

**Municipality of Anchorage**  
**WEST ANCHORAGE LAND TRADE TASK FORCE**  
**MEETING #10**

Wednesday, May 14, 2014    10:30 am – 12:30 pm  
Federation of Community Councils Conference Room  
URS Corporation, Meeting Facilitators

---

**AGENDA**

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

Joan Kluwe, meeting facilitator, welcomed the participants and conducted the introductions of facilitation staff, Task Force members, and public attendees.

Dr. Kluwe started the meeting with a summary of goals the Task Force has established for the entire meeting series. She outlined the desire of members to develop scenarios for exchanges that addressed long term land use conflicts on parcels surrounding the airport and develop a recommendation for the Mayor. Before beginning discussion Dr. Kluwe explained the next steps, which included the following:

- As requested by the Mayor, MOA planning staff will develop a report summarizing the four scenarios identified and discussed by this Task Force. To date, the Task Force has discussed 1) no exchange, 2) limited exchange, 3) whole parcel exchange, and 4) partial parcel exchange.
- Once the report is developed by MOA, Task Force members will be asked to submit a short statement in support or a statement in opposition for each scenario. These statements will be submitted along with the report to the Mayor for review.

Dr. Kluwe outlined the discussion from Meeting 9 and summarized key points regarding the western parcels in the vicinity of parcels 5, 17, 30, and 6, highlighting that Mr. Parrott's comments on the proposed location of the additional N/S runway posed a challenge to working assumptions for the Task Force and policies regarding placement of the Coastal Trail. At this point Mr. Tobish made a statement that the purpose of the Task Force was to make a recommendation to the Mayor on the potential scenarios and conditions. He added that further detail and design work would be need to be completed to support the future decision making process (AWWU expansion, Coastal Trail alignment and buffer, runway expansion, etc.). Mr. Tobish also discussed the Coastal Trail policy as outlined in the WADP, which specifies a continuous trail with buffer of approximately 300 feet depending on conditions. Dr. Kluwe summarized discussion from past meetings including several differences in perception have been clearly articulated about why the airport should or should not expand and how such an expansion would impact dedicated parklands, the Coastal Trail, and neighborhoods.

## **2. Conclude Discussions on Partial Parcel Exchange Scenario**

At this point Dr. Kluwe requested that the Task Force finish their discussion on the remaining parcels under assessment (parcels 7, 8, 9, and 11), which likely have a clearer path forward. Then the discussion will return to the western parcels (5, 17, 30, and 6). After a question from Ms. Gleason, Dr. Kluwe clarified that there would be many additional opportunities for public input. Decisions would need to go before HLB, Parks and Recreation Commission, Assembly and potentially a public vote.

The discussion was then directed to the items outlined in the parcel exchange evaluation form for each parcel. Details from this discussion are captured in the individual parcel forms.

Upon completion of the discussion of parcels 7, 8, 9, and 11, Dr. Kluwe brought the conversation back to the western parcels (5, 17, 30, and 6), since they had the highest level of uncertainty and may require the most future discussion. She reminded the Task Force that the purpose now is to frame and inform future discussions and that the group would not be able to develop distinct lines on a map at this meeting. Dr. Kluwe then displayed the runway graphic overlaid on aerial imagery and the parcel lines. She outlined a few key points regarding the graphic including: runway layout was preliminary, further engineering would be required, and design and placement of the Coastal Trail would need to occur. Mr. Parrott added that the taxi ways shown may be moved and area between the two runways may be adjusted (distance between runways is estimated at 3400'). Dr. Kluwe then presented several questions to the group for further consideration. These could likely contribute to the next phase of discussion and planning.

- How far to the east can the proposed N-S runway be moved?
- Would moving the existing tank farm accommodate a reconfigured runway alignment that would preserve more of parcel 17 and a Coastal Trail alignment in a buffered, vegetated condition?
- Would an alignment further to the east allow for AWWU expansion into parcel 30?
- As stated previously, would the proposed runway affect the mixing zones?
- Is the RPZ/clear zone at the end of the runway the minimum required?
- Would Coastal Trail and recreation use be allowed between the two N/S runways?

