

FNSB Roads Plan Comments September - October 2022							
Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
4	10/17	email	Lili	Misel		The Waterford Pack Trail is heavily used by walkers, skiers, bikers, dogsledgers, 4-wheelers and kick sledgers. Running a road down this well established and community maintained trail will remove a local access to other trail systems that is used by many community members.	Corridor 4 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 4's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 4 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated."
4	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>6. As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>•New and existing proposed road corridors north of the Goldstream Valley, chiefly 15, 293, 262, 4, 209 could have significant conflict with recreational trails. I think developing this area would be a mistake for the Borough and would lead to a loss in wildlands and trails and would also negatively contribute to the urban sprawl of Fairbanks.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	Corridor 4 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 4's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 4 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated."
13	10/20	email	Dan	Reichardt		<p>•General Comment (Regarding Corridors #209, #262, #372, #273 and #13) – In general, this roads plan seems to take a maximalist view of roads, providing multiple connecting routes between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road. The residents of FNSB benefit greatly by the wilderness lands that are preserved due to having very few north-south connecting roads between the East-West arteries (the arteries being College, Farmers Loop, Goldstream and Old Murphy Dome.) These existing arteries provide ample access to subdivisions north and south of the arteries on prime residential land with short subdivision roads. While this road plan appropriately contemplates future roads for accessing subdivisions, it seems to me that – taken as a whole – it represents a political decision fill the valleys between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome road with connecting routes that aren't needed or desired by existing residents. This is a substantively significant political decision that I really think hasn't been properly discussed with the residents of the borough and I think that this roads plan – despite representing some really good work by the stakeholders – would need to be rejected or forestalled until such a decision is more fully contemplated by borough residents. At the very most, if a more direct route to the central subdivisions on Old Murphy Dome road is needed, the stakeholders should choose just one of those 5 connecting routes.</p>	<p>131 corridors were removed from the Plan over the course of the Plan's development. This included corridors from the 1991 Roads Plan, the 2006 Plan update, and the 2022 effort. Forty-one corridors were realigned with the current effort to put the corridors on more suitable terrain or avoid other features (e.g., trails, parks, buildings).</p> <p>Corridor 13 traverses FNSB land that has the potential for future development. The road corridor was placed with recreational trails in mind, as the recreational trails plan identifies several trails in the area. The remainder of the corridors will only be developed if the property owner chooses to subdivide. At that time the Borough will work with the property owner to dedicate and if needed construct the connecting road. This area would need to fully develop to realize all the shown connections.</p>
13	10/21	web form	Kristen	Sullivan		<p>Message: I am writing you about proposed road 204, 254, 18, 20, 21, 13, 255. This is putting roads thru the UAF Land that has long been vacant. The only problem is adding these roads will allow more houses to be built and add more traffic to the dangerous roads we already have. The end of Frenchman has Frenchman creek and a large seasonal slough from the snow melt. It would definitely require a bridge. The present culvert does get overwhelmed on big snow years as it is. Putting a road there is like the proposed road connecting MHE to Miller hill rd. That road would also require a bridge and impact local green space and trails.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Corridor 13 does not cross any University of Alaska land. The corridor traverses several large FNSB parcels that could potentially be developed in the future. The remainder of the corridors will only be developed if the property owner chooses to subdivide. At that time the Borough will work with the property owner to dedicate and if needed construct the connecting road. This area would need to fully develop to realize all the shown connections.
15	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>–Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.
15	10/13	web form	Jean	Leder		<p>The proposed Route #217 extending Skyflight Avenue and connecting to Pandora via proposed Route #15 is not a viable option for future roads. It violates all 3 goals of the community road planning project. It is a deterrent to health, well-being, and safety. Currently Skyflight is a quiet dead-end road in the Cordes Service Area that can handle the existing traffic and safely allow children and residents to walk along the road. If proposed Route#217 was to connect Cordes Road to Pandora then Cordes would become the overwhelming choice for all traffic from the Pandora Service area. The Cordes area roads would see an increase in traffic and need much more maintenance without any additional revenue from the Pandora service area. The Cordes Service area property owners' financial obligation to maintain roads would increase exponentially. Another issue is the curve where Cordes Road turns into Skyflight which is already a safety concern. It's a blind curve and adding traffic to that is a bad idea.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Based on an engineering analysis and modelling, Corridors 15 and 217 are likely feasible to construct to FNSB standards given small adjustments based on survey data during the platting process.
15	10/19	email	Darren	Rorabaugh		Corridor #15 goes through the lot in which our family lives. The lot has our home and is not subdivided. This route is not an option	Corridor 15 would only be developed if you as the property owners decide to subdivide your land.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
15	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21.</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about.</p> <p>Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here:</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.
15	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.
15	10/20	web form	David	DeLong		<p>The FBNSB plan has major flaws. First, Our trails must protected, This plan makes existing trails into roads. That should not be allowed. Specifically the proposed roads 217 and 15 would destroy a significant trail. This plan would make Cordes and Skyflight more dangerous. The increase in traffic will be especially dangerous at the hairpin turn as Cordes transitions into Sky flight. There are 6 driveways that have to negotiate a blind turn with attendant dangers from increased traffic. Fairbanks has beautiful trails. Don't turn those trails into roads</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.
15	10/20	web form	Nina	Harun		<p>The FBNSB Roads Plan has some major flaws. First, no new road should destroy existing highly used neighborhood trails. Second, no new road should dramatically alter existing subdivisions and lower property values in those existing subdivisions. No new proposed road should make an existing road dangerous. This is what the proposed roads 217 and 15 would do. These proposed roads would come off of Skyflight from Cordes Dr. Cordes Dr. is not built and can not be built to accommodate a high traffic load that the proposed roads would entail. There is a hairpin curve on Cordes Dr where five driveways enter into. This part of the road is very dangerous if there are high volumes of traffic. All traffic from as far away as Old Murphy Dome would funnel into this area. This would completely change the quality of our neighborhood and lower our property values. It would also result in accidents and injuries. Furthermore, established trails would be destroyed further lowering our property values. This makes no sense and it will meet with significant resistance. New roads should come off existing major state roads (Goldstream or Steese Hwy) NOT neighborhood roads and trails.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.
15	10/20	email	Dan	Reichardt		<p>•Corridor #15 – This corridor seems poorly thought out and I recommend eliminating it. It has been made redundant by other routes, it passes very near to the only house currently constructed on TL-104, which is served by an existing driveway from Penrose, and it interferes greatly with existing recreational uses related to the Cranberry Trail System. If this corridor remains on the map mostly because it pre-exists on maps from the 1990s I would advocate that that is not a good reason to leave this corridor in place which is not generally supported by the neighborhood. It is to be expected that if the owner of TL-104 were to ever subdivide they would request a variance – as this route would interfere with pre-existing conditions. We shouldn't be drawing alignments on a roads plan that we understand will almost certainly require variances.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
15	10/20	web form	Paul	Reichardt		<p>Message: My comments are about portions of the road plan shown on maps 01N02W, 02N02W, and 02N01W. I live in the area shown on 01N02W.</p> <p>Fundamentally, it seems to me that these portions of the road plan are totally disconnected from borough plans related to recreation and, in particular, trails. I understand that, assuming the population of the Fairbanks area grows, the FNSB will sell additional land and that the Goldstream area will undoubtedly see related development. However, people choose to live in Goldstream because of a balance between access to town and life in a somewhat rural environment. Planning roads that crisscross the area is inconsistent with the Goldstream lifestyle as it exists today and likely will exist well into the future, and encroachment of these roads into or near existing hiking trails would negatively impact the extensive recreational use by local residents as well as large numbers of hikers who come from around the borough to use the Cranberry Trail and O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail systems. Some detailed comments follow:</p> <p>2. Corridors 15 and 293 are unnecessary redundancies in that the 15/Pandora Drive connection would on its own lead to the proposed 293 corridor.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.
15	10/20		Marjorie	Richards		<p>As a resident of the neighborhood (2046 Goldstream Road) and user of trails between Pandora Road, Old Murphy Dome Road, and O'Connor Creek, please consider extinguishing the Route 15 alignment as it is both particularly noxious to the existing trails and redundant to the other alignments. Route 217 would probably negatively affect my trail enjoyment but to a lesser extent than Route 15.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.
15	10/20		Inna	Rivkin		<p>I live on Toboggan Lane off Goldstream, and as someone with MCS (Multiple Chemical Sensitivities) who is quite sensitive to car exhaust and pollution, very much appreciate and treasure the nearby trails that allow exercise in clean air away from roads, as do many others in our community for whom such trails are critical for health, wellness, and wellbeing. I am concerned with #15, #217, and #209, and was wondered how they will impact our privately maintained non-through drive Toboggan Lane, the cranberry trail in that area, and the trail from Waterford / Molly which is used and treasured by many outdoor recreators myself included. Could you please clarify the impacts and plans. Unfortunately most of the smaller roads are not labeled on the plan making it difficult to ascertain, but it looks like it's right on the trails! I am concerned the quality of mine and my neighbors' lives and health will be adversely affected. Also, are 293 and 262 on the broken sled trail?</p> <p>Thanks,</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads. In addition, the corridors will only be developed if the property owner chooses to subdivide. At that time the Borough will work with the property owner to dedicate and if needed construct the connecting road. This area would need to fully develop to realize all the shown connections.
15	10/21		Mike	Schmoker		<p>Message: I would like to comment on the FNSB road plan. I will limit my comments to the proposed roads of 15, 217 & 262. All of these roads would cross numerous trails that have been in the area for several decades. 15 & 217 would impact the Cranberry trail that has been established for years. 262 would greatly impact the O'Conner Ridge trail that has been used since the early 70's. I would greatly encourage any road development be in conjuncture with the recent comprehensive plan. I would encourage the Borough to improve and maintain are present roads before extending the present road system</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads.
15	10/20		Terry	Reichardt		<p>Message: How disappointing to see this plan. We have worked so hard to establish and maintain the borough trail system that people come to use from all over the borough. Your roads (217 and 15) appear to follow those trails (displace them) and thus destroy them. Why?! The juncture of 217 and 15 has a proposed road that goes through private property to join Pandora. Why do you think people live out here? The roads that presently exist (Old Murphy Dome Road and Goldstream) are able to access borough properties and allow undeveloped land in between. If you want to solidly develop from Goldstream to Old Murphy Dome we might as well all be living in the Chicago suburbs. I would strongly advise that, instead of designing roads to crisscross the area perpendicular to Goldstream and Murphy Dome roads, you instead pick the areas where you want to sell land and then put in access roads from either Goldstream or Old Murphy Dome roads. I would also strongly recommend that you stay away from borough trail systems.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads. In addition, the corridors will only be developed if the property owner chooses to subdivide. At that time the Borough will work with the property owner to dedicate and if needed construct the connecting road. This area would need to fully develop to realize all the shown connections.
15	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>6. As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>•New and existing proposed road corridors north of the Goldstream Valley, chiefly 15, 293, 262, 4, 209 could have significant conflict with recreational trails. I think developing this area would be a mistake for the Borough and would lead to a loss in wildlands and trails and would also negatively contribute to the urban sprawl of Fairbanks.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads. Development of personal property is a foundational right in the Fairbanks North Star Borough. The Borough doesn't control who develops or when that development will take place. That is why we have the Trails Plan and the Roads Plan working together to make sure that trails stay connected, and that roadways can connect as areas develop.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
15	10/21		Margaret	Mannix		<p>Message: I am responding in particular to Routes 15, 217 and 293/262 . These proposed roads directly impact the numerous trails that exist there and are mostly multi use trails and heavily used. I have provided input on the Comprehensive Trail use process and am very surprised that neither of these projects seem to reflect the other. At least there are no references in the proposals. Protecting trail use is future thinking and new roads should accommodate existing trails.</p> <p>I see no point in Route 15, and I hope that private property is respected.</p>	Corridor 15 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. Additionally, there were several other corridors identified in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update that were located between corridor 15 and corridor 293. During the 2022 Roads Plan update, the project team and steering committee removed these intermediate corridors due to the presence of several recreational trails in the area. Corridor 15 has been realigned to provide a wider vegetated buffer between the trail system and potential future roads. Development of personal property is a foundational right in the Fairbanks North Star Borough. The Borough doesn't control who develops or when that development will take place. That is why we have the Trails Plan and the Roads Plan working together to make sure that trails stay connected, and that roadways can connect as areas develop.
18	10/21	web form	Kristen	Sullivan		<p>Message: I am writing you about proposed road 204, 254, 18, 20, 21, 13, 255. This is putting roads thru the UAF Land that has long been vacant. The only problem is adding these roads will allow more houses to be built and add more traffic to the dangerous roads we already have. The end of Frenchman creek and a large seasonal slough from the snow melt. It would definitely require a bridge. The present culvert does get overwhelmed on big snow years as it is. Putting a road there is like the proposed road connecting MHE to Miller hill rd. That road would also require a bridge and impact local green space and trails.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Corridor 13 does not cross any University of Alaska land. The corridor traverses several large FNSB parcels that could potentially be developed in the future. The Roads Plan does not trigger any subdivision or road development. Instead, it guides road siting when landowners do decide to subdivide their property. In addition, the corridors will only be developed if the property owner chooses to subdivide. At that time the Borough will work with the property owner to dedicate and if needed construct the connecting road. This area would need to fully develop to realize all the shown connections. Development of personal property is a foundational right in the Fairbanks North Star Borough. The Borough doesn't control who develops or when that development will take place. That is why we have the Trails Plan and the Roads Plan working together to make sure that trails stay connected, and that roadways can connect as areas develop.
20	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>--Road/routes 20,21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p>	Corridor 20 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. As aligned, it does offer a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and proposed but yet unconstructed trails. The on-going coordination between the Roads and Trails Plans will help plan for future impacts and mitigate trail and road conflicts.
20	10/12	Email	Karl	Kassel		<p>Hello Shelly and Kellen,</p> <p>Since the official comment form does not seem to work well with my computer, I am sending you a plain email with my comments regarding the Roads Plan.</p> <p>It is easy to see the extensive thought processes and work that has gone into this road plan. I believe it represents some very needed corridors for our community. It is an excellent plan for the easiest development of road additions for the near future. However, a quality healthy community needs more than just roads to thrive, and the easiest routes to build a road may not be the best. Several of the proposed routes follow, or "upgrade," existing trails. You are well aware there are significant benefits to a community that has access to quality trails. As roads develop, we must be sensitive to the benefits of preserving the existing trail corridors and adding to them as the need increases with expanding population. Converting a trail to a road is rarely an "upgrade" unless there are alternate trail routes constructed as part of the road project and trail connectivity is maintained.</p> <p>Case in point: corridor #21 follows right on top of the backbone of an extensive trail system that extends between the Richard Berry Ridge and Old Murphy Dome Road. This system has existed for literally decades, and is a primary reason why I live where I live. This trail system also would be impacted by routes 20, 255 and 191. The existing trails cover a significant portion of sections 2, 3, and 10, most of which is currently Borough land. These trails are used extensively by the locals and have also hosted races by the running club. It is one of the few higher altitude systems that has tree cover to protect users from the wind and colder temperatures in the winter. It is more than just a neighborhood trail and has the potential to grow into an excellent recreation area for the west side of town.</p> <p>Bottom line: Any road development in this area should include substantial consideration of the other recreational potentials here, and as an absolute minimum should preserve the integrity of the existing trail system.</p> <p>Thanks for your planning efforts, Karl Kassel</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
20	10/12	Web form	Jane	Lanford		<p>I am concerned about potential connector roads from the top of Richard Berry Drive to Old Murphy Dome Road (near its intersection with Spinach Creek Drive). From the maps, they appear to be 21, 20, 191 and 255. At present there is a wonderful set of interconnecting trails in the area which do, indeed, connect those two roads. If any roads get closer to reality, please consider recreation and trail use conflicts, both summer and winter. I live nearby on Vancouver Road and especially enjoy snowshoe running up there in the winter! Thank you.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, 191, and 255 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
20	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21.</p> <p>https://fnsbroadplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here:</p> <p>https://fnsbroadplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/routes 20, 21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
20	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/routes 20,21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
20	10/21	web form	Kristen	Sullivan		<p>Message: I am writing you about proposed road 204, 254, 18, 20, 21, 13, 255. This is putting roads thru the UAF Land that has long been vacant. The only problem is adding these roads will allow more houses to be built and add more traffic to the dangerous roads we already have. The end of Frenchman has Frenchman creek and a large seasonal slough from the snow melt. It would definitely require a bridge. The present culvert does get overwhelmed on big snow years as it is. Putting a road there is like the proposed road connecting MHE to Miller hill rd. That road would also require a bridge and impact local green space and trails.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Corridor 20 does not cross any University of Alaska land. The corridor traverses three parcels, all owned by the Fairbanks North Star Borough. In addition, the corridors will only be developed if the property owner chooses to subdivide. At that time the Borough will work with the property owner to dedicate and if needed construct the connecting road. This area would need to fully develop to realize all the shown connections.
21	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>--Road/routes 20,21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
21	10/12	Email	Karl	Kassel		<p>Hello Shelly and Kellen,</p> <p>Since the official comment form does not seem to work well with my computer, I am sending you a plain email with my comments regarding the Roads Plan.</p> <p>It is easy to see the extensive thought processes and work that has gone into this road plan. I believe it represents some very needed corridors for our community. It is an excellent plan for the easiest development of road additions for the near future. However, a quality healthy community needs more than just roads to thrive, and the easiest routes to build a road may not be the best. Several of the proposed routes follow, or "upgrade," existing trails. You are well aware there are significant benefits to a community that has access to quality trails. As roads develop, we must be sensitive to the benefits of preserving the existing trail corridors and adding to them as the need increases with expanding population. Converting a trail to a road is rarely an "upgrade" unless there are alternate trail routes constructed as part of the road project and trail connectivity is maintained.</p> <p>Case in point: corridor #21 follows right on top of the backbone of an extensive trail system that extends between the Richard Berry Ridge and Old Murphy Dome Road. This system has existed for literally decades, and is a primary reason why I live where I live. This trail system also would be impacted by routes 20, 255 and 191. The existing trails cover a significant portion of sections 2, 3, and 10, most of which is currently Borough land. These trails are used extensively by the locals and have also hosted races by the running club. It is one of the few higher altitude systems that has tree cover to protect users from the wind and colder temperatures in the winter. It is more than just a neighborhood trail and has the potential to grow into an excellent recreation area for the west side of town.</p> <p>Bottom line: Any road development in this area should include substantial consideration of the other recreational potentials here, and as an absolute minimum should preserve the integrity of the existing trail system.</p> <p>Thanks for your planning efforts, Karl Kassel</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings and maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
21	10/12	Web form	Jane	Lanford		<p>I am concerned about potential connector roads from the top of Richard Berry Drive to Old Murphy Dome Road (near its intersection with Spinach Creek Drive). From the maps, they appear to be 21, 20, 191 and 255. At present there is a wonderful set of interconnecting trails in the area which do, indeed, connect those two roads. If any roads get closer to reality, please consider recreation and trail use conflicts, both summer and winter. I live nearby on Vancouver Road and especially enjoy snowshoe running up there in the winter! Thank you.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings and maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
21	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21. https://fnsbroadsplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here: https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/routes 20,21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings and maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
21	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/routes 20,21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
21	10/21	web form	Kristen	Sullivan		<p>Message: I am writing you about proposed road 204, 254, 18, 20, 21, 13, 255. This is putting roads thru the UAF Land that has long been vacant. The only problem is adding these roads will allow more houses to be built and add more traffic to the dangerous roads we already have. The end of Frenchman has Frenchman creek and a large seasonal slough from the snow melt. It would definitely require a bridge. The present culvert does get overwhelmed on big snow years as it is. Putting a road there is like the proposed road connecting MHE to Miller hill rd. That road would also require a bridge and impact local green space and trails.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Corridor 21 only crosses the corner of two University of Alaska parcels. The corridor crosses one parcel for 515' and the other for 640'. The majority of the corridor crosses FNSB land (8,800').
22	10/17	web form	Heather	McBride		<p>In favor of routes 372, 375, 22 connecting Jones road to moose mountain. We own property in both road service areas and it makes sense to have more than one way out of each neighborhood for safety reasons. Will Jones road merge with the moose mountain road service area?</p>	The merging of Road Service Areas would be determined through a vote of residents of both service areas. Development of a road connecting the two RSAs does not require that the RSAs merge.
22	10/12	Email	Matt	McBride		<p>On Draft 01N 02W route 375 (from Jones Road) to route 372 (to Monteverde Road); that looks like a Fantastic Connection! It would be great to be able to drive up to Moose Mountain from the Jones Road Area through that proposed route. How long do you think it could take for this connection to be built? Is there a proposed time range at least?</p>	As a second-class borough, the FNSB does not construct or maintain roads. It does, however, provide a transportation network through its mandatory areawide planning, platting, and land use regulation powers. The FNSB facilitates the construction of roads through its subdivision process. At the time of land subdivision, landowners (developers) work with the FNSB to design and construct subdivision roads. There is no set timeline for road development. It is entirely dependent on local subdivision activity.
22	10/21		Andy	Mahoney		<p>These proposed "minor collector" roads connect the neighborhoods north of Goldstream Valley to Old Murphy Dome road. At their southern ends, they all begin at the end of what are already lengthy neighborhood roads. Any properties accessed from the proposed roads would therefore lie a considerable road distance from any major collector or arterial roads. This not only represents undesirably commute times for residents who may be contributing the FNSB economy but will also contribute to a significantly higher carbon footprint compared with development of other roads better connected to FNSB's road system. Additionally, the development of these roads and any properties along them would add significant additional traffic to these existing neighborhood roads, requiring more maintenance and potentially lowering values of existing properties</p>	All of the proposed corridors (minor collectors and major collectors) connect to equivalent or higher functional classification roads. For example, corridor 273 connects to Moose Mountain Road, which is a minor collector.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
28	10/16	email	Commissioners	Esro Road Assoc.	Esro Road Assoc.	<p><i>*NOTE: The comment was submitted as a PDF and the PDF includes some drawings, maps, and other graphics that did not translate here.</i></p> <p>The Esro Road Association, formed in 2005 as an IRS recognized community service association to maintaining Esro Road has the following comments on the proposed updates to the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan.</p> <p>1. Esro Road is well maintained by a commission that is elected at each annual meeting of the Esro Road Association.</p> <p>The draft plan categorizes Esro Road as an orphan road, meaning it does not have a dedicated maintenance authority. Further definition of orphan road is typified by the Nov. 2021 FAST Plan. These definitions do not apply to Esro Road.</p> <p>The maintenance authority for Esro Road is the formally established Esro Road Association. While Esro Road is mostly across private property, we request that the apparent pejorative term 'orphan road' be changed to 'private road' to accurately state the legal condition.</p> <p>While the narrative on orphan roads on page 23 of the draft Road Plan quoted above does indicate some applicability to our road, other statements do not apply. The above statement of how orphan roads came into existence is not universally correct and does not apply to Esro Road. The narrative implies that orphan roads are poorly or not maintained, which we state is not the case with Esro Road. We further note that RSAs have the same issues of maintainability, hired contractors, but due to FNSB rules, are actually more limiting in what the users are allowed to self-maintain.</p> <p>We request that private roads that are well maintained and are reasonably within road standards have a separate classification from the defined 'orphan roads' and be treated differently than those with challenging access and safety.</p> <p>2. Esro Road, as Corridor 28 on the draft map, shows it being extended past the established turnaround all the way through to Steele Creek to presumably tie into the north undeveloped portion of Tungsten Subdivision. This goes through the GCI Earth Station property, former the satellite observation site of the European Space Research Organization, since renamed as the European Space Agency. A road through that site would degrade the security GCI naturally has as a cul-de-sac. In addition, this designation goes through extensive unstable soils.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 28 was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. After being reviewed by the Roads Plan Steering Committee, the connection up to the Tungsten subdivision is being maintained to provide alternate points of ingress/egress to both neighborhoods.
						<p>When ESRO constructed their site in 1965, buildings were on adjustable pilings in recognition of the many ice lenses. Since their project termination in 1978, the ground has continued to shift and would be more akin to a roller coaster. GCI certainly has the capacity to keep their road to a maintenance standard that meets their access needs.</p> <p>We request that Corridor 28 be terminated at the current cul-de-sac.</p> <p>3. The plan for Corridor 28 shows a crossing of Steele Creek, which is well-recognized for winter overflow and would be in conflict with the road plan's recognition of avoiding poor soils and challenging environmental conditions. While the north portion of the DNR created Tungsten Subdivision is undeveloped, with only a 1980 era Cat trail and also with challenging unstable ground conditions, the University of Alaska now owns it and attempts to sell the many platted lots have been entirely unsuccessful. Proposed corridors 32 and 43 provide for alternate access to/from Tungsten Subdivision. The cul-de-sac shown in blue is sufficient for fire service.</p> <p>4. It has been stated by the FNSB Road Plan team that the extension of Corridor 28 is required to provide alternate access to Esro Road residents beyond the 1320 feet limitation on single access properties. That argument is fallacious as Corridor 335 to the east to tie into Amanita Road provides that dual access and is already underway with the recent approval of Moose Bait Subdivision.</p> <p>5. The general theme of the FNSB Road Plan is to promote safe and functional road system. One concern Esro Road residents have is the large amount of mineral exploration on DNR and Mental Health Trust Authority directly adjacent to Esro Road, all zoned GU-1. We believe that the plan's goals of maintainability and safety are contrary to dedicated public access within and to Esro Road. There are limits, as there are limits of safety and maintenance of the controversial Manh Choh Mine truck transportation plan. The draft plan and the position of the FNSB is that all private roads are bad. That should not be the case.</p> <p>We request that that the FNSB Road Plan recognize those private roads as legitimate legal access where conditions make sense.</p> <p>Respectfully submitted, Esro Road Association Commissioners</p>	
28	10/21	email	Miles	Bond		<p>This corridor shows an extension of Esro road to connect out to the Tungsten Subdivision. Esro road is a Private road and is mislabeled as an Orphan road (Please see submission from Esro road association for further details). The Esro Road Association maintains the road to a higher standard than could be provided by the State or Borough. Extension of the road to connect across Steele Creek is ill advised due to underlying ground conditions and terrain. This connection would degrade Esro road from increased traffic use and subsurface road conditions are not ideal for this increased use. Corridor 331 would provide the "code" of allowing Esro to not be considered "Cul De Sac", comments on this condition can be seen under comments for 331. Like many things, it may look good on a map and "check a box" for community planning, but has real underlying consequences for the existing communities in the area and has a high potential for negative impacts.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 28 was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. After being reviewed by the Roads Plan Steering Committee, the connection up to the Tungsten subdivision is being maintained to provide alternate points of ingress/egress to both neighborhoods.
28	10/21	email	Miles	Bond		<p>This corridor shows an extension of Esro road to connect out to the Tungsten Subdivision. Esro road is a Private road and is mislabeled as an Orphan road (Please see submission from Esro road association for further details). The Esro Road Association maintains the road to a higher standard than could be provided by the State or Borough. Extension of the road to connect across Steele Creek is ill advised due to underlying ground conditions and terrain. This connection would degrade Esro road from increased traffic use and subsurface road conditions are not ideal for this increased use. Corridor 331 would provide the "code" of allowing Esro to not be considered "Cul De Sac", comments on this condition can be seen under comments for 331. Like many things, it may look good on a map and "check a box" for community planning, but has real underlying consequences for the existing communities in the area and has a high potential for negative impacts.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 28 was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. After being reviewed by the Roads Plan Steering Committee, the connection up to the Tungsten subdivision is being maintained to provide alternate points of ingress/egress to both neighborhoods.
31	10/20		Christin	Swearingen		<p>I live on Quakenbush and would like to see improved foot trails in my area so that I can view the huge old spruce trees, but know firsthand that the hill is steep and prone to erosion. Please don't cut any of the very old trees. Thanks!</p>	Tree clearing for road construction would be determined by the developer/contractor at the time of construction.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
34	10/21	email	Kalina	Grabinska-Marusek		<p>I am opposed to the creation of new roads in these corridors for three reasons:</p> <p>1.New roads will destroy the recreation possibilities found in this area. I have been walking on the trails in this area for 35 years. Even though it is close to town because there are so few roads and cars there, it feels remote and wild, which makes it an incredibly popular place for people to spend time. I have observed people running, biking, skiing, sledding, exercising their dogs and riding their horses. These activities would not be as safe or enjoyable if they were taking place along a roadway.</p> <p>2.New roads will detrimentally affect the neighborhood. I live in the neighborhood and prize the quiet atmosphere that living at a dead-end road provides. New roads will bring more cars and more noise.</p> <p>3.New roads will turn the steep and pothole filled roads of Moose Trail and Eldorado into through streets. Both roads are 20 mph roads, and each poses its own challenge to drivers. Moose Trail can be a slippery mess in the fresh snow. School buses and cars alike end up in the ditch all winter long. Eldorado develops numerous potholes in the summer, directly related to how many people drive on it in the rain. Adding more traffic will increase maintenance costs and driving difficulty on these roads. Thank you for your time.</p>	Corridor 34 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. It has been aligned to follow constructed Ski Boot Hill Road to provide access to Skyline Park and connect Musk Ox subdivision with other neighborhoods to the east via Corridor 251. Corridor 251 has been realigned to provide a larger vegetated buffer between the road corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail.
36	10/20	email	Hajo	Eicken		<p>Road corridor #36, Donna & Cranberry Ridge Dr</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on road corridor #36, between Donna & Cranberry Ridge Dr. As residents of Donna Drive we are asking to remove this proposed road corridor for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) The proposed road corridor is in conflict with existing neighborhood trail easements put in place at the time the Panorama Park subdivision was established. In the vicinity of road corridor #36 these trails connect into several trail systems to the North, West and Southwest.</p> <p>(2) The proposed corridor is in steep terrain that likely will not allow for a road compliant with Borough Code in terms of road grade, width and shoulder/drainage requirements.</p> <p>(3) Upon subdivision of the single, currently developed property contiguous with the proposed corridor, property on that corridor would also abut or be removed by one property from a major arterial/collector road to the North (Summit Dr.) , such that emergency access considerations concerning cul-de-sacs are not as much of a concern as for other cul-de-sacs of similar or greater length immediately to the south off Summit/Skyline Dr. that have no associated/proposed road corridors.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 36 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. It closes a small gap in the existing road network. Cranberry Ridge and Donna were also likely developed based on proposed corridors from the 1991 Roads Plan or 2006 update.
36	10/20	email	Angela	Dirks Eicken		<p>Road corridor #36, Donna & Cranberry Ridge Dr</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on road corridor #36, between Donna & Cranberry Ridge Dr. As residents of Donna Drive we are asking to remove this proposed road corridor for the following reasons:</p> <p>(1) The proposed road corridor is in conflict with existing neighborhood trail easements put in place at the time the Panorama Park subdivision was established. In the vicinity of road corridor #36 these trails connect into several trail systems to the North, West and Southwest.</p> <p>(2) The proposed corridor is in steep terrain that likely will not allow for a road compliant with Borough Code in terms of road grade, width and shoulder/drainage requirements.</p> <p>(3) Upon subdivision of the single, currently developed property contiguous with the proposed corridor, property on that corridor would also abut or be removed by one property from a major arterial/collector road to the North (Summit Dr.) , such that emergency access considerations concerning cul-de-sacs are not as much of a concern as for other cul-de-sacs of similar or greater length immediately to the south off Summit/Skyline Dr. that have no associated/proposed road corridors.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 36 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan. It closes a small gap in the existing road network. Cranberry Ridge and Donna were also likely developed based on proposed corridors from the 1991 Roads Plan or 2006 update.
