



**Municipality of Anchorage
Historic Preservation Commission**

A G E N D A

Thursday, June 25, 2026

5:30 – 7:30 p.m.

Regular Meeting

In-Person Physical Location

City Hall (south entrance)
Conference Room 155
632 West 6th Avenue
Anchorage, Alaska

via Microsoft Teams

[Click here to join the meeting](#)

Meeting ID: 248 770 395 485 47, Passcode: 6At3rY64

Or Join by Conference Call:

Dial-in Number: +1 907-519-0237, Conference ID: 766 049 847#

5:30 – 6:00 p.m.

I. OPENING BUSINESS

- A. Call to Order / Roll Call
- B. Land Acknowledgement
- C. Disclosures
- D. Approval of Agenda
- E. Approval of Minutes
- F. Persons to Be Heard
- G. Committee Reports
- H. Staff Reports

6:00 – 7:00 p.m.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- A. Historic Preservation Plan
- B. Landmark Nominations and Commemorations

7:00 – 7:25 p.m.

III. NEW BUSINESS

- A. Section 106 Project Consultations

7:25 p.m.

IV. COMMISSIONERS' COMMENTS

7:30 p.m.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Next Regular Meeting—August 20, 2026

Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission Members (*Agenda Item I.A.*):

- | | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| • Wanetta Ayers | Seat 5: Citizen-at-Large |
| • Deirdre Bryan (<i>Vice Chair</i>) | Seat 2: Historian |
| • Bryce Klug (<i>Recording Officer</i>) | Seat 3: Architect |
| • Marc Lamoreaux | Seat 4: Native Culture Advisor |
| • Richard Martin | Seat 8: Archaeologist |
| • Connor Scher (<i>Chair</i>) | Seat 9: Land Use Expertise |
| • Pierce Bateman | Seat 7: Citizen-at-Large |
| • Vacant | Seat 1: Construction Experience |
| • Vacant | Seat 6: Real Estate Experience |

Ex Officio Commission Members:

- Mélisa Babb, Planning Director, Municipality of Anchorage
- John Crowther, Interim State Historic Preservation Officer, State of Alaska DNR
- Tiffany Briggs, Real Estate Director, Municipality of Anchorage

Land Acknowledgement (*Agenda Item I.B.*)

The Historic Preservation Commission would like to acknowledge that we gather today on the traditional lands of the Dena'ina Athabascans. For thousands of years the Dena'ina have been and continue to be the stewards of this land. It is with gratefulness and respect that we recognize the contributions, innovations, and contemporary perspectives of the upper Cook Inlet Dena'ina.

Persons to Be Heard (*Agenda Item I.F.*)

If possible, please contact Tom Davis, Historic Preservation Officer, at 907-343-7916 or tom.davis@anchorageak.gov prior to the meeting.

Committee Reports (*Agenda Item I.G.*):

Standing Committees:

- Historic Preservation Plan Committee
(Wanetta Ayers, Pierce Bateman, Deirdre Bryan, Bryce Klug, Connor Scher)
- Landmarks Commemoration Committee
(Bryce Klug)

Historic Preservation Commission

June 25, 2026, Meeting Packet TOC

<i>Description</i>	<i>Page</i>
I. Opening Business	
I.E.1. HPC Draft Minutes – May 21, 2026	1
I.H.2. HPC Draft Minutes – June 2, 2026	7
I.H.1. Memo – June 2026 Staff Reports	11
I.H.2. Flier – America250 Events Schedule	15
I.H.3. Booklet – <u>Baseball: Alaska's Fields of Dreamers</u>	(Separate; Hardcopy only)
II. Unfinished Business	
II.A.1. Memo – HPP Commissioner Survey Questionnaire	17
II.A.2. Memo – HPP Project Next Steps	22
III. New Business	
III.A.1. Memo – Section 106 Project Consultations	23
III.A.2. Letter from Chair to DOT&PF Re: Safer Seward Highway (signed)	25
III.A.3. Letter to JBER Conveying HPC Comments Re: Draft WGC&AO PA	28

This page intentionally left blank.



**Municipality of Anchorage
Historic Preservation Commission**

MEETING SUMMARY

Thursday, May 21, 2026
5:30 p.m.

Regular Meeting

Hybrid Meeting – In-person and Virtual via Teams
Conference Room 155, City Hall, 632 West 6th Avenue

I. OPENING BUSINESS

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

A. Call to Order/Roll Call

A quorum was present.

Present: Wanetta Ayers *
Deirdre Bryan, *Vice-Chair* *
Bryce Klug, *Recording Officer*
Marc Lamoreaux *
Richard Martin
Connor Scher, *Chair*

Excused: Pierce Bateman

Ex-Officio Members & Staff:

Tom Davis, Senior Planner/Historic Preservation Officer, Planning Department

B. Land Acknowledgement *(delivered)*

C. Disclosures *(none)*

D. Approval of Agenda

Commissioner Klug moved to approve the agenda. *Commissioner Bryan* seconded.

The agenda was approved unanimously as presented.

* Attended remotely

E. Approval of Minutes

There were no minutes available from February, March, or April meetings. *Tom Davis* said all minutes are forthcoming by June.

F. Persons to Be Heard (*none*)

G. Committee Reports

1. **Historic Preservation Plan Committee (*no report*)**
2. **Landmark Commemoration Committee (*no report*)**

H. Staff Reports

Tom Davis summarized the Staff Reports memo on page 1 of the meeting packet.

Mr. Davis reported that an Air Force project manager at JBER has applied for appointment to the construction experience seat of the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Davis referred to the Assembly Information Memorandum on page 3-5 of the meeting packet is on the agenda of the regular Assembly meeting on May 26 as an information item.

Regarding Staff Report memo item 3.d., *Chair Scher* and *Commissioner Klug* responded to *Mr. Davis's* offer to forward the invite to the Oscar Anderson House meeting on May 26.

In response to a question from *Chair Scher*, *Mr. Davis* said that the Real Estate and Maintenance & Operations Departments want to find funding to repaint the exterior of the Brown's Point Cottages (item 3.a. in the Staff Reports memo) and still support pursuing grant to rehabilitate the Oscar Anderson House and possibly a few of the other buildings.

Action Items:

1. Staff to invite Commissioners *Scher* and *Klug* to the Oscar Anderson House meeting.

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Historic Preservation Plan

Tom Davis referred to the project memo on pages 6 and 7 of the meeting packet, and explained that the purpose of this item is for the commission to continue its conversations from recent meetings to give additional advice about the public involvement process.

