TASK FORCE WORKING ASSUMPTIONS

These are existing conditions, recognized conflicts or contentions about certain Airport perimeter parcels, and/or basic items that the Task Force stipulates are correct, factual, or otherwise accepted. Some of these may require more research but generally these are established conditions. The Task Force may need to discuss these further to expand their descriptions and/or assign the proper timing. Many of these have existed for years.

#1. There are *immediate/near-term* and *long-term land needs* by various parties on numerous Airport perimeter parcels. These needs arise from existing or future land use requirements or parcel conflicts based on one party needing to use land of another party. Resolution of these issues requires negotiation of various parties. There is a mix of support or disagreement about these needs and sometimes the timing of these needs or actions to address each. Most of these are described in the *West Anchorage District Plan*.

Immediate/Near-term Needs (present to ~5 yrs):

- MOA Kloep Snow Dump Expansion – Facility is located on ANC land. MOA requires construction updates to the site to meet federal water quality mandates. MOA fund sources require that permanent upgrades may only be done on land that is owned/or under long-term lease by MOA. Airport and MOA cannot come to agreement on purchase or long-term lease terms. Negotiations are tabled.

- MOA/Airport resolution of long-term use of Airport land for MOA parks [DeLong Lake Park, Connors Bog Park, Little Campbell Lake & north side ski trail @ Kincaid Park, Spenard Beach Park, Pt. Woronzof Overlook, portions of Coastal Trail, and creation of some form of permanent easement for Coastal Trail.] Each of these areas has been variously covered with maintenance agreements, of which all but one is expired and in month-to-month holdover. ANC can retake these areas with minimal notice (30 days notice).

- MOA/Airport – Address the accelerating erosion on the bluff at the north side of the Airport from Earthquake Park to the north face of Pt. Woronzof, which threatens the Coastal Trail, the north end of the N-S runway, and W. Northern Lights Rd.

- Airport/MOA- Resolution of land uses and ultimate ownership of the GSA parcel known as the FCC land. Under disposal consideration now.

- Neighboring residents want Airport Buffers - Formalizing permanent buffers along sections of the Airport perimeter, including the northwest corner of Turnagain Bog at the residential subdivision interface; the east and south borders of the Kulis Land; along the south border of the Airport along Raspberry Road.

- Airport Need - Possible continued runway approach facility expansion at the west end of the main E-W runway. (Potential ongoing or periodic need)

Long-term Needs (> 5 yrs):

- MOA/AWWU Asplund Wastewater Treatment Facility (AWWTF) – AWWTF currently processes up to 58-million gallons of wastewater per day utilizing a primary treatment process authorized by an EPA discharge permit. Continued operations under the existing discharge permit is largely dependent on the hydraulics of the mixing zone at the plant outfall in the Knik Arm. Any impacts to the existing mixing zone or regulatory changes associated with the existing discharge permit will require the AWWTF to be upgraded to a secondary or tertiary treatment process. Preliminary estimates associated with such an upgrade anticipate the use of the existing land under AWWU management authority and a cost impact of approximately 1 billion dollars. The MOA/AWWU must preserve the existing ability to operate AWWTF as a primary treatment facility but also secure rights for future expansion. Long range airport expansion conflicts with proposed AWWTF expansion concepts.
  <u>AWWU is investigating land use needs if it is ever required expand to secondary or tertiary treatment. Preliminary figures prepared as part of this effort indicated expansion will require use of all of the Woronzof Tracts Subdivision, Tract A1. This places AWWU long range planning in direct conflict with AIA long range planning</u>.

- Airport - A second N-S runway on the Airport, which can only be located west of and parallel to the existing N-S runway may be needed in the future.

- Airport - Associated infrastructure and lease parcels for a new West Airpark, including relocation of West Northern Lights, possible relocation of main sewer trunk and other utilities, etc.

- Airport - Expansion, per future Airport Master Plans and FAA approved airport traffic projections, of Airport facilities to the West Airpark, South Airpark, Turnagain Bog, and Connors areas. These expansions may include relocation or construction of associated roads and utilities.

#2. Given the range of current and future land conflicts around the Airport perimeter, there continues to be a need to resolve these conflicts, which will likely require changes of ownership and/or management of certain parcels.

#3. From past studies and alternatives evaluations, it is understood that ANC operations and facilities cannot simply be moved to the former BLM reserve in the Mat Valley. The BLM reserve no longer exists. This issue is not for consideration.

#4. ANC is a major employment center in Anchorage, whose facilities are essential to local, regional and statewide economies and markets.

#5. Airport noise issues continue to impact neighborhoods. Airport and FAA programs will continue to manage and mitigate noise issues generated at the Airport.

#6. Relevant sections of Assembly Ordinance *2000-151 (S-2)* remain in effect and some conditions set forth therein still require action.