64	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>--Road/routes 295 and 64 may conflict with trails in the Goldstream Valley.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/19	web form	Kyla	Durham		<p>Hello. I am strongly against proposed road 64 That would connect Miller Hill with Miller Hill extension over Goldstream Creek. As a resident and land owner on little creek road I feel that if it went forward it would have a very negative impact on the residential neighborhoods both on the Miller Hill and Miller Hill extension sides. As it is now we have minimal traffic and it's safe for people to walk, ride bikes, safe to cross with snow machines and dog teams. It's a nice quiet end of the Road neighborhood and if we start having through traffic the increased noise, dust, road wear and tear and generally less safe for non-motorized activities will greatly impact the quality of life for all of the residence here. In addition that road would go over a main winter trail used by many valley residents snowmachine, dog sled, fat bikers, skiers and walkers. I hope that you will listen to the residence in this area and not go forward with this route.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	10/13	web form	Kristen	Eckwright		I am strongly against roads 295 and 64 being developed. We chose to live in these areas to have a quiet neighborhood and without traffic. I chose to live on Miller Hill Road to have direct access to trails in a quiet neighborhood. Why not use the money to better maintain the goldstream roads and Ballaine road? Having a main road go through Miller hill road to Miller hill extension will have devastating effects to the neighborhood, the public use winter trails, and to the wetland and wildlife areas. There will be more accidents due to wildlife crossing more roadways. Having another high trafficked road going through a heavily permafrosted area is only going to create more problems.	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/20	web form	Mary Lee	Guthrie		I have only this week taken a look at the proposed roads/connectors #64, 72 and 73 in 01N 02W which are fairly close to my home. Setting aside #64, bridge and roadway across Goldstream connecting Miller Hill roads, I am concerned that very few residents in my larger neighborhood have "gotten the memo" regarding #72 and 73. I hope I am wrong. My opinion on 72/73 is parallel to the many earlier comments made regarding #69, the Line Drive connector. Present dead end roads are maintained by ad hoc neighbor efforts. Very low budget and yet, at least on Nottingham Drive, going back for decades. Not a service district and never likely to be voted into one. (Note that even the excellent quality roads in new Magoffin subdivision were not accepted by adjacent College Hills service district.) Yet Nottingham is highly favored by walkers and bikers from surrounding area. We have a much used link into the Skarland Trail system and paths on the north side connect into Goldstream trails. Permafrost compromises homes and roads across the all of the proposed 72/73. Parcels to the north are dedicated public lands in the bottom of the valley. I do wish representatives of the FNSB would come take a walk and drive around the area north of Nottingham and West of upper Dalton to understand the dramatically different terrain and homeowners approaches to their micro locations. A number of us understand the heartache an abandoned home with roof caving in represents. Planning should not promote more of this. The permafrost research team at UAF has long had monitors placed in this neighborhood. Have you discussed the extent, depth, and ongoing thaw of our local permafrost with them? Finally, road locations, property lines, and even key section markers are rather imprecise. This largely works out given the informality of approach and general lack of density. Cleaning this up likely costly, troublesome. Better plan would acknowledge present value in strong neighborhood cooperation and handsome resiliency in face of challenging and changing terrain and a local government with no road powers, no free state money and no new service districts. So IMHO #72/73 offer only more trouble, expense without a sugar daddy and questionable increase in "through" traffic. Crazy!	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/18	email	David	Jonas		To whom it may concern, My wife and I reside near this proposed road corridor. We also own an 80 acre parcel (who's western boundary is the section line which the proposed road would occupy) which is preserved under the Interior Alaska Land Trust. It is a part of the larger "green belt" that runs between Ballaine rd. and Sheep crk. rd. which protects the riparian habitat along Goldstream creek, provides recreational space for multi use trails, and refuge for a multitude of wild species. A road through here would cut this small intact area in half! Crossing it with dog teams- etc. would be dangerous. A road through here would have a largely negative effect on the aspects of goldstream valley that the people who live here hold dear. Sure it would shorten the commute of a number of residents on the north side of the valley, but at what cost? It would be another expensive project (road + bridge) with expensive maintenance required (permafrost bog). For those who live on Miller hill and Miller hill extension- it would cause noise pollution, air pollution (dust), traffic danger (kids, pets). Those using the road from other neighborhoods, are doing fine on existing roads- when was the last traffic jam on Ballaine?? I am wholly against putting a road/bridge through here. Thank you for your work on this. Sincerely,	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/17	web form	Brett	Parks		64 - Connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension would unnecessarily increase traffic through the area; Ballaine, Goldstream, and Sheep Creek connect all areas in a reasonably timely fashion without undue traffic issues. Investing in the maintenance of Goldstream and Ballaine would be a better investment - and they need constant attention due to frost heaves, etc., which would be a constant problem with the proposed corridor. Additionally, area residents value the natural feeling of the area, and lament the sadly decreasingly trail connectedness of it. Further fragmenting increasingly rare natural areas in the immediate Goldstream Valley, and bisecting several historic and well loved trails would diminish the positive attributes of the area as much as the increased traffic and through traffic would.	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21. https://fnsbroadspan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here: https://fnsbroadspan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/routes 295 and 64 may conflict with trails in the Goldstream Valley.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/routes 295 and 64 may conflict with trails in the Goldstream Valley.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/14		Jacob	Yule		<p>My name is Jake Yule and I live off Miller Hill Extension (MHE). I'd like to voice my, and several others in the community that would be effected, opposition to proposed corridor 64 to connect MHE and Miller Hill. My reasons are increased traffic volume and trail degradation. I'm aware that connecting these two roads would cut commute time to town for many living in the West central Goldstream area. However, Sheep Creek Rd and Ballaine Rd already fit that role well. Connecting MHE and Miller Hill would only serve to increase traffic and dust on both, all while tarnishing the laid back Goldstream culture.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64		email	Amy	Marsh		<p>Dear Planners,</p> <p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed FNSB road plan. These comments are directed at Route 64, which would connect Miller Hill and Miller Extension.</p> <p>This is an extremely personal issue for me because I live at the bottom of Miller Hill Road along Goldstream Creek and my driveway would be part of the ROW for this project. This project would be devastating for me; it would transform my property from being a peaceful place on a creek filled with wildlife to being immediately along a shortcut road filled with speeding cars. The idea is so stressful to me that it is hard for me even to write this. My best case scenario would become having my property bought out by the borough so that I am not stuck living in a worthless place.</p> <p>That said, I think there are more than personal reasons why this is a bad idea. Our current section of Miller Hill is not in a road service area and is privately maintained by a few residents. It swallows rock and gravel and pass ability is a constant concern for part of the year. We spend considerable money on the road just keeping it passable for fire trucks, and my mechanic could tell you how much I've spent on CV boots, shocks, and general suspension parts for my truck. If this road were to be connected, maintenance would have to be taken over by the borough. This road would become a shortcut route for those who do not live in the immediate area, and there is no way that even a road service could cover those costs. The road would require a major upgrade, a bridge, and then constant maintenance to keep the road going over the lowest permafrost areas of Fairbanks. These days the borough barely has money to keep up with plowing and I don't see how adding another major route would help things.</p> <p>While I understand that a shortcut would be tempting, it would be adding another route up and over a hill, and there is a similar route over Ballaine Hill not very far away on the other end of Yankovich Road. There are already two ways around the loop of the valley, and I believe this is sufficient. I believe the best use of these low lying valley is the current use: as a riparian corridor, as a green space for recreation, and as a bit of open land in the midst of our growing population. All winter long I see a steady trickle of trail users going down my driveway to cross Goldstream Creek and continue to trails on the other side. These are the kinds of spaces that get easily swallowed up by "progress" and are irreplaceable.</p> <p>Thank you,</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	10/20	web form	Olivia	Edwards		I am commenting on road corridor #64 in the comprehensive roads plan, that would connect Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension. I am opposed to this corridor as it would bisect heavily used public winter trail systems and increase neighborhood traffic. The road would cross delicate permafrost as well, making it challenging and costly to maintain. Thank you,	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/20	email	Owen	Guthrie	Board President Interior Alaska Land Trust	I'm writing in regard to the proposed road corridor #64 that would connect Miller Hill to Miller Hill Extension. Unfortunately, this would bisect the Goldstream Public Use Area pretty painfully. As you know this is a critical area full of trails for winter recreation and one that the Interior Alaska Land Trust has spent years and years developing as the Goldstream Greenbelt Project. https://interioraklandtrust.org/land-and-projects/goldstream-valley-greenbelt/ It would be interesting to see a distance analysis based on Ballaine vs. Miller Hill for Goldstream Residents. The distance between the mouths of the two roads on Goldstream is quite small. One leads directly to Farmers Loop and University Emergency Services, the other leads to Miller Hill (very steep) and Sheep Creek. Thank you for your work and for your consideration. Best regards,	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/20	web form	Katie	McClellan		Message: I am emailing regarding the FNSB Roads Plan, specifically to oppose the construction of corridor #64 that would connect Miller Hill Rd with Miller Hill Extension (MHE). As a homeowner on MHE, I recognize the convenience this connector would create for me traveling to/from town vs driving up & over Ballaine Road OR driving the full way around Sheep Creek to Goldstream Rd in order to get home. However, this connector would create more traffic on MHE, disrupting the quiet neighborhood (& potentially causing safety issues with the many runners, bikers, dogs, & moose who move along the roads) & would disrupt the Goldstream Greenbelt, which Interior Alaska Land Trust has worked to hard to put acres & acres of land into over the last decade +. This area of Goldstream provides PHENOMENAL recreational opportunities for fat biking, skiing, dog mushing, snowmachining, & more. Having a road corridor built along the conservation easement would disrupt the safety & peace of recreating in this area. While there are many areas around town where people can crush winter miles, the Goldstream Valley, & particularly the west side of the Goldstream Valley within & adjacent to the greenbelt, provides incredibly easy & safe access to miles & miles of trails & trail connections without going near or crossing roads. Goldstream Creek itself is also used as a transportation corridor for many recreators. While I value the borough's efforts to provide safe & convenient transportation access between areas of town, one of the many reasons folks live in Goldstream is to avoid all the roads & traffic, & to appreciate the many miles of open wetlands, trails, & recreational opportunities. Goldstream has been just fine without this connection since it was washed out by the flood, & we will continue to do just fine without this shortcut. This location provides more value as part of the greenbelt & its adjacent lands than it would as a shortcut.	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/20		Christin	Swearingen		This would disturb conservation property stewarded by Interior Alaska Land Trust and cut right across a popular recreation trail. People canoe this area in the summer. The road doesn't connect for a reason--it was flooded and the soils there do not support construction (Chatanika mucky silt). I oppose the road.	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/20		Mary	Szatkowski		I am writing to oppose corridor 64, proposed to connect Miller Hill Ext to Miller Hill. I live on Dome View Ave, which is part of the MHE subdivision so I would be directly impacted by corridor 64. I am concerned about the increased traffic that corridor 64 would bring to both Miller Hill and MHE. People who chose to buy land and/or live in these neighborhoods did so because they wanted to be separate from the main road. MHE is a dirt road where people drive slow, expecting to see children playing in the street, runners/walkers/bikers, four wheelers / dirt bike, dog teams, and even sometimes loose livestock. In the winter, there are major trails which cross through MHE, bringing even more pedestrians through the area. Increased vehicle traffic through MH/MHE would change the character of the neighborhood drastically, especially for those who live directly on MHE. I understand the concerns about fire safety in the area, but without further information about the size of the road proposed and the bridge construction plan (extremely unstable area due to permafrost and sensitive wetland environment) I can not support corridor 64. I urge the review process to value the opinions of those who live in directly affected area most strongly.	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	10/20	web form	Cynthia	Steiner		<p>on it. It is a dead end road. The proposed 72 and 73 connector roads would create access to Nottingham Drive from the north, allowing traffic over our privately maintained road and through our neighborhood, which would greatly change the safety and privacy of the current neighborhood. Nottingham Dr has it's own set of challenges: the road would be difficult to ever bring up to borough standards. Nottingham Dr follows the hillside, not the property lines, which means north side property owners own property on the south side of the road. Cables and phone lines are laid under and on the north side of road, which makes widening difficult and unfeasible.</p> <p>The proposed road 64 (O1N O2W) is also a potential issue, if subdivisions to the east were developed and tried to connect to Nottingham Dr. We would object to any road connecting to the privately maintained Nottingham Dr.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/21	email	Ali	Fugle		<p>I am writing in opposition of developing these road corridors. Both roads would be prohibitive to residential use of the local recreational trails that are already in existence in the area. Additionally, much of the ground in the Goldstream Valley is permafrost, which would make these roads difficult to maintain, in an area where we already struggle to maintain our current roads. Funding for road development in the Goldstream Valley should be used to fix the many roads already in place that are currently in need of maintenance. Developing these corridors would bring unwanted and unnecessary traffic into these neighborhoods particularly the Line Drive/295 corridor, which also connects to Black Sheep Lane. The intersection of Black Sheep Lane and Sheep Creek Rd. is super dangerous- on a blind corner, with people frequently speeding on Sheep Creek Lane, and it would be negligent and irresponsible of FNSB to funnel more traffic into an already dangerous area.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/21	web form	Hitchcock			<p>Message: Hey thank you for the opportunity to comment on the road plan. I'm excited to be involved in the process and hope that peoples comments are taken into consideration. I have multiple friends that live on either side of miller hill extension and are against the proposed corridor 64. This road would bisect the valley and ruin habitat continuity for that whole section of valley while increase traffic to a quiet neighborhood by people who live farther away. Everyone I know on the road would take the extra time driving to keep that continuity and trail system that would be more dangerous with a more active road. I don't think the borough wants to further upkeep that road and put more money into upkeeping it. Ballaine is right down the road so why would we need to segment the valley further? While some proposed roads I'm sure make sense, this one does not and would be a travesty in frsb went through with it. It honestly feels like the borough is trying to push this through as a favor to someone as it is so unpopular with the majority</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>6.As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>3.New and existing proposed road corridors in the Goldstream Valley chiefly 64 and 295 could impact recreational trails and the wild character of the area. Significant efforts have been made in the Goldstream Valley by the public and nonprofits to preserve the ecosystem functionalities of this area. Great care should be taken if these corridors are developed.</p> <p>I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/21	web form	Ashley			<p>Route 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension would be awful for residents on Miller Hill extension. The road has significant permafrost problems and people already recklessly drive 45+ MPH down it because it is a straight shot. Adding substantial through traffic would cause safety issues as well as decrease quality of living and property values for many that live just off the main road. I strongly appose route 64.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	10/22	web form	Karin	Bodony		Please preserve the integrity of the Goldstream Valley Greenbelt and remove road 64 (Miller Hill to Miller Hill Extension) from the plan.	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/21		Mary Lee	Guthrie		<p>Hello Shelly Wade and Kellen Spillman, Thank you for the opportunity to comment on #64 in 01N 02W. For decades my husband and I have lived at 2183 Nottingham Drive, near the proposed #64. We've discussed the pros and cons of such a roadway/bridge over many a dinner. We also have lived with permafrost on our property and under our home and thoroughly appreciate the data collected by the instruments permafrost researchers at UAF have placed in our neighborhood. It helps us weigh what we do in our effort to keep our home livable a while longer. We've raised kids, and now grandkids on local roads and trails and, along with neighbors, have been part of the informal group that more or less maintains our 3/4 mile road. We appreciate roads, and especially when somebody else pays the bill.... Safety and Connection - Yes, and it's complicated! #64 -- The bottom of Goldstream, "connector" for Miller Hill and Miller Hill extension. Is extensive development proposed in Goldstream that would make the addition of a new road corridor necessary? If #64 is not proposed to address anticipated traffic volume that will challenge the capacity of Sheep Creek and Ballaine, then, maybe it is true that #64 is proposed merely as a way to shorten commutes for residents Goldstream who live midway from the Ballaine and Sheep Creek arteries? 1. I would like to see more evidence regarding the comparative "shortness" of the new route. And 2, raise questions about the implicit primacy given to the driving time of a limited set of Goldstream commuters over an array of interests and values of other people which are highly likely to suffer changes, many of them diminishment and damage, if #64 goes forward. Calculation of a preferred driving route is not just a matter of miles driven. The time it takes to reach a destination and anticipated road conditions along the way also count. What sort of route is proposed for #64? It seems to me that a road suitable for speeds of 50 - 65 MPH would be needed for this new route to be superior in time, if not in distance to the two existing arteries. Further, are we to imagine this new volume of high speed cars and trucks feeding into some sort of 4 way stop intersection at the cemetery corner at Miller Hill? Some drivers would go straight downhill onto Sheep Creek and the Parks while others turn east onto Yankovich, traversing the length of Yankovich to reach Ballaine and feed into Farmer's Loop? Not one in a hundred actually arriving at a destination before returning to the existing Ballaine/Sheep Creek arteries. I am concerned that such a change in traffic character with the increase in traffic volume and speed would result in a step change to the existing use of these local roads. Creating a thoroughfare hazardous to numerous present users.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
						<p>It is well established that the risk of pedestrian death increases with the speed of vehicles. (10% at 23 MPH, 50% at 42 MPH and 90% plus at 58 MPH.) Yet DOT has, I believe, decided not to build a separated bike path along Yankovich due to a narrow right of way and the thoroughly built out neighborhood replete with driveways, bus stops, mailboxes, trail access points, etc. Are we to imagine that more cars and trucks moving at higher speeds and on the way to someplace else will not make a notable change? In addition to traffic use of road surface and margins, a commuter thoroughfare density and speed would upend qualities beyond the roadway itself. For instance the present calm setting of the cemetery, the UAF arboretum, numerous trails, and the rural, touristic appeal of LARS ...would all be changed. In my opinion, not for the better. If we imagine that DOT might be able to construct #64 as a new roadway with slower speeds enforced by design, we come back to the initial question of commuter calculation of "fastest" / "Best" route. The impact of a #64 roadway and bridge would, by definition, slice apart and effect a dramatic diminishment to the Goldstream Valley open space, habitat and trails system. Cutting up the longest stretch of these irreplaceable local features, it would insert a noisy obstacle into the heart of that much valued amenity. The sprawl dynamic noted in the FNSB document fits hand and glove with the simplistic argument for "connection" given for #64. To merely assert "connection" as an overarching good is incomplete. Where is a discussion of the "backyard wilderness" trails and wild animal habitat, the quiet beauty of the Goldstream trails system so many appreciate and have organized their selection of residence and recreation choices around. I think the planning document should address and listen to these highly salient aspects of our lives in Fairbanks. In short, while #64 is a potential "connector", it is also clearly a disconnector, guaranteed to make some delicate and highly prized things worse, not better. And likely to make some roads less safe, not more safe.</p>	

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
						<p>Surely we don't have to let casual road building cut up trail systems and rich habitat, damage quiet, well established neighborhoods and mar relatively intact and lovely public/private places in the name of vaguely anticipated commuter convenience. Privileging the value of the fastest most direct roadway is a recipe for a single ingredient stew we've had all had a lot of.and it contributes to people giving up on an area and moving further out for an "Alaskan" home lifestyle....and to needing to drive further afield to reach a quiet trail. Those "added miles" are just as real as miles which might be "saved" by route #64.Finally, in addition to questioning this instance of the road/ sprawl dynamic, I want to mention another reason to pull this valley bottom connector from current plan documents. It has to do with the allocation of our limited resources, mostly public in this case, but also private. There is no question that permafrost in the Fairbanks area has entered notably different conditions. Without clear acknowledgment of the thaw chapter we are now living in, I am concerned that a simple minded "we know how to build for permafrost" assumption will drive choices that prove to have quite costly outcomes.</p> <p>Does the FNSB, perhaps especially the FNSB Planning Dept have a positive role to play in this chapter full of new risks?</p> <p>Removing # 64 is a low risk strategy. It allows extant values to remain and be elaborated and strengthened by those who enjoy them: healthy habitat, trails, beauty, neighborhoods. It conserves our limited infrastructure funds and avoids further stretching of inadequate road maintenance budgets.</p> <p>There is something to be said for not damaging what we've been given. What risk is there in waiting for the next chapter? One our grandkids might see. Let them look at this part of the Goldstream Valley and make the choice that is right for their time.</p> <p>Thank you for reading this lengthy note.</p> <p>Mary Lee Guthrie</p>	
69	9/24	Web form	Terrance	Gacke		<p>Could you please send me the link to the most current Steering Committee meeting that discusses corridors 295 & 69. The ones list are in 2021. Please update the Resources page so the public can see the discussion that lead to this flawed decision regarding 295. Thank you.</p>	Corridors 69 & 295 have been removed from the plan due to public input and feasibility issues due to topography.
69	10/20	web form	Mary Lee	Guthrie		<p>I have only this week taken a look at the proposed roads/connectors #64, 72 and 73 in 01N 02W which are fairly close to my home.</p> <p>Setting aside #64, bridge and roadway across Goldstream connecting Miller Hill roads, I am concerned that very few residents in my larger neighborhood have "gotten the memo" regarding #72 and 73.</p> <p>I hope I am wrong.</p> <p>My opinion on 72/73 is parallel to the many earlier comments made regarding #69, the Line Drive connector.</p> <p>Present dead end roads are maintained by ad hoc neighbor efforts. Very low budget and yet, at least on Nottingham Drive, going back for decades. Not a service district and never likely to be voted into one. (Note that even the excellent quality roads in new Magoffin subdivision were not accepted by adjacent College Hills service district.)</p> <p>Yet Nottingham is highly favored by walkers and bikers from surrounding area. We have a much used link into the Skarland Trail system and paths on the north side connect into Goldstream trails.</p> <p>Permafrost compromises homes and roads across the all of the proposed 72/73. Parcels to the north are dedicated public lands in the bottom of the valley.</p> <p>I do wish representatives of the FNSB would come take a walk and drive around the area north of Nottingham and West of upper Dalton to understand the dramatically different terrain and homeowners approaches to their micro locations.</p> <p>A number of us understand the heartache an abandoned home with roof caving in represents. Planning should not promote more of this.</p> <p>The permafrost research team at UAF has long had monitors placed in this neighborhood. Have you discussed the extent, depth, and ongoing thaw of our local permafrost with them?</p> <p>Finally, road locations, property lines, and even key section markers are rather imprecise. This largely works out given the informality of approach and general lack of density. Cleaning this up likely costly, troublesome.</p> <p>Better plan would acknowledge present value in strong neighborhood cooperation and handsome resiliency in face of challenging and changing terrain and a local government with no road powers, no free state money and no new service districts.</p> <p>So IMHO #72/73 offer only more trouble, expense without a sugar daddy and questionable increase in "through" traffic. Crazy!</p>	Corridors 69 & 295 have been removed from the plan due to public input and feasibility issues due to topography.
