

Submitted by: Chairman of the Assembly
at the Request of the Mayor
Prepared by: Economic and Community
Development
For reading: May 18, 2004

CLERK'S OFFICE

APPROVED

Date:

6-8-04

Anchorage, Alaska
AR No. 2004-136

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE 2003-2007
HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONSOLIDATED PLAN TO INCLUDE
THE MOUNTAIN VIEW NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION STRATEGY.

WHEREAS, extensive research and analysis was used to compile the Municipality of Anchorage 2003-2007 *Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan (Consolidated Plan)*, which is the basis for a comprehensive approach to address the housing and community development needs of lower income residents and neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) invites local jurisdictions to create Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies for low income neighborhoods as part of the *Consolidated Plan*; and

WHEREAS, extensive public consultation, including planning efforts dating back to 1998, was incorporated into a *Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy*; and

WHEREAS, the *Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy* provides the community with a strategy for revitalization which will allow for more flexibility with Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and related funding programs in the neighborhood and better coordination of neighborhood initiatives; and

WHEREAS, the draft *Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy* was made available to the public on September 21, 2003, presented to the Mountain View Community Council on October 13, public testimony on said Strategy was heard on October 8 and again in front of the Housing and Neighborhood Development Commission on December 10, 2003, and written comments on the Strategy were accepted through December 22, 2003; and

WHEREAS, the *Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy* was endorsed by resolution of the Housing & Neighborhood Development Commission on January 14, 2004; and


NOW, THEREFORE, the Anchorage Assembly Resolves:


Section 1. The Assembly amends the Municipality of Anchorage 2003-2007 *Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan* to include the *Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy*, included as Attachment A.

Section 2. This resolution shall take effect immediately upon passage and approval by the Anchorage Municipal Assembly.

1
2 PASSED AND APPROVED by the Anchorage Assembly this 8th day
3 of June, 2004.
4

5
6
7 ATTEST:


Chairman

8
9
10
11
12
13 
14 Municipal Clerk

MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE

ASSEMBLY MEMORANDUM

AM 423 -2004

Meeting Date: May 18, 2004

From: Mayor

Subject: AR No. 2004-136 : A resolution amending the *Municipality of Anchorage 2003-2007 Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan* to include the *Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy*.

The purpose of the attached resolution is to adopt the *Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (Mountain View NRS)* as a component of the *2003-2007 Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan (Consolidated Plan)*.

The attached *Mountain View NRS* is the final draft for submission to the US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). The strategy described draws on nearly ten years of neighborhood planning and activism to fulfill the intent of HUD regulations found at 24 CFR 91.215(e)(2). These regulations allow a local jurisdiction to prepare and submit a neighborhood revitalization strategy as part of its *Consolidated Plan*. The format, requirements and incentives of such a strategy are further defined by HUD in Notice CPD-96-1.

Because the *Mountain View NRS* responds to the format and opportunities defined by HUD, it is not a neighborhood plan encompassing the full scope or authority of the Municipality's comprehensive plan, *Anchorage 2020*. The *Mountain View NRS* will, however, provide a mechanism for the community to better coordinate the array of activity currently underway in Mountain View, including a method of tracking progress through the *Consolidated Plan's* annual reports. In addition, HUD approval of the *Mountain View NRS* will provide Anchorage, and more specifically, Mountain View, additional flexibility in the use of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, and related grant programs. For example, housing rehabilitation projects funded by CDBG may be streamlined and made easier to administer, and economic development projects funded by either CDBG or Section 108 loan guarantees within the strategy area have fewer reporting requirements.

The *Mountain View NRS* was presented to the Mountain View Community Council on October 13, 2003. Residents were encouraged to review the plan and provide comments during the public comment period or during one of the scheduled public hearings. The general public was invited via electronic mailing and newspaper publication to comment on the *Mountain View NRS* from September 21 to December 22, 2003 and at public hearings on October 8, 2003 and December 10, 2003. A summary of comments received at the public hearing and during the public comment period are included in Appendix F of the *Mountain View NRS*. The Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) Commission recommended approval of the *Mountain View NRS* on January 14, 2004, included in Appendix G.

1 THE ADMINISTRATION RECOMMENDS ADOPTION OF THE ATTACHED
2 ASSEMBLY RESOLUTION AMENDING THE MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE
3 HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CONSOLIDATED PLAN TO
4 INCLUDE THE MOUNTAIN VIEW NEIGHBORHOOD REVITALIZATION
5 STRATEGY.

6
7
8 **Prepared by:** Carma E. Reed, Manager, Community Development Division

9
10 **Concur:** Mary Jane Michael, Executive Director, Office of Economic and Community
11 Development

12
13 **Concur:** Denis LeBlanc, Municipal Manager

14
15 **Respectfully submitted:** Mark Begich, Mayor

Mountain View
Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy

Part of the 2003-2007 Consolidated Plan

Final Draft

April 5, 2004

Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION	1
VISION STATEMENT	1
BOUNDARIES	3
DEMOGRAPHIC CRITERIA	3
COMMUNITY CONSULTATION	4
ASSESSMENT	10
STRATEGIES	11
PERFORMANCE MEASUREMENTS	11
LIST OF APPENDICES	14

Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy

Introduction

This document includes the final draft for submission to HUD of the *Mountain View CDBG Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (Mountain View NRS)*. The *Mountain View NRS* draws on nearly ten years of neighborhood planning and activism to fulfill the intent of the 24 CFR 91.215(e)(2), US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) regulations. These regulations allow a local jurisdiction to prepare and submit a neighborhood revitalization strategy as part of its Consolidated Plan. The format, requirements and incentives of such a strategy are further defined by HUD in Notice CPD-96-1.

This Mountain View NRS responds to the format and opportunities defined by HUD, and as such it is not a neighborhood plan encompassing the full scope or authority of the Municipality's comprehensive plan, *Anchorage 2020*. The Plan was presented to the Mountain View Community Council on October 13, 2003. Residents were encouraged to review the plan and provide comments during the public comment period or during one of the scheduled public hearings. The general public was invited via electronic mailing and newspaper publication to comment on the Mountain View NRS from September 21, 2003 to December 22 and at public hearings on October 8, 2003 and December 10, 2003. A summary of comments received at the public hearing and during the public comment period are included in Appendix F. The HAND Commission recommended approval of the *Mountain View NRS* on January 14th, 2004, included as Appendix G.