#7. There is a possibility that sufficient acreage exists on the west side of the Airport to accommodate a new runway and associated facilities, Pt. Woronzof Park, the Coastal Trail, and AWWU plant expansion. If the existing lot lines and ownership patterns were removed or reconfigured, the areal extent of facility needs <u>might</u> fit within this area. If the AWWU reserve is changed, it would need to be <u>designed and</u> formalized well ahead of the project. Changing the AWWU reserve will require completion of a technical study to evaluate impacts to AWWU primary treatment operations under 301(h) of the Clean Water Act and provision for an area large enough to accommodate secondary or tertiary treatment.

#8. Any change in land use from Municipal dedicated parkland to a non-park use will likely require a vote of the general public before land can change hands. Before such a vote is initiated, the possible new locations and designs for a moved coastal trail and replacement park land shall be drafted and made available to the public.

#9. While it might not be preferred, should it become necessary, the use of Eminent Domain to attain acreage or areas needed to construct a new N-S runway is available to the State DOT.

#10. Restrictive covenants or federal patents that may apply to certain parcels on the west side of the Airport do not restrict the use of these lands for public purposes, which include parks and Anchorage Airport facilities.

#11. The existing Dena'ina archeological site on the bluff to the west of the Airport must be addressed with any future developments.

#12. The Coastal Trail will be retained in perpetuity as a continuous, buffered system extending from Earthquake Park to Kincaid Park.

#13. ANC shall be responsible for all costs associated with any future need to realign the coastal trail to accommodate Airport development. .

#14. As noted in the *West Anchorage District Plan*, the 1986 land selection by the Municipality of *six* Airport perimeter parcels is no longer considered a valid possibility. Because the 1986 State selection process is subordinate to federal jurisdiction and FAA guidelines, these lands have the highest and best use determination for Airport facilities and the National Airport System, i.e. the Airport maintains a superior claim that the Municipality cannot achieve. The State claims they have no obligation to provide alternative selections.

#15. Past evaluations have determined that moving ANC cargo facilities and activities to one of the JBER airfields is infeasible, due to costs, security concerns, airspace complications, and

the need to keep cargo and passenger/commercial flight line facilities together. If this is to become a recommendation, these issues will require revisiting and assessments.

#16. There is community, business, and airline support to continue to expand ANC on available lands at this existing facility.

#17. There will eventually be an adopted Airport Zoning District that will include regulations and standards to address certain aspects of airport land uses.

#18. The *West Anchorage District Plan* land use designations and policies are adopted and can only be changed via a public process and plan amendment.

#19. Unless determined otherwise by FAA, applicable FAA grant assurances and national airport policies, and state regulations (17 AAC 42.005-42.990) regulate Airport land uses and planning.

#20. The Municipality will operate the AWWTF in accordance with EPA discharge permit requirements. Regulatory changes to permit requirements and/or physical impacts to the existing mixing zone in the Knik Arm have the potential to require a facility upgrade. The treatment facility and future upgrades will remain in or near the current location.

#21. Any future new N-S runway and/or runway expansion project will go through the full NEPA process, which includes an alternatives analysis and environmental and social impacts assessments, determinations about use of the Anchorage Coastal Refuge, etc.

#22. The Airport cannot permanently dedicate Airport land to buffer areas or for permanent park or other non-aviation related uses as per FAA Grant Assurances, policies, and mandates.

#23. It may prove valuable for the Airport area stakeholders and the Task Force to make determinations of highest and best use scenarios for certain parcels of Airport perimeter land. These could then guide, justify or support future land use designations and land exchange decisions. The establishment of public need statements or determinations could play a role in these highest and best use scenarios.

#24. Although the *Anchorage Wetlands Management Plan* assigns most remaining wetlands within the Airport an "A" designation, public need and other Corps guidelines would justify the issuance of future wetland permits for Airport expansion. Ongoing concerns with bird conflicts with Airport facilities will likely lead to off-site mitigation.

#25. Neither the state nor FAA can require carriers to move operations to FAI, as a potential means of lessening the future need for a new N-S runway at ANC. .

#26. Any land trade scenario must incorporate parcel appraisals. The Municipality and/or the Airport may initiate appraisals during the life of this Task Force.

#27. Task Force members accept the role and direction of the facilitator and agree to treat the meetings and other members with respect and understanding. Members will attempt to work "outside the box" to consider issues and pursue solutions.

#28. To go from a concept to operational, a significant new N-S runway project on the west side of the Airport requires a 10-20 year process.

#29. During the past evaluation and planning efforts for a new N-S runway, some air carriers ended up not supporting the new runway. It is understood (and outlined in a letter from the airlines) that this lack of support was based on economic conditions and their unwillingness to pay into the project at that time under those conditions.

#30. There is broad community support and MOA Parks and Recreation funding and support for retention of the Coastal Trail, the Little Campbell Lake section of Kincaid Park, Delong Lake, Connors Bog, and Spenard Beach Parks in their current location in perpetuity.

#31. Pt Woronzof Park was created as a result of an Airport-MOA land trade with the intent that it remains a dedicated park with the Coastal Trail corridor in perpetuity.

#32. The existing Runway Protection Zones at the ends of each runway are strictly regulated by FAA regulations.