69	10/20	web form	Mary Lee	Guthrie		<p><i>*NOTE: The first half of these comments are the same as previous comments submitted by this person. This set of comments have additional comments at the end of the comment.</i></p> <p>Setting aside #64, bridge and roadway across Goldstream connecting Miller Hill roads, I am concerned that very few residents in my larger neighborhood have "gotten the memo" regarding #72 and 73.</p> <p>I hope I am wrong.</p> <p>My opinion on 72/73 is parallel to the many earlier comments made regarding #69, the Line Drive connector.</p> <p>Present dead end roads are maintained by ad hoc neighbor efforts. Very low budget and yet, at least on Nottingham Drive, going back for decades. Not a service district and never likely to be voted into one. (Note that even the excellent quality roads in new Magoffin subdivision were not accepted by adjacent College Hills service district.)</p> <p>Yet Nottingham is highly favored by walkers and bikers from surrounding area. We have a much used link into the Skarland Trail system and paths on the north side connect into Goldstream trails.</p> <p>Permafrost compromises homes and roads across the all of the proposed 72/73. Parcels to the north are dedicated public lands in the bottom of the valley.</p> <p>I do wish representatives of the FNSB would come take a walk and drive around the area north of Nottingham and West of upper Dalton to understand the dramatically different terrain and homeowners approaches to their micro locations.</p> <p>A number of us understand the heartache an abandoned home with roof caving in represents. Planning should not promote more of this.</p> <p>The permafrost research team at UAF has long had monitors placed in this neighborhood. Have you discussed the extent, depth, and ongoing thaw of our local permafrost with them?</p> <p>Finally, road locations, property lines, and even key section markers are rather imprecise. This largely works out given the informality of approach and general lack of density. Cleaning this up likely costly, troublesome.</p> <p>Better plan would acknowledge present value in strong neighborhood cooperation and handsome resiliency in face of challenging and changing terrain and a local government with no road powers, no free state money and no new service districts.</p> <p>So IMHO #72/73 offer only more trouble, expense without a sugar daddy and questionable increase in "through" traffic. Crazy!</p>	Corridors 69 & 295 have been removed from the plan due to public input and feasibility issues due to topography.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
72	10/20	web form	Mary Lee	Guthrie		<p>I have only this week taken a look at the proposed roads/connectors #64, 72 and 73 in 01N 02W which are fairly close to my home. Setting aside #64, bridge and roadway across Goldstream connecting Miller Hill roads, I am concerned that very few residents in my larger neighborhood have "gotten the memo" regarding #72 and 73.</p> <p>I hope I am wrong.</p> <p>My opinion on 72/73 is parallel to the many earlier comments made regarding #69, the Line Drive connector.</p> <p>Present dead end roads are maintained by ad hoc neighbor efforts. Very low budget and yet, at least on Nottingham Drive, going back for decades. Not a service district and never likely to be voted into one. (Note that even the excellent quality roads in new Magoffin subdivision were not accepted by adjacent College Hills service district.)</p> <p>Yet Nottingham is highly favored by walkers and bikers from surrounding area. We have a much used link into the Skarland Trail system and paths on the north side connect into Goldstream trails.</p> <p>Permafrost compromises homes and roads across the all of the proposed 72/73. Parcels to the north are dedicated public lands in the bottom of the valley.</p> <p>I do wish representatives of the FNSB would come take a walk and drive around the area north of Nottingham and West of upper Dalton to understand the dramatically different terrain and homeowners approaches to their micro locations.</p> <p>A number of us understand the heartache an abandoned home with roof caving in represents. Planning should not promote more of this.</p> <p>The permafrost research team at UAF has long had monitors placed in this neighborhood. Have you discussed the extent, depth, and ongoing thaw of our local permafrost with them?</p> <p>Finally, road locations, property lines, and even key section markers are rather imprecise. This largely works out given the informality of approach and general lack of density. Cleaning this up likely costly, troublesome.</p> <p>Better plan would acknowledge present value in strong neighborhood cooperation and handsome resiliency in face of challenging and changing terrain and a local government with no road powers, no free state money and no new service districts.</p> <p>So IMHO #72/73 offer only more trouble, expense without a sugar daddy and questionable increase in "through" traffic. Crazy!</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
72	10/20	web form	Mary Lee	Guthrie		<p><i>*NOTE: The first half of these comments are the same as previous comments submitted by this person. This set of comments have additional comments at the end of the comment.</i></p> <p>Setting aside #64, bridge and roadway across Goldstream connecting Miller Hill roads, I am concerned that very few residents in my larger neighborhood have "gotten the memo" regarding #72 and 73.</p> <p>I hope I am wrong.</p> <p>My opinion on 72/73 is parallel to the many earlier comments made regarding #69, the Line Drive connector.</p> <p>Present dead end roads are maintained by ad hoc neighbor efforts. Very low budget and yet, at least on Nottingham Drive, going back for decades. Not a service district and never likely to be voted into one. (Note that even the excellent quality roads in new Magoffin subdivision were not accepted by adjacent College Hills service district.)</p> <p>Yet Nottingham is highly favored by walkers and bikers from surrounding area. We have a much used link into the Skarland Trail system and paths on the north side connect into Goldstream trails.</p> <p>Permafrost compromises homes and roads across the all of the proposed 72/73. Parcels to the north are dedicated public lands in the bottom of the valley.</p> <p>I do wish representatives of the FNSB would come take a walk and drive around the area north of Nottingham and West of upper Dalton to understand the dramatically different terrain and homeowners approaches to their micro locations.</p> <p>A number of us understand the heartache an abandoned home with roof caving in represents. Planning should not promote more of this.</p> <p>The permafrost research team at UAF has long had monitors placed in this neighborhood. Have you discussed the extent, depth, and ongoing thaw of our local permafrost with them?</p> <p>Finally, road locations, property lines, and even key section markers are rather imprecise. This largely works out given the informality of approach and general lack of density. Cleaning this up likely costly, troublesome.</p> <p>Better plan would acknowledge present value in strong neighborhood cooperation and handsome resiliency in face of challenging and changing terrain and a local government with no road powers, no free state money and no new service districts.</p> <p>So IMHO #72/73 offer only more trouble, expense without a sugar daddy and questionable increase in "through" traffic. Crazy!</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
72		Web form	Jeanne	Laurencelle		I'm looking at 72 and 73 at the end of Dalton trail. Your plan is to do nothing with the first part of the orphan road, and then improve the end of the road. That doesn't make any sense. All the new traffic will trash the unimproved road, which is already often impassible in breakup.	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
72	10/17	web form	Brett	Parks		72 & 73 - There is no new or additional development in the area. There is no real need to access Nottingham from Shadow Ln. nor to access Shadow Ln. from Nottingham. While the few neighbors who live on the current Shadow Ln. have their hands full maintaining the road (one out of state, vacant building/land owner won't consent to a road commission, we appreciate the character, quiet, and privacy of the road. We welcome Goldstream State Rec. Area users to access the area via Shadow Ln, but additional, through, traffic would benefit no one, cost everyone, ruin the character of the immediate area; and potentially encourage additional development in an increasingly unstable permafrost area. The road would be unwelcome, unnecessary, and difficult and costly to maintain.	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
72	10/20	web form	Cynthia	Steiner		<p>It is a dead end road. The proposed 72 and 73 connector roads would create access to Nottingham Drive from the north, allowing traffic over our privately maintained road and through our neighborhood, which would greatly change the safety and privacy of the current neighborhood . Nottingham Dr has it's own set of challenges: the road would be difficult to ever bring up to borough standards. Nottingham Dr follows the hillside, not the property lines, which means north side property owners own property on the south side of the road. Cables and phone lines are laid under and on the north side of road, which makes widening difficult and unfeasible.</p> <p>The proposed road 64 (O1N O2W) is also a potential issue, if subdivisions to the east were developed and tried to connect to Nottingham Dr. We would object to any road connecting to the privately maintained Nottingham Dr.</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
72	10/21	email	David	Dansel		<p>David L Dansel and Karen Toland (property owner) living at 651 Old Cat Trail (2545 25 1N2W) own two properties on proposed Rd corridor 72 & 73. Corridor Proposal # 72 Parcel: 2554 25 1N2W 0420611 Corridor Proposal # 73 Parcel: 2520 25 1N2W 0250309 As a property owner contiguous to these corridor proposals I have no interest in the Borough building these projects. A Precaution to the Borough from someone who has lived for some 40 yrs. in this neighborhood is that the amount of permafrost would make such a road development very high maintenance and very costly (to the Borough.) I am open to further comment in the future on these proposed Rd developments. Also review the preferences voiced by a community large survey that took place during the McGoffin Subdivision. Strong concern was voiced about swelling density and also a valued precedence for the wild undisturbed DNR land to the north.</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
72	10/21	email	Karen	Toland		<p>David L Dansel and Karen Toland (property owner) living at 651 Old Cat Trail (2545 25 1N2W) own two properties on proposed Rd corridor 72 & 73. Corridor Proposal # 72 Parcel: 2554 25 1N2W 0420611 Corridor Proposal # 73 Parcel: 2520 25 1N2W 0250309 As a property owner contiguous to these corridor proposals I have no interest in the Borough building these projects. A Precaution to the Borough from someone who has lived for some 40 yrs. in this neighborhood is that the amount of permafrost would make such a road development very high maintenance and very costly (to the Borough.) I am open to further comment in the future on these proposed Rd developments. Also review the preferences voiced by a community large survey that took place during the McGoffin Subdivision. Strong concern was voiced about swelling density and also a valued precedence for the wild undisturbed DNR land to the north.</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
73	10/20	web form	Mary Lee	Guthrie		<p>I have only this week taken a look at the proposed roads/connectors #64, 72 and 73 in 01N 02W which are fairly close to my home. Setting aside #64, bridge and roadway across Goldstream connecting Millier Hill roads, I am concerned that very few residents in my larger neighborhood have "gotten the memo" regarding #72 and 73. I hope I am wrong.</p> <p>My opinion on 72/73 is parallel to the many earlier comments made regarding #69, the Line Drive connector.</p> <p>Present dead end roads are maintained by ad hoc neighbor efforts. Very low budget and yet, at least on Nottingham Drive, going back for decades. Not a service district and never likely to be voted into one. (Note that even the excellent quality roads in new Magoffin subdivision were not accepted by adjacent College Hills service district.)</p> <p>Yet Nottingham is highly favored by walkers and bikers from surrounding area. We have a much used link into the Skarland Trail system and paths on the north side connect into Goldstream trails.</p> <p>Permafrost compromises homes and roads across the all of the proposed 72/73. Parcels to the north are dedicated public lands in the bottom of the valley.</p> <p>I do wish representatives of the FNSB would come take a walk and drive around the area north of Nottingham and West of upper Dalton to understand the dramatically different terrain and homeowners approaches to their micro locations.</p> <p>A number of us understand the heartache an abandoned home with roof caving in represents. Planning should not promote more of this.</p> <p>The permafrost research team at UAF has long had monitors placed in this neighborhood. Have you discussed the extent, depth, and ongoing thaw of our local permafrost with them?</p> <p>Finally, road locations, property lines, and even key section markers are rather imprecise. This largely works out given the informality of approach and general lack of density. Cleaning this up likely costly, troublesome.</p> <p>Better plan would acknowledge present value in strong neighborhood cooperation and handsome resiliency in face of challenging and changing terrain and a local government with no road powers, no free state money and no new service districts.</p> <p>So IMHO #72/73 offer only more trouble, expense without a sugar daddy and questionable increase in "through" traffic. Crazy!</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
73	10/20	web form	Mary Lee	Guthrie		<p><i>*NOTE: The first half of these comments are the same as previous comments submitted by this person. This set of comments have additional comments at the end of the comment.</i></p> <p>Setting aside #64, bridge and roadway across Goldstream connecting Miller Hill roads, I am concerned that very few residents in my larger neighborhood have "gotten the memo" regarding #72 and 73.</p> <p>I hope I am wrong.</p> <p>My opinion on 72/73 is parallel to the many earlier comments made regarding #69, the Line Drive connector.</p> <p>Present dead end roads are maintained by ad hoc neighbor efforts. Very low budget and yet, at least on Nottingham Drive, going back for decades. Not a service district and never likely to be voted into one. (Note that even the excellent quality roads in new Magoffin subdivision were not accepted by adjacent College Hills service district.)</p> <p>Yet Nottingham is highly favored by walkers and bikers from surrounding area. We have a much used link into the Skarland Trail system and paths on the north side connect into Goldstream trails.</p> <p>Permafrost compromises homes and roads across the all of the proposed 72/73. Parcels to the north are dedicated public lands in the bottom of the valley.</p> <p>I do wish representatives of the FNSB would come take a walk and drive around the area north of Nottingham and West of upper Dalton to understand the dramatically different terrain and homeowners approaches to their micro locations.</p> <p>A number of us understand the heartache an abandoned home with roof caving in represents. Planning should not promote more of this.</p> <p>The permafrost research team at UAF has long had monitors placed in this neighborhood. Have you discussed the extent, depth, and ongoing thaw of our local permafrost with them?</p> <p>Finally, road locations, property lines, and even key section markers are rather imprecise. This largely works out given the informality of approach and general lack of density. Cleaning this up likely costly, troublesome.</p> <p>Better plan would acknowledge present value in strong neighborhood cooperation and handsome resiliency in face of challenging and changing terrain and a local government with no road powers, no free state money and no new service districts.</p> <p>So IMHO #72/73 offer only more trouble, expense without a sugar daddy and questionable increase in "through" traffic. Crazy!</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
73		Web form	Jeanne	Laurencelle		I'm looking at 72 and 73 at the end of Dalton trail. Your plan is to do nothing with the first part of the orphan road, and then improve the end of the road. That doesn't make any sense. All the new traffic will trash the unimproved road, which is already often impassible in breakup.	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
73	10/17	web form	Brett	Parks		72 & 73 - There is no new or additional development in the area. There is no real need to access Nottingham from Shadow Ln. nor to access Shadow Ln. from Nottingham. While the few neighbors who live on the current Shadow Ln. have their hands full maintaining the road (one out of state, vacant building/land owner won't consent to a road commission, we appreciate the character, quiet, and privacy of the road. We welcome Goldstream State Rec. Area users to access the area via Shadow Ln, but additional, through, traffic would benefit no one, cost everyone, ruin the character of the immediate area; and potentially encourage additional development in an increasingly unstable permafrost area. The road would be unwelcome, unnecessary, and difficult and costly to maintain.	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
73	10/20	web form	Cynthia	Steiner		<p>on it. It is a dead end road. The proposed 72 and 73 connector roads would create access to Nottingham Drive from the north, allowing traffic over our privately maintained road and through our neighborhood, which would greatly change the safety and privacy of the current neighborhood. Nottingham Dr has it's own set of challenges: the road would be difficult to ever bring up to borough standards. Nottingham Dr follows the hillside, not the property lines, which means north side property owners own property on the south side of the road. Cables and phone lines are laid under and on the north side of road, which makes widening difficult and unfeasible.</p> <p>The proposed road 64 (O1N O2W) is also a potential issue, if subdivisions to the east were developed and tried to connect to Nottingham Dr. We would object to any road connecting to the privately maintained Nottingham Dr.</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
73	10/21	email	David	Dansel		David L Dansel and Karen Toland (property owner) living at 651 Old Cat Trail (2545 25 1N2W) own two properties on proposed Rd corridor 72 & 73. Corridor Proposal # 72 Parcel: 2554 25 1N2W 0420611 Corridor Proposal # 73 Parcel: 2520 25 1N2W 0250309 As a property owner contiguous to these corridor proposals I have no interest in the Borough building these projects. A Precaution to the Borough from someone who has lived for some 40 yrs. in this neighborhood is that the amount of permafrost would make such a road development very high maintenance and very costly (to the Borough.) I am open to further comment in the future on these proposed Rd developments. Also review the preferences voiced by a community large survey that took place during the McGoffin Subdivision. Strong concern was voiced about swelling density and also a valued precedence for the wild undisturbed DNR land to the north.	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
73	10/21	email	Karen	Toland		David L Dansel and Karen Toland (property owner) living at 651 Old Cat Trail (2545 25 1N2W) own two properties on proposed Rd corridor 72 & 73. Corridor Proposal # 72 Parcel: 2554 25 1N2W 0420611 Corridor Proposal # 73 Parcel: 2520 25 1N2W 0250309 As a property owner contiguous to these corridor proposals I have no interest in the Borough building these projects. A Precaution to the Borough from someone who has lived for some 40 yrs. in this neighborhood is that the amount of permafrost would make such a road development very high maintenance and very costly (to the Borough.) I am open to further comment in the future on these proposed Rd developments. Also review the preferences voiced by a community large survey that took place during the McGoffin Subdivision. Strong concern was voiced about swelling density and also a valued precedence for the wild undisturbed DNR land to the north.	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
94	10/13	email	Colin	Craven	Natural Resource Specialist Land Conveyance Section Division of Mining, Land, and Water Department of Natural Resources	<p>Proposed route 94 appears to follow a north-south section line south of Chena Hot Springs Road to connect to proposed route 90, Baseline Road, an east-west section line. Route 94 is highly problematic in that it runs through a substantial area of wetlands, and is baffling in that it proposes to create an access corridor redundant to Grange Hall Road in connecting Chena Hot Springs Road to Baseline Road. Because Grange Hall Road is in a road service area and could benefit from reconstruction and/or more regular maintenance, it is not prudent for future subdivision development and RSA resources to propose creating a redundant corridor in a relatively low-traffic volume area.</p> <p>There are other road corridors in the CHS Road and North Pole area that appear to follow section lines versus a route that has been vetted for appropriateness, however, I am not sufficiently familiar with each of these routes to comment on them individually. Like the comments above on corridor 217, this emphasizes the need for a flexible interpretation of road corridors within the Roads Plan such that subdivision applications can propose practical alternatives without requirements for dedicating redundant road corridors.</p>	Corridor 94 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan in this update. It provides legal access to several large parcels that have potential to subdivide in the future along an existing section line easement that already grants public right-of-way. The Roads Plan allows some flexibility for corridors to be adjusted to address topographical issues during the platting process. If survey data indicates wetlands or other challenging conditions, the alignment can be adjusted to address those concerns as long as the alternative corridor meets the same intent as the original corridor in the Roads Plan.
95	10/16	Web form	Megan	Hamlin		Please remove 95 Zuendel extension. This would literally be a road to nowhere. There are no lots or potential subdivisions that aren't already road accessible. There are already roads accessing the ag parcels to the east and south. To the west is a subdivision that is already fully accessible with multiple looping roads that are maintained by the road service area. Zuendel is a privately maintained road by the 3 properties it services. At least 2 of the 3 properties Zuendel accesses do NOT want our road extended or looped into another road. Not to mention the fact that the 8 properties this proposed extension would doze through likely don't want another road flanking their east property line since they have an existing road on their west property line (Lake Trout).	Corridor 95 was removed from the Plan.
95	10/18	Web form	Megan	Hamlin		I would also like to add, we did not receive notification about this, as was stated on the planning website that all those affected within 50' will receive a flyer by mail in May 2022. And I know for a fact my kitty corner neighbor did not either. Despite both of our properties touching the proposed extension. Thank you for considering my thoughts and frustration with the proposed Zuendel extension.	Corridor 95 was removed from the Plan. Two postcards were mailed to Megan Hamlin and Andrew Hamlin, PO Box 16258, Two Rivers, AK 99716-0258
95	10/20		Milan	Shipka		Message: Please remove 95 Zuendel extension. There are no potential subdivisions that don't already have road access in the area that this extension would lead to. The only lands for subdivision to the south and east of the proposed extension are agricultural lands with covenants placed on the land by the State of Alaska in perpetuity. Based on Alaska statute title 38, Chapter 38.05. ALASKA LAND ACT Sec. 38.05.321, there are restrictions on sale, lease, or other disposal of agricultural land, such these lands may not be subdivided into less than 40-acre parcels. Given that road access is already available by existing roads, and that potential subdivision is extremely low-density and unlikely, the need for a Zuendel extension is not warranted. Further, the Thomas subdivision to the west of this line is already accessed by Lake Trout Lane and there is no need for roads on both sides of those properties. Zuendel is privately maintained. Three full-time residents, one absentee owner, and a GCI cell tower are currently accessed from Zuendel Road. Only two of the full-time residents provide all road maintenance despite the commercial traffic associated with the non-contributing resident. We don't need more traffic and the requisite increase in required road maintenance.	Corridor 95 was removed from the Plan.
95	10/20		Nancy	Shipka		Message: Please remove 95 Zuendel extension. There are no potential subdivisions that don't already have road access in the area that this extension would lead to. The only lands for subdivision to the south and east of the proposed extension are agricultural lands with covenants placed on the land by the State of Alaska in perpetuity. Based on Alaska statute title 38, Chapter 38.05. ALASKA LAND ACT Sec. 38.05.321, there are restrictions on sale, lease, or other disposal of agricultural land, such these lands may not be subdivided into less than 40-acre parcels. Given that road access is already available by existing roads, and that potential subdivision is extremely low-density and unlikely, the need for a Zuendel extension is not warranted. Further, the Thomas subdivision to the west of this line is already accessed by Lake Trout Lane and there is no need for roads on both sides of those properties. Zuendel is privately maintained. Three full-time residents, one absentee owner, and a GCI cell tower are currently accessed from Zuendel Road. Only two of the full-time residents provide all road maintenance despite the commercial traffic associated with the non-contributing resident. We don't need more traffic and the requisite increase in required road maintenance.	Corridor 95 was removed from the Plan.
115	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to table on Page 3.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
118	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
119	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
120	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
122	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
125	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
139	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
140	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
141	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
143	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
144	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
145	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
191	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>--Road/routes 20,21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
191	10/12	Email	Karl	Kassel		<p>Hello Shelly and Kellen,</p> <p>Since the official comment form does not seem to work well with my computer, I am sending you a plain email with my comments regarding the Roads Plan.</p> <p>It is easy to see the extensive thought processes and work that has gone into this road plan. I believe it represents some very needed corridors for our community. It is an excellent plan for the easiest development of road additions for the near future. However, a quality healthy community needs more than just roads to thrive, and the easiest routes to build a road may not be the best. Several of the proposed routes follow, or "upgrade," existing trails. You are well aware there are significant benefits to a community that has access to quality trails. As roads develop, we must be sensitive to the benefits of preserving the existing trail corridors and adding to them as the need increases with expanding population. Converting a trail to a road is rarely an "upgrade" unless there are alternate trail routes constructed as part of the road project and trail connectivity is maintained.</p> <p>Case in point: corridor #21 follows right on top of the backbone of an extensive trail system that extends between the Richard Berry Ridge and Old Murphy Dome Road. This system has existed for literally decades, and is a primary reason why I live where I live. This trail system also would be impacted by routes 20, 255 and 191. The existing trails cover a significant portion of sections 2, 3, and 10, most of which is currently Borough land. These trails are used extensively by the locals and have also hosted races by the running club. It is one of the few higher altitude systems that has tree cover to protect users from the wind and colder temperatures in the winter. It is more than just a neighborhood trail and has the potential to grow into an excellent recreation area for the west side of town.</p> <p>Bottom line: Any road development in this area should include substantial consideration of the other recreational potentials here, and as an absolute minimum should preserve the integrity of the existing trail system.</p> <p>Thanks for your planning efforts, Karl Kassel</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
191	10/12	Web form	Jane	Lanford		<p>I am concerned about potential connector roads from the top of Richard Berry Drive to Old Murphy Dome Road (near its intersection with Spinach Creek Drive). From the maps, they appear to be 21, 20, 191 and 255. At present there is a wonderful set of interconnecting trails in the area which do, indeed, connect those two roads. If any roads get closer to reality, please consider recreation and trail use conflicts, both summer and winter. I live nearby on Vancouver Road and especially enjoy snowshoe running up there in the winter! Thank you.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
191	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21.</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here:</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/routes 20,21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
191	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/routes 20,21, and 191 may conflict with trails that connect Richard Berry and Old Murphy Dome roads.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	Corridors 21, 20, and 191 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
204	10/16	Email	Holly	Dean		<p>Frenchman-Murphy dome connector. The trails at the end of Frenchman rd. is another series of beloved trails for residents and non-residents of the area. This beautiful birch forest is an amazing area for hiking, dog walking, cross-country skiing, horse riding, and other pedestrian activities. It would be devastating to lose this beautiful getaway, especially for residents of the area. Additionally, this would increase traffic on Frenchman Rd, which is otherwise a wonderful quiet road for local residents, including kids, to take a walk from their homes without worrying about heavy traffic speeding through. Please reconsider this plan.</p>	The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan does not identify any trails near corridor 204. If the large, University of Alaska-owned parcel is subdivided, the location and protection of local trails would be accommodated at that time. Frenchman Road was platted to accommodate an extension to the west.
204	10/21	email	Griggs			<p>Corridor 204 is wholly on University property and does not open any new land to development. Making Frenchman a through-street would only increase traffic and and degrade existing recreational trails to the west. Further, the RSA cannot maintain the existing road and does not need more.</p>	Corridor 204 would only be developed if the University decides to subdivide its property, the parcel 204 crosses. The corridor would provide direct access to lots within the subdivided parcel and address the Frenchman cul-de-sac, which is currently longer than FNSB road standards allow, with a connection to Murphy Dome Road.
204	10/21	web form	Kristen	Sullivan		<p>Message: I am writing you about proposed road 204, 254, 18, 20, 21, 13, 255. This is putting roads thru the UAF Land that has long been vacant. The only problem is adding these roads will allow more houses to be built and add more traffic to the dangerous roads we already have. The end of Frenchman has Frenchman creek and a large seasonal slough from the snow melt. It would definitely require a bridge. The present culvert does get overwhelmed on big snow years as it is. Putting a road there is like the proposed road connecting MHE to Miller hill rd. That road would also require a bridge and impact local green space and trails.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Corridor 204 would only be developed if the University decides to subdivide its property, the parcel 204 crosses. The corridor would provide direct access to lots within the subdivided parcel and address the Frenchman cul-de-sac, which is currently longer than FNSB road standards allow, with a connection to Murphy Dome Road. In addition, the other mentioned corridors will only be developed if the property owner chooses to subdivide. At that time the Borough will work with the property owner to dedicate and if needed construct the connecting road. This area would need to fully develop to realize all the shown connections.
209	10/12	web form	Kathy	Cannone		<p>I am opposed to road reroute 209. I live in the Goldstream Alaska subdivision on Doonerak Rd and have been there for almost 35 years. I see no benefit in a road reroute that would impact the Waterford (Pack) Trail. This trail is used extensively for recreational purposes by people living both in the subdivision and outside of it. The subdivision road commission has graded in a parking space on Molly Road for people to park when accessing the trail. Additionally people that live in the subdivision often groom the trail in the winter to make it available for multi-use. It is used by mushers, bikers, walker, kick sleds and skiers. People in the subdivision have maintained this trail for years, even installing water bars to help with trail drainage. There is nothing wrong with the current roads in this area.</p>	Corridor 209 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 209's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 209 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated."
209	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>--Road/route 209 is along the same route as the Waterford Trail.</p>	Corridor 209 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 209's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 209 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated."

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
209	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21. https://fnsbroadplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here: https://fnsbroadplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/route 209 is along the same route as the Waterford Trail.</p>	<p>Corridor 209 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 209's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 209 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated."</p>
209	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/route 209 is along the same route as the Waterford Trail.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	<p>Corridor 209 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 209's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 209 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated."</p>
209	10/20	email	Dan	Reichardt		<p>•General Comment (Regarding Corridors #209, #262, #372, #273 and #13) – In general, this roads plan seems to take a maximalist view of roads, providing multiple connecting routes between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road. The residents of FNSB benefit greatly by the wilderness lands that are preserved due to having very few north-south connecting roads between the East-West arteries (the arteries being College, Farmers' Loop, Goldstream and Old Murphy Dome.) These existing arteries provide ample access to subdivisions north and south of the arteries on prime residential land with short subdivision roads. While this road plan appropriately contemplates future roads for accessing subdivisions, it seems to me that – taken as a whole – it represents a political decision fill the valleys between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome road with connecting routes that aren't needed or desired by existing residents. This is a substantively significant political decision that I really think hasn't been properly discussed with the residents of the borough and I think that this roads plan – despite representing some really good work by the stakeholders – would need to be rejected or forestalled until such a decision is more fully contemplated by borough residents. At the very most, if a more direct route to the central subdivisions on Old Murphy Dome road is needed, the stakeholders should choose just one of those 5 connecting routes.</p>	<p>The Roads Plan does not trigger or promote subdivision or road development in any area. What it does is guide the placement of roads based on a long-range planning analysis for when landowners do decide to develop their property.</p>
209	10/20	web form	Paul	Reichardt		<p>Message: My comments are about portions of the road plan shown on maps 01N02W, 02N02W, and 02N01W. I live in the area shown on 01N02W.</p> <p>Fundamentally, it seems to me that these portions of the road plan are totally disconnected from borough plans related to recreation and, in particular, trails. I understand that, assuming the population of the Fairbanks area grows, the FNSB will sell additional land and that the Goldstream area will undoubtedly see related development. However, people choose to live in Goldstream because of a balance between access to town and life in a somewhat rural environment. Planning roads that crisscross the area is inconsistent with the Goldstream lifestyle as it exists today and likely will exist well into the future, and encroachment of these roads into or near existing hiking trails would negatively impact the extensive recreational use by local residents as well as large numbers of hikers who come from around the borough to use the Cranberry Trail and O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail systems. Some detailed comments follow:</p> <p>3. The number of north/south connectors between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road (e.g., 209, 262, 372, 273) seems like big-time overkill. While having a road plan to support anticipated land sales and subdivision development is a good thing, this road plan looks like a shotgun approach to planning roads everywhere so that any imaginable land disposal would have road access. A better approach would be to identify the most favorable sites for land disposals and then come up with a road plan to support those priorities.</p>	<p>The Roads Plan does not trigger or promote subdivision or road development in any area. What it does is guide the placement of roads based on a long-range planning analysis for when landowners do decide to develop their property. For FNSB-owned lands, the Assembly, which changes often, makes decisions about land disposals. The Roads Plan provides a longer-range ~20 year planning horizon for road connections which helps to create an orderly road network and ensure that all landowners have legal access to their properties. The FNSB Roads and Trail planning processes have been coordinated to minimize impacts on trails and recreation spaces. Through long range planning and coordination, shared trail/road corridors and crossings can be developed to preserve the quality of trails as land subdivides and roads are constructed. Corridor 209 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 209's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 209 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated." In addition, the corridors will only be developed if the property owner chooses to subdivide. At that time the Borough will work with the property owner to dedicate and if needed construct the connecting road. This area would need to fully develop to realize all the shown connections. Development of personal property is a foundational right in the Fairbanks North Star Borough. The Borough doesn't control who develops or when that development will take place. That is why we have the Trails Plan and the Roads Plan working together to make sure that trails stay connected, and that roadways can connect as areas develop.</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
209	10/20		Inna	Rivkin		I live on Toboggan Lane off Goldstream, and as someone with MCS (Multiple Chemical Sensitivities) who is quite sensitive to car exhaust and pollution, very much appreciate and treasure the nearby trails that allow exercise in clean air away from roads, as do many others in our community for whom such trails are critical for health, wellness, and wellbeing. I am concerned with #15, #217, and #209, and was wondered how they will impact our privately maintained non-through drive Toboggan Lane, the cranberry trail in that area, and the trail from Waterford / Molly which is used and treasured by many outdoor recreators myself included. Could you please clarify the impacts and plans. Unfortunately most of the smaller roads are not labeled on the plan making it difficult to ascertain, but it looks like it's right on the trails! I am concerned the quality of mine and my neighbors' lives and health will be adversely affected. Also, are 293 and 262 on the broken sled trail? Thanks,	Corridor 209 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 209's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 209 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated."
209	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		Hello, My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan. Comments: 6. As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained. •New and existing proposed road corridors north of the Goldstream Valley, chiefly 15, 293, 262, 4, 209 could have significant conflict with recreational trails. I think developing this area would be a mistake for the Borough and would lead to a loss in wildlands and trails and would also negatively contribute to the urban sprawl of Fairbanks. Best, Max	Corridor 209 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The alignment has been adjusted for the 2022 Plan update to avoid poor soils at the bottom of the Eldorado Creek drainage. Corridor 209's alignment coincides with a 100' public right-of-way. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan acknowledges corridor 209 and the ROW and indicates that "This section may also require realignment where a road corridor is planned. ...the trail should be realigned to a lower elevation where a sustainable contour can be built, driveway crossings minimized, and saleable parcels accommodated." The on-going coordination between the Roads and Trails Plans will help plan for future impacts and mitigate trail and road conflicts.
213	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you. --Road/route 213 is along the same route as the Equinox Marathon Out-and-Back section as well as other trails in that area.	The first 4,000' of Corridor 213 follows the unplatted section of Ester Dome Road. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan update identifies the need to move the Ester West Ridge Trail off the ridgetop which would provide separation between Corridor 213 and the recreational trail. Additionally, the Trails Plan recommends that future road development be coordinated with trail reroutes.
213	10/16	Email	Holly	Dean		Growing up in Fairbanks, and to this day, this corridor off of Ester Dome is a beloved recreation trail/area. It's a way for the community to get out for a remote hike. while only driving a short distance from town. Creating a major corridor road through this area and connecting it to Old Nenana Hwy will not only take away this great recreation trail(s), but I fear would also create noisy and unsafe motorized traffic, increased air pollution, and disrupt the natural environment for local residents. Please reconsider this plan, many Fairbanksans would be devastated to lose this beloved recreation area.	The first 4,000' of Corridor 213 follows the unplatted section of Ester Dome Road. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan update identifies the need to move the Ester West Ridge Trail off the ridgetop which would provide separation between Corridor 213 and the recreational trail. Additionally, the Trails Plan recommends that future road development be coordinated with trail reroutes.
213	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21. https://fnsbroadsplan.com/ Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer). General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here: https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf --Road/route 213 is along the same route as the Equinox Marathon Out-and-Back section as well as other trails in that area.	The first 4,000' of Corridor 213 follows the unplatted section of Ester Dome Road. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan update identifies the need to move the Ester West Ridge Trail off the ridgetop which would provide separation between Corridor 213 and the recreational trail. Additionally, the Trails Plan recommends that future road development be coordinated with trail reroutes.
213	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope. As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment. Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include: --Road/route 213 is along the same route as the Equinox Marathon Out-and-Back section as well as other trails in that area. Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained. Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.	The first 4,000' of Corridor 213 follows the unplatted section of Ester Dome Road. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan update identifies the need to move the Ester West Ridge Trail off the ridgetop which would provide separation between Corridor 213 and the recreational trail. Additionally, the Trails Plan recommends that future road development be coordinated with trail reroutes.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
213	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>6.As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>2.Corridor 213 across Ester Dome could affect recreational trails, the wild character of the area and the Equinox Marathon Route.</p> <p>I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	The first 4,000' of Corridor 213 follows the unplatted section of Ester Dome Road. The 2022 Recreational Trails Plan update identifies the need to move the Ester West Ridge Trail off the ridgetop which would provide separation between Corridor 213 and the recreational trail. Additionally, the Trails Plan recommends that future road development be coordinated with trail reroutes.
217	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>--Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor.
217	10/13	email	Colin	Craven	Natural Resource Specialist Land Conveyance Section Division of Mining, Land, and Water Department of Natural Resources	<p>The route shown for corridor 217 could be an excellent road routing if there was legal access across private property connecting Skyflight Avenue and DNR land. Because this corridor crosses a parcel of private property that is likely never to be subdivided, it is a road corridor that is very unlikely to be realized. However, the FNSB can achieve its goals of planning for future development and providing better means for emergency egress by ensuring that appropriate allowances are made in the Roads Plan for corridor rerouting based on platting applications.</p> <p>DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses with access based on a section line easement along the west boundary. While the SLE route has complications, it is possible to use since it provides legal and practical access from Skyflight Avenue to the subdivision boundary. If the FNSB took a literal interpretation of the Roads Plan for route 217, DNR 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 on the opposite end. Because this subdivision also will need trail easements in addition to a subdivision access road, the dedication of a redundant road corridor is likely to make the subdivision infeasible to develop. Furthermore, redundant road corridors would likely compromise the trail corridors within the subdivision that would be squeezed between and/or across the road corridors. DNR considers the trails within the subdivision as an asset to preserve and wants to do so in a manner that will earn public support.</p>	The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards.
