

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE

ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY

Minutes for Regular Meeting of September 26, 2000
continued to September 27 and October 3, 2000

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was convened at 5:00 p.m. by Assembly Chair Fay Von Gemmingen in the Assembly Chambers, 3600 Denali, Anchorage, Alaska.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Dan Sullivan, Dick Tremaine (5:15 p.m.), Pat Abney, Dan Kendall, Allan Tesche, Fay Von Gemmingen, Kevin Meyer, Anna Fairclough, Melinda Taylor, Wilda Hudson, Cheryl Clementson.
Absent: None.

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

The pledge was led by Ms. Hudson.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:

A. Regular Meeting - May 16, 2000

Ms. Abney moved, to approve the minutes of the regular meeting of
seconded by Ms. Taylor, May 16, 2000.
and it passed without
objection,

5. MAYOR'S REPORT:

Mayor Wuerch noted the various 2001 budget documents appeared on the agenda for introduction at this meeting. He reported department heads will provide an orientation next week, and all Assemblymembers are invited.

6. ADDENDUM TO AGENDA:

Mr. Tesche moved, to amend the agenda to include the addendum items.
seconded by Mr. Sullivan,

Chair Von Gemmingen read the addendum items.

Question was called on the motion to amend the agenda and it passed without objection.

7. CONSENT AGENDA:

Mr. Meyer moved, to approve all items on the consent agenda as amended.
seconded by Ms. Abney,

A. BID AWARDS:

1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 882-2000, recommendation of award to Alaska Pollution Control, Inc. for furnishing **year round road maintenance services for the Birchtree/Elmore Limited Road Service Area** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Public Works Department (ITB 20-B090) (\$133,000), Purchasing.
2. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 892-2000, recommendation of award to Swalling Construction Co., Inc. for the **Port of Anchorage pile repairs, gangway painting, Transit Shed heating, and miscellaneous maintenance** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Port of Anchorage (ITB 20-C053) (\$1,129,000), Purchasing.
3. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 893-2000, recommendation of award to Graff Contracting for **2000 miscellaneous sidewalk improvements-Hillcrest Drive and Bayshore Drive** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Department of Public Works (ITB 20-C058) (\$212,992.50), Purchasing.

Ms. Fairclough requested this item be considered on the Regular Agenda. See item 8.A.

4. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 894-2000, recommendation of award to H.R. Redmond Company, Inc. for furnishing **year round road maintenance services (for the Girdwood Road Service Area)** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Public Works Department (ITB 20-B091) (\$215,000), Purchasing.

5. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 895-2000, recommendation of award to G & S Enterprises, Inc. for furnishing **end dump trucks with operators** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Department of Public Works (ITB 20-B095) (\$1,000,000), Purchasing.
6. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 896-2000, recommendation of award to Renegade Equipment for the **AWWU soil disposal at the Anchorage Regional Compost Facility** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Water and Wastewater Utility (ITB 20-C054) (\$262,126), Purchasing.
7. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 915-2000, recommendation of award to Rain Proof Roofing, Inc. for **Transit roof repair** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Property and Facility Management (ITB 20-C052) (\$112,735), Purchasing.
8. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 916-2000, recommendation of award to Consolidated Enterprises for the **Solid Waste Services Central Transfer Facility tipping floor repair** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Solid Waste Services (ITB 20-C057) (\$249,243), Purchasing.

B. ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS FOR INTRODUCTION:

1. Ordinance No. AO 2000-143, an ordinance amending Anchorage Zoning Ordinance 94-235 (S-1) (aa), an ordinance that rezoned to PC (Planned Community) District approximately 530 acres, described as **Tract A of the Powder Reserve**, to amend the standards of development and site layout previously adopted in the Master Plan for Tract A of the Powder Reserve, generally located immediately northwest and southwest of the North Eagle River Interchange of the New Glenn Highway, in the Eagle River & Birchwood Area, located within portions of Sections 25, 26, 35 and 36, T15N, R2W, S.M., Alaska containing 530 acres more or less (Birchwood Community Council) (Planning and Zoning Commission Case 00-013), Community Planning and Development. public hearing 10-24-00.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 880-2000.
2. Ordinance No. AO 2000-144, an ordinance of the Municipality of Anchorage adopting and appropriating funds for the **2001 General Government Operating Budget** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Office of Management and Budget. public hearing 10-17-00 and 10-24-00.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 881-2000.
3. Ordinance No. AO 2000-145, an ordinance adopting and appropriating funds for the **2001 Municipal Utilities Operating and Capital Budgets** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Office of Management and Budget. public hearing 10-17-00 and 10-24-00.
4. Resolution No. AR 2000-273, a resolution approving the **2001-2006 Municipal Utilities Capital Improvement Program**, Office of Management and Budget. public hearing 10-17-00 and 10-24-00.
5. Ordinance No. AO 2000-146, an ordinance adopting the **2001 General Government Capital Improvement Budget**, Office of Management and Budget. public hearing 10-17-00 and 10-24-00.
6. Resolution No. AR 2000-274, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage adopting the **2001-2006 General Government Capital Improvement Program**, Office of Management and Budget. public hearing 10-17-00 and 10-24-00.
7. Ordinance No. AO 2000-147, an ordinance of the Municipality of Anchorage, Alaska, approving **submission by the Anchorage Wastewater Utility a proposed rate decrease and changes to nonrecurring charges for both the Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utilities (AWU, ASU)** to the Regulatory Commission of Alaska, Water and Wastewater Utility. public hearing 10-17-00.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 897-2000.
8. Resolution No. AR 2000-275, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$420,571 to the Federal Categorical Grants Fund (241), Department of Health and Human Services, from the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services to **fund Family Planning Services**, Health and Human Services. public hearing 10-17-00.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 898-2000.
9. Resolution No. AR 2000-276, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$963,314 to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231), Department of Health and Human Services, from the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services to **fund Community Health Nursing Services**, Health and Human Services. public hearing 10-17-00.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 899-2000.
10. Resolution No. AR 2000-277, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$1,078,416 to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231), Department of Health and Human Services, from the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services for the **provision of Women, Infants & Children Nutrition Services**, Health and Human Services. public hearing 10-17-00.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 900-2000.
11. Resolution No. AR 2000-278, a resolution appropriating \$298,704 of revenue from the State of Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities to the State Categorical Grants Fund 231 to the Public Works Department for **National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit services** provided in 2001, Public Works Department. public hearing 10-17-00.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 901-2000.
12. Resolution No. AR 2000-284, a resolution of the Anchorage Assembly appropriating an amount not to exceed \$1,800,000 as a loan from the Areawide General Fund (101) to the Management Information Systems Capital Fund (608) for the **installation of additional PeopleSoft modules and reporting capability of the PeopleSoft software system** for the Municipality, Finance Department. public hearing 10-17-00. (**addendum**)
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 919-2000.
13. Resolution No. AR 2000-285, a resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly appropriating \$125,000 from Areawide General Fund (101) Balance to the Anchorage Fire Department to **fund overtime for staffing an ambulance at Station #4**, Assemblymembers Abney, Tremaine, Fairclough, Meyer, Taylor, Tesche, and Von Gemmingen. public hearing 10-17-00 (**LAI D ON THE TABLE**)

Ms. Abney presented this item and requested it be considered on the Regular Agenda. See after action on item 9.A.

C. RESOLUTIONS FOR ACTION:

1. Resolution No. AR 2000-270, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$95,000 to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231), Department of Health and Human Services, from the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services for the provision of **HIV/AIDS Prevention Services**, Health and Human Services.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 883-2000.
2. Resolution No. AR 2000-271, a resolution authorizing the Municipality to **grant a 20 foot wide electric easement within Beach Lake Park**, Lots 1, 2, 5, 6, 7 and portions thereof within Section 24, Township 15 North, Range 2 West, Tax #s 051-381-06, 07, 08, 09, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14, generally located off Hillcrest Drive in Eagle River, Public Works Department.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 884-2000.
3. Resolution No. AR 2000-272, a resolution authorizing the Municipality to **grant a 30 foot wide natural gas easement across a portion of Kincaid Park**, lying within SE 1/4 Section 5, N 1/2 Section 8 and S 1/2 Section 6, Township 12 North, Range 4 West, S.M., Tax Code #s 010-411-03, 09, 10, 11, 12, 16, 17, 18, 19, 22, 23, 24 and 28, Public Works Department.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 885-2000.
4. Resolution No. AR 2000-279, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$15,000 to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231), Department of Health and Human Services, from the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services for the **provision of Denali KidCare services**, Health and Human Services.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 902-2000.
5. Resolution No. AR 2000-280, a resolution authorizing the Municipality of Anchorage, Public Transportation Department, to enter into an amendment to Transfer of Responsibilities Agreement (TORA) in the amount of \$564 with the State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, and appropriating these funds to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231) for the **planning and implementation of landscaping at selected bus stops** within the Anchorage Area through an Enhancement Youth Work Program, Public Transportation Department.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 903-2000.
6. Resolution No. AR 2000-281, a resolution authorizing the Municipality of Anchorage, Public Transportation Department, to enter into an amendment to Transfer of Responsibilities Agreement (TORA) in the amount of \$1,320 with the State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, for **financing the implementation of a Public Transportation Marketing Program** and appropriating these funds to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231), Public Transportation Department.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 904-2000.
7. Resolution No. AR 2000-282, a resolution authorizing the Municipality of Anchorage, Public Transportation Department, to enter into an amendment to Transfer of Responsibilities Agreement in the amount of \$13,275 with the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities, State of Alaska, for the **Municipal Share-A-Ride Program** and appropriating these funds to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231), Public Transportation Department.
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 905-2000.
8. Resolution No. AR 2000-283, a resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly **recognizing and honoring Senior Patrol Officer Thomas W. Hume for his 20 years of service** with the Anchorage Police Department, Assemblymembers Abney, Clementson, Fairclough, Hudson, Kendall, Meyer, Sullivan, Taylor, Tesche, Tremaine, and Von Gemmingen. (**addendum**)
 - a. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 905-2000.

Mr. Kendall requested this item be considered on the Regular Agenda. See item 8.C.

D. NEW BUSINESS:

1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 886-2000, **Airport Aviation Advisory Commission appointment** (Erin Marston), Mayor's Office.
2. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 887-2000, **Budget Advisory Commission appointment** (Jeff Staser), Mayor's Office.

(Clerk's Note: Action on this item was reconsidered later in the meeting. See the October 3 continuation of the meeting, under item 15, Unfinished Agenda.

3. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 913-2000, **Parking Authority Board of Directors reappointment** (Soren Orley), Mayor's Office.
4. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 914-2000, **Sister City Commission appointment** (Franklin Andrews), Mayor's Office.
5. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 917-2000, **Chugiak-Eagle River Parks and Recreation Board of Supervisors appointment** (Carl Waters), Mayor's Office.
6. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 889-2000, **Tokyo Garden** - New Restaurant/Eating Place Liquor License and Application for a Restaurant Designation Permit (Spenard Community Council), Clerk's Office.
7. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 890-2000, **Villa Nova** - 2000/2001 Renewal for a Restaurant/Eating Place Liquor License (Spenard Community Council), Clerk's Office.
8. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 891-2000, **Williams Express #5007** - 2000/2001 Renewal for a Package Store Liquor License (Russian Jack & Northeast Community Councils), Clerk's Office.

Ms. Clementson requested the record reflect her "no" vote on this item.

9. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 888-2000, change order No. 2 to purchase order 83801 to exercise the second option renewal period with Liburdi Engineering, Ltd. for **combustion turbine technical services and support** to the Municipality of Anchorage, Municipal Light and Power (\$100,000), Purchasing.
10. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 906-2000, change order No. 1 to vendor contract 99MLP515 to exercise the first option period with HCG, Inc. dba Hoefler Consulting Group for providing **air quality consulting services** to the Municipality of Anchorage, Municipal Light and Power (\$75,000), Purchasing.
11. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 907-2000, proprietary approval for **library periodical subscriptions** from EBSCO Subscription Services to the Municipality of Anchorage, Department of Cultural and Recreational Services (\$90,000), Purchasing.
12. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 908-2000, change order No. 1 to annual supply contract 99ASC494 to exercise the first option period with Downtown Legal Copies, LLC for **furnishing miscellaneous printing/reproduction services** to the Municipality of Anchorage, Management Information Systems Department (\$100,000), Purchasing.
13. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 909-2000, proprietary purchase to **furnish and install Antilock Braking Systems (ABS) and Automatic Traction Control (ATC) on New Flyer buses** from New Flyer Parts for the Municipality of Anchorage, Public Transportation (\$110,757.88), Purchasing.
14. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 910-2000, proprietary purchase with Chugach Electric Association for the **installation of a 3-phase underground electrical line** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility (\$38,251.84), Purchasing.
15. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 911-2000, proprietary purchase with the State of Alaska, Department of Transportation and Public Facilities for a **utility relocation agreement** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Anchorage Water and Wastewater Utility (\$400,277), Purchasing.
16. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 912-2000, amendment No. 1 to the **lease with Hickel Investment Company for the Valley River Center - Building B** - \$321,763, Property and Facility Management.
17. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 920-2000, proprietary services contract with Crestone International for providing **PeopleSoft client assistance** for Phase I of the financial system upgrade to the Municipality of Anchorage, Finance Department (\$650,000), Purchasing. (**addendum**)

E. INFORMATION AND REPORTS:

1. Information Memorandum No. AIM 99-2000, Internal Audit Report 2000-9 - **Road Improvement and Gas Improvement Districts Special Assessments**, Public Works Department/Internal Audit.
2. Information Memorandum No. AIM 100-2000, **Ombudsman's Report concerning Barclay Drive**, Municipal Ombudsman.
3. Information Memorandum No. AIM 101-2000, **contract awarded between \$30,000 and \$100,000 through formal competitive processes** for the month of August 2000, Purchasing.
4. Information Memorandum No. AIM 102-2000, **Sole Source Procurement Report** for the month of August 2000, Purchasing.
5. Information Memorandum No. AIM 103-2000, waiver of formal procedures with Norcon, Inc. for **Eklutna-Palmer transmission line avalanche repair** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Municipal Light and Power (\$243,125.02), Purchasing.
6. Information Memorandum No. AIM 104-2000, **report of Public Works' construction contract amendments**, Public Works.
7. Information Memorandum No. AIM 105-2000, **transmittal of Federal and State Financial Assistance Reports** and required federal information for Fiscal Year 1999, Finance.

Question was called on the motion to approve the remaining items on the consent agenda as amended and it passed:

AYES: Sullivan, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.

NAYS: None.

(Clerk's Note: Mr. Tremaine had not arrived at the time of the vote.)

8. REGULAR AGENDA:

A. BID AWARDS:

1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 893-2000, recommendation of award to Graff Contracting for **2000 miscellaneous sidewalk improvements- Hillcrest Drive and Bayshore Drive** for the Municipality of Anchorage, Department of Public Works (ITB 20-C058) (\$212,992.50), Purchasing.

Ms. Fairclough moved,
seconded by Ms. Clementson,

to approve AM 893-2000.

In response to Ms. Fairclough, an **unidentified** staff member explained concrete may be poured at any temperature, as long as it is insulated at colder temperatures. **He** said during the later days of the construction season, when there are freezing temperatures, there is a requirement for contractors to provide insulation to preclude damage to the concrete. **He** added they plan to expedite the subject project to enable completion this year.

Question was called on the motion to approve AM 893-2000 and it passed without objection.

B. ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS FOR INTRODUCTION: See after item 9.A.

C. RESOLUTIONS FOR ACTION:

1. Resolution No. AR 2000-283, a resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly **recognizing and honoring Senior Patrol Officer Thomas W. Hume for his 20 years of service** with the Anchorage Police Department, Assemblymembers Abney, Clementson, Fairclough, Hudson, Kendall, Meyer, Sullivan, Taylor, Tesche, Tremaine, and Von Gemmingen. (**addendum**)

Mr. Kendall moved, to approve AR 2000-283.
seconded by Mr. Tesche,
and it passed without
objection,

Mr. Kendall read the resolution, while Mr. Tesche presented it to Officer Hume.

Officer Hume thanked the Assembly. He said he was proud to be a member of the Anchorage Police Department. He also thanked the Administration for treating public safety employees very well, allowing them to retire relatively early in life.

D. NEW BUSINESS: None.

E. INFORMATION AND REPORTS: None.

9. OLD BUSINESS AND UNFINISHED ACTION ON PUBLIC HEARING ITEMS:

- A. Resolution No. AR 2000-226, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage **authorizing the application for matching capital grant funds** through the Municipal Capital Project Matching Grant Program - AS 37.06 - for State Fiscal Year 2002, Office of Management and Budget.
 1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 865-2000.
 2. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 918-2000, "S-1" version of Assembly Resolution 2000-226, Office of Management and Budget. (**addendum**)
(POSTPONED FROM 9-12-00)

Chair Von Gemmingen gave the history of the resolution and noted a motion to approve was on the floor.

Mr. Tesche moved, to amend AR 2000-226 by substituting Form A from
seconded by Ms. Clementson, AM 918-2000.
and it passed with Mr. Kendall,
Mr. Tremaine and Ms. Fairclough
objecting,

Ms. Fairclough moved, to amend Form A, item #2 Eagle River/Chugiak Road and
seconded by Mr. Kendall, Drainage Rehab, to adjust the requested amount to \$700,000.

Ms. Clementson spoke against the motion. She argued this grant request, and last year's, proposed a disproportionate amount of money directed to the Eagle River/Chugiak area. She did not object to dispersing funds to all taxpayers, but cautioned her colleagues that they were faced with a "taxpayer revolt." Ms. Clementson pointed out the Anchorage Roads and Drainage Service Area (ARDSA) has the largest mill rate for road service, and its members pay for maintenance on main roads used by non-members. She felt ARDSA members should receive a proportionate amount of the proposed grant funds.

In response to Mayor Wuerch, Tim Rogers of the Office of Management and Budget discussed the changes in the substituted Form A. He noted the ADA Parks & Recreation Facilities item was now partially below the funding line, and the south Anchorage sports park was completely below the funding line. Also, the total amount of the Elmore Road project should read \$1 million. That change will be made before the list is submitted to the Alaska Legislature.

In response to Mr. Meyer, Mr. Rogers felt the \$4.3 million funding amount was received by the Governor's administration. The amount is the same as last year; he felt it was fairly reliable.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. Rogers explained the increase for Elmore Road was in response to concerns by several Assemblymembers about the inequity between the amounts for ARDSA versus Eagle River. The Elmore Road project is a priority for the Administration. The proposed amount for Eagle River/Chugiak is the same as the amount from 1999, \$350,000.

In response to Ms. Fairclough, Mr. Rogers said ARDSA did not receive any of the grant funds last year, other than a small amount added by the Assembly for Elmore Road.

Ms. Fairclough spoke in support of the amendment.

Chair Von Gemmingen concurred with Ms. Clementson's remarks. She pointed out the Assembly has been criticized in the past for allowing schools to be built without associated road access. She felt roads were necessary, and ARDSA has not received a fair share of these funds in the past.

Mr. Kendall pointed out the Eagle River area mill rates are lower because Anchorage bowl voters normally defeat Eagle River bonds. He noted Elmore Road, if its status is changed, could qualify for other sources of funding such as Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Study (AMATS.)

Question was called on Ms. Fairclough’ motion to amend and it failed:

AYES: Tremaine, Kendall, Fairclough.
NAYS: Sullivan, Abney, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.