1. **Update: Public Engagement Consultants**

Mr. Davis reported from the first section of the memo on page 6 that he and the prospective contractors for the HPP public engagement and planning process have agreed on a scope of work for their services and they should be able to join the project soon. They have a term contract with the Planning Department and need only sign a task order under the current contract to begin.

Commissioner Ayers asked if there is a funding shortfall for the consultants to carry out the tasks. *Mr. Davis* responded that there are enough project grant funds to complete the tasks in bullets on page 6, but not enough for them to help with some of the other public engagement tasks on the work program. He explained that we would need additional funds or to remove the PZC and Assembly work sessions from their task list to add focus group or public workshops to their list. He will ask one of the grantors if more grant funds are available. *Commissioner Scher* responded that it will be most valuable for the consultants to participate in the PZC and Assembly work sessions because they have credibility and can help set the tone for those meetings, and that commissioners can participate in the additional focus group meetings.

Commissioner Ayers suggested approaching the UAA public engagement department and offered to ask the Alaska Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America to ask if they could take on the HPP public engagement work as a project. *Mr. Davis* and commissioners expressed appreciation for the idea and offer.

Commissioner Scher asked how individual commissioners could help with tasks, such as analyzing the results of the public questionnaire survey. *Mr. Davis* suggested commissioners focus their time on giving policy guidance, writing parts of the plan, and participating in public meetings.

2. Opportunity for CAMP Workshop “Add-On”

Mr. Davis reported from the second section of the memo on page 6 regarding an opportunity to hold a post-CAMP meeting with three of the CAMP trainers and receive a follow-up report using \$2,500 in project grant funds. Commissioners expressed support, that the CAMP training was high-value and the cost seems reasonable. In response to a question, he confirmed there is CLG Grant monies that would cover the \$2,500 cost.

3. Commissioner Questionnaire Survey

Chair Scher asked where the draft commissioner survey questions in the memo on page 7 came from. He posed the question how build on the public comments and questionnaire responses that the 2018 draft Historic Preservation Plan reflected in these new surveys.

Tom Davis explained that the questions on page 7 are a draft survey questionnaire for the HPC commissioners to consider. His hope was that commissioners take it home, review it, and offer changes before we complete a final version for the members to take. It could be an online survey.

Mr. Davis adapted most of the draft questions from a similar survey that Kodiak gave its commissioners during its own HPP public process, and from questions that the CAMP workshop trainers recommended we ask. Commissioners’ responses to a survey like this would help us

develop a public questionnaire survey. Commissioners' responses could also be a way to help understand all the members' thinking and frame the public engagement process. Commissioners supported taking a survey and requested staff to send a MS Word version of the draft questions for consideration.

Mr. Davis said that there was a public questionnaire survey in 2017-2018. The responses to that survey are documented and available for review on the HPC SharePoint site. Some of the public comments from that time made it into the 2018 draft goals. He committed to incorporating the public feedback and resulting draft goals from the 2018 era.

Chair Scher asked what the schedule for the public engagement will be. Mr. Davis responded that the project would last through 2027. This and next month we will be designing a public involvement plan and doing groundwork for that public process.

Action Items:

1. Staff ask the HPP grantors if additional funds could be available for the project.
2. Staff request the \$2,500 CAMP Ad-On meeting and report from the NAPC.
3. Staff and Commissioner Ayers ask the Alaska Chapter of the Public Relations Society of America and the UAA public engagement department program if they would take on part of the public engagement process as projects.
4. Staff submit the draft Commissioner Questionnaire Survey in MS Word file format to commissioners for their review.
5. Commissioners to review the draft survey questions.
6. Staff to schedule a meeting with the HPC Historic Preservation Plan Committee in the first week of June, avoiding Thursdays.
7. Staff request NAPC to provide the PowerPoint slide decks from the CAMP workshop #2.

B. Section 106 Project Consultations (Unfinished)

1. Letter to DOT&PF Regarding Safer Seward Highway

Commissioners discussed the revised draft letter to the DOT&PF commenting on the Safer Seward Highway project, on pages 8-10 of the meeting packet. The revised draft incorporated commissioners' comments from the April HPC meeting. Commissioners offered more comments and edits on the revised draft that staff carried out on a track changes version of the file document.

Action Items:

1. Staff incorporate the track changes edits, replace first-person references with "HPC," and send the letter to the Chair for signature.

2. Programmatic Agreement for JBER WG&CAO

Tom Davis referred to a draft Programmatic Agreement (PA) on page 11 of the meeting packet, and explained this item is for the commissioners to discuss JBER's draft mitigation measures on

pages 15 and 16 of the packet. JBER is seeking HPC comments by June 5. The project could affect 5 to 8 historic resources and some old cabins of uncertain origin.

Commissioners discussed. *Chair Scher* questioned if archeological sites would be affected. *Commissioner Martin* disagreed with the use of the term “indigenous” in the draft PA. *Commissioner Klug* asked if creative mitigation measures could be taken, such as providing funds for rehabilitating buildings of the same era, by contributing to the Municipality’s Historic Preservation Fund (HPF). *Mr. Davis* responded that the agency seems to be open to these suggestions, and that the Municipality can accept donations to its HPF. *Chair Scher* suggested using mitigation funds to conduct inventory surveys or develop nominations for resources outside the project APE.

Chair Scher tabled the item and asked commissioners to consider it and to continue the discussion in a special meeting of the HPC before June 5.

Action Items:

1. Staff to schedule a special meeting of the HPC in early June to continue discussion.
2. Commissioners to review the PA and email all comments to staff by June 5.

III. NEW BUSINESS

A. Section 106 Project Consultations (New)

Tom Davis summarized two consultation requests to the HPC on page 81 of the meeting packet. Comments on the first consultation project, JBER Perimeter Security Improvements, must be sent to JBER by May 30.

Action Items:

1. Commissioners to email comments on the Section 106 projects on page 81 of the meeting packet to staff by Friday, May 29.

IV. COMMISSIONERS’ COMMENTS

Commissioner Ayers shared a video from Facebook about the history of the Wireless Station:
<https://www.facebook.com/share/v/1QYcYGDxms/?mibextid=wwXlfr>

V. ADJOURNMENT

Commissioner Klug moved to adjourn. *Commissioner Martin* seconded the motion.

The motion to adjourn was approved unanimously at 7:30 p.m.

This page intentionally left blank.



**Municipality of Anchorage
Historic Preservation Commission**

MEETING SUMMARY

Tuesday, June 2, 2026
5:30 p.m.

Special Meeting
Virtual Meeting via Teams

I. OPENING BUSINESS

The meeting was called to order at 5:30 p.m.

A. Call to Order/Roll Call

A quorum was present.