The desire and intent to submit a Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (NRS) to HUD has been included in the Municipality of Anchorage's *Consolidated Plan* since 1996. While the momentum behind the NRS in the Municipality's *Consolidated Plan* documents has ebbed and flowed over the years, the commitment to neighborhood planning by Mountain View residents has remained strong. This publication signifies the current Municipal administration's acknowledgement of the work to date, its desire to support and build upon those efforts, and to promote neighborhood revitalization strategies in Anchorage.

Vision Statement

In 1998, the community of Mountain View developed a vision for its main commercial district through a highly successful neighborhood visioning

event sponsored by the State Legislature and the Municipality of Anchorage, and hosted by the community of Mountain View:

Mountain View Drive will become the showcase of an ethnically diverse community, a main street that is aesthetically pleasing, with appropriate landscaping, and pedestrian friendly orientation that accommodates winter, and remains supported by strong zoning and code enforcement.

Furthermore, Mountain View Drive will have the best ethnic restaurants and coffee shops in the area. There will be bookstores, hobby shops, craft and art galleries, native art studios, and professional office providing legal, real estate, medical, dental and pharmaceutical services. Mountain View will have a contract post office, bank/co-op credit union, full time library, and computer services with affordable childcare services to support neighborhood residents.

Mountain View Drive will have broadened public transportation services, with traffic calming measures incorporated into street design and traffic/circulation patterns. This area will be structured as to provide adequate parking and sidewalks for pedestrian use.

With a relatively small population, increased commercial activity is doubtful in Mountain View if neighborhood residents are the only market being served, making this vision difficult to achieve without an additional "hook". In 2002, *Mountain View in Motion*, a collaborative effort spearheaded by Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services, articulated a cornerstone strategy to accomplish the neighborhood's vision: the Mountain View Arts and Cultural District. The vision continues:

A stroll through the district will reveal new and rehabilitated restaurants, specialty retail shops, art galleries and offices lining Mountain View Drive. Wider streets with angled parking and pedestrian amenities such as sidewalk benches and planters are currently being designed. The district will be home for the Museum of Natural History, Anchorage Opera, Alaska Dance Theatre, and many other arts and cultural organizations. Nonprofits such as Special Olympics, Boys and Girls Club and the Success by Six youth organizations have already moved in, with others on the way. Plans for constructing modern studio apartments and

live/work/studio space are part of the district's housing design. The district will be vibrant, populated, safe and economically healthy.

Through community-wide efforts, this Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy anticipates a glorious Mountain View in year 2008 in line with these vision statements.

Boundaries

The Mountain View Community Council is a part of the Renaissance Zone, an area identified through the Consolidated Planning process in 1997 and the focus of two Empowerment Zone applications (1998 and 2001). The scope of the Mountain View NRS covers the same boundaries as the Mountain View Community Council, which incorporates the commercial district along Mountain View Drive as well as the more residential portion of Mountain View primarily to its North (see map in Appendix D). The two necessarily go hand in hand; successful commercial revitalization must be accompanied by strategies to retain and improve the neighborhood's residential housing and affordability over time.

Demographic Criteria

A Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy may be considered for approval by HUD if it encompasses an area that is primarily residential and contains 70 percent or more low- and moderate-income residents. The Mountain View Community Council most closely aligns¹ with census tracts and block groups averaging 75.6 percent low- and moderate-income (see Table 1, below). Individually, all but one of these block groups exceeds 70 percent.

Furthermore, the area is primarily residential. Several maps attached to the hard copy draft of this plan in Appendix D show the zoning north of the commercial district is primarily R-3 and R-4, which allows single family to multi-family land use. Actual land use shows a scattered pattern of single family to multi-family residential developments.

¹ The Mountain View Community Council boundaries do not align exactly with census tract/block group boundaries. Small portions of Census Tract 10, Block Group 1 (62.48% low/moderate income), Census Tract 9.01, Block Group 1 (75.00% low/moderate income), and Census Tract 4, Block Group 1 (65.94% low/moderate income) are also included within the Mountain View Community Council. However, the portions of each of these block group included within the Community Council boundaries are small relative to the total size of the block group, therefore, it is more accurate to exclude these block groups from the data calculation than to include them.

It is not the purpose of this NRS to extensively discuss the demographics of the neighborhood, however, a complete neighborhood profile was prepared in January, 2003, and is attached to this document by reference as Appendix E (See Mountain View: A Neighborhood Profile, Davis Consulting, January 2003). Data in the profile is based primarily on census tract 6, which represents 87 percent of the population included in the table above, and 89 percent of the low/mod population.

Table 1. Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area
Income by Block Group

Census Tract	Block Group	Low/Mod Population	Total Population	% Low/Mod
9.01	2	604	911	66.3%
6	2	755	1,021	73.9%
6	3	653	827	79.0%
6	4	744	983	75.7%
6	5	864	1,132	76.3%
6	6	587	735	79.9%
6	7	675	891	75.8%
6	8	622	781	79.6%
Total		5,504	7,281	75.6%

Source: Year 2000 US Census

Community Consultation

The development of a comprehensive community revitalization strategy is expected to create a partnership among federal and local governments, the private sector, community organizations and neighborhood residents in order to secure economic empowerment opportunities in distressed neighborhoods. Neighborhood revitalization strategies must detail specific criteria, objectives, policies and programs that create viable opportunities to rebuild the community. Participation by all the stakeholders, particularly the neighborhood residents, is required in the development of the strategy. This Mountain View Revitalization Strategy culminates from multiple neighborhood and community planning processes that have taken place, sponsored by a variety of stakeholders, over the past ten years.

While there has been neighborhood planning in Mountain View for at least a decade, the consultation for this NRS began in 1997 with a neighborhood visioning session as part of the development of Anchorage's comprehensive plan, now called *Anchorage 2020*. Successive planning and visioning efforts since have built an array of initiatives that affect Mountain View. By pulling these diverse initiatives together, this *Mountain View NRS* strives to promote their synergy for a more cohesive, coordinated and effective revitalization strategy. Here is a chronological synopsis of how the strategies evolved:

In 1997, a Mountain View visioning session was facilitated by the Municipality's Community Development Division with the Mountain View Community Council, to provide input into the Comprehensive Plan. Notes on Mountain View strengths, weaknesses and future vision compiled and used in future planning processes.

In the summer of 1998, funded jointly through Community Development Block Grants and the Economic Development Administration, the Community Development Division commissioned a survey by Land Design North targeting residents of the Renaissance Zone regarding their commercial activity, where they shopped, their likes and dislikes about Mountain View and other Renaissance Zone neighborhoods, etc. A companion report surveyed businesses, neighborhood residents and public officials of four commercial districts in the Renaissance Zone, one of which was Mountain View. The latter report included neighborhood-specific "Strengths Weaknesses Opportunities and Trends" (SWOT) analysis.