Mr. Tremaine moved,
seconded by Ms. Abney,

to amend Form A to add four new items, numbers 14 through 17 (below).

priority	Project Name	FY 2000 requested amount	local share amount	Total	House District
14	Heights Hill	\$140,000	\$60,000	\$200,000	18
15	Toilsome Hill	\$105,000	\$45,000	\$150,000	18
16	Girdwood water and sewer	\$490,000	\$210,000	\$700,000	18
17	South Anchorage Limited Road Service Areas	\$70,000	\$30,000	\$100,000	18

Mr. Tremaine noted these items were well below the funding line, and would not displace any existing items.

Ms. Abney explained Heights Hill is the only entrance/exit from the Rabbit Creek View/Heights area. The road is very steep and traverses mainly Heritage Land Bank property. There is a spring which crosses the road, causing problems. The residents have enough money for a match, but not the entire project. She continued by explaining Toilsome Hill is the access point to Glen Heights subdivision and Chugach State Park. Residents of Limited Road Services Areas (LRSAs) have taxed themselves an extra half-mill or mill to qualify for matching grant funds. She encouraged her colleagues to support the motion.

In response to Mr. Meyer, Ms. Abney said she felt the proposed amounts were close to actual needs. She pointed out Glen Alps was a special service area, with a separate road board.

Ms. Clementson acknowledged the need for servicing roads that traverse Limited Road Service Areas to access parks. However, she disagreed with adding funds for LRSAs. She noted Stuckagain Heights is a subdivision in a similar situation, but is not in south Anchorage so would not benefit. Ms. Clementson explained this grant system was not the appropriate vehicle for local road improvements.

Ms. Clementson moved,
seconded by Mr. Sullivan,
and it was withdrawn,

to amend the amendment to delete item #17.

Ms. Hudson moved,
seconded by Ms. Clementson,

to divide the question between items 14 through 16 and number 17.

AYES: Sullivan, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.
NAYS: Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Fairclough.

Mr. Kendall pointed out the State matching grant program is intended to address all types of capital projects, not only roads. He felt it was important to balance the list with all types of needs.

Ms. Abney clarified that LRSAs were a normal entry on this list until about 5 years ago.

Question was called on Mr. Tremaine’s motion to amend by adding items 14 through 16 and it passed:

AYES: Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson.
NAYS: Sullivan, Clementson.

Mr. Tremaine moved,
seconded by Mr. Tesche,
and it passed without
objection,

to amend item #17 to delete the word “south.”

Question was called on Mr. Tremaine’s motion to amend by adding item #17, Limited Road Service Areas, and it passed:

AYES: Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Fairclough, Taylor.
NAYS: Sullivan, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Hudson, Clementson.

Ms. Fairclough moved,
seconded by Mr. Kendall,

to amend Form A, item #2 Eagle River/Chugiak Road and Drainage Rehab, to adjust the requested amount to \$450,000.

Ms. Fairclough felt this project should return to a 70/30 split.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. Rogers said the proposed amendment would have the effect of reducing the Alaska Center for the Performing Arts item by \$30,000. He added the local share amount is required to be 30 percent, but in many cases the local amount is more than 30 percent.

In response to Mr. Meyer, Mr. Rogers said ADA improvements have been fully funded in the past; the process is nearing its end, although there are some remaining needs.

Question was called on Ms. Fairclough’s motion to amend and it failed:

AYES: Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Fairclough.
NAYS: Sullivan, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.

Mr. Kendall moved,
seconded by Ms. Fairclough,

to amend Form A to insert a new item #9, an exact duplicate
of item #2, Eagle River/Chugiak Road and Drainage rehab,
and renumber the following items accordingly.

Ms. Fairclough felt it was important to include items on the list, even if below the funding line, to show State Legislatures the priorities of the community.

Question was called on Mr. Kendall’s motion to amend and it passed:

AYES: Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson.
NAYS: Sullivan, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Clementson.

Ms. Clementson moved,
seconded by Mr. Sullivan,

to amend Form A to insert a new item #9, for ARDSA area
projects, at a total of \$350,000 and renumber the following
sections accordingly.

Ms. Hudson moved,
seconded by Ms. Clementson,

the previous question.

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.
NAYS: Fairclough.

Question was called on Ms. Clementson’s motion to amend and it passed:

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Taylor, Clementson.
NAYS: Kendall, Tesche, Fairclough, Hudson.

Question was called on the motion to approve AR 2000-226 as amended and it passed:

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.
NAYS: Kendall.

Mr. Tesche moved,
seconded by Mr. Meyer,

immediate reconsideration.

AYES: Abney, Kendall, Fairclough, Taylor.
NAYS: Sullivan, Tremaine, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Hudson, Clementson.

The Assembly then returned to item 8.B, AR 2000-285.

Resolution No. AR 2000-285, a resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly appropriating \$125,000 from Areawide General Fund (101) Balance to the Anchorage Fire Department to **fund overtime for staffing an ambulance at Station #4**, Assemblymembers Abney, Tremaine, Fairclough, Meyer, Taylor, Tesche, and Von Gemmingen. public hearing 10-17-00 (**LAID ON THE TABLE**)

Ms. Abney, Mr. Tesche and Mr. Tremaine joined in introducing this resolution. The public hearing was scheduled for October 17, 2000.

Ms. Abney thanked the Fire Chief and the Administration for their cooperation on this item.

- B. Resolution No. AR 2000-267, a resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly supporting a statewide **Grant Anticipated Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) Bond for transportation improvements**, Office of Management and Budget.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 871-2000.
(POSTPONED FROM 9-12-00)
- C. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 877-2000, Bear Tooth - Transfer of Ownership and Location for a Beverage Dispensary Liquor License and Application for a Restaurant Designation Permit (Spenard Community Council), Clerk’s Office.
(POSTPONED FROM 9-12-00)

Items 9.B and 9.C were considered during the October 3 continuation of this meeting. See item 15, Unfinished Agenda.

- D. Resolution No. AR 2000-131, a resolution **confirming and levying special assessments for Special Assessment District No. 4SR96**, which reconstructed North Point Drive, North Point Circle, and Mere Circle, and setting the date of assessment, installment, payments, interest on unpaid assessments, and providing for penalties and interest in the event of delinquency, Public Works Department.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 509-2000.
2. Information Memorandum No. AIM 60-2000.
3. Information Memorandum No. AIM 76-2000.
4. Information Memorandum No. AIM 86-2000.

(CARRIED OVER FROM 6-13-00; AMENDED 6-20-00; POSTPONED FROM 6-20-00, 7-18-00, 8-29-00, AND 9-12-00)

This item was considered later in the meeting. See item 15, Unfinished Agenda.

10. APPEARANCE REQUESTS:

- A. **Dennis L. Ruhle**, regarding lack of subdivision agreement, road standards, and 10' setback on R-6 zone in Hokama Heights Subdivision.

Mr. Ruhle did not appear.

- B. **David McCabe**, to present a report from the Board of Equalization. (**addendum**)

Mr. McCabe discussed the report of Board of Equalization appeals from the year 1999. He noted year 2000 appeals are still being heard by the Board. He anticipated year 2000 appeals may not be completed by the end of the year.

In response to Chair Von Gemmingen, Mr. McCabe noted about 2,300 appeals were filed this year; about 1/3 will be heard by the Board. He said 1998, about 15 low income tax credit properties' value were appealed. The Board heard these appeals in November, 1999; 1998 and 1999 appeals were heard together. Due to the extreme complexity of this issue, the Board requested a legal analysis which is still pending. Mr. McCabe said he learned some of these properties were appealed for the year 2000. He noted because of the Federal statutes, these properties are extremely difficult to value fairly. He added the major case pending for 1999 was the Captain Cook Hotel property.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. McCabe addressed a proposed plan by the Administration to streamline the appeal process. He noted most appeals are submitted without identification of grounds. It takes a great deal of staff time to glean grounds individually from appellants. The Board is discussing with the Administration a change in procedure to mandate submittal of grounds with an appeal. Mr. McCabe felt the appeal volume has been very high since 1985, mostly from residential property appeals. He explained the Municipality uses a system of valuation based on multiple-regression analysis. He felt a lot of taxpayer dissatisfaction was because changes in value have been more irregular than market values. However, he felt these values are beginning to stabilize. The Administration's approach has not yet been finalized, but the Board agreed the process needs to be streamlined, in a manner which will preserve the right of citizens to appeal. He did not feel the proposed system would result in cost savings at a level that many staff positions could be eliminated. However, it would free staff to perform appraisal activities and update formulas for valuation. Mr. McCabe said he and the other Board members were not pleased by the proposed cuts in personnel in the Property Appraisal Division.

In response to Mr. Tremaine, Mr. McCabe confirmed there are approximately 90,000 parcels of land in the Municipality, and about 18 different classes of residential and commercial property.

In response to Mr. Sullivan, Mr. McCabe noted during Board meetings, the Board members, Assessors and appellants all speak under oath. He explained how meetings are conducted and the type of information discussed about a property. Professional appraisals are not a required element. Appellants and properties vary greatly in complexity.

The Assembly members thanked Mr. McCabe and the other Board of Equalization members for their hard work and sitting in the Assembly's stead.

The meeting recessed at 6:45 p.m. and reconvened at 7:15 p.m.

11. CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- A. Ordinance No. AO 2000-119, an ordinance amending Chapter 21.05, adding Chapter 21.06, **adopting the Anchorage 2020 Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan**, directing codification thereof and providing an effective date, Legal Department/Community Planning and Development.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 663-2000.
 2. Information Memorandum No. AIM 81-2000.
- (CONTINUED FROM 7-25-00, 8-15-00, 8-23-00, 8-29-00, 9-12-00, 9-13-00, AND 9-14-00)
- B. Ordinance No. AO 2000-101, an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 3.30.172 to **classify executive positions**, Legal Department.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 757-2000.
 2. Ordinance No. AO 2000-101(S), an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 3.30.172 to classify executive positions, Legal Department.
- (CONTINUED FROM 8-29-00 AND 9-12-00)

Items 11.A and B were considered later in the meeting. See item 15, Unfinished Agenda.

12. NEW PUBLIC HEARINGS:

- A. **SECOND PUBLIC HEARING:** Ordinance No. AO 2000-124, an ordinance **adopting the Girdwood Commercial Areas and Transportation Master Plan** as an element of the Anchorage Comprehensive Plan and amending Chapter 21.05 of the Anchorage Municipal Code (Girdwood) (Planning and Zoning Commission Case 2000-032), Community Planning and Development.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 742-2000.

This item was considered later in the meeting. See item 15, Unfinished Agenda.

- B. Resolution No. AR 2000-258, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$150,000 to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231) from the Alaska Department of Health and Social Services for the provision of **Perinatal Case Management/Healthy Baby Services**, Health and Human Services.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 848-2000.

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. There was no one, and she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Clementson moved, to approve AR 2000-258.
seconded by Mr. Kendall,

AYES: Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

(Clerk's Note: Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Tremaine, Ms. Abney and Ms. Hudson were out of the room at the time of the vote.)

- C. Resolution No. AR 2000-259, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$10,664,573 from the State of Alaska Department of Education and Early Development to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231) for the **Day Care Assistance Program** in the Department of Health and Human Services.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 849-2000.

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. There was no one, and she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Clementson moved, to approve AR 2000-259.
seconded by Ms. Fairclough,

AYES: Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

(Clerk's Note: Mr. Sullivan and Ms. Hudson were out of the room at the time of the vote.)

- D. Resolution No. AR 2000-266, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$492,778 from the Alaska Department of Education and Early Development to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231) for the **Child Care Licensing Program** in the Department of Health and Human Services.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 869-2000.

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. There was no one, and she closed the public hearing.

Mr. Meyer moved, to approve AR 2000-266.
seconded by Ms. Fairclough,

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

(Clerk's Note: Ms. Hudson was out of the room at the time of the vote.)

- E. Resolution No. AR 2000-268, a resolution of the Municipality of Anchorage appropriating \$18,074 from the Alaska State Council on the Arts, \$37,000 from the Anchorage Museum Association, \$17,967 from the Anchorage Museum Foundation, \$8,000 from Anticipated Miscellaneous Revenues, and \$19,220 as a contribution from the CY00 Museum Operating Budget, Areawide General Fund (101), to the State Categorical Grants Fund (231), Cultural and Recreational Services Department, for **operating support at the Anchorage Museum of History and Art**, Cultural and Recreational Services.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 876-2000.

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. There was no one, and she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Fairclough moved, to approve AR 2000-268.
seconded by Mr. Meyer,

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

(Clerk's Note: Ms. Hudson was out of the room at the time of the vote.)

- F. Ordinance No. AO 2000-140, an ordinance of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly authorizing the long term lease between the Municipality of Anchorage as lessor and ACE Hangars Owners Association, an Alaska non-profit corporation, as lessee of **Lot 1, Block 4, Merrill Field Replat**, located on the south side of Runway 6-24, Merrill Field Airport.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 864-2000.

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. There was no one, and she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Fairclough moved, to adopt AO 2000-140.
seconded by Mr. Meyer,

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

(Clerk's Note: Ms. Hudson was out of the room at the time of the vote.)

- G. Ordinance No. AO 2000-129, an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Chapter 26.50, **Sewer Service** to provide new or amended definitions and revised technically based discharge limitations for toxic pollutants, standards for sewerage discharge, permit forms and procedures, sampling requirements and methodology, reporting requirements, and enforcement mechanisms and fines to comply with federal law, Water and Wastewater Utility.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 788-2000.

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. There was no one.

Mr. Meyer moved, to continue the public hearing for AO 2000-129 to November 21, 2000.
seconded by Ms. Clementson,
and it passed without objection,

- H. Ordinance No. AO 2000-141, an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 3.20.060, **Executive and Administrative Organization**, to revise the Municipality's executive/administrative branch structure and amending other provisions of the Anchorage Municipal Code and Anchorage Municipal Code of Regulations to reflect and implement said revisions, Legal Department.
1. Ordinance No. AO 2000-141(S), an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 3.20.060, Executive and Administrative Organization, to revise the Municipality's executive/administrative branch structure and amending other provisions of the Anchorage Municipal Code and Anchorage Municipal Code of Regulations to reflect and implement said revisions, Legal Department.
 2. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 866-2000. (**addendum**)

This item was considered later in the meeting. See item 15, Unfinished Agenda.

- I. Ordinance No. AO 2000-136, an ordinance of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 10.45.050 regarding **surcharges on tickets sold at the George M. Sullivan Sports Arena**, Assemblymember Fairclough.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 789-2000.

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak. There was no one, and she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Fairclough moved, to postpone action on AO 2000-136 indefinitely.
seconded by Mr. Tesche,
and it passed without objection,

Ms. Fairclough explained she intended to return with another, modified, ordinance on this topic.

- J. Ordinance No. AO 2000-137, an ordinance of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly amending Regulation 25.11 of the Anchorage Municipal Code and pertaining to the **facility use policy for the George M. Sullivan Arena**, Assemblymember Fairclough.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 789-2000.
- K. Resolution No. AR 2000-246, a resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly approving a conditional use for sales of alcoholic beverages for a Beverage Dispensary License and a Brew Pub Liquor License on Anchorage Original Townsite, Block 15, Lots 14, 15, 16A and the west 20 feet of Lot 18A, Block 16, generally located on the north side of West 3rd Avenue between "F" and "H" Streets (Gary J. Klopfer d.b.a. **Snow Goose Restaurant & Brewery**) (Cases 2000-170 & 2000-171), Community Planning and Development.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 807-2000.

Items 12.J and 12.K were considered later, during the October 3 portion of this meeting. See item 15, Unfinished Agenda.

- L. Ordinance No. AO 2000-134, an ordinance amending the zoning map and providing for the rezoning from PLI (Public Lands and Institutions District) to R-3 SL (Multiple Family Residential District) with Special Limitations for **NW 1/4 of the NE 1/4 and S 1/2, and a portion of the E 1/2 of the NE 1/4 of the NW 1/4 of Section 10, Township 11 North, Range 3 West, S.M., Alaska**, excluding proposed Preliminary Plat S-10561, Tract A; generally located between the Seward Highway and Goldenview Drive, and East 172nd Avenue and Potter Valley Road (Rabbit Creek Community Council) (Planning and Zoning Commission Case 2000-026), Community Planning and Development.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 828-2000.

Action on this item was continued to October 17, 2000.

13. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT/ASSEMBLY APPEALS: None.

14. SPECIAL ORDERS:

- A. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 879-2000, certification of the Run-Off Municipal Election of September 19, 2000 (Assembly Section 4, Seat F).

This item was considered during the September 27, 2000 continuation of this meeting. See item 15.E.

15. UNFINISHED AGENDA:

Mr. Sullivan moved, to combine the public hearings for items 11.B and 12.H,
seconded by Ms. Fairclough, AO 2000-101 and AO 2000-141.
and it passed without
objection,

- A. Ordinance No. AO 2000-101, an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 3.30.172 to **classify executive positions**, Legal Department.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 757-2000.
 2. Ordinance No. AO 2000-101(S), an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 3.30.172 to classify executive positions, Legal Department.
- (CONTINUED FROM 8-29-00 AND 9-12-00)
- B. Ordinance No. AO 2000-141, an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 3.20.060, **Executive and Administrative Organization**, to revise the Municipality's executive/administrative branch structure and amending other provisions of the Anchorage Municipal Code and Anchorage Municipal Code of Regulations to reflect and implement said revisions, Legal Department.
1. Ordinance No. AO 2000-141(S), an ordinance amending Anchorage Municipal Code Section 3.20.060, Executive and Administrative Organization, to revise the Municipality's executive/administrative branch structure and amending other provisions of the Anchorage Municipal Code and Anchorage Municipal Code of Regulations to reflect and implement said revisions, Legal Department.
 2. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 866-2000. (**addendum**)

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing for AO 2000-101 and AO 2000-141 and asked if anyone wished to speak. There was no one, and she closed the public hearing.

Ms. Fairclough moved, to adopt AO 2000-101(S).
seconded by Mr. Kendall,

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

Ms. Fairclough moved, to adopt AO 2000-141(S).
seconded by Mr. Tremaine,

Mr. Tremaine thanked the Administration for its presentation on the new organization at today's worksession.

Ms. Abney felt the new organization was a good plan. However, she was concerned the public may be confused about the structure. She requested the Administration arrange for a presentation for the public at an upcoming Assembly meeting, to explain the new structure.

Office of Planning, Development and Public Works Director Craig Campbell agreed to Ms. Abney's request.

Question was called on the motion to adopt AO 2000-141(S) and it passed:

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

Ms. Taylor moved, to combine the public hearings for items 11.A and 12.A,
seconded by Mr. Meyer, AO 2000-119 and AO 2000-124.

Ms. Clementson spoke against the motion. She felt the ordinances were very different, and combining the public hearing would muddle the information.

Ms. Hudson concurred with Ms. Clementson.

Question was called on the motion to combine the public hearings for AO 2000-119 and AO 2000-124 and it failed:

AYES: Tremaine, Von Gemmingen, Meyer.
NAYS: Sullivan, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.

- C. Ordinance No. AO 2000-119, an ordinance amending Chapter 21.05, adding Chapter 21.06, **adopting the Anchorage 2020 Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan**, directing codification thereof and providing an effective date, Legal Department/Community Planning and Development.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 663-2000.
 2. Information Memorandum No. AIM 81-2000.
- (CONTINUED FROM 7-25-00, 8-15-00, 8-23-00, 8-29-00, 9-12-00, 9-13-00, AND 9-14-00)

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak.