Present: Wanetta Ayers *
Pierce Bateman*
Deirdre Bryan, *Vice-Chair* *
Bryce Klug, *Recording Officer* *
Connor Scher, *Chair* *

Excused: Marc Lamoreaux
Richard Martin

Ex-Officio Members & Staff:

Tom Davis, Senior Planner/Historic Preservation Officer, Planning Department *

B. Land Acknowledgement *(delivered)*

C. Disclosures *(none)*

II. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Historic Preservation Plan – Commissioner Survey

1. Questions for Commissioners

* Attended remotely

Tom Davis referred to the memo on page 3 of the meeting packet, and explained this continues the review of the draft Commissioner Questionnaire Survey about the Historic Preservation Plan.

Commissioners commented and asked questions about the draft questions from May 21 and an additional section of questions from Mr. Davis at the bottom of page 4 about connecting Historic Preservation to other community issues. *Commissioner Klug* suggested asking commissioners to score the relevance of the community issues on a scale of 0 to 10 and include an open-ended menu choice to allow for other answers.

Chair Scher requested adding broader, bigger-picture questions to the survey: What do we want this plan to do? Why are we doing this plan? Where do we want to take this plan? To bring in several of the questions from the April 4 CAMP Workshop session about preservation planning. *Mr. Davis* shared the slide deck from that session. *Chair Scher* recommended adding the second and third bullets from slide #5 as questions, and making the bulleted items on slide #22 into a checklist for commissioners to score, strike, or add to. He requested Mr. Davis to review the other slides and incorporate broader questions into the survey sections.

Commissioner Bateman suggested adding an open-ended question at the end of the survey, to ask, what did the survey miss, or any further thoughts?

2. Public Questionnaire

Mr. Davis presented the example public questionnaire questions that he collected from other planning processes on pages 5 – 9 of the packet.

Chair Scher observed that the other jurisdictions' questions presume respondents are familiar with historic preservation. *Mr. Davis* suggested using the NAPC Messaging Guide as a tool to communicate with general audiences. It could be a source of menu choices for responding to the questions, such as "What is Historic Preservation" on page 31 of the Messaging Guide.

Commissioner Bryan suggested thinking about who our audience is and tailoring a few versions of the public survey for different stakeholders such as for schools—not changing the substance of the questions, just language. The public engagement consultant could help.

Action Items before June 18 HPC Meeting:

1. Tom Davis will incorporate the commissioners' suggestions into the Commissioner Survey and make it available in ESRI Survey 1-2-3 format for commissioners to take online.
2. Commissioners, ex officio members, and HPC staff to respond to the survey.

Other Action Items:

3. Staff to distribute a version of the survey to municipal agency managers and directors whose work touches on Historic Preservation.
4. Staff to bring HPC suggestions regarding public survey questions to the public engagement consultants.

B. JBER WGC&AO Programmatic Agreement

Chair Scher referred to the materials beginning on page 10 of the meeting packet, and explained this item continues discussion on JBER's draft Programmatic Agreement for the Weapons Generation Complex and Airfield Optimization (WGC&AO) projects and its proposed mitigation measures on pages 15 and 16 of the packet. JBER is seeking comments by June 5.

Commissioners discussed. *Commissioner Klug* said the third bullet on page 10 of the meeting packet captured his idea from May 21 to provide funds for rehabilitation of buildings. He clarified he suggests the funds be for pre-Cold War era buildings—this terminology may capture funding for buildings prior to World War II. He also agreed with the comments in bullets from *Chair Scher* on page 10 of the meeting packet. Follow up with *Commissioner Martin* should occur regarding his comment about use of the word “indigenous” on line 29 in the PA.

Commissioner Klug suggested another idea, to request mitigation funds for rehabilitation of Nike Site Summit, another historic resource on JBER land. He also commented that if ANC-01234 (Temnac Valley P-38G Lightning) is an aircraft on display and is affected, then JBER should move it to somewhere else on JBER or donate it to an Alaska museum—including delivery cost.

Commissioners Bateman, Klug, and Scher raised concerns about PA Section V.B. on page 16 of the packet, starting on line 197. The language implies JBER actions that adversely affect historic resources could exempt themselves from Section 106 mitigation requirements if an updated assessment determines that those effects render the resources no longer eligible for the NRHP. It seems to imply that, by making changes to the resources in a historic district, JBER could reevaluate the district's eligibility for the NRHP and may find its own project makes them no longer eligible, and if they are no longer eligible the resources will no longer merit mitigation. The commissioners recommended changing the language to instead direct that any new buildings follow the Secretary of Interior Standards to be consistent with the historic district.

Chair Scher recommended adding mitigation measures addressing archeological sites if JBER finds any will be adversely affected. The mitigation measures should be to nominate a similar era archeological site in general or the Cairn Point site specifically to the NRHP.

Chair Scher raised concerns about PA Exhibit B Section 1 on page 26, exempting activities concerning existing buried linear non-building infrastructure. If JBER does not follow Section 106 consultation for these undertakings disturbing ground, it is possible they could disturb significant areas or features without external review. *Commissioner Bateman* added that some linear features such as walkways may contribute to the “feel” (or eligibility) of historic sites.

Commissioners and staff questioned how much mitigation funding to request or negotiate. Is it based on the value of historic resources being subject to adverse effects? The mitigation measures proposed in the PA seem like minimum activities, such as surveys and documentation. The preservation community should expect more. *Commissioner Bryan* suggested there may be some phraseology we can include in the PA to keep it general but avoid undervaluation of the adverse effects. For example, it could call for making monetary contributions to a fund, the amount of funding to be commensurate with the loss being mitigation.

Action Items:

1. Tom Davis will prepare draft notes from the discussion for commissioners to review.
2. Commissioners will respond with any edits and Tom to submit to JBER by June 5.
3. Tom Davis will convey to JBER that HPC would be interested in a tour of the APE.
4. Tom Davis to seek information or guidance on the amount of mitigation to request.

III. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned by unanimous consent at 7:30 p.m.



Municipality of Anchorage
Planning Department
Memorandum



I.H.1.

Date: June 25, 2026
To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Tom Davis, AICP, Senior Planner–Urban Designer
Subject: Staff Reports

1. America250 Week of Dreams

The State Historian Katie Ringsmuth has organized a series of events that appear on the flyer attached to the end of this memo. Could representatives of the HPC attend the following two events?

- Saturday 27 June, 6:30–7:30 p.m., **Week of Dreams Opening Ceremony** at Mulcahy Stadium.
- Monday 29 June, 6:00–8:00 p.m., **Week of Dreams Reception** at Alaska Native Heritage Center.

Dr. Ringsmuth presented permanent exhibit boards to the Municipality on June 23. She has also given copies of a commemorative booklet to the commission.



