

Appendix A

10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries

Questionnaire Responses and Public Comments Identifying the Boundary Study Areas



Municipality of Anchorage
Planning Department

Appendix A
Table of Contents

<i>Description</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Appendix A-1: Survey Questionnaire Responses and Email Comments	1
Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses	3
Table 1.2: Responses Received by Email and Phone	21
2. Appendix A-2: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Public Comments	23
Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Recommended Changes	25
Table 2.2: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Comments by Email or Phone that Recommended Changes	41
3. Appendix A-3: Summary of Boundary Study Areas	43
Table 3.1: Summary of Boundary Study Areas	45

Introduction

Appendix A-1 documents the public's responses to the 10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries project online questionnaire regarding community council district boundaries. It also documents comments about boundaries that the Planning Department staff received by email and telephone. The feedback shown in Appendix A-2 provided the source information for identifying the Boundary Study Areas to be evaluated for the project in the Public Hearing Draft *Report and Recommendations*. Appendix A-2 also provides an indicator of community council members' level of satisfaction with current boundaries that can inform this project's assessment of the Boundary Study Areas.

The Planning Department solicited initial comments regarding community council district boundaries from the community councils and their members from November 4, 2022, through the end of February 2023. This included an online survey questionnaire that was distributed in two information alerts (in November and February) to the Community Councils Center's mass notification of approximately 9,500 email addresses. The online questionnaire was developed by Planning staff using the ESRI, Inc., Survey 1-2-3 software application. Additionally, the Planning Department also sent letters to all community council officer contacts listed on the *Community Council Master Contact List* maintained by the Community Council Center and visited the Federation of Community Councils Board of Delegates monthly meetings in November 2022, and January and February 2023.

The public feedback documented in this Appendix A-2 comes from individual community council members, community council officers and executive boards. The municipal Ombudsman and the manager of the Community Councils Center also provided information and comments. The Planning Department received 409 responses to the online survey questionnaire, 9 emails, and one response by phone, for a total of 419 responses.

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Table 1.1 documents the 409 questionnaire responses. The questionnaire responses are organized alphabetically by the home Community Council districts of the respondents (i.e., in order from Abbott Loop to University Area). Each questionnaire response occupies a row in the table.

The first column in Table 1.1. is the questionnaire response identification number, which was automatically assigned by the ESRI Survey 1-2-3 software application. The remaining 10 columns provide the responses to the 10 questions in the survey questionnaire, arranged from left to right in the order that these questions appeared in the survey form.

Table 1.2: Responses Received by Email and Phone

Table 1.2 documents the additional comments that the Planning Department received, in emails and one phone conversation. Where a single email or phone conversation provided comments about more than one boundary area or district, Table 2.1 documents each of those comments from the same response in a separate row in the table.

The first column in Table 1.2 is a unique identification number for the comment, which staff assigned. The second column is the name of the community council district that was the subject of the comment. The third column is a summary of the comment made, which staff edited for length and clarity. The remaining columns provide the source of the comment.

Use of Appendix A-1

The information in Appendix A-1 is the base data for Appendices A-2 and A-3. Appendix A-2 selects the approximately 120 questionnaire and email comments from Appendix A-1 that expressed dissatisfaction with current boundaries or suggested boundary changes be considered, and groups those responses into 38 *Boundary Study Areas*. Appendix A-3 is a summary table that describes the 38 Boundary Study Areas and cross-references back to the individual comments in Appendices A-1 and A-2.

The information in Appendix A-1 Appendix A-1 also provides an indication of how community council members in general feel about their community council district areas and boundaries. Part 2 of the Public Hearing Draft *Report and Recommendations* begins with a summary of the public feedback from Appendix A-1, including the number and percentage of responses indicating satisfaction with existing boundaries, the size of their community council districts, and whether any changes to boundaries should be considered.

The evaluation of each Boundary Study Area in Part 2 of the Public Hearing Draft *Report and Recommendations* includes a summary of all the questionnaire responses and other public comments documented in Appendix A-1, for each community council affected by the Boundary Study Area. This information became a part of determining the community desires as to the boundaries under evaluation.

