hafele Road will be entirely on the north side of the hill, through mostly swampy ground. It will intersect both Lawlor Road Extension and Miller Hill Road and both are rutted and slippery on the north side of the hill. Most private land along this route already obtains access from an established road and driveway.</p> <p>A portion of the Equinox Marathon Trail runs through a wooded section of this potential ROW. In addition to runners, this route is also used by walkers, hikers, bicyclists, horses, skiers, dog teams and snow machines. An adjacent road would compromise the safety of these recreationists throughout the year, again encroaching on an existing use.</p> <p>In summary, I take issue with these potential roads providing any decent alternate access (AR) or emergency services (EES) due to existing substandard roads and new roads with a high potential for failure. Since we have fewer than 100 units in our neighborhood, we do not need multiple access (MA). The property to be accessed is inappropriate for development (NE) due to wetlands and poor soils (WFPS). Existing use is primarily recreational and any road work would be incompatible with that use (COMP). As a former employee in AKDOT's Construction Section, I contend that construction in these areas is NOT reasonably feasible (FEA) due to poor soils and wetlands. I respectfully request that these rights of way be eliminated from the FNSB plan. The recreational potential far exceeds the need to further encourage building on poor ground.</p>	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to thorough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/26	Web Form	Cathy	Turner		<p>I am writing to oppose proposed road corridors #69 and # 295. These proposed road extensions meet very few of the criteria, and considering the great cost to build and maintain these roads, the cost (both social and financial) would far outweigh the benefit. I hope that you will consider more carefully my concerns with these road extensions and remove them from the proposed future plan.</p> <p>Regarding #295 Hafele Rd</p> <p>Social and Environmental: It is well known that dead end neighborhoods make safer neighborhoods, with reduced transiency and traffic in residential areas. Hafele residents have easy access to Sheep Creek rd. through Line drive, while those on Lawlor are best serviced by Miller Hill/Yankovich. By opening this road, there's the possibility the disrupt current traffic flow to become more heavy on Line Drive, which is not designed for heavier traffic that would almost inevitably be driving too fast as well. This would make it a less safe road for the current residential uses by children and adults who bike and walk in this area. Second, the road would be crossing adjacent to a Wildlife Conservancy area, which would increase wildlife disruption and environmental damage to these lands. Thirdly, this land is part of the Equinox Marathon race trail and would further reduce the quality of this race route by adding additional road portion to the route. The runners, skiers, and bikers who train on this route would be forced to travel by road in this portion of the trail.</p>	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to thorough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
FNSB Roads	Plan Comment Tracker						Page 15

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	6/26	Email	Dan	O'Neill	Former land use and environmental planner, resident off Line Drive for 43 years	<p>I oppose this change of status granting a road corridor where none exists now. On the one hand, I do not think the FNSB has accurately presented reasons for this change. On the other, the I think FNSB fails to address other quite important considerations that militate against these designations.</p> <p>Regarding the former, it is not true that such a road would avoid conflict with existing uses. This road would be immediately adjacent to a popular trail through the woods, which has been use by residents here for at least 50 years. It is also used annually during the Equinox Marathon. Residents use this trail daily; hundreds use the trail during the race. The eventual construction of such a road would not be "compatible with existing uses," as claimed; it represents a conflict of land uses.</p> <p>Demonstrably, a trail through the woods is neighborhood amenity compared to a trail immediately adjacent to a road, with cars, traffic, and exhaust. I would think that would be obvious. Surely planners recognize the value to residents of undeveloped natural spaces. Why isn't that reflected in your analysis?</p> <p>FNSB has looked at the value of closing a small gap in a road network, and apparently not at the value of a long-established trail. I believe that if you had asked the residents before proposing this designation, you would have found that they value less traffic, rather than more, and appreciate the quiet and the freedom from dust and noise. We here like the fact that our neighborhood is not on a frequently traveled corridor.</p> <p>We do not feel inconvenienced by having to drive a few extra blocks to travel to the east. We prefer doing that to seeing our neighborhood and our woods carved up with rights of way that incentivize the construction of roads we don't want. This is the tail wagging the dog. It demonstrates a finely developed awareness of the possible wishes of future moneyed interests like land developers, and tone deafness to ordinary homeowners, happy with their neighborhoods as they are.</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>
295	6/25	Email	Larry & Elizabeth	Freeman (L) & Belknap (E)		<p>General Comments: Corridors 69 and 295 are bad ideas and we strongly object to them being in the FNSB Road Plan. Both are extensions onto saturated permafrost Fairbanks Loess on north facing slopes with active thaw subsidence and year-round standing water. Both interact, cross, or overlay trails in the Borough Trails Plan, in particular the Equinox Marathon Trail and the Goldstream/Tanana Valley RR winter trail. Line Drive and Hafele Avenue are currently in "Our Road Service District", maintenance is done on a timely basis and managed efficiently. If Hafele becomes a through road, would the road service district shoulder the extra maintenance caused by through travelers?</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>
295	6/25	Email	Larry & Elizabeth	Freeman (L) & Belknap (E)		<p>Corridor 295: Hafele Avenue right of way, as platted is reduced by an approved variance from Minor Collector ROA width to 40 feet, with an 18 foot trafficway width. This is an insufficient width for a through-going road. Hafele is on hill-crest saturated permafrost Fairbanks Loess, there are existing thaw pits along the road edge on the right of way. The Equinox Marathon currently uses Lawlor and Hafele because they are only local low volume roads. The alignment of the existing, dedicated easement for the Marathon trail crosses the straight-line eastward of the Hafele corridor.</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	6/24	Email	Janlee	Irving		<p>I am a resident off Line Drive in Our subdivision, and have been for almost 37 years. The potential plan to extend Line Drive or Hafele Avenue are very confusing to me. A Line Drive extension would go straight into Goldstream valley. This means serious wetland habitat-- very much inaccessible all summer (for environmental reasons), and very much accessible and well-used all winter by skiers, bicyclists, mushers, walkers, runners, and snowmachiners. Fairbanks needs this area of trails close to town, and already accessible from many points.</p> <p>As it is, Line Drive becomes a mass of soft lumps in the spring as the permafrost reminds us all of its presence. To add more traffic would make it impassable. Emergency vehicles would not be able to help people in need, fight fires, etc etc.</p> <p>Hafele Avenue is a short road that is a part of the Equinox Marathon trail. It could connect to Miller Hill Extension/Lawyer roads only in a nightmare scenario. If you have not driven those roads, you have no idea of how poorly maintained they are. These are private roads, driven on by few vehicles. Heavy traffic would require widening, raising.... basically starting from scratch.</p> <p>Without trying very hard, I can come up with several roads around town that are not properly maintained. Herreid Road could be used to alleviate the traffic for Pearl Creek school, but is now barely passable. Bonanza Trail leads to the homes of hundreds of people and is a morass of soft humps. St Patrick Rd falls apart every spring.</p> <p>We shouldn't build more roads on our unstable ground when we can't care for what we have.</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>
295	6/26	Email	Nathan	Turner		<p>I am requesting that you not move forward with the proposed road corridors #69 and # 295 in the Line Drive / Sheep Creek area. My family and I have maintained a residence in the area for 20 years now, and are in agreement with the others who live in this area that these proposed changes will not only fail to bring any benefits to those who have long lived in this in this neighborhood, but will actually negatively impact our neighborhood in a number of ways. There seems to be no upside to such development other than to "fill in the road map" in an area that otherwise enjoys the benefit of roadless recreation opportunities.</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>
295	6/26	Email	Nathan	Turner		<p>Line Drive has recently been extensively rebuilt after years of degraded quality. Neighbors would often get stuck in the middle of the road for the first half of the summer and several of us who live in the area would volunteer our own time and equipment to make repairs or tow neighbors from "the hole in the road". We finally were able to contract this out to be rebuilt - but it is little more than a single lane access to properties in this dead-end neighborhood. Through-access will require widening of line drive for safety and practical reasons if the proposed extensions go through, and this burden should not again fall on our neighborhood.</p> <p>Line Drive is one of the hard-to-find areas where neighbors often walk their dogs in the evening, visit with one another, and neighboring children can safely ride their bikes and play due to the limited nature of local traffic. If the extensions go through, you will be ending one of these ever-decreasing opportunities for friendly and interactive neighborhoods.</p> <p>Line Drive is already a dusty road, prone to potholing. Increased traffic will make a real mess of air quality for many of us due to many people who would choose to drive the route for the novelty of it, rather than any real necessity that would justify construction of the extensions.</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	6/26	Email	Nathan	Turner		<p>The existing Sheep Creek to Murphy Dome route, and Ballaine to Ivory Jacks offer adequate efficiency in reaching those areas, making any extension through Line Drive of questionable value - especially when you consider that the existing routes are often in need of repair. Adding another road will only decrease the opportunity for the resources to maintain the existing road infrastructure, and the extension itself would soon be another problematic maintenance area due to the wetland/permafrost nature of the proposed route crossing goldstream valley.</p> <p>The proposed route also will bisect a very active winter recreational area along Goldstream creek that is of great value for many Fairbanksans. This area is easily accessed from many homes on Line Drive, Black Sheep, and from along Sheep Creek road all the way around to Ballaine. Bisecting it will essentially ruin a novel opportunity for people to get out on foot , ski, dogteam, and snowmachine to recreate close to home on short winter days.</p> <p>There are numerous other reasons that can be listed for opposing such development, and I know our neighbors have done so. Please do not disrupt a healthy and functioning neighborhood as well as other Goldstream resident values for something that will likely bring very little benefit to the valley.</p>	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/26	Email	Nathan	Turner		<p>The existing Sheep Creek to Murphy Dome route, and Ballaine to Ivory Jacks offer adequate efficiency in reaching those areas, making any extension through Line Drive of questionable value - especially when you consider that the existing routes are often in need of repair. Adding another road will only decrease the opportunity for the resources to maintain the existing road infrastructure, and the extension itself would soon be another problematic maintenance area due to the wetland/permafrost nature of the proposed route crossing goldstream valley.</p> <p>The proposed route also will bisect a very active winter recreational area along Goldstream creek that is of great value for many Fairbanksans. This area is easily accessed from many homes on Line Drive, Black Sheep, and from along Sheep Creek road all the way around to Ballaine. Bisecting it will essentially ruin a novel opportunity for people to get out on foot , ski, dogteam, and snowmachine to recreate close to home on short winter days.