LARRY CASH, chairman of the Urban Design Commission, spoke representing the Commission. He summarized a letter to the Assembly outlining the Commission's position. He noted the Commission strongly supported the expedient adoption of the Plan, and encouraged an early implementation strategy. Commission members felt specific focus should be on the Central Business District plan and revision of Title 21 of the Municipal Code. Mr. Cash expressed appreciation for the diligent work of Community Planning and Development (CPD) staff and that of members of the community who contributed countless hours of work over the past two years. Commission members felt the Plan was an excellent framework for Anchorage.

In response to Mr. Tremaine, Mr. Cash felt there should be no delay in starting redesign of architecture standards.

ERNIE HALL, a member of the Airport Community Advisory Council spoke. Mr. Hall explained the group had existed for about one year. During this time, members have realized there is a deficit in the system of communication between the community and Airport officials. He noted the Airport has a great influence on surrounding neighborhoods, and there are many things about neighborhoods that influence development at the Airport. Mr. Hall felt chapters 4 and 5 of the Plan provided an opportunity to develop better systems of communication between the community and Airport officials. This would allow citizens to be involved in Airport development issues such as long range plans, buffers, noise studies and construction. He recommended adoption of the language in the Plan, developed by the Council and Airport officials.

TOM MIDDENDORF, a member of the Airport Community Advisory Council and planning manager at Stevens Anchorage International Airport, noted Airport staff participated in the Comprehensive Plan process from the beginning. He discussed suggested amendments to the language in the Plan. Mr. Middendorf felt discussion of the importance of the Airport to the community, with respect to providing jobs and transportation services, could be improved in the Plan. Another area where technical changes were made was with regard to plans for Airport expansion beyond existing boundaries. The Comprehensive Plan seemed to suggest there were no expansion plans, but that is not the case. Mr. Middendorf clarified that the suggestion in the Plan that the Airport would develop toward the Sand Lake area was not initiated by Airport officials and is not currently in the Airport's master plan. He agreed the Airport's impact on the community needs to be considered during expansion plans, but also stressed the Airport must be considered when Municipal officials plan for development of land around the Airport. Mr. Middendorf agreed Airport and Municipal officials should collaborate more for planning efforts in west Anchorage, and the entire community should be involved in planning processes. He acknowledged the importance of recreational areas, and agreed the community should be involved when and if land uses at the Airport change. He felt the Comprehensive Plan should support buffers between the Airport and other land uses.

GENE DUSEK, representing the Anchorage Economic Development Corporation (AEDC), noted Anchorage competes with many other communities in a global economy. Exceeding competitors in providing a positive business environment is essential for Anchorage to attract business and industry. Part of this message must be that responsible development is promoted. Mr. Dusek felt the proposed Comprehensive Plan was an impressive document, but AEDC has two concerns. The first is the mandatory nature of the Plan, and adoption by reference in the Plan several documents that have not yet had the benefit of the public hearing process. He expressed concern that making the Plan mandatory would invite litigation any time someone opposes a particular project. While AEDC agrees open spaces are part of quality of life, a healthy economy and jobs are also within the definition of "quality of life." Currently, the organization is working hard to sell Anchorage as a strategic hub of the planet. The Stevens International Airport plays a vital role in Anchorage's economy. There is land within the Airport boundaries that will be needed for future expansion of the Airport and related activities. To proposed to permanently protect selected areas within the Airport boundaries would impeded necessary expansion and impact Anchorage's economic development. Given AEDC's mission, its interest is to ensure the Plan allows the flexibility needed for continued responsible development. Mr. Dusek said AEDC officials are looking forward to working with Municipal officials to develop an ordinance to implement the Plan.

JOE GRIFFITH, co-chair of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce Comprehensive Plan committee, cautioned that the proposed Plan was probably workable, but not workable as a prescriptive document. Mr. Griffith expressed concern that if the Plan was adopted as proposed, under the constraints of AO 2000-119, the Assembly's hands will be tied and its responsibilities will be passed to the courts. He pointed out the Plan has too many loose ends and gray areas. He felt it would be difficult for such a broad Plan to be prescriptive and have the effect of law. That is the purpose of Title 21 of the Municipal Code; he hoped the Plan could be adopted as a guideline and Title 21 subsequently be changed accordingly. Mr. Griffith added concern that there was no fiscal analysis of the Plan. He agreed with the Tischler & Associates analysis that there are insufficient assets to implement the Plan, and encouraged the Assembly to take this into consideration.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. Griffith clarified he did not advocate delay in adopting the Plan. However, he felt it should be adopted as a guideline rather than a mandate. With regard to insufficient funding for the Plan, he felt a discussion of taxes might be necessary in the future.

RANDY NEWCOMER, president of Williams Alaska Petroleum, commended the CPD staff for their work on this Plan. Mr. Newcomer spoke as someone in a business which depends on an efficient freight distribution system, and addressed how transportation is addressed in the Plan. He noted the Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) would be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, and felt Anchorage was in need of this LRTP. He questioned when the LRTP would be completed, and whether it would be before or after approval of the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Newcomer noted the Comprehensive Plan sought to change the dominance of the vehicle for personal travel in Anchorage. He quoted from chapter 4 of the Plan: "the overall intent is to create a city in which there will be more opportunities to live a less automobile-dependent lifestyle." However, the Plan recognizes that this goal, while laudable, is unrealistic: "in the existing spread out, low density urban structure of Anchorage, it is likely that the automobile will remain the predominant mode of transportation for the foreseeable future, even with the implementation of the concepts contained in the land use policy map. As a result, it is expected that roadway improvements will also be needed in the next 20 years to meet the transportation needs of Anchorage residents." Mr. Newcomer felt this illustrated the importance of approving the LRTP with the Comprehensive Plan. If the plans are

approved separately, and the Comprehensive Plan is given the weight of law as proposed, the two plans will likely be in constant conflict for the next 20 years.

EVAN ROWLAND, president of the Anchorage Homebuilders Association, noted the Association members have been involved in the Comprehensive Plan revision process from the beginning. He distributed suggestions for amendments to the Plan. Mr. Rowland noted Anchorage has the most affordable housing among major cities in the western United States. However, homebuilders make have the profit of the national average, due to competition. He felt some existing parts of the Plan might jeopardize Anchorage's status of most affordable housing, such as wetlands permits, zoning and planning review, street connectivity standards, urban and rural boundaries, impact fees, land-clearing issues and prominence of garages.

TOM DREYER, a land surveyor and president of Lantech Incorporated, said he served on the Platting Board from 1992 to 1995. He proposed a minor amendment to the Plan, in chapter 5, page 19 line 25. Mr. Dreyer said the existing language should be changed (with the italicized text) to read: "those applications deemed ready would be released for public review *at the time of preliminary plat application and at times the major changes to the preliminary plat, the affected community council shall be notified and the application and changes shall be made available* ~~and the application could not be altered until after the public hearing.~~" He explained if the text is allowed to remain as proposed, the time it takes to process a preliminary plat will be significantly increased, which will add to the cost of development and new homes. He felt it would move the price of new homes out of the financial reach of many homebuyers.

MARC COTTINI, a civil engineer, said he works with developers. He noted it is important to developers to keep timelines to a minimum. The Plan, in Policy 29, requires a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers wetlands permit for applicable lands before the platting process begins. He felt the requirement would double the timeframe for projects on applicable wetlands, and financially impact developers.

DON MCCLINTOCK, an attorney, spoke to preserving the hierarchy in the Plan. He discussed the difference between goals, policies and strategies. He felt the goals in the Plan were the vision of what our community should be. Policies set the trajectory for achieving the goals. Strategies are for implementing the policies, and are enforceable. Mr. McClintock proposed an amendment to chapter 5 of the Plan, to clarify the difference in these terms. He also felt a distinction should be made between the Planning documents, such as the various land use maps, and other sketches, photographs and illustrations which do not have the force of law.

ROB GAMEL, a real estate developer, discussed the portion of chapter 5 regarding impact fees. Mr. Gamel recalled while serving on various groups and committees for the Plan revision, impact fees were discussed as a possible means of paying for infrastructure-related costs, they were never formally reviewed and were not the only method discussed. He noted impact fees have wide-ranging implications for the community, and raise serious legal and public policy questions. He felt sufficient dialogue has not occurred on how to balance impact fees with a future increase in the property tax base, nor on alternative revenue sources. Mr. Gamel proposed the existing Fiscal Policy #4 be changed to remove paragraphs A through D, as they are tools to evaluate the level of services and do not reflect not a goal or policy. He said this proposed change would allow public dialogue to continue and provide the necessary flexibility to enact appropriate legislation in the future.

JIM WARD, a hillside resident, expressed concern with a point in chapter 5, policy #11. He proposed a minor amendment to this policy, regarding fire protection and the wetlands/urban interface. Mr. Ward asked language be added to read: "healthy mature trees and forested areas shall be retained as much as possible in all types of development or landscaped according to the landscape ordinance *and in accordance with national and local recommendations on fire defense zones.*" He felt protecting his family and property against fire was more important than any law, and asked the Assembly to consider his proposed amendment. He distributed copies to Assembly members. He felt awareness that fire defense zones are important should be incorporated into the local planning process.

CHUCK SPINELLI, a homebuilder, discussed policy #13 in chapter 5. He explained the statement "site and design residences to enhance the residential street-scape, diminishing the prominence of garages and paved parking areas" if taken literally, would create lots of a minimum of 60 feet in width. Mr. Spinelli noted 95 percent of the homes he builds are on lots of 50 feet or less in width and are in the average price range of \$179,000. He discussed the space requirements if garages were to be located to face away from the street. Lots of the size that would be required for this type of garage orientation would cost several tens of thousands more than average, and affordable housing needs in Anchorage would not be met. He suggested the language regarding "diminishing the prominence of garages etc." be eliminated. He felt the policy in the Plan must be universal and meet the test of time.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. Spinelli felt the system of alleys to hide garages was discontinued decades ago because of the cost. The cost of alleys would probably cost even more than making lots wide enough to have side access to a garage. He said median-income families usually can afford a home on a lot that costs \$50,000 for development. Most lots in this price range are about 34 feet wide. A wide lot would double the cost, and an alley would triple the cost.

In response to Ms. Clementson, Mr. Spinelli concurred with previous speakers that the Plan be adopted as a guideline, rather than as a legal mandate.

KEN DUFFES, a professional engineer, said he owned development and building companies. He discussed the rezone and variance issue, mentioned in chapter 5, policy #18. He recommended the words "in scale and density with adjacent nearby uses" be deleted from the proposed ordinance. He pointed out these things depend on the perspective of adjacent landowners. Mr. Duffes strongly recommended the Plan be adopted as a guideline. He felt if it had the power of law, as proposed, a great deal of flexibility would be lost, both from the perspective of the community and Municipal staff. He felt if the Plan was mandatory, the result would be battles on many different cases and many different levels.

PAUL PALMER, a hillside resident, real estate broker and land developer, addressed the Land Use Policy Map, which indicates a conceptual boundary between urban and rural services. He noted the Map indicates exclusion of about 18 square miles of the hillside from any future required urban services, such as sewers. Mr. Palmer pointed out in this area, there are thousands of small, non-conforming lots in large subdivisions. He felt the practice of not extending sewer service in some

urban areas was accelerating use of scarce residential land. Mr. Palmer noted he could have developed 240 lots rather than 56 one-acre lots in his Skyhills Subdivision development under the current zoning, if sewers had been available. He added that impact fees on developers will increase the price of lots more than the market can bear. Homebuyers will likely seek houses in the Matanuska-Susitna Valley. Last year, over 1,000 new single family homes were built in the Valley, while only 600 were built in Anchorage. Mr. Palmer felt new incentives to help developers utilize remaining vacant land to its maximum potential, if land use density of Anchorage is to flourish.

DAVE GRENIER, a civil engineer, said he was involved with development in Anchorage for 27 years. He commended staff for their efforts to bring the Plan to this point. He addressed street connectivity standards listed in Chapter 5 of the Plan's zoning recommendations. He felt the word "greatly" should be replaced with the word "may" on line 3, and asked line 5 be amended to read "destinations but may be appropriate in certain situations as further defined in neighborhood plans." Mr. Grenier acknowledged that street connectivity is important from a traffic standpoint. However, he felt building neighborhoods centered on the needs of people rather than the automobile is a higher priority. Cul-de-sacs are desirable, promote safety and a sense of neighborhood. He pointed out the Municipality is currently involved in this issue, and upgrades to roads promote dead-ends, cul-de-sacs and traffic calming. All these projects promote the neighborhood over automobile convenience. He requested the mandatory tone of the street connectivity strategy be softened in order to allow and promote development of quiet neighborhoods.

BILL BRADY, president of Citizens for Smart Growth, explained the group was a coalitions formed by the real estate industry, composed of realtors, builders, mortgage bankers and the title and escrow industry. Some small businesses, individuals and families have joined. Mr. Brady clarified the group has not tried to undermine the Comp Plan, but has tried to raise concerns and questions in order to promote serious public thought about the Plan. He felt the Plan was a work in progress, so the current format is problematic. Some of the referenced studies in the Plan are not yet complete or were not available at the time of the Comp Plan release. Mr. Brady pointed out the Tischler & Associates Fiscal Analysis was recently released, and the conclusion was that there are insufficient funds to implement the Plan. Mr. Brady added concerns about the various illustrations, pictures and diagrams in the Plan. He felt these objects may be perceived as law, rather than as a guide. If they are interpreted as law they would greatly influence requirements in Title 21 of the Anchorage Municipal Code.

HARVE PRICKETT, a member of the Anchorage Homebuilders Association and Citizens for Smart Growth, felt the 2020 Comp Plan was an exiting step forward in the growth of Anchorage, and should be adopted as a general guideline. He expressed concern that the Plan will be viewed as mandatory, and certain elements will be viewed as unchangeable. He pointed out that any large-scale plan will have multiple revisions prior to final implementation. Mr. Prickett asked that when the Plan is discussed, terms as "general guideline" and "intention" be used rather than "mandatory" and "force of law." The Plan must be allowed to grow and change, as should Anchorage.

MARSHA DAVIS, a long-time east Anchorage resident, noted community councils in the area work hard to protect the character of this area of town, which includes a mixture of multi-family and single-family homes with residents of many economic levels, convenient commercial areas and many public open spaces. Ms. Davis felt the proposed Plan would tie the hands of community activists, because of requirements for a housing allocation by type and sub-area. She felt growth should be managed by the area residents, who know the area and know best which types of uses would be appropriate and accepted in certain areas. She pointed out south Anchorage residents have voiced their preference that zoning in their neighborhoods remain as rural with large lots. She respected and understood the desires of south Anchorage residents. However, east Anchorage residents do not want to absorb all development growth, and should be allowed the same voice in preferences for east Anchorage development. Ms. Davis requested the language that allows other areas of town to maintain growth allocations similar to current housing be applied to descriptions of east Anchorage neighborhoods. She asked the housing allocation chart be limited.

KATHLEEN STEVENSON, a resident near the curve of Muldoon and Tudor Roads, pointed out the local community councils and residents have worked hard to create a positive image. She felt allowing more high density development in east Anchorage would result in unsightly dumpsters, increase to existing overcrowding in schools, and more traffic problems. Ms. Stevenson asked the Assembly not take any action to take away open spaces or further stress over-burdened roads with more traffic.

In response to Ms. Taylor and Ms. Clementson, Ms. Davis said diversity is one of the desirable features in east Anchorage. Residents have been able to manage the great diversity; however, they would no longer be able to make judgements on a case-by-case basis if the growth allocation formula remains in the Plan. She felt even in the Plan was adopted as a mere guideline, the growth allocation should be removed. If it remains, even as a guideline, some people will interpret it as law.

DIRK SISSON urged the Assembly to support the Plan as recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission (P&Z). He also commended CPD staff and P&Z for their efforts to address public concerns raised earlier in the process. He felt the current version of the Plan was much improved over the original draft. He felt the current version has clarified and strengthened the Municipality's role to provide a collaborative public process with the Stevens International Airport. As a long-time resident of Turnagain, he has experienced the increased impacts from expanding development at the Airport. Mr. Sisson felt the public should have a stronger voice in future Airport growth. The new language in the Plan is a step in the right direction.

BARBARA HOOD, a Turnagain resident, encouraged the Assembly to adopt the Plan as recommended by CPD staff and P&Z. She felt its provisions were a step in the right direction. She commended P&Z and CPD staff for their efforts to respond to public comments early in the process. The original Plan revision, proposed in March, contained some significant problems specifically with respect to the Stevens International Airport. However, the existing revision is acceptable. She felt further changes requested by Airport officials are unnecessary, and asked the Assembly adopt the Plan as proposed with respect to the Airport. The collaborative guidelines in the Plan are important, because future growth of the Airport will be smoother with collaboration. Growth at the Airport has become a real problem and threat to quality of life for west Anchorage residents. Ms. Hood expressed concern that Airport officials have asked the Plan be revised to serve their needs, when reciprocal requests have been ignored. Until there is reciprocation and cooperation, the Plan should not be tailored to

serve the needs of one industry. She acknowledged the importance of the Airport, but pointed out the needs of residents are equally importance.

PAT REDMOND, representing the Turnagain Community Council, said the Council supported the changes made to the Plan by the CPD staff and encouraged approval of revisions recommended by P&Z. Ms. Redmond also spoke as an individual, and said she was comfortable with the recommendations of P&Z. She pointed out the Plan includes several text references which read: “the statements provide direction to public officials and the general public until the strategies are implemented.” There is also a section on the procedure for implementing strategies through a public process. With regard to the cost of implementation, Ms. Redmond pointed out there are insufficient revenues to pay for existing services, so it will not matter what choices are made. There will have to be new revenue sources for any services and improvements in the future. Therefore, she recommended the Plan be adopted and funding be addressed in the future.

ED EARNHART agreed Title 21 is unsatisfactory, especially in terms of its interpretation. He felt there was insufficient staff to address the complexity of Title 21. He said the Plan should include more detail with regard to implementation funding, and should have more discussion of regional plans. Mr. Earnhart felt without incorporation of regional plans and intergovernmental cooperation, planning would continue to be disrupted by disagreements and inefficiencies between local government entities. He was unsure whether the Plan was ready to be approved.

Mr. Tremaine moved, seconded by Ms. Clementson, and it passed with one member objecting,	to extend the public hearing portion of the meeting until midnight.
---	--

Mr. Tremaine moved, seconded by Ms. Clementson,	to change the orders of the day to consider item 12.A, AO 2000-124.
--	--

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

Ms. Hudson moved, seconded by Mr. Kendall, and it passed without objection,	to return to item 11.A, AO 2000-119, after completion of item 12.A, AO 2000-124.
--	---

Ms. Clementson moved, seconded by Mr. Tremaine, and it passed without objection,	to continue this meeting until September 27, 2000 at 5:00 for the purpose of considering certification of the Special Municipal Election, and continue that meeting until October 3, 2000 for the purpose of completing the agenda.
---	--

See the October 3, 2000 continuation of this meeting, after item 15.J, for further consideration of AO 2000-119.

- D. **SECOND PUBLIC HEARING:** Ordinance No. AO 2000-124, an ordinance **adopting the Girdwood Commercial Areas and Transportation Master Plan** as an element of the Anchorage Comprehensive Plan and amending Chapter 21.05 of the Anchorage Municipal Code (Girdwood) (Planning and Zoning Commission Case 2000-032), Community Planning and Development.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 742-2000.