These reports provided insight and direction while developing revitalization strategies for Mountain View and the Renaissance Zone for the 1998 Empowerment Zone application, the Comprehensive Plan, and subsequent planning efforts including the Mountain View NRS (see *Renaissance Zone Economic Development: Resident Survey and Socioeconomic Factors* and *Renaissance Zone Economic Development: A Strategic Assessment*).

In the Fall of 1998, the Municipality's first Empowerment Zone (EZ) application was finalized and submitted to HUD. The application covered the entire Renaissance Zone, which includes Mountain View. The community effort that went into this application was vast, including a community wide planning effort called the Anchorage Healthy Futures Project. The details of the community consultation associated with these efforts may be found in the EZ application itself (see the Anchorage Empowerment Zone application, 1998). While the application earned Anchorage a "runner up" title of a Strategic Planning Community, this

recognition includes very few formal incentives or benefits. One it does include, however, is mention in the neighborhood revitalization strategy guidance, which states: “Those entitlement grantees that submitted applications for designation as an EZ or EC but did not receive a designation should be able to meet these criteria [for the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy], but may not yet have developed the necessary benchmarks” (see Notice CPD-96-01).

Following the submission of the EZ application, in November of 1998, Representative Allen Kemplen organized a Mountain View visioning session hosted by the Mountain View Community Council and assisted by the Municipality of Anchorage’s Community Planning and Development project (see *Mountain View Drive: A Vision for the Future*, November 14 1998). This visioning session was well attended and highly successful. In 2003, the session has the rare distinction of being a planning effort that participants remember positively five years later, and can say they are beginning to see strategies that might make its vision come to be. The vision produced by this session is adopted by this *Mountain View NRS*.

The *1999 Action Plan*, covering the time period of July 1999 to June 2000 proposed to submit a NRS to HUD based on the EZ application submitted a year earlier (see *1999 Action Plan*). During the program year, through the Consolidated Planning process, it was decided that without the incentives that go along with the Empowerment Zone, it would be better to pare down the geographic area for purposes of the NRS. The Housing and Neighborhood Development Commission developed an extensive set of criteria to select a sub-area of the Renaissance Zone, evaluated each neighborhood, interviewed key stakeholders, and identified Mountain View as one of the target areas for an initial NRS (see 2000 Action Plan pages 23-26).

In October of 2001, a second EZ application for the Renaissance Zone was submitted. The application acknowledged the swell of planning activity in Mountain View in 2001: “Evidence of that pride [in Mountain View] is the dedication to the neighborhood planning process being spearheaded by the Mountain View Community Council Neighborhood Planning Committee” (see page 14, Empowerment Zone Application, September 2001). This second EZ application ultimately was not funded by HUD.

The 2001 Action Plan (covering the period July 2001 to June 2002) reaffirmed the intention to submit an NRS including Mountain View, and clarified that while the NRS would complement Anchorage 2020 (the Anchorage bowl’s comprehensive plan), “the scope of the Strategy project

itself does not include the full spectrum of community planning issues in a long-range 'neighborhood plan'." (see 2001 Action Plan, page 8). However, the NRS was never finalized, and from 2001 to 2003, without the support of the Municipality's administration at the time, the neighborhood planning processes were picked up more and more by non-Municipal entities. The *2002 Action Plan* made no mention of specific neighborhoods, although it did state "one or more Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Areas" would be a possibility in the 2003 *Consolidated Plan*. Neither the *2003 Action Plan* nor the *2003-2007 Consolidated Plan* included Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies.

During 2001, however, neighborhood planning gained momentum and recognition in another forum. The Mountain View Community Council held regular meetings with its planning subcommittee (referred to in the 2001 Empowerment Zone application). The concept of a Mountain View arts center emerged both as a strategy to positively engage Mountain View youth, and as a potential revitalization theme for the neighborhood (see Mountain View Arts Center concept Paper, 1st Quarter 2001). As a Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO), Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI), experienced developer, fundraiser, and neighborhood organizer, Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services (ANHS) emerged as an organization that could spearhead the Mountain View revitalization effort and provide structure to the Community Council's vision. From this process, the Mountain View revitalization effort was given a formal name: *Mountain View in Motion*.

Another key organization in these neighborhood planning meetings was, and continues to be, Cook Inlet Housing Authority (CIHA). Along with ANHS, CIHA is one of the foremost non-profit housing providers in Anchorage, and has shown a strong commitment to Mountain View. Out of its consultation with the neighborhood, CIHA committed to heavily investing in housing in Mountain View, as evidenced by its August 2002 *Neighborhood Revitalization Plan* for Mountain View. The strategies in CIHA's plan contribute to the housing revitalization and affordability component of the *Mountain View NRS*.

On the commercial front, ANHS built on its past experience of revitalizing Spenard in the 80s and 90s. ANHS engaged outside experts to assist in a review of three neighborhoods: Government Hill, Mountain View and Fairview. David Jon Boehlke, an affiliate of the Neighborhood Reinvestment network based in Washington DC, did an on-site visit and prepared a report "Revitalizing Three Anchorage Neighborhoods: A Brief Discussion Paper on Government Hill, Fairview and Mountain View". This paper characterized Mountain View as a "Neighborhood of Blocks"

referring to its varied development patterns (single family homes, multi-family apartments, well kept properties, dilapidated properties) despite its streets' regular grid pattern and uniform lots. Along with several useful suggested strategies, the paper reiterated a strong theme consistent in Mountain View planning to date: that the neighborhood has more assets than its reputation lets on. Changing this reputation is key to revitalizing the neighborhood.

The Mountain View Arts & Cultural District gained momentum in 2002 and 2003 as a primary way to bring investment into the neighborhood and changing its image. In September, 2002, Artspace Projects, Inc. (Artspace) was invited to the community to do a preliminary assessment of the arts district development in Mountain View. Artspace did a one-day site-visit and consulted with community leaders and artists in Anchorage. Artspace's ultimate assessment of the district was "Good-Very Good," but emphasized that to overcome the challenges of Mountain View's relative isolation from downtown, a "critical mass" of arts organizations would have to be incorporated on the onset.

As a follow-up, the arts and culture concept was given a thorough review by another expert affiliated with Neighborhood Reinvestment, Peg Barringer. Ms. Barringer also visited Anchorage and met with artists, community leaders, and Mountain View residents. Her October, 2002 paper, "Assessment and Recommendations for Development of an Arts and Cultural District in Mountain View" describes her consultation with the community, and emphasized the benefit of pursuing a district concept as opposed to funding or developing individual projects absent an overall district strategy at hand. Her paper also included an economic analysis of the neighborhood, including obstacles and potential assets to the revitalization of Mountain View.