</p> <p>There are numerous other reasons that can be listed for opposing such development, and I know our neighbors have done so. Please do not disrupt a healthy and functioning neighborhood as well as other Goldstream resident values for something that will likely bring very little benefit to the valley.</p>	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/24	Email	Martha	Reynolds		<p>I am writing to comment on several corridors on the draft map that are in the part of the Borough where I live and recreate. Mostly I am objecting to proposed corridors which would connect two neighborhoods by replacing trails at the end of their road systems with roads. These connections do not benefit anyone. No one from the greater Fairbanks area will drive all the way to the end of the neighborhood roads to then drive back through another complex of neighborhood roads. We already have connector roads for that purpose. The residents of the neighborhood don't benefit either, unless they happen to have very close friends in the other area who they visit often. Most residents would just lose recreational trails.</p> <p>295 - this corridor extends Hafele Road to Lawlor and Miller Hill Extension. Currently, residential areas on both ends of the corridor are well served by roads and driveways. Neither neighborhood would benefit by this connection.</p>	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	6/26	Email	Sarah	Campbell		<p>I appreciate the information about the Team's justification for the two possible FNSB roads in our neighborhood (69 and 295). I would like to offer more data about the environment of our neighborhood.</p> <p>"Our Subdivision" and adjacent properties comprise about 40 separate housing units, most of which are modest dwellings, many built on permafrost. We are a discreet neighborhood with a limited, stable population whose members cooperate. We have had a road service area, "Our Service Area," for about forty years including only Line Drive, Home Run and Hafele Road. Line Drive is the main feeder for the neighborhood and is built on saturated soils underlain by permafrost. A couple of service area projects have stabilized limited portions of Line Drive with geotextile and large rock. Despite this costly work, additional areas of this road continue to fail each year due to traffic and thawing permafrost.</p> <p>The service area ends at Hafele Road and the continuation of Line Drive from there north into Goldstream Valley is a private road. This was a deliberate decision by the property owners of the four cabins on the north side of the hill because the cost of construction of a road to FNSB standards through saturated soil was prohibitive. FNSB road 69 extends this private road into the valley where the ground is mostly lake in the summer. The continuation of this alignment on the north side of the valley across Goldstream Creek is O'Brien Road, where the soils are equally poor, if not poorer. Cabins on that road have major problems with overflow all winter. With global warming taking a greater toll on soil in the Arctic and Subarctic, it makes little sense to encourage "alternate access" through a bog. Better to upgrade a major thoroughfare like Sheep Creek than add roads that are sure to fail.</p> <p>Our Service Area is challenged to maintain the roads we have, and would be unable to raise the funds to support roads through such problematic ground. Don says that the service area model may be replaced someday. It is unknown what this new program might be, since FNSB does not have road authority. I want to record that we like the service area concept and find it workable as currently configured.</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>
295	6/26	Email	Sarah	Campbell		<p>While Goldstream Valley is problematic for auto access, it is a wonderful winter recreation area. The valley trail (also known as the "three lakes trail" due to its summer condition!) allows walkers, runners, skiers, bicyclists, dog mushers and snow machines to travel from Sheep Creek Road to Fox, crossing only one busy road (Ballaine). Goldstream Creek, Line Drive, the Sheep Creek bike trail and Miller Hill Road offer a wonderful winter network of trails used extensively by the locals. These areas are well suited for recreation and roads would encroach on this use.</p> <p>All the above comments are directed to FNSB Road 69, but apply equally to FNSB Road 295. This brand new alignment beyond the current end of Hafele Road will be entirely on the north side of the hill, through mostly swampy ground. It will intersect both Lawlor Road Extension and Miller Hill Road and both are rutted and slippery on the north side of the hill. Most private land along this route already obtains access from an established road and driveway.</p> <p>A portion of the Equinox Marathon Trail runs through a wooded section of this potential ROW. In addition to runners, this route is also used by walkers, hikers, bicyclists, horses, skiers, dog teams and snow machines. An adjacent road would compromise the safety of these recreationists throughout the year, again encroaching on an existing use.</p> <p>In summary, I take issue with these potential roads providing any decent alternate access (AR) or emergency services (EES) due to existing substandard roads and new roads with a high potential for failure. Since we have fewer than 100 units in our neighborhood, we do not need multiple access (MA). The property to be accessed is inappropriate for development (NE) due to wetlands and poor soils (WFPS). Existing use is primarily recreational and any road work would be incompatible with that use (COMP). As a former employee in AKDOT's Construction Section, I contend that construction in these areas is NOT reasonably feasible (FEA) due to poor soils and wetlands. I respectfully request that these rights of way be eliminated from the FNSB plan. The recreational potential far exceeds the need to further encourage building on poor ground.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	<p>Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	6/20	Email	William	Schneider		I want to register my strong objection to any extension of Line Drive or Hafele Road, both located in Our Subdivision. I am a resident and enjoy the fact that our subdivision does not have thru roads. This has been a factor in making this a coherent community. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/26	Web Form	Yvette	Lancaster	Developer	The corridors fail to meet the standards of the criteria set forth in the Boroughs analysis. While I could go through line by line it would only serve to make a cumbersome and long message. If the comprehensive plan is to be effective it also needs to contain goals that are achievable. The goals need to reflect the voice of the people. I would like to go on record as opposed to both Line Drive and Hafele and encourage that they be removed from this plan. Again, a basic review of the criteria supports this position. Thank you for hearing my comments. Yvette.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/26	Web Form	(blank)	(blank)		Project #295 Hafele This proposed road project also does not conform to your Corridor Selection criteria either. It would reroute traffic from an already maintain road access to Sheep Creek Road and town. Rerouting traffic to Line Dr. would be a longer distance to get to town via Sheep Creek Road. This proposed road crosses Wildlife Conservancy area dedicated to protecting wildlife, as well as the Equinox Marathon Race trail. The rerouting of traffic would also put a burden on Line Dr., which does not have a wide corridor and was not built to support the increase of traffic It is a waste of the Boroughs time and money to build and maintain these unnecessary and detrimental roads. .	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	5/19	Open House				Do not do it, land already accesable from both east and west. A waste of road building money, would only benefit private land owners.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/21	Email	Colin	Campbell		I'm a resident of this neighborhood (I live off Black sheep lane) and am writing to voice my strong objection to extending Line drive or Hafele. With the melting permafrost we are already having a lot of difficulty with maintaining our roads at their current traffic levels. Extending either of these roads to make them a thru road would exponentially increase traffic and surely degrade the road quality significantly. Another factor for me buying and building in this neighborhood was the fact it did not have highly trafficked through roads. Thank you for your consideration.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
295	6/21	Email	Laura and Sven	Grage		We, Laura and Sven Grage, are writing to you in opposition to the proposed road corridor #295, the extension of Hafele Ave. to Miller Hill Rd. We reside on and own the property at 2560 Hafele Ave. (PAN #059699). We urge you to eliminate proposed road corridor from the 2021 Comprehensive Roads Plan for the following reasons: 1.) Low Development Value: The development value of the area is extremely low. Slopes in excess of 20%, covered by black spruce and permafrost, adjoin the entire stretch of the proposed corridor. 2.) Road Construction Impediments: Road construction and maintenance along the corridor would be prohibitively expensive due to the degree of the slope and underlying permafrost; The road corridor follows, in part, the existing Equinox Marathon Trail easement; Existing power lines to the south of the proposed corridor could further complicate road construction. 3.) Existing Access Points: Both of the areas to be connected with the proposed road corridor already have two access points: Miller Hill Rd and Lawlor Rd on the east end, Line Dr and Black Sheep on the west end. 4.) Hafele Ave Designation: At the time of the construction of Hafele Ave., a variance was granted that puts the road below borough standards needed for the proposed extension. 5.) Hay Field Conservation Easement: To the south of the proposed corridor the Hayfield Conservation Easement exists which might further restrict road development alongside it. 6.) Restriction of any further subdividing: Upon the approved replat of our property (RP021-21 Birkebakke Subdivision), it is our firm intention to disallow any further subdividing through a covenant agreement and a planned conservation easement of part of the two lots. It is my understanding that a road corridor can only be dedicated at the time a private property is subdivided. In this case there will be no further subdividing. Thank you very much for your work and for considering our input.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	6/21	Email	Terrance	Gacke		I'm writing to express my opposition to any road extensions or developments for Line Drive or Hafele Ave. I specifically purchased my property because of the dead end nature of the roads in this neighborhood. Connecting them to other roads will bring more traffic from Yankovich and Miller Hill trying to save 2 minutes of time getting to Goldstream. Please remove these 2 proposed extensions from the borough list. Thank you.	Corridor 295 has been maintained in the public review draft. Significant community feedback was received in opposition to this corridor, which the project team took into serious consideration. The project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting. Steering committee suggested taking a closer look at the feasibility of the corridor and potentially maintaining it for the public review draft if feasible to construct. The project team consulted with platting and surveying professionals familiar with the area. Findings include: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge (Economic/Feasibility, Environment/Wetlands, Permafrost, Soils); Corridor is feasible to construct while not conflicting with the adjacent utility and Equinox Marathon easements (Environment/Recreation); the corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc. (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions (Connectivity); Public right-of-way is already partially dedicated along the corridor (Economic/Rights-of-Way); If remaining parcels along the corridor subdivide, adequate new access will need to be provided (Access/New Access); During a recent platting hearing for an adjacent subdivision, testimony was received from a resident at the easterly end of the corridor including concerns about emergency and essential services access due to the current sub-standard condition of the road running along the proposed corridor. Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access (Access/Alternate Routes, Emergency & Essential Services); An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits and alleviate some concerns about additional traffic if the connection is ever built (Social/Public Input).
306	6/25	Email	Jeff	Adams		I oppose the addition of any proposed new road corridors that would harm the integrity of the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, the existing Riedel trail network, or the public use values for recreation of the FNSB land parcel off Amanita. Specifically: Road Corridors #44, #306, and #385 should not be advanced due to their impact on existing recreational and public use values.	Corridor 306 has been removed based on public comments, conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve, and lack of public easement at the end of Haida Lane.