2. HPC Tour of Nike Site Summit

The Nike Site Summit bus tour will take place from 9:30 to noon on Saturday 11 July, starting from the Arctic Valley parking lot. We have reserved your seats so please mark your calendars. The Friends of Nike Site Summit (FONSS) will email instructions.

3. FORUM 2026 Conference

The NAPC [FORUM](#) conference will take place July 22-26 in Minneapolis. The SHPO awarded CLG travel grants of up to \$3,825 for Commissioners Bryan and Ayers to attend the conference and submit reports regarding the training. I will also attend.

4. Paul Bruhn Rural Historic Revitalization Grants Program Development

I have begun program development work. Please let me know if you are interested in reviewing and giving me editorial comments regarding the drafts-in-progress of the following:

- RFQ (Request for Qualifications) for cultural resources firms with experience identifying, determining eligibility, and nominating historic properties to the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). We will select a firm to provide these services under the grant.
- Evaluation criteria for the HPC and partners to use in scoring candidate project proposals to rehabilitate properties eligible for or listed on the NRHP. (Museums Alaska agreed to help develop these criteria.)

5. Certified Local Government (CLG) Grant Projects Status

- a. **Government Hill Wireless Station HSR Phase 2 (CLG Grant #24-001)**: Additional administrative delays have placed this CLG Grant project at greater risk of not meeting its performance deadline. The Planning Department learned in May that if it and the OMB could unlock the project grant funds for use by early June, Capital Facilities Division term contractors could still complete the project work by the September 30 grant deadline. The SHPO prepared an amendment to the grant agreement to correct the two budget items that had held up OMB accountants for eight months from loading the funds. The Planning Department Administration submitted that amendment by May 29 for agency review and the Municipal Manager's signature, typically a 2-week review process for non-urgent items. At 3 weeks I requested a status from the Planning Department and expressed urgency. Have received no update, I am requesting it again now that we are at 4 weeks.

I reported to the Government Hill Community Council at its May 21 general membership meeting. The GHCC supported holding the Wireless Station neighborhood consultation for the CLG project during the Government Hill Fall Harvest Festival in September.

- b. **Historic Resources Inventory Database (CLG Grant #24-002)**: Project work is progressing on schedule. Commissioner Bryan and helpers have edited the descriptions, statements of significance, and public-facing narrative summaries for the 40 historic places in the inventory database to appear this fall in the public-facing map app. The GIS contractor has loaded these descriptions into the inventory database and map app. The team is preparing to give previews of the map app to consulting parties in July and August. Their consultation with HPC is in August.
- c. **Anchorage Historic Preservation Plan (HPP) Public Engagement (Grant #24-003)**: Administrative delays are again affecting the HPP project. The Planning Department's Administration received the proposed scope of services from the Department's term contractors (DOWL) and began to prepare the contract task order for DOWL to begin work 6 weeks ago. On May 29 the Planning Department Administration had nearly completed this paperwork but had become concerned regarding the end dates for the CLG and CDBG-DR grant periods. I responded and explained the end dates but did not hear back. Four weeks later, after DOWL and I each had put in requests for a status, the Planning Department Administration repeated its original concerns from May 29, revealing it had not made progress. So, I re-explained the grant end dates to Planning Administration and am awaiting a response. I explained that issuing the contract task order has so far used up 6 out of 20 weeks left to use the CLG grant funds and provide the 40% match. The CLG Grant closes on September 30. From then we depend solely on the CDBG-DR grant funds. I have requested the Planning Department Administration to express any issues to me and resolve and give DOWL the green light to begin work.

I requested the NAPC to make the rest of the slide decks from the April 18 CAMP training available, and for a Post-CAMP meeting and summary report at \$2,500 cost.

For project next steps, see Unfinished Business item II.A.

- d. **Old St Nicholas Chapel Roof Replacement (Grant #25-007)**: The state awarded the Municipality the CLG grant for re-roofing the Old St Nicholas Russian Orthodox Church in Eklutna, increasing the federal share to \$50,000. We received a draft grant agreement from the state OHA in May and the Municipal Manager recently signed the agreement for the state SHPO to execute. Last week, however, the OHA realized it had made two errors in the agreement form and a separate form and sent us a corrected version of both for the Municipal Manager to re-sign. The Planning Department Administration must now re-submit through the 2-week agency review process for the Municipal Manager's signature.

I am preparing a separate agreement between Municipality and ROSSIA to establish responsibilities. The state OHA has informed me the agreement must establish that the Municipality will pay ROSSIA's roofing contractor directly, using the CLG Grant funds and ROSSIA's 40% match funds (which ROSSIA must first convey to the Municipality). This differs from the typical grant agreement template that is familiar to the Planning Department Administration. I am asking for help from the Municipal Attorney's Office.

6. Municipal Historic Properties Status

- a. **Anchorage Memorial Park Cemetery in Downtown**: Memorial Park Cemetery, a division of the municipal Parks and Recreation Department, is seeking grant funding to convert its record keeping into an inventory database of names and locations of historical people interred there and to identify early unmarked graves.
- b. **Brown's Point Cottages at 786 and 800 Delaney Street**: In May I reported the exteriors of the cottages need repainting and possibly other repairs to seal the buildings from the elements. The Real Estate Department intended to gather more information.
- c. **A.E.C. Cottage 25 at 645 W. 3rd Avenue**: A boiler failed last winter and may need replacing.
- d. **Historic Anchorage City Hall in Peratrovich Park**: I have no report.
- e. **Oscar Anderson House Museum in Elderberry Park**: Preservation Alaska representatives and Donna Burgess (granddaughter of Oscar Anderson) met with me and Real Estate Department Director Tiffany Briggs regarding the status of OAHM on May 26. We have tentatively scheduled a follow-up meeting for 2:00 p.m. on Monday 29 June. We have abandoned opening the museum in summer-fall 2026. We have agreed to propose CLG Grant project to prepare a Historic Structure Report for the Oscar Anderson House, make any urgent minor repairs with other funding or a separate CLG Grant, and focus on developing a business plan possibly as a match for the grant.

Spring flooding resulted in a return of mold to the basement. Capital Facilities Division was working on abating. Preservation Alaska recommends improvements to security system.

f. **Pioneer School House in Ben Crawford Memorial Park**: I have no report.

g. **Wireless Station at 124-140 E. Manor Avenue**: See item 5.a. of this memo.

7. Municipality of Anchorage Historic Preservation Fund Status

In May 2026 the balance in the Historic Preservation Capital Reserve Account (Fund 490) was \$61,684.99. Of that, \$15,000 is encumbered for the Wireless Station CLG Grant project.