Mr. Tesche disclosed a potential conflict of interest on this item. He explained work has been done by his law firm, by persons other than himself, for the Alaska Railroad during the year 2000. He stated he did not recall doing any work for the Alaska Railroad during this year. Mr. Tesche explained his law firm represents a number of clients on workers compensation and self insurance cases, but he has not personally worked on any of these issues during this year for the Alaska Railroad. He said the total amount of billings to others in the law firm, for Alaska Railroad cases in 2000 through September 15 was \$6,483.58 of which \$560.58 were reimbursable costs. He reiterated that the work was handled by other employees of the firm, so it would be difficult to calculate whether he received any personal economic benefit from the Railroad’s work.

Mr. Meyer moved, seconded by Ms. Fairclough,	the question “does Assemblymember Tesche have a substantial financial interest in the matter before the Assembly?”
---	--

In response to Mr. Meyer, Mr. Tesche agreed the amount in question was probably less than five percent of total gross revenue.

In response to Chair Von Gemmingen, Mr. Tesche estimated a very small fraction of the amount in question, if any, would eventually be distributed to him as an employee of the firm. Because of the firm’s method of compensation, an exact analysis would take several days.

Question was called on whether Mr. Tesche had a substantial financial interest and it failed:

AYES: None.
NAYS: Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.
ABSTAIN: Tesche.

(Clerk’s Note: Mr. Sullivan was out of the room at the time of the vote.)

Chair Von Gemmingen opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak.

MARTIN STEWART, president of the Alyeska Ski Club, spoke representing its Board of Directors. He distributed and read a resolution approved by the Club in support of including the proposed railroad spur in the Girdwood Transportation Master Plan. The resolution outlined the importance of safe and efficient transportation for Club members, and a rail spur would allow members to travel to Alyeska with greater convenience and without the danger of automobile travel. Mr. Stewart pointed out the rail spur is still at the conceptual level, and must undergo significant economic and environmental review before implementation. He felt removal of the spur from the Master Plan would be premature at this time and would not allow continued review of that option. Mr. Stewart concluded by stating the Board of Directors strongly discouraged the Assembly from removing the spur as an option from the Master Plan.

ERIC DOWNEY read a statement by KIRK HOESSLE. The statement outlined Mr. Hoessle's position as president of Alaska Wildland Adventures, and his involvement on various tourism boards. Mr. Hoessle felt the Girdwood Board of Supervisor's position on the Master Plan accurately reflected the desires of the community. Tourism industry representatives must work with members of the community as the industry grows. The character of the community and the desires of its residents should shape the growth and development of tourism, rather than the reverse. If growth begins to shape the character of the community, Alaska will lose its unique qualities, which are what attract tourists to the State. Mr. Hoessle felt the proposed rail spur would be too costly, is proposed for the wrong area, and would not substantially alleviate road traffic. His tour company operates its own transportation system of buses and shuttles. Should they ever choose to utilize the Alyeska resort, they would provide their own bus transportation. A transit station at the Valley entrance would better serve a broader spectrum of tourism interests in the Valley, as well as residents. Although Alyeska Resort is important to the economy of Girdwood, a healthy economy and a healthy quality of life would be better served by developments that provide opportunities for a wider range of tourism interests.

Mr. Downey added his own perspective, saying he commutes to his job in Girdwood. He had no interest in doubling the cost and duration of his commute by using the proposed rail spur.

ANNE HERSHLEB, chair of the Girdwood trails committee, spoke against inclusion of the rail spur in the Master Plan. She noted six of thirteen trails in the Girdwood Valley that would be displaced by the proposed spur. She noted the spur is only feasible with public subsidies: Federal funds to build the project; Municipal transfer of Heritage Land Bank land; and taxes by the Regional Transit Authority to operate and maintain the project. Ms. Hershleb questioned the public benefit that could justify the cost of these subsidies for a private organization. She felt the maximum 10 percent of traffic decrease was not enough of a benefit to justify the impact to the community. She noted the Alaska Railroad Corporation has taken a position that it is exempt from local planning and zoning and land use regulations; she felt a clarification of this issue was necessary before proceeding. Ms. Hershleb supported the proposed Valley entry multi-modal transportation center in the Master Plan. She felt it was a fine alternative for mass transportation and would benefit the entire community, including those small businesses that would be bypassed by the spur. It would also serve the Resort at a much lower cost to the taxpayer. She supported the other areas of the Master Plan. Ms. Hershleb asked the Assembly delete the railroad spur from the Master Plan, and replace it with the Valley-entry transportation center.

GENE ANDERSON, a commercial fisherman and citizen activist, said he was very familiar with land use and transportation issues. He discussed the difficulties in communities that are built to accommodate automobiles rather than people. He suggested more transit-oriented developments be built, and more transportation modes be offered, such as rail. As the population ages, more communities will need to be pedestrian-friendly. A resident of Girdwood, he urged the Assembly to approve the proposed Master Plan, including the rail spur.

WILLIAM CHADWICK discussed public safety concerns. He noted there was an access problem in Girdwood, as there is only one road to enter and exit the community. A major incident on the road would trap citizens in the community. He felt it was imperative that the Master Plan include a second ingress/egress route to the Valley. Mr. Chadwick said the route might be a rail spur. He also supported the collector street proposed between Crow Creek Road and Arlburg Avenue. This collector would include a second bridge over Glacier Creek. If something happens to or on the existing bridge, half the community would be isolated from emergency services. Mr. Chadwick also supported provisions in the Master Plan to clear trees from road rights-of-way to serve as fire breaks. It is imperative that roads be wide enough to isolate a wildfire and create a defensible space, to avoid damage to the entire community. Along these same lines, he also asked that provisions be included that would address flammable roofing materials. He noted during wildfires, the greatest cause of structure loss is due to flammable roofing material. He felt such materials should be prohibited in the commercial areas of Girdwood. Mr. Chadwick supported the rail spur concept, as a means for alternative transportation for intoxicated visitors to Girdwood. He pointed out there have been a disproportionate number of driving-while-intoxicated fatalities in their community. He felt mass transportation between Anchorage and the Resort was a important public safety need.

R.J. (JIM) HENDERSON, of the Anchorage Convention and Visitors Bureau, spoke as an individual. He felt the proposed rail spur was an excellent idea. In his work, he tries to promote Anchorage as a better visitor destination than other communities. He explained the length of stay per visitor continues to decrease, and the cost of attracting visitors continues to increase. He said more attractions and activities within Anchorage would increase visitors' time spent here. He felt the rail spur would be new and exciting, and would increase the marketability of Anchorage as a tourist destination. It could help increase the number of days per visit of tourists. Mr. Henderson felt Anchorage residents would also enjoy the increased rail service.

RAVEN (DAVID SWENDIMAN), a member of the Society for International Sustainable Development, said he has worked as an intermediary between developers and environmentalists around the world. He pointed out the missing element of the Master Plan, in the battle between economics and ecology, was education. Education would allow the two opposing sides to come together and find a solution. Mr. Swendiman felt Girdwood was unparalleled on Earth, in terms of its residents and access to wild spaces. If developers and environmentalists come together on this issue, Girdwood and other places in and around Anchorage could be unprecedented income-producers, with minimal infrastructure and low ecological impact. Mr. Swendiman felt an aggressive, strategic initiative to encourage railroad use between Anchorage and Girdwood was a great idea. Also, a bus system within Girdwood would benefit everyone.

PER BJORN-ROLI said when he was a ski instructor at Alyeska in the early 1960's, he felt Alyeska would become a world-class resort. That expectation has been surpassed. He felt growth in the future will be expansive. Therefore, he supported the proposed Master Plan, specifically the rail spur to the Resort. Mr. Bjorn-Roli explained in his home as a child, Norway, very few people use automobiles to visit the mountains. In that country, a network of electric rail cars transport skiers to the ski area. This commitment to rail was the key to the winter tourism success in Norway. He hoped they would have vision for the future, and set aside the rail corridor and study mass transportation. Mr. Bjorn-Roli felt the advisory vote in Girdwood did not reflect the sentiments of the entire community. If Girdwood property owners who reside in Anchorage voted, the outcome would have been different. Surveys conducted by Hellenthal & Associates showed Girdwood property owners who reside in Anchorage favor the rail spur by 77 percent.

In response to Mr. Tremaine, Mr. Bjorn-Roli was not sure he would support using a heavy rail system; he pointed out the Master Plan would initiate a period of study and debate of what kind of equipment should be used. It would be the Alaska Railroad's responsibility to come up with alternatives that officials and citizens would support. He felt citizens were smart enough to oppose the wrong form of railroad transportation. However, the rail corridor should be set aside to study the options.

GEORGE MCCOY, involved in community planning in Girdwood since the 1970's, was a former member of the Girdwood Board of Supervisors and Heritage Land Bank Commission. Mr. McCoy said 27 years ago, his new home of Girdwood had a population of 180. He could not have envisioned the community as it is today, including a 4-star hotel, tram, natural gas service, public water and sewer and a population of over 2,000. He felt equally unable to predict the changes in Girdwood by the year 2025, but was sure the community would be very different. He supported the Master Plan as proposed, with some very minor changes. It was extremely important to keep all options open, and he supported the corridor on the east side of the Valley. However, he felt the corridor should be generalized and not depict specific connections with existing roads in Alyeska Basin Subdivision. Mr. McCoy added he supported the Arlburg connector from Crow Creek Road to the Alyeska Prince Hotel. Also, he wanted to see the westside route preserved as a transportation corridor. He pointed out buses run on diesel fuel, and there are no emission standards for diesel engines. If the rail option does not exist, hundreds of buses will gradually become the method of transit for tourists in Girdwood.

The Assembly suspended the rules to consider item 9.D, AR 2000-131. See following this item for further action on item 15.D, AO 2000-124.

Resolution No. AR 2000-131, a resolution **confirming and levying special assessments for Special Assessment District No. 4SR96**, which reconstructed North Point Drive, North Point Circle, and Mere Circle, and setting the date of assessment, installment, payments, interest on unpaid assessments, and providing for penalties and interest in the event of delinquency, Public Works Department.

1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 509-2000.
2. Information Memorandum No. AIM 60-2000.
3. Information Memorandum No. AIM 76-2000.
4. Information Memorandum No. AIM 86-2000.

(CARRIED OVER FROM 6-13-00; AMENDED 6-20-00; POSTPONED FROM 6-20-00, 7-18-00, 8-29-00, AND 9-12-00)

Chair Von Gemmingen gave the history of the resolution and noted a motion to approve as amended was on the floor.

BRANT MCGEE, son of property owners in the subject District, said he had discussed his proposal with the Municipal Attorney, Bill Greene. His understanding was that there are no technical barriers to his proposal, although Mr. Greene had legal arguments against the scheme. Mr. McGee reiterated his parents' assessment is unfair because it would be a cost of \$16,591 but they would receive no practical benefit from the road reconstruction. Other members in the district will be assessed an average of \$2,840. He proposed his parents be charged \$2,840 and the remainder of the assessment be deferred until such time as access is constructed or until his parents die. He explained the various exception justifications that could be used in this case.

In response to Ms. Hudson, Mr. McGee said the assessment was not fair, and he was trying to protect his parents from being charged. He said if there is any development of the property after his parents die, the owners would then pay the assessment.

Mr. Sullivan moved,
seconded by Ms. Abney,

to amend AR 2000-131 in the assessment roll, to change
parcel #1 to show an assessment amount of \$2,840.

Mr. Sullivan felt the McGee's argument was sound. They were being asked to pay eight times the average assessment in the district for a road they would never use. He acknowledged the assessment laws apply in this case, as the property abuts the improvement; however, the Assembly must act based on the big picture and common sense. The Assembly has the ability to make exceptions; he felt one was justified in this case.

Municipal Attorney Bill Greene disagreed with the McGee's analysis of the situation. However, he noted the Assembly is free to determine whether the assessment is proportional in cost to the benefit received.

Mr. Tesche agreed the Assembly could make a judgement on these matters. He felt Mr. Sullivan's motion was the most fair and equitable way to deal with this situation.

Ms. Hudson supported the motion, but felt some stipulation should be made for any future development of the property.

Mr. Greene noted future development is one of the indirect benefits from assessments. To say that the assessment should be low now and raised in the future based on subdivision or further improved is inconsistent with the fundamentals of the assessment as it presently stands. Benefits from the assessment cover a wide range, including driveway access and indirect such as dust control, improvement of amenities, potential future development, environmental conditions and traffic considerations.

Ms. Clementson noted the unassessed share of costs against applicable lots shall not be spread to the remaining properties in the district, but shall be borne by everyone in ARDSA, the Anchorage Roads and Drainage Service Area. Although the amount in question is relatively small, it is not the first or last time there has been a request of this nature. She explained the difference between a levy-upon-connection for water and sewer service, and the subject assessment district. She noted only half of the McGee's parcel is being assessed. Ms. Clementson felt it would set a dangerous precedent to issue exceptions based on the identity of property owners. The longest edge of the McGee's parcel will abut the road proposed to be improved, so it will clearly benefit. The assessment is much larger than other properties in the district because their parcel is much larger than others in the district. She felt policies on assessment districts must be consistent, because of the risk of favoritism. She cited examples of other assessment districts where the Assembly has decided a protesting property owner did benefit from an improvement, even though they could not physically access the improvement from their property.

Ms. Fairclough agreed with Ms. Clementson. She sympathized with the McGee's, but pointed out the Regulatory Commission of Alaska defines the burden for improvement districts.

Mr. Sullivan clarified the McGee's stature was not the basis for his motion; he felt the Assembly should decide whether the case was fair. He pointed out the McGee's property does not have access to the road proposed to be improved. He pointed out they would actually experience negative effects from the improvement, such as noise, pollution and increased traffic. He argued the Assembly has made exceptions in the past, which have not set precedents.

In response to Ms. Clementson, Municipal Engineer Howard Holtan said there were a few districts scheduled to come before the Assembly in the future, that include properties that do not have direct access to the improved road. He agreed this is a difficult dilemma, but he asked the Assembly not tie assessments to the issue of access.

Office of Planning, Development and Public Works Director Craig Campbell pointed out there is a direct parallel between the access issue in the subject district and the Turnagain Northeast assessment district, which is currently in litigation.

Ms. Clementson stressed Mr. Campbell's point about Turnagain Northeast Subdivision. She recalled, for members who were not on the Assembly, the extreme pain during processing of that assessment district. She pointed out paved roadways enhance property values by reducing dust pollution, improving marketability and many other areas. She questioned how Mr. Sullivan determined that his proposed assessment reflected the actual benefit that would be received by the McGee's.

Mr. Sullivan responded he felt using an average of the assessments in the district was fair and as good as any other method of determining the benefit. In response to Chair Von Gemmingen, he said he would let the Municipal Attorney determine who would bear the remaining amount of the McGee's assessment, if his motion passed.

Question was called on Mr. Sullivan's motion to amend and it failed:

AYES: Sullivan, Abney, Tesche, Meyer, Hudson.
NAYS: Tremaine, Kendall, Von Gemmingen, Fairclough, Taylor, Clementson.

Mr. Tremaine moved,	to amend AR 2000-131 in the assessment roll, to change
seconded by Mr. Sullivan,	parcel #1 to show an assessment amount of \$8,300.

Mr. Tremaine explained this proposed amount was half of the assessment based on area. He felt there was some future benefit, but it was not as large as reflected by the assessment proposed by the Administration.

In response to Chair Von Gemmingen, Mr. Holtan explained Tract 32 is a large tract, perhaps as large as five acres. Only half of the Tract was used to calculate the assessment.

Question was called on Mr. Tremaine's motion to amend and it failed:

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Tesche, Meyer.
NAYS: Kendall, Von Gemmingen, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.

Mr. Kendall moved,	to amend AR 2000-131 on line 32 to read: "...before the
seconded by Mr. Tremaine,	first day of December of each year..." and on line 33 to read:
and it passed without	"...payable on December 1, 2000."
objection,	

Ms. Hudson moved,	to amend AR 2000-131 by attaching the assessment roll
seconded by Ms. Fairclough,	dated July 18, 2000 and attached to AIM 76-2000.
and it passed without	
objection,	

Question was called on the motion to approve AR 2000-131 as amended and it passed:

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Hudson, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

Ms. Fairclough suggested the Administration and Assembly try to address inequities in the assessment formula.

Mr. Holtan noted the Administration realizes the problem and has been working toward improvements. Their plan was to investigate various options, and present them to the Assembly, by the end of the year, as a wholesale change to the road assessment methods in Municipal Code Title 19.

The meeting recessed at 10:50 p.m. and reconvened at 10:55 p.m.

Ms. Fairclough moved, immediate reconsideration of AR 2000-131 as amended.
seconded by Ms. Clementson,

AYES: Sullivan, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Taylor.

NAYS: Tremaine, Von Gemmingen, Meyer, Fairclough, Hudson, Clementson.

The Assembly then returned to the public hearing on item 15.D, AO 2000-124.

GARY RANDALL, a Girdwood property owner, said he was in support of the proposed rail spur. He pointed out Alyeska Resort has grown over the years to provide many all-season recreation opportunities, and felt the spur would enhance access to the Resort. It would also provide a safe way to travel in winter months when roads are dangerous, and an easy way to transport visitors in the summer. Mr. Randall felt the rail spur would be a positive addition to the area, and fits within the long term comprehensive plan for the Girdwood area, as well as future development plans of Alyeska Resort. He noted Alyeska has been a benefit to Girdwood, employing many residents. Therefore, everyone should support the spur which will enhance the health and future of the area. He pointed out Girdwood would not exist in its present form without the Resort.

BUTCH WEST, a long-time Anchorage resident and Girdwood property owner, encouraged the Assembly to retain the rail spur in the Master Plan as a viable option. He pointed out at this point, the spur is only an option, and not ready to be implemented. Before implementation, it would require rigorous environmental and economic reviews before it is implemented. Mr. West felt it was premature to delete the spur based on the emotions that seem to be surrounding the issue.

GARY MCCARTHY spoke on behalf of Girdwood 2020, a group of over 300 members who organized to provide a voice for a larger vision of developing Girdwood in a planned, environmentally sound way. He said members want Girdwood to grow and prosper as a unique, mountain resort community through environmentally-responsible economic development. The group commissioned a survey of the attitude of Anchorage residents toward Girdwood, because of the fundamental flaws associated with the advisory vote last year regarding building a rail spur. The ballot language was misleading, because it did not take into account map #3 in the plan. Also, most of the 1,200 Girdwood property owners who live in Anchorage did not participate. Mr. McCarthy pointed out the survey showed amazing consensus; eighty-two percent of Anchorage residents, and seventy-nine percent of Girdwood residents support development of a four-season resort in Girdwood. Seventy-three percent of Anchorage residents and sixty-two percent of Girdwood residents support development of Winner Creek as a new downhill ski area. Seventy-nine percent of Anchorage residents support commuter rail service into Girdwood Valley. Forty-five percent of Girdwood residents either support, or do not oppose, the rail spur. Eighty-eight percent of Girdwood property owners with residences in Anchorage also support the rail spur. Mr. McCarthy said support of the rail spur is widespread. A vote to oppose this transportation option is a vote against the vision of the large majority of the community. He felt the real issue was use of the Municipality's substantial land assets in Girdwood. Girdwood has great potential to continue maturation to a four season destination resort. The adoption of the Girdwood Area Plan was a huge step forward because it guided and controlled the type of growth residents desire. This growth would develop the valley's land resources with care and preserves the small town atmosphere cherished by all. Mr. McCarthy said Girdwood 2020 strongly supports implementation of the Master Plan and its vision. However, vision cannot become reality without preserving options for the future. He asked the Assembly approve the Plan as presented. He pointed out it was developed by experts with guidance from residents of Girdwood who fully participated in the process. The Plan was unanimously recommended by the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Heritage Land Bank Advisory Commission.