310	5/19	Paper Form	Mike, Dave, Nathan, Donna	(blank)		Already exists	Corridors 310 and 44 have been maintained in the plan because Amanita Rd does not have legal public access and is not built to Title 17 road design standards. Inclusion of these corridors in the plan can help obtain legal public access and bring Amanita up to standard when these parcels subdivide.
310	6/25	Email	Ruslan	Grigoriev		My name is Rus and I live at 1070 Amanita Rd. I pay out of pocket and put in labor for the year round road maintenance here. The road is narrow, with unsafe steep hill (17% grade), and has limited spots for passing. The dramatic increase in atv traffic this year has led to unsustainable traffic, high silica dust, road damage, trash, and multiple safety concerns from our neighbors due to speeding atvs. We use the road to walk our children and dogs to access trails. Making Amanita Rd an access rd is not a good idea.	Corridors 310 and 44 have been maintained in the plan because Amanita Rd does not have legal public access and is not built to Title 17 road design standards. Inclusion of these corridors in the plan can help obtain legal public access and bring Amanita up to standard when these parcels subdivide.
331	5/16	Open House				We oppose 331 because it would traverse beautiful, intact parcel of FNSB land adjacent to our new lands [Riedel Reserve].	Corridor 331 is included in the plan to provide better alternative and emergency services access to residents along Amanita and Esro Rd, as well as future access to the parcels that they cross, should they ever subdivide. Both Esro Rd and Amanita Rd are cul-du-sacs much longer than the FNSB's Title 17 road design standards allow (maximum 1,320 ft), which has potential health, safety, and access implications for the borough and area residents. Corridor Criteria: Access/New Access, Access/Alternate Routes, Access/Multiple Access Points
360	5/19	Paper Form	Debbie	Eberhardt		Remove. Eberhardt Rd and Funk Rd corridor 360 (I think). This is "Trust Property."	Corridor 360 has been removed from the plan based on public comments and failure to satisfy several corridor criteria: Social/Public Input: inclusion does not address community feedback, public comments do not support the corridor. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: potential challenges with road construction and maintenance due to poor ground conditions.
360	5/19	Open House	Dave	Eberhardt		No way Jose. Eberhardt Family Turst owns the mile of property	Corridor 360 has been removed from the plan based on public comments and failure to satisfy several corridor criteria: Social/Public Input: inclusion does not address community feedback, public comments do not support the corridor. Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils: potential challenges with road construction and maintenance due to poor ground conditions.
361	5/27	Email	Seth	Adams		Hi friends, For some reason the online comment form wouldn't work for me. I also missed the open house due to a conflict. I'd like to comment on 361 and 117. That corridor is over an existing trail. I used to live in (and still own and rent out) a cabin at the end of Northridge (which weirdly is not labeled on the map), and so I know that that trail is not heavily used since access is inconvenient. Turning that particular trail into a road wouldn't be so bad, and would shorten the drive for my tenant and everyone else living on Northridge and Dragline Dr. However, that trail is part of a fantastic trail network that I strongly feel deserves maximum protection both for its value as trails and also a historical structure - the FE Ditch trails are down there. They currently suffer from private property issues near Guinevere, but otherwise it's a fantastic trail network that is way under-used. If a road were ever built at 361/117 I would strongly suggest that there be a provision for a trailhead (that would provide access from Chena Ridge to State Land adjacent to the Isberg Rec Area.) and that the remaining trails in that area be protected as trails. Thanks for all your hard work!	Thank you for your comments. A connection in this area would only be built should the parcels it crosses subdivide. To protect the area's trail network and mitigate impacts, a shared trail and road corridor could be developed at the time of subdivision. This corridor has been maintained in the plan based on satisfying the following criteria: Access/Alternate Routes, Access/Emergency & Essential Services, Connectivity/Small Gap Closures, and Connectivity/Vehicle Miles Travelled. The planning team attempted to balance these positive criteria with concerns about trail conflicts (Environment/Recreation). The team ultimately decided that the corridor should remain in the plan due to its benefits for access and connectivity, and since design decisions could mitigate potential trail and road conflicts.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
363	6/22	Email	Jeanne	Laurencelle		<p>(Part 1) (image attached) These comments are in regard to segments 363 and 365, which extend Gold Lode Road in Ester.</p> <p>Road and Maintenance Costs Gold Lode Road was poorly constructed in the 1980's. It is not in a service area, and the cost to bring it up to standards to join a road service area is prohibitive, as the cost of improvements would be paid out-of-pocket by the few people on our road. That said, individuals on our road have spent thousands of dollars of our own money to maintain the road. We also pay for all plowing.</p> <p>An increase of traffic on Gold Lode would therefore add an additional financial burden to the few residents on our road who choose to pay for repairs and plowing. Therefore I suggest the borough get our road upgraded and into a road service area before any additional traffic is added.</p> <p>Routing - Section line and an issue The current route of 365 appears to go right next to or through the the cabin and large workshop on the property at the end of Gold Lode, making this a non-starter for the property owner, ever. It's possible an alternate route would be more feasible.</p> <p>There is an existing road that, as shown on the image, goes up to two cabins. The starred cabin is not permitted to use the road due to legal dispute of the green section. See Figure 1.</p> <p>Brief history: As I understand it: Before the subdivision, the road followed a section line /power line (blue). It is still visible in Figure 1. After the subdivision 3779 Gold Lode Road was purchased, and the new landowner blocked the road, depriving the uphill cabin of access. There was a legal dispute and an easement for the current road (green) was agreed to. The borough showed or shows this road in their online GIS image, as a public easement based on the agreement. The road (green) was built and in use for over 10 years. Then that road was blocked, depriving both cabins above of access to their property. The owner of the uphill cabin property recently opened the road based on prescriptive easement, but the owner of the newer cabin (less than 10 years) still does not have access through that route.</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed and thoughtful comments. Corridors 365 and 363 are being maintained in the plan update from the 1991 Road Plan due to their benefits for new access should the parcels that they cross subdivide. Like all corridors shown in the plan, these roads will only be platted and built if the parcels subdivide. If there is no subdivision, then no road will be built (for example, corridor 365 where it crosses the large parcel and cabin/workshop property at the end of Gold Lode Rd will not be built unless the landowner at the end of Gold Lode decides to subdivide their property). Additionally, the subdivision process and Road Plan allow for some flexibility in the final siting of road corridors. A landowner/subdivider may propose an alternate corridor <i>as long as they can prove that it will meet Title 17 road design standards and that it satisfies the original intent of the connection shown in the Road Plan</i>. In this way, the Road Plan and subdivision process facilitate landowners and the borough working together to achieve health, safety, and access goals while still respecting private property rights. Proposed realigned corridor 377 in the plan could also potentially provide permanent legal access to the two cabin properties should the parcels it crosses subdivide.</p>
363	6/22	Email	Jeanne	Laurencelle		<p>(Part 2) Which is all to say that there is an existing road that could be used, and the uphill cabin property owners might be very happy to cooperate with an easement if the borough could help with the access over that short stretch (green). The property, 3779 Gold Lode Road, with the disputed road is currently up for sale, so there will be a new owner soon.</p> <p>Note that the disputed easement on 3779 Gold Lode Road was to replace a section line easement that was in daily use. So possibly the section line access across the property could be re-opened, or used in negotiation.</p> <p>"Section Line Easement (SLE)s are existing easements established for access purposes, up to and including construction of paved roads. These easements are managed by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) under AS 38 pursuant to AS 19.30. 400."</p> <p>Continuation of Section Line easement It also might be possible to just extend any trail or road along the section easement instead of using route 363 and 365. Then getting easements would not be an issue, since it already exists (white line).</p> <p>Figure 1. Shows an alternate route for 365. Disputed part of road in green, original road in blue, section line in yellow and white.</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed and thoughtful comments. Corridors 365 and 363 are being maintained in the plan update from the 1991 Road Plan due to their benefits for new access should the parcels that they cross subdivide. Like all corridors shown in the plan, these roads will only be platted and built if the parcels subdivide. If there is no subdivision, then no road will be built (for example, corridor 365 where it crosses the large parcel and cabin/workshop property at the end of Gold Lode Rd will not be built unless the landowner at the end of Gold Lode decides to subdivide their property). Additionally, the subdivision process and Road Plan allow for some flexibility in the final siting of road corridors. A landowner/subdivider may propose an alternate corridor <i>as long as they can prove that it will meet Title 17 road design standards and that it satisfies the original intent of the connection shown in the Road Plan</i>. In this way, the Road Plan and subdivision process facilitate landowners and the borough working together to achieve health, safety, and access goals while still respecting private property rights. Proposed realigned corridor 377 in the plan could also potentially provide permanent legal access to the two cabin properties should the parcels it crosses subdivide.</p>
363	6/22	Phone	Jeanne	Laurencelle		<p>Concerned those proposed routes would mean increased recreation traffic in the area (people trying to gain access to trails), but no place for them to park. Concerned with the ability to maintain any new roads in area that is not within an RSA. Residents have spent a lot of time and money trying to maintain Gold Lode, just so it is functional. New roads would need to come with maintenance dollars. Question/raising flag re: 365/363 transition – cuts right through neighbor's property? She has some ideas about different routes that may work to avoid this issue and others. Generally OK with idea of better access, appreciated hearing the criteria in that regard, just have the concerns above re: maintenance and folks coming up to access trails which equals increased traffic, no place for folks to park, and lack of funding for existing/new roads. She was also confused by the blue lines = new proposed corridors on the maps – she was looking at the key, but was still thinking the blue was a waterway. Good point, I think. Maybe for full draft we consider a different color for new proposed corridors?</p>	<p>Corridors 365 and 363 are being maintained in the plan update from the 1991 Road Plan due to their benefits for new access should the parcels that they cross subdivide. Like all corridors shown in the plan, these roads will only be platted and built if the parcels subdivide. If there is no subdivision, then no road will be built (for example, corridor 365 where it crosses the large parcel and cabin/workshop property at the end of Gold Lode Rd will not be built unless the landowner at the end of Gold Lode decides to subdivide their property). Additionally, the subdivision process and Road Plan allow for some flexibility in the final siting of road corridors. A landowner/subdivider may propose an alternate corridor <i>as long as they can prove that it will meet Title 17 road design standards and that it satisfies the original intent of the connection shown in the Road Plan</i>. In this way, the Road Plan and subdivision process facilitate landowners and the borough working together to achieve health, safety, and access goals while still respecting private property rights. Proposed realigned corridor 377 in the plan could also potentially provide permanent legal access to the two cabin properties should the parcels it crosses subdivide.</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
364	6/27	Email	Jon and Mari	Sallstrom	Property Owners	<p>(part 1)</p> <p>Selection Criteria:</p> <p>Access: NA (new access)</p> <p>According to the Roads Plan, it appears that this Corridor will be used to connect to proposed Corridors 363 and 365 to provide access to expected future development of the remainder Sections 9, 10, and 11, currently owned by FNSB Division of Natural Resources.</p> <p>Private property TL-1000 borders the east side of proposed Corridor. Property Owner opposes development of these Sections in favor of preserving natural habitats. Where there is no development, there is no need to place a Corridor. Oppositions are explained under the following Categories addressed below.</p> <p>Social: PI (public input)</p> <p>Development in the area along Old Nenana Hwy. over the past twenty-four years has increased traffic and noise in this rural neighborhood. New Construction of Old Nenana Hwy. four years ago has further increased visiting traffic and "joy rides" (noisy, safety risk, high-speed motor cycles and snow machines), bicyclists, hikers, and skiers. To add an access road as proposed will attract more visitors, and with it, increased trash, noise, risks to safety, and potential disrespect to residents and property.</p> <p>Considered "pristine" to urban/suburban dwellers, the area has lost some of the appeal that had attracted long-time residents decades ago.</p> <p>Social: EN (encroachment)</p> <p>Existing Trails. This Corridor will encroach upon existing and historical use of naturally made wildlife trails as well as residents' made and maintained hiking, skiing, and dog mushing trails. A Corridor and Subdivision would disrupt this existing low impact tranquil experience, thus depress residents' level of happiness.</p> <p>Social: COMP (compatibility)</p> <p>Occupational Nature. Particular creative type occupations and hobbies thrive in a peaceful, focused environment: artists, musicians, composers, writers, photographers, researchers (esp. wildlife or botany type), archeologists, and the like. Development disruptions can hinder these creative endeavors that are beneficial to a community as a whole.</p> <p>Human Health and Well-Being. Regular peaceful surroundings and quiet nature walks enhance health and well-being. Fast-moving and noisy vehicles (including off-road vehicles) are disturbing. For the very ill, nature sounds and scenes are vital factors to improved health or quality of life during hospice.</p>	Corridor 364 has been realigned to the west solely within large FNSB-owned parcel to mitigate potential impacts on nearby private property. Corridor 364, like all corridors identified in the Road Plan, would only be constructed if and when the parcels it crosses are subdivided. If subdivision never occurs, no road will be built.