#33. There has been considerable public concern about the potential future impacts of Airport growth, especially at the interface areas with residential neighborhoods.

#34. There has been strong protest about the planning for and potential development of a new N-S runway, because of impacts to parks and the Coastal Trail and also with associated noise and disturbance impacts. Some of the public does not see a need for a new runway.

#35. Any future Airport expansion must include definitive analyses of how a project will impact AWWU facility mixing zones and plant operations. If a project negatively impacts mixing zones, the Airport will be responsible for all facility upgrade requirements per EPA.

#36. This Task Force is not charged with judging the need for future facilities to meet growth projections at ANC nor whether ANC should expand facilities or reach some limit of growth at the current location. But those issues might be highlighted as a finding in need of future determination from this Task Force.

#37. The need for land trades around ANC is generated by both ANC and Municipal land use and parcel needs.

#38. All involved entities should pursue viable alternatives and present details for new alignments and designs for the Coastal Trail early on in land trade discussions so the public understands how the Trail might change.

#39. ANC's new Master Plan will require airport tenants' acceptance and commitment prior to the pursuit of a new N-S runway and west ANC developments.

#40. The future location of a new N-S runway, an expanded AWWU facility, and associated coastal trail realignments must account for the Denaina Archeological site.

ITEMS FOR EXPLORATION

Over the course of the *West Anchorage District Plan* planning process and continuing now are issues and items that remain poorly understood and/or that could impact land use and land exchanges around the Airport. The Task Force should determine relevance of these items and then direct further evaluation as appropriate.

#1. The Task Force should decide how best to reach decisions on land trades and trade scenarios, either via voting or consensus agreements

#2. It should be determined if the state can create incentives that might entice cargo carriers to move to or share operations with Fairbanks and/or Kenai Airports. This might be a means of reducing landings, and consequently negating the need for a new N-S runway or related expansions in ANC. Important to this action, is the notion that neither the state nor FAA can require carriers to move operations to FAI.

#3. The Task Force must determine the role that the current ANC Master Plan will play in future land use designations and land exchanges.

#4. The Task Force will make recommendations on the role and types of milestones and tipping points upon which future Airport projects and expansions will commence.

#5. Is it possible and with which parcels included, for a phased land exchange scenario to resolve long-term Airport perimeter conflicts.

#6. The Task Force should discuss the role of phasing or creating incremental land trades as a means of resolving conflicts.

#7. Should and can FAA in collaboration with MOA and ANC determine if there is a trigger point at which ANC will require relocation and/or separation of specific types of services and functions. (Noise impact targets, air quality targets, traffic, etc.)

#8. The Task Force should attempt to identify constraints to long-term needs of ANC, the public, and the MOA on lands at the Airport perimeter. Associated with this is an attempt by the Task Force to identify methods to surmount these constraints.

#9. Can the Task Force construct a checklist with relevant milestones of all items needed to create a land exchange package.

#10. What is the role, and who is responsible for the evaluation of 4F guidelines and restrictions, the National Recreation Trail, and the federal Recreational Trails Program on land trades, new runways, uses of state and federal lands, etc.

#11. Can or should the Task Force define if there is an overwhelming public need and/or public interest in park uses and park facilities around the Airport? Does this public need or public interest determination have any regulatory type bearing on MOA decisions to pursue long-term ownership of certain parcels and/or on trading MOA parkland?

#12. The Task Force should attempt to determine the highest and best use for the Airport perimeter parcels in question.

#13. Is there a way to create predictability for ANC on the future N-S runway without doing a land exchange?

#14. Determine if and where it might be possible for the MOA to do a fee simple acquisition of certain ANC lands. Or request a finding by FAA.

#15. The Task Force should undertake a planning exercise that removes lot lines at the Airport's west side and then rearranges existing and potential future needs in the space. The goal would be to see how the Airport's needs, Pt. Woronzof Park, and the AWWU facility might be accommodated within the constraints of each land use, geography, environmental issues, etc.

SPECIFIC ACTIONS FOR CONSIDERATION/DECISIONS BY TASK FORCE

Given that the Task Force has been assigned a formal role in the resolution of Airport area land conflicts via the *West Anchorage District Plan*, certain items require Task Force review, clarification, and /or actions. Some of these are highlighted here.

#1. Can the Task Force agree to the concept of triggers to initiate a land exchange or a series of incremental trades. Can a land exchange scenario and the MOA un-dedication ballot item include triggers that would initiate the exchange?

#2. Should the Task Force recommend initiation of land exchange actions, including completing appraisals, title searches, technical studies, etc, along with a direction to package a ballot proposal for un-dedicating Pt. Woronzof Park?

#3. Task Force will review, discuss, and provide recommendations on a final draft land trade package, with conditions, timing, triggers, and actions. This will likely come from MOA and ANC.

#4. Determine if a land trade agreement include a reversion clause that certain areas or parcels shall revert to original ownership and management controls should the future need for each area not come to fruition; e.g., Pt. Woronzof Park be returned to MOA-Parks and Recreation, etc.