

CLERK'S OFFICE

APPROVED

Date: 5-20-03

IMMEDIATE RECONSIDERATION

FAILED 5-20-03; VETOED 5-27-03;

SUSTAINED--NO ASSEMBLY

ACTION TAKEN 6-17-03

Submitted by: Assemblymembers Tesche, Traini

Prepared by: Department of Assembly

For reading: May 20, 2003

ANCHORAGE, ALASKA

AR NO. 2003-159

1 A RESOLUTION OF THE ANCHORAGE MUNICIPAL ASSEMBLY REQUESTING
2 FURTHER INFORMATION AND REVIEW REGARDING SITE COSTS AND THE
3 AVAILABILITY OF MUNICIPAL SITES, INCLUDING 3500 TUDOR, FOR USE IN
4 CONNECTION WITH THE NEW FACILITY FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
5 AND HUMAN SERVICES.

6
7
8 WHEREAS, in AO No. 2003-32, the Assembly tentatively approved siting of the new
9 Facility "relatively close" to the university-medical district; and

10
11 WHEREAS, the Assembly further concluded that a location "relatively close" to the
12 District "[did] not automatically outweigh all other factors, including cost"; and

13
14 WHEREAS, the Administration issued Phase I of the procurement for the facility, within
15 which the Administration stated that "no suitable municipal land is known to be available for the
16 project"; and

17
18 WHEREAS, subsequent to issuance of the RFP, the Anchorage voters rejected the
19 issuance of bonds to construct an administrative headquarters for the Anchorage School District
20 on the 3500 Tudor Road site owned by the Municipality; and;

21
22 WHEREAS, the 3500 Tudor Road Master Plan is now underway, with issuance of a
23 tentative report anticipated within 90 days; and.

24
25 WHEREAS, it appears there may be other Municipal sites to the immediate south of the
26 university-medical district which may also be an appropriate site for the Facility; and

27
28 WHEREAS, the Administration failed to review site cost information in the Phase I site
29 evaluation, notwithstanding the direction in AO 2003-32 that the site evaluation should weigh
30 other factors, including cost; and

31
32 WHEREAS, state budget constraints and the likelihood of substantial reduction in state
33 assistance for essential municipal programs makes it critical that the Facility be developed in the
34 most cost-effective fashion; and

35
36 WHEREAS, notwithstanding the relative desirability of a site "relatively close" to the

university-medical district as stated in AO 2003-32, the Administration applied the site preference to reject any site outside the university-medical district; and

WHEREAS, use of a municipal site will offer substantial cost savings; and

WHEREAS, better cost information on all potential sites may be relevant to the site evaluation process.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Anchorage Assembly:

1. The Administration is directed to defer release of Phase II of the Facility RFP for 90 days.
2. The Administration is further directed to explore the 3500 Tudor Road Master Plan, and to report to the Assembly whether there is one, or more, suitable Municipal sites for the Facility.
3. The Administration is further directed, as stated in AO No. 2003-32, to assess site cost information, including acquisition and site development costs, for both public and private sites, including all sites presented in Phase I, and to present a report of such site cost information to the Assembly. At a minimum, the information provided will include a 5-year business plan for public and private sites, together with all relevant development and operation cost comparisons.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this 20th day of May, 2003

Chair

ATTEST:


Municipal Clerk



M.O.A.
MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE

2003 MAY 27 PM 4:03

VETO MEMORANDUMS OFFICE

1D

DATE: May 26, 2003
TO: Anchorage Assembly
FROM: Mayor George P. Wuerch
SUBJECT: Veto of Assembly Resolution ("AR") No. 2003-158, A Resolution Of The Anchorage Municipal Assembly Regarding 2003 Hand Commission Action Plan Amendment ("Resolution").

I hereby veto Assembly Resolution No. 2002-158 referenced above. The reasons for this veto are:

1. There is a well-established and comprehensive public process for the consideration and selection of projects from numerous, worthwhile proposals designed to improve and benefit neighborhoods within the Municipality. This resolution inappropriately interferes with that public process; and
2. The Resolution unfairly singles out and emphasises one of many worthwhile proposals for special consideration.