

Planning and Zoning Commission

April 18, 2022

Case #: **2022-0032**

Case Title: Park Master Plan for Russian Jack Springs Park

Agenda Item #: **G.2** Supplementary Packet #: **1**

X Comments submitted after the packet was finalized

Additional information

Other:

Sent by email: **X** yes no

Marc Grober
5610 Radcliff Dr
Anchorage , 99504

marc@interak.com

9073375687

4/13/2022 1:03:27 PM

I have polled property owners within 500 feet of the park boundary and can confirm that notice WAS NOT mailed out to every property owner of land within 500 feet of the Park boundary.

I can also state without risk of contradiction that notice was not posted that was visible from each developed right-of-way adjacent to the property.

Based upon the above I am led to believe that other mailing requirements may not have been met.

I advised Planning staff that I had documented previous occasions upon which Parks and Rec contractors responsible for notice had failed to actually mail notice required but had billed P&R as if they had.

I have asked for any kind of documentation from P&R (such as an affidavit) reflecting P&R's claim that notice was properly mailed and published but have yet to receive anything.

Marc Grober
5610 Radcliff Dr
Anchorage , AK 99504

marc@interak.com

9073375687

4/13/2022 1:15:54 PM

The Staff Report prepared by Karlie Gedig and signed by Craig Lyon indicates at page 8 that the Northeast Community Council recommended approval of the Master Plan. This is absolutely false. The NECC made it very clear TWICE that it would not recommend approval of the plan because it was grossly inadequate and recommended that the plan be returned to P&R for community review and amendment (in as much as Parks and Rec refused to collaborate with the NECC with regard to its contents, refused to seat NECC designates to the CAC - despite claims by Rafuse to the contrary), whereupon it could then be resubmitted to the Park Commission for reconsideration and ONLY THEN considered by the PZC,

I personally called Planning to speak to Ms. Gedig (as did others) and asked her to advise ASAP as to whether she intended to correct the staff report or whether community members would be forced to testify that the report was apparently an intentional misrepresentation of the NECC's position.

The report contains additional misrepresentations, including the descriptions of the actions of other community councils and the claim that notices were mailed to property owners pursuant to AMC 21.03.020H

Robert Kapke
5510 Craig drive
Anchorage , Ak 99504

rkapke@aol.com

19077174004

4/15/2022 10:51:13 PM

I live in the first home outside the tunnel in Nunaka Valley . I have never received notice of any meetings regarding changes to south Russian Jack Park . This park , both north and south could be an amazing asset to east anchorage. Unfortunately no one east of Boniface has safe access to the north end of the park . The bike trails within the both sides of the park are unsafe and in need of repair . The most unfortunate aspect of the park is personal safety . In recent years the Municipality has ignored illegal activities inside the park . All the new items proposed for the parks are a waste if user's don't feel safe .

Marc Grober

marc@interak.com

9073375687

4/17/2022 6:28:08 PM

5610 Radcliff Dr
Anchorage, AK 99504

The Park, used by thousands, was based on the comments of a few handful of people, in no small part because the drafting process DID NOT involve the community. Had it involved the community the contractor may have populated the plan with information about the orchard in the park (completely missing, apparently because the contractor never communicated with anyone in Horticulture). It might have spent more than a paragraph mentioning the 2012 wind storm (but the contractor never spoke to the MOA arborist nor sought any real plan for addressing the thousands of trees still down in the park). It might have actually included the management documents prepared at my request for use with planning for the park by ADFG and F&WP in 2018 (when P&R attempted to promote a project that would have run trails through protected wetlands without regard for the wildlife present), but the contractor never obtained or referenced any documentation about wildlife management and simply muttered a half accurate listing of wildlife in the park without planning for management at all. It might have fully addressed the fact that Park trails have become transportation thoroughfares focusing as much on commuters, shoppers, and the like as recreators and the fact that the park is a critical nexus for no less than FIVE regional trails systems, but as with the NMP, the contractor had no interest in talking to anyone about such issues.

The "plan" was always intended to be a shallow "visioning" document which in fact gave P&R carte blanche, NOT a master plan guiding future management of the park, and in fact P&R have NEVER acted to accomplish any goals set out in the first and only adopted Master Plan, the one adopted in 1979, whose guidelines have been studiously rejected by Parks and Rec for over 50 years!