The neighborhood meetings continued, now incorporating arts organizations interested in moving to the neighborhood. The *Mountain View in Motion Neighborhood Revitalization through Arts and Culture* brochure and plan includes a listing of 59 organizations and stakeholders supporting the project (see Mountain View in Motion brochure). Among others, these stakeholders include the Mountain View Community Council, local businesses, lending institutions, social service providers, Municipal offices, homebuilders, developers, and representatives. The Mountain View in Motion project also commissioned a neighborhood profile based on the new 2000 census data. This profile provides a current demographic analysis of the neighborhood which will be used as baseline data in future assessments.

Encouraged by the neighborhood revitalization efforts, the Rasmussen Foundation has supported the concept by proposing to make up to \$5 million available to capitalize a revolving loan program for development projects in Mountain View. This private investment provides legitimacy to the concept, as well as promotes the establishment of a Mountain View Community Land Trust, which is expected to play a key role in the technical aspects of pulling individual projects together, and maintaining the neighborhood's benefit over the long term.

By the Spring of 2003, the *Mountain View in Motion* group, lead by ANHS, approached the Community Development Division of the Municipality of Anchorage to assist in the funding of several of the projects associated with the strategy. Through the Consolidated Planning process, extensive discussions with the Municipal Assembly and public testimony, and ultimate support by the Municipality's new administration, three Mountain View projects in line with the Mountain View in Motion strategy were incorporated into the *2003 Action Plan* by amendment in September, 2003. These projects anticipate the real possibility of bringing in the arts organizations "critical mass" identified as crucial earlier in the planning process.

The Municipality of Anchorage further supported the district through an application submitted in July, 2003 for a Brownfields Environmental Development Initiative (BEDI) grant with a proposed marriage of future Section 108 lending program for the district. In addition, in September of 2003, Mayor Mark Begich's capital budget proposed to move upgrades to Mountain View Drive scheduled for 2005 up to 2004 to complement the neighborhood efforts.

Simultaneous to these actions, the Mountain View Community Council began consulting with the successful Weed and Seed program in the neighborhood of Muldoon. This program is funded by the Department of Justice and in-kind contributions by local law enforcement, businesses and community residents. As a companion strategy to Mountain View in Motion, the Community Council, with the Weed and Seed coordinator's assistance, began to compile a Weed and Seed application for Mountain View. While not submitted during 2003, the Weed and Seed application for Mountain View is still being considered.

While the Weed and Seed program, the *Mountain View in Motion* plan, Cook Inlet Housing Authority's *Neighborhood Revitalization Plan*, individual activities included in the Municipality's *2003 Action Plan*, Municipal capital projects and other actions currently underfoot in Mountain View will all contribute to the neighborhood's revitalization, regardless of whether there is a formal NRS recognized by HUD, the

Mountain View NRS is a mechanism to bring all these efforts together. It also brings greater opportunities and flexibility to the tools, primarily CDBG funds, the Municipality has to assist in the effort. This, it is strongly believed, will result the potential for a neighborhood's revitalization, or in Ms. Barringer's words, an Arts and Cultural District rather than a focus on individual projects.

In conclusion, rather than reinvent the wheel to compile this Mountain View NRS, ten years worth of planning documents highlighting Mountain View challenges, assets, and suggested strategies were reviewed and compiled to highlight do-able strategies, most of which are already in motion. Stakeholders in Mountain View have been consulted multiple times through the years, and are ready to see action.

A listing of the documents reviewed is included in the Annotated Bibliography of this plan, Appendix B. Hard copies of these documents are available for review at the Community Development Division office in City Hall.

Assessment

An NRS approved by HUD must include an assessment of the economic conditions of the area and an examination of the opportunities for economic development improvement and the problems likely to be encountered. Such an assessment has been done from a variety of angles beginning with the socio-economic studies of the Renaissance Zone conducted in 1998 in preparation for the Empowerment Zone application. More specific to the strategies presented in this NRS is the "Assessment and Recommendations for Development of an Arts and Cultural District in Mountain View" by Peg Barringer of OKM Associates, completed in 2002. While the assessment's purpose was to focus on the Arts and Cultural District (the commercial area of Mountain View), it recognized the integral role of the neighborhood's residential area and incorporated it into its analysis as well. Mountain View's opportunities and potential barriers to revitalization are covered with the clarity and insight of a professional experienced in neighborhood revitalization. Rather than repeat the report's contents in this space, the "Assessment of Existing Conditions", beginning on page six of the report, is included by reference to this report (see Appendix C).

Strategies

The seven strategies presented here summarize the action steps identified through the consultation processes discussed earlier in this report. Strategies are not listed in any priority order, nor have they been prioritized. More detail on the specific outputs (actions) of these strategies is included in Appendix A.

1. Promote an Arts & Cultural District to revitalize the commercial district of Mountain View
2. Increase small business activity compatible with the commercial revitalization of Mountain View
3. Encourage housing densities appropriate to the small lot, grid streetscape of Mountain View
4. Improve the quality of existing housing in Mountain View
5. Retain the affordability of housing in Mountain View
6. Decrease the real and perceived crime rates in Mountain View
7. Improve the urban environment in Mountain View through design standards, street upgrades, code enforcement, clean-up efforts, commercial revitalization, and reduction of other nuisances.

Performance Measurements

Success and progress of the Mountain View NRS will be measured by two types of performance measures: outputs and outcomes. Outputs are measures of programmatic benchmarks or milestones, such as the number of affordable housing units produced or a specific action completed. Outcomes are more generic measures of the neighborhood's overall well-being, usually based on aggregate demographic data such as the percent of a neighborhood's population in poverty.

The outcomes presented later in this section were developed by the Housing and Neighborhood Development Commission as measurements of overall health of a neighborhood for use with Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy evaluations. Care was taken by the HAND commission to identify outcome measures that may be used in any Anchorage neighborhood so that future NRS strategies may be developed

and compared with ease. These outcomes may also be incorporated into a city-wide performance measurement system to be used in each annual Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report.

Outputs incorporated into this NRS are included in Appendix A along with benchmarks to measure the progress of each strategy. For the sake of consistency across all output measurements, two benchmark years were chosen in this initial plan: 2004 and 2008. The year 2004 benchmarks will allow quick evaluation of the strategies and outputs proposed for fine tuning, or changing. Future Action Plans will identify additional benchmarks for that year's actions. Year 2008 the fifth year of the proposed Mountain View NRS. By year 2008, the bulk of the strategies should be implemented and Mountain View's vision well on its way to being realized.