217	10/13	web form	Jean	Leder		<p>The proposed Route #217 extending Skyflight Avenue and connecting to Pandora via proposed Route #15 is not a viable option for future roads. It violates all 3 goals of the community road planning project. It is a deterrent to health, well-being, and safety. Currently Skyflight is a quiet dead-end road in the Cordes Service Area that can handle the existing traffic and safely allow children and residents to walk along the road. If proposed Route#217 was to connect Cordes Road to Pandora then Cordes would become the overwhelming choice for all traffic from the Pandora Service area. The Cordes area roads would see an increase in traffic and need much more maintenance without any additional revenue from the Pandora service area. The Cordes Service area property owners' financial obligation to maintain roads would increase exponentially. Another issue is the curve where Cordes Road turns into Skyflight which is already a safety concern. It's a blind curve and adding traffic to that is a bad idea.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/18		Kate	Ripley		<p>I do not support the proposed connector road (No. 217) between Skyflight and Pandora. I'm concerned about the impacts to the Cranberry Trail and to property values of existing homes in adjacent neighborhoods. As a homeowner in this area, I appreciate the rural nature of the Cranberry Trail on a daily basis. Increasing density surrounding this trail is a negative, not a positive. I see no benefit to either the Skyflight or Pandora neighborhoods by conjoining them, as each one has suitable access currently. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21.</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here:</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
217	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21.</p> <p>https://fnsbroadplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here:</p> <p>https://fnsbroadplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/20	web form	David	DeLong		<p>The FBNBS plan has major flaws. First, Our trails must protected, This plan makes existing trails into roads. That should not be allowed. Specifically the proposed roads 217 and 15 would destroy a significant trail. This plan would make Cordes and Skyflight more dangerous. The increase in traffic will be especially dangerous at the hairpin turn as Cordes transitions into Sky flight. There are 6 driveways that have to negotiate a blind turn with attendant dangers from increased traffic. Fairbanks has beautiful trails. Don't turn those trails into roads</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/20	web form	Nina	Harun		<p>The FBNBS Roads Plan has some major flaws. First, no new road should destroy existing highly used neighborhood trails. Second, no new road should dramatically alter existing subdivisions and lower property values in those existing subdivisions. No new proposed road should make an existing road dangerous. This is what the proposed roads 217 and 15 would do. These proposed roads would come off of Skyflight from Cordes Dr. Cordes Dr. is not built and can not be built to accommodate a high traffic load that the proposed roads would entail. There is a hairpin curve on Cordes Dr where five driveways enter into. This part of the road is very dangerous if there are high volumes of traffic. All traffic from as far away as Old Murphy Dome would funnel into this area. This would completely change the quality of our neighborhood and lower our property values. It would also result in accidents and injuries. Furthermore, established trails would be destroyed further lowering our property values. This makes no sense and it will meet with significant resistance. New roads should come off existing major state roads (Goldstream or Steese Hwy) NOT neighborhood roads and trails.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/20	email	Dan	Reichardt		<p>•Corridor #217 – This route seems to be unnecessarily close to the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. The State of Alaska owned lots crossed by Corridor #217 (TL-1207&TL-1203) are heavily used by residents for recreational uses and provide valuable wildlife habitat. While I understand the borough is interested in providing access to borough lands north of Skyflight, this corridor should be located as far west as possible in order to minimize interference with other land use on State owned public lands.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/20	web form	Paul	Reichardt		<p>Message: My comments are about portions of the road plan shown on maps 01N02W, 02N02W, and 02N01W. I live in the area shown on 01N02W.</p> <p>Fundamentally, it seems to me that these portions of the road plan are totally disconnected from borough plans related to recreation and, in particular, trails. I understand that, assuming the population of the Fairbanks area grows, the FNSB will sell additional land and that the Goldstream area will undoubtedly see related development. However, people choose to live in Goldstream because of a balance between access to town and life in a somewhat rural environment. Planning roads that crisscross the area is inconsistent with the Goldstream lifestyle as it exists today and likely will exist well into the future, and encroachment of these roads into or near existing hiking trails would negatively impact the extensive recreational use by local residents as well as large numbers of hikers who come from around the borough to use the Cranberry Trail and O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail systems. Some detailed comments follow:</p> <p>1. Corridor 217 seems like an unnecessary connector that would have serious adverse impacts on the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
217	10/20		Marjorie	Richards		As a resident of the neighborhood (2046 Goldstream Road) and user of trails between Pandora Road, Old Murphy Dome Road, and O'Connor Creek, please consider extinguishing the Route 15 alignment as it is both particularly noxious to the existing trails and redundant to the other alignments. Route 217 would probably negatively affect my trail enjoyment but to a lesser extent than Route 15. Thank you for your consideration.	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/20		Inna	Rivkin		I live on Toboggan Lane off Goldstream, and as someone with MCS (Multiple Chemical Sensitivities) who is quite sensitive to car exhaust and pollution, very much appreciate and treasure the nearby trails that allow exercise in clean air away from roads, as do many others in our community for whom such trails are critical for health, wellness, and wellbeing. I am concerned with #15, #217, and #209, and was wondered how they will impact our privately maintained non-through drive Toboggan Lane, the cranberry trail in that area, and the trail from Waterford / Molly which is used and treasured by many outdoor recreators myself included. Could you please clarify the impacts and plans. Unfortunately most of the smaller roads are not labeled on the plan making it difficult to ascertain, but it looks like it's right on the trails! I am concerned the quality of mine and my neighbors' lives and health will be adversely affected. Also, are 293 and 262 on the broken sled trail? Thanks,	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/21		Mike	Schmoker		Message: I would like to comment on the FNSB road plan. I will limit my comments to the proposed roads of 15, 217 & 262. All of these roads would cross numerous trails that have been in the area for several decades. 15 & 217 would impact the Cranberry trail that has been established for years. 262 would greatly impact the O'Conner Ridge trail that has been used since the early 70's. I would greatly encourage any road development be in conjuncture with the recent comprehensive plan. I would encourage the Borough to improve and maintain are present roads before extending the present road system	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/20		Terry	Reichardt		Message: How disappointing to see this plan. We have worked so hard to establish and maintain the borough trail system that people come to use from all over the borough. Your roads (217 and 15) appear to follow those trails (displace them) and thus destroy them. Why?! The juncture of 217 and 15 has a proposed road that goes through private property to join Pandora. Why do you think people live out here? The roads that presently exist (Old Murphy Dome Road and Goldstream) are able to access borough properties and allow undeveloped land in between. If you want to solidly develop from Goldstream to Old Murphy Dome we might as well all be living in the Chicago suburbs. I would strongly advise that, instead of designing roads to crisscross the area perpendicular to Goldstream and Murphy Dome roads, you instead pick the areas where you want to sell land and then put in access roads from either Goldstream or Old Murphy Dome roads. I would also strongly recommend that you stay away from borough trail systems.	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/21		Margaret	Mannix		Message: I am responding in particular to Routes 15, 217 and 293/262 . These proposed roads directly impact the numerous trails that exist there and are mostly multi use trails and heavily used. I have provided input on the Comprehensive Trail use process and am very surprised that neither of these projects seem to reflect the other. At least there are no references in the proposals. Protecting trail use is future thinking and new roads should accommodate existing trails. I see no point in Route 15, and I hope that private property is respected.	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
217	10/23	email	Terry	Chapin		"Hi Shelly, Sorry for weighing in late with comments on the FNSB road plan. I've been out of the country the past two weeks, but the issues are important to me so I want to provide you with some feedback. I hope it is not too late to do so. In general, it seems important NOT to plan road corridors that compromise trail networks and to which local residents are opposed. In our neighborhood, I specifically am opposed to corridor 217 that would connect Skyflight Road (at the top of Cordes behind the Vallata (where there is a small air strip) with Pandora Subdivision. Such a road corridor is in the heart of the Cranberry Trail Network that is widely used by many people in that part of Goldstream Valley. Such a connector road would destroy a recreational resources that have drawn many families (including my own) to live in this neighborhood. I doubt that any of the people in the neighborhood would use such a connector road, and most of us would oppose it. Thanks for considering my input."	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. The proposed placement of Corridor 217 avoids conflicts with the Skyflight airstrip, making it a safer and more reliable route northward to DNR lands than the existing SLE that bisects the active airfield. The southern connection of 217 into Skyflight is feasible since the large developed parcel which it crosses is large enough to potentially subdivide in the future, based on FNSB Title 17 subdivision standards. Coordination between the FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes can mitigate trail impacts by planning for a shared trail/road corridor. Once DNR subdivides its land, the additional residences built along Corridor 217 can be added to existing adjacent road service areas to provide revenue to support continued road maintenance.
228	10/14	Web form	Oralee	Nudson		As the only fulltime residents and owners of 15 parcels in Desperation Loop Subdivision, we are opposed to new corridor #228. Desperation Loop Road is an easement which has never been constructed. A corridor leading to the far end of Desperation Loop would be a road to no where. The Martin Road Service area would have no reason to maintain corridor #228 because it would provide access only to vacant lots which are a full mile away from existing road access. We have lived in Desperation Loop for 20 years and have no interest developing Desperation Loop Road. New corridor #228 would follow a North facing steep sidehill covered by questionable building soils.	Corridor 228 is entirely on Alaska DNR land. The corridor provides access to these parcels should they be subdivided. Property owners in the Desperation Subdivision would not be responsible for building corridor 228.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
250	10/20		Christin	Swearingen		This trail looks like it would be very close to conservation property stewarded by Interior Alaska Land Trust for the purposes of keeping Cripple Creek shaded and clear. I don't know enough about this project to oppose outright, but have concerns about developing close to a boggy nature area. This map shows most of IALT's properties: https://interioraklandtrust.org/land-and-projects/	Corridor 250 crosses UAF lands that have potential to subdivide in the future. It would only be developed to provide access to the created parcels if UAF decides to subdivide this land.
251	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you. --Road/route 251 is along the same route as the ridge trail that connects Moose and Ski Boot Hill roads.	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property.
251	10/15	Web form	Maggie	Druckenmiller		I live in university heights on De Pauw Dr. and would like to oppose road/route 251. My family and many others recreate in the area which contains beautiful woods and trails for skiing, running, and biking. A road would disrupt the beautiful quiet area. I hope you take this into your consideration. Best, Maggie Druckenmiller 15 years in the university heights area	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property.
251	10/19	web form	Lisa	Druckenmiller		I am writing to comment on a corridor on the draft map that is in a part of the Borough where I live and recreate. Mostly I am objecting to a proposed corridor which would connect two neighborhoods by replacing a trail at the end of their road systems with a road. 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 but instead bear the brunt of increased traffic. Most residents would just lose recreational trails. 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.	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
251	10/18	email	Dorli	McWayne		Please do not extend Moose Trail through to Ski Boot Hill Road (#251) as it would go through a prime recreation area - Skyridge Park - that is used daily by walkers, skiers, runners, cyclists, and horseback riders. Rerouting the trails would still put them too close to the new road and completely change the "walk-in-the-woods" type of recreating. The proposed road is not a necessary means of egress from either end and would only encourage "Sunday drivers" and create too much traffic on Moose Trail, a residential road with many blind driveways. Thank you for your consideration.	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
251	10/19	web form	Stephen	Parker		To Whom It May Concern: I have been a resident of the Musk Ox subdivision and Fairbanks for forty years. I have thoroughly read the Comprehensive Roads Plan for the Fairbanks North Star Borough. I am very familiar with the terrain, roads and trails in the plan that proposes a connection between Moose Trail and Ski Boot Hill Road (labeled 251 and 34 on the map.) According to the document, the Roads plan was "developed to "meet the needs of a growing community." From the information available to me, the population of FNSB has been slowly decreasing over the last years. How is it with fewer people we need more roads? Certainly many of the roads could be improved, but more roads that need maintenance and plowing? In Goal 4, the Environmental Impacts section the goal is "to retain the integrity of the neighborhood." I doubt there is even one resident of the Musk Ox Subdivision that thinks this is a good idea. Moose Trail is a narrow steep road that has substantial potholes in the spring and fall. In the winter it is essentially one lane because of snow buildup from plowing. The proposed road will create a cut-off for folks traveling to and from Goldstream to Farmer's Loop and the Steese area. This will greatly increase traffic, noise, and danger in a quiet residential area. The proposed road will also impact the large number of people that use the trail from Taiga Subdivision to the top of Ski Boot Hill Road,, (i.e., the extension of the Skarland Trail.) I would estimate that there are up to fifty people a day who walk here to have a peaceful experience of being in the woods on a pleasant trail; the road would greatly interfere with the recreational use in the neighborhood. I think most of us live in Fairbanks for the quality of life it can provide with its closeness to wilderness and nature. We are not here to get to places faster. I am aware that decisions are rarely made on a rational basis, but rather are often based on hidden agendas or power or personal issues behind the appearance of things. One of the rumors in the neighborhood is that the road is planned so that Cook Inlet Region Inc. can have better access to the land it owns near Ski Boot Hill Rd. i.e., follow the money. If this is the case, this needs to be made public. Note that Ski Boot Hill Rd. can be improved without building the extension to Moose Trail. This proposed extension of Moose Trail will greatly reduce the quality of life for many people and benefit very few. It does not make any rational sense.	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
251	10/18	web form	Robert	Perkins		<p>Comment on Corridor 251 of the current draft of the FNSB Comprehensive Roads Plan. Forty-two year resident of 1605 Moose Trail. This comment refers to Corridor 251. This proposed corridor would effectively extend the current road, Moose Trail. I will refer to it as the "Moose Trail Extension." The proposed corridor will increase traffic on a substandard road and thus increase hazard to residents and others using Moose Trail. I request that Corridor 251 be removed from the Roads Plan.</p> <p>Moose Trail is approximately 0.6 miles long. Most of the current road has slopes that do not meet relevant safety standards. Approximately 18% of the road has slopes greater than 10%, the current FNSB subdivision standard. However, that standard itself does not meet the safety standards of AASHTO, the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials, the professional standard for roads. The recommended maximum slope for rural collectors is 8% according to the AASHTO Policy on Geometric Design of Highways and Streets. For very low-volume roads where AADT [traffic] does not exceed 400 vehicles per day, the recommended maximum grade is 9%. Approximately 31% of Moose Trail has slopes between 9% and 10%, and a further 20% has slopes greater than 8%. A full 70% of Moose Trail does not meet current safety standards. (Two other roads in the Musk Ox Subdivision, Pika Road and Meadow Mouse, feed into Moose Trail and residents of those roads would likewise be adversely affected by an increase in traffic.)</p> <p>A further hazard on Moose Trail derives from several very short driveways. Residents using those driveways enter the road by backing. The limited vision associated with backing onto the road increases the hazard for motorist and bicycle riders.</p> <p>Implementation of the Road Plan will limit adequate review of future plans that might increase traffic on Moose Trail and limit proper input for affected residents of Musk Ox Subdivision on an issue that will affect their well-being.</p> <p>I will make a further comment on ethical responsibility. There are many substandard roads in the FNSB. Many of these were developed before there was a subdivision ordinance and some before there was a borough. The FNSB has, in my opinion, no culpability for those substandard roads. However, the current issue is that the FNSB is at this time proposing a plan that would serve to increase the hazard of FNSB residents – for that the FNSB is responsible.</p>	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
251	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21.</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here:</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/route 251 is along the same route as the ridge trail that connects Moose and Ski Boot Hill roads.</p>	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
251	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/route 251 is along the same route as the ridge trail that connects Moose and Ski Boot Hill roads.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
251	10/19	web form	Michael	West		<p>Minor corridor 251 connecting Moose Trail to Ski Boot Hill concerns me. The route serves as a key artery in a vibrant trail network. I don't know the history of the road corridor discussion. I do note that no explanation is given for this corridor in Table 3 of the plan. I realize this is a future-looking document. But if there were ever a push to develop this corridor, I would urge deep community engagement long in advance. There is a significant community of people (and long history) for this particular trail segment and open space. I am certain this discussion would draw a pretty engaged set of voices. Thanks!</p>	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
251	10/18	web form	Kesler	Woodward		<p>This is a comment on Section 251. I urge you to consider eliminating the corridor in the plan which would connect Moose Trail with Ski Boot Hill Road. This trail on this route is currently used by a significant number of residents of the area and visitors. It is a very popular woodland trail that has been both preserved and upgraded as part of the Borough Trails Plan. There is no significant benefit to the residents at either end of the corridor for the proposed connection, and those of us who use those trails year-round would lose recreational access if the road were built. Rerouting the trail and/or establishing a road beside it would essentially destroy the character of one of Fairbanks' premier boreal forest trails.</p>	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
251		email	Helena	Rueter		I would not like this to become a road. If it does, I would like to see the trail preserved, preferably with some natural vegetation left as a separation.	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
251	10/21	email	Kalina	Grabinska-Marusek		I am opposed to the creation of new roads in these corridors for three reasons: 1.New roads will destroy the recreation possibilities found in this area. I have been walking on the trails in this area for 35 years. Even though it is close to town because there are so few roads and cars there, it feels remote and wild, which makes it an incredibly popular place for people to spend time. I have observed people running, biking, skiing, sledding, exercising their dogs and riding their horses. These activities would not be as safe or enjoyable if they were taking place along a roadway. 2.New roads will detrimentally affect the neighborhood. I live in the neighborhood and prize the quiet atmosphere that living at a dead-end road provides. New roads will bring more cars and more noise. 3.New roads will turn the steep and pothole filled roads of Moose Trail and Eldorado into through streets. Both roads are 20 mph roads, and each poses its own challenge to drivers. Moose Trail can be a slippery mess in the fresh snow. School buses and cars alike end up in the ditch all winter long. Eldorado develops numerous potholes in the summer, directly related to how many people drive on it in the rain. Adding more traffic will increase maintenance costs and driving difficulty on these roads. Thank you for your time.	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
251	10/21	web form	Paul	Schneider		Message: My comments address the proposed Road 251 connecting Ski Boot Hill Drive to Moose Trail Road. Connecting these roads serves no purpose for the foreseeable future and should be deleted from this planning document. Also, building the road would have a negative impact and leave vulnerable the Skyline Ridge multipurpose trail system including the Ridge Trail, the Secret Trail, and the After Hours Trail, each of which meander 3-4 miles each on and below the Ridge. My wife and I have hiked these popular trails for years along with many other hikers, runners, families, pet owners, bicyclists, skiers, and mushers. I've also seen the damage caused by pick up-trucks and all terrain vehicles leaving deep trenches in the trails. It appears the proposed Moose Trail Road entrance at the current western trail head would trample 1-1/2 miles of trail up to the transmitter tower giving access to vehicles to enter the rest of the trail system. The FNSB should focus on protecting this beautiful trail system, not participating in destroying it. Hike, bike, ski or snow shoe this popular trail system to understand how special it is.	Corridor 251 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a significant vegetated buffer between the corridor and the Skyline Ridge Trail. This road would only be developed if and when the owner of the large parcels it crosses decides to subdivide their property. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads. The cost and work of road construction falls to the developer (subdivider) of land to provide legal access to the newly developed lots that result. Moose Trail is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB road standards allow, causing concerns about emergency services and resident access. Corridor 251 addresses this issue by providing an additional access point to the neighborhood.
254	10/21	email	Griggs			Corridor 254, like 204, only crosses University property and does not open any new land to development. Many recreational trails are present in the area, and a new road would degrade the value of those trails. Drouin Rd is poorly maintained, and it does not need increased traffic.	Corridor 254 would only be developed if the university decides to subdivide the large parcel it crosses. The purpose of the corridor would be to provide legal access to those newly created lots. It also provides alternate ingress/egress to the Silver Fox subdivision, addressing the Drouin/Old John cul-de-sac, which is currently longer than FNSB road standards allow.
254	10/21	web form	Kristen	Sullivan		Message: I am writing you about proposed road 204, 254, 18, 20, 21, 13, 255. This is putting roads thru the UAF Land that has long been vacant. The only problem is adding these roads will allow more houses to be built and add more traffic to the dangerous roads we already have. The end of Frenchman has Frenchman creek and a large seasonal slough from the snow melt. It would definitely require a bridge. The present culvert does get overwhelmed on big snow years as it is. Putting a road there is like the proposed road connecting MHE to Miller hill rd. That road would also require a bridge and impact local green space and trails. Thank you for your time.	Corridor 254 would only be developed if the university decides to subdivide the large parcel it crosses. The purpose of the corridor would be to provide legal access to those newly created lots. It also provides alternate ingress/egress to the Silver Fox subdivision, addressing the Drouin/Old John cul-de-sac, which is currently longer than FNSB road standards allow.
255	10/12	Email	Karl	Kassel		Hello Shelly and Kellen, Since the official comment form does not seem to work well with my computer, I am sending you a plain email with my comments regarding the Roads Plan. It is easy to see the extensive thought processes and work that has gone into this road plan. I believe it represents some very needed corridors for our community. It is an excellent plan for the easiest development of road additions for the near future. However, a quality healthy community needs more than just roads to thrive, and the easiest routes to build a road may not be the best. Several of the proposed routes follow, or "upgrade," existing trails. You are well aware there are significant benefits to a community that has access to quality trails. As roads develop, we must be sensitive to the benefits of preserving the existing trail corridors and adding to them as the need increases with expanding population. Converting a trail to a road is rarely an "upgrade" unless there are alternate trail routes constructed as part of the road project and trail connectivity is maintained. Case in point: corridor #21 follows right on top of the backbone of an extensive trail system that extends between the Richard Berry Ridge and Old Murphy Dome Road. This system has existed for literally decades, and is a primary reason why I live where I live. This trail system also would be impacted by routes 20, 255 and 191. The existing trails cover a significant portion of sections 2, 3, and 10, most of which is currently Borough land. These trails are used extensively by the locals and have also hosted races by the running club. It is one of the few higher altitude systems that has tree cover to protect users from the wind and colder temperatures in the winter. It is more than just a neighborhood trail and has the potential to grow into an excellent recreation area for the west side of town. Bottom line: Any road development in this area should include substantial consideration of the other recreational potentials here, and as an absolute minimum should preserve the integrity of the existing trail system. Thanks for your planning efforts, Karl Kassel	Corridors 21, 20, 191, and 255 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.
255	10/12	Web form	Jane	Lanford		I am concerned about potential connector roads from the top of Richard Berry Drive to Old Murphy Dome Road (near its intersection with Spinach Creek Drive). From the maps, they appear to be 21, 20, 191 and 255. At present there is a wonderful set of interconnecting trails in the area which do, indeed, connect those two roads. If any roads get closer to reality, please consider recreation and trail use conflicts, both summer and winter. I live nearby on Vancouver Road and especially enjoy snowshoe running up there in the winter! Thank you.	Corridors 21, 20, 191, and 255 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
255	10/21	web form	Kristen	Sullivan		Message: I am writing you about proposed road 204, 254, 18, 20, 21, 13, 255. This is putting roads thru the UAF Land that has long been vacant. The only problem is adding these roads will allow more houses to be built and add more traffic to the dangerous roads we already have. The end of Frenchman has Frenchman creek and a large seasonal slough from the snow melt. It would definitely require a bridge. The present culvert does get overwhelmed on big snow years as it is. Putting a road there is like the proposed road connecting MHE to Miller hill rd. That road would also require a bridge and impact local green space and trails. Thank you for your time.	Corridors 21, 20, 191, and 255 were in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 map update. The Recreational Trails Plan has identified several trails in this area (Spinach Creek Bowl Trails per North Goldstream map). The Roads Plan and Trails Plan have been coordinated such that trails and road corridors in this area minimize crossings maintain appropriate buffers between the trails and roads. Corridor 254 would only be developed if the university decides to subdivide the large parcel it crosses. The purpose of the corridor would be to provide legal access to those newly created lots.
262	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you. --Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/19	email	Darren	Rorabaugh		Corridor #262 would ruin one of best connector trails in the area. I spent 50-60 hours cleaning up that trail 23 years ago. It has become important to the community. There does not seem to be a need to develop that ridge.	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21. https://fnsbroadsplan.com/ Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer). General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here: https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf --Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail.	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope. As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment. Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include: --Road/route 262 is along the same route as the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail. Road/routes 15 and 217 may also conflict with that trail. Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained. Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/19	email	Susan			These road corridors seem unnecessary and undesirable. The pressure for development of these areas is not really there so these corridors are not warranted. The impacts to the neighborhood and neighborhood roads would be incredibly negative.	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/20	email	Dan	Reichardt		•General Comment (Regarding Corridors #209, #262, #372, #273 and #13) – In general, this roads plan seems to take a maximalist view of roads, providing multiple connecting routes between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road. The residents of FNSB benefit greatly by the wilderness lands that are preserved due to having very few north-south connecting roads between the East-West arteries (the arteries being College, Farmers's Loop, Goldstream and Old Murphy Dome.) These existing arteries provide ample access to subdivisions north and south of the arteries on prime residential land with short subdivision roads. While this road plan appropriately contemplates future roads for accessing subdivisions, it seems to me that – taken as a whole – it represents a political decision fill the valleys between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome road with connecting routes that aren't needed or desired by existing residents. This is a substantively significant political decision that I really think hasn't been properly discussed with the residents of the borough and I think that this roads plan – despite representing some really good work by the stakeholders – would need to be rejected or forestalled until such a decision is more fully contemplated by borough residents. At the very most, if a more direct route to the central subdivisions on Old Murphy Dome road is needed, the stakeholders should choose just one of those 5 connecting routes.	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
262	10/20	web form	Paul	Reichardt		<p>Message: My comments are about portions of the road plan shown on maps 01N02W, 02N02W, and 02N01W. I live in the area shown on 01N02W.</p> <p>Fundamentally, it seems to me that these portions of the road plan are totally disconnected from borough plans related to recreation and, in particular, trails. I understand that, assuming the population of the Fairbanks area grows, the FNSB will sell additional land and that the Goldstream area will undoubtedly see related development. However, people choose to live in Goldstream because of a balance between access to town and life in a somewhat rural environment. Planning roads that crisscross the area is inconsistent with the Goldstream lifestyle as it exists today and likely will exist well into the future, and encroachment of these roads into or near existing hiking trails would negatively impact the extensive recreational use by local residents as well as large numbers of hikers who come from around the borough to use the Cranberry Trail and O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail systems. Some detailed comments follow:</p> <p>3. The number of north/south connectors between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road (e.g., 209, 262, 372, 273) seems like big-time overkill. While having a road plan to support anticipated land sales and subdivision development is a good thing, this road plan looks like a shotgun approach to planning roads everywhere so that any imaginable land disposal would have road access. A better approach would be to identify the most favorable sites for land disposals and then come up with a road plan to support those priorities.</p>	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/20		Inna	Rivkin		<p>I live on Toboggan Lane off Goldstream, and as someone with MCS (Multiple Chemical Sensitivities) who is quite sensitive to car exhaust and pollution, very much appreciate and treasure the nearby trails that allow exercise in clean air away from roads, as do many others in our community for whom such trails are critical for health, wellness, and wellbeing. I am concerned with #15, #217, and #209, and was wondered how they will impact our privately maintained non-through drive Toboggan Lane, the cranberry trail in that area, and the trail from Waterford / Molly which is used and treasured by many outdoor recreators myself included. Could you please clarify the impacts and plans. Unfortunately most of the smaller roads are not labeled on the plan making it difficult to ascertain, but it looks like it's right on the trails! I am concerned the quality of mine and my neighbors' lives and health will be adversely affected. Also, are 293 and 262 on the broken sled trail? Thanks,</p>	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/21		Mike	Schmoker		<p>Message: I would like to comment on the FNSB road plan. I will limit my comments to the proposed roads of 15, 217 & 262. All of these roads would cross numerous trails that have been in the area for several decades. 15 & 217 would impact the Cranberry trail that has been established for years. 262 would greatly impact the O'Conner Ridge trail that has been used since the early 70's. I would greatly encourage any road development be in conjuncture with the recent comprehensive plan. I would encourage the Borough to improve and maintain are present roads before extending the present road system</p>	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>6. As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>•New and existing proposed road corridors north of the Goldstream Valley, chiefly 15, 293, 262, 4, 209 could have significant conflict with recreational trails. I think developing this area would be a mistake for the Borough and would lead to a loss in wildlands and trails and would also negatively contribute to the urban sprawl of Fairbanks.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
262	10/21		Margaret	Mannix		<p>Message: I am responding in particular to Routes 15, 217 and 293/262 . These proposed roads directly impact the numerous trails that exist there and are mostly multi use trails and heavily used. I have provided input on the Comprehensive Trail use process and am very surprised that neither of these projects seem to reflect the other. At least there are no references in the proposals. Protecting trail use is future thinking and new roads should accommodate existing trails.</p> <p>I see no point in Route 15, and I hope that private property is respected.</p>	Corridor 262 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail is identified in the Recreational Trails Plan. The Trails Plan indicates that "reroutes may be necessary in the future as road development may require some of the ridgeline." If parcels are subdivided in this area, the alignment of the road and the O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail will be coordinated so as to minimize conflicts and avoid multiple driveway crossings.
273	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>--Road/route 273 is along the same route as the Moose Mountain Powerline trail to Old Murphy Dome Road.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p> <p>The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately.</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
273	10/16	Email	H. Roger	Evans, P.E.	Civil Engineer Founder, Designer, President Moose Mountain, Inc.	<p>Thank you for the chance to comment on your ideas for future road access.</p> <p>273 is a privately constructed road, built to FNSB standards 30 years ago and has been in constant use by the ski area ever since. We use it in winter to bus skiers to the summit for skiing, and in summer it serves us for maintenance and security. Although it would be the best route by far for accessing the ridge all the way to Old Murphy Dome road, we do not have any plans for subdividing any time in the near future. We may some day be amenable to an offer that would allow us to purchase an alternate lift system and maintain security from motorized vehicles on our ski slopes, but that would take several millions of dollars so we don't expect that to happen.</p> <p>372 as shown has a sharp left turn from the end of Monteverde, which would take it immediately across a steep, high altitude black spruce permafrost zone, with evidence of slumping showing just above the creek below. A road cut through there would cause excessive thawing, slumping and probably mud flows into the creek. It would be far safer, and better, to continue Monteverde straight for another few thousand feet, through developable residential grade property, then turn left across the creek at a lower elevation, then begin climbing on the dry south slopes beyond. It would also be an opportunity to connect to a Jones Road extension, which could prove to be much better access to the area with its lower grades and straight alignment.</p> <p>Moose Mountain road is graded between 8-10% from the intersection at the base to the top of the mountain and can be dangerous to vehicles without chains or studs during spring freeze/thaw cycles. It is also quite a ways farther from the Goldstream Road zone than other proposed access points, and already has over 110 lots, most of them developed in the past 30 years.</p> <p>Attached is a Google Earth view of the area. The heavily spruced and shaded area just north of the existing Monteverde Road should be avoided and the extension through the better land straight ahead considered.</p> <p>If you would like, I'd be available to come to the borough office and discuss these thoughts with you.</p> <p>Thanks in advance,</p>	Corridors 273 and 372 were both in the 1991 Roads Plan. Several corridors in the area have been constructed since the 1991 Plan, including Monteverde Road and Meribel Road. Both proposed corridors provide secondary egress from the Moose Mountain neighborhood that currently has a single access point (Moose Mountain Road). Fire protection best practices indicate that a neighborhood with more than 100 residences should have at least two points of egress.