8. Proposed Archeological Survey in Beach Lake Park

Commissioner Richard Martin is preparing a proposal to conduct a pro-bono, non-invasive archeological survey in part of Beach Lake Park, for review by the Municipality, and in consultation with the tribal organizations. We are trying to determine what the review and approval procedures are at municipal and state levels, if there are any.



Marquee Events

June 26 - July 4, 2026

Presented by

GLOBAL
CREDIT UNION

Anchorage

June 26

Guided Hike up Flattop Mtn.

June 28

Tour Mountain View Fieldhouse
Meet & Greet MLB Ambassadors
Community Softball Game vs.
Knock Down & Skin 'Em Club

June 27

MLB PLAY BALL! Youth Clinic
MLB Pitch, Hit & Run Event
Week of Dreams Opening Ceremony
Glacier Pilots vs. Mat-Su Miners

June 29

Week of Dreams Reception

Fairbanks

July 2

A Celebration of History with
Former Goldpanner and MLB
Veteran Greg. A. Harris

July 3

MLB PLAY BALL! Youth Clinic

July 4

Week of Dreams Closing Ceremony
Goldpanners vs. Stars



america250.alaska.gov

Page 15 of 29



America250Alaska



alaskaamerica250



The Lineup

June 26 - July 4, 2026

Presented by

GLOBAL[™]
CREDIT UNION

June 26, 10am, Glen Alps Trailhead: Flattop Mountain guided hike (Chugach State Park)

June 27, 10am-12pm, Anchorage Football Stadium: MLB PLAY BALL! youth clinic

June 27, 1-3pm, Anchorage Football Stadium: MLB Pitch Hit & Run event

June 27, 6:30-7:30pm, Mulcahy Stadium: Week of Dreams Opening Ceremony

June 27, 7:30pm Mulcahy Stadium: Anchorage Glacier Pilots vs. Mat-Su Miners

June 28, 11am: Tour of new Mountain View Fieldhouse/Meet & Greet with MLB Ambassadors

June 28 1pm, Mt. View Lions Park: Community softball game vs. Knock Down & Skin 'Em Club

June 28, 12pm Loretta French Sports Complex: Chugiak-Eagle River Midseason Celebration

June 28, 4pm Lee Jordan Field: Chugiak-Eagle River Chinooks vs. Peninsula Oilers

June 24-June 28 Mulcahy Stadium: American Legion Alaska 529 Midseason Classic

June 29, 6pm, Alaska Native Heritage Center in Anchorage: Week of Dreams Reception

June 30, Utqiagvik: Community America250-Alaska event

July 2, 5-6pm, Morris Thompson Cultural & Visitor Center, Fairbanks: A Celebration of Goldpanners History with Former Goldpanner and MLB Veteran Greg. A Harris

July 3, 10am-1pm, Growden Memorial Field: MLB PLAY BALL! youth clinic

July 4, 6-6:30pm Growden Memorial Field: Week of Dreams Closing Ceremony

July 4, 7pm Growden Memorial Field: Alaska Goldpanners Independence Day game



Municipality of Anchorage
Planning Department
Memorandum



II.A.1.

Date: June 18, 2026
To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Tom Davis, AICP, Senior Planner–Urban Designer
Subject: Historic Preservation Plan – Commissioner Survey Questionnaire

During the public engagement process, we will conduct several questionnaire surveys. The first survey is the Commissioner Questionnaire Survey. Your responses to this survey will help us develop a public questionnaire survey, frame the public process, and understand commissioners' thinking on key topics.

The Commissioner Questionnaire Survey became available to you on June 15, and it is still open. If you could submit your responses by the end of June, we will be able to compile the responses for the HPP Committee in July.

For your reference, following is a list of the topics and questions in the Survey.

A. Public Outreach

1. We are compiling a list of local organizations and groups that may have an interest in preservation in Anchorage. Which of the listed groups and organizations do you believe are essential to engage in the historic preservation planning process? Which essential groups or organizations are missing from the list?
2. We plan to conduct up to six Focus Group meetings with categories of stakeholder groups. Following are some ideas for Focus Group categories. Which of these do you think reflect categories of stakeholders with the most likely interest in the plan? Which groupings would you modify? Any you would add or replace?
3. Are there informal community networks or specific individuals that should be part of the conversation? Include the 5 people most likely to support us and the 5 people most unlikely to support the plan.
4. What avenues or methods do you recommend the project team use to get the word out about the project and participation opportunities? What are we asking of people? What kinds of comments and contributions?

B. Public Engagement

5. What are we asking of participants and commenters from the public? What kinds of comments and contributions?

6. What level of public engagement should this project aim for, on a spectrum of least to most impact the public would have on decisions about the plan?

Select one menu choice. Menu choices appear in order of the least to most public impact. Menu choice definitions:

"Inform" means to provide the public with balanced and objective information to assist them in understanding the problem, opportunities, and solutions. *"We'll keep you informed."*

"Consult" means to obtain public feedback on analysis, alternatives, and decisions: *"We'll listen to and acknowledge concerns and aspirations and provide feedback on how the public comments influenced the decision."*

"Involve" means to work with the public throughout the process to ensure that public concerns and aspirations are consistently understood and considered: *"We will work with you to ensure that your comments are directly reflected in the alternatives developed and provide feedback on how the comments influenced the decision."*

"Collaborate" means to partner with the public in each aspect of the decision, including the development of alternatives and the identification of the solution: *"We will look to you for advice and innovation in formulating solutions, and incorporate your advice and recommendations into the decisions as much as possible."*

"Empower" means to place final decision making in the hands of the public: *"We will implement what you decide."*

7. What barriers do you think the public faces when engaging with historic preservation initiatives?
8. Are the challenges the public faces when engaging with historic preservation initiatives any different in Chugiak-Eagle River or Girdwood-Turnagain Arm than in the Anchorage Bowl?
9. What does successful public engagement for this project mean or look like to you?
10. What has worked well in previous public engagement efforts you have seen or experienced?
11. Any further comments on public engagement? Are there any specific strategies or ideas you suggest for engaging the public in the preservation planning process?

C. Historical and Cultural Insights

12. What do you feel are important phases or events in Anchorage's history?
13. What do you see as important themes in Anchorage's history and memory? Important throughlines in its story?
14. Is there anything else you would like us to know about Anchorage's history?

D. Diversity, Inclusivity, Accessibility

15. Who cares, and who should get to decide what is saved, lost, celebrated, or forgotten?

16. What stories or aspects of Anchorage's past do you feel are overlooked or underrepresented?

17. How can we make the HPP public process inclusive and welcoming to diverse community members, including hard-to-reach and historically marginalized groups? How can we ensure that historically marginalized communities have an equitable opportunity to participate in the preservation planning process?