Table 2. Proposed Outcome Measurements

Subject	Measure	Anchorage Data	Mt. View Baseline Data
Income:	Percent of Families in Poverty (year 2000)	7%	25%
	Percent of LMI Residents (year 2000)		
Housing:	Percent of Owner Occupied Housing Units (year 2000)	60%	21%
	Age of Housing: % units built in previous 10 years (year 2000)	13%	3%
	School Mobility Rate (01-02 school year)	39%	Clark: 32% W. Tyson: 47% M. View: 73%
	% of housing valued less than \$100,000* (year 2000)	8%	77%
Employment	Unemployment Rate (year 2000)	5%	16%
Transportation:	Percent using public transportation to commute to work (year 2000)	2%	10%
Crime	Rate of Drug/Alcohol crimes per 10,000 (year 2002)	104	169
	Rate of Property Crimes per 10,000	487	841
	Rate of Person Crimes per 10,000	153	553

List of Appendices

Appendix A. Mountain View NRS Strategies, Outputs and Benchmarks

Appendix B. Annotated Bibliography

Appendix C. Excerpt from "Assessment and Recommendations for Development of an Arts and Cultural District in Mountain View" by Peg Barringer of OKM Associates, completed in 2002

Appendix D. Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area Boundaries

Appendix E. Mountain View: A Neighborhood Profile, Davis Consulting, January 2003. This document is included as a separate file on the internet.

Appendix F. Summary of Public Comments and Responses.

Appendix G. Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) Commission Resolution

Appendix A. Mountain View NRS Strategies, Outputs and Benchmarks

Strategy*	Output	Baseline Data (2003)	Benchmark 2004	Benchmark 2008
1. Promote an Arts & Cultural District to revitalize the commercial district of Mountain View	Establish Arts & Cultural "anchors" in the Mountain View Commercial District	Identification of the Arts & Cultural District as a conceptual tool for neighborhood revitalization, but lack of existing major arts organization "anchors" in the neighborhood to support the concept.	Utilize CDBG funds to support a mixed-commercial-use development for the Anchorage Opera, the Alaska Dance Theater (or other arts "anchors"), and other businesses. Development design must enhance the pedestrian character of the neighborhood, contribute to the "district" concept and utilize winter-city design.	Secure all funding sources and complete development of the Mountain View Cultural District anchors. Net at least 18 new jobs, or a minimum of one job per \$50,000 in CDBG funds contributed.
			Utilize CDBG funds to support establishment of the Museum of Natural History in Mountain View.	Secure all funding sources and complete development of the Museum of Natural History.

Strategy*	Output	Baseline Data (2003)	Benchmark 2004	Benchmark 2008
			Utilize CDBG funds to rehabilitate the new Special Olympics Alaska structure	Active Special Olympics Alaska program brings positive publicity and recreational opportunities to Mountain View.
		Enthusiasm for economic development amongst local officials and organizations not matched by local experience in utilizing the diverse tools for economic development available.	Build local capacity in and pursue utilization of Section 108, Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) funds and New Market Tax Credits to support the revitalization and commercial development of the Mountain View Arts & Cultural District (see Strategy C.6, 2001 EZ)	Utilize Section 108, BEDI, and/or New Market Tax Credits in a commercial project in Mountain View.

Strategy*	Output	Baseline Data (2003)	Benchmark 2004	Benchmark 2008
2. Increase small business activity compatible with the commercial revitalization of Mountain View	Small Business Lending (similar to EZ application strategy #C.2.)	The vision for revitalization of Mountain View includes small retail shops and ethnic restaurants.	Complete a detailed baseline inventory of existing businesses in the Mountain View Commercial District. Certify an organization that will serve Mountain View as a CDBG Community Business Development Organization (CBDO).	In partnership with the Small Business Development Center, local lenders and CDBG funds, capitalize a small business lending and training program through a Mountain View CBDO. Net at least three new businesses in Mountain View, and at least six new jobs.
3. Encourage housing densities appropriate to the small lot, grid streetscape of Mountain View	In-fill development of single family homes or duplexes on vacant lots and lots with dilapidated structures.	With R-3 zoning, and lack of design requirements, poorly designed multi-family structures have been built on small lots. Remaining vacant lots could result in the same.	New construction of single family and other low density housing through Habitat for Humanity and Cook Inlet Housing Authority redevelopment efforts.	Continue appropriately designed and affordable residential infill development. See the neighborhood's first artist live-work space created.

Strategy*	Output	Baseline Data (2003)	Benchmark 2004	Benchmark 2008
	Better synchronize Mountain View's zoning with its lot design through completing a Neighborhood Plan for Mountain View as part of <i>Anchorage 2020</i> , possibly including district and/or overlay zones		Begin Neighborhood Planning Handbook project, beginning with a Mountain View Neighborhood Plan, (funded by CDBG planning funds), to codify the process by which neighborhoods may incorporate local plans Anchorage's Comprehensive Plan, Anchorage 2020	Adopt a Mountain View Neighborhood or District Plan as part of Community 2020.
4. Improve the quality of existing housing in Mountain View	Rehabilitation of existing housing units, both rentals and homeownership.	Housing quality in Mountain View varies considerably, with many absentee landlords and aging, poorly maintained units.	Utilize CDBG and HOME funded programs to rehabilitate 15 rental units and 15 homeownership units in the first year.	

Strategy*	Output	Baseline Data (2003)	Benchmark 2004	Benchmark 2008
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Under this NRS, CDBG rehabilitation undertaken by Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services during 2004 (including its "World Changers" coordination effort) will be considered a single "multi-family" rehabilitation project in order to allow for more flexible address of housing quality throughout the neighborhood. (This allows requiring that 51 percent of all housing units rehabilitated meet income guidelines, instead of 100 percent). Rehabilitate additional rental units through CIHA's redevelopment efforts. 	

Strategy*	Output	Baseline Data (2003)	Benchmark 2004	Benchmark 2008
	Facilitate the use of federal funds for housing rehabilitation in Mountain View by completing Historic Survey of all residential properties in Mountain View.	Mountain View's aging housing may be eligible for listing on the historic register. Without a historic survey, the significance of these homes is difficult to discern, leading to loss of history, and lengthening the environmental review process required when utilizing federal funds.	Utilize CDBG and secure additional funds for a complete a historic survey of Mountain View. Complete survey during 2004.	Complete at least one update of the historic survey to include additional units as they age.
5. Retain the affordability of housing in Mountain View	Utilize a Community Land Trust to secure land for long term affordable housing, both rental and homeownership.	As revitalization continues in Mountain View, there is currently no mechanism to retain affordable housing when land values increase.	Create/incorporate a Mountain View Community Land Trust. Identify possibility of the Mountain View CLT becoming a HOME CHDO and/or CDBG CBDO.	Fully operational and financially self-sufficient Mountain View Land Trust with at least 20 quality housing units reserved for long term affordability.