364	6/27	Email	Jon and Mari	Sallstrom	Property Owners	<p>(part 2)</p> <p>Electromagnetic Field Toxicity (EMFs). A growing number of people suffer from EMF toxicity. Development encourages, even demands, increased electrical and digital use. While a sufferer can control exposure stemming from one's own property, personal choice of usage by neighbors cannot be controlled. Adding to this toxic load, increased development may demand the potential installation of nearby towers highly toxic to these sensitive people.</p> <p>Environment: RH (recreation/habitat)</p> <p>Conflict with Recreational Trails. Proposed Corridor sets upon an existing non-dedicated trail mostly used by nearby residents. The tranquil experience one seeks by using these trails will be diminished by a Corridor nearby. This is not acceptable and cannot be mitigated. (Refer to comments under Social: EN, Existing Trails above.)</p> <p>Conflict with Wildlife Trails and Habitats. Wildlife trails adorn the landscape of the area of the proposed Corridor, indicating that wildlife is well and active with ample food supply.</p> <p>Preservation of "Green Space". Typically, cities sprawl out in a continuous fashion without regard to the preservation of "green space." Let not the Borough imitate such poor practice. Vegetation cleans the air we breathe. Green is uplifting and the color for healing. Wildlife require ample space and balanced varied eco-systems for its sustainability. Encroachments disrupt food supply and creates air and noise pollution that stresses wildlife. A disgruntled animal poses endangerment to humans.</p> <p>Consider the very reason Borough residents gravitate to the area and remain: open green space and happy people. The continuous development of Section after Section becomes self-defeating: Borough appeal will greatly diminish. There is a limit to population growth. Generations to come are to enjoy what is enjoyed today.</p> <p>Therefore, it is prudent that FNSB exercise foresight by setting aside preservation of "green space" of vegetation, wildlife and quietude for overall community well-being.</p> <p>Economic: PR (property rights)</p> <p>A right-of-way dedication would be required for a Road Corridor to border the west side of parcel TL-1000. The use of this parcel over the decades has been the preservation of natural habitats. A road would not only disrupt footage of vegetation, but will also create motor vehicles' noise and exhaust, and human trash along the Road that disturbs the well-being of wildlife habitats. A Corridor will devalue the aesthetic quality of parcel TL-1000.</p> <p>Conclusion: In view of the above statements, property owner opposes the proposed Corridor # 364.</p>	Corridor 364 has been realigned to the west solely within large FNSB-owned parcel to mitigate potential impacts on nearby private property. Corridor 364, like all corridors identified in the Road Plan, would only be constructed if and when the parcels it crosses are subdivided. If subdivision never occurs, no road will be built.
364	5/19	Open House				Off of 364 - private drive with no name, gravel road, one owner with lots of property, doesn't have plans to subdivide. Parcel to right (east), all undeveloped - why do a road. Area surrounding 364 - who owns that? Trails - concern they will bring traffic into neighborhood - where will they park? 364 - off of private drive look to John Deere	Corridor 364 has been realigned to the west solely within large FNSB-owned parcel to mitigate potential impacts on nearby private property. Corridor 364, like all corridors identified in the Road Plan, would only be constructed if and when the parcels it crosses are subdivided. If subdivision never occurs, no road will be built.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
365	6/22	Email	Jeanne	Laurencelle		<p>(Part 1) (image attached) These comments are in regard to segments 363 and 365, which extend Gold Lode Road in Ester.</p> <p>Road and Maintenance Costs Gold Lode Road was poorly constructed in the 1980's. It is not in a service area, and the cost to bring it up to standards to join a road service area is prohibitive, as the cost of improvements would be paid out-of-pocket by the few people on our road. That said, individuals on our road have spent thousands of dollars of our own money to maintain the road. We also pay for all plowing.</p> <p>An increase of traffic on Gold Lode would therefore add an additional financial burden to the few residents on our road who choose to pay for repairs and plowing. Therefore I suggest the borough get our road upgraded and into a road service area before any additional traffic is added.</p> <p>Routing - Section line and an issue The current route of 365 appears to go right next to or through the the cabin and large workshop on the property at the end of Gold Lode, making this a non-starter for the property owner, ever. It's possible an alternate route would be more feasible.</p> <p>There is an existing road that, as shown on the image, goes up to two cabins. The starred cabin is not permitted to use the road due to legal dispute of the green section. See Figure 1.</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed and thoughtful comments. Corridors 365 and 363 are being maintained in the plan update from the 1991 Road Plan due to their benefits for new access should the parcels that they cross subdivide. Like all corridors shown in the plan, these roads will only be platted and built if the parcels subdivide. If there is no subdivision, then no road will be built (for example, corridor 365 where it crosses the large parcel and cabin/workshop property at the end of Gold Lode Rd will not be built unless the landowner at the end of Gold Lode decides to subdivide their property). Additionally, the subdivision process and Road Plan allow for some flexibility in the final siting of road corridors. A landowner/subdivider may propose an alternate corridor <i>as long as they can prove that it will meet Title 17 road design standards and that it satisfies the original intent of the connection shown in the Road Plan.</i> In this way, the Road Plan and subdivision process facilitate landowners and the borough working together to achieve health, safety, and access goals while still respecting private property rights. Proposed realigned corridor 377 in the plan could also potentially provide permanent legal access to the two cabin properties should the parcels it crosses subdivide.</p>
365	6/22	Email	Jeanne	Laurencelle		<p>(Part 2) Brief history: As I understand it: Before the subdivision, the road followed a section line /power line (blue). It is still visible in Figure 1. After the subdivision 3779 Gold Lode Road was purchased, and the new landowner blocked the road, depriving the uphill cabin of access. There was a legal dispute and an easement for the current road (green) was agreed to. The borough showed or shows this road in their online GIS image, as a public easement based on the agreement. The road (green) was built and in use for over 10 years. Then that road was blocked, depriving both cabins above of access to their property. The owner of the uphill cabin property recently opened the road based on prescriptive easement, but the owner of the newer cabin (less than 10 years) still does not have access through that route.</p> <p>Which is all to say that there is an existing road that could be used, and the uphill cabin property owners might be very happy to cooperate with an easement if the borough could help with the access over that short stretch (green). The property, 3779 Gold Lode Road, with the disputed road is currently up for sale, so there will be a new owner soon.</p> <p>Note that the disputed easement on 3779 Gold Lode Road was to replace a section line easement that was in daily use. So possibly the section line access across the property could be re-opened, or used in negotiation.</p> <p>"Section Line Easement (SLEs) are existing easements established for access purposes, up to and including construction of paved roads. These easements are managed by the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) under AS 38 pursuant to AS 19.30. 400."</p> <p>Continuation of Section Line easement It also might be possible to just extend any trail or road along the section easement instead of using route 363 and 365. Then getting easements would not be an issue, since it already exists (white line).</p> <p>Figure 1. Shows an alternate route for 365. Disputed part of road in green, original road in blue, section line in yellow and white.</p>	<p>Thank you for your detailed and thoughtful comments. Corridors 365 and 363 are being maintained in the plan update from the 1991 Road Plan due to their benefits for new access should the parcels that they cross subdivide. Like all corridors shown in the plan, these roads will only be platted and built if the parcels subdivide. If there is no subdivision, then no road will be built (for example, corridor 365 where it crosses the large parcel and cabin/workshop property at the end of Gold Lode Rd will not be built unless the landowner at the end of Gold Lode decides to subdivide their property). Additionally, the subdivision process and Road Plan allow for some flexibility in the final siting of road corridors. A landowner/subdivider may propose an alternate corridor <i>as long as they can prove that it will meet Title 17 road design standards and that it satisfies the original intent of the connection shown in the Road Plan.</i> In this way, the Road Plan and subdivision process facilitate landowners and the borough working together to achieve health, safety, and access goals while still respecting private property rights. Proposed realigned corridor 377 in the plan could also potentially provide permanent legal access to the two cabin properties should the parcels it crosses subdivide.</p>
365	6/22	Phone	Jeanne	Laurencelle		<p>Concerned those proposed routes would mean increased recreation traffic in the area (people trying to gain access to trails), but no place for them to park. Concerned with the ability to maintain any new roads in area that is not within an RSA. Residents have spent a lot of time and money trying to maintain Gold Lode, just so it is functional. New roads would need to come with maintenance dollars. Question/raising flag re: 365/363 transition – cuts right through neighbor’s property? She has some ideas about different routes that may work to avoid this issue and others. Generally OK with idea of better access, appreciated hearing the criteria in that regard, just have the concerns above re: maintenance and folks coming up to access trails which equals increased traffic, no place for folks to park, and lack of funding for existing/new roads. She was also confused by the blue lines = new proposed corridors on the maps – she was looking at the key, but was still thinking the blue was a waterway. Good point, I think. Maybe for full draft we consider a different color for new proposed corridors?</p>	<p>Corridors 365 and 363 are being maintained in the plan update from the 1991 Road Plan due to their benefits for new access should the parcels that they cross subdivide. Like all corridors shown in the plan, these roads will only be platted and built if the parcels subdivide. If there is no subdivision, then no road will be built (for example, corridor 365 where it crosses the large parcel and cabin/workshop property at the end of Gold Lode Rd will not be built unless the landowner at the end of Gold Lode decides to subdivide their property). Additionally, the subdivision process and Road Plan allow for some flexibility in the final siting of road corridors. A landowner/subdivider may propose an alternate corridor <i>as long as they can prove that it will meet Title 17 road design standards and that it satisfies the original intent of the connection shown in the Road Plan.</i> In this way, the Road Plan and subdivision process facilitate landowners and the borough working together to achieve health, safety, and access goals while still respecting private property rights. Proposed realigned corridor 377 in the plan could also potentially provide permanent legal access to the two cabin properties should the parcels it crosses subdivide.</p>
367	5/11	Email	Gary	Newman		<p>(images attached) Haman to Allenadale You've probably looked this up already. Besides being really steep, it's across a significant drainage that ends up on Duckhawk Pond It's ain't 'golden'). I'm after common sense here. Good connections are fine, but not slavishly, ignoring obvious flaws (if I may be so bold). Hope you got caught up and thanks for the time today.</p>	<p>Corridor 367 has been removed based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that verified the connection would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of less than 10% grade.</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
367	5/19	Open House				New corridor for Road 185, 367, too steep: all snow melt will wash away road every year. Haman St drainage already runs down and floods roads and houses below. This will make it worse for no apparent reason	Corridor 367 has been removed based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that verified the connection would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of less than 10% grade.