18. How do we ensure that the preservation planning process is relevant, inclusive, and responsive to all parts of the Municipality: Chugiak-Eagle River, Turnagain Arm, and Girdwood?

19. What is your hope for engaging all communities in protecting and sharing their important places, traditions, and stories, for the benefit of Anchorage?

E. Preservation in Anchorage

20. When you think of historic preservation, what comes to mind?

21. What heritage places, spaces, stories, and traditions in the Municipality are most important to you? What do you feel is most important to preserve about Anchorage's heritage and why?

22. Which of the following benefits of heritage preservation are most important to you? (Select up to five from the menu.)

23. Why does preservation matter? Why does the municipal historic preservation program matter?

24. What are the biggest challenges or threats to preservation in Anchorage? (Arrange the menu choices in rank order of greatest to least.)

25. What preservation challenges did we miss in the previous question? What preservation concerns do you have for Anchorage?

26. Do any of the biggest challenges to historic preservation in Chugiak-Eagle River or Girdwood-Turnagain Arm differ from in Anchorage?

27. What are the biggest weaknesses or opportunities for improvement in the municipal historic preservation program?

28. What are important preservation strengths, opportunities, and successes in the Municipality?

29. What should the Municipality's preservation priorities be?

30. What resources are needed? Where and how can the community acquire those resources?

F. Vision for the Historic Preservation Plan

31. Why do we plan for preservation? Why are we preparing a Municipality of Anchorage historic preservation plan?

- 32. In what direction should we be taking this Plan? Select from the following or describe your ideas.
- 33. How do you envision the Historic Preservation Commission using the Plan?
- 34. How do you envision state and municipal agencies using the Plan?
- 35. How do you envision the public using the Plan?
- 36. What kind of guidance do you think the Historic Preservation Commission needs most from the Plan?
- 37. What kind of guidance or information do you think the public needs most from the plan?
- 38. The NAPC CAMP Training workshop advised us to craft a preservation vision for the plan that people can get excited about and motivated to make a reality. **If you were to develop a vision statement for the Plan, what would it be?**
- 39. Do you have additional suggestions regarding the Historic Preservation Plan?

G. Connection to Community Issues and Trends in Anchorage

How important is the interaction and relevance between Historic Preservation and the following trends, on a scale of 1 to 5 stars? (1 being unimportant, 2 being somewhat relevant, 3 being fairly important, 4 being very important, and 5 being the most important)

- 40. Rapid change in the community, nation, and world: Including social, political, environmental, economic, and technological change
- 41. Community rights, civic culture, and information
- 42. Affordability and housing
- 43. Diversity, fairness, and inclusion
- 44. Local economy, businesses, and jobs
- 45. Energy efficiency, sustainability, and natural conservation
- 46. Hazard and disaster mitigation, response, and recovery
- 47. Education and civic and cultural awareness
- 48. Community infrastructure and fiscal management
- 49. Please explain or provide any follow-up comments you may have regarding the interactions between historic preservation and any of the trends.
- 50. What other community issues and trends interact with historic preservation? How would you rate their relevance on a scale of 1 to 5?

About You:

- A1. Would you care to give your first and last name? (Optional)
- A2. What is your relationship to the Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission?
- A3. Which community council area best describes where you live now?
- A4. How long have you been a resident of the Municipality?
- A5. What is your role in historic preservation or interest in Anchorage's history and heritage?
- A6. What age group are you in? (Optional)
- A7. What is your gender? (Optional)
- A8. How do you identify your race and/or ethnicity? (Optional)
- A9. In the Municipality we speak more than 100 languages. What language(s) do you speak? (Optional)
- A10. Any comments regarding the survey questions about the respondent or how we ask them?



Municipality of Anchorage
Planning Department
Memorandum



II.A.2.

Date: June 26, 2026
To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Tom Davis, AICP, Senior Planner–Urban Designer
Subject: Historic Preservation Plan – Next Steps

Public Engagement Consultants

DOWL Engineering and **Huddle AK** should come aboard soon to provide \$116,446 in public engagement and planning services for the HPP project. Among the team members are Holly Spoth-Torres (Huddle AK) who was the public engagement consultant for the 2018 draft HPP, and Lucy Flynn O’Quinn (DOWL Engineering) a cultural resources specialist who also participated in the public process for the 2018 draft HPP. The team will come onboard as soon as the Planning Department administrator sets up a contractual task order with them (see Staff Reports memo). Their primary scope of services will include:

- Huddle will prepare a public involvement plan (PIP) for the project.
- Huddle will help us develop a public questionnaire survey.
- DOWL and Huddle will facilitate 6 advisory committee meetings, 2 focus group meetings, and 2 PZC or Assembly work sessions.
- DOWL and Huddle will help revise the HPP Goals, Objectives, and Strategies.

I am determining how much additional CDBG-DR funding we would need for the consultants to participate in more focus groups, advisory committee meetings, and public workshops planned for this project. If additional CDBG-DR funding were available, I would prepare a request for it.

Historic Preservation Plan Committee – Next Meeting

I would like to submit the following items for a HPP Committee discussion in July:

- A summary and analysis of your responses to the Commissioner Survey Questionnaire.
- A proposed scope of work tasks and schedule for the project.
- A staff comparative assessment of the 2018 draft HPP and five recently adopted historic preservation plans, from Des Moines, IA, Plano, TX, Austin, TX, Phoenix, AZ, and Kodiak, AK). It will include suggestions and options for revising the draft plan.
- A draft of a public engagement framework statement. This document will set expectations for the level and breadth of stakeholder involvement and propose values and measures of success for public engagement and for evaluating draft recommendations in the plan. The consultants will use the framework statement as a starting place for writing a public involvement plan (PIP) for the project.



Municipality of Anchorage
Planning Department
Memorandum



III.A.1.

Date: June 25, 2026
To: Historic Preservation Commission
From: Tom Davis, AICP, Senior Planner—Urban Designer
Subject: Section 106 Project Consultations - REVISED

(I revised this memo on June 24 to incorporate new information from DOT&PF into section 2, and to add section 5 regarding an airport project and section 6 regarding the JBER WGC&AO Programmatic Agreement.)

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and its implementing regulations in 36 CFR 800, we received the following Section 106 project consultation requests and notifications as of June 24.

The supporting documents are available in the HPC SharePoint site under folder file path **Documents/Federal Review – Section 106/June 2026 Project Consultations**.