JOAN PASCAL FRANKEVICH, a Girdwood resident and property owner, said she supported mass transit in Girdwood. However, she felt the proposed rail spur was the wrong method of achieving that service. She supported the alternative, which was bringing rail or bus service to the valley entrance, and building a valley-entry multi-modal center as called for in the draft Master Plan. This service would then be combined with a local shuttle bus system, also in the Master Plan. She felt it was important to note the Master Plan was designed to work without the spur. Ms. Frankevich pointed out the alternative she described has been the locally-preferred alternative for many years. She noted the Girdwood Area Plan adopted in 1995 states that shuttle bus service should be instituted between the two existing resort-based areas, any future resort-based areas, the Girdwood commercial areas and a rail service station, when service is offered. She noted in 1995, Alyeska Resort officials supported the train/shuttle combination system. She asked the Assembly honor the concept in the 1995 transit plan by deleting the rail spur from the proposed Master Plan. Ms. Frankevich added there are few indicators that the spur will be used, and many indicators that people will not use the service. She said it would not serve residents or commuters, and would serve very few visitors. She noted according to major tour companies, the majority of tour busses that visit Girdwood cannot be replaced by rail, because they originate from non-rail locations such as Portage Glacier and the Kenai Princess Hotel. Tour operators also have described the flexibility and convenience that busses offer, with their ability to pick up passengers from their hotels, and ability to stop at will to view wildlife along Turnagain Arm. Ms. Frankevich pointed out the spur would not eliminate or reduce use of roads. Also, the Master Plan calls for building the spur soon, rather than in the future as proponents claim.

DAVID KASSER, a long-time Alaska resident, said he had eighteen years of experience with tourism. He supported retaining the rail spur corridor as outlined in the Master Plan as a future option. Mr. Kasser felt in order to plan for the future, there is an obligation to look past current concerns regarding development, in order to give people in the future the ability to choose a rail link. Ultimately, a rail corridor would offer better access between Anchorage and Chugach National Forest. Currently, that access is stymied by road conditions and heavy traffic. He felt students, skiers and commuters would all benefit from rail service. Also, the footprint of a rail corridor is smaller than that of a roadway, and offers emergency egress from the valley which is currently unavailable. Mr. Kasser felt negative impacts can be addressed through careful planning and design allowing for viaducts, underpasses and overpasses. He added new rail equipment will continue to be lighter and quieter as technology improves. Girdwood is growing, and the current roadway connecting the community with Anchorage will eventually become insufficient to meet the needs of residents.

JERRY REICHLIN, a 22-year Girdwood resident, said he commutes to Anchorage daily. He asked the Master Plan be remanded to the Planning Department, so the rail corridor plans can be eliminated. He noted railroads were good for

transporting tons of coal or wheat over long distances, but for transporting people short a distance to a pristine valley, they are inappropriate. There must be a better, cleaner, less intrusive and less expensive way to transport people to and around Girdwood. Mr. Reichlin noted the Master Plan does not provide for a spur in the future, rather, it calls for immediate action to begin the process for implementing the spur. He questioned the value to the Municipality from the spur. There is no plan for the Alaska Railroad to purchase the land necessary for the spur. They will expect the Municipality to donate the land. Although federal funds would pay for construction, he felt funding for operation and maintenance of the tracks and railroad cars would be borne by Anchorage taxpayers. This would be unfair, as the spur will serve tourists and skiers rather than commuters. Mr. Reichlin felt a multi-modal station should be built at the entrance of the valley that would serve the needs of the community and the needs of the future for the recreational areas in Girdwood.

SOREN WUERTH, of the group Empower Communities With Non-violent Direct Action and Grass Roots Organizing, said local decisions are often the best. He said the rail spur was a plan that will benefit a single, private interest that will ignore costs, harm to the environment and harm to the community. Despite unanimous opposition by the Girdwood Board of Supervisors, overwhelming opposition from residents and the fact that the spur does not appear in the Girdwood Area Plan, it is still being discussed. Mr. Wuerth felt it was wrong that a small group of politically-powerful individuals can force their agenda upon a community. He asked the Assembly do the right thing and leave the rail spur option out of the Master Plan. He pointed out if there is desire for the spur in the future, or a more cost effective plan using better technology, the Master Plan can always be revised.

CHRIS VON IMHOF spoke as a resident of Girdwood for over 30 years, former chair of the Girdwood Board of Supervisors and general manager of Alyeska Resort. He noted the proposed Master Plan was developed over the last four years with expert consultants and with many public meetings. He felt it was an excellent guideline for community planning and development. The Plan reviews many alternatives, including two future new roads and the rail spur. He was surprised that the rail spur was receiving all the criticism, rather than the two roads. The new roads would require a footprint width of 60 to 80 feet, whereas the rail spur would be less than 20 feet. Mr. Von Imhof noted roads require more land, create more vehicular traffic and pollution require more parking lots. He felt these impacts were undesirable in a pedestrian and trail-friendly community. The Master Plan lists four potential negative impacts and ten potential positive impacts for the rail spur option. Mr. Von Imhof said growth was inevitable, and asked the Assembly retain the rail spur option in the Master Plan. He noted it would take many years of economic and environmental review to determine the best long-term transportation solution for Girdwood, and all possible alternatives should be preserved.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. Von Imhof said he did not oppose a valley-entrance multi-modal transportation center. However, that may not be economically feasible for the Alaska Railroad. Also, he felt users would not care for a service that would require them to transfer from a train to a bus.

CAMILLA SEIFERT, a long-time Girdwood resident, said she did not oppose development in general, but did oppose the proposed rail spur. She noted the spur would not serve transportation needs within the Girdwood valley. The spur route would be from the Stevens International Airport to the Alyeska Prince Hotel, and would not help local transportation or reduce traffic on the Alyeska Highway. She felt the spur would not serve the tourism industry, as there was no indication from tour operators that they will use rail service. Rail service will be prohibitively expensive for individual users, such as skiers. Ms. Seifert questioned whether the Municipality would be responsible for funding operation and maintenance of the spur, and questioned the benefit to the Municipality of a project that would benefit one private business. She felt it would be irresponsible to proceed before these questions are answered. She noted the rail spur does not have support in the Girdwood community; she felt if Anchorage residents understood the issues, it is likely the spur would not be supported in Anchorage either. Ms. Seifert asked the Assembly to remove the spur proposal from the Master Plan.

LEWIS LEONARD, president of the Girdwood Community Club, outlined the many community buildings and services the Club has helped establish. He noted the requests of the Club are included in the Master Plan, but the Club is mis-identified as the Girdwood Commercial Club. Mr. Leonard asked the Assembly to remember the contributions and requests of the Club when approving the Master Plan.

Ms. Hudson moved,
seconded by Mr. Meyer,
and it passed without
objection,

to adjourn until 5:00 p.m. on September 27, 2000, to certify
the results of the Special Municipal Election of September 19,
2000 and to swear in Assemblymember-elect Doug Van Etten.

Chair Von Gemmingen announced that unfinished items from this portion of the meeting would be considered at the October 3, 2000 continuation of the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at midnight on September 26, 2000.

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE
ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY

Minutes for Regular Meeting of September 26, 2000
continued to September 27 and October 3, 2000

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was reconvened at 5:00 p.m. on September 27, 2000 by Assembly Chair Fay Von Gemmingen in conference room 160, 632 West 6th Avenue, Anchorage, Alaska.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Dan Sullivan, Dick Tremaine, Pat Abney, Allan Tesche, Fay Von Gemmingen, Kevin Meyer,
Anna Fairclough, Melinda Taylor, Wilda Hudson, Cheryl Clementson.
Absent: Dan Kendall (excused.)

The Assembly continued with **Unfinished Agenda** items.

E. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 879-2000, certification of the Run-Off Municipal Election of
September 19, 2000 (Assembly Section 4, Seat F).

Marie Lastufka, Chair of the Municipal Election Commission, introduced other members of the Commission in attendance. Ms. Lastufka explained Commission members had completed counting of remaining absentee and questioned ballots, and read a report of the final totals.

Mr. Tesche moved, to approve AM 879-2000.
seconded by Mr. Sullivan,
and it passed without
objection,

Assembly member Doug Van Etten was sworn in by Municipal Clerk Jane Ferguson.

Ms. Clementson expressed appreciation to Election Commission members for their work on this election.

Chair Von Gemmingen presented a plaque to Ms. Hudson, in appreciation of her service to the Municipality as a member of the Anchorage Assembly.

Ms. Hudson thanked the Assembly. She said she enjoyed her tenure on the body.

The Assembly members thanked Ms. Hudson in turn.

Mr. Meyer welcomed Mr. Van Etten.

Other Assembly members welcomed Mr. Van Etten.

Ms. Clementson moved, to adjourn the meeting until 6:00 p.m. on October 3, 2000.
seconded by Mr. Tesche,
and it passed without
objection,

The meeting adjourned at 5:35 p.m. on September 27, 2000.

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE

ANCHORAGE ASSEMBLY

Minutes for Regular Meeting of September 26, 2000
continued to September 27 and October 3, 2000

1. CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was reconvened at 6:00 p.m. on October 3, 2000 by Assemblymember Melinda Taylor in the Assembly Chambers, 3600 Denali, Anchorage, Alaska.

2. ROLL CALL:

Present: Dan Sullivan, Dick Tremaine, Pat Abney (6:45 p.m.), Dan Kendall, Allan Tesche, Kevin Meyer (6:45 p.m.), Anna Fairclough, Melinda Taylor, Doug Van Etten, Cheryl Clementson.
Absent: Fay Von Gemmingen (excused.)

3. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:

The pledge was led by Mr. Van Etten.

The Assembly continued with **Unfinished Agenda** items.

F. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 887-2000, Budget Advisory Commission appointment (Jeff Staser), Mayor's Office.

Ms. Fairclough moved, to reconsider action on item 7.D.2, AM 887-2000.
seconded by Ms. Clementson,

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Tesche, Taylor, Fairclough, Van Etten, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

(Clerk's Note: Ms. Abney and Mr. Meyer had not arrived at the time of the vote.)

Ms. Fairclough moved, to substitute and approve AM 887-2000(A).
seconded by Mr. Tesche,

In response to Ms. Fairclough, Deputy Municipal Clerk Vickie Cantrell advised that the substitute was submitted at the request of the Administration to correct the expiration date of the term as well as the name of the person to be replaced.

Mr. Sullivan clarified that Jeff Staser was the replacement person. The name of the person he was replacing was incorrect on the original version.

Question was called on the motion to substitute and approve AM 887-2000(A) and it passed:

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Kendall, Tesche, Taylor, Fairclough, Clementson.
NAYS: None.

(Clerk's Note: Ms. Abney and Mr. Meyer had not arrived, and Mr. Van Etten was out of the room, at the time of the vote.)

G. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 877-2000, Bear Tooth - Transfer of Ownership and Location for a Beverage Dispensary Liquor License and Application for a Restaurant Designation Permit (Spenard Community Council), Clerk's Office.
(POSTPONED FROM 9-12-00)

Chair Taylor gave the history of the memorandum and noted a motion to approve AM 877-2000 was on the floor.

ROD HANCOCK, co-owner of the Bear Tooth, said an advertising error had occurred when the State Alcoholic Beverage Control (ABC) Board listed the notice as a transfer of ownership and location. He said it was only a transfer of ownership, not location.

In response to Ms. Clementson, Mr. Hancock said the project was not completed. He said the theater side was finished, but they had an open permit with the Municipality for the completion of the restaurant side, and the landscaping would be done as part of that package. He anticipated that the building permit would be closed out in the spring.

Ms. Fairclough said she had received a letter advising that the landscaping required by the conditional use permit on Mr. Hancock's other facility, the Moose's Tooth, has also not been completed. She asked him to explain why he was currently in noncompliance on that conditional use permit.

Mr. Hancock stated their five-year lease was up on the building, and they are currently negotiating with the owners to purchase the building or renew the lease. Landscaping was part of those negotiations. He said the matter would be resolved by their renewal date of February 28, 2001, and the landscaping would be done in the springtime.

Ms. Fairclough requested that the owners of the Moose's Tooth appear before the Assembly the first meeting in March to advise of their intentions with respect to the property. In the alternative, she asked that the owners of the building advise in writing the status as of the first of March.

Ms. Clementson suggested the owners be given until June 1 so the landscaping at both locations could actually be accomplished by that time. Ms. Fairclough concurred.

Mr. Hancock assured the Assembly that they wanted to have attractive landscaping at both locations.

In response to Mr. Sullivan, Mr. Hancock said the change in State law that required a beverage dispensary permit at the Bear Tooth had been expensive to comply with. He said that location was grandfathered, and they would not have been permitted to have the Bear Tooth without acquiring a beverage dispensary license and converting their brewery to a brew pub. He said they had been forced to do the same thing at the Moose's Tooth, which was essentially a beer and wine facility, and it had cost them \$125,000, but it had allowed them to expand. He said since they have a full beverage dispensary permit and the restaurant had a southwestern theme, they would serve tequila on the restaurant side, but there would be no hard liquor in the theater, it would remain beer and wine only. With respect to special events, Mr. Hancock said they had recently brought a band up from the Lower 48 for a special event. He said they were fun and they would continue to do them. However, the movies were extremely successful, and they were very much committed to the movie concept around which the facility had been developed.

Question was called on the motion to approve AM 877-2000 and it passed without objection.

- H. **Resolution No. AR 2000-267**, a resolution of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly supporting a statewide **Grant Anticipated Revenue Vehicle (GARVEE) Bond for transportation improvements**, Office of Management and Budget.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 871-2000.
(POSTPONED FROM 9-12-00)

Chair Taylor gave the history of the resolution and noted a motion to approve AR 2000-267 was on the floor.

Ms. Clementson said they had an excellent work session on this item, and she felt all their questions had been answered. She recommended a yes vote.

Ms. Fairclough explained that this item represents a new vehicle through which bonds could be financed with federal funds in the future. She agreed with Ms. Clementson that their questions regarding liability issues and how it would affect bond ratings had been answered during the work session. She said the GARVEE Bond would be beneficial to the City.

Mayor Wuerch explained that the GARVEE Bond concept had recently been authorized by Congress. He said it allows local jurisdictions to borrow against future federal highway funds. He said they would effectively sell a form of revenue bond, and the payment of the bond would come from future highway dollars. He said they have met regularly during the past year with the Southcentral District of the State Department of Transportation, and the draft that was before the Assembly for approval at this time was jointly agreed to by the Administration and the State Department of Transportation. Mayor Wuerch stated that the next meeting of the AMATS Policy Board was scheduled for Thursday, October 5, and it would be timely for the Assembly to approve this item tonight.

Mr. Sullivan said Mr. Tremaine had pointed out earlier during the work session that in item number one, the C Street extension, some of the funds were already included in the Municipality's capital projects funds. So the total being requested for this item would include a surplus of nine to twelve million dollars.

Mr. Sullivan moved,	to amend the project list in AR 2000-267 to allocate \$9 million
and it died for lack of a second,	to build a frontage road on the east side of Minnesota Boulevard, from Dimond Boulevard to Raspberry Road.

Question was called on the motion to approve AR 2000-267 and it passed without objection.

- I. **SECOND PUBLIC HEARING: Ordinance No. AO 2000-124**, an ordinance **adopting the Girdwood Commercial Areas and Transportation Master Plan** as an element of the Anchorage Comprehensive Plan and amending Chapter 21.05 of the Anchorage Municipal Code (Girdwood) (Planning and Zoning Commission Case 2000-032), Community Planning and Development.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 742-2000.

Ms. Clementson moved,	that they allow representatives from the Alaska Railroad to
seconded by Mr. Tesche,	testify first on AO 2000-124 so that the Assembly could gain a
and it passed without	better understanding of this issue.
objection,	

Chair Taylor opened the public hearing and asked if anyone, first from the Railroad then others, wished to speak.

JIM KUBITZ said the Alaska Railroad's Master Plan includes building an integrated rail network that would make commuter rail from the Matanuska-Susitna Valley to Girdwood a viable transportation alternative. He said the Railroad encouraged the Assembly to leave the rail spur option in the Plan as they would like to conduct engineering and environmental studies in the near future to determine the feasibility of the spur.

In response to Ms. Fairclough, Mr. Kubitz said when they gained the answers that the proposed studies would provide, the Railroad would be able to measure the community's will and provide answers as to how the spur would affect the valley and the route the spur would take. Mr. Kubitz said the spur would be constructed of the same type of rail as is used on the main

line, but they would use different, lighter equipment. He added the Railroad had not yet considered how the land for the spur project would be paid for.

In response to Ms. Clementson, Mr. Kubitz said the transportation study now before the Assembly recommended a main depot on the main line with a depot in the valley and one at the end of the spur near the hotel as well. He said the plan does not specifically set aside the corridor, it simply recommends that a corridor be maintained for the project as an option within the Plan. Mr. Kubitz said he did not think the Railroad was responsible for that in the Plan, it was an item that had been developed by the transportation consultant. He also agreed with Ms. Clementson that they should acknowledge in the Plan that a cost feasibility study would be undertaken by the Railroad and a NEPA process would be conducted to determine the best alignment for the spur route. However, he said the spur project should not be included in the Plan maps to the level of detail currently contained in the Plan.

Ms. Clementson asked Mr. Kubitz to respond to a quote in an Anchorage Daily News article that appeared last week wherein he had stated, "The City would contribute almost all the land along the Railroad corridor."

Mr. Kubitz said if such a project were undertaken, the Railroad would simply provide the track and infrastructure to make commuter rail in Southcentral Alaska possible, but the Railroad had never committed to operating such a service itself. He said local transit authorities are responsible for commuter services, not railroads, so if the local government did not want to find a way to fund commuter services, those services would not be provided. With respect to the size of the right-of-way for the spur, Mr. Kubitz said the Railroad Engineering Department prefers the maximum right-of-way of 100 feet on either side of the centerline for access and maintenance purposes. He said as part of the commuter rail study currently underway by Wilbur Smith & Company, they would look at the viability of a Southcentral rail commuter network from Wasilla to Whittier and Seward.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. Kubitz said the Railroad would have to pay for the right-of-way land with a grant. He pointed out that when the Railroad needs land, it is normally required to purchase it, but if others want to use Railroad land, the Alaska Railroad has to provide it at no charge even though it tries to operate on the profits it is able to generate. He explained the spur would be advantageous to the local economy, and rail transportation would be safer than road travel. Girdwood residents would benefit by having an alternative transportation method to accommodate future growth, and it would negate the need for an additional ingress/egress road into and out of the valley. Mr. Kubitz reiterated that the Railroad had gone through an extensive local component last year during the land trade negotiations with the Heritage Land Bank. He said he did not know if the Railroad was required to legally, but they try to adhere to all local planning laws. He said if the spur was not included in the proposed Plan, the Railroad would continue to support the valley entry multimodal center if it was economically feasible. He said they do not require an immediate build decision of any kind, but they would like to implement the environmental and study work. He said the minimum language the Railroad would like in the Plan was, in the Immediate Section, to be allowed to conduct the environmental and engineering studies necessary to determine a potential route.

In response to Mr. Van Etten, Mr. Kubitz said it would be unlikely that the Railroad would want to provide freight services via the spur. He said that would require a facility to be built in Girdwood for unloading freight, and the Railroad would be unable to compete with the freight services provided by trucking firms.