Strategy*	Output	Baseline Data (2003)	Benchmark 2004	Benchmark 2008
6. Decrease the real and perceived crime rates in Mountain View	Establish a Weed and Seed program in Mountain View	Mountain View exhibits some of the highest crime rates in the Municipality of Anchorage.	Pursue application of a Weed and Seed program in Mountain View similar to that which currently exists in Muldoon.	Fully operational Weed and Seed program in Mountain View.
	Continue Mountain View's long tradition of Community Patrol and volunteer clean-up efforts.	With recent loss of one of Mountain View's long standing volunteers, these cornerstones of Mountain View pride and safety are in jeopardy.	Identify a mechanism to fund or otherwise support Mountain View's Community Patrol.	Continuous Community Patrol and neighborhood cleanup efforts at at least the same level as in year 2002.
7. Improve the urban environment in Mountain View through design standards, street upgrades, code enforcement, clean-up efforts, and reduction of other nuisances.	Using existing funding sources and a new partnership with the Alaska National Guard, expedite code enforcement resolutions in the Mountain View area.	Buildings with long-standing code enforcement issues remain standing in Mountain View. These sites offer undesired harbor for drug activity, unsafe environment for residents, and discourage neighborhood investment.	Eliminate the back-log of demolitions related to code enforcement with the use of CDBG Slum & Blight funds. Establish a joint effort with the Alaska National Guard to provide training opportunity to troops through demolition and clearance of dilapidated structures that contribute to illicit drug use.	Maintain demolition program with no back-logs in Mountain View.

Strategy*	Output	Baseline Data (2003)	Benchmark 2004	Benchmark 2008
	Develop a Physical Improvement Strategy that addresses the types of uses, building heights, setbacks, façade and storefront renovation, signage improvements and screening for vehicle, equipment, and dumpster storage areas.	Lack of design standards and other planning tools has led to a hodge-podge of development both in the commercial and residential areas.	Design committee continues to meet to map out plans to develop a Mountain View Gateway, overlay district, design guidelines, and potential façade and screening improvement (incentive) program, possibly to be funded through CDBG funds.	Adoption in Anchorage's Comprehensive Plan of design standards and an overlay district for Mountain View's commercial district. Completion of the Mountain View Gateway. Implementation of façade and screening improvement program.
	Make improvements to Mountain View drive through the Municipality of Anchorage's capital improvement plan.	Mountain View Drive is due for improvements and its position on the capital improvement plan has moved from later years to year 2004 to promote the revitalization of Mountain View.	Secure funding for physical improvements to Mountain View Drive	Complete physical improvements to Mountain View Drive.

*Strategies are not prioritized and therefore are not presented in priority order. Numbering is for convenience only.

Appendix B. Annotated Bibliography

- 1) Concerned Citizens of Mountain View, ***Mountain View Community Strategic Plan***, 1993. This document was produced by the Mountain View Community Council, “Concerned Citizens of Mountain View”, members of the Alaska State Legislature, Anchorage Assembly members, Key Bank of Alaska, First National Bank, Municipality of Anchorage, and Public Interest Service Agencies. This is the blueprint for accomplishing their mission of promoting positive change through partnerships, political leadership, and shared responsibility for community values. Identifies objectives and strategies for community livability, business development and housing.
- 2) Cook Inlet Housing Authority, Planning Department, ***Neighborhood Revitalization Plan***. August 2002. CIHA’s Neighborhood Revitalization Plan outlines a program that will ongoing; that enables the establishment of measurable objectives; that is transportable to any neighborhood and that allows maximum development and participation of partners and other funding sources.
- 3) Davis Consulting, ***Mountain View, a Neighborhood Profile***. January 2003. Prepared for Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services, this report covers the demographic profile of Mountain View including population, gender, race household income occupations, employment, poverty rates, businesses, housing, education, and crime rates
- 4) Land Design North and Northern Economics Inc. ***Renaissance Zone: Economic Development a Strategic Assessment***. 1998. This report identifies the strengths and weaknesses of the target neighborhoods and to make recommendations regarding economic development/redevelopment in those areas. The report is divided into four sections, the issues and concerns found from interviewing key stakeholders, a review of the physical and socioeconomic characteristics and SWOT (Strengths, Weaknesses, Opportunities, Threats) and the last section reveals the implementation and overall recommendations for the revitalization of the Neighborhood Commercial Districts (NCD)
- 5) Lennertz Coyle Associates, Town Planners, ***Northway Town Center***, 2002. The Plan for the Northway Town Center.

- 6) **Mountain View Arts Center, concept Paper.** 2001 Describes the Mountain View Arts Center Concept.
- 7) Mountain View in Motion, **Neighborhood Revitalization Thorough Arts and Culture. Brief description of the Arts & Cultural District and its timeline.**
- 8) Municipality of Anchorage Department of Community Planning and Development and the Offices of Alaska State Legislature, **Mountain View Drive: A Vision for the Future**, 1998. The focus of this report is on the neighborhood and how the character of the neighborhood should be reflected in the revitalization of the commercial core is Mountain View Drive. This report contains information on neighborhood trends, economic characteristics, and potential strategies for re-energizing Mountain View Drive
- 9) Municipality of Anchorage, Community Development Division. **2003-2007 Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan** 2003. Consolidated Plan for Anchorage.
- 10) Municipality of Anchorage, Community Development Division. **Housing and Community Development 1999 Action Plan.** July, 1999. Adopted 1999 Action Plan.
- 11) Municipality of Anchorage, Community Development Division. **Housing and Community Development 2000 Action Plan.** July, 2000. Adopted 2000 Action Plan.
- 12) Municipality of Anchorage, Community Development Division. **Housing and Community Development 2001 Action Plan.** July, 2001. Adopted 2001 Action Plan.
- 13) Municipality of Anchorage, Community Development Division. **Housing and Community Development 2002 Action Plan.** January, 2002. Adopted 2002 Action Plan.
- 14) Municipality of Anchorage, Community Development Division. **Housing and Community Development 2003 Action Plan.** September, 2003. Adopted 2003 Action Plan.
- 15) Municipality of Anchorage. **Brownfields Economic Development Initiative Application.** July, 2003. Application for BEDI funds to assist with the Mountain View revitalization plan, and also proposes future use of Section 108 program funds..