Before discussion of the western parcels began, Dr. Kluwe added the Task Force may wish to consider potential deed restrictions to maintain parcels in an undeveloped condition until there is a demonstrated need for the proposed runway, preventing other airport uses such as ancillary facilities. She also reminded the Task Force that the airport, via the State, retains the authority to seek eminent domain for the future N-S runway.

## **3. Discussion on western parcels**

Mr. Parrott opened up discussion by stating that he does not agree with the assumption that more detailed engineering plans are needed and emphasized the need for flexibility to account for future changes. He added that any trade needs to specify that the Coastal Trail and AWWU needs cannot be precluded. Mr. Baus agreed that construction design

documents are not needed, but he believes additional engineering work needs to occur to ensure future functionality. He added that he needed more information to feel confident. Mr. Moe asked about the difference between trading these parcels now versus in twenty years. Mr. Parrott stated the need for a more holistic approach to the perimeter parcels. In response to a question from Steve Strait, Mr. Baus indicated that AWWU would need approximately \$250,000 to move AWWU planning to level where he could be confident in future land trade assessment. Mr. Tobish emphasized the importance of predictability for all parties and highlighted how a potential exchange could improve predictability for all involved. This was followed by a discussion of the stipulations associated with the conveyance documents, which state that the airport cannot interfere with AWWU operations. Ms. Gleason then inquired about a line shown on the overlay figure indicating development in parcel #9. Mr. Parrott said he would have to go back and review the plan to provide an answer.

After clarifying questions from Ms. Gleason, Ms. Spoth-Torres reiterated that the Parks Department was still open to a partial parcel exchange and that she felt the final runway layout would be different from what is currently shown. Mr. Parrott added that parcel 5 could be used for additional parkland. Ms. Gleason expressed her concern about determining the boundaries based on an unknown future. Gloria Manni, member of the public, added that the Task Force needs to come to an agreement in principle and that the Point Woronzof Park should be used by the public until it is needed. David Landry, member of the public, asked how many of these high value targets are going to remain owned by the airport after the exchange. Mr. Parrott indicated that appraisals, not the value of the land to the airport, would determine the value of the parcels and determine the balance of the trade. He added that he hopes to resolve most, if not all of the parcels of high priority, but that bits and pieces would be needed to balance out the trade.

Following this discussion, Dr. Kluwe invited each member of the Task Force to provide concluding remarks.

Ms. Ward stated that HLB is very interested in a potential land trade and wants predictability associated with future land use decisions.

Ms. Spoth-Torres indicated that the Parks Department is interested in protecting the recreational assets that are currently used by the public under the assumption that they are protected, but are currently owned by the airport. This includes many of the parcels discussed as well as the Coastal Trail.

Steve Strait, Aviation Advisory Board, stated that he was pleased with the progress made in these meetings as was looking forward to the next step in the process.

Mr. Parrott thanked the MOA for making these meetings happen and thanked meeting participants because the public process is important. He found the process very informative and indicated that the airport has learned many opinions and facts and feels that this process has laid the ground work for progress in future.

Mr. Auth felt that this was a challenging process because it is difficult to determine the public value of the parcels discussed and assess what the MOA is getting in an exchange versus what it is giving up. He is particularly concerned about what is not identified in an appraisal process and thinks it will be hard to say the value of these trades will match up,

especially in the public's eyes. He also emphasized that the un-designation of Point Woronzof Park would require a vote of the people and asked if this vote would include all of the parcels. Mr. Auth added that the nitty gritty is going to be cumbersome and hard to convey to the public.

Ms. Gleason said she never imagined 20 years ago that she would be discussing trading Point Woronzof Park or that a Park Dept. representative would be advocating for a park's destruction. She reiterated the history that led to the designation of Point Woronzof Park, emphasizing the compromise with the airport, and expressed that the new proposed runway would destroy Point Woronzof Park. She added that the issue of recreational access between the two runways needs to be discussed but she feels this would never be allowed. In conclusion, she feels that an exchange is premature to come up with a land deal and that uses have been allowed for decades should continue. She feels that with no proposal by the airport for development for the next 20 years there is no reason to give up parkland or compromise AWWU facilities.