367	5/19	Open House	Jim	Magdanez	owner, KH lot 13	New corridor above 185 road too steep. Road will wash away. Old landslide	Corridor 367 has been removed based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that verified the connection would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of less than 10% grade.
367	5/19	Open House	Miho	Acki	owner lot 14	Road 185 the new plan goes through very steep area	Corridor 367 has been removed based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that verified the connection would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of less than 10% grade.
367	5/19	Open House				Road 185 Keep it on the plan so that future families may be able to have school bus go to both Allen Adale Rd and Haman St. and in case of wildfire	Corridor 367 has been removed based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that verified the connection would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of less than 10% grade.
380	6/8	Email	Krista	Heeringa		<p>I would like to get clarification on the statement, "will only be dedicated on private property at the time that landowners subdivide".</p> <p>I am one of the property owners on the proposed road 380. If we were to subdivide our land (which is something we have considered), this proposed road would go through the middle of the portion we would keep intact and essentially is drawn through our yard. If this route was approved in your plan, would this mean as property owners we would have no say in the road development if we subdivided portions of our property that have access on different roads, which they would?</p> <p>Does the consideration of property owners not wanting a proposed route be adopted have any bearing?</p>	Road corridors identified in the plan are dedicated and constructed during the subdivision process. The subdivision process and the plan both allow for flexibility in corridor location as long as the alternative corridor meets the intent of the original corridor identified in the Road Plan. This flexibility is intended to facilitate the FNSB and private property owners working together to achieve public health, safety and access objectives while respecting private property rights. Corridor 380 has been removed from the plan based on public and landowner comments as well as an engineering analysis that verified the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades.
380	6/25	Paper form	Nathan	Heeringa		TL-603 is greater than 10% grade in this corridor, therefore it will not meet Title 17 road standards.	Corridor 380 has been removed from the plan based on public and landowner comments as well as an engineering analysis that verified the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades.
380	6/25	Paper form	Nathan	Heeringa		Furthermore, TL-613 at the top of the corridor will not be subdivided allowing for the completion of the road to Becker Ridge Road.	Corridor 380 has been removed from the plan based on public and landowner comments as well as an engineering analysis that verified the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades.
380	6/25	Paper form	Nathan	Heeringa		As the owners of TL-616 this corridor would take away from the health, safety, and well-being of our family and our neighbors.	Corridor 380 has been removed from the plan based on public and landowner comments as well as an engineering analysis that verified the corridor would be too steep to meet Title 17 road design standards of <10% grades.
381	5/19	Printed comments	Thomas Felix	Krause		An extension of Keystone Road (proposed new corridor 381) would exacerbate the poor condition of the road due to the dangerous alignment and gradient, since the road already now is way too steep. In addition this gradient would get worse since it would loop downhill to meet the road (proposed realigned corridor #206) extending north from Spinach Creek Rd (via Sunlight Drive) increasing the steepness of Keystone Road and increasing the maintenance costs in winter. Already now this road service area is stretched way too thin and cannot keep up with maintenance!	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
381	5/19	Printed comments	Thomas Felix	Krause		<p>In addition, we want to drive your attention to the hazardous situation at the Spinach Creek - Keystone Road intersection. The reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -In the winter, cats driving down Keystone Road and wanting to stop at the intersection tend to slide over the intersection. -Any car that slides over the intersection falls down a 60 foot drop (no protection) -Cars coming down Keystone Road are unable to see approaching traffic coming down Spinace Creek since a 90-degree curve obstructs any view (not sufficient sight distance!) 	Corridor 381 has been removed from the plan based on public comments and engineering analysis which has shown that the topography is likely too steep (>25%) for feasible road construction and maintenance. Corridor Criteria: Economic/Feasibility.
381	5/19	Printed comments	Thomas Felix	Krause		<p>A number of years ago, when FNSB planned to open up a new development which included an extension of Keystone Rd (Moonlight Acres), we took the initiative to buy all the land FNSB wanted to develop (150 acres) in 2007. As a result, we created that subdivision ourselves with a group of friends and neighbors (Uncommon Ground Neighborhood Initiative LLC) and minimized the additional number of lots to be served by Keystone Rd (at least 5 acres each lot). That is a rather extreme measure that we do not want to resort to again!</p> <p>Please do a responsible development. What you have in mind is dangerous! We will call you out and hold you responsible when the number of accidents once again increase in our neighborhood.</p>	Corridor 381 has been removed from the plan based on public comments and engineering analysis which has shown that the topography is likely too steep (>25%) for feasible road construction and maintenance. Corridor Criteria: Economic/Feasibility.
381	5/19	Printed comments	Dr. Silke	Schiewer		<p>(photo attached)</p> <p>The extension of Keystone Road (item 381) should not be considered an access route for the area north of the existing Spinach Creek and Sunrise Mountain subdivisions. Already now this steep road is dangerous to drive, serving only a small number of houses. In the winter, the steep road is so slick that cars can maneuver it only with four-wheel-drive and good tires. In past years my husband and I skidded towards the 60 ft drop off Spinach Creek Road and twice used the stop sign as a last resort to avoid crashing down the precipice on the south side of Spinach Creek Rd (photo attached).</p> <p>Without mentioning names, I would like to add that this is not an isolated incident; similar accidents have happened to others at that same corner.</p> <p>Even a school bus turning around at this intersection went into the ditch and had to be towed out.</p> <p>I urge you again not to consider extending Keystone Road if you do not want to bear the responsibility for any serious accidents in the future. The property sale profit can clearly not justify putting our lives and the lives of kids riding in a school bus on the line.</p>	Corridor 381 has been removed from the plan based on public comments and engineering analysis which has shown that the topography is likely too steep (>25%) for feasible road construction and maintenance. Corridor Criteria: Economic/Feasibility.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
381	5/19	Open House				Look at photos as better choice. Krause, Schiewer	Corridors 206 and 381 have been removed from the plan based on public comments and engineering analysis which has shown that the topography is likely too steep (>25%) for feasible road construction and maintenance. Corridor Criteria: Economic/Feasibility.
385	5/20	Email	Darla	Theisen		Please remove the 385 road. You cannot put a road through private property. The Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve is non motorized only. 1/2 of Haida Rd is private. This road makes no sense and I wonder how and why someone even proposed without talking with the owners of the property. Please include my comments. Besides impacting the Nature Reserve this road would also impact my property and my neighbors' property and for what purpose? Who are the consultants I can talk with?	Corridor 385 was removed based on public comments, conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve, and lack of public easement at the end of Haida Lane.
385	6/26	Email	Darla	Theisen		Please remove the 385 road as it is impossible to put a road there. Haida is private and the Reserve is non motorized. This was added in with no commo to the people whose property it would border or pass through. It is a very negative proposal and has served to create mistrust of the FNSB regarding our communities. Deficiencies in the previous plan is that road corridors were mapped without regard to soil conditions, in some cases topography and lack of attention to potential land use conflicts (e.g. mining adjacent to residential areas). Please consider an MCO around the subdivisions and Nature Reserve to avoid the mining conflicts.	Corridor 385 was removed based on public comments, conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve, and lack of public easement at the end of Haida Lane.