In response to Mr. Tremaine, Mr. Kubitz said the Railroad makes exceptions for public use of the Railroad's rights-of-way for people who need access to their property. He said the Railroad, at its own expense, had even built trails alongside the rail north of Talkeetna because people were riding their four-wheelers on the tracks and it became a public safety issue. Mr. Kubitz said the Railroad would not prefer language to prohibit construction for 16 years because it would not only restrict the Railroad, but it would restrict the public use options in that time frame.

Vice Chairman Meyer arrived and assumed the Chair.

LANICE DRAKE said she was a 15-year Girdwood resident, and she and her husband were homeowners and taxpayers. She said she opposed the rail spur at this time because there were too few residents and not enough tourists to support it. She said while she was grateful for the presence of the Alyeska Resort, she felt it was severely limited in its ability to attract a large ski population due to its geographical location, size, amount of terrain, and its extreme ski and weather conditions. Ms. Drake felt they must plan for future growth, but she did not feel a rail spur would respond to Girdwood's needs at this time. She said the destruction of world-renowned wetlands and rainforests for the construction of a rail spur was unacceptable to her and to most Girdwood residents. She said the general feeling in Girdwood over this issue was one of panic at the potential loss of those things they treasure and respect. She said the rail spur was neither economically nor ethically feasible. She said their tax dollars should not be squandered but used wisely and for the right reasons. It was time to do the right thing and say no.

GABRIELLE MARKEL (reading letter for Alicia Foster). Ms. Markel said Ms. Foster lives and works in Girdwood, and like many other Girdwood residents, she had attended a number of meetings on the rail spur issue over the past three years. Ms. Foster felt there were too many unanswered questions regarding the rail spur portion of the Plan. Two questions she had were: (1) Who would ride and benefit from this train, and (2) How would the rail spur be an environmentally friendly alternative? She said a Railroad representative had explained at a previous meeting there would be only one price to ride the train, and it would mostly likely not be less than \$30 one way; it is currently \$52. She said even if Anchorage parents could afford to send their children on the train to go skiing, the train would not benefit Girdwood residents as it would not be an affordable commuter solution. She pointed out that there was already a train to Girdwood for tourists. She said the proposed spur would go to the resort, and not all tourists who go to Girdwood visit the resort. In addition, none of the major tour companies have said they would favor using the spur over their own buses. Therefore, the train would not be likely to reduce tourist road traffic to Girdwood. She asked if resort employees would use the train to get to and from work and if the train would accommodate people who were too inebriated to drive back to Anchorage at 2:00 or 3:00 a.m. She said the proposed rail spur would not be an environmentally friendly alternative as it would not eliminate any roads in the Plan, and the corridor cuts through a number of wetland corridors that are home to a variety of wildlife and waterfowl species. In addition, the rail

spur would add to the noise level throughout the valley. Ms. Foster asked that the Assembly eliminate the rail spur before adopting the Plan.

JULIE CROGHAN (reading letter from Debra Croghan). Ms. Croghan said she has been an Alaska resident for 21 years, and her husband has been an Alaska resident for 34 years. They live in Girdwood and own residential property in Anchorage and Girdwood. Ms. Croghan said she was a member of the Girdwood Trails Committee, was involved in several other community organizations, and had participated in shaping the Girdwood Area Plan. She had attended most of the meetings for the Girdwood Commercial Areas and Transportation Master Plan. With respect to the airport access collector on page 36, she asked that the language be changed to read, *"This roadway will provide a more direct access to the airport from the north. Thus, airport traffic on the residential area to the south and east will be restricted to local traffic only and that a limited amount of key cards shall be the only access to the airport."* Ms. Croghan was opposed to the proposed rail spur for four reasons: (1) It does not meet Girdwood's transportation needs, (2) It would grossly impact the local trails, (3) There are other feasible alternatives, and (4) The proposed rail spur through Girdwood overwhelmingly lacks community support. Ms. Croghan said it was her belief the rail spur would cause negative economic and recreational impacts throughout the valley, to the trail system, and to the quality of life in the community that would adversely affect both the residents and visitors. She pointed out that proposed roads included in the Plan would be built as needed after having gone through the appropriate legal process for approval. She said the rail spur, as provided for in the Plan, was scheduled to be built whether it was necessary or not. Ms. Croghan noted that an education summit with 400 attendees was held last week at the Alyeska Prince Hotel in Girdwood, and the community had easily absorbed the resulting vehicle traffic without any repercussions. She said the Alyeska Resort provides shuttle service for their guests, and the shuttle bus service could expand to meet the future growth of the community and perhaps the Alaska Railroad could begin commuter service to the valley entry. However, she did not believe that taxpayer-supported bus service was needed at this time, and they especially did not need a rail spur through Girdwood.

TOMMY O'MALLEY said he was born and raised in Anchorage, had lived with his family in Girdwood for 15 years, and was a commuter, working in Anchorage as a teacher. He has three children, they live next to the highway, and his children have been trained to be aware of the traffic and they use the bike path across the street. He said the message he wanted to leave the Assembly with was that the people in Girdwood really like their community, and they think of it as a special place, not just another subdivision. He said people who do not live there recognize the beauty of it, and it is a place they want to come to visit. It is a tourist attraction, and he enjoys tourists. Mr. O'Malley asked the Assembly to listen to the people who live in the community. The people who want the railroad want it for economic reasons, and it benefits mainly the resort. He pointed out that the resort has already received a lot of support from Anchorage, such as tax breaks, installation of the sewer system, and construction of roads. He said in turn, the resort has supported the community in the past few years. He pointed out that Girdwood residents are Alaskans, and he hoped the Assembly heard their collective voice and put the community's desires ahead of those of the foreign and commercial interests that were pushing for the rail spur.

BILL SCHWARTZ, representative of the Girdwood Board of Supervisors, said he had been in the valley since 1978. He said having been involved in all of the comprehensive and other plans since unification, he considered himself knowledgeable about the process. Mr. Schwartz stated that the election they held in Girdwood was a fair one, and State Troopers had been present to ensure its fairness and accuracy. He said the funding that was at issue could be better spent on many other projects that would benefit the community as well as the state. He said the community had tried to get the Railroad to upgrade the bridge over Glacier Creek, which was built in 1917 and is a significant flood hazard. He said the Railroad had refused to upgrade the bridge in the past, but it appears they may have recently reconsidered. Mr. Schwartz noted that it took Girdwood years to convince the Railroad to stop in their community, and when the Railroad did implement a stop there, it charged \$52 for a one-way fare from Girdwood to Portage, the same fare as it charged from Anchorage to Portage. In closing, he said the question the Assembly should ask the Railroad was, 'What project has the railroad not built after going through the NEPA process?'

KATIE MILLER, junior at Dimond High School, said she had attended Girdwood School from kindergarten through eighth grade. She had cross-country skied and hiked many of Girdwood's trails, and she felt she had a good understanding of what would be best for Girdwood in the long run. She felt Girdwood should develop alternative ways to get around the community instead of continuing to cater to the automobiles, trucks, and buses. She favored the concept of being able to board the train in Anchorage with her bicycle or ski gear and disembark right at the resort base. She said loading and unloading at the base of the mountain was the best way for skiers and hikers to get in and out of the valley. She noted that the Plan calls for using the shuttle service around the valley for visitors and residents, and she felt this would reduce vehicular traffic and as well as the number of intoxicated drivers on the roads. She thought it would be great for local businesses as well. She said that limiting Girdwood's future by deleting the rail spur option would be shortsighted. They must keep potential alternative transportation modes open for accessing Girdwood, and rail would provide many opportunities to curtail road traffic into and out of Girdwood. She said the rail spur would provide opportunities for commuters, students, and recreational visitors. She recommended keeping the rail spur option in the Plan because it made sense. The Municipality already owns the land, and setting it aside for future transportation needs would be prudent.

In response to Mr. Tremaine, Ms. Miller said she gets around Girdwood by walking or using her bicycle. She noted that the parking lots at the resort were over-crowded. She responded that it was literally impossible to be involved in after-school activities because of the lack of transportation, and that was why her family chose to move to Anchorage.

LAURIE TRYCK said she has been skiing on Mount Alyeska for 26 years and had lived in Girdwood for 12 years. She said her three children had attended Girdwood School, participated in the Alyeska Ski Club Mighty-Mights, Girdwood Ski Club, and various cross-country skiing programs. Ms. Tryck said as Girdwood's beautification chairperson, she works with volunteers on over 20 beautification sites throughout Girdwood. She has observed the traffic on the highway, including the dust storms that are created by the large commercial buses traveling in and out of Girdwood in the summertime. She said last winter, she and her son walked to the base of chair four holding their breath to keep from breathing the exhaust of 11 diesel buses with their engines running in the Alyeska parking lot. Referring the Assembly to her letter of October 30, 1996 on page 116 of the attachment to the Girdwood Transportation Plan, she said she supported the efforts of the consultants. She felt their recommendations were worthy and valid and that the process had been fair, objective, and professional. The rail spur vote was not fair and objective, and she did not vote as she felt it was a poorly worded ballot question that promoted the

anti-everything genre invading Girdwood at that time. She strongly advocated dedicating a transportation corridor into Girdwood for future alternative transportation modes. She said it would be imprudent to preclude opportunities to curtail vehicular traffic in and out of Girdwood. She said the Plan clearly provided for the qualities that were important to Girdwood residents, i.e., quality of life, environment, community character, and strategic tourism. She likened the current controversy over the rail spur to the reorganization of the Girdwood Fire Department that she said had also risen to the level of hysteria. She said after the community had been embroiled in legal battles over the issue at the time, they were now proud to claim a \$1.6 million fire hall with new state-of-the-art equipment. She said those were not pleasant times, but they had achieved their goal of improving Girdwood's emergency services. The rail spur was a new opportunity to plan for the future and to help preserve their open spaces and trails. She said change was coming, and how they control the change would affect their children's future.

In response to Ms. Clementson, Ms. Tryck said she believed a lot of people had voted in that election that were not registered, were not residents of or employed in Girdwood. She would have worded the question, *"Would you support the potential or future rail transportation in and out of Girdwood valley?"*

PAM RENKERT said she was a lifelong resident of Anchorage, and she opposed the rail spur. She said she goes to Girdwood often to downhill and cross-country ski, and her family enjoys the natural environment there. She said although she was not familiar with the exact proposed location of the spur, she thought it would adversely impact the Moose Meadow and Enchanted Forest areas. She said she has skied all over Anchorage and north of Anchorage, but these were her favorite areas. She said these areas were suitable for the elderly and children to ski, and it was multi-use land. She said her family had used the shuttle system at Sun Valley, and she did not see why Girdwood could not have a similar transportation system. She said it would be a huge loss if the rail spur was built through those areas.

MATT BERMAN said he was a 20-year Girdwood resident and he has worked in Anchorage the entire time, and he had waited for public transportation to be established between Anchorage and Girdwood for that entire time. He was optimistic this might finally happen when the consultants had started work on the Girdwood Transportation Plan. However, instead of the Draft Plan analyzing transportation alternatives between Anchorage and Girdwood, it proposed a rail spur to the Alyeska Prince Hotel. He said the objective of the rail spur as stated in the Plan was to reduce road traffic by eliminating tour bus traffic, but what was needed was to reduce commuter and visitor automobile traffic, and the proposed rail spur would not accomplish that. Mr. Berman noted that some people have testified that the rail spur option should be left in the Plan for future consideration. He said the problem with leaving a bad option in the Plan discourages people from developing and acting on good options. He said commuter bus service is feasible at this time. He said federal tax dollars would have to be obtained to build the rail spur to serve the Alyeska Prince Hotel. If they were able to get the \$20 million it would take to build the spur, he felt it would be better spent to improve public transportation between Anchorage, Girdwood, and the Matanuska-Susitna valley. He urged the Assembly to delete the rail spur from the Girdwood Transportation Plan and send a message to the Alaska Congressional Delegation that they want public transportation that will meet the needs of all residents. As a side note, Mr. Berman said he had recently returned from California, and he was amazed at the compressed natural gas buses that are used for public transportation there. He said as far as he knew, they are completely emissions-free, and he suggested looking into obtaining federal grant money to purchase these types of buses for Alaska. In response to Mr. Van Etten's earlier question regarding Sun Valley, Idaho, Mr. Berman said Sun Valley was developed by the Union Pacific Railroad, and they built a rail spur into the community. He said the Railroad had removed the rails years ago, and the rail right-of-way is now a bike path that is used by residents and visitors.

THOMASJOHN MILLER said he was speaking on behalf of himself and would be making a brief statement from Candy Bursiel as well. Mr. Miller said Ms. Bursiel had arrived in Girdwood in June 1948. He said she opposes the rail spur but does not feel her opinion carries much weight. He said Ms. Bursiel had been the sounding board and wife of the first Mayor of Girdwood, Robert Bursiel. Speaking on his own behalf, Mr. Miller reminded everyone that there was already a train to Girdwood, they just need a schedule. He asked if the Assembly realized that all the residents of Girdwood are able to get out of jury duty because there is no bus or train to Girdwood. He said he had gone to the Railroad's home page on the Internet last week to find out about train fare to Anchorage so he could come into the Clerk's Office in Anchorage to pick up copies of the tapes of the Assembly's special meeting in Girdwood on this issue. He discovered the Railroad had terminated service to Girdwood in September when the tourist season was over. Mr. Miller noted that the Alaska Railroad's home page had a Japanese language link, but there was no Spanish language link. He said he had also visited the Girdwood 2020 website, which was under construction, and there was only one comment under the invitation to submit feedback. He noted that not everyone who is part of Girdwood 2020 supports the rail spur. Mr. Miller quoted from an article by Neal Wienberg entitled *"The Nagano Olympics Promises Gold"* from the February 23, 1998 *Forbes* magazine: He said Yakiashi Sitsumi owns the resort where over half of the Olympics ski events will be held. Mr. Sitsumi is also the sole owner of Kokudo Holding Company, which owns Seibu Alaska. He said Seibu Alaska is licensed in the state as a corporation that has filed its tax reports on time but has allowed its business license to lapse.

In response to Ms. Clementson's request that he elaborate on his comment that not everyone on Girdwood 2020 supports the rail spur, Mr. Miller stated that some Girdwood 2020 members are against the spur, but say nothing against it because the spur will benefit their employment or business interests. He said part of his job was to poll the members of Girdwood 2020, and although he had requested their member list, it had not been provided, and it was not made public. However, he does know people who are members who are not in favor of the rail spur.

GRANT GIBBS said he was a 40-year resident of the Anchorage area, with 13 of those years having been spent in Girdwood. Mr. Gibbs said he has enjoyed recreational opportunities in Girdwood all his life, and he operates a business in the Alyeska Prince Hotel. He asked the Assembly to exclude the corridor for a potential rail spur from the Plan. He said Girdwood was small and precious, and a train running through the community, with its diesel engines and wide right-of-ways would have a large impact. He noted that local sentiment was against the plan according to the vote held last year in Girdwood. Mr. Gibbs said he was in favor of mass transit where it was economically viable and had public support. He said creating a multimodal shuttle hub at the existing train depot would be a low-impact, practical alternative. He pointed out that a taxi service could not even stay in business due to the low demand in the community, and it was not "mass" transit in any event. Mr. Gibbs said he wanted the resort to be successful. It provided the opportunity for good people to live and work in Girdwood and provides a place for both Alaskans and visitors to enjoy an exceptionally beautiful recreational facility. He

said it had been commented that tourists don't like switching transportation modes between destinations. He noted that cruise clients do not like to have to get up at 5:00 a.m. to get to Denali or spend 15 minutes at the top of Alyeska to be hustled off to get their next bus. But he pointed out that they keep returning because of the lure of the natural beauty and the promise of adventure in Alaska, and especially in Girdwood. He said he had never heard anyone comment that, Gee, this place is so beautiful, if only it had a train, it would be perfect. He said they need to keep it the pristine place that people visit for and not ignore the voice of the community. He urged the Assembly to exclude the corridor from the Plan and to create the multimodal transit system at the entry to the valley.

KEITH TRYCK stated that the Girdwood Area Plan followed a number of other plans, and it recommended that Girdwood be kept a pristine place. It also recommended that Girdwood be user friendly and pedestrian friendly, and that they should aspire to presenting Girdwood as an attractive tourist destination based on its beauty and natural environment. He said to achieve these goals required further planning efforts, one of which was currently before the Assembly in the form of the Transportation and Commercial Areas Plan. Another plan being contemplated was the future development of the Winner Creek area for skiing. Mr. Tryck said on the issue of public subsidies, all passenger and commuter rail in the United States was subsidized by the federal government to some degree, and assessment of a subsidy could be undertaken during the NEPA process. With respect to Mr. Tesche's question regarding the value of the Heritage Land Bank property, Mr. Tryck said if the right-of-way was 120 feet wide and four and a half miles long, it would consist of 56 acres. For purposes of his calculation, Mr. Tryck used the figure of \$10,000 per acre for a total of \$560,000 for the land required for the rail spur project. Regarding the comments that the rail spur would benefit one company and not the entire community, Mr. Tryck pointed out that the area where the Alyeska Prince Hotel was located had been designated in the Girdwood Area Plan as the resort base. He was not in favor of constructing the rail spur immediately. He said the section of the Girdwood Transportation Plan entitled "For Immediate Action" on page 91 stated that the NEPA process required environmental analysis and public process for the proposed rail spur to be launched. He pointed out that the corridor would be identified and preserved based on the outcome of the NEPA process. He said the cost of \$7.50 per person to ride the train was a conjectural figure used to provide an illustration, and the actual cost would be established at a later date. He noted that the Railroad had repeatedly said it would participate in upgrading any and all trails that would be impacted by the project and that it would support the intermodal bus survey.

In response to Ms. Fairclough, Mr. Tryck said he currently lives in Anchorage, but he had been a Girdwood resident for 19 of the last 20 years and had been a member of the Girdwood Board of Supervisors for 7 years. He said if he was one of the persons whose back yard the rail spur would run through, he would get involved in the process. One of the first questions he would ask the Railroad was if it intended to utilize continuous welded rail (CWR), and if it did, would the rail be bedded on rubber, because that is an extremely quiet railway system. Then he would ask what kind of cars the Railroad intended to use. He said trillions of dollars were being spent worldwide for rail technology, and the information and technology for railway systems that was available currently was mind-boggling.

At Ms. Abney's request, Mr. Tryck elaborated on his involvement with the Girdwood Transportation Plan and briefly explained how it fit into the big picture. He said he would like to see the study go forward because he felt it was always better to have data to work with rather than emotions. With respect to the environmental issues, Mr. Tryck said exhaust pollution levels were extremely high in the major cities throughout the nation, and Anchorage's pollution levels were one of the highest. If the number of gas engines could be reduced over time, they would be able to reduce pollution levels as well as save communities the cost of oxygenated fuel, which would promote environmental progress as well as a significant cost savings.