- 16) ***Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Committee Report***, 2000. The Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Ad Hoc Committee of the Housing and Neighborhood Development Commission will recommend an Anchorage neighborhood for revitalization. This document describes the methodology for determining the boundaries of neighborhoods for consideration.
- 17) OKM Associates, Inc, Peg Barringer, ***Assessment and Recommendations for Development of an Arts and Cultural District in Mountain View***, 2002. This reports focuses on the steps require if Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services decides to pursue the planned district approach. This report provides some observations and guidance concerning the creation of an Arts and Cultural District in Mountain View.
- 18) ***Tourism as a Tool for Economic Development in the Renaissance Zone, Impediments to Implementation & How They Might be Overcome***. Describes opportunities for the Renaissance Zone, and overcoming impediments to implementation.

Appendix C. Excerpt from “Assessment and Recommendations for Development of an Arts and Cultural District in Mountain View” by Peg Barringer of OKM Associates, completed in 2002.

This document is included as a separate .pdf file on the internet.

Appendix D. Maps of the Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Area are available in hard copy from the Community Development Division, 632 W. 6th Ave, Suite 630.

Appendix E. Mountain View: A Neighborhood Profile, Davis Consulting, January 2003.

This document is included as a separate . pdf file on the internet.

Appendix F. Summary of Public Comments

Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area Public Hearing October 8, 2003 Mayor's Conference Room

In attendance:

HAND Commission Members:

Margaret Evans, Access Alaska
Diana Lopez, First National Bank of Alaska

Members of the Public:

Paul Rieland, Kic Associates
Debe Mahoney, Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services
Kim Ross, Habitat for Humanity
Todd Yoon, The Arc of Anchorage
Kathy Cline, Alaska Dance Theatre
Paul Hansmeyer, Cook Inlet Housing Authority
Mary Ann Frazier, Alaska Dance Theatre
Bruce Geraghty, Cook Inlet Housing Authority

Staff:

Carma E. Reed, Manager, Community Development Division
James H. Boehm, Senior Planner
Carlos Lertora, Junior Accountant

Summary of Comments:

Meeting began at 4:05 pm.

Carma Reed opened the meeting by welcoming attendees and explaining that while this meeting was scheduled to coincide with the Housing and Neighborhood Development (HAND) Commission meeting, the HAND Commission did not have a quorum so would not be officially meeting. Margaret Evans from the HAND Commission was present to listen to comments (Diana Lopez also arrived later) and comments would be summarized, provided to other HAND Commission members, and responded to in the final Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (Mountain View NRS). Extra copies of the Mountain View NRS were made available for those who did not have one.

Ms. Reed continued by briefly going over the format of the Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy (NRS) and explaining that it draws from ten years of neighborhood involvement. The format was designed to coincide with the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's (HUD's) NRS requirements. The NRS is part of the Consolidated Plan, and as such must be adopted through the substantial amendment process. However, the NRS is not a formal component of the Municipality of Anchorage's Comprehensive Plan.

There were nine people in the audience. One audience member signed up to comment: a representative from Cook Inlet Housing Authority cautioned that a community land trust (CLT) bearing the name of Mountain View might stigmatize the neighborhood, and be unduly limiting to the organization. The traditional role of CLT's is to provide affordable housing. A CLT should be able to work in more neighborhoods to expand its potential, and should not be tied to Mountain View exclusively. The CIHA representative also clarified that the strategies in the NRS are not prioritized, and that strategies that are not a high priority are simply not in the plan.

A conversation ensued and Ms. Reed clarified that the CLT identified in the plan, as with all the other strategies, is an action that has already been adopted by other sponsors (Rasmussen Foundation in particular) and is being formed. The initial impetus of this land trust is not necessarily to create affordable housing, but, rather, to promote commercial development for the arts and cultural district. There is nothing keeping the CLT from getting into affordable housing in the future, however.

While there were no other formal comments, a conversation regarding the timeline of the Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy ensued. Ms. Reed explained comments will be accepted through October 21, 2003. Following that, comments will be reviewed by staff. If comments require substantial changes to the NRS, a subsequent comment period may be initiated. If not, the HAND Commission will then advise on the draft, and the final draft will be submitted to the Assembly for approval. Without a second comment period, this should be completed in November. With a second comment period, completion may be in December.

There was also conversation about the implications of a Mountain View Revitalization Strategy. Do the strategies in the NRS change the goals and strategies in the Consolidated Plan? Was this going to result in funneling money into the neighborhood to the detriment of other neighborhoods? Ms. Reed explained that while the NRS is a component of the Consolidated Plan, the strategies are neighborhood specific, and do not change the overall goals and strategies in the Consolidated Plan. Those remain unchanged. Also, the NRS is not an appropriating document. Funds are assigned to projects through the Action Plan and the Assembly's adoption of it, not the NRS. The NRS is, rather, a planning document that strives to coordinate a variety of different actions in Mountain View. It does require that the Municipality report on progress of strategies included in the plan in its Annual Performance Report, however, it does not require that the community dedicate CDBG, HOME and/or ESG resources to the neighborhood, nor does it relieve the Municipality of any of the public process required for dedicating such resources. All resources dedicated in the current plan have already been through a public process. The NRS does allow the Municipality more

flexibility with what it can do with funds that are spent in accordance with the NRS, and make administration of some programs less burdensome. In that way, the NRS will actually make funds go further.

The meeting concluded at 5:15pm.

Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Area
Public Hearing and Housing and Neighborhood Development Commission
Meeting
December 10, 2003
Mayor's Conference Room

In attendance:

HAND Commission Members:

Mac Carey – via teleconference
Glenn Gellert
Diane Johnson
Shannon Planchon
Timothy Sullivan
Jean Wall

Members of the Public:

Stephanie Vaughn, Denali Family Services
Lori Nealley, Anchorage Neighborhood Housing Services
Kim Ross, Habitat for Humanity
Jim Frederick, Habitat for Humanity
Cary Sinnett, Salvation Army
Sherry McWherter, Salvation Army
Shannon Wilks, Southcentral Counseling/Anchorage Housing Initiatives
Kara Nyquist, Covenant House
Jeff Judd, Cook Inlet Housing Authority

Staff:

Carma E. Reed, Manager, Community Development Division
James H. Boehm, Senior Planner

Excerpt from Minutes concerning comments related to the Mountain View Revitalization Strategy:

[Staff Note: while these comments were provided in relation to *the 2004 Action Plan*, they are also relevant to the Mountain View Revitalization Strategy Area and therefore are included.]