273	10/12	Web form	Jennifer	Schell		<p>I am writing to ask the FNSB to reconsider the wave of development they are promoting in the area north of Jones Road (and other areas between Goldstream and Old Murphy Dome Road). Much of this land contains recreational trails, used, loved, and enjoyed by local residents. I am especially concerned about the proposed 273, which lies along the same route as the Moose Mountain Powerline Trail to Old Murphy Dome Road. That trail is amazing and well used in all seasons, by hikers, joggers, bikers, mushers, snow machiners, and skiers. Building a road there would only destroy the recreational values of that trail.</p> <p>Generally speaking, I am concerned that the FNSB wants to expand the wildland/urban interface in a time of climate change, when wildfire seasons are getting longer in duration and more severe in intensity. I am not confident that federal, state, and borough resources can protect the developments that we currently have, never mind more.</p> <p>I live off of Jones Road, and I am familiar with the degrading permafrost in the area. At present, our road service district does not have the money to maintain these roads. Every time Jones Road is scraped, it dips further and further BELOW grade. Needless to say, the road has very few ditches or working culverts. In one place, a culvert lies at grade. It flooded during breakup last year. Jones Road can barely handle traffic at current levels. How is it supposed to handle more? Instead of improving our current infrastructure--and finding a way to fund improvements--the FNSB just wants to promote more development and more problems. The rural road situation really is a disaster. It needs the attention of the FNSB.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Jennifer Schell</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p> <p>The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately.</p>
273	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21.</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about.</p> <p>Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here:</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/route 273 is along the same route as the Moose Mountain Powerline trail to Old Murphy Dome Road.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p> <p>The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately.</p>
273	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/route 273 is along the same route as the Moose Mountain Powerline trail to Old Murphy Dome Road.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p> <p>The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately.</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
273	10/20	email	Dan	Reichardt		<p>•General Comment (Regarding Corridors #209, #262, #372, #273 and #13) – In general, this roads plan seems to take a maximalist view of roads, providing multiple connecting routes between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road. The residents of FNSB benefit greatly by the wilderness lands that are preserved due to having very few north-south connecting roads between the East-West arteries (the arteries being College, Farmer's Loop, Goldstream and Old Murphy Dome.) These existing arteries provide ample access to subdivisions north and south of the arteries on prime residential land with short subdivision roads. While this road plan appropriately contemplates future roads for accessing subdivisions, it seems to me that – taken as a whole – it represents a political decision fill the valleys between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome road with connecting routes that aren't needed or desired by existing residents. This is a substantively significant political decision that I really think hasn't been properly discussed with the residents of the borough and I think that this roads plan – despite representing some really good work by the stakeholders – would need to be rejected or forestalled until such a decision is more fully contemplated by borough residents. At the very most, if a more direct route to the central subdivisions on Old Murphy Dome road is needed, the stakeholders should choose just one of those 5 connecting routes.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p> <p>The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately.</p>
273	10/20	web form	Paul	Reichardt		<p>Message: My comments are about portions of the road plan shown on maps 01N02W, 02N02W, and 02N01W. I live in the area shown on 01N02W.</p> <p>Fundamentally, it seems to me that these portions of the road plan are totally disconnected from borough plans related to recreation and, in particular, trails. I understand that, assuming the population of the Fairbanks area grows, the FNSB will sell additional land and that the Goldstream area will undoubtedly see related development. However, people choose to live in Goldstream because of a balance between access to town and life in a somewhat rural environment. Planning roads that crisscross the area is inconsistent with the Goldstream lifestyle as it exists today and likely will exist well into the future, and encroachment of these roads into or near existing hiking trails would negatively impact the extensive recreational use by local residents as well as large numbers of hikers who come from around the borough to use the Cranberry Trail and O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail systems. Some detailed comments follow:</p> <p>3. The number of north/south connectors between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road (e.g., 209, 262, 372, 273) seems like big-time overkill. While having a road plan to support anticipated land sales and subdivision development is a good thing, this road plan looks like a shotgun approach to planning roads everywhere so that any imaginable land disposal would have road access. A better approach would be to identify the most favorable sites for land disposals and then come up with a road plan to support those priorities.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p> <p>The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately.</p>
273	10/21	email	Eleanor	Boyce		<p>Moose Mtn road can't sustain the level of traffic it already gets. Added traffic would create dust, washboard, noise problems. Would road become borough maintained? Already the road service maintenance is inadequate (poor response times, sometimes poor quality grading, etc.). If road gets more traffic, existing road service area taxed residents should not be on the hook for increased road maintenance requirements. Same comment applies to Monteverde north. Road corridor lies directly on top of an extremely popular multi-use recreational trail extending from top of Moose Mtn all the way to Old Murphy Dome road. Trail includes multiple steep hills where grade is not suitable to vehicle traffic. Road corridor extends from end of Monteverde and forest type quickly changes from birch forest to black spruce / permafrost as you round the northeast shoulder of the hill. Proposed road corridor crosses permafrost slope on the contour which seems very problematic for road construction without major disruption to stable permafrost. Road will be expensive to maintain.</p> <p>Road also crosses existing recreation trails and old trapline trail. Road is incorrectly proposed as minor collector. If constructed, I would expect it to be heavily used by traffic from Old Murphy Dome neighborhoods who currently drive via Fox. Old Murphy Dome Road between McCall and Hattie Creek is incorrectly labeled as a major collector. This stretch of Old Murphy Dome Rd gets no maintenance outside of infrequent grading and repair for wildfire response activities and powerline access. It is not plowed in the winter. It would be more properly classified as a proposed major collector, since it currently doesn't function or receive maintenance that are consistent with an active major collector.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p> <p>The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately.</p>
273	10/21		Jill	O'Brien		<p>Message: I oppose the planned roads #273 and #372. These roads would completely interrupt existing recreational trails. Road number 273 and 372 would not provide any advantage for people living at either end and they pass through land not fit for building with steep terrain. Instead of improving the area it would diminish its value to borough residents.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p>
273	10/21		Kris	Howk		<p>Message: I strongly disagree for the 273 plan off of Monteverde Road as it impacts my home and peace of mind.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p>
273	10/21		Charlotte	LaRue		<p>No to 273. Please do not turn the public use trail on Corridor number 01N 02W, proposed road Minor Collector 273, into a public use road. There is already Monteverde Road that runs parallel to this proposed road which is sufficient to meet your goals. I live here and would be sandwiched between two roads, which would be detrimental to my property and lifestyle.</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p>
273	10/21		Andy	Mahoney		<p>This proposed road follows the route of a popular recreation trail, the Moose Ridge Trail. Continued access to the Moose Ridge Trail was a stipulation when the Moose Mountain Subdivision was developed. The development of this trail into a "minor collector" road would significantly diminish the recreational use of the trail, which includes hiking, biking, skiing, dog mushing, and snow machining. There are relatively few trails that offer similar access to the hills and, through connected trails, the creeks, and rivers north of Fairbanks. These proposed "minor collector" roads connect the neighborhoods north of Goldstream Valley to Old Murphy Dome road. At their southern ends, they all begin at the end of what are already lengthy neighborhood roads. Any properties accessed from the proposed roads would therefore lie a considerable road distance from any major collector or arterial roads. This not only represents undesirably commute times for residents who may be contributing the FNSB economy but will also contribute to a significantly higher carbon footprint compared with development of other roads better connected to FNSB's road system. Additionally, the development of these roads and any properties along them would add significant additional traffic to these existing neighborhood roads, requiring more maintenance and potentially lowering values of existing properties</p>	<p>Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."</p>

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
273	10/21	web form	Murray	Howk		Message: The 273 Plan extending Monteverde would severely impact the area and our property. Moose Mountain Road is very narrow with steep drop offs and increased traffic on it would create a possible safety hazard for the public and land owners .I strongly disagree with the 273 plan.	Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."
273	10/21	web form	Michael	Obrien		Message: I oppose any proposal to construct roads 273. and 372. This is an area that is either too steep, too swampy, or too shaded for any development. Even if construction was possible on these lots, it would be of little value and no tax value. Thousands of borough residents recreate in these areas (when they are not too swampy) and this recreational use's value far outweighs any potential tax value. Please do not pursue development of these areas.	Corridors 273 and 372 were both in the 1991 Roads Plan. Several corridors in the area have been constructed since the 1991 Plan, including Monteverde Road and Meribel Road. Both proposed corridors provide secondary egress from the Moose Mountain neighborhood that currently has a single access point (Moose Mountain Road). Fire protection best practices indicate that a neighborhood with more than 100 residences should have at least two points of egress.
273	10/21	web form	Sarah	Trainor		<p>Thank you so much for the opportunity to comment on the draft plan.</p> <p>My comments specifically related to proposed minor collector road 273 on maps 01N 02W and 02N 02W.</p> <p>First, nowhere in the Full Plan could I find a definition of what the proposed classifications mean. What are the current and future on-the-ground, practical implications for "major collector" and "minor collector" designations? The final plan should include these definitions and people providing comment should have access to them.</p> <p>What your map designates as "minor collector" #273 is a multi-use recreation trail that has high recreation use by many people, including families, from throughout the borough as well as the neighborhood. Especially in the winter, this trail sees high recreation use for skiing, snow shoeing, dog mushing, and snow-machining. It also sees high recreation use in the summer by hikers, runners, and mountain bikers. This high recreation value conflicts with designating this trail as a road corridor.</p> <p>As a multi-use trail with high recreational value, this trail is an asset that will increase the property value of any future development. Starting near Moose Mountain Road, the trail ascends to near the top of Moose Mountain and runs along a ridge. If parcels in the vicinity were to be developed, their road access should be from the valley floor.</p> <p>Thank you again for the opportunity to comment.</p> <p>Respectfully, Sarah Trainor</p>	Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."
278	10/20	web form	Dana	Platta		Message: I am opposed to the proposed 278 corridor from Meyeres to Gilmore. Unless there are significant improvements to Meyeres, increased traffic would be a significant safety concern due to the blind curve. There currently is not sufficient traffic in the area to require this addition. Since the land to the north of Eastside /High Grade is BLM land, as I understand, there will not be additional residences constructed in the west side of this proposed connector.	Corridor 278 would only be developed if the DNR and Alaska Mental Health Trust parcels that it crosses are subdivided in the future. The purpose of the corridor would be to provide legal access to the new lots that would be created through those subdivisions. Corridor 278 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The first 766 feet of Flat Rabbit from Gilmore Trail is a platted road. There is a 60' wide roadway and utility easement that extends from the end of Flat Rabbit to the edge of the subdivision (providing access to the 300 acre Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority parcel).
278	10/4	Web form	Ken	Sather		The proposed road #278 on the roads plan is a 25' easement dedicated to only those occupying the sections granted by the easement. I've spoken with all the affected parties and we are adamantly opposed to the proposed corridor. The proposed road does not appear to serve any useful purpose than to open access to our homes by the desperate, drug addicted or criminal elements of the borough. Please do not proceed with the plan. Thank you	Corridor 278 would only be developed if the DNR and Alaska Mental Health Trust parcels that it crosses are subdivided in the future. The purpose of the corridor would be to provide legal access to the new lots that would be created through those subdivisions. Corridor 278 was in the 1991 Plan and the 2006 update. The first 766 feet of Flat Rabbit from Gilmore Trail is a platted road. There is a 60' wide roadway and utility easement that extends from the end of Flat Rabbit to the edge of the subdivision (providing access to the 300 acre Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority parcel).
279	10/20		Christin	Swearingen		I live on Quakenbush and would like to see improved foot trails in my area so that I can view the huge old spruce trees, but know firsthand that the hill is steep and prone to erosion. Please don't cut any of the very old trees. Thanks!	Tree clearing for road construction would be determined by the developer/contractor at the time of construction.
287	10/17	email	Lili	Misel		This current trail runs down into very swampy permafrost and would not serve any purpose other than taking out a trail access to the Eldorado Creek Trail system.	Corridor 287 was in the 1991 Roads Plan as well as the 2006 Plan update. The corridor traverses generally well-drained soils and higher elevation terrain. Corridor 287 provides access to University of Alaska land that is highly desirable for development (higher elevations, south-facing slopes, easy access from Goldstream Road). Molly Road was platted with a stub for this corridor.
293	10/19	email	Susan			These road corridors seem unnecessary and undesirable. The pressure for development of these areas is not really there so these corridors are not warranted. The impacts to the neighborhood and neighborhood roads would be incredibly negative.	Corridor 293 appeared in the 1991 Roads Plan and 2006 update. It would only be developed if and when the large parcels it crosses subdivide to provide legal access to the newly created lots.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
293	10/20	web form	Paul	Reichardt		<p>Message: My comments are about portions of the road plan shown on maps 01N02W, 02N02W, and 02N01W. I live in the area shown on 01N02W.</p> <p>Fundamentally, it seems to me that these portions of the road plan are totally disconnected from borough plans related to recreation and, in particular, trails. I understand that, assuming the population of the Fairbanks area grows, the FNSB will sell additional land and that the Goldstream area will undoubtedly see related development. However, people choose to live in Goldstream because of a balance between access to town and life in a somewhat rural environment. Planning roads that crisscross the area is inconsistent with the Goldstream lifestyle as it exists today and likely will exist well into the future, and encroachment of these roads into or near existing hiking trails would negatively impact the extensive recreational use by local residents as well as large numbers of hikers who come from around the borough to use the Cranberry Trail and O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail systems. Some detailed comments follow:</p> <p>2. Corridors 15 and 293 are unnecessary redundancies in that the 15/Pandora Drive connection would on its own lead to the proposed 293 corridor.</p>	Corridor 293 appeared in the 1991 Roads Plan and 2006 update. It would only be developed if and when the large parcels it crosses subdivide to provide legal access to the newly created lots. Two other north-south corridors from the 1991 Roads Plan were removed (Corridors 16 and 17) immediately to the west of Corridor 293 due to redundancy.
293	10/20		Inna	Rivkin		<p>I live on Toboggan Lane off Goldstream, and as someone with MCS (Multiple Chemical Sensitivities) who is quite sensitive to car exhaust and pollution, very much appreciate and treasure the nearby trails that allow exercise in clean air away from roads, as do many others in our community for whom such trails are critical for health, wellness, and wellbeing. I am concerned with #15, #217, and #209, and was wondered how they will impact our privately maintained non-through drive Toboggan Lane, the cranberry trail in that area, and the trail from Waterford / Molly which is used and treasured by many outdoor recreators myself included. Could you please clarify the impacts and plans. Unfortunately most of the smaller roads are not labeled on the plan making it difficult to ascertain, but it looks like it's right on the trails! I am concerned the quality of mine and my neighbors' lives and health will be adversely affected. Also, are 293 and 262 on the broken sled trail? Thanks,</p>	Corridor 293 appeared in the 1991 Roads Plan and 2006 update. It would only be developed if and when the large parcels it crosses subdivide to provide legal access to the newly created lots. Two other north-south corridors from the 1991 Roads Plan were removed (Corridors 16 and 17) immediately to the west of Corridor 293 due to redundancy. Corridor 293 runs adjacent to the proposed Upper Eldorado Creek Trails for a portion of the connection. The FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes have been coordinated to appropriately plan for shared road/trail corridors where trail impacts can be mitigated.
293	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>6. As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>•New and existing proposed road corridors north of the Goldstream Valley, chiefly 15, 293, 262, 4, 209 could have significant conflict with recreational trails. I think developing this area would be a mistake for the Borough and would lead to a loss in wildlands and trails and would also negatively contribute to the urban sprawl of Fairbanks.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	Corridor 293 appeared in the 1991 Roads Plan and 2006 update. It would only be developed if and when the large parcels it crosses subdivide to provide legal access to the newly created lots. Two other north-south corridors from the 1991 Roads Plan were removed (Corridors 16 and 17) immediately to the west of Corridor 293 due to redundancy. Corridor 293 runs adjacent to the proposed Upper Eldorado Creek Trails for a portion of the connection. The FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes have been coordinated to appropriately plan for shared road/trail corridors where trail impacts can be mitigated.
293	10/21		Margaret	Mannix		<p>Message: I am responding in particular to Routes 15, 217 and 293/262. These proposed roads directly impact the numerous trails that exist there and are mostly multi use trails and heavily used. I have provided input on the Comprehensive Trail use process and am very surprised that neither of these projects seem to reflect the other. At least there are no references in the proposals. Protecting trail use is future thinking and new roads should accommodate existing trails.</p> <p>I see no point in Route 15, and I hope that private property is respected.</p>	Corridor 293 appeared in the 1991 Roads Plan and 2006 update. It would only be developed if and when the large parcels it crosses subdivide to provide legal access to the newly created lots. Two other north-south corridors from the 1991 Roads Plan were removed (Corridors 16 and 17) immediately to the west of Corridor 293 due to redundancy. Corridor 293 runs adjacent to the proposed Upper Eldorado Creek Trails for a portion of the connection. The FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes have been coordinated to appropriately plan for shared road/trail corridors where trail impacts can be mitigated.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	10/17	web form	Elizabeth	Belnap		<p>We oppose Corridor 295. We dispute the project team's findings (numbered) in the bulleted points below each finding.</p> <p>Finding: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The only section of Corridor 295 that runs on the ridge is the existing Hafele Avenue. -Vegetation along Lawlor Road and the eastern, unconstructed portion of the corridor is black spruce, willow, and alder, typical of poorly drained soils overlying permafrost. -The entire area is underlain by a thick section of thawing/permafrost loess as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Two bore holes, drilled in 1994 at 2635 Hafele Avenue, that encountered frozen loess with 29-40% moisture from 25 to 50-foot depths. -A rapidly developing sinkhole adjacent to the presently constructed road at 2597 Hafele Avenue. The homeowner filled the hole in the summer of 2022. -Accelerating development of sinkholes and surface topography changes on the Mayo hay field (Tract A, Wild Rose Acres) adjacent to the proposed corridor. -Year-round standing water on both sides of the east-west segment of Lawlor Road adjacent to Lots A and B Reeves Subdivision. A portion of existing Lawlor Road is north of the end of state maintenance; it contains an 800-foot long, steep north-facing grade ending in a right-angle turn to the very wet and rough westward terminus of Lawlor Road. <p>Finding: The corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Existing subdivision(s)", perhaps referring to Birkebakke and Hafele Subdivisions, are sufficiently served by Hafele Avenue. The proposed corridor provides no value to subdivision residents. Not a single subdivision resident has spoken in favor of the proposed corridor. -Wildfire danger: Corridor 295 east of Hafele Avenue is dense black spruce forest, providing explosive wildfire fuels, and would have little value as an egress route during a wildfire event. -Ice on snow events: The steep north-facing section of presently constructed Lawlor Road is patently unsafe during ice on snow events, especially with the right angle turn at the bottom of the hill. It does not provide a safe alternate route for subdivision residents during extreme winter weather. <p>Finding: The corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -See comments on ingress/egress above. -Hafele Avenue is maintained by Our Road Service District. Lawlor Road north of the end of state maintenance is not in a service district. Property owners in Our Road Service District would be strongly opposed to annexing new construction and the substandard existing Lawlor Road into our service district. -As stated above, Lawlor Road and the unconstructed portion of Corridor 295 is on unstable, poorly drained permafrost and would add a substantial maintenance burden on Our Road Service District. -The remaining four parcels bordering the corridor to be developed are owned by different individuals, and zoned RE-4 or RA-4. Subdividing all four parcels would result in only 11 parcels of primarily poorly drained soils overlying permafrost. -Lawlor Road is substandard; it is maintained below the level of a pioneer road. Hafele Avenue is constructed to pioneer road standard. Development of Corridor 295 would be presumed to require an upgrade of the entire corridor to at least secondary connector. -Based on the number and value of new land parcels to be developed, it is financially unfeasible to build the connecting road. <p>Finding: Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -At the western end of the corridor, EMS access is provided by Hafele Avenue, which is well maintained by Our Road Service District. -At the eastern end of the corridor, EMS access is poor along Lawlor Road due to lack of maintenance by landowners and lack of participation in a Road Service District. In addition, each end of the corridor is served by different EMS providers. The east end is served by the University FSD, and the west end is served by Chena-Goldstream. <p>Finding: An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Stated compound curve is only one ROW wide and is at the crest of the corridor; westward traffic would accelerate for the 1200 feet downhill from the crest to the stop sign at Line Drive. <p>In summary, any connector road constructed on this corridor would be expensive to construct, expensive to maintain, and supports a very small number of new parcels. Thus Corridor 295 should be removed from the borough plan.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/17	web form	Tait	Chandler		<p>I would like to call attention to the proposed roads listed below. If these roads are built, I hope that the existing recreational trails are preserved and a vegetative buffer remains between the road and the existing trail. Thank you.</p> <p>--Road/routes 295 and 64 may conflict with trails in the Goldstream Valley.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/13	web form	Kristen	Eckwright		<p>I am strongly against roads 295 and 64 being developed. We chose to live in these areas to have a quiet neighborhood and without traffic. I chose to live on Miller Hill Road to have direct access to trails in a quiet neighborhood.</p> <p>Why not use the money to better maintain the goldstream roads and Ballaine road?</p> <p>Having a main road go through Miller hill road to Miller hill extension will have devastating effects to the neighborhood, the public use winter trails, and to the wetland and wildlife areas. There will be more accidents due to wildlife crossing more roadways. Having another high trafficked road going through a heavily permafrosted area is only going to create more problems.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	10/17	web form	Lawrence	Freeman		<p>We oppose Corridor 295. We dispute the project team's findings (numbered) in the bulleted points below each finding.</p> <p>Finding: Corridor 295 is feasible to construct based on topography and soils, primarily runs along ridge</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The only section of Corridor 295 that runs on the ridge is the existing Hafele Avenue. -Vegetation along Lawlor Road and the eastern, unconstructed portion of the corridor is black spruce, willow, and alder, typical of poorly drained soils overlying permafrost. -The entire area is underlain by a thick section of thawing/permafrost loess as evidenced by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Two bore holes, drilled in 1994 at 2635 Hafele Avenue, that encountered frozen loess with 29-40% moisture from 25 to 50-foot depths. -A rapidly developing sinkhole adjacent to the presently constructed road at 2597 Hafele Avenue. The homeowner filled the hole in the summer of 2022. -Accelerating development of sinkholes and surface topography changes on the Mayo hay field (Tract A, Wild Rose Acres) adjacent to the proposed corridor. -Year-round standing water on both sides of the east-west segment of Lawlor Road adjacent to Lots A and B Reeves Subdivision. -A portion of existing Lawlor Road is north of the end of state maintenance; it contains an 800-foot long, steep north-facing grade ending in a right-angle turn to the very wet and rough westward terminus of Lawlor Road. <p>Finding: The corridor provides another point of ingress/egress to the existing subdivision in case of emergencies such as wildfire, downed trees, blocked roads, etc.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -"Existing subdivision(s)", perhaps referring to Birkebakke and Hafele Subdivisions, are sufficiently served by Hafele Avenue. The proposed corridor provides no value to subdivision residents. Not a single subdivision resident has spoken in favor of the proposed corridor. -Wildfire danger: Corridor 295 east of Hafele Avenue is dense black spruce forest, providing explosive wildfire fuels, and would have little value as an egress route during a wildfire event. -Ice on snow events: The steep north-facing section of presently constructed Lawlor Road is patently unsafe during ice on snow events, especially with the right angle turn at the bottom of the hill. It does not provide a safe alternate route for subdivision residents during extreme winter weather. 	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
						<p>Finding: The corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -See comments on ingress/egress above. -Hafele Avenue is maintained by Our Road Service District. Lawlor Road north of the end of state maintenance is not in a service district. Property owners in Our Road Service District would be strongly opposed to annexing new construction and the substandard existing Lawlor Road into our service district. -As stated above, Lawlor Road and the unconstructed portion of Corridor 295 is on unstable, poorly drained permafrost and would add a substantial maintenance burden on Our Road Service District. -The remaining four parcels bordering the corridor to be developed are owned by different individuals, and zoned RE-4 or RA-4. Subdividing all four parcels would result in only 11 parcels of primarily poorly drained soils overlying permafrost. -Lawlor Road is substandard; it is maintained below the level of a pioneer road. Hafele Avenue is constructed to pioneer road standard. <p>Development of Corridor 295 would be presumed to require an upgrade of the entire corridor to at least secondary connector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Based on the number and value of new land parcels to be developed, it is financially unfeasible to build the connecting road. <p>Finding: Including the corridor in the Roads Plan provides a potential path for upgrading the road to borough standards and improving EMS access</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -At the western end of the corridor, EMS access is provided by Hafele Avenue, which is well maintained by Our Road Service District. -At the eastern end of the corridor, EMS access is poor along Lawlor Road due to lack of maintenance by landowners and lack of participation in a Road Service District. -In addition, each end of the corridor is served by different EMS providers. The east end is served by the University FSD, and the west end is served by Chena-Goldstream. 	