1. JBER: Perimeter Security Improvements – In response to HPC member comments regarding the Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) in May, the Department of the Air Force (DAF) provided two additional documents, which are available now in SharePoint:
 - Installation Security Notification Letter
 - CR Reports Combined

The Draft EA public comment period was extended and closed on June 12. However, if you have any comments on the two documents above that you would have me convey to Liz Ortiz, please send to me. Electronic copies of the Draft EA and Draft FONSI/FONPA are available on the JBER website: <https://www.jber.jb.mil/Services-Resources/Environmental/Environmental-Planning/>.

2. DOT&PF: Seward Highway and Tudor Road Interchange Reconstruction – DOT&PF sent a finding of “no historic properties affected” for the subject project prior to the May 21 HPC meeting, and invited questions and comments. I submitted HPC member comments at the end of May, and DOT&PF acknowledged the comments. These comments were:
 - Do not concur with Findings of Effect as the project has noise or property acquisition on the following districts and buildings. Suggest altering to the finding to: “No historic properties adversely affected.”
 - The draft finding does not address the impacts to the Bancroft and Evanson subdivisions as two potential historic districts. (Eligible under A and C).
 - 1011 E Tudor Rd: Eligible under Criteria C, and possibly A, as the only commercial building in Anchorage by James Dalton Clark, originally clad in Core-Ten. This would have been significant at the time for use of the material.

The building still has integrity of style and is a good example of Corporate Modernism from the period, and from the architect.

- 1515 E Tudor Rd: Additional research is needed as its previous uses may have had associations with a historic event or person.
- 1549 E Tudor Rd: Additional research is needed as its previous uses may have had associations with a historic event or person. Also has a characteristic octagon penthouse.

On June 23 the DOT&PF sent a letter in response to the HPC comments.

Since we commented, a separate project brought to my attention that Fish Creek's original alignment is in the project impact area, on DOT&PF land NE of the interchange. The Planning Department staff is exploring commenting to DOT&PF regarding potentially daylighting a section of the creek that is currently in a pipe underneath the interchange. A 1950 aerial photo with the historical and current creek alignments superimposed is available to the HPC in the SharePoint project folder. Could the HPC consider if commenting on restoring part of the creek is within its Section 106 consultation scope?

3. Merrill Field Airport Gate and Lighting Improvements – We have received a direct-to-findings letter from a project manager contractor for the FAA regarding a security gate and lighting improvements project at Merrill Field Airport. It finds there would be no adverse effect to historic properties. The letter invites comments.
4. DOT&PF Safer Seward Highway (FYI) – The signed letter providing HPC member comments to the DOT&PF is attached in the meeting packet. The DOT&PF acknowledged the comments and is preparing a formal response. In researching the issues Erik Hilsinger at DOT&PF informed me that the Bird Creek railroad bridge was replaced by the Alaska Railroad last year, and provided me with the following documentation:
 - https://alaskarails.org/pix2/bridges/CD-Bird/FCTSHT_2023_Bridge_86.6_Replacement_0.pdf
 - <https://alaskarails.org/pix2/bridges/DG-bird-creek.html> Mobilizing cranes to replace bridge
 - <https://alaskarails.org/pix2/bridges/CD-Bird/index.html> 2007 photo of Warren truss bridge
 - <https://alaskarails.org/pix2/bridges/RK-bird/index.html> finished replaced bridge
5. ANC Atlas Air Hardstand Upgrades – We have received a direct-to-findings letter and enclosures from a consultant for Anchorage International Airport regarding improvements to the Atlas Air, Inc., Hardstand. The letter finds there would be no adverse effect to historic properties. The letter invites comments.
6. JBER WGC&AO Programmatic Agreement – I submitted HPC member comments from the May 21 and June 2 HPC meetings in a letter to JBER (see attachment to this memo in the packet). Several commissioners participated in the site visit to Elmendorf on June 18. JBER is tentatively scheduling the next PA signatories discussion to take place from 10 to 11:30 a.m. on Tuesday 28 July.



Mayor Suzanne LaFrance
Municipality of Anchorage
-Planning Department-
-Historic Preservation Commission-

May 21, 2026

Mr. Erik Hilsinger
Cultural Resources Specialist, Historian
Design & Engineering Services Division
Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities
P.O. Box 196900
Anchorage, AK 99519-6900

Dear Mr. Hilsinger:

I want to extend a gracious thank you to the consulting team for visiting the Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) on February 16, 2026, and answering some of our questions regarding the Safer Seward Highway project. After holding several follow-up deliberations, the HPC offers the following comments and concerns. I also request the HPC be included in any future consultations when designs for portions of the project move forward.

As the HPC members read the project documents, it appears as though the agency entered the NEPA process with a preferred alternative already in mind, framed the questions and studies toward reaffirming this predisposition, and created project goals for which a divided four-lane highway is the only solution. This solution seems pre-defined by embedded values that rank higher design speeds and traffic volumes above cost, safety, and preservation, prior to initiation of the project. It does not appear there has been serious consideration for alternative solutions that do not perpetuate the hegemony of personal cars at the expense of other values.

One of the primary concerns of the HPC is with an oversight in the Section 106 consultation process for this project so far. The SHPO received and consented to proposed findings of no effect which were not shared with the Municipality. During the Section 106 process for this project, the Anchorage staff and HPC were unaware of ongoing correspondence between the project agency and the SHPO, the proposed findings of no effect, and the SHPO concurrence with those findings in fall 2025. We became aware only after the fact along with the public. It does not seem that the project agency followed Section 106 process regulations that require consulting parties like the Anchorage HPC receive the same consultation opportunity as the SHPO to express concurrence or disagreement with proposed finding of no effect. Given the magnitude of the Safer Seward Highway project, the HPC position is that, even after such findings from the SHPO, it is still necessary for the project agency to address comments from the other consulting parties, including Anchorage HPC, regarding proposed findings of effect.

Findings of Effect

With the knowledge of the history of the Turnagain Arm that commissioners have, the HPC does not concur with the finding of no adverse effect. The HPC members believe that historic and cultural resources in the project corridor will be irreversibly affected or destroyed, and rendered ineligible should the preferred alternative proceed. Project design alternatives and mitigation are needed to address the environmental and historic impact of this project. The HPC has identified the following sites on which this project will have adverse effects.

Historic or cultural properties impacted include Beluga Point, Potter Marsh, Windy Corner, Turnagain Arm, Iditarod National Historic Trail, historic properties in Bird adjacent to the highway, and the Alaska Railroad. This is in addition to resources heretofore unidentified in the corridor, and the overall “feel” of Turnagain Arm, a landscape with cultural significance.