385	6/25	Email	Jeff	Adams		I oppose the addition of any proposed new road corridors that would harm the integrity of the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, the existing Riedel trail network, or the public use values for recreation of the FNSB land parcel off Amanita. Specifically: Road Corridors #44, #306, and #385 should not be advanced due to their impact on existing recreational and public use values.	Corridors 385 and 306 have been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve and lack of public easement at the end of Haida Lane. Corridors 310 and 44 have been maintained in the plan because Amanita Rd does not have legal public access and is not built to Title 17 road design standards. Inclusion of these corridors in the plan can help obtain legal public access and bring Amanita up to standard when these parcels subdivide.
385	6/25	Email	Jeff	Adams		I oppose the addition of any proposed new road corridors that would harm the integrity of the Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, the existing Riedel trail network, or the public use values for recreation of the FNSB land parcel off Amanita. Specifically: Road Corridors #44, #306, and #385 should not be advanced due to their impact on existing recreational and public use values.	Corridor 306 has been removed based on public comments, conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve, and lack of public easement at the end of Haida Lane.
385	5/19	Paper Form	(blank)	(blank)		I don't think the access is available either on Haida or through the Audubon-Riedel preserve to Amanita. I would like to see this removed from the plan.	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	5/19	Paper Form	Mike, Dave, Nathan, Donna	(blank)		Don'r support - too much traffic in in our neighborhood, private access	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	5/19	Printed comments	Mancy (& Tom)	Rabener (& Stimpfle)		This corridor is on Haida Lane, which is a private road - there are bits in public access and others in private. I have spoekn with borough employees in the 1990s regarding the private/public access and utilities. They confirmed the access is private. We on Haida are <u>not</u> in a road service district and have <u>never</u> received assistance with road repair or snow removal. We take care of the road and snowfall ourselves. My husband and I live at the northern end of Haida. Haida is about 1/2 mile long. There are about 12 families on the private, quiet road. Our land (5 acres) is adjacent to the Audubon land. It is <u>not</u> appropriate to build a road on <u>private</u> Haida to access Audubon since Audubon has already an access easement from Amanita Lane. In the 1980s when Audubon was unsuccessful in obtaining access along Haida, due to the private easement status, they secured access off Amanita Rd. Their challenge is in gaining funds to improve their already-legal access to make it a viable passage. As you can see it is a long saga.	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	5/17	Open House				Please remove potential road 385 because it goes through Arctic Audobon Society's Audobon Riedel Lands. Protected by land covenants that do not allow roads.	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	5/19	Open House				Please protect Riedel! put this hard won treasure back in the 20 year plan! I object to a road (385) that is unnecessary and betrays this neighborhood.	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	5/19	Open House				Please take 385 off the map as it crosses the Audobon Ridel nature Reserve lands. Is not needed or feasible. Stick to Amanita.	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	5/19	Open House				Delete 385. Use Aminita off Chena Hot Springs Rd	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	5/19	Open House				Delete 385. Use Amanita off of CHSR. Crosses Riedel Audobon property	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	5/19	Open House				The road map as this overlay shows conflict of Rt 385 with Audobon Ridel lands.	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
385	5/22	Email	Julie	Scully		Haida Lane extension through Audubon Riedel property to Amanita Road: Both HL and AR are steep, narrow and have access and ownership issues. As a resident of HL my husband and I share "end of the road" status with 1 set of neighbors. We drive the entire "Land" each time we leave home. HL is not a public throughfare, it is not maintained. It is usable by the current residents, but it is a 50+ year old home-made road. It cannot handle school busses for field trips to a nature center and opening any path to Amanita only entices mining opportunities. Which by the way none of us are remotely interested in. And would HORRIFY the Riedels that the property they donated for perpetuity AS A NATURE RESERVE, AND WHERE THEY ARE BURIED would EVER be used for heavy equipment would an immoral travesty of their intent. At this point I realize BOTH of the last 2 properties would have to be purchased and legally subdivided and HL upgraded AND Audobon would have to approve to continue this "suggestion". May I humbly suggest that Prop #385 is just not an appropriate use of energy. I appreciate the intent of granting neighbors options for escape in a fire. But it was evident when we AL BOUGHT our properties, the in ONLY ONE WAY OUT. Regarding police feedback for changes to Roads and Trails. The current notification of property holders with-in 50 feet of the" affected areas" is ludicrous. The entire road AND the 2 roads on either side should be included. Not getting any notification seems very hard to swallow. NO ONE on HL was notified. If not for diligent neighbors we would not have heard about these meetings. Clearly our addresses are public record. How is it legal to conduct business at this level with NOTHING FROM the powers that be? I appreciate your efforts but this is not acceptable.	Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve.
385	6/10	Email	David	Kistler		My name is David Kistler and I reside on Amanita Road. I am writing to you concerning the CEDs roads and trails plan drafts. I was notified today from neighbors of the deadline for comment ending today. I have not thoroughly reviewed all of the information and sites concerning the drafts but have been trying to keep up with the information as it is provided to me. I would like to share my concerns for the proposed roads and trails here in the Amanita Road area. 1. First, as you may well know Amanita Rd. is a complicated little road. The road is maintained out of the pockets of the resident here. Much of it is not where it belongs (section lines, private property, etc.). Furthermore the road is sometimes narrow with steep grades which prevents it from qualifying for subdivision standards and such. We just went through an ordeal with mining prospecting here(quite sure it is still active) where the road again was a concern, as well as the mining activity and the impact to home owners here. If Amanita Rd. were to be opened up to additional traffic, who would be responsible to help maintain/redesign the road? 2. I am astounded that the borough would basically open up a new recreational area in our neighborhood. The old abandoned military site on upper Amanita Rd. has been a problem for a couple of decades, with people using the site as a shooting range and party area. Someone had set up targets there as well as leaving a BBQ grills and their trash. There have been at least two fires up there that luckily never got out of control. This kind of recklessness may one day bring crime and other trouble to the residents. 3. I do not understand the desire for trails in this area (excepting the Arctic Audubon Society) as there is nothing spectacular here. One must drive over two miles to the top to be clear of any homes. Has anyone thought of using the end of Gilmore Trail to access several trails in that region? It is foolish and somewhat of an insult to try and push this "road" and trail through our neighborhood. If it were your neighborhood or the FNSB Mayor's, I doubt there would be so much enthusiasm concerning this endeavor. There is so much land to explore and develop in our borough. There must be some ulterior motive behind this proposal? 4. With some of the upper Amanita Rd. Mental health Land being leased to mining businesses for prospecting and hopes of future mining, it seems there is a conflict with the borough's desire to develop some of the same land. Finally, Amanita Road cannot handle all of this impact, nor do most if not all of Amanita's residents want any part of it. I am all for trails and I believe in mining. There just needs to be some common sense and a little respect applied here. Looking forward to attending the upcoming meetings. Thank you for your time. David Kistler	Thank you for your detailed comments. Corridor 385 has been removed based on public comments and conflicts with the Riedel Nature Reserve. Corridors 44 and 310 are being maintained in the plan due to historic and ongoing access issues along Amanita, which does not have legal public right-of-way and is currently not built to Title 17 road design standards. Additional connections 331 and 404 are included in the plan to provide better alternative and emergency services access to residents along Amanita and Esro Rd (331), as well as future access to the parcels that they cross, should they ever subdivide. Both Esro Rd and Amanita Rd are cul-du-sacs much longer than the FNSB's Title 17 road design standards allow (maximum 1,320 ft), which has potential health, safety, and access implications for the borough and area residents. Corridor Criteria: Access/New Access, Access/Alternate Routes, Access/Multiple Access Points
395	6/18	Landowner Notes	Colin	Craven	DNR Land Conveyance Section	Comment on F454E land north of Johnson Road (Salcha) I appreciate that several section line easement-following road corridors were removed between the steering committee drafts and the most recent draft in this township. However, proposed route 395 crosses wetlands and then walks up a steep hillside along a SLE (along sections 17 & 20 and 16 & 21) to connect to Sulliwood Road. This is not a good road corridor. There are possibilities for more practical access through the areas that DNR plans to develop for rural residential parcels and agricultural land within sections 8, 9, 15, 16, 17, 21, 22 and 23 along Sulliwood Road (already a dedicated ROW and 396 in the roads plan) and potentially with a connection to Military Pipeline Rd to provide another means back to Johnson Road. The main issues DNR wants to avoid are complications from crossing the former Haines-to-Fairbanks Pipeline corridor (as the SLE does) and being prescribed to follow an already existing but not practical to develop easement corridor. I see this as a unique area in that it is a large swath of DNR land, therefore our eventual subdivision proposal (and likely a concomitant zoning proposal) should be given more weight than in other situations where we would be platting only a portion of an access corridor because of varying land ownership.	Corridor 395 has been removed from the plan based on landowner feedback and concerns about road construction and maintenance feasibility due to wetlands and steep topography. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input, Environment/Wetlands, Flood Zones, Permafrost, Soils.
General	6/25	Email	Bobbie	Ritchie	Homeowner	Incidentally, we heard about this comment period through the neighborhood grapevine. We have not received any notifications for this or previous actions in the planning process. As property owners along Line Drive, should we have received notices? Please consider these concerns in your planning process and record my opposition to proposed road corridors 69 and 295. I do appreciate your hard work and thank you for the opportunity to comment.	Postcard were sent out to all property owners within 50 feet of a proposed new, realigned, or removed road or trail. There were quite a few additional outreach activities as well and will continue to be as the plan goes through draft and adoption processes.
General	5/20	Email	Darla	Theisen		I did not receive a postcard. Will you do another open house or are there other opportunities to review the maps and comments? I am out of town for my Mom's celebration of life.	Draft maps will be available for review online on the project website and in the FNSB Community Planning Department office until 6/26/22.
General	6/16	Email	Debbie	Eberhardt	Eberhardt Family Trust	My son-in-law got a reminder of comments due by 6/26 I did not I was at that first meeting and left comments, can you see if you have them? Also can I meet with you again at the office before the 26th?	Comments were received and recorded.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	6/23	Web Form	Gina	Graham		Better adherence to water management standards and the inclusion of snow dumps need to be in new road builds. All of them. Thanks for your time and attention.	Thank you for your comments. They will be considered for inclusion into the vision, goals, and strategies portion of the Road Plan.
General	5/31	Email	Gary	Newman		Hi Shelly, Thanks for this. I'll be looking to see changes in the most recent maps that reflect community feedback to date. FYI, I looked on the website and didn't find: (see the project website for a summary of community input to date).	The project website includes a high-level summary of all outreach and engagement activities conducted so far, but not a detailed summary of all specific comments. This will be shared at a later date with the full Road Plan public review draft.