STEPHANIE VAUGHN, PRESIDENT, BOARD OF DIRECTORS, DENALI FAMILY SERVICES:

Ms. Vaughn commented on the Mountain View Revitalization Project on behalf of Denali Family Services and the Randy Smith Center. Ms. Vaughn presented the history behind the Randy Smith Center. The history of the Center began with a preschool program called Little Steps Preschool that is in Mountain View currently. The purpose of the Randy Smith Center is an attempt to bring all parts of the Denali Family Services organization into Mountain View and into one location. Doing this will eliminate some of the difficulties for the individuals served by the program. Ms. Vaughn stated that the hopes of Denali Family Services is that the Randy Smith Center will be an opportunity for economic development for the Mountain View area in that it will employ approximately 150 individuals while providing approximately 50 new jobs for Mountain View. The Center will also provide an opportunity for the families of Mountain View to bond as a community in one place and will have space available for various tenants interested in the arts and culture of Mountain View. Denali Family Services will perform extensive renovation on the warehouse building, both interior and exterior as well as renovation of the parking lot and landscaping of the property. The goal of Denali Family Services is that the Randy Smith Center will not only be an economic opportunity for the community, but will also prove to be a community beautification project as well. Ms. Vaughn thanked the Municipality of Anchorage and the Housing and Neighborhood Development Commission for the application opportunity for the Denali Family Services.

Commissioner Sullivan inquired if Denali Family Services had any plans for dealing with the liquor store adjacent to the property that will house the Randy Smith Center.

Ms. Vaughn stated that the liquor store is on an attached property and it would become a tenant of the property. She stated the goal of Denali Family Services is for renovation of the entire parcel of land including the liquor store. Plans are for the liquor store to remain on the property; however, will not be accessible through the Denali Family Services area.

Commissioner Johnson inquired about the current location of the Little Step Preschool and the other facilities of Denali Family Services.

Ms. Vaughn stated that the Little Steps Preschool is on the same street in a different building.

Commissioner Johnson stated that already in existence in Mountain View is the Boys and Girls Club as well as the Community Center. She inquired if the Randy Smith Center would be an addition to those programs.

Ms. Vaughn stated that the Randy Smith Center will serve additional families from other programs already in the area by serving children as young as three years of age to approximately 15 years of age.

Commissioner Planchon inquired if the Randy Smith Center will be strictly a recreational facility.

Ms. Vaughn stated this will be a preschool as well as a treatment center for children who are having difficulties with their families. The Randy Smith Center will also have an after-school program for school children as well as will serve elementary and middle school children.

Vice-Chair Wall requested clarification of the opportunities for employment for the community.

Ms. Vaughn stated that there will be approximately 50 new opportunities for employment for individuals in the community.

Commissioner Gellert inquired about the number of clients Denali Family Services anticipates for the Randy Smith Center.

Ms. Vaughn stated that the current estimation is 135 children as well as their families. She stated that the Center will not only provide services to the children, but will extend to the families of those children. The current Little Steps Preschool houses approximately 20 children; however, the Randy Smith Center will enable Denali Family Services to expand their preschool program.

Commissioner Sullivan inquired if Denali Family Services has considered the impact to traffic in that particular location without a traffic light.

Ms. Vaughn stated that Denali Family Services is in communication with the Municipality of Anchorage traffic department for the best way to handle the traffic pattern in the area.

Commissioner Sullivan asked for specifics from those meetings.

Ms. Vaughn stated she has not yet been made aware of the specific plans for the area; however, she is aware that there needs to be an additional parking spaces as well as changes to the access going in and coming out of the parking lot.

Chairman Carey inquired of the 150 possibilities for employment, how many living in the Mountain View community will be employed by the Randy Smith Center.

Ms. Vaughn stated that of the 100 current employees there is approximately 20 percent that reside in Mountain View.

Commissioner Gellert requested that Ms. Vaughn address the current efforts in fund raising for the Center.

Ms. Vaughn stated there is a significant amount of funds needed for the development of the Randy Smith Center and Denali Family Services is working with the Rasmussen Foundation as well as other State grants and revenue from Denali Family Services.

There were no other questions for Ms. Vaughn.

No other comments were received.

Appendix G. HAND Commission Resolution

[Signed resolution is provided as a separate .pfd document.]

Content Information**Content ID :** 001804**Type:** AR_AllOther - All Other Resolutions

A resolution amending the Municipality of Anchorage's 2003-2007

Title: Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan to include the Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy**Author:** reedce**Initiating Dept:** DCD**Review Depts:** ECD**Description:** Does not require a public hearing. Pls. no later than 5/18 if possible. Approval of Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy as part of the 2003-2007 Housing and Community Development Consolidated Plan**Keywords:** Mountain View Neighborhood Revitalization Strategy Consolidated Plan**Date Prepared:** 5/6/04 2:42 PM**Director Name:** Mary Jane Michael**Assembly Meeting**
Date MM/DD/YY: 05/18/04**Public Hearing**
Date MM/DD/YY: 06/08/042004 MAY 10 PM 2:25
CLERK'S OFFICE**Workflow History**

<u>Workflow Name</u>	<u>Action Date</u>	<u>Action</u>	<u>User</u>	<u>Security Group</u>	<u>Content ID</u>
DCD_SubWorkflow	5/6/04 2:46 PM	Approve	reedce	Public	001804
AllOtherARWorkflow	5/6/04 2:46 PM	Checkin	reedce	Public	001804
ECD_SubWorkflow	5/7/04 2:09 PM	Approve	barkleyva	Public	001804
AllOtherARWorkflow	5/7/04 3:05 PM	Reject	katkusja	Public	001804
AllOtherARWorkflow	5/7/04 3:14 PM	Checkin	reedce	Public	001804
AllOtherARWorkflow	5/7/04 3:24 PM	Checkin	reedce	Public	001804
DCD_SubWorkflow	5/7/04 3:24 PM	Approve	reedce	Public	001804
AllOtherARWorkflow	5/10/04 9:18 AM	Reject	barkleyva	Public	001804
DCD_SubWorkflow	5/10/04 9:28 AM	Approve	reedce	Public	001804
AllOtherARWorkflow	5/10/04 9:28 AM	Checkin	reedce	Public	001804
ECD_SubWorkflow	5/10/04 9:29 AM	Approve	barkleyva	Public	001804
MuniManager_SubWorkflow	5/10/04 11:27 AM	Approve	leblancdc	Public	001804
MuniMgrCoord_SubWorkflow	5/10/04 12:01 PM	Approve	abbottmk	Public	001804