Mr. Baus stated that to preserve existing uses for the community there needs to be a land trade with the airport and this is likely a partial parcel exchange; however, a lot of legwork and technical evaluation is needed to come up with the parcel boundaries.

Mr. Moe indicated that he is skeptical of the entire process and stated that the MOA will achieve this exchange no matter what occurs. He added that by threatening eminent domain, the airport has bullied AWWU and the MOA with runway expansion. He felt that airport expansion can occur without expanding the footprint and that none of the triggers have been met to drive an exchange. He feels it is disingenuous to threaten parklands and that the airport is holding the community hostage, adding that if the airport threatens existing recreation uses then there will be political consequences.

Mr. Fogels stated that the community council does not want to wait for a trigger in the future and he feels this should happen sooner rather than later. He expressed the need for predictability and security associated with land uses and sees a future where this can all work since there are other parklands that can offset parcel 17 and maintain quality of these resources.

Tim Steele would like to see more detailed information and has found the meetings extremely valuable; however, he does not see a resolution where everyone is happy. He reiterated the need for more data, particularly for AWWU, but that the Task Force has pointed out all the issues.

Mr. Tobish stated that the Planning Dept. sees this process flowing from the plans; however, the devil is in the details. He added that this process has elevated several safe guards and identified several new safe guards, including the public process that would follow any proposal. Lastly, he indicated that the Planning Dept., including the Planning Director, is coming to the negotiating table expecting the Municipality to get all of the parcels discussed in exchange for parcel 17 and possibly other MOA lands in an exchange.

Bill Wortman stated that the Turnagain Community has an interest in many of these parcels as well as the Coastal Trail, which is used by thousands of people every day.

At this point, Dr. Kluwe opened the floor to members of the public in attendance.

Elaine asked for more information regarding belugas and the birds that move through this area, which are important to subsistence hunters further north. Albert Circosta advocated for maintaining existing recreation uses at parcels currently used by the public and added this has been a great forum for discussion. He expressed interest in the next step towards a responsible way to develop West Anchorage. Gloria Manni reiterated that it is important for the community to receive financial benefit from any exchange and that an agreement should be based on what is doable. David Landry cited a paragraph from the WADP that indicated that given the State's ownership of the airport, there was no ability to balance community needs. He stated this was the main problem and if airport was controlled by MOA this would not be an issue.

Dr. Kluwe asked the Task Force if they felt there was a need for another meeting and if so what would be the purpose and focus of the meeting. Multiple members asked for the opportunity to review the MOA report before it was submitted to the Mayor. Mr. Tobish indicated that it may be appropriate to convene this group before going in front of the Assembly and stated that the Task Force should not be dissolved, given the need for future discussion at strategic points.

#### **4. Meeting Logistics / Next Steps**

Dr. Kluwe followed this discussion by outlining the next steps for the group

- As requested by the Mayor, MOA planning staff will develop a report summarizing the four scenarios identified and discussed by this Task Force. To date, the Task Force has discussed 1) no exchange, 2) limited exchange, 3) whole parcel exchange, and 4) partial parcel exchange.
- Once the report is developed by MOA, Task Force members will be asked to submit a short statement in support or a statement in opposition for each scenario. These statements will be submitted along with the report to the Mayor for review.
- A separate technical work group would need to be formed to address engineering and design questions, valuation questions, and other topics identified by the Task Force, associated with the western parcels (5, 17, 30, and 6).
- If the Mayor chooses to act, the decision would require approval from the Assembly, HLB, Parks and Recreation, and a vote of the public. There would be many avenues for further public input.

Information requests:

- Determine who owns the sliver of land between parcel 7 and the water.
- Ms. Gleason requested to see the FAA regulations governing buffers on airport property.
- Requested that any conveyance documents be provided to the Task Force (western parcels).