LARRY CASH said he was the President of Rim Architects, formerly known as Cash Barner Architects. He said he had been involved in the construction of the Alyeska Prince Hotel, the new Girdwood power station, and the library/community center projects. He said he has had a cabin in Girdwood since 1983, and he was in favor of the Girdwood Commercial Areas and Transportation Plan as approved by the Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission. Mr. Cash said his two children have participated in competitive ski programs offered by the resort in Girdwood for the past 12 years, and his son was still involved in those programs. He said he has driven to the resort several times on weekends when his work conflicted with ski training schedules, and his family would have benefited from safe and convenient rail access. He said he thought other families would too. He said this type of utilization would only increase in the future if the rail corridor portion of the plan proved viable. He said the Plan was based on recommendations of experts hired by the Municipality. The experts were to evaluate the Girdwood valley, get community input, and work with the Planning staff to develop a Plan that would be the basis for guiding the future development of transportation infrastructure and commercial development in the Girdwood area. He said the proposed Plan provides the flexibility to add the rail spur as a component of transportation into Girdwood at some time in the future if it is appropriate. He said the Assembly should keep in mind that the Girdwood Commercial Areas and Transportation Plan was just that, a plan, not a rail spur construction project. He urged the Assembly to approve the Plan as recommended by P&Z.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. Cash said he was not an expert on multimodal facilities, so his opinion was from a personal perspective. He felt a valley entry multimodal facility would be more functional if the rail spur was extended into the valley. He said whether the spur ended at the resort or some other location, it needed to provide direct access to the base of the mountain.

In response to Mr. Van Etten, Mr. Cash said it was his understanding and belief that the Plan did not designate a specific corridor. He said he thought the confusion and public belief that a particular corridor had already been designated had resulted from illustrations that showed a specific location of the corridor. However, he noted that the Plan itself simply allows for a study to be conducted to identify an appropriate corridor for the construction of a rail spur. He said what he also meant by flexibility was providing the rail spur as an option for an alternative mode of transportation in the Girdwood valley in the future.

Vice Chairman Meyer asked if anyone else wished to speak. There was no one, and he closed the public hearing.

Ms. Fairclough moved, to postpone action on AO 2000-124 until December 19, 2000.
seconded by Mr. Tremaine,

Acting Community Planning and Development Director Sue Fison explained Tom Nelson was unable to attend tonight, but funding was available to have a work session with the consultant.

Ms. Clementson clarified, and Ms. Fison verified, that there was enough money to bring the consultant up from out of state for a work session, but there would not be enough funds left to publish the final Girdwood Commercial Areas and Transportation Master Plan. Ms. Fison added that she did not feel the Girdwood Plan would be ready for printing prior to the end of the year. She said printing of the final Girdwood Plan was not funded in next year's budget either, and the consultant would be able to meet with the Assembly via teleconference instead of traveling to Anchorage.

Question was called on the motion to postpone action on AO 2000-124 until December 19, 2000 and it passed:

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Meyer, Fairclough, Van Etten, Clementson.
NAYS: Taylor.

- J. Ordinance No. AO 2000-137, an ordinance of the Anchorage Municipal Assembly amending Regulation 25.11 of the Anchorage Municipal Code and pertaining to the **facility use policy for the George M. Sullivan Arena**, Assemblymember Fairclough.
1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 789-2000.

Vice Chairman Meyer opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak.

KIM JONES, President and CEO of Sourdough Productions, said he was totally in favor of the ordinance even though it increased the fees. He said Sourdough Productions has been a major user of all three community facilities in Anchorage for the past 16 years, and they utilize the Egan Center, the Performing Arts Center, and the Sullivan Arena for their trade shows, conferences, and concerts. He said there has not been a rate increase since the building opened, and he felt it was fair to impose one at this time. He said hundreds of thousands of dollars in user fees had not been collected by the previous management of the Sullivan Arena. Under the new management, assuming they diligently collect the new user fees, it would not take long to make up for the lost revenue that had occurred under the old management. Mr. Jones's request was that when the new fees were implemented, that collection was also enforced and that the fees were collected from both commercial promoters and facility users alike, and that the new management be directed to diligently collect all fees from all facility users.

Municipal Manager Harry Kieling requested that Mr. Jones provide him the information about improperly collected fees and said he would be happy to meet with Mr. Jones to discuss the issue.

Vice Chairman Meyer asked if anyone else wished to speak. There was no one, and he closed the public hearing.

Ms. Fairclough moved, to adopt AO 2000-137.
seconded by Mr. Tesche,

Ms. Fairclough moved, to amend AO 2000-137 at line 4 of page 4, to replace the words "alcohol sales and/or novelty sales" with the words "ancillary sales," and at line 6 of page 4, to replace the words "alcohol/novelty sales" with the words "ancillary sales."
seconded by Ms. Clementson,
and it passed without objection,

Ms. Fairclough moved, to amend AO 2000-137 at line 17 of page 6 to read:
seconded by Mr. Tesche, "Section 2: This ordinance shall become effective upon passage and approval, except the revised fees and charges under AMC 25.11.006 shall become effective on and shall be applicable only to user rental agreements executed after January 1, 2001."

Ms. Fairclough said the purpose of the amendment was so that existing contracts and agreement between users and the Arena would not be disturbed, but that when those contracts and/or agreements expire, new user contracts and agreements would be subject to the new fee structure. In other words, if any users had reserved dates in excess of one year with the Arena, they would be subject to the increased rates after a period of one year from the date the rate increases were implemented.

Assistant Municipal Attorney Dennis Wheeler said he did not think the amendment, as worded, would accomplish Ms. Fairclough's intent. He suggested the Aces, who have a user agreement that extends through 2005, be grandfathered in. Mr. Wheeler advised that it would be unconstitutional to impinge the Aces' contract through later legislative action. He said it would be the Law Department's advice not to implement the new rate structure with respect to the Aces unless The Law Department could provide case law that would support it. Mr. Wheeler responded that they had looked at the documents and provided the suggested language, but if it had been Ms. Fairclough's intent at that time that the Aces' contract be subject to the rate increases, legal counsel had been unaware of it. He said they would have to research that matter to determine if they could achieve the intent of her amendment, but at this point, he could not advise her that it could be done so that it would be legally defensible.

Ms. Clementson suggested deferring this item until later in the evening so legal counsel could confer.

Mr. Tesche pointed out that the fee increase would not become effective until 2001, and the amendment was very clear with respect to all users of the Sullivan Arena, and it made good public policy. He said the issue could be resolved at a later time if necessary. However, if the ordinance was passed with the amendment, if it was later determined that the Aces' contract was exempt from the rate increases, the rate increases would still apply to all other users of the facility but not to the Aces.

He said this issue should not prevent the Assembly from acting on the ordinance this evening so that the Administration could proceed with the RFP process and have the issue resolved outside of the Assembly Chambers. He said he was in favor of the ordinance with the amendment.

Ms. Fairclough urged approval. She said the contention of whether the Aces' contract would be included could be resolved at a later date. She said she simply wanted it to be a matter of record how she expected the ordinance to take effect.

Question was called on Ms. Fairclough's motion to amend AO 2000-137 and it passed without objection.

Mayor Wuerch stated the Administration was in favor of the proposed rate increases for the Sullivan Arena, but they would not break a multi-year contract with the Anchorage Aces through legislative action on this item tonight.

Ms. Fairclough clarified that her intent was not to break a contract, but if the contract only contained dates and no fee structure, then the new fees would apply to the Aces.

Question was called on the motion to adopt AO 2000-137 as amended and it passed:

AYES: Sullivan, Tremaine, Abney, Kendall, Tesche, Meyer, Fairclough, Taylor, Van Etten, Clementson.

NAYS: None.

The Assembly then returned to consideration of item 15.C, AO 2000-119.

Ordinance No. AO 2000-119, an ordinance amending Chapter 21.05, adding Chapter 21.06, **adopting the Anchorage 2020 Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan**, directing codification thereof and providing an effective date, Legal Department/Community Planning and Development.

1. Assembly Memorandum No. AM 663-2000.
2. Information Memorandum No. AIM 81-2000.

(CONTINUED FROM 7-25-00, 8-15-00, 8-23-00, 8-29-00, 9-12-00, 9-13-00, AND 9-14-00)

Vice Chairman Meyer opened the public hearing and asked if anyone wished to speak.

ROD MCCOY said he had lived in the northeast area since 1974. He noted the northeast area represents what Anchorage was in the past, due to its diversity in ethnic groups and socioeconomic levels. So he felt the northeast area of town was basically a renaissance zone. On behalf of the community council, Mr. McCoy said they were not in favor of the 2020 Plan if it increases commercial and residential density in their area. He said they are currently in the process with the Municipality of changing over a half-mile of residential property along Muldoon Road into commercial property; however, they want to retain a residential statement along Muldoon Road, so they are cautious of any proposed increases in those densities.

MACKENNA JOHNS spoke with respect to the recent Alaskan Village and Plaza 36 rezone applications, Ms. Johns said some outside communities actively support mobile home communities and manufactured housing communities as a desirable housing option to serve a demonstrated need. She said they increase affordable housing in an area and put home ownership within the reach of low- to mid-income families. They can also provide a very attractive high-density community when properly planned. She said the 2020 Plan speaks to the current mobile home situation and not long-term planning, so there are concerns that the option of mobile home communities would be lost through attrition and lack of foresight. She said it would be logical for Anchorage to preserve this affordable housing stock through zoning changes and ordinances. She said land could be made available for manufactured housing co-ops and individual private purchase, HUD funding was available for mobile home co-ops, AHFC had modified their criteria to include mobile home units, and codes could be modified to facilitate the preservation of the stock.

In response to Ms. Taylor, Mr. McCoy elaborated on the diversity and density of the northeast area. He felt the Plan, as written, threatens the diversity of the community. He said if the density pressure in the area is increased, potential development of single-family homes would be decreased, and the balance that now provides the Old Anchorage atmosphere of the community would disappear as density increased. He specifically objected to the growth charts that were included in the Plan for the northeast area. He said they tend to predict for and dictate to the community what the growth quota for the area should be. He also objected to DeBarr and Muldoon Road being designated as the town center. He pointed out that it was not a crossroads, it was a T. He said there is not a large residential area surrounding the area, and traffic at that location was already very heavy. He said if the Assembly imposes these aspects of the Plan on the community, it would force them to not make wise decisions regarding planning for the area in the future. He said the community will grow, both in terms of residential and commercial, but the Assembly should not attempt to force it on them.

In response to Ms. Taylor, Ms. Johns elaborated on the benefits of properly maintained mobile home parks to the community and its residents. She provided suggestions as to how mobile home owners could become homeowners by being afforded the opportunity to buy the land upon which their mobile homes are located. She said mobile homes serve a need in the community, they provide a niche, and they are affordable.

In response to Mr. Kendall, Mr. McCoy said they were well aware of the provision for high-density development, and that mandate within the Comprehensive Plan would ruin the very character of the neighborhood. He said the community preferred that their neighborhood be allowed to develop as it will, in the very complex way that it has in the past, and that they not be mandated to fulfill a high-density-requirement. He said in order for the Comprehensive Plan to respond to the community's desires, he would request that the charts and references to an expected number of people to live in the area be deleted from the Plan. He added that the statement that the northeast area was the most populous in the city should be deleted as well, since it was untrue. He pointed out that areas that had numerous parks would naturally not be as populous as an area that had few, and the northeast area of town has few parks, so it naturally has more residential and commercial development. But he said the northeast area is not denser than other areas of town. Mr. McCoy said he was in favor of reasoned growth in the area, but he did not want growth imposed upon the community.

VIC FISCHER said he had seen phenomenal changes in the Anchorage community during the 50 years he has lived here. He said the Planning and Zoning (P&Z) Commission and the Planning staff had done an excellent job on the Comprehensive Plan and had responded to the public input. He felt it was a good Plan at this point and should be adopted. He stated that the key to the Plan and to future development was in implementation, which was addressed in Chapter 5. He said there were tremendous resources within the community that could be used in implementing the Plan and its various components. Specifically, the design standards was one of the elements that should be followed, and there were numerous professionals within the community who would be able to ensure satisfactory design standards that would preclude undesirable types of development in the future. Lastly, he pointed out that planning was a continuous process, and they must follow up with implementation. He said an effective Planning staff was essential to ensure effective coordination of the implementation process and community involvement.

In response to Mr. Tesche, Mr. Fischer said he was Anchorage's first Planning Director in the early and mid-1950s. He said an example of early planning that had proven effective and had worked over a period of time was a recreation plan that was developed involving a large citizen group. He said it was published in 1954, and as a result of that plan, the city today has Elderberry Park, the Delaney Park Strip, the Chester Creek Greenbelt, Goose Lake, Russian Jack Springs, and an areawide park system. He said he did not think these landmarks and recreational opportunities would be available to the community today had it not been for those planning efforts in the 1950s. With respect to the previous testimony, Mr. Fischer pointed out that the population figures and density projections would not come about without implementation. He said the key was in implementation, and the neighborhood plans and land use plans that are yet to be developed with the participation and input of residents of the community would determine what ultimately becomes of the land in community neighborhoods.

ROD PFLEIGER spoke on behalf of the Anchorage Downtown Partnership. He said the Partnership supported adoption of the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan as a policy guide to future development, code, and zoning implementation. He said the Partnership had collaborated with private and public organizations in June 2000 to create a downtown development framework, and that framework was an outgrowth of the Anchorage 2020 Plan. He said as stated in the 2020 Plan, the downtown area is an important indicator of the community's economic vitality. He said the Partnership felt that the work done by the Planning Department and the Administration, with input from the community, was valuable, and would be valuable for many years to come. Mr. Pfeigler read a portion of a resolution of the Partnership that endorsed the Anchorage 2020 Plan as a working document for the Anchorage community.

BETH SILVERBERG, Executive Director of the Greatland Trust, said the Trust was founded in 1995 and was an independent, Anchorage-based land conservation organization serving southcentral Alaska. Ms. Silverberg said the Trust uses voluntary lands in Anchorage and the southcentral region, but the Trust does not use adversarial conservation tools and is not an advocacy organization. She said the Trust had worked in tandem with the Municipality on the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan since 1997 and, at the Municipality's request, had conducted a detailed survey of natural lands in the Anchorage Bowl for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan. She said the survey focused on which lands were important to Anchorage residents for recreational and other uses and which lands constituted important natural wildlife habitat. She explained the sources of data used in the survey, and she said the public had identified 139 natural places of interest within the Anchorage Bowl. She said the message they had received repeatedly while conducting the survey was that Anchorage residents truly value and place great importance on having open space within the community.

The Assembly stood at ease from 10:10 p.m. to 10:15 p.m.

JULIE JOHNSON continued reading Ms. Silverberg's testimony. She said Anchorage residents do not see protecting important natural areas as inconsistent with or in opposition to sensible development that provides a vibrant economic future for their city. She said residents want to see well designed residential and commercial development that will enhance existing properties and that will retain value over time. Ms. Johnson said residents believe in promoting efficient land use and are in favor of appropriate infill and redevelopment in the downtown area that is economical and takes advantages of existing utilities, facilities, and public safety infrastructure. She said it was the Trust's position, based on its work, that the public does not favor short-term thinking with respect to natural lands, nor does it seek development for development's sake. The public is increasingly in favor of investing in the community and its long-term future, including conserving a portion of the remaining natural lands, and this was from the perspective of a maturing community. Ms. Johnson said the outpouring of community effort and input that had resulted from the Greatland Trust survey had infused the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan with the public's vision. She said the principles and policies contained within it reflect the public's priorities and values in a meaningful way and were worthy of the Assembly's consideration and attention. In closing, Ms. Johnson said Ms. Silverberg wanted to thank the Planning staff for their work on this Plan. She also thanked P&Z and the Assembly for their many efforts to be responsive and to involve the public in the planning and deliberation process.

KELLEY DAVITT, Anchorage resident, said the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan was a forward-thinking document that would positively shape the future of Anchorage, and she urged the Assembly to adopt the Plan as approved by the P&Z. Ms. Davitt said she was a newcomer to the community, and she had moved here because of the quality of life. She felt we need opportunities to recreate close to home and to live in neighborhoods where architectural design standards foster a sense of community. She said she would be willing to pay additional taxes for the ability to have open spaces and parkland. She trusted the Assembly would honor the public process that has shaped the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan, and that it would take the necessary steps to ensure its approval.

HOLLY KENT, Executive Director of the Anchorage Waterways Council, urged the Assembly to adopt the most current revision of the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan as approved by the P&Z. Ms. Kent said the public process surrounding the development of the Plan had been extremely inclusive and was representative of the community's desires regarding growth and responsible development in Anchorage in the future. She noted, however, that all of the hard work and community involvement in development of the Plan would be for naught if the infrastructure was unable to support implementation of the growth and development strategies contained within it. She said it was imperative that the Plan be adopted as an enforceable guide for future public officials. She asked the Assembly to take notice of the strength with which the community had backed the Plan throughout all of the development phases, and she asked that they work toward taking Anchorage into the next decade with a diverse and compassionate community with a thriving, sustainable, broad-based economy.

BILL GOSSWEILER said he had been involved in all the work meetings and public forums associated with the development of the "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Planning Effort" component of the Plan. He was dismayed by the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce's comments regarding this component of the Comprehensive Plan. He said the Chamber's comments would lead one to believe that the component was an impediment to Anchorage's growth and progress, and that it imposed legal restrictions on any development within the community. Mr. Gossweiler said nothing could be further from the truth. He said the majority of the time spent developing that component of the Comprehensive Plan was spent crafting it in such a way that it would not be legally binding, restrictive, or even offensive to the different factions that comprise the city of Anchorage. He said the Living With Wildlife component provided a wealth of information regarding one of Anchorage's greatest treasures and attractions, its magnificent wildlife. He said the document laid out, in an open, honest, and user-friendly way, the philosophies, goals, and methods to ensure that wildlife would remain an important element in the Anchorage matrix. Mr. Gossweiler reminded everyone of Seymour the Moose, Anchorage's most famous ambassador in the "Wild About Anchorage" campaign that advocated Anchorage as a wildlife place and beckoned people to visit Anchorage and see its wildlife. He said "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Planning Effort" was by no means a red light to progress or development. It was more like a speed bump to signify caution and consideration for those things that helped to make Anchorage a city like no other in the world. He said the Assembly members were the trustees of Anchorage, and the document only advised that if they wanted to keep the wild spirit of Anchorage, certain things should be done. He asked that the Assembly show that there was good conscience by keeping the "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Planning Effort" component an integral part of the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan.

VAL GLOOSCHENKO said open space has a major influence on the surrounding land market and is referred to as enhancement value. She said the enhancement value of open space, trails, and natural areas was readily evidenced in real estate advertisements, and studies show that surrounding land values increase when urban homes, schools, and other properties adjoin open space and trail systems. Ms. Glooschenko said the quality of life benefits of parks, natural areas, and open space is also ranked very highly among residents nationwide. She said statistics reflect that employers found quality of life for employees to be the third most important factor in locating a business within a community, second only to domestic markets and availability of skilled labor. She noted that owners of small companies ranked recreational parks and open space as the highest possible priority in choosing a new location for their businesses. Ms. Glooschenko stated she had worked on a contract with county government in Valance, Oregon, to study the best combination of trail systems and open space to meet the needs of the city and the surrounding communities. She said the city and county had used the study to justify designation of protected natural areas and to increase the trail system. Ms. Glooschenko said she had been impressed by Anchorage's extensive trail system when she had arrived in the spring of 2000. However, she had become very concerned when she learned that many of the trails are not secure. She urged the Assembly to consider the strong economic and quality of life issues that support the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan and to move forward as soon as possible to approve the Plan so the city's parks, natural areas, and trail systems can be protected now and in the future.

Ms. Fairclough moved,
seconded by Ms. Taylor,
and it passed without
objection,

to extend the meeting to until midnight to complete the public
testimony on this item.