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
26	Abbott Loop	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
33	Abbott Loop	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
64	Abbott Loop	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
68	Abbott Loop	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
78	Abbott Loop	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
105	Abbott Loop	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
131	Abbott Loop	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
218	Abbott Loop	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
227	Abbott Loop	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
302	Abbott Loop	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
307	Abbott Loop	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
355	Abbott Loop	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
406	Abbott Loop	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
28	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
49	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	The Anchor Park neighborhood south of Chester Creek seems like it might be more appropriate as part of the Airport Heights CC .	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
51	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	The conundrum is that the community council (CC) is supposed be bounded by "natural boundaries" and the Assembly districts are split by other boundaries. After the last round of reapportionment, we (Airport Heights) are split across 3 Assembly districts. This means we don't have a strong relationship with any single set of Assembly representatives. It also makes it hard for our Assembly representatives to attend our meetings (either at all or for the full duration) as they are all meeting hopping among their represented CCs. I've been a CC board member both before and after reapportionment and the communication chain with our Assembly representatives has noticeably degraded. Unfortunately, I don't have a great solution to this :(Provide_representation_for_all		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
55	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
92	Airport Heights	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
104	Airport Heights	Disagree	Yes	Move Penland Park to Mountain View	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
118	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
144	Airport Heights	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
178	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
181	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	Yes	The residential complex at corner of Glenn Hwy and Bragaw on west side may need to go to Mt. View.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
187	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
196	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
197	Airport Heights	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
204	Airport Heights	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
205	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	Move residences east of lake Otis,and north of northern lights from Rogers park to airport heights	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
206	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	West side of Lake Otis as part of Roger's Park. North of DeBarr as part of MountainView.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
208	Airport Heights	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
210	Airport Heights	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
211	Airport Heights	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
228	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
231	Airport Heights	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
294	Airport Heights	Strongly agree					In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
330	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
337	Airport Heights	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
345	Airport Heights	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
372	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	Home on the North East corner of lake Otis / Northern Lights should be added. 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis(one house, many lots, should be added.	Align_the_district_with_areas_ s		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
378	Airport Heights	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
393	Airport Heights	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
402	Airport Heights	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
420	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
423	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
109	Basher	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
111	Basher	Strongly agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
176	Basher	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
242	Basher	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
243	Basher	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
244	Basher	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
315	Basher	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range			This year (in 2022)
60	Bayshore/Klatt	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
135	Bayshore/Klatt	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
193	Bayshore/Klatt	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
237	Bayshore/Klatt	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
238	Bayshore/Klatt	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
269	Bayshore/Klatt	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
332	Bayshore/Klatt	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
359	Bayshore/Klatt	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
371	Bayshore/Klatt	Disagree	Yes	Bayshore/Klatt should be divided into 2 separate Community Councils	Align_the_district_with_areas_ s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
416	Bayshore/Klatt	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
277	Bear Valley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
300	Bear Valley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
349	Bear Valley	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
50	Birchwood	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
305	Birchwood	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
386	Birchwood	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
29	Campbell Park	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
59	Campbell Park	Neutral					Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
153	Campbell Park	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
185	Campbell Park	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