						<p>Finding: An existing compound curve at Hafele cul-du-sac would likely require lowered speeds on the constructed road, which could provide traffic calming benefits...</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Stated compound curve is only one ROW wide and is at the crest of the corridor; westward traffic would accelerate for the 1200 feet downhill from the crest to the stop sign at Line Drive. <p>In summary, any connector road constructed on this corridor would be expensive to construct, expensive to maintain, and supports a very small number of new parcels. Thus Corridor 295 should be removed from the borough plan.</p>	
295	9/24	Web form	Terrance	Gacke		<p>Could you please send me the link to the most current Steering Committee meeting that discusses corridors 295 & 69. The ones list are in 2021. Please update the Resources page so the public can see the discussion that lead to this flawed decision regarding 295. Thank you.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/12	Email	April	Monroe	Tanana Chiefs	<p>Hi Donald,</p> <p>I am have received this evening from a colleague a copy of the proposed road corridor 295. Given its proximity to lands I own and manage I am so disturbed to be just now seeing this. When is the public comment period and how/where may we submit comments? When and where are any public meetings which we can attend to voice opposition?</p> <p>Thank you. April</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	10/6	Email	Bobbie	Ritchie		<p>It sounds like there is still a possibility of designating Hafele Rd as a through road so I would like to reiterate my previous comments</p> <p>I live on the corner of Black Sheep Lane and Line Drive so corridor 295 will directly affect me for a variety of reasons. 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 Hafele 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 Program.</p> <p>Another big concern of mine, and the property owners on Black Sheep Lane, is the maintenance of that road. 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. Cars using corridor 295 going from East to West or West to East would more than likely want to access Sheep Creek Rd by way of Black Sheep Lane which would very quickly make the road impassable for all of us. Please abandon plans to make Hafele Rd. a through road.</p> <p>Thank you, Bobbie Ritchie</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/19		Bob	Ritchie		<p>Dear Borough Road Planning team,</p> <p>It sounds like there is still a possibility of designating Hafele Rd as a through road, so I would like to record my reasons for opposing this road plan. As background, my wife and I have lived on the corner of Black Sheep Lane and Line Drive for the past 45 years. We were some of the very first who moved into this area. Corridor 295 would directly affect us, our neighbors, and Black Sheep Lane. For the reasons described below I am opposed to an extension of Hafele Road connecting Our Subdivision with roads to the east (Corridor 295).</p> <p>First, although 'the project team suggested removal of this corridor to the project steering committee at its July 27, 2022 meeting, the 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.' Justifications for this closer look included the feasibility 'to construct based on topography and soils', afforded by a ridgeline position of the corridor. Really only a portion of the road corridor occurs on suitable soils on a ridge, as most of the corridor is on the north side with poorly drained soils. Conditions suggest that this could be another poorly constructed road, impacted even more by changing climatic conditions and permafrost melting. For a closer look at local melt, Lawler Field is currently going through thaw/sink phenomena even after years of clearing and settling.</p> <p>Justifications also referenced that 'the corridor provides beneficial connectivity to the area as it continues to develop with just a few additional subdivisions'. I am afraid that any road plan might increase interest in subdividing properties and continuing to build on less suitable lands for housing. A 'build it and they will come (or go)' strategy is not a good one for sustainable roads and communities.</p> <p>In addition, if the road is constructed it will be the logical route for regular traffic from residential properties east of Our Subdivision (Line Drive, Home Run, Black Sheep Lane) to Sheep Creek Road and Goldstream Valley. Currently, we are effectively a community of cul de sacs or road ends, which reduce overall through traffic; that feature supports more sustainable use of our current, sometimes sensitive, roads. Additional traffic and wear on the roads from vehicles originating in eastern areas would exacerbate wear and reduce an important community feature: current lower traffic levels accommodates road use by families such as safe walking, jogging, and biking. I suspect that increased use could hinder this neighborhood quality.</p> <p>As my wife has reported in her letter, I'm particularly concerned about the maintenance of Black Sheep Lane. Black Sheep Lane is a private road and being a private road, road service money is not used for either maintenance or road improvements. Because of thawing and drainage issues along this road, it can be impassable in spring and early summer. In some years, we block access during the spring break-up. Although adjacent neighbors have helped with some upkeep and respect its private status and short periods of closure, the added burden to improve the road for those of us living on Black Sheep Lane, would be prohibitive if more traffic were regularly using the road. Importantly, cars using corridor 295 going from East to West or West to East would more than likely want to access Sheep Creek Rd by way of Black Sheep Lane.</p> <p>In summary, I respect your efforts to plan and improve the road system for rural Borough residents. However, I don't feel that Corridor 295 is a good candidate for a road extension and I oppose including it as a potential roadway in any future plans.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	10/12	Email	Sidney	Stephens		<p>I appreciate the responsiveness of the FNSB planners who recently met on-site with home owners who would be negatively affected by the creation of this corridor. After talking with us, reviewing the map, and walking the proposed route, I hope that the planners better understand the basis of our objections to this corridor and are convinced that it should be deleted from the current plan because: it is neither feasible nor desirable; would unduly impact current Hafele and Line Drive residents without benefitting us at all; and because other options could be employed to accomplish the stated goals.</p> <p>The FNSB Justification for inclusion of Corridor 295 listed several feasibility findings which I dispute as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The corridor does not run primarily along a ridge, but on the north slope of a ridge with attendant unstable soil, potential permafrost/ice lenses, and drainage issues making road construction unfeasible. 2. The proposed corridor does indeed directly conflict with the Equinox Marathon Trail as it runs directly along it. 3. Emergency access to the Line Drive community already exists via Line Drive and Black Sheep so additional access via Corridor 295 is redundant and not needed. Furthermore, extension of Hafele Road would require likely road expansion, increase traffic on existing roads, and increase our road maintenance costs. This would unduly impact current residents in terms of cost, traffic, noise and privacy. 4. Emergency access to the east for the Lawlor Road Extension residents could be accomplished by two other options without impacting the existing Hafele Road. Those options are simply running the corridor directly east from Lawlor Road to Miller Hill, or accessing Miller Hill via Fox Hollow. Additionally, since a major reason for proposing this corridor is to create better access for existing residents along Lawlor Extension, the first and easiest thing to do would be for those home owners to fix their lousy and substandard road so emergency vehicles don't get stuck. <p>And finally, while I understand the goal of this plan to clean up and standardize roads and easements for the future, it seems unconscionable to propose this corridor, that will negatively</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/12	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>Trail advocates should speak up in defense of trails regarding the Fairbanks North Star Borough Comprehensive Roads Plan Update. Comments must be submitted by October 21.</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/</p> <p>Several residents have expressed concern about some of the proposed roads in the plan conflicting with trails. The plan does not automatically mean that the roads will be built and that the trails will be lost. And roads and trails can coexist along the same corridors. However, this is a good time for trail advocates to speak up and let officials know that they want trails protected if a road is built along the same corridor (preferably with at least some vegetative buffer).</p> <p>General comments are fine, but it is better to speak specifically about which road corridors and trails you are concerned about. Below are several specifics. I'm sure I've missed some. Take a look at the plan and make comments if you have concerns about a trail. See maps here:</p> <p>https://fnsbroadsplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/09/09-22-22_FNSB-Roads-Plan_Public-Review-Draft_MAPS-ONLY.pdf</p> <p>--Road/routes 295 and 64 may conflict with trails in the Goldstream Valley.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/15	Email	Eric	Troyer		<p>In general, I am very pleased with the plan. As a long-time resident of the borough, I am glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope.</p> <p>As an avid trail user and non-motorized user, I am glad to see both trails and non-motorized use taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both trails and non-motorized transportation in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment.</p> <p>Many of the proposed roads in the plan would run along corridors already in use by popular trails, some in the FNSB Comprehensive Recreational Trail Plan and some not. Examples include:</p> <p>--Road/routes 295 and 64 may conflict with trails in the Goldstream Valley.</p> <p>Wherever possible I would like to see these trails preserved if a road is built along the same corridor. Further, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration and your hard work on this important project.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/17	web form	Lynn	Wages		<p>I have read most of the comments regarding corridor 295, as you know they are overwhelmingly opposed to this proposal. All the reasoning is sound but I don't need to repeat it. My additional concern is for increasing traffic on Black Sheep lane where I live. This is a narrow road that is not officially part of "our service area" it is privately maintained (plowing, grading, gravel) increasing traffic would further increase the financial burden carried by a few families. A larger concern is for the safety of traffic entering and exiting Black Sheep onto Sheep Creek road- this is on an S curve with very limited line of sight in both directions. We do not use it for this reason, it is an accident waiting to happen. I believe this "short cut" will bring increased traffic and increased danger to our quiet residential road. Black Sheep road is part of the equinox trail and is used frequently by runners, hikers, bikers and many local families. Increasing traffic on this road has much burden, many risks and no benefit to local residents. Please listen to the majority of comments opposing this project.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	10/20	email	T.L.	Gacke		<p>Greetings again Shelly, and all,</p> <p>Thanks for posting that July 27, 2022 advisory meeting discussion and notes, and thanks to Natalie, Patrick, Don and George for coming out to the 295 corridor site. I hope some of the corridor issues of concern were apparent to all of you planners and will be reflected in the amended draft plan moving forward.</p> <p>My concerns are in the rationale used to include corridor 295.</p> <p>1.)Topography/Soils: I feel the "ridge issue" was obvious. The proposed corridor runs no where near the ridge and the "primarily runs along ridge" statement does not accurately describe the topography of the proposed corridor. The "issues with poor soils" was detailed in the July meeting but was included as positive feasibility issue in the rationale. Poor soils make poor roads.</p> <p>2.)Conflict w/GVEA and Equinox: The proposed corridor would definitely conflict with the GVEA guy wires that currently conflict with the trail. All that infrastructure would have to get moved. There is no legal Equinox trail easement through that proposed area. The trail currently uses the state road easement on Lawlor and as that ends there is no easement along the North boundary of Moving Free Horse Farm. So there is plenty of conflicts with the Trail that would have to get sorted out.</p> <p>3.)Ingress/Egress/Connectivity: We currently have good access. The parcels in this area are "not likely to be developed" according to the July meeting bullet points. There are only about 4 parcels that could be developed along the corridor and thus the road development costs would be astronomical.</p> <p>4.)Access/EMS/Essential services : Red Herring Issue. The residents at the eastern end of the proposed corridor should have thought about access/EMS and other essential services before buying some of the cheapest most permafrost laden land, in the FNSBorough, which is on the north side of a ridge with poor roads and poor soils to build roads on. They had a choice where to buy land and now the advisory committee is trying to include that access issue as an excuse for extending Hafele.</p> <p>5.)Hafele cul-du-sac: Another Red Herring Issue. A compound curve would not lower the speeds of the hundreds of cars that would be trying to save 5 minutes by using Hafele instead of going down Miller Hill on their way out to Goldstream and thus would not alleviate concerns about additional traffic.</p> <p>6.)"Remnant of '91 plan". This is False. Hafele was never on the "91 plan nor the 2006 plan update. This is first time, in 2021, this has ever been proposed. I've lived here since '91 and never would have purchased land here if I knew that there was a proposed road extension corridor here.</p> <p>7.)Advisory Committee comments: Questions about is there "clear criteria" to remove this corridor or is this "only based on public comments not wanting a road there?" Do the committee members read the submitted comments or just get a overview from the project team? If they had read the comments they would see that many of the issues regarding, topography, soils, access, subdividing, and additional traffic, as well as quality of life issues, were articulated by various members of the public and should have been considered by the committee. Who is steering the Steering Committee ? Also, I noticed that 14 out of the 27 committee members were not present for this July 27th meeting. Is there no type of quorum for this group ? That's a poor representation of a committee that is supposed to represent all residents of the borough. Are the steering committee members compensated for their time or only volunteers?</p> <p>Thanks again for the opportunity to comment on this and I look forward to getting a response from someone regarding my committee questions, and to the next phase of the hearing process.</p> <p>Is there any way to listen in on the October 26 meeting?</p> <p>Thanks again, Cheers,</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/20	email	Sven	Grage		<p>Dear Project Team Members; Fairbanks, Oct.20, 2022</p> <p>We, Laura and Sven Grage, are writing to you in response to retaining proposed road corridor #295 in the draft corridor map. We reside on Birkebakke Lot 2A and own Lot 2B.</p> <p>In this feedback we will specifically respond to the steering committee suggestions and the project teams rationale to retain corridor #295 in the corridor map. Below we will also attach our previous input, because the arguments presented in it are valid and make the proposed corridor an inadequate choice. Rationale for keeping #295: 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).</p> <p>Response: Whereas it is, in theory, feasible to construct a road from an engineering perspective (almost any road construction is feasible these days), economic feasibility is highly in question. Particularly the east end of the corridor presents significant challenges, as observed during an on site visit with members of the project team. The statement that a construction would not be in conflict with utility and trail easements could also not be completely supported during the on-site visit.</p> <p>Rationale for keeping #295: 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); 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.</p> <p>Response: The existing subdivision to the west already has two access points (Line Dr. and Black Sheep). In addition, for emergency purposes, an existing landing strip along Hafele Ave. and the Mayo hayfield with direct access to Hay Way/Line could be used in case of an emergency. As for the lots on the east side of the proposed corridor, road improvements of the existing private roads (Lawlor and Fox Hollow) will serve a much more immediate and tangible solution to emergency access. Connecting Lawlor with Fox Hollow would furthermore increase ingress/egress to the existing lots east of the proposed corridor.</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
						<p>Rationale for keeping #295: 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);</p> <p>Response: The development potential of the immediate area, and therefore the "beneficial connectivity" along the proposed corridor is very limited! It appears to be as few as three lots hold the potential for additional subdividing due RE-4 zoning. The economic benefit from this is in no relation to the high costs of road construction and maintenance under the given circumstances. Additionally, the proposed road corridor would be within 50 to 100 feet of any somewhat suitable patches for constructing a residence. Further limiting any already subpar potential for development - as we have observed with our Lot 2-B after publication of the draft corridor map. Finally, another significant hindrance regarding further subdividing along the corridor is the fact that we are in the process of conveying Birkebakke Lot 2-B into a conservation easement and therefore cannot be subdivided anytime in the future.</p> <p>Rationale for keeping #295: 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> <p>Response: The "existing compound curve" most definitely does not alleviate any of the concerns voiced by the residents! The presumed increase in through traffic will have a serious impact on the neighborhood, compound curve or not. (While a "compound curve" might encourage some to slow down, others will navigate it as fast as possible). N/A In the event of an extension of Hafele Ave., the existing part of Hafele Ave. would have to be widened to a "minor collector road" for which the existing road easement is not sufficient. Extending the easement to the necessary width adds another significant obstacle to the proposed corridor.</p> <p>Conclusion: While we do understand the necessity for a Comprehensive Roads Plan, we do urge you to remove the proposed corridor #295 from the plan. We believe the reasons listed in this response strongly support our request. We see a compelling imbalance between potential advantages for the community as a whole and many concrete negative impacts to an entire neighborhood, as reflected in the numerous and unanimous responses. Lastly, we'd like to add that keeping the questionable option of a future road in the plan might potentially delay the needed improvements on the bottom of Lawlor. We are convinced that removing proposed corridor #295 is the more realistic and honest decision.</p> <p>Many regards,</p>	
295	10/20	email	Laura	Grage		<p>Dear Project Team Members; Fairbanks, Oct.20, 2022</p> <p>We, Laura and Sven Grage, are writing to you in response to retaining proposed road corridor #295 in the draft corridor map. We reside on Birkebakke Lot 2A and own Lot 2B.</p> <p>In this feedback we will specifically respond to the steering committee suggestions and the project teams rationale to retain corridor #295 in the corridor map. Below we will also attach our previous input, because the arguments presented in it are valid and make the proposed corridor an inadequate choice. Rationale for keeping #295: 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);</p> <p>Response: Whereas it is, in theory, feasible to construct a road from an engineering perspective (almost any road construction is feasible these days), economic feasibility is highly in question. Particularly the east end of the corridor presents significant challenges, as observed during an on site visit with members of the project team. The statement that a construction would not be in conflict with utility and trail easements could also not be completely supported during the on-site visit.</p> <p>Rationale for keeping #295: 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); 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.</p> <p>Response: The existing subdivision to the west already has two access points (Line Dr. and Black Sheep). In addition, for emergency purposes, an existing landing strip along Hafele Ave. and the Mayo hayfield with direct access to Hay Way/Line could be used in case of an emergency. As for the lots on the east side of the proposed corridor, road improvements of the existing private roads (Lawlor and Fox Hollow) will serve a much more immediate and tangible solution to emergency access. Connecting Lawlor with Fox Hollow would furthermore increase ingress/egress to the existing lots east of the proposed corridor.</p> <p>Rationale for keeping #295: 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);</p> <p>Response: The development potential of the immediate area, and therefore the "beneficial connectivity" along the proposed corridor is very limited! It appears to be as few as three lots hold the potential for additional subdividing due RE-4 zoning. The economic benefit from this is in no relation to the high costs of road construction and maintenance under the given circumstances. Additionally, the proposed road corridor would be within 50 to 100 feet of any somewhat suitable patches for constructing a residence. Further limiting any already subpar potential for development - as we have observed with our Lot 2-B after publication of the draft corridor map. Finally, another significant hindrance regarding further subdividing along the corridor is the fact that we are in the process of conveying Birkebakke Lot 2-B into a conservation easement and therefore cannot be subdivided anytime in the future.</p> <p>Rationale for keeping #295: 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> <p>Response: The "existing compound curve" most definitely does not alleviate any of the concerns voiced by the residents! The presumed increase in through traffic will have a serious impact on the neighborhood, compound curve or not. (While a "compound curve" might encourage some to slow down, others will navigate it as fast as possible). N/A In the event of an extension of Hafele Ave., the existing part of Hafele Ave. would have to be widened to a "minor collector road" for which the existing road easement is not sufficient. Extending the easement to the necessary width adds another significant obstacle to the proposed corridor.</p> <p>Conclusion: While we do understand the necessity for a Comprehensive Roads Plan, we do urge you to remove the proposed corridor #295 from the plan. We believe the reasons listed in this response strongly support our request. We see a compelling imbalance between potential advantages for the community as a whole and many concrete negative impacts to an entire neighborhood, as reflected in the numerous and unanimous responses. Lastly, we'd like to add that keeping the questionable option of a future road in the plan might potentially delay the needed improvements on the bottom of Lawlor. We are convinced that removing proposed corridor #295 is the more realistic and honest decision.</p> <p>Many regards,</p>	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
295	10/21		William	Stodden		TO: Community planning and FAST planning potential projects review. This is in regard to the Miller Hill, Yankovich Road, and other Sheep Creek Road area proposals, specifically the 295 proposed corridor intended to eventually link Hafele Ave and Lawlor Road. This would facilitate development of land along the south slope of this road link. The target parcels are Mayo's Field and the adjacent horse farm. My concern is the potential of a commercial housing development on these parcels. The surrounding area is Rural Estates II and I hope "quality of life" is a important as "highest and best use" when it comes to community planning. If the benefits of development are higher property taxes and traffic endangering children on our roads local enthusiasm will be lacking. Whatever local road easements are eventually approved, Hay Way and Yankovic Road West should be included so that traffic will be dispersed. This is my input as an adjacent property owner and our service area road commissioner. Our services area will get most traffic resulting from any development. Multiple access routes would ameliorate this issue. On the Miller Hill and Yankovich Road improvements, I'm disappointed that the bike path improvements don't address UAF ski team roller skiing safety issues. They currently share the road with cards and trucks. Sincerely,	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/21	web form				Message: Comment on section 295 connecting Miller hill to line drive. As a resident of lawlor road I disagree with the proposal of pushing a road thru this chunk. The neighborhoods and roads on both sides of the equinox trail wooded section are quiet, have little traffic and most homes are very close to the roads. The impact that making the roads connected on the quality of living in this area would make it un desirable to be here and I would need to move. If emergency vehicles being able to access is the problem. I think many of us here understand that by choosing to live here we will not receive the same emergency services someone on a "thru" road may and we are all alright with that. If it's for allowing the subdivisions to expand perhaps the owners of the lots that are subdividing the lots should pay for the roads, When and if they ever choose to subdivide and gain FNSB approval for the road before they are allowed to subdivide. The lots here are a rapidly changing scene of melting permafrost and sinkholes, to think the lots can be subdivided and built on other than the prime places they already have been is ridiculous. To think that the road could be maintained thru this section without the influx of an unreasonable amount of money to begin to make it able to be driven regularly is foolish. I work in a business of risk versus reward. There is no reward to pushing a road down this section of land The FNSB should focus spending money on repairing and maintaining the vast network of roads they have already let fall into disrepair all summer every summer with sinkholes and rollers ruts and mud, and fail to timely plow, sand, and deal with overflow when necessary in the winter months. If the objective is to just put roads on maps to fill green spaces that are used by recreational users I feel I have made a mistake by becoming a resident of FNSB and will take my income, tax money, and community support somewhere else.	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/21	email	Ali	Fugle		I am writing in opposition of developing these road corridors. Both roads would be prohibitive to residential use of the local recreational trails that are already in existence in the area. Additionally, much of the ground in the Goldstream Valley is permafrost, which would make these roads difficult to maintain, in an area where we already struggle to maintain our current roads. Funding for road development in the Goldstream Valley should be used to fix the many roads already in place that are currently in need of maintenance. Developing these corridors would bring unwanted and unnecessary traffic into these neighborhoods particularly the Line Drive/295 corridor, which also connects to Black Sheep Lane. The intersection of Black Sheep Lane and Sheep Creek Rd. is super dangerous- on a blind corner, with people frequently speeding on Sheep Creek Lane, and it would be negligent and irresponsible of FNSB to funnel more traffic into an already dangerous area.	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		Hello, My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan. Comments: 6.As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained. 3.New and existing proposed road corridors in the Goldstream Valley chiefly 64 and 295 could impact recreational trails and the wild character of the area. Significant efforts have been made in the Goldstream Valley by the public and nonprofits to preserve the ecosystem functionalities of this area. Great care should be taken if these corridors are developed. I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration. Best, Max	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
295	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		295- Page 38 of 56 Miller Hill toward Sheep Creek to Hafele. Testimony didn't support and further development not likely, also complications by conservation easement.	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
310	10/21	web form	Darla	Theisen		Does 310 replace Corridor 44?	Corridor 310 extends Corridor 44 northward to cover constructed Amanita road up to Boreal Heights. This portion does not currently have publicly dedicated right-of-way.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
273	10/21		Andy	Mahoney		These proposed "minor collector" roads connect the neighborhoods north of Goldstream Valley to Old Murphy Dome road. At their southern ends, they all begin at the end of what are already lengthy neighborhood roads. Any properties accessed from the proposed roads would therefore lie a considerable road distance from any major collector or arterial roads. This not only represents undesirably commute times for residents who may be contributing the FNSB economy but will also contribute to a significantly higher carbon footprint compared with development of other roads better connected to FNSB's road system. Additionally, the development of these roads and any properties along them would add significant additional traffic to these existing neighborhood roads, requiring more maintenance and potentially lowering values of existing properties	Corridor 273 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. The Roads Plan does not trigger, direct, or limit development in specific areas. Rather, it directs road siting when landowners do decide to subdivide and develop their land. Corridor 273 follows constructed Moose Mountain Road and then traverses several large FNSB-owned parcels. The Assembly can make decisions about land disposals and development of FNSB lands. The Roads Plan provides longer-range guidance (~20 years time horizon) for siting corridors to develop a functional and connected road network and ensure that all property owners have legal access to their land. If the parcels that Corridor 273 crosses ever subdivide and develop, the new residences on those parcels could be added into an existing service area, bringing in additional funds for road maintenance.
331	10/21	email	Pamela	Miller	President, Arctic Audubon Society	<p><i>NOTE: A PDF attachment to this comment included a map.</i></p> <p>Dear Planners:</p> <p>Arctic Audubon is pleased this September draft Roads Plan removed earlier routes 306 and 385 which would have traversed and directly affected our Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve. Our members, including board members, and the public raised issues concerning these Road routes at the May and June open house meetings, as the Comment Tracker notes,</p> <p>"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."</p> <p>"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."</p> <p>We still have major concerns about Routes 331 which would traverse the beautiful, intact, regional park-quality FNSB parcel of lands and affect our Audubon Riedel Nature Reserve, including newly gifted lands from the Estate of Colleen Herning. The proposed new connector road is proposed from Amanita Road (now route 310) to Esro Road. It would also connect with Route 404 on the FNSB intact parcel, which would also add even more traffic. Therefore, substantial traffic could result through the intact parcel of FNSB lands thereby affecting the quality of the trails and natural values of the FNSB lands and the adjacent Nature Reserve. The FNSB lands have current recreational, wildlife, wetlands, and natural values in their current condition. The integrity of the Riedel trails on these FNSB lands, the trail heads and public access to these existing recreational trails on the FNSB lands needs to be retained and potential impacts evaluated.</p> <p>The proposed Route 331 would depart to the West from the existing Amanita Road about midway N through the FNSB parcel without explanation why that is necessary or upon what factors that route is based. Were wetlands, forests lands, wildlife habitat, winter and summer recreational trail access, nature education, and other existing values of the FNSB lands which would be traversed with additional sources of traffic from Esro Road end addressed? We are concerned that this access may also be used by heavy mining equipment with additional negative impacts.</p> <p>In conclusion, we appreciate removal of routes 306 and 385, but urge more detailed evaluation of Route 331 and how this may increase the level and kinds of uses of Amanita Road in ways with potential negative effects on the natural land qualities of the FNSB intact parcel, and its connected Riedel trails of the Audubon Riedel Reserve.</p> <p>Thank you for this opportunity to comment.</p>	The Roads Plan does not trigger, direct, or limit development in specific areas. Rather, it directs road siting if and when landowners decide to develop their properties. For FNSB-owned parcels, the Assembly has authority to make decisions about land disposals and development of FNSB lands. The Assembly changes often, but the Roads Plan provides a longer range outlook (~20 yrs.) to plan for a logical and connected road network. The absence of Corridor 331 from the Roads Plan would not mean a corridor wouldn't get built on the FNSB parcel were it to subdivide. Rather, the siting of the road would then be determined through the platting process and led by the developer. The Roads Plan allows for a longer-term vision and deeper planning and engineering analysis than otherwise would likely happen during the platting process. Corridor 331 traverses several large privately owned parcels east of ESRO road, one of which has already subdivided resulting in construction of the first portion of the corridor. The corridor provides access to newly subdivided parcels and if ever fully constructed, would address both ESRO and Amanita Rd cul-de-sacs which are longer than FNSB standards allow for sufficient resident and emergency services access.
331	10/21	email	Sarah	Nelson		This corridor connects existing areas from recently subdivided "Moose Bait" Subdivision to Amanita Rd. If there were "lesser of two evils" to choose from for emergency access this would be the corridor over corridor 28 as it crosses more favorable conditions. As stated before I have concerns about increased traffic on these roads and the negative impact of the current residents. As Esro is a private road, residents accept the fact that they have a one way in and one way out road system. This is why I live in the area and understand the risks of living in a rural area. There are many examples of this across the borough and one could make the same argument for Chena Hot Springs Road which only has one way in and out, but making a secondary access route is unreasonable and unnecessary. If the Borough has interest in further developing lands for residential use off of Esro and Amanita they should be in closer coordination with the DNR as they are actively allowing mineral exploration in the area of these communities. Future land use and or development in this area should be addressed in a separate open forum with community members and land management agencies to accurately address what the future development should be to benefit the local communities and Alaska as a whole. There seems to be a general lack of coordination and discussion between the DNR, Borough and Residents and this should occur before setting forth long term road planning for the area.	The Roads Plan does not trigger, direct, or limit development in specific areas. Rather, it directs road siting if and when landowners decide to develop their properties. For FNSB-owned parcels, the Assembly has authority to make decisions about land disposals and development of FNSB lands. The Assembly changes often, but the Roads Plan provides a longer range outlook (~20 yrs.) to plan for a logical and connected road network. The absence of Corridor 331 from the Roads Plan would not mean a corridor wouldn't get built on the FNSB parcel were it to subdivide. Rather, the siting of the road would then be determined through the platting process and led by the developer. The Roads Plan allows for a longer-term vision and deeper planning and engineering analysis than otherwise would likely happen during the platting process. Corridor 331 traverses several large privately owned parcels east of ESRO road, one of which has already subdivided resulting in construction of the first portion of the corridor. The corridor provides access to newly subdivided parcels and if ever fully constructed, would address both ESRO and Amanita Rd cul-de-sacs which are longer than FNSB standards allow for sufficient resident and emergency services access.
331	10/21	email	Sarah	Nelson		This corridor connects existing areas from recently subdivided "Moose Bait" Subdivision to Amanita Rd. If there were "lesser of two evils" to choose from for emergency access this would be the corridor over corridor 28 as it crosses more favorable conditions. As stated before I have concerns about increased traffic on these roads and the negative impact of the current residents. As Esro is a private road, residents accept the fact that they have a one way in and one way out road system. This is why I live in the area and understand the risks of living in a rural area. There are many examples of this across the borough and one could make the same argument for Chena Hot Springs Road which only has one way in and out, but making a secondary access route is unreasonable and unnecessary. If the Borough has interest in further developing lands for residential use off of Esro and Amanita they should be in closer coordination with the DNR as they are actively allowing mineral exploration in the area of these communities. Future land use and or development in this area should be addressed in a separate open forum with community members and land management agencies to accurately address what the future development should be to benefit the local communities and Alaska as a whole. There seems to be a general lack of coordination and discussion between the DNR, Borough and Residents and this should occur before setting forth long term road planning for the area.	The Roads Plan does not trigger, direct, or limit development in specific areas. Rather, it directs road siting if and when landowners decide to develop their properties. For FNSB-owned parcels, the Assembly has authority to make decisions about land disposals and development of FNSB lands. The Assembly changes often, but the Roads Plan provides a longer range outlook (~20 yrs.) to plan for a logical and connected road network. The absence of Corridor 331 from the Roads Plan would not mean a corridor wouldn't get built on the FNSB parcel were it to subdivide. Rather, the siting of the road would then be determined through the platting process and led by the developer. The Roads Plan allows for a longer-term vision and deeper planning and engineering analysis than otherwise would likely happen during the platting process. Corridor 331 traverses several large privately owned parcels east of ESRO road, one of which has already subdivided resulting in construction of the first portion of the corridor. The corridor provides access to newly subdivided parcels and if ever fully constructed, would address both ESRO and Amanita Rd cul-de-sacs which are longer than FNSB standards allow for sufficient resident and emergency services access.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
348	10/21	email	Tom	Duncan		<p>NOTE: This comment has several attachments in its PDF submission.</p> <p>Kellen, Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on these proposed road plans.</p> <p>I have comments on the following areas and have highlighted those on sheet 24 and on the map, see attached.</p> <p>-Most importantly 404 as this proposed ROW directly affects me as there is an easement on my property</p> <p>-331</p> <p>-348</p> <p>348: We would like to know the reason why corridor #348 was suggested or what its purpose is.</p>	Corridor 348 has been removed from the plan.
331	10/21	web form	Darla	Theisen		<p>Message: Thank you for letting us comment though it took me awhile to find the correct comment form to use.</p> <p>For route 331: 331 as shown on the map does not appear to match the description on page 24. This route per the map appears to connect amanita and ESRO and onto Tungsten Trail? not Amanita and Boreal Hts as indicated on the table on page 24.</p> <p>What is the purpose or reasons for extending this road from amanita to ESRO/ Tungsten. Isn't Ero a private road? It would be great to have Tungsten developed so the University could sell their land there.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The corridor description will be corrected on page 24. Corridor 331 traverses several large privately owned parcels east of ESRO road, one of which has already subdivided resulting in construction of the first portion of the corridor. It then extends across the northern portion of a large FNSB-owned parcel to connect with Amanita Rd at the Boreal Heights intersection. The corridor provides access to newly subdivided parcels and if ever fully constructed, would address both ESRO and Amanita Rd cul-de-sacs which are longer than FNSB standards allow for sufficient resident and emergency services access.
337	10/21	email	Jon	Kostohrys		Just a comment/question about the Road Corridor # 337 that connects Buffalo/Mink Roads to, well something to the west, it's not clear, maybe John Cole Rd extension, is the relocated alignment that was agreed upon when the Robertson subdivision was approved. That alignment moved the proposed road corridor from the top to the ridge to the slope break on the north facing side of the ridge (Little Chena Prong). Thanks, Jon & Andy	Corridor 337 realigns Corridor 74 that appeared in the 1991 Roads plan and 2006 maps update to better follow topography and connect with platted unconstructed Robertson Ridge to the west and Mink to the southeast. The corridor follows contour lines along the north side of the ridge before it curves around the summit and turns south for the connection into Mink.
337	10/21	email	Andy	Krumhardt		Just a comment/question about the Road Corridor # 337 that connects Buffalo/Mink Roads to, well something to the west, it's not clear, maybe John Cole Rd extension, is the relocated alignment that was agreed upon when the Robertson subdivision was approved. That alignment moved the proposed road corridor from the top to the ridge to the slope break on the north facing side of the ridge (Little Chena Prong). Thanks, Jon & Andy	Corridor 337 realigns Corridor 74 that appeared in the 1991 Roads plan and 2006 maps update to better follow topography and connect with platted unconstructed Robertson Ridge to the west and Mink to the southeast. The corridor follows contour lines along the north side of the ridge before it curves around the summit and turns south for the connection into Mink.
331	10/21	email	Tom	Duncan		<p>NOTE: This comment has several attachments in its PDF submission.</p> <p>Kellen, Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on these proposed road plans.</p> <p>I have comments on the following areas and have highlighted those on sheet 24 and on the map, see attached.</p> <p>-Most importantly 404 as this proposed ROW directly affects me as there is an easement on my property</p> <p>-331</p> <p>-348</p> <p>331: First 331 as shown on the map does not appear to match the description on page 24. This route per the map appears to connect amanita and ESRO, not amanita and Boreal hts as indicated on 24.</p> <p>Second – can you please provide the purpose or reasons for extending this road from amanita to ESRO?</p>	Thank you for your comments. The corridor description will be corrected on page 24. Corridor 331 traverses several large privately owned parcels east of ESRO road, one of which has already subdivided resulting in construction of the first portion of the corridor. It then extends across the northern portion of a large FNSB-owned parcel to connect with Amanita Rd at the Boreal Heights intersection. The corridor provides access to newly subdivided parcels and if ever fully constructed, would address both ESRO and Amanita Rd cul-de-sacs which are longer than FNSB standards allow for sufficient resident and emergency services access.
365		Web form	Jeanne	Laurencelle		365. Same situation. Your plan is to extend the Gold Lode Road, an orphan road, but not improve the first part. And of course the first part will get trashed. Residents of Gold Lode pay thousands of dollars out of pocket for road repairs. The road will not support increased traffic.	Corridor 365 is being maintained from the 1991 Roads Plan/2006 maps update. It provides new access to a number of DNR and FNSB parcels, should they ever subdivide and develop. If development does occur, existing Gold Lode residences and the new residences could be added into a nearby existing service area for road maintenance.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
372	10/16	Email	H. Roger	Evans, P.E.	Civil Engineer Founder, Designer, President Moose Mountain, Inc.	<p>Thank you for the chance to comment on your ideas for future road access.</p> <p>273 is a privately constructed road, built to FNSB standards 30 years ago and has been in constant use by the ski area ever since. We use it in winter to bus skiers to the summit for skiing, and in summer it serves us for maintenance and security. Although it would be the best route by far for accessing the ridge all the way to Old Murphy Dome road, we do not have any plans for subdividing any time in the near future. We may some day be amenable to an offer that would allow us to purchase an alternate lift system and maintain security from motorized vehicles on our ski slopes, but that would take several millions of dollars so we don't expect that to happen.</p> <p>372 as shown has a sharp left turn from the end of Monteverde, which would take it immediately across a steep, high altitude black spruce permafrost zone, with evidence of slumping showing just above the creek below. A road cut through there would cause excessive thawing, slumping and probably mud flows into the creek. It would be far safer, and better, to continue Monteverde straight for another few thousand feet, through developable residential grade property, then turn left across the creek at a lower elevation, then begin climbing on the dry south slopes beyond. It would also be an opportunity to connect to a Jones Road extension, which could prove to be much better access to the area with its lower grades and straight alignment.</p> <p>Moose Mountain road is graded between 8-10% from the intersection at the base to the top of the mountain and can be dangerous to vehicles without chains or studs during spring freeze/thaw cycles. It is also quite a ways farther from the Goldstream Road zone than other proposed access points, and already has over 110 lots, most of them developed in the past 30 years.</p> <p>Attached is a Google Earth view of the area. The heavily spruced and shaded area just north of the existing Monteverde Road should be avoided and the extension through the better land straight ahead considered.</p> <p>If you would like, I'd be available to come to the borough office and discuss these thoughts with you.</p> <p>Thanks in advance,</p>	<p>Corridors 273 and 372 were both in the 1991 Roads Plan. Several corridors in the area have been constructed since the 1991 Plan, including Monteverde Road and Meribel Road. Both proposed corridors provide secondary egress from the Moose Mountain neighborhood that currently has a single access point (Moose Mountain Road). Fire protection best practices indicate that a neighborhood with more than 100 residences should have at least two points of egress.</p> <p>Corridor 372 does traverse a north-facing hillside that is likely underlain with discontinuous permafrost. The segment is less than 1/2-mile long. The majority of the 5-mile-long corridor is on higher elevation, south-facing slopes that would be good for road construction. The proposed corridor accesses several large FNSB parcels that could be developed in the future.</p>
372	10/12	Email	Matt	McBride		On Draft 01N 02W route 375 (from Jones Road) to route 372 (to Monteverde Road); that looks like a Fantastic Connection! It would be great to be able to drive up to Moose Mountain from the Jones Road Area through that proposed route. How long do you think it could take for this connection to be built? Is there a proposed time range at least?	Like all corridors in the plan, Corridors 372 and 375 would be incrementally constructed if and when the parcels they cross are subdivided. As a second-class borough, FNSB does not construct roads itself. This falls to the developers of land. The Roads Plan doesn't trigger development, but directs road corridor siting for if and when development does occur.
372	10/17	web form	Heather	McBride		In favor of routes 372, 375, 22 connecting Jones road to moose mountain. We own property in both road service areas and it makes sense to have more than one way out of each neighborhood for safety reasons. Will Jones road merge with the moose mountain road service area?	The merging of Road Service Areas would be determined through a vote of residents of both service areas. Development of a road connecting the two RSAs does not require that the RSAs merge.
372	10/20	email	Dan	Reichardt		<p>•General Comment (Regarding Corridors #209, #262, #372, #273 and #13) – In general, this roads plan seems to take a maximalist view of roads, providing multiple connecting routes between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road. The residents of FNSB benefit greatly by the wilderness lands that are preserved due to having very few north-south connecting roads between the East-West arteries (the arteries being College, Farmers's Loop, Goldstream and Old Murphy Dome.) These existing arteries provide ample access to subdivisions north and south of the arteries on prime residential land with short subdivision roads. While this road plan appropriately contemplates future roads for accessing subdivisions, it seems to me that – taken as a whole – it represents a political decision fill the valleys between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome road with connecting routes that aren't needed or desired by existing residents. This is a substantively significant political decision that I really think hasn't been properly discussed with the residents of the borough and I think that this roads plan – despite representing some really good work by the stakeholders – would need to be rejected or forestalled until such a decision is more fully contemplated by borough residents. At the very most, if a more direct route to the central subdivisions on Old Murphy Dome road is needed, the stakeholders should choose just one of those 5 connecting routes.</p>	Corridor 372 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 mapping update. In the 2022 Roads Plan update, it was realigned to better match topography using more precise topographical data. The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately. Like all corridors in the plan, Corridor 372 would only be constructed if and when the parcels it crosses subdivide. For FNSB-owned lands, the Assembly, which changes often, can make decisions about land disposals. The Road Plan provides longer-range (~20 yr. time horizon) direction about road siting, based on a planning and engineering analysis. FNSB land disposals also have their own public process at the time they are considered.