Impacts to Sites and Scenic Corridor Designations

Specifically, the proposed grade-separated pedestrian crossings in several areas will bring greater public traffic to sensitive places. This particularly concerns Beluga Point. Beluga Point may be the most significant known archaeological site in Anchorage. Aside from mitigating the construction impacts from such a structure, the design should carefully direct paths away from significant resources. Management of this pedestrian traffic may be outside the scope of the DOT&PF, placing the responsibility on Chugach State Park planners. It would be more responsible to collaborate with local tribes and Chugach State Park now on how to address the influx of pedestrian traffic when it arrives on the site, outside of the DOT&PF right-of-way. The HPC disagrees with the finding of no adverse effects to Beluga Point and recommends entering into a Programmatic Agreement to determine mitigation.

The overall project footprint, including its earthwork cuts and fill, narrowly avoids physically encroaching into known historic or cultural properties—e.g., the Isle Site (ANC-0816), Beluga Point, Indian Valley Mine, Birdhouse Garage—but it drastically alters their settings. The deterioration of physical context surrounding these resources is an adverse effect on them. Additionally, with the construction sure to create traffic delays, access to historic properties like those in Girdwood will be more difficult and impact businesses that operate in them. This will result in loss of income that owners might have otherwise invested in maintenance, restoration, or ongoing operation. Noise, dust, and pile driving will create other indirect impacts to nearby properties, especially at river crossings. The HPC disagrees with the finding of no adverse effects to these properties and recommends entering into a Programmatic Agreement to determine mitigation.

Stretches of natural coastline with rock outcrops (e.g., at miles 106 and 110) are proposed to be buried in fill to accommodate the wider highway. The project should include a thorough survey to identify cultural resources in the areas subject to excavation and fill, as mitigation.

Several realignments of the Alaska Railroad will require demolition of existing bridges that are historic structures. This is especially true at Bird Creek. The project agency or Alaska Railroad has not yet approached the Municipality for consultation on this and other Alaska Railroad structures this project will impact. If it is the responsibility of the project agency to do this, I invite

Mr. Erik Hilsinger

May 21, 2026

Page 3

it to send information to the HPC. Lastly, the project does not appear to align with previous planning efforts for the Seward Highway corridor. The draft EIS underplays the All-American Road and Alaska Scenic Byway designations. Although this may be outside the purview of the HPC's Section 106 review, the HPC believes this designation is a significant positive attribute to the road and corridor. These designations positively impact the state and the experience of its visitors, and the associated signage and publications highlight the scenic nature of the roadway. Natural features and landscapes with cultural value like those that contribute to these scenic designations can be eligible for listing on the National Register. Increasing the facility design speed, capacity, and footprint will negatively impact this character which also provides context for historic sites.

The Seward Highway was designated an Alaska Safety Corridor in 2006. For more than 20 years, the DOT&PF, Municipality, residents and commuters have sought to reduce fatalities, crashes, and risky behaviors, while accommodating the use and enjoyment of the scenic, historic, and recreational values of the corridor. Expansion to a four-lane configuration seems to contradict these past efforts.

Conclusion

The HPC believes this project perpetuates a car-centric, highway-construction-at-all-cost paradigm that is irreversibly destructive to our environment and surroundings. With mass extinction of species and cultural loss all around us and a warming climate, creating such a piece of infrastructure in this corridor is irresponsible when other alternatives are available. We believe that the planning and public process that contributed to the All-American Road designation years ago provided a more responsible, contextual vision for the Seward Highway in the Turnagain Arm. How can a four-lane highway with higher speeds, wider lanes, more pavement, more snow clearing, more forest clearing, and blasting and filling of natural landscapes and coastlines be a preferred alternative? How can a historic preservation commission concur that a freeway-scale construction project will have no adverse effects on historic resources when it corresponds with a historical ice-free travel corridor with archaeological evidence dating back to 8,000 years BCE? As the HPC cannot answer any of these questions in the affirmative, it does not accept the findings of no adverse impact and request entering into a Programmatic Agreement to determine mitigation.

Kind regards,

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION



Connor Scher, NCARB
Chair

cc: Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission
Mélisa Babb, Planning Director, Municipality of Anchorage



Mayor Suzanne LaFrance
Municipality of Anchorage
-Planning Department-
-Historic Preservation Commission-

June 5, 2026

Liz Ortiz
673d Civil Engineer Squadron
Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson, Alaska 99506

Dear Liz:

The Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission discussed the draft WGC&AO Programmatic Agreement at its May 21 and June 2 meetings. The commissioners' comments about the draft PA follow.

1. Would it be more appropriate to replace the word "indigenous," for example on line 29, to a more specific term such as "Alaska Native?"
2. In addition to the draft mitigation measures in PA Section V., Commissioners recommend using mitigation funds to conduct inventory surveys or develop NRHP nominations for resources outside the project APE.
3. Include a creative mitigation measure, such as providing funds for rehabilitating pre-Cold War-era buildings on JBER or providing mitigation funds for rehabilitation of Nike Site Summit, by contributing to the Municipality's Historic Preservation Fund (HPF).
4. There is concern about the draft mitigation language in PA Section V.B., starting on line 197. It seems to imply JBER actions that adversely affect historic resources could exempt themselves from Section 106 mitigation requirements if an updated assessment determines that those effects render the resources no longer eligible for the NRHP. It seems to imply that by making changes to the resources in a historic district JBER could reevaluate the district's eligibility for the NRHP and find its own project makes the district no longer eligible, and, if no longer eligible, the resources will no longer merit mitigation. Change the language in V.B. to instead direct that any new buildings follow the Secretary of Interior Standards to be consistent with the historic district.
5. Revise Section V.C. to indicate possible mitigation measures addressing archaeological sites if JBER finds any adversely affected. Commissioners propose that potential mitigation measures include nominating a similar era archeological site to the NRHP or nominating the Cairn Point site specifically to the NRHP.

6. If site ANC-01234 (Temnac Valley P-38G Lightning) is an aircraft on display and will be adversely affected, add a mitigation measure to move it to somewhere else on JBER or donate it to an Alaska museum—including delivery cost.
7. Commissioners raised concerns about PA Exhibit B, Section 1, exempting activities concerning existing buried linear non-building infrastructure. If JBER does not follow Section 106 consultation for these undertakings disturbing ground, it could disturb significant areas or features without external review. Additionally, certain linear features such as walkways may contribute to the “feel” (or eligibility) of historic sites, and so merit inclusion in Section 106 review.

The Commission appreciated this comment opportunity and the invitation for a site visit. We look forward to learning more and further discussion.

Sincerely,

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION



Tom Davis
Historic Preservation Officer

cc: Connor Scher, Chair, Anchorage Historic Preservation Commission