General	6/8	Email	Krista	Heeringa		An additional comment. This plan was brought to my attention by a neighbor, who heard it from a neighbor. Given the Borough has access to mailing addresses of property owners, it seems that it would make sense for property owners to be aware of this proposed plan in time to comment. I am really surprised and frustrated that this was not included as part of the public engagement process. Thanks for clarifying.	Postcards were sent to all property owners within 50 feet of a proposed new, realigned, or removed road or trail. Additionally, there has been quite a bit more outreach including public service announcements, newsminer articles, facebook posts, and information on radio interviews.
General	5/18	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		We reviewed the FNSB draft road plan. We had questions about three of the proposed roads included in the Northwest Quadrant Proposed Road Corridors map and the formal definition of constructed and unconstructed roads. Thank you for taking the time to consider and answer these questions. We'd appreciate a quick response so we can learn more about how these three corridors were proposed and how the planning team justified including them in the draft plan. That information will help us develop our comments for the plan. Definitions of constructed roads and unconstructed road: The map legend shows that constructed roads are indicated by a solid black line and unconstructed roads are shown as dashed black lines. Please provide us with the legal definition for constructed and unconstructed roads.	The legal definition of a constructed road can be found in FNSB Code 17.56.060.A. Road is constructed if: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> •It is a state-maintained roadway OR •The road was previously approved by the Borough Engineer by this or former code requirements OR •The road meets 17.56.060.A.2 -- these are cases where the road wasn't previously approved by the borough engineer. There are several additional criteria that must be met, listed in 17.56.060.A.2. Please see: https://fnsb.borough.codes/FNSBC/17.56.060 .
General	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the FNSB draft roads plan. We appreciate Paul Cotter and the team responding to our questions regarding some of the recommended corridors. In an email responding to our initial list of questions, Mr. Cotter told us that the team "erred on the side of inclusivity for the public draft maps" and that "a big focus of the steering committee and public feedback has been road maintenance; the team is working to balance maintenance needs with access and safety goals". We appreciated learning this and kept these statements in mind as we read the plan and drafted our comments. We also appreciate learning more about the six criteria that the FNSB roads planning team used during the evaluation process and drafted our comments to address each of the six criteria (see below).	Thank you for your detailed and thoughtful comments on the draft corridors.
General	6/25	Email	Carol and Ray	McIntyre (C) and Hander (R)		Social: a. Address community feedback. In an email response to some of our questions regarding community input on the draft roads plan, the planning team replied that "the large extent of the study area and project budget precluded direct neighborhood outreach meetings". Thus, rather than scheduling time to meet with local community members to discuss if either 203 or 270 address any local needs, the team solicited for comments via online sources and during two public meetings. While we are sympathetic to budgetary constraints, we think that meeting with local community members would have been very beneficial, offering insights into various options for meeting the goals of the FNSB roads plan while meeting the current needs of the local community.	We appreciate your feedback. Corridors 203, 270, and many others in the initial draft corridor maps have been removed or adjusted based on public feedback from local residents gathered through two public open houses, an online comment map, and the draft corridor maps public review period. An additional 30-day public review period will occur in mid-August 2022 for the full draft plan including revised corridor maps.
General	6/23	Web Form	Monte	Galvin Landis		We live behind Fort Wainwright in the land-locked area. When will we ever get access without having to go through Wainwright? We are denied visitors and other liberties enjoyed by others because of access through post.	1991 Road Plan corridors 189, 188, 104, 107, 105, and 329 were removed from the Road Plan due to concerns about development encroachment upon Fort Wainwright. Currently, the take-off and landing pattern for aircraft from Ft. Wainwright follows undeveloped lands on a path along the Chena River from the end of the airfield, across the northern portion of the Secluded Acres subdivision, and over the corridors listed above. Military concerns about security and additional development in this area further limiting airfield access were documented in the 2006 Joint Land Use Study and the 2019 Salcha-Badger Road Area Plan, and informed the decision to remove these corridors from the plan. Road Plan criteria: Social/Encroachment: encroaches on military or other existing uses. Social/Compatibility: incompatible with existing uses and/or FNSB Plans. This comment will be passed along to the Planning Commission and Assembly and they could chose to include this corridor in the final plan.
General	5/24	Email	Mindy	Lane		Hi, The FNSB page says you are the public involvement lead. I literally live adjacent to one of you proposed changes and will be significantly affected, but I didn't hear about it until it's almost done in a 2 year process. I'm curious what you did to notify Amanita and Esro Rd area owners of your committee plans, of the open house and comment periods? Please include dates. Thanks. m	Postcards were sent to all property owners within 50 feet of a proposed new, realigned, or removed road or trail on May 6, 2022. Open houses were held on May 17 at North Pole High School and on May 19 at Lathrop High School.
General	5/19	Printed comments	Dr. Silke	Schiewer		I appreciate being notified by FNSB about the draft plan for road corridors. After downloading the maps from www.FNSBRoadsPlan.com I have the following comments about our immediate neighborhood.	Thank you for your comments.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	6/18	Landowner Notes	Colin	Craven	DNR Land Sales	<p>I'm glad you got in touch, as I do have a few comments specific to my role in DNR Land Sales (not as a steering committee member). I think there a few areas where there are potential blockages or better options on State land.</p> <p>I'm going to summarize my comments below to get things started, but I would also like to take up your offer to discuss them in a virtual meeting next week. I'm most available Wed-Fri mornings (June 22 -24) but could make another time that week available if need be.</p>	Thank you for your comments.
General	6/25	Landowner Notes	Rachel	Longacre	DNR Land Conveyance Section	The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) Land Conveyance Section is a willing partner with the FNSB to plan for future road corridors and provide appropriate preservation for recreational trails within State subdivisions. However, the combined effect of the FNSB's draft update to its Recreational Trails Plan and Comprehensive Roads Plan excessively encumbers some of DNR's property, making it not practical to develop.	Thank you for your comments.
General	6/25	Landowner Notes	Colin	Craven	DNR Land Conveyance Section	<p>Insufficient Consideration of Plan Interactions</p> <p>DNR has provided input on both plan updates in isolation, which has been productive in other areas of the borough for DNR land. However, this approach has been insufficient the O'Connor Creek East area. For this property, the draft Comprehensive Roads Plan shows trail corridors that are not in the draft Recreational Trails Plan, and the draft Trails Plan does not show the road corridor proposed in the Comprehensive Roads Plan. Therefore, it is likely that the planning groups were not aware of the cumulative impacts of these plan updates.</p> <p>If DNR accepted the proposed corridors as shown in both plans currently, approximately the east half of our property would largely be a collection of dedicated road rights-of-way and trail easements surrounding substandard lots, or DNR would need to retain a large tract encompassing these corridors that would make DNR the de facto manager of a FNSB park.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Your input will be considered and shared with the Trails Plan team for their consideration and action as well.
General	6/25	Landowner Notes	Colin	Craven	DNR Land Conveyance Section	<p>Recreational Trails Plan</p> <p>DNR discussed this area at length with FNSB Parks & Recreation in January 2022 about preserving some existing trails while not overly encumbering a potential subdivision. At that time DNR stated that the existing trail corridors were excessive, but now the Trails Plan public review draft shows even more trail corridors than are described in the currently adopted Trails Plan. DNR supports the proposed alternate trailhead access to the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Line Trail from Skyflight Avenue that follows the section line easement north partially onto DNR land. However, because this section line easement has a width of 66 feet and DNR intends to use this corridor for road access to DNR property for subdivision platting, FNSB Parks & Recreation should recognize that the width of the access corridor will probably not allow for adjacent road and trail corridors. A combined corridor may need to suffice until upon DNR land where we will be able to grant easements of a greater width.</p> <p>Similar to the comment above about securing legal access, DNR is not aware of legal access to the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Line Trail from Skyflight Avenue across private property to DNR land. Given the prevalence of "no trespassing" signs on the eastern margin of DNR's land in this area, DNR assumes that private property owners are generally not accepting of trails that cross their property. If there is to be a trailhead for this trail at the intersection of Skyflight Avenue and the section line easement, then there is no longer a need for a trail segment encouraging trespass on private property that then continues as extra trail segments on DNR land.</p> <p>Alternatively, if the FNSB wants to allow for continued development and expansion of the tax base while appropriately preserving access, DNR needs timely coordination on these matters before the plans are finalized.</p> <p>We look forward to working with the FNSB on creating and preserving access within and through our property that would be mutually beneficial to both agencies and to the public.</p>	Corridor 217 has been maintained in the plan due to its importance for providing new access to parcels to the north and west of the Skyflight airstrip with a high likelihood of development. The corridor has been realigned slightly to the west based on public feedback to avoid impacting private parcels. Comments related to the Trails Plan will be shared with the team facilitating that process.
General	7/20	Email	Anthony	Lacortiglia		<p>Hello Brittany, I am a service area commissioner for the Keystone Service area which services Lincoln creek subdivision. We have been following the development of the Borough Roads plan since there seemed to be some focus on development in our area. We recently had a service area meeting and submitted a request for public safety maintenance for a portion of Reconstruction rd and a portion of Abraham rd. These two roads are platted to connect to form a loop at the western edge of the subdivision but they do not connect as roads only by trail at the far ends. Reconstruction is also where Gettysburg and Rebel Way connect to our subdivision. Neither of these roads are up to title 17 standards. The residents have been maintaining these sections without support from the service area. So any increased traffic on these roads increases the already unfair burden those residents bear. I'd like to follow up on some information another resident received from the Roads team. One of the questions they asked was "Did the planning team discuss improvements to Reconstruction rd and Cache Creek rd to provide year round access to Gettysburg and Rebel Way?" The answer they received was "yes". Could you elaborate at all on that? I'd also like to discuss any other options for funding improvements to these roads. We are required by borough code to provide road maintenance to all year round residences but are not currently doing that for about 10 of those residences, which is almost 1/3 of the subdivision, due to the condition of those roads. Thanks for your efforts on the road plan and your time on this.</p>	Corridors adjacent to the Lincoln Creek subdivision (203, 270, 224) have been removed from the plan based on public feedback and an engineering analysis that verified these corridors are too steep to be constructed to Title 17 road design standards. Corridor Criteria: Social/Public Input, Economic/Feasibility, Geometry/Road Grade.