372	10/20	web form	Paul	Reichardt		<p>Message: My comments are about portions of the road plan shown on maps 01N02W, 02N02W, and 02N01W. I live in the area shown on 01N02W.</p> <p>Fundamentally, it seems to me that these portions of the road plan are totally disconnected from borough plans related to recreation and, in particular, trails. I understand that, assuming the population of the Fairbanks area grows, the FNSB will sell additional land and that the Goldstream area will undoubtedly see related development. However, people choose to live in Goldstream because of a balance between access to town and life in a somewhat rural environment. Planning roads that crisscross the area is inconsistent with the Goldstream lifestyle as it exists today and likely will exist well into the future, and encroachment of these roads into or near existing hiking trails would negatively impact the extensive recreational use by local residents as well as large numbers of hikers who come from around the borough to use the Cranberry Trail and O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail systems. Some detailed comments follow:</p> <p>3. The number of north/south connectors between Goldstream Road and Old Murphy Dome Road (e.g., 209, 262, 372, 273) seems like big-time overkill. While having a road plan to support anticipated land sales and subdivision development is a good thing, this road plan looks like a shotgun approach to planning roads everywhere so that any imaginable land disposal would have road access. A better approach would be to identify the most favorable sites for land disposals and then come up with a road plan to support those priorities.</p>	Corridor 372 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. In the 2022 Roads Plan update, it was realigned to better match topography using more precise topographical data. The FNSB Trails and Roads planning processes have been coordinated to plan for future shared road/trail corridors and crossings and mitigate impacts to preserve trails. The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately. Like all corridors in the plan, Corridor 372 would only be constructed if and when the parcels it crosses subdivide. For FNSB-owned lands, the Assembly, which changes often, can make decisions about land disposals. The Road Plan provides longer-range (~20 yr. time horizon) direction about road siting, based on a planning and engineering analysis. FNSB land disposals also have their own public process at the time they are considered.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
372	10/21	email	Eleanor	Boyce		<p>Moose Mtn road can't sustain the level of traffic it already gets. Added traffic would create dust, washboard, noise problems. Would road become borough maintained? Already the road service maintenance is inadequate (poor response times, sometimes poor quality grading, etc.). If road gets more traffic, existing road service area taxed residents should not be on the hook for increased road maintenance requirements. Same comment applies to Monteverde north. Road corridor lies directly on top of an extremely popular multi-use recreational trail extending from top of Moose Mtn all the way to Old Murphy Dome road. Trail includes multiple steep hills where grade is not suitable to vehicle traffic. Road corridor extends from end of Monteverde and forest type quickly changes from birch forest to black spruce / permafrost as you round the northeast shoulder of the hill. Proposed road corridor crosses permafrost slope on the contour which seems very problematic for road construction without major disruption to stable permafrost. Road will be expensive to maintain.</p> <p>Road also crosses existing recreation trails and old trapline trail. Road is incorrectly proposed as minor collector. If constructed, I would expect it to be heavily used by traffic from Old Murphy Dome neighborhoods who currently drive via Fox. Old Murphy Dome Road between McCall and Hattie Creek is incorrectly labeled as a major collector. This stretch of Old Murphy Dome Rd gets no maintenance outside of infrequent grading and repair for wildfire response activities and powerline access. It is not plowed in the winter. It would be more properly classified as a proposed major collector, since it currently doesn't function or receive maintenance that are consistent with an active major collector.</p>	Corridor 372 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. In the 2022 Roads Plan update, it was realigned to better match topography using more precise topographical data. A detailed engineering model and analysis of Corridor 372 determined that it is likely feasible to construct to FNSB Title 17 road standards. If the corridor is ever developed, the new residences along it could be added to adjacent existing service areas to provide additional revenue for road maintenance. The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately. Like all corridors in the plan, Corridor 372 would only be constructed if and when the parcels it crosses subdivide. For FNSB-owned lands, the Assembly, which changes often, can make decisions about land disposals. The Road Plan provides longer-range (~20 yr. time horizon) direction about road siting, based on a planning and engineering analysis. FNSB land disposals also have their own public process at the time they are considered. Roads in the plan are typically classified by their 'future' expected function rather than current function, in order for the FNSB to plan appropriately for limiting direct lot access to higher classification roads.
372	10/21		Jill	O'Brien		<p>Message: I oppose the planned roads #273 and #372. These roads would completely interrupt existing recreational trails. Road number 273 and 372 would not provide any advantage for people living at either end and they pass through land not fit for building with steep terrain. Instead of improving the area it would diminish its value to borough residents.</p>	Corridor 372 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. In the 2022 update it has been slightly realigned to better match underlying topography. The Moose Ridge Trail is protected through a platted easement to ensure connectivity from the neighborhood. The Recreational Trails Plan notes that "as roads are developed, it is recommended that major viewpoints remain vacant and accessible by trail, and where the trail must be rerouted that a contoured alignment be established along the southeast aspect of the hill and that driveway crossings be minimized."
372	10/21	web form	Michael	Obrien		<p>Message: I oppose any proposal to construct roads 273. and 372. This is an area that is either too steep, too swampy, or too shaded for any development. Even if construction was possible on these lots, it would be of little value and no tax value. Thousands of borough residents recreate in these areas (when they are not too swampy) and this recreational use's value far outweighs any potential tax value. Please do not pursue development of these areas.</p>	Corridor 372 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. In the 2022 update it has been slightly realigned to better match underlying topography. A detailed engineering model and analysis of Corridor 372 determined that it is likely feasible to construct to FNSB Title 17 road standards. If the corridor is ever developed, the new residences along it could be added to adjacent existing service areas to provide additional revenue for road maintenance. The intent of the Roads Plan is not to encourage or discourage development, but rather to ensure that when development occurs it is conducted in a responsible, thoughtful way and that infrastructure such as roads and trails are constructed appropriately. Like all corridors in the plan, Corridor 372 would only be constructed if and when the parcels it crosses subdivide. For FNSB-owned lands, the Assembly, which changes often, can make decisions about land disposals. The Road Plan provides longer-range (~20 yr. time horizon) direction about road siting, based on a planning and engineering analysis. FNSB land disposals also have their own public process at the time they are considered.
375	10/12	Email	Matt	McBride		<p>On Draft 01N 02W route 375 (from Jones Road) to route 372 (to Monteverde Road); that looks like a Fantastic Connection! It would be great to be able to drive up to Moose Mountain from the Jones Road Area through that proposed route. How long do you think it could take for this connection to be built? Is there a proposed time range at least?</p>	As a second-class borough, the FNSB does not construct or maintain roads. It does, however, provide a transportation network through its mandatory areawide planning, platting, and land use regulation powers. The FNSB facilitates the construction of roads through its subdivision process. At the time of land subdivision, landowners (developers) work with the FNSB to design and construct subdivision roads. FNSB Code Title 17 contains the road design and construction standards that apply to subdivision roads within the borough.
375	10/17	web form	Heather	McBride		<p>In favor of routes 372, 375, 22 connecting Jones road to moose mountain. We own property in both road service areas and it makes sense to have more than one way out of each neighborhood for safety reasons. Will Jones road merge with the moose mountain road service area?</p>	The merging of Road Service Areas would be determined through a vote of residents of both service areas. Development of a road connecting the two RSAs does not require that the RSAs merge.
375	10/21		Andy	Mahoney		<p>These proposed "minor collector" roads connect the neighborhoods north of Goldstream Valley to Old Murphy Dome road. At their southern ends, they all begin at the end of what are already lengthy neighborhood roads. Any properties accessed from the proposed roads would therefore lie a considerable road distance from any major collector or arterial roads. This not only represents undesirably commute times for residents who may be contributing the FNSB economy but will also contribute to a significantly higher carbon footprint compared with development of other roads better connected to FNSB's road system. Additionally, the development of these roads and any properties along them would add significant additional traffic to these existing neighborhood roads, requiring more maintenance and potentially lowering values of existing properties</p>	Corridor 375 was in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 update. In the 2022 update, it has been slightly realigned to better match topography. The Roads Plan does not trigger, direct, or limit development in specific areas. Rather, it directs road siting when landowners do decide to subdivide and develop their land. If the parcels that Corridor 375 crosses ever subdivide and develop, the new residences on those parcels could be added into an existing service area, bringing in additional funds for road maintenance. For FNSB-owned lands, the Assembly, which changes often, can make decisions about land disposals. The Road Plan provides longer-range (~20 yr. time horizon) direction about road siting, based on a planning and engineering analysis. FNSB land disposals also have their own public process at the time they are considered.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
386	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Concerning Corridors 115, 118, 119, 120, 122, 125, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, and 386: I am particularly interested in the fate of Borough and State land in the Peede Extension/Heritage Forest area in northeast North Pole, and continue to urge the Borough not to sell off any areas without full public engagement and review. I do understand that the presence of a Corridor does not imply any upcoming plans for development, and was pleased to see this explicitly stated in the Plan: "The intention of this plan is not to advocate for the subdivision and sale of large publicly owned tracts, but to plan a logical, well-connected road network in the event that future subdivision and development of such areas does occur. The development of these areas depends heavily on the base zoning, FNSB Comprehensive Plan, and plans/goals of the owning agencies." (pp. 8-9) My request is that this statement be elevated in importance from a footnote to a line in the section "The Road Plan does not..." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. This statement will be added to the table on Page 3.
404	10/21	email	Tom	Duncan		<p>NOTE: This comment has several attachments in its PDF submission.</p> <p>Kellen,</p> <p>Thank you for giving us the opportunity to comment on these proposed road plans.</p> <p>I have comments on the following areas and have highlighted those on sheet 24 and on the map, see attached.</p> <p>-Most importantly 404 as this proposed ROW directly affects me as there is an easement on my property</p> <p>-331</p> <p>-348</p> <p>404:</p> <p>First ide like to comment on 404 - I have attached:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Your FNSB map showing 404 where I highlighted my property 2035 Boreal hts. 2. Aerial photo of easement received from Don Galligan of FNSB in 2020. This shows the easement you have on record. 3. Plat of my property – showing easement and how currently the road is off of its easement <p>First we would like to know the intentions of the FNSB for this suggested ROW or the purpose of it.</p> <p>Before 404 or Boreal heights is considered for ROW to Hopper Creek we would suggest that the ROW be per the previous #38 as that is the true access to Hopper Creek (between TL 1808 and 1812). Boreal hts ends at 343943 Block 3 lot 1 and there is no direct connection or easements to Hopper creek from the end of boreal hts without going on private property.</p> <p>This suggested ROW 404 has an easement that is on my property 2035 boreal hts. See attached 1,2 and 3 mentioned above. As you can see this proposed ROW affect my property as there is an easement on my property, and the current road is not on its correct easement – See attachment 3. I would also ask that if this is made an official ROW that the road be put back on its true easement and moved further north.</p> <p>As a property owner I would like to have a discussion with FNSB to reserve the right to approve making this an official ROW, before it is made a ROW, as there are official heirs and assigns for use of this easement.</p> <p>Finally, we would like this proposed or suggested ROW to only be used for those who are currently allowed to use it OR who currently have houses or property directly accessed using Boreal hts and can currently access them using highway vehicle only. We request this suggested ROW not be allowed to be used for further expansion to access any other properties nor be accessed using recreational vehicles nor for recreational purposes (This is currently not a public road ROW)</p>	Corridor 404, like all corridors in the plan, would only be developed if the parcels it crosses and/or is adjacent to subdivide. Road 38 was taken out of the plan and replaced by road 404 because there is already a built road along Boreal Heights Lane.
15/217	10/19	email	Susan			<p>As a private property owner and resident in this neighborhood, I am opposed to these corridors. The impact on existing roads and neighborhoods would be extremely negative. FNSB dedicated trails in this area are heavily used by people from all over (not just the neighborhood) and would be negatively impacted. Our private property is not available for a road corridor. There is not a high need to develop this area.</p>	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. Based on public input, Corridor 15 has been adjusted to provide a larger vegetated buffer between existing trails and the corridor. Like all corridors in the plan, 15 and 217 would only be developed if and when the parcels they cross are subdivided. The Trails and Roads planning processes have been coordinated to plan for potential future shared trail/road corridors and crossings to mitigate trail impacts and preserve trail quality.
General	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		Took a look at the most recent draft. Some of my comments are similar to prior ones.	N/A- No changes identified.
General	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		P.19 FMSBC, what is the "C"?	FNSBC stands for Fairbanks North Star Borough Code. The team will update the plan to ensure that acronyms are spelled out at their first use.
General	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		It would be helpful if the maps indicated adjacent map labels around the perimeter of the maps, so one could navigate to adjacent maps without having to refer back to the Map Key.	Thank you for your comments. The team will update the maps with labels at the perimeter to improve navigation.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		In general - Very few corridors were proposed in the areas that were not covered in the 1991	For the 2022 update, the Roads Plan team expanded the study area to provide opportunity to potentially add more corridors in areas that weren't included in the 1991 Plan. A number of corridors were proposed in these areas early in the process, but were later removed based on an analysis of feasibility and/or public and steering committee input. At the plan's next update, these areas will be re-evaluated again to determine if any new connections are warranted based on expected growth in those areas.
General	10/18	web form	ZoAnne	Boyd		I do not want my property tax payments paying for this! I'm sure know one else wants this either and since all of our property taxes are paying for this, put it before the people.	As a second-class borough, the FNSB does not construct or directly maintain roads. Road construction falls to landowners who subdivide and develop land, and service areas fund road maintenance. The Roads Plan itself is also not supported by taxes. The Roads Plan is funded by a grant from the Department of Defense Office of Local Defense Community Cooperation (formerly the Office of Economic Adjustment).
General	10/15	Web form	Jane	Burchard		are u planning on doing any thing at 13 mile	Asked Ms. Burchard for clarification on 19 October. No changes identified.
General	10/15	Web form	David	DeLong		How do I comment on these plans. This process is very opaque and difficult to navigate. The comments sheet provided does not allow any input. How can I make my comments?	To date, there have been three public comment periods for the Roads Plan and four public open houses where residents were able to provide input into the planning process. During the summer and fall of 2021, there was also an online interactive comment map where residents could provide comments on specific corridors (over 800 individual comments were received). Three rounds of post card mailings were completed to alert residents of corridors near their property prior to the public open houses events. Comments can be sent to the project team via the comment form on the footer of fnsbroadspan.com or emailed to kellen.spillman@fnsb.gov or shelly@agnewbeck.com. You can also call Kellen or Shelly to discuss specific concerns - contact info is available on the project website.
General	10/18	web form	Alyssa	Enriquez	Fairbanks Cycle Club	In general, the Fairbanks Cycle Club is pleased with the plan. While we have a special interest in cycling, we are also residents and drivers within the borough. We are glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope. As cycle advocates, we are glad to see that both non-motorized use and trails are taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both non-motorized transportation and trails in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment. We would like to see non-motorized transportation not only protected but also encouraged whenever new roads are considered. We would also like to see trails preserved, with at least some vegetative buffer, whenever new roads are built. We hope the borough will continue to make efforts to encourage non-motorized transportation and to preserve trails as development of our community continues. Thank you for working on this important project.	Thank you for your comments. An additional action has been added based on public input to protect trails: Action 6.4D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts.
295	9/26	Email	Terrance	Gacke		Thanks Shelly for the prompt response, I'm a bit disappointed that the Resources page is incomplete at this stage of this multi year plan. Maybe the 30 day comment period deadline should start after all the decision making resources are available to the public. I feel the public could better understand the "rationale" for this decision if there was more transparency in the decision making process. I'll offer a more detailed response once this information is published. I've looked at the slides presented and my response is that the rationale listed ,for this decision, is flawed. I'll initially comment on the first item to give you an example of my concerns. The first item on the rationale list is an "opinion" by an unnamed surveyor. What ridge are you talking about? The FNSB maps are confusing. I've been unable to see one map that shows the proposed road easement, the ROW easement, the powerline easement, the Equinox trail easements. The proposed corridor is on the north side of the powerline easement down in the swampy ground that runs between Lawlor Rd and Fox Hollow, correct? Where is the ridge? It seems the unnamed surveyor's positive opinion has more standing than all 3 of "our neighborhood" road commissioners, as well as a retired DOT road builder/engineer and 20+ neighborhood comments opposed to this extension. It doesn't seem like a equitable process! Thank you for your attention to this and I look forward to commenting once all planning resources are available. Cheers,	Corridor 295 has been removed from the plan based on public input, planning and engineering analysis, and an in-person site visit to verify conditions.
General	10/12	Web form	Beverly	Hormann		The plan seems reasonable to me. I haven't looked up ownership on the many parcels, but assume they are mostly all FNSB or SOA owned. To me the connections should be appreciated by local property owners. Living on the Elliott I do worry about having only one "out" to Fairbanks. I need to go back and look if both sides of Old Murphy Dome Road will be connected.	As a second-class borough, the FNSB does not construct roads itself. This falls to landowners who decide to subdivide their property. The Roads Plan provides direction for corridor siting to ensure a logical and connected network so that all property owners have legal access to their land. Planned corridors cross both public and private lands, but will not be constructed until the time that a landowner decides to subdivide. The purpose is to provide access to the newly created lots and also to adjacent properties beyond the subdivision. There is a not a planned corridor covering all of Old Murphy Dome Rd because much of it is already constructed and/or has platted right-of-way or dedicated road easements. There are several proposed corridors that connect Old Murphy Dome Road to other roads, thus providing additional access/egress for Old Murphy Dome Road. These include corridors 256, 18, 13, 273, 262, and 209.
General	10/12	Web form	Elisha	none given		I am all for new roads, however the borough can't even maintain the current ones they have. My road is a borough road and it is shit. I don't see that being maintained at all this is waterthrush and starling court. I also see that in town we like to tear up all the roads for years not realizing how this effects ppl long term. Finish the project downtown aka the bridges and the mess by the military base. Do these things before adding more to your plate.	The FNSB does not construct or directly maintain subdivision roads. Local Road Service Areas are responsible for subdivision road maintenance. Construction projects on larger capacity roads in town are managed by the Alaska DOT&PF. The Roads Plan focuses on siting future subdivision roads in the borough.
General	9/28	Email	Robert	Perkins	Dr. Robert A. Perkins, PE Professor of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Emeritus University of Alaska Fairbanks	Regarding the Road Plan, I left a phone message, but responding to this email is better. Two questions. 1.How recent are the comments in the Comment Tracker pdf? 2.Presumably, for each segment, there is a file that has the history of the segment proposal and pertinent documents that pertain. Where is this file and how might access it?	Public comment trackers with responses are being developed for each public comment period: May-June 2022 (posted on project website), Sept-Oct 2022 (in development), and Jan-Feb 2023 (in development). For each tracker, the date the comment was submitted can be found in the second column. Documentation related to proposed corridors can be found on the project website, fnsbroadspan.com, in the Steering Committee Meetings presentations, maps, and Related & Project Specific Documents sections. The FNSB Roads Plan: January 2023 Corridor Descriptions - DRAFT document is a helpful resource that summarizes each corridor.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	10/20	web form	Oralee	Nudson		<p>Is there a conflict with proposed road corridors overlapping with proposed high voltage transmission lines carrying electricity generated by a 200 Megawatt power generating source?</p> <p>Map of proposed high voltage transmission lines: https://aws.state.ak.us/OnlinePublicNotices/notices/Attachment.aspx?id=130699</p> <p>Land Lease application for 200 Megawatt wind farm: https://aws.state.ak.us/OnlinePublicNotices/notices/View.aspx?id=204364</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	There are no conflicts at this time. The proposed high-voltage transmission lines have several alternatives that would be evaluated and decided in the future should the Shovel Creek wind farm be developed.
General	10/20	web form	Patrick	Druckenmiller		<p>Message: I am object to proposed corridors which would connect two neighborhoods by replacing trails at the end of their road systems with roads. We need trails; not more roads! Protect the trails that make Fairbanks great!</p>	The Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to plan for future shared road/trail corridors, crossings, and to mitigate impacts to preserve trails.
General	10/20	web form	Paul	Reichardt		<p>Message: My comments are about portions of the road plan shown on maps 01N02W, 02N02W, and 02N01W. I live in the area shown on 01N02W.</p> <p>Fundamentally, it seems to me that these portions of the road plan are totally disconnected from borough plans related to recreation and, in particular, trails. I understand that, assuming the population of the Fairbanks area grows, the FNSB will sell additional land and that the Goldstream area will undoubtedly see related development. However, people choose to live in Goldstream because of a balance between access to town and life in a somewhat rural environment. Planning roads that crisscross the area is inconsistent with the Goldstream lifestyle as it exists today and likely will exist well into the future, and encroachment of these roads into or near existing hiking trails would negatively impact the extensive recreational use by local residents as well as large numbers of hikers who come from around the borough to use the Cranberry Trail and O'Connor Creek East Ridge Trail systems. Some detailed comments follow:</p> <p>4. The extensive number of north-south connectors would destroy the local environments that have been created and maintained by a network of roads largely based on east/west connectors (e.g., Farmers Loop, Goldstream, Old Murphy Dome. That layout provides reasonable access with large roadless areas in between--exactly the environment that attracts people to these areas. Turning that "linear" approach for access to a "network" approach will dramatically diminish the residential experience of today's residents and reduce the "somewhat rural" option for future residents.</p>	The Roads Plan does not promote, trigger, or direct development to any specific areas. What it does do is direct road siting for if and when landowners decide to subdivide their properties. For FNSB-owned lands, the Assembly, which changes often, makes decisions about land disposals. The Roads Plan provides a ~20 yr. planning horizon for corridors based on a planning and engineering analysis. FNSB land disposals also have their own public process at the time they are considered. The Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to plan for future shared road/trail corridors, crossings, and to mitigate impacts to preserve trails.
General	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>5.Shelly reassured me that the specific map comments generated from the community early-on would be saved and accessible in the future. This is important to me, because I think there are a lot of great recommendations, specifically recommendations to existing roads, that were captured via the map that are not necessarily represented in the Road Plan.</p> <p>I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	Thank you for your comments. The public comments from the online map have been saved and will be maintained by the project team and FNSB Community Planning to inform future projects and decisions.
General	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>6. As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>•New and existing proposed road corridors north of the Goldstream Valley, chiefly 15, 293, 262, 4, 209 could have significant conflict with recreational trails. I think developing this area would be a mistake for the Borough and would lead to a loss in wildlands and trails and would also negatively contribute to the urban sprawl of Fairbanks.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	The Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to plan for future shared road/trail corridors, crossings, and to mitigate impacts to preserve trails. An additional action has been added based on public input to protect trails: Action 6.4D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts. Goal 5 and associated actions also seek to promote multi-modal transportation options such as biking and pedestrian infrastructure.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
General	10/21	web form	Darla	Theisen		Also, can comments come in later than today? Took awhile to find the correct submission form. Thank you.	N/A- No changes identified.
General	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>----</p> <p>Overall: I approve of the intent of the Road Plan, and the intent and execution of this update to the 1991 Plan. The ten Goals are well chosen, and the Actions appropriate. In particular, Goal 5 - Multi-Modal Connections is important to me as a trail user, bike user, bus user and general pedestrian. It is definitely advantageous that the Road Plan was revised in parallel with the Trails Plan, and the joint roads/trails Open House I attended in May made it clear that there was close collaboration between the Roads and Trails teams. As a Commissioner for a Service Area (Whitman), I was pleased to see Strategy 8.3: "Research and secure additional funding... for RSA roads...", and hope some action to this end will be taken." (p. 3).</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Planning team will take this suggestion into consideration.
General	10/23	email	Terry	Chapin		<p>Hi Shelly,</p> <p>Sorry for weighing in late with comments on the FNSB road plan. I've been out of the country the past two weeks, but the issues are important to me so I want to provide you with some feedback. I hope it is not too late to do so.</p> <p>In general, it seems important NOT to plan road corridors that compromise trail networks and to which local residents are opposed. In our neighborhood, I specifically am opposed to corridor 217 that would connect Skyflight Road (at the top of Cordes behind the Vallata (where there is a small air strip) with Pandora Subdivision. Such a road corridor is in the heart of the Cranberry Trail Network that is widely used by many people in that part of Goldstream Valley. Such a connector road would destroy a recreational resources that have drawn many families (including my own) to live in this neighborhood. I doubt that any of the people in the neighborhood would use such a connector road, and most of us would oppose it.</p> <p>Thanks for considering my input,</p>	The Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to plan for future shared road/trail corridors, crossings, and to mitigate impacts to preserve trails. An additional action has been added based on public input to protect trails: Action 6.4D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts. The project team has responded to public comments and worked with the Roads Plan steering committee to realign adjacent Corridor 15 further away from existing trails to provide a vegetated buffer and minimize trail impacts, should these corridors be developed. DNR has a planned subdivision on lands just north of corridor 217. The current alignment of Corridor 217 provides safer access to those lands than an existing SLE does cross the Skyflight air field, which DNR has proposed using.
64	10/17	web form	Ellen	Bohman Mitchell		<p>Message: I would like to be on record as opposing the connection between Miller Hill and Miller Hill extension. I think this would be a bad idea because of</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. the potential for destruction of the historic trail system, 2. the inability to maintain the new road, and 3. the disruption to the residents in that area. <p>The potential benefit of traffic reduction would pale in comparison to the destruction caused, and I beg the planners to stop immediately.</p> <p>Thank you for your time.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		P.11 Action 4.1B - insert "as" after word such.	Thank you for your comments. Correction will be made.
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		Under Goal 4 Environmental Impacts, add action "Ensure that road crossings of waterways allow for adequate fish passage.	Added as Action 4.2.B.
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		Goal 5 Action 5.1A - I believe this is the first place CoF and CoNP abbreviations are used, it might be helpful if notations to explain them, as was done in Action 4.1B on safety features, were included.	Made this change.
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		1N1W - Why weren't Chad Street and Noll Drive extensions not included?	Both connections were removed because the parcel they crossed is now the Skyline Ridge Park.
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		152E - Dawson Road should be shown as a proposed major collector south to where it is shown as an existing major collector. It appears to stop just short. If Parham McCormick is not proposed between Repp and Plack, the stub (158) south of Repp should be deleted.	Slight adjustment made to Corridor 144 along Dawson Rd. There is a platted unconstructed section just north of Dundee that causes the apparent gap on printed maps, but is reflected as a road in the FNSB GIS. Corridor 158/Parham-McCormick is being maintained to indicate the location of the platted unconstructed right-of-way in contrast to the current location of the constructed trespass road which turns to the east.
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		353E - Segment 387 does not connect to anything, why is it included?	Corridor 387 connects platted unconstructed Joline Ave with Sebaugh Rd to create a loop.
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		453E - It seems like the major collector classification of what is shown as Old Valdez Loop should extend east to the Richardson Highway.	Thank you for your comments. This adjustment will be made.
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		P.17 Table 2 - Limiting this to residential areas with over 100 dwelling units is a bad idea. FNSB sees very few subdivisions of that scale. It should be considered in most subdivisions. This also seems to conflict with other portions of the Road Plan.	Thank you for your comments. Changed to "Support multiple access for residential areas that currently have > 100 dwelling units or have the potential to develop > 100 dwelling units. "
	10/17	email	Todd	Boyce		P.13 Strategy 6.2 - Same comment as above for RSAs.	No change identified.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
	10/17	web form	Jeffrey	Deeter		Hello, I have a few concerns in the proposed road plan regarding development between Goldstream and Old Murphy Dome. There are many trail users in this area that would be seriously and negatively affected by some of the proposed roads. I am not opposed to development, but the existing trails should be taken into consideration and protected during the road planning phase. Large culverts are a great way to allow trails to exist in harmony with roads, but bridges and gently, straight banked approaches are also an option. Many of us, as trail users, are professional outdoorsman that can't see the trails in this area disappear. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to ensure the best proactive planning and mitigation measures to preserve trails. A number of goals, strategies and actions in the Roads Plan speak to trail protection and preservation: ACTION 4.2.A: Implement the future corridors map in a way that discourages roadway alignments penetrating or dividing established recreational and wildland corridors. GOAL 5 – Multi-Modal Connections: Support multi-modal transportation linkages and encourage use of non-motorized transportation systems through corridor development. STRATEGY 5.2: Integrate safe multiuse trail circulation into road networks and maintain multiuse trails for commuter and recreational users, including bikes, pedestrians, ATVs, and snowmachines. ACTION 5.2.B: Work with developers to acquire additional ROW for shared trail and road corridors and trail/road crossings through the subdivision platting process, where appropriate. ACTION 5.2.C: Continue to require dedicated ROW or established easements for trails and crossings identified in the FNSB Comprehensive Trails Plan during the subdivision platting process. ACTION 6.4.D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts.
	10/17	web form	Kattijo	Deeter		Message: Hello! Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this plan. I am an Iditarod musher who lives off of Old Murphy Dome Road in the McCloud subdivision (Errol Ave). I am concerned about all of the proposed roads that would touch Old Murphy Dome Road. Many of these proposed roads are currently trails (see Waterford and Molly area), or would intersect with current trails (Desperation). I understand these trails might not technically be in the Comprehensive Trails Plan, although I did have extensive conversations with Bryant Wright and the Trails Planning Committee trying to get them included. Whether they are "official" trails or not doesn't really matter. They are still well-loved and well-used, and absolutely essential for some of us who literally use the land as part of our careers and livelihoods. Please resist the temptation to ignore the concerns of trail users by leaning on the CTP, or passing the responsibility of trail protection/road development onto future land developers or home owners. Please take the steps NOW to ensure the protection of these trails.	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to ensure the best proactive planning and mitigation measures to preserve trails. A number of goals, strategies and actions in the Roads Plan speak to trail protection and preservation: ACTION 4.2.A: Implement the future corridors map in a way that discourages roadway alignments penetrating or dividing established recreational and wildland corridors. GOAL 5 – Multi-Modal Connections: Support multi-modal transportation linkages and encourage use of non-motorized transportation systems through corridor development. STRATEGY 5.2: Integrate safe multiuse trail circulation into road networks and maintain multiuse trails for commuter and recreational users, including bikes, pedestrians, ATVs, and snowmachines. ACTION 5.2.B: Work with developers to acquire additional ROW for shared trail and road corridors and trail/road crossings through the subdivision platting process, where appropriate. ACTION 5.2.C: Continue to require dedicated ROW or established easements for trails and crossings identified in the FNSB Comprehensive Trails Plan during the subdivision platting process. ACTION 6.4.D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts.