190	Campbell Park	Strongly disagree	Yes	The neighborhood on the south side of Tudor Road bounded by Elmore rd, Lake Otis Rd, and Campbell creek should be part of the UMed as this is the community all lands in this area serve. The development for the UMed area is also pushing onto the south side of Tudor. The Campbell Park community council does not characterize this area as well as the UMed community council does. I formally request the boundary for UMed be extended to this area.	Align_the_district_with_areas_ s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_ bounda,Maximize_opportunitie s_for_all_,Provide_representati on_for_all_		Too large		I am a non-resident owner of bo	Last year (in 2021)
198	Campbell Park	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
217	Campbell Park	Neutral	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
223	Campbell Park	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
280	Campbell Park	Neutral	Yes	West Campbell area should run New Seward, Tudor, Lake Otis, and Dowling. The folks of Campbell north of Lake Otis have little in common with the south of Lake Otis folks., and belong to a separate neighborhood.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large			Before last year
289	Campbell Park	Strongly agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
338	Campbell Park	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
354	Campbell Park	Neutral	Yes	I feel more like Tudor Area and Campbell Park should merge. Tudor meetings are dead compared to Campbell Creek.	Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	Tudor Area	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
387	Campbell Park	Strongly disagree	Yes	Recent redistricting has placed my State Representative and State Senator outside the area of the Council boundaries. An adjustment of the Community Council boundary to coincide with that of 20 and J would be appreciated.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
38	Chugiak	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
76	Chugiak	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
86	Chugiak	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
115	Chugiak	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
124	Chugiak	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
134	Chugiak	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
156	Chugiak	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
165	Chugiak	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
175	Chugiak	Strongly disagree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
245	Chugiak	Agree	Not sure or do not know			Community Councils serve a vital function in Anchorage, but since they started emailing notices, rather than snail mailing, most residents probably don't receive notification of the meetings.	In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
261	Chugiak	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
319	Chugiak	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
323	Chugiak	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
329	Chugiak	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
373	Chugiak	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
30	Downtown	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
80	Downtown	Agree	No				In an optimal size range			This year (in 2022)
121	Downtown	Strongly disagree	Yes	Extend East to Ingra South to 15th west to I street	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
150	Downtown	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I am a non-resident owner of bo	I have not attended a meeting
152	Downtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
270	Downtown	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
334	Downtown	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
83	Eagle River	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
184	Eagle River	Strongly disagree	Yes	JBER to Eklutna	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Provide_representation_for_a ll_		Too small	Eagle River Valley	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
257	Eagle River	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
258	Eagle River	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
259	Eagle River	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
260	Eagle River	Disagree	Yes	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley should be one	Provide_representation_for_all		Too small	Eagle River Valley	I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
262	Eagle River	Disagree	Not sure or do not know			I think the area around Eagle River High school and up by Walmart that appear to be in different districts should be together.	Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
263	Eagle River	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know			I have not attended a meeting
264	Eagle River	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
265	Eagle River	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
266	Eagle River	Disagree	Yes	Area that includes Lions Park, Parkview terrace, Gruening School, and the Max Center area need to be added to ERCC	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too small	Eagle River Valley	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
268	Eagle River	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
296	Eagle River	Neutral	Yes	My neighborhood is more aligned with the Eagle River Valley Community Council. I live in the Eagle Ridge Subdivision	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunitie s_for_all_,Provide_representati on_for_all_		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
352	Eagle River	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
375	Eagle River	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
377	Eagle River	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
399	Eagle River	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
409	Eagle River	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
21	Eagle River Valley	Strongly agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
84	Eagle River Valley	Disagree	Yes	The Eagle River Valley community should start from the intersection of Mile Hi AVE and Eagle River Road and east of there. West o9f that is Eagle River proper.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
95	Eagle River Valley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
143	Eagle River Valley	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
167	Eagle River Valley	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
170	Eagle River Valley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
200	Eagle River Valley	Neutral	Not sure or do not know			Our community council includes different kinds of residential areas, property types, and lot sizes. Some of the concerns for people up valley aren't necessarily the same as people closer to ER proper.	In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
256	Eagle River Valley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
293	Eagle River Valley	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
317	Eagle River Valley	Neutral	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
320	Eagle River Valley	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
327	Eagle River Valley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