General	5/17	Email	Linda	DeFoliart		I had several thoughts when I saw your dream map, none very favorable. If I were you, I'd come to the public meetings and explain how you plan to maintain these roads? More than half my commute time to town is used traversing the 1.5 miles of subdivision roads to Goldstream. I actually bottomed out twice and that was taking the smoothest route I could find. Our shortest route in has been closed and will be that way for the foreseeable future. This is ridiculous.	Thank you for your comments. They will be considered by the Road Plan team.
General	5/17	Email	Anne	Godduhn		I find it bizarre and incredibly frustrating that no direct link to the roads plan can be found from the borough's site, but with the PSA's help, I finally found it. I am now writing to report that the link provided for the NE quadrant map isn't working (the address is included twice, so it only works if you figure that out and edit accordingly). Please correct the link on the website ASAP!!	The link has been corrected.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	6/24	Email	Bob	Ritchie		These projects do not fall into the FAST program for Metro Fairbanks, correct?	Correct. Corridors identified in the Road Plan are platted and build by the developer during the subdivision process.
General	10/10	Email	Gary	Newman		FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan Update Comment of Gary Newman from 9/30/21 meeting. Upgrade and insure maintenance of existing roads including 4. below. I heard this loud and clear from others. Encourage collaboration on major/minor collectors with FNSB RSAs and State of Alaska DOT (example Roland Road, which would require eminent domain to widen in some areas). Any required dedication through new subdivisions beyond must consider types of land use, zoning, topography, soils and feasibility. A serious analysis of likely anticipated impacts from climate change. (see 3. above). Partnership in local/regional zoning efforts to minimize future conflicts and establish acceptable uses for landowners. E.g. mining development adjacent to residential areas (Ester, Amanita) where road extensions would create conflicts. Would like to know more about RSA Plan in progress. FNSB needs to have road powers. Expectations of 1. above are unrealistic without this. (My 10 year future desire). Integration with trails plan and recreational/natural areas. Encourage DOT to not go overboard with multiple creative intersection designs that require more maintenance without more funding and confusing for a community with a lot of transient users (e.g. military). Clean up unnecessary past dedications by making easement vacations easier, especially where prior dedications were required from the previous road plan, but are no longer appropriate. Insure appropriate easements for utilities. Change the name of 'orphan' roads. It sounds pejorative. And just because a road is not in a service area does not mean it is substandard. Title 17 should allow for methodologies of accepting those roads for limited development. Flexibility of mapped future corridors with alternatives that generally meet the standards of functionality. Other comments: I know that the website is fnsb roads plan.com but it looks like fns roads plan.com. Too late to change, I recognize. I did see Mayor Ward's Community Perspective, held until after the election by the News-Miner to not appear to be favorable to one candidate and not the others in our local government election. Would like to see the 1991 documentation that Kellen referred to as well as ANC and Wasilla's plan by weblink. The 1991 Comp Road Plan map on the website showing Esro to Tungsten and Amanita Roads extensions is a great example of roads that are not needed and are undevelopable due to poor ground, going through GCI's major earth station for Fairbanks and conflicting land uses (residential and mining). If we are going to modify the 1991 Plan narrative, I'm happy to mark up, already started to do so. However, if we are starting fresh, I won't spend more time on it.	Thank you for your thoughtful and detailed comments. They will be considered by the Road Plan team.
General	6/1	Email	Steve	Lowry	Chief of surveys, 3-Tier Alaska	I was wondering if there were any provisions, anything being written into the overall plan that would allow for changes to the plan, or roads to be eliminated from it (say by the assembly at large?). The best example I could give is if there was a road put on the plan, and then some type of development or environmental/topography condition (like a large building or gravel pit, wetlands, massive soil contamination et cetera) that would make the proposed road impractical to construct. I guess it would be hard to predict what might make a road impractical or no longer needed, just think it would be a good idea to be able to eliminate a road without waiting 30 or 40 years for the plan to be revised. I know some changes or revision have been made to the existing plan as better topography data became available, so I guess I'm thinking of something that would allow for more flexibility to actually update the plan on the fly so to speak.	Thank you for your thoughtful and detailed comments. They will be considered by the Road Plan team.
General	5/13	Email	Eleanor	Boyce		Our road service commissioner sent out two screen captures of maps showing our neighborhood roads plan (see one example attached). He also forwarded the map key explanation, "Black lines are in the existing 1991 plan, blue lines proposed to be added, red x--x--x lines proposed to be deleted, yellow lines are proposed for future study." I'm not sure who sent these, but I hope one of you might be able to answer a question: I don't see any yellow lines (in my area), but I do see purple lines. Could someone please provide a key for those? Also, is it still possible to submit comments via the interactive map page? I note that your website says the page is open through 1/1/2022, but the map is still available and allowing comments.	Purple lines on the draft corridor maps indicate 1991 Road Plan corridors proposed to be realigned or adjusted but maintained in the plan update. Future Study corridors are indicated by light/lime green lines, which may appear yellow on some computer screens or when printed. The online comment map remained open after 1/1/2022 for public comments until mid-May 2022.
General	3/24	Email	Gerald	Colp		I have a few linger thoughts I have been meaning to pass on to you. Regarding the 1/16/22 DRAFT POLICIES & CORRIDOR SELECTION CRITERIA, STRATEGY 6.4: Apply consistent roadway design standards based on state and national best practices: ADD something like the following: and consistent with design and construction guidelines of local practices including the City of Fairbanks and the City of North Pole. (My comment: without some recognition of local home-rule authority and their road powers, it makes FNSB, look very heavy handed and usurping) Regarding 12/15/21 Preliminary Survey Analysis, 3rd Bullet of Key Takeaways: Respondents are significantly concerned that more roads will over-burden the FNSB road maintenance department and lead to more roads with potholes and unplowed snow. (My comment: Please correct the implication by this statement that the FNSB has a road maintenance department and clarify the role of FNSB (incorporated without road powers) is through road service areas created as the road maintenance authority within the boundary of the FNSB but outside of the cities of Fairbanks and North Pole.) Regarding 3/3/22 NWQuadrant_DraftRoadCorridors (specifically the area in the vicinity of Johansen and New Steese HWYs): consider addressing the following: DOTPF corridor and Johansen / New Steese intersection study as showing their preferred alternative old City Fairbanks &/ or DOT roadway plans / studies / proposed connectors from Northside Blvd to Farmers Loop Rd Ext. (as for frontage road/ alt access /continuity) old FTWW road master plan to connect / upgrade Lazelle Rd / Canol Service Rd for the new north gate to FTWW in lieu of existing Trainor Gate Rd gate. old City of Fairbanks water system master plans that had a proposed water reservoir on Birch Hill that was to be fed by the 18" water transmission line running up Old Steese Hwy to Johansen by Seekins (with future-use utility sleeves in place I believe under existing intersection from SW quadrant) with possible connection to Harold Bentley Ave water distribution line constructed east of Northside Blvd. platting D Street extension and underground utility systems for telecommunications and electric from Joyce Dr to Lazelle Rd across Lazelle Estates North Tract A-1 Regarding www.FNSBRoadsPlan.com posted interactive map: Correct mislocated note located at Central St / Aurora Drive intersection indicating: "A road between Central and Chena Hot Springs. A nice tourist loop would result." (My comment: Central refers to the community of Central on the Steese Hwy and not the City of Fairbanks street by that name.) Consider previous City of Fairbanks, City of North Pole and DOTPF roadway master plans or corridor studies with the FNSB.	Thank you for your thoughtful and detailed comments. They will be considered by the Road Plan team.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	10/7	Email	Daniel	Swift		I have two issues related to roads in the Borough. The first is noise, primarily due poorly muffled vehicles. This is entirely unnecessary noise. The worst is Airport Road. The noise is primarily due to vehicle drag racing from one traffic light to the next. This is an annoyance lowering the quality of living in an urban area. This encourages urban sprawl. This should be a concern in the era of global warming because it increases consumption of fossil fuels the amount of greenhouse gasses dumped into our atmosphere. One solution would be a reduction in the number of traffic lights by use of over or underpasses. Another solution would be laws at the state level requiring adequate mufflers on vehicle. My second issue is the Borough's program of offering remote lands for residential development. This again encourages community sprawl with increased cost of public services like power lines and school bussing. It also results in increased of greenhouse gas emissions. The solution: Discontinue sale of remote parcels for residential development.	Thank you for your thoughtful and detailed comments. They will be considered by the Road Plan team.
n/a	6/24	Email	Bob (Robert)	Pristash		Hi Shelly, It doesn't appear that any part of this plan is within the city limits. Is that true? Bob	The Road Plan study area does not include the majority of roads in the City of Fairbanks.
new	5/31	Email	Gary	Newman		(image attached) I did have one suggestion that I neglected to offer more than once because we didn't really cover the city in our reviews. This would be an off ramp midway up the on ramp to the Johansen heading east from College Road that would enter the box store area, shown in red. This would reduced the bottleneck further to the east to access Merhar and also give the Bentley Trust more exposure to what is more or less a dead commercial zone. I've seen this type of entry done before elsewhere and it's most effective.	Thank you for your suggestion. While many areas in the City of Fairbanks are not currently included in the Road Plan study area due to many areas/roads being built out, your comments will be documented in the plan for future consideration. This particular suggestion would be very difficult to implement because FHWA requires access restrictions onto interstate roads and off-ramps that are designated access controlled.
	5/13	Email	Eleanor	Boyce		(image attached) Our road service commissioner sent out two screen captures of maps showing our neighborhood roads plan (see one example attached). He also forwarded the map key explanation, "Black lines are in the existing 1991 plan, blue lines proposed to be added, red x--x--x lines proposed to be deleted, yellow lines are proposed for future study." I'm not sure who sent these, but I hope one of you might be able to answer a question: I don't see any yellow lines (in my area), but I do see purple lines. Could someone please provide a key for those? Also, is it still possible to submit comments via the interactive map page? I note that your website says the page is open through 1/1/2022, but the map is still available and allowing comments.	Purple lines indicate corridors planned in the 1991 Road Plan proposed to be realigned or adjusted in the plan's update. Future Study corridors are indicated in a light/lime green color on the maps.