15/217	10/15	Email	David	DeLong		I am trying to comment on plans for Cordes Drive The current format for commenting is not allowing me to use. The comment form does not allow any input. I am very concerned regarding infringing on the trail at the end of Cordes road and any increase in traffic on Cordes Dr., especially because of the hairpin turn as Cordes transitions to Skyflight. There are 5 driveways that have to negotiate a blind turn with attendant dangers from increased traffic. Please contact me and inform of how I can officially comment on this dangerous plan.	DNR has tentative plans for a subdivision within the 70 acres of State land that route 217 crosses. Based on public input, Corridor 15 has been adjusted to provide a larger vegetated buffer between existing trails and the corridor. Like all corridors in the plan, 15 and 217 would only be developed if and when the parcels they cross are subdivided. The Trails and Roads planning processes have been coordinated to plan for potential future shared trail/road corridors and crossings to mitigate trail impacts and preserve trail quality.
	10/18	web form	Alyssa	Enriquez	Fairbanks Cycle Club	In general, the Fairbanks Cycle Club is pleased with the plan. While we have a special interest in cycling, we are also residents and drivers within the borough. We are glad to see the borough planning ahead with road development so that future road construction makes sense within a wider planning scope. As cycle advocates, we are glad to see that both non-motorized use and trails are taken into account with Goal 5, strategies 5.1 and 5.2. We should be encouraging both non-motorized transportation and trails in our borough's future. Both are essential for our population's mental and physical health. Both are also critical for encouraging actions that take better care of our environment. We would like to see non-motorized transportation not only protected but also encouraged whenever new roads are considered. We would also like to see trails preserved, with at least some vegetative buffer, whenever new roads are built. We hope the borough will continue to make efforts to encourage non-motorized transportation and to preserve trails as development of our community continues. Thank you for working on this important project.	Thank you for your comments. Along with strategies and actions under Goal 5, an additional action has been added based on public input to protect trails: Action 6.4D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts.
	10/12	Web form	Christina	Evans		Thank you for considering making wider shoulders or bike lanes on Murphy Dome. I live between mile 4 and 5 and I would love the ability to walk my dog or ride a bike safely. This road has consistent truck traffic, bike traffic, and recreation traffic, and no space for them to coexist with each other. This would increase safety and the quality of residing in the area.	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB Roads Plan is focused on subdivision roads. Higher classification roads in the borough like Murphy Dome are managed and maintained by the Alaska DOT&PF. Adding a wider shoulder or bike lanes to Murphy Dome would be under the purview of the DOT&PF.
64	10/18	web form	Glenn	Helkenn		I'm a landowner and resident living on Railroad Drive, just next to Goldstream Creek. Please no bridge across the creek connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension. That would be a nightmare of additional traffic on Miller Hill road, which is a very rough road and is notoriously hard and expensive to maintain. A bridge there would destroy the character of our neighborhood and plow right through an area where locals have created a land trust greenspace corridor for wildlife and outdoor recreation (dog mushing, skiing, hiking, photography, etc.).	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	10/19	email	Jenna	Jonas	Alaska Homestead Adventures LLC	<p>My name is Jenna Jonas and I am writing as an owner of 95 acres off of Railroad Drive, 80 of those acres run along the proposed connection of Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension.</p> <p>This 80 acres is protected in a land trust and part of a greater greenbelt area and winter trail network that greatly enhances the quality of life of residents of goldstream Valley. We work to create a network of snowshoe and dogsledding trails in this area and are concerned about the negative impacts a road would have in terms of safety, noise pollution, and destroying the sense of solitude that makes this place so special. We live in quiet neighborhood and have no interest in becoming residents along a major corridor.</p> <p>For several years my family ran a winter dogsledding tour business out of our property and in this area and having a road there would make doing this in the future implausible.</p> <p>It seems like this plan is about expanding access and connectivity and this road would not introduce new access.</p> <p>In addition, our neighborhood has long struggled to maintain Miller Hill and Railroad drive and these roads are very expensive. For several years we had to walk or bike the last mile to our property because Miller Hill was completely impassable in the Spring. Thawing permafrost makes this an unwise place to pursue further development. Also, Goldstream Creek is prone to flooding, it has flooded 3 out of the past 10 years, two times taking bridges out.</p> <p>I hope you take the considerable opposition in our neighborhood this into account in considering this road.</p> <p>Thank you for your time,</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/13	web form	Steve	Vick		<p>I oppose connecting miller hill and miller hi extension. Nobody in the valley wants it.</p> <p>And if you build it you better maintain it. You don't do a good enough job now. Who is going to play that thing. And have you seen what it looks like in the spring.</p> <p>You all ain't the smart if you think this road ain't going to need to be paved.</p> <p>I can't think of 100s of better things to waste time and money on.</p> <p>But then again your the government. Wasting time and money is what you good at. So why not just build a tunnel through Ballaine. Your engineers would love it.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
64	10/17	email	Steve	Vick		<p>Thanks for the reply. And I hope you can understand my opposition. I just reread it and there are a ton of typos. Shouldn't have submitted in on the phone.</p> <p>One more thing about this road issue. I read the purpose is to reduce traffic congestion. I have lived in the valley 10+ years. I have never seen any traffic congestion on Ballaine rd. The Miller hill connection is useless and unwanted.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
72/73	10/20		Charles	Steiner		<p>Message: Re: discussed road that would connect to Nottingham— I certainly agree with the comments I have read regarding this potential road. I understand it is simply being discussed as a potential project rather than as a planned entity but I do not think it should even be being discussed. I don't believe that the borough should construct a road that relies on Nottingham.</p> <p>In the first 1st place, Nottingham is a private road. We maintain it and would not be likely to agree to such increased use. If were necessary to do that, I believe that the borough would have to assume responsibility for nottingham and upgrade it to standards. We are happy with Nottingham's current construction as see no reason change it.</p> <p>If a new road needs to be constructed to connect to Dalton trail, I think a more direct route to Dalton Trail would make more sense than connecting via Nottingham though I am not sure that the ground that would need to be crossed to do that is actually suitable for such a road.</p>	Corridors 72 and 73 were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and the 2006 Plan update. Nottingham Road is currently in violation of FNSB code regarding cul-de-sac length.
64	10/21		Sarah	Swanson		<p>I am writing in opposition of the road connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension. I feel that we do not need to add roads when our established ones are hard enough to maintain, and highly value the trails currently occupying that space. I also think it would increase traffic in neighborhoods that are not equipped to deal with it.</p> <p>Thanks!</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
	10/21	web form	Josh	Horst		Message: I live in Goldstream Valley on Toboggan Lane. I use the network of trails in the lower lying areas of the valley in the winter and the higher hillside and ridge trails year around. What I see on these maps in the Pandora, Cordes, and Jones Road areas seems like you're simply taking existing trails and making them into roads. Roads like Jones and Moose Mountain barely handle the amount of traffic they currently have, particularly in the spring. Miller Hill struggles as well and would be a primary artery if connected. If you create more residences that will flow traffic down those roads, what is your plan to improve and maintain the existing roads? I think there is a need in Goldstream for one road that connects the valley to Old Murphy Dome Road and maybe a couple small extensions here and there to allow a little more residential property development, but this plan has far too many roads to even give them reasonable consideration and would further bisect the existing trail system, which has already lost so many routes due to properties being subdivided and roads being developed. My encouragement to you would be to trim this plan down to some primary focal points, be mindful of existing trail routes and the comprehensive trail study that was recently conducted, and collaborate with the Interior Lands Trust to make sure that all of these Stakeholder's goals are aligned. Then, with minimal impact to the quality of life of local residents, and with a focus on creating re-routes and safe crossings for existing trail routes, proceed forward. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to ensure the best proactive planning and mitigation measures to preserve trails. A number of goals, strategies and actions in the Roads Plan speak to trail protection and preservation: ACTION 4.2.A: Implement the future corridors map in a way that discourages roadway alignments penetrating or dividing established recreational and wildland corridors. GOAL 5 – Multi-Modal Connections: Support multi-modal transportation linkages and encourage use of non-motorized transportation systems through corridor development. STRATEGY 5.2: Integrate safe multiuse trail circulation into road networks and maintain multiuse trails for commuter and recreational users, including bikes, pedestrians, ATVs, and snowmachines. ACTION 5.2.B: Work with developers to acquire additional ROW for shared trail and road corridors and trail/road crossings through the subdivision platting process, where appropriate. ACTION 5.2.C: Continue to require dedicated ROW or established easements for trails and crossings identified in the FNSB Comprehensive Trails Plan during the subdivision platting process. ACTION 6.4.D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts.
15/217	10/21	web form	Josh	Horst		Message: I live in Goldstream Valley on Toboggan Lane. I use the network of trails in the lower lying areas of the valley in the winter and the higher hillside and ridge trails year around. What I see on these maps in the Pandora, Cordes, and Jones Road areas seems like you're simply taking existing trails and making them into roads. Roads like Jones and Moose Mountain barely handle the amount of traffic they currently have, particularly in the spring. Miller Hill struggles as well and would be a primary artery if connected. If you create more residences that will flow traffic down those roads, what is your plan to improve and maintain the existing roads? I think there is a need in Goldstream for one road that connects the valley to Old Murphy Dome Road and maybe a couple small extensions here and there to allow a little more residential property development, but this plan has far too many roads to even give them reasonable consideration and would further bisect the existing trail system, which has already lost so many routes due to properties being subdivided and roads being developed. My encouragement to you would be to trim this plan down to some primary focal points, be mindful of existing trail routes and the comprehensive trail study that was recently conducted, and collaborate with the Interior Lands Trust to make sure that all of these Stakeholder's goals are aligned. Then, with minimal impact to the quality of life of local residents, and with a focus on creating re-routes and safe crossings for existing trail routes, proceed forward. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to ensure the best proactive planning and mitigation measures to preserve trails. A number of goals, strategies and actions in the Roads Plan speak to trail protection and preservation: ACTION 4.2.A: Implement the future corridors map in a way that discourages roadway alignments penetrating or dividing established recreational and wildland corridors. GOAL 5 – Multi-Modal Connections: Support multi-modal transportation linkages and encourage use of non-motorized transportation systems through corridor development. STRATEGY 5.2: Integrate safe multiuse trail circulation into road networks and maintain multiuse trails for commuter and recreational users, including bikes, pedestrians, ATVs, and snowmachines. ACTION 5.2.B: Work with developers to acquire additional ROW for shared trail and road corridors and trail/road crossings through the subdivision platting process, where appropriate. ACTION 5.2.C: Continue to require dedicated ROW or established easements for trails and crossings identified in the FNSB Comprehensive Trails Plan during the subdivision platting process. ACTION 6.4.D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts. Corridor 15 has been realigned based on public comments to provide a larger vegetated buffer between the planned corridor and existing trail network.
	10/21	web form	Josh	Horst		Message: I live in Goldstream Valley on Toboggan Lane. I use the network of trails in the lower lying areas of the valley in the winter and the higher hillside and ridge trails year around. What I see on these maps in the Pandora, Cordes, and Jones Road areas seems like you're simply taking existing trails and making them into roads. Roads like Jones and Moose Mountain barely handle the amount of traffic they currently have, particularly in the spring. Miller Hill struggles as well and would be a primary artery if connected. If you create more residences that will flow traffic down those roads, what is your plan to improve and maintain the existing roads? I think there is a need in Goldstream for one road that connects the valley to Old Murphy Dome Road and maybe a couple small extensions here and there to allow a little more residential property development, but this plan has far too many roads to even give them reasonable consideration and would further bisect the existing trail system, which has already lost so many routes due to properties being subdivided and roads being developed. My encouragement to you would be to trim this plan down to some primary focal points, be mindful of existing trail routes and the comprehensive trail study that was recently conducted, and collaborate with the Interior Lands Trust to make sure that all of these Stakeholder's goals are aligned. Then, with minimal impact to the quality of life of local residents, and with a focus on creating re-routes and safe crossings for existing trail routes, proceed forward. Thank you.	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB Roads and Trails planning processes have been closely coordinated to ensure the best proactive planning and mitigation measures to preserve trails. A number of goals, strategies and actions in the Roads Plan speak to trail protection and preservation: ACTION 4.2.A: Implement the future corridors map in a way that discourages roadway alignments penetrating or dividing established recreational and wildland corridors. GOAL 5 – Multi-Modal Connections: Support multi-modal transportation linkages and encourage use of non-motorized transportation systems through corridor development. STRATEGY 5.2: Integrate safe multiuse trail circulation into road networks and maintain multiuse trails for commuter and recreational users, including bikes, pedestrians, ATVs, and snowmachines. ACTION 5.2.B: Work with developers to acquire additional ROW for shared trail and road corridors and trail/road crossings through the subdivision platting process, where appropriate. ACTION 5.2.C: Continue to require dedicated ROW or established easements for trails and crossings identified in the FNSB Comprehensive Trails Plan during the subdivision platting process. ACTION 6.4.D: Encourage vegetative buffers between recreational trails and roads to preserve trail quality and minimize impacts.
	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		Hello, My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan. Comments: 1. I support ACTION 4.1.D, but would like to see an amendment or an ACTION 4.1.E that also includes language to reduce noise pollution in addition to light pollution. I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration. Best, Max	Added ACTION 4.1.E: Minimize the impacts of road noise pollution on neighborhoods and in other sensitive areas. Coordinate with DOT&PF and the cities to mitigate the noise impacts of roads during and after construction.
	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		Hello, My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan. Comments: 2. Likewise, I support ACTION 4.1.A, however I would like to see an amendment or additional action that discourages roadway alignments penetrating or dividing established recreational and wildland corridors. I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration. Best, Max	Added ACTION 4.2.A: Implement the future corridors map in a way that discourages roadway alignments penetrating or dividing established recreational and wildland corridors.

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>3.I think that STRATEGY 4.3 is important, but I would encourage you to make an amendment or additional action that discourages road corridors through current and future areas that are environmentally challenging. The arctic is warming at an unprecedented rate and will continue to do so over the next century. Areas that would be considered feasible for road construction today will not be in a decade. I think it would be ill-advised to publish any infrastructure plan in 2022 and not include language regarding our rapidly changing climate.</p> <p>I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	Added ACTION 4.3.A: Discourage road corridors through areas that are environmentally challenging now or are expected to become environmentally challenging in the future due to changing climatic conditions.
	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>4.I appreciate and support GOAL 5 and the subsequent strategies and actions.</p> <p>I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration.</p> <p>Best, Max</p>	Thank you for your comments. No changes identified.
	10/21	email	Maxwell	Plichta		<p>"Hello,</p> <p>My name is Max Plichta. I am a Fairbanks North Star Borough resident living in the Farmers Loop area. Last week I briefly spoke with Shelly Wade on the phone about a few questions I had, thank you for taking my call. Today I am emailing the team with some final comments about the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan. First and foremost, I appreciate the process to provide feedback and I am grateful that we are updating the comprehensive road plan.</p> <p>Comments:</p> <p>6.As you know, roads can divide a community just as much as they can connect a community. As an avid non-motorized trail and road corridor user and an adamant supporter of intact-connected greenspace I am chiefly concerned about how several of these proposed road corridors could negatively impact recreational trail users, greenspace, and ecosystem functions. I would like to see trails preserved if roads are built along the same corridor. Furthermore, I would want to see a significant vegetative buffer included so that the current wild nature of the trails is at least partially retained.</p> <p>4.I don't live in the Badger Road area. However, I sympathize with existing and future residents should all of the new proposed road corridors come to fruition. If we are striving to make safe, easily traversed, pedestrian-friendly communities with some access to wild-lands and recreational opportunities then a grid system of major collector roads every mile sprawling for 6-7 miles seems like it would not serve any resident who values non-motorized mobility. We should be building communities for people not vehicles.</p> <p>I greatly appreciate your time, effort, and consideration.</p> <p>Best, Max "</p>	Thank you for your comments. The major collector network in the North Pole/Badger area has been planned since 1991 and is being maintained in the current update. Many of these corridors run along existing north-south and east-west section line easements (SLEs) that already provide public right-of-way access. Since the topography is very flat in this area, aligning future roads to the SLEs avoids property owners needing to dedicate additional property to road corridors. As you know, the Roads Plan does have a number of Goals, Strategies, and Actions to promote a more walkable and bikeable road network. Specifically, ACTION 5.1.D: Explore the feasibility of dedicated rights-of-way or established easements for: Pedestrian and bicycle facilities along major collectors and arterials during the subdivision platting process.
	10/21	email	John	Chythlook		<p>Hello,</p> <p>This is John Chythlook, I live on Spudwood Rd, off of Steele Creek Rd. I would like the plan to address the flooding and aufeis problems off Steele Creek Rd, including Spudwood, Northwood, Eastwood, and Southwood Rds. There are probably a few others that I'm missing. There may not be a real solve to the problem, but it would be good to know that, if nothing else, through studies or comparisons to other areas that may have similar problems. I'm not sure if this is exactly where to pursue that, as I've asked through the public meeting process and also through the Borough Rural Services staff, but if so I really wanted to get my two cents in if this is one of the appropriate places.</p> <p>This has been an expensive and ongoing problem since about 2015, when changes in the aquifer made a summer season creek into a year-round warm spring. It seems to be a common problem through the hillside that Steele Creek Rd hillside.</p> <p>Thanks.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridors 383 Spudwood to Old Farm/Tikchik connection and 384 Birch Knoll to Moosewood connection were added during the 2022 Roads Plan update to help address the aufeis and flooding-caused access issues in the Steele Creek area. Both of these corridors provide alternate points of ingress and egress to existing subdivisions in case one route is blocked due to emergency or seasonal conditions.
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>Shelly/Kellen,</p> <p>Attached are my comments on the final draft of the FNSB Comprehensive Road Plan.</p> <p>I look forward to the next Steering Committee meeting to discuss all the comments received as we work to finalize the plan. Does this plan adequately address upgrading existing roads other than asking for state and federal funding? That was the top and overriding priority of the steering committee from the beginning. Is Strategy 6.2 enough?</p> <p>Best, Gary</p>	Thank you for your comments. The Roads Plan primarily focuses on the siting of new roads but can provide recommendations for road construction and maintenance as it does under Goal 6: Road Construction (Strategies 6.1-6.2) and Goal 8: Road Maintenance (Strategies 8.1-8.6).

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>Page 13 of pdf document (Page 8 as internally numbered) Strategy 1.1 Regularly update and maintain the Comprehensive Roads Plan</p> <p>Action 1.1.A: Update the Roads Plan at least every 20 years</p> <p>The FNSB Comprehensive Land Use Plan advocates respect for private property as the first goal. The Road Plan is an auxiliary component of that plan.</p> <p>If the corridors and subsequent dedications are not or no longer required to meet the intent of those dedications in support of the goals of the Comprehensive Road Plan, it would be considered a taking, which is not supported by that respect for private property.</p> <p>Add: Action 1.1.B: When plans are updated and in recognition of the Vision, some corridors in the 1991 plan were previously dedicated. Where they are removed in this plan, FNSB Community Planning will support vacating those dedications upon request of property owners fronting those dedications.</p>	Added ACTION 1.1.B: In recognition of the Roads Plan vision, where a previously dedicated corridor is removed in a plan update, FNSB Community Planning will support vacating those dedications upon request of property owners fronting the dedication.
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>Page 18 Strategy 6.2 Research and secure additional funding, including potential funds through the Federal Infrastructure Bill or the State of Alaska, for RSA road construction projects.</p> <p>Change to: FNSB should seek federal, state, or other funding to assist service areas to upgrade roads to economically sustainable standards, if not the most current Title 17 Road standards.</p> <p>For a 10-20 year plan, it doesn't make sense to call out what will no longer be a source of funding after 5 years. Just say federal, state, or other funding.</p>	Changed to: STRATEGY 6.2: Secure federal, state, or other funding to assist road service areas (RSAs) with upgrading roads to economically-sustainable standards or the most current Title 17 Road standards.
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>State and national best practices not necessarily applicable in our rural service areas and community priorities? How are community priorities implemented and who determines those priorities?</p> <p>Action 6.4.B Adopt a user-friendly road standards manual with a goal of functional and economically sustainable design and construction, informed by state and national best practices and community priorities.</p>	Changed to: ACTION 6.4.B: Adopt a user-friendly road standards manual with the goal of functional and economically-sustainable road design and construction, informed by state and national best practices and community priorities.
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>Page 19 Strategy 8.2 orphan roads (i.e. constructed roads with 'no maintenance authority'). Instead of the pejorative term "orphan roads", one could just say non-government supported roads. And all those roads do not have the same characteristics of support or lack of support. A mechanism to recognize those differences would be useful and respectful of neighborhood wishes.</p>	Changed to: STRATEGY 8.2: Work with FAST Planning to implement potential options in the 2021 Road Service Area Expansion Plan to provide consistent and equitable road maintenance for non-governmentally-supported public roads (i.e., constructed roads with no public maintenance authority).
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>Page 29 of 56 - table 3: New Road Corridors should be sorted by number in column 1. All corridors need an index cross-referenced by number. Actually, ALL road corridors need to be listed. One could put a * or other symbol next to new corridors if useful.</p>	New corridors have been sorted into number order. The Road Corridors Description Document has ALL corridors listed in an index by number, and can be found on the project website: https://fnsbroadplan.com/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/23y01m16d-FNSB-Roads-Plan-Corridor-Descriptions_DRAFT.pdf
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>Page 16 of 56 Strategy 4.3 Actions aren't strong enough - one can't insure road design standards with climate change accelerating impacts. TRY would be a better word. Drainage in poor soils is not the only consideration. Drainage is also from flooding, extensive rainfall/snowfall, etc.. Damage can't always be prevented and what we know of likely upcoming climate changes is far less than what we do know.</p>	Changed ACTION 4.3.A to include a statement about changing climatic conditions: "Discourage road corridors through areas that are environmentally challenging now or are expected to become environmentally challenging in the future due to changing climatic conditions."
69	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		P 69- Line Drive extension is to be eliminated.	Corridor 69 has been removed from the plan.
28	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>Page 40 of 56 28 - Esro extending thru GCI property. Stop at turnaround. Corridor 331 provides a more sustainable ingress/egress without the impingement of GCI satellite operations. Ground conditions brought up are ignored in the consultant response, particularly the crossing of Steele Creek with auefs (overflow) in winter. This is in conflict with Strategy 4.3. Tungsten alternate access was included in new plane and proposed in two locations. This issue was also addressed by the Esro Road Association in their comments.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 28 was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. After being reviewed by the Roads Plan Steering Committee, the connection up to the Tungsten subdivision is being maintained to provide alternate points of ingress/egress to both neighborhoods.
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		Page 46 by FAI - It's not WEIN Lake, it's WIEN Lake.	Thank you for your comments. The FNSB will verify and correct the naming issue.
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		Page 48 of 56 - All the extensions in NP by quadrant - were those in the Badger Road Study?	All of the north-south and east-west major collector planned corridors were included in the 1991 Roads Plan and maintained in the 2022 update. Most follow existing section line easements (SLEs) that already grant public right-of-way access and reduce the need to dedicate additional private property to road corridors. Salcha-Badger Road Plan doesn't explicitly map out the corridors but references them in Goal 2e: Encourage subdivision road alignments that integrate natural landscape features such as ponds, sloughs, and seasonally flooded wetlands, rather than roads laid-out in a traditional cardinal-direction grid (e.g., north, east, south, and west). Local subdivision roads within the gridded major collector network can be informed by this Goal.
	10/21	email	Gary	Newman		<p>GOAL 1 states: Consider land use when developing the transportation network to better move people and essential goods and services safely and efficiently while minimizing adverse impacts on local neighborhoods.</p> <p>The 1991 Road Plan had the following important policies on page 11 which I don't find in this plan's narrative, though GOAL 4 so attempts. The 1991 language is a lot clearer and should be incorporated in support of the Executive Summary statement that states in part "... develop a road system that protects the health, safety, and well-being of the community."</p> <p>1991 Plan</p> <p>1. Internal road networks in subdivisions shall be designed to discourage through traffic on roads providing direct access to residential lots.</p> <p>2. Routing of commercial and industrial traffic through residential areas shall be avoided.</p> <p>2022 Draft Plan</p> <p>GOAL 4 – Environmental Impacts: Minimize and mitigate road network impacts on the natural environment and FNSB community.</p> <p>STRATEGY 4.1: Retain the integrity of neighborhoods as the road network expands.</p> <p>ACTION 4.1.A: Implement the future corridors map that discourages roadway alignments penetrating or dividing established residential neighborhoods from major service facilities such as schools and parks.</p> <p>ACTION 4.1.C: Support DOT&PF and FAST Planning to establish and implement official heavy industry and trucking through-routes away from areas planned or zoned as residential or commercial.</p> <p>What is the definition of 'official heavy industry and trucking'?</p> <p>This concludes my comments. I look forward to discussion by the Steering Committee on all our residents' comments and steering committee members on the draft 2022 Comprehensive Road Plan.</p>	Thank you for your comments. The following changes have been implemented: Added ACTION 4.1.F: Discourage the routing of commercial and industrial traffic through residential areas. Did not add suggested action "Internal road networks in subdivisions shall be designed to discourage through traffic on roads providing direct access to residential lots" because it conflicts with Roads Plan goals and corridor siting criteria related to alternate ingress/egress and multiple access points for subdivisions. Freight routes are defined in the FAST Planning Freight Mobility Plan on page 60 and Figure 6-1: https://fastplanning.us/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/freight-mobility-plan-for-approval.pdf

Corridor #	Date	Form Received	First name	Last name	Affiliation	Comment	Response/How Addressed in Revised Maps
64	10/21	web form	Andrea	Swingley		<p>Message: I'm a landowner, homeowner and resident on Railroad Drive next to Goldstream Creek and off Miller Hill Road. I'm opposed to connecting Miller Hill Road with Miller Hill Extension for a number of reasons.</p> <p>Some of the land I own is part of the land trust greenspace corridor adjacent to the creek and the proposed road connection. The trust was created to protect wildlife and outdoor recreation and new road construction is counter to the intent of the land trust.</p> <p>Currently Miller Hill Road is maintained by the neighborhood homeowners and receives no maintenance or support from the borough or state; it is not part of a road service area. Miller Hill Road is difficult and expensive to maintain in part because it traverses boggy boreal forest with underlying permafrost. The road cannot support the additional traffic that would result from connecting with Miller Hill Extension without significant and costly improvements. These would be in addition to the expense of building a bridge across Goldstream Creek and ensuing maintenance costs. Goldstream Creek has flooded or come close to flooding more often in recent years, which adds an additional concern for constructing a bridge and road across.</p> <p>The Tanana Valley Railroad Trail, a main trail across the protected Goldstream Valley Public Use Area, crosses Miller Hill Road and is regularly used by dog teams, skiers and skijorers, runners, bikers, and others during winter. Additional vehicular traffic would increase the likelihood of conflicts and potentially dangerous interactions at the crossing.</p>	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
	10/21	web form	Darla	Theisen		Are trail comments due on this same form? I would ask to restrict the use of heavy equipment and road traffic on the Gilmore- Chena Connector Trail. They (Avidian) have also blocked it off and dammed the creek.	Trails Plan comment - no change identified.
28/310	10/21	web form	Darla	Theisen		I would ask the you meet with the homeowners in Esro and Amanita before finalizing plans for roads in this area as we are our own road service.	Thank you for your comments. Significant input has been received from the ESRO and Amanita areas through the public comment periods. Additionally, comments have been received from the ESRO Road Association.
	10/21	email	Cam	Webb		<p>Dear Mr. Spillman and Ms. Wade,</p> <p>Thank you for your work on the new Road Plan, and for the opportunity to comment on the draft Plan. Please find my comments below.</p> <p>Best wishes,</p> <p>Cam Webb</p> <p>Overall: I approve of the intent of the Road Plan, and the intent and execution of this update to the 1991 Plan. The ten Goals are well chosen, and the Actions appropriate. In particular, Goal 5 - Multi-Modal Connections is important to me as a trail user, bike user, bus user and general pedestrian. It is definitely advantageous that the Road Plan was revised in parallel with the Trails Plan, and the joint roads/trails Open House I attended in May made it clear that there was close collaboration between the Roads and Trails teams. As a Commissioner for a Service Area (Whitman), I was pleased to see Strategy 8.3: "Research and secure additional funding... for RSA roads...", and hope some action to this end will be taken.</p>	Thank you for your comments. No specific plan changes identified.
64	10/21	web form	Jack B	Wilbur Jr		Message: I am opposed to proposed road connecting Miller Hill Rd and Miller Hill Extension. The area through which the road would pass is best left as-is, an uninterrupted green belt connecting the winter recreation areas laying to the east and west the road. Our community is better without the connector.	Corridor 64 connecting Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. Like all planned corridors, Corridor 64 would only be developed if the adjacent parcels subdivide. Additionally, there is an existing section line easement already designating public access along a section of the proposed corridor. Because this corridor has been planned since 1991, direct lot access from Miller Hill and Miller Hill Extension has been limited to support the future development of this corridor. Topographical challenges can be addressed through small adjustments to alignment and design during the subdivision and platting process. Should the adjacent lands subdivide, this corridor has significant benefits for emergency service access, travel times, and overall vehicle miles travelled and connectivity in this portion of the road network. Road and trail conflicts can be mitigated through proactive planning such as that through the coordinated FNSB Trails and Roads Plan update.
310	10/24	email	Josh	Church		<p>Hello,</p> <p>I recently moved into amanita. This is a nice quite neighborhood and does not need to be connected with other rds. to increase access and traffic.</p> <p>Well I am not against the plan to connect amanita to Esro and the other rd. It would be unsafe to do so with our spending considerable time improving Amanita as it is one of the worst rds. in the borough. If the borough has plans to improve this rd. than I would welcome the connections built into the plan. If not the increased traffic will cause accidents.</p>	Thank you for your comments. Amanita is currently a cul-de-sac longer than FNSB standards allow, raising concerns for resident and emergency services access. Corridors 331 and 404 provide an additional access point to the Amanita Rd subdivisions to address the cul-de-sac issue.
28	10/21	email	Karyn	Janssen		I fear your plan it tie Esro Rd. into an extension from a tungsten Subd. is ill advised. Neither the topography nor sub surface soil conditions would allow this to prove successful, besides, we like Esro as. Private road. Thanks but no thanks.	Thank you for your comments. Corridor 28 was included in the 1991 Roads Plan and is being maintained in this update. After being reviewed by the Roads Plan Steering Committee, the connection up to the Tungsten subdivision is being maintained to provide alternate points of ingress/egress to both neighborhoods.
95	10/25	email	Melanie	Ebersole		It's my understanding that at some point corridor 95 which I believe is referenced as the Zuendel extension could become a road. This corridor 95 is a trail behind my home, and the homes of my neighbors that is a private small trail leading out to larger trails going to baseline. All of our properties already have driveway access on the parallel street to our properties and making this a road would serve no one but would increase the noise and take away from our peaceful environment we moved here for. It would drop out into a private property / hay field that has trails surrounding it that are also NOT roads. Anyone that might want access to this already HAS a road coming from their home so the access is not needed there either. It also increases security risks and makes all of our properties less secure, and less private. Thank you.	Corridor 95 has been removed from the plan.