JONNE SLEMONS, spoke for Doug Whittaker, who was in favor of retaining inclusion of the "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Planning Effort" in the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Whittaker stated he had lived and/or worked in Anchorage since the mid-1980s and had recently returned to Anchorage as a resident after having lived in other parts of the state. He was a natural resources researcher and planner who had been involved with the Living With Wildlife effort since inception. He said the survey data that comprised a key source of information for the Plan was his Ph.D. project, and he had been hired by the Alaska Department of Fish and Game to help lead the planning effort during the past two years. Mr. Whittaker observed that there were people who were "wildlife intolerant," but he noted that this perspective was held by less than 20 percent of Anchorage residents. He said while another 20 percent do not care one way or the other, the remaining 60 percent of the population have very strong appreciation values toward wildlife in Anchorage. In addition, he had found that over 86 percent of Anchorage residents agree that wildlife enhance the quality of life in Anchorage, despite the fact that wildlife do cause problems at times. However, one of the most interesting implications from the survey that he had found was that even the problems caused by wildlife were a source of pride among Anchorage residents. He said that while reducing wildlife conflicts and problems was an important focus of the Plan, enhancing opportunities to appreciate wildlife was the greater focus, reflecting the attitudes and values of the majority of Anchorage residents. Mr. Whittaker said that multiple species, multiple land-managing agencies, extensive private lands, diverse land use patterns, modification of natural environment, and diversity of public opinion made urban wildlife issues complex and multi-faceted. He said the Living With Wildlife component of the Plan had extensive content to address all these issues, and few people would agree with every aspect of it. Mr. Whittaker also noted the Chamber of Commerce's dim view of the wildlife component, but pointed out that some wildlife protection groups felt that it did not go far enough. He felt this was a well researched, non-binding vision for coordinating wildlife management at many levels of government in Anchorage, and he urged the Assembly to retain the reference to the "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Planning Effort" component in the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan.

JONNE SLEMONS said she had coordinated the planning effort that resulted in the "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Planning Effort" component of the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan, and she supported the inclusion and reference to the document within the Plan. She said she appreciated the fact that wildlife planning was included in the Plan by calling for simple strategies in the back part of the Plan. With respect to the sidebar on page 59 of the previous version of the Plan that addressed urban wildlife, the "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Planning Effort" sub-document, and the respective responsibilities of the State and the Municipality, she said the P&Z had approved revisions to the language in the sidebar, but the entire sidebar had inadvertently been deleted in its entirety. She requested that the sidebar be restored with the revised wording approved by the P&Z. She said to omit the sidebar would result in changing the content of the Plan based on a simple printing error. Ms. Slemons urged the Assembly to remember the public's expression of their interest in the survey results mentioned in the previous testimony, and she elaborated on some of the statistics she had mentioned in giving Mr. Whittaker's testimony above. She showed the Assembly an article regarding the Visitors Guide in the Anchorage Convention and Visitors Center newsletter that she had received today, and she quoted from another article

entitled "Wild About Wildlife." She urged the Assembly to keep the reference to the "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Planning Effort" in the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan, and she urged adoption of the Comprehensive Plan.

LORA NEWBY pointed out more people would ride the Municipal buses if there were more routes, more frequent service, and better access in the wintertime. She noted plans for higher-density housing comprised an important part of the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan. She said the Assembly should keep in mind that people who would reside in the new high-density housing proposed in the Plan would require improved bus service, or the increased traffic and congestion that people feared would become a reality. She urged the Assembly to consider the higher-density housing first in the downtown and midtown areas and ensure that accessible bus service was in place.

JON BARLOW said he was speaking on behalf of the future energy consumer of Anchorage. Mr. Barlow said the Comprehensive Plan was supposed to enable the future, but he asked if the Plan was going to be a case of 20/20 hindsight. He cited municipal Code Title 21.05.40(d)(1), and he noted that review and revision of the Plan was necessary at least every 10 years. He said it was not necessary to completely revise the entire Plan, only to make adjustments to reflect changes in community attitudes, economics, demographics, and trends. He said the Comprehensive Plan was, of necessity, a dynamic document. He said in spite of various downturns and crises within the community, state, and nation over the past 18 years, the current Plan had succeeded, for the most part, in meeting the needs of Anchorage as it had progressed. He noted the beautification projects within the city, commercial development, traffic congestion, and the reduction of "green space" during that time and said the Comprehensive Plan was a guide for amelioration, improvement, and/or changing Anchorage into the kind of northern city that residents will enjoy and be proud of. He said, hopefully, they would not have to revise the Plan in 10 years, and they should not have to if it is revised at the two-year and five-year phases.

ANNABELLE ALVITE said the majority of the public comments on the Comprehensive Plan had focused on growth and development, but little had been said thus far about the garbage and "stuff" that accumulates and eventually needs to be disposed of. She said in the discussion on land values, they must not forget the value to the entire community of the landfill and its role in the community. Ms. Alvite said recycling alone was not the panacea to Comprehensive Plan conflicts, but it was one step in the challenging process of balancing growth and development with natural as well as socioeconomic environmental quality. She applauded the hard work and effort that had gone into preventing environmental degradation in order to create a high quality of life for Anchorage residents. She advocated making recycling as important as beautification with flowers and lights, parks, and green space. She said making recycling more visible and available could create a recycling ethic as the public became more aware of and conscientious about our environment. She said this effort would result in more people appreciating their existing natural open space, natural landscape, and wildlife for their intrinsic value. Visitors would appreciate that the community was litter-free, and Alaska residents should be conscientious of the state's and Anchorage's image to the outside world.

ROBERT AUTH said he was the Chair of the Spenard Community Council, but he was speaking personally. He was a 15-year resident of Spenard and had been very active in land use issues. With respect to midtown, he said the market-driven growth that has occurred there has been because developers buy less expensive residential property, have it rezoned to commercial, and then develop it as commercial property. So there is now very little residential property in midtown, and what is left is undeveloped commercial property. He said that imbalance was symbolic of Anchorage as a whole. He said the Plan calling for residential development in midtown and making it a mixed-use area was a positive approach. However, it attempts to reverse the historical trend of the past 10 years, and that would be difficult to accomplish. With respect to the Airport, while it is not private commercial growth, it is commercial growth, and it impacts nearby residences. That too has also had an effect on the rezoning process, with residential properties having been rezoned to commercial and then developed. Mr. Auth said there were approximately 17,000 people living between midtown and the airport, and their concern was that the entire area would become an industrial and commercial area with very little residential. He felt the Plan provided opportunities to increase residential properties in that area of town, and he said this was a step in the right direction.

DIANE ETTER, President of Tudor Community Council, said Council members had testified before P&Z in May, but their concerns had not been addressed in subsequent revisions to the Plan. Referring to the zoning map, Ms. Etter pointed out their neighborhood just to the south of 36th Avenue and said the two areas marked in green that were connected by 36th Avenue were major high-density employment areas. She said the Council's primary concern was traffic congestion. She said traffic was so congested that residents cannot even get out of their neighborhood, and the Plan proposes additional high-density employment, which would result in high-density housing in that area. She said page 46 spoke to how traffic congestion in the hillside area would be addressed, but there was no mention of any mitigation plans for the midtown and 36th Avenue area. She noted that when the council members had asked the question regarding traffic congestion, they were told that when the population and employment reach a greater density, people would ride the bus. Ms. Etter felt they must be realistic and admit people who have access to vehicular transportation were not going to ride the bus, especially in the wintertime. Ms. Etter said the Council would not support any development that increases traffic volume on 36th Avenue, that increases the size of 36th Avenue, or that further impacts the Tudor/Lake Otis intersection. Council members felt it was grossly unfair to impact one area of town in this manner; they felt that development should be evenly distributed throughout the community. She said traffic concerns should be a primary consideration, and established neighborhoods should be valued and preserved.

JANE ANGVIK said she had served on staff in 1972 and participated in writing that years' Comprehensive Plan, and in 1982, she was a member of the Assembly and had to grapple with the issues of that day in adopting the Plan. In general, she said she was in support of this Comprehensive Plan, including the changes approved by the P&Z. Ms. Angvik told the Assembly to keep in mind that Anchorage would change, with or without a plan, and the Assembly, as the policy-setters, could guide those changes to follow the direction as set out in the Plan. Therefore, she felt the Plan should be a guideline, not a law, because there were other mechanisms contained within the Plan for the legal implementation of its component parts. As an example, she said each time the Assembly considered a zoning, rezoning, or a replatting, they were implementing the Plan. She noted they considered a transportation plan annually, and the Comprehensive Plan called for neighborhood plans that would provide specific information for each individual area of town. Ms. Angvik said for the last year, she had served on the Citizens Advisory Committee for the Airport and had the pleasure of working with diverse groups, including people from the industries and the neighborhoods. In closing, Ms. Angvik said the Citizens Advisory Committee's goal had been to develop a policy for the airport that would be adopted by the Assembly which would preserve the Coastal Trail and Kincaid

Park permanently in the future. Ms. Angvik felt that the issue of sewers on the hillside could be resolved very simply -- through the implementation of the Hillside Wastewater Management Plan.

Vice Chairman Meyer ruled that no more testimony would be accepted from people who had not signed up in advance. He explained that people had contacted him to ask if they could sign up to testify tonight, and he had said “no”. It was his intent that tonight's meeting would be to continue the public testimony of those persons who had signed up but had been unable to testify at the last meeting. He added that there had been an article in today's newspaper that had stated this .

Mr. Tesche moved, to appeal the Chair's ruling.
seconded by Mr. Kendall,
and it was withdrawn,

Mr. Tesche recommended that they allow the remaining people to testify on the Comprehensive Plan. He said if there was any issue to encourage public testimony on, it was the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Fairclough suggested that if the testimony was reopened, viewers at home or others who did not have the opportunity to testify tonight be allowed to submit their testimony in writing.

Vice Chairman Meyer concurred and said it would be some time before the Comprehensive Plan was finalized, and there would be ample opportunity for persons to submit their comments in writing. He withdrew his ruling.

Mr. Tesche withdrew his motion with the consent of the second.

TIM POTTER pointed out the military comprised a significant segment of the population in Anchorage, and he believed that they were short-shrifted in the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan . He suggested that the community work with the military to ensure that Anchorage stays at the top of the list of major military facilities in the world. Mr. Potter pointed out that over 95 percent of the goods that come into this community to meet our daily needs come through the Port. He said the Anchorage 2020 Plan projects a 70,000-person population growth over the next 20 years, yet the Plan did not address how this very important infrastructure for the community would be assured future potential growth and the ability to accommodate the needs of the growing community. Regarding the sketches of subdivision layouts on page 104, Mr. Potter said he had distributed to the Assembly members an analysis that had been submitted to the P&Z. He said the Assembly should keep this in mind when they were considering putting into a potentially binding legal document a suggestion as to how such things should be carried out. He stated they should have a clear idea of what the price and cost implications were. He said his analysis provided a third alternative, along with detailed cost estimates, to show the Assembly the significant cost impacts to put one of these lots on the market and still maintain the ability to develop the property and have lots on the market. With respect to the controversy over whether the Plan should be a guideline or legally binding, , Mr. Potter read the first sentence of the 1982 Comprehensive Plan: *"This is Anchorage's Comprehensive Plan. It is intended to serve as a practical guide for community development."* Mr. Potter said a significant amount of discussion had gone into formulating that sentence. He said the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan should also be a guidance document. He said Anchorage was a dynamic city, and it needed a dynamic document, and laws that are adopted are typically not very dynamic.

HELEN NIENHAUSER said she had worked extensively on the Comprehensive Plan through the Rogers Park Community Council and as a member of one of the working groups, and she stated her support for adoption of the Plan. The Plan contains many important progressive principles that will help keep Anchorage a good place to live, to work, and to raise children. However, she felt it needed much stronger language regarding the role of the Municipality in planning for the Airport expansion, to ensure that such growth minimizes the impacts to neighborhoods. She was also very concerned that the Long-Range Transportation Plan was not included as part of the Comprehensive Plan. She said without it, they are unable to see the effects of increased density in various parts of town on our transportation systems and, hence, on our neighborhoods, our personal lives, and our property values. Ms. Nienhauser said although she thought Chapter 5 was excellent, she was very concerned about the implementation aspect of the Plan as it was premised upon having an adequate Planning staff to develop the building blocks that would be necessary to implement the Plan. If adequate staff was not available, the Comprehensive Plan would likely be “put on the shelf”, and their ability to develop the beautiful northern city that the Plan envisions would also be put on the shelf. Despite her concerns, she still urged adoption of the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan as soon as possible, along with a clear process for amending it as necessary that includes ample public notice and the opportunity for public involvement.

Helen Nienhauser, speaking for JANELLE IRAOPPEN, said Ms. Iraoppen urged the Assembly to adopt the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan and to consider the "Living With Wildlife in Anchorage: A Cooperative Effort" as an important component. Ms. Iraoppen noted that when she had arrived at the Assembly meeting tonight, a moose was browsing 20 yards from the Assembly Chamber doors and, ironically, peered into the Alaska Collection. She wondered how many Assembly members from other states could say that a moose was looking over their shoulders while they were making decisions about it. Ms. Iraoppen said much work had gone into the Plan, the public had spoken, and she urged the Assembly to listen.

STEVE GRAVEL, Vice Chair of Sand Lake Community Council, said people had expressed concern at Council meetings regarding the Anchorage International Airport. He pointed out the Airport was a State facility and was not governed by Municipal planning and zoning ordinances. Mr. Gravel asked if the title of "Airport Environs Planning Area" could be renamed to "West Anchorage Planning Area." He said it was a minor change, but having the word "Airport" had proved volatile to his community. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan contained provisions for a collaborative effort between the airport and Anchorage residents. He said the Airport had been a good neighbor, had sent representatives to Council meetings, and had addressed issues of concern to the community. Referring to page 5 of Volume I of Planning and Zoning Commission Review and Recommendations, Mr. Gravel referred to pages 5, 12, 14, and 15. He said those pages contained important information, and he requested that they not be stricken from the Plan.

ERIC PAULI said he had participated in the Physical Environment and Natural Studies Task force in the spring of 1998 as part of the Anchorage 2020 Comprehensive Plan workgroup. He said the task force knew that if the Plan was to be meaningful, it had to be enforceable. He said the task force had been comprised of diverse individuals, and they shared the

knowledge of the sad fate of the 1982 Plan, which seemingly spent a lot of time on the shelf and was called into action very few times. He said the task force agreed they did not want to waste their time on an effort such as that. They had agreed that a large component of the quality of life in Anchorage was the abundance of natural open space. Therefore, natural open space planning would be a necessity if Anchorage wanted to remain a desirable location for business and for family life. Mr. Pauli asked that the Assembly retain the natural open space language as recommended by the P&Z Commission. He noted the Plan was an effort by to inject long-term thinking with respect to the concept of sustainability into Municipal decision-making. He said they had used tried and true urban planning tools, and the task force felt the community could not afford to be without them any longer. He asked that the Assembly help assure, through retention of the strong Chapter 5 language of intent, that the Plan eventually be enforceable so that the outpouring of creativity from the community was not wasted.

Vice Chairman Meyer asked if anyone else wished to speak. There was no one, and he closed the public hearing.

Mr. Tremaine moved,
seconded by Mr. Tesche,

to postpone action on AO 2000-119 until October 31,
2000.

There was lengthy discussion on the target completion date for the Plan, the number of worksession which would be appropriate, and the possibility of adopting various chapters of the Plan separately .

Ms. Clementson said she did not feel they should adopt one chapter at a time. She said they should wait until they had considered the entire Plan and then adopt it as a whole all at once.

Question was called on the motion to postpone action on AO 2000-119 until October 31, 2000 and it passed with one objection by Ms. Clementson.

16. AUDIENCE PARTICIPATION: None.
17. ASSEMBLY COMMENTS: None.
18. EXECUTIVE SESSIONS: None.
19. ADJOURNMENT:

The meeting adjourned at 11:55 p.m.

Chair

ATTEST:

Municipal Clerk

Date Minutes Amended and Approved: March 27, 2001

VC/db/ccarl

INDEX

<i>Subject</i>	<i>Page</i>
Air Quality Consulting Services	4
Airport Aviation Advisory Commission	3
Ambulance Staffing At Fire Station #4.....	2, 7
Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan.....	8, 11, 29
Anchorage Museum Of History And Art	9
Anchorage Regional Compost Facility	2
Anchorage Wastewater Utility A Proposed Rate Decrease.....	2
APPEARANCE REQUESTS	
David Mccabe, To Present A Report From The Board Of Equalization	8
Dennis L. Ruhle, Subdivision Agreement, Road Standards, And 10' Setback In Hokama Heights Subdivision.....	8
Beach Lake Park.....	3
Board Of Equalization.....	8
Budget Advisory Commission	3, 22

Bus Brakes And Traction Control.....	4
Bus Stops Landscaping.....	3
Capital Project Matching Grant Program.....	5
Central Transfer Facility.....	2
Child Care Licensing Program.....	9
Chugiak-Eagle River Parks And Recreation Board Of Supervisors	3
Code Changes.....	3, 8, 10, 11, 15, 23, 28, 29
Combustion Turbine Technical Services And Support.....	4
Community Health Nursing Services	2
Conditional Use For Sales Of Alcoholic Beverages	10
Conflict Of Interest.....	15
Construction Contract Amendments	4
Contracts Awarded Between \$30,000 And \$100,000.....	4
Day Care Assistance Program.....	9
Denali Kidcare Services	3
Dump Trucks With Operators	2
Eklutna-Palmer Transmission Line Avalanche Repair.....	4
Electrical Easements	3
Electrical Line Installation	4
Executive And Administrative Organization.....	10, 11
Executive Positions Classification.....	8, 11
Family Planning Services	2
Federal And State Financial Assistance Reports	4
Fire Department.....	2, 7
General Government Capital Improvement Budget.....	2
General Government Capital Improvement Program.....	2
General Government Operating Budget	2
Girdwood Commercial Areas And Transportation Master Plan.....	8, 15, 23
Girdwood Road Service Area	1
HIV/AIDS Prevention Services	3
Internal Audit Report.....	4
Kincaid Park.....	3
Land Sale, Purchase, Lease, Conveyance Or Donation	4, 9
Library Periodical Subscriptions.....	4
Limited Road Service Areas	1
Liquor Licenses.....	3, 7, 10, 22
Merrill Field Airport.....	9
Municipal Share-A-Ride Program.....	3
National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System.....	2
Natural Gas Easements	3
Ombudsman's Report	4
Parking Authority Board Of Directors	3
Peoplesoft Software System.....	2, 4
Perinatal Case Management/Healthy Baby Services.....	9
Planning And Zoning Commission	2, 8, 10, 15, 23
Police Department.....	3, 5
Port Of Anchorage Pile Repairs And Miscellaneous Maintenance.....	1
Printing/Reproduction Services	4
Public Transportation Marketing Program.....	3
Rate Decrease And Changes To Nonrecurring Charges For AWWU.....	2
RECOGNIZING	
Senior Patrol Officer Thomas W. Hume	3, 5
Rezoning.....	2, 10
Road Maintenance.....	1
Roof Repair.....	2
Sewer Service Changes	10
Sidewalk Improvements	1, 4
Sister City Commission.....	3
Soil Disposal.....	2
Sole Source Procurement Report	4
Special Assessment Districts	7, 17
State Transfer Of Responsibilities Agreement (Tora).....	3
Sullivan, George M. Arena.....	10, 28
Transportation Improvement Bonds.....	7, 23
Utilities Capital Improvement Program.....	2
Utilities Operating And Capital Budgets	2
Utility Relocation Agreement.....	4
Women, Infants & Children Nutrition Services	2
Youth Work Program.....	3