350	Eagle River Valley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
369	Eagle River Valley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
380	Eagle River Valley	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
77	Fairview	Disagree	Yes	Gambell is a clear separation point that splits Fairview. The east side has the Senior Center and the Rec Center. It has sidewalks, traffic calming, and landscaping. While the west has the Sullivan and all the vagrancy issues that come with it. We have few sidewalks & essentially no traffic calming or landscaping. West side also has the Crazy Horse strip club. While it's not been an issue, I am just making a point. The difference between the two is very obvious from the ground.	Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	Midtown	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
97	Fairview	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
107	Fairview	Agree	Yes	The western boundary between 9th and 15th Aves should go to C Street as it is more of a natural boundary than the current boundary of Cordova Street. North of Memorial Park Cemetery, the western boundary of Cordova Street should continue until Ship Creek. On the east side, the Sitka Street boundary should continue south from Merrill Field until Chester Creek.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
119	Fairview	Agree	Yes	During the last redrawing, or maybe the time before we lost a section of west Fairview to South Addition that was a more natural fit into Fairview's geographic space. But whatever. Don't want to rock the boat. Just saying.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
279	Fairview	Neutral	Yes	North of 5th Ave should be part of another community council. Also potentially the area in-between A and C St, and 15th through Charles Smith Memorial Park. The area north of 5th is all commercial (to my knowledge) and I feel that whole commercial strip has more in common with itself than it does with the communities it crosses into. The square bounded by A, C, 15th, and the park are kind of geographically cut off from the rest of Fairview. I think that they have easier access by walking/driving into the South Addition Neighborhood than they do with Fairview.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
286	Fairview	Disagree	Yes	Currently, West Fairview is cut off from East Fairview by the Gambell Ingra couplet. Fairview west of Gambell is geographically more connected to south addition and downtown. Ideally, the Gambell Ingra couplet would be modified to be less of a blight on this community.	Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
412	Fairview	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
31	Girdwood_	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
411	Girdwood_	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
321	Government Hill	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
57	Hillside	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
65	Hillside	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
70	Hillside	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
164	Hillside	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
229	Hillside	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
246	Hillside	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
247	Hillside	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
282	Hillside	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
316	Hillside	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
366	Hillside	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
43	Huffman/O'Malley	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
58	Huffman/O'Malley	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
62	Huffman/O'Malley	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
73	Huffman/O'Malley	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
110	Huffman/O'Malley	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
130	Huffman/O'Malley	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
157	Huffman/O'Malley	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
166	Huffman/O'Malley	Disagree	Yes	Huffman/O'Malley should stop on the east at Elmore Road. Uphill from Elmore is a much different neighborhood than downhill from Elmore.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
192	Huffman/O'Malley	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
219	Huffman/O'Malley	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
255	Huffman/O'Malley	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
276	Huffman/O'Malley	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
389	Huffman/O'Malley	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
16	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of bo	This year (in 2022)
17	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of re	This year (in 2022)
18	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner or ag	This year (in 2022)
19	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner or ag	This year (in 2022)
20	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of bo	This year (in 2022)
56	Midtown	Strongly disagree	Yes	Midtown CC used to have its northern half part of North Star CC and the southern half part of Spenard CC. About 20 years ago, Assembly member and business owner Dan Coffey pushed to create the mid-town CC. Unfortunately, it has become a voice of only commercial property and business owners and not reflective or inclusive of the people who live there. When I was president of it, we spent time and effort talking with these neighboring CC's about taking us back, so we'd be part of a greater residential group. They were both willing. Our CC vote failed by 1 vote out of about 12 people in attendance, with all the residents voting for and all the business/commercial people voting against it. I even tried to get the business folks to form their own Chamber of Commerce, like the Spenard businesses have (or join theirs), but they weren't interested in developing their own organization. I was part of NECC for years and know how important one that represents all who live in the area is.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Provide_representation_f or_all_other	Have a critical mass of residents as well as businesses.	Too small	North Star	I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
101	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner or ag	This year (in 2022)
102	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of bo	This year (in 2022)
172	Midtown	Strongly disagree	Yes	The council is dominated by businesses and refuses to change to accommodate residents who actually live within the boundaries. Either carve out the neighborhoods of discipline the council making it a true community council.	other		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
239	Midtown	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
248	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner or ag	This year (in 2022)
249	Midtown	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner or ag	This year (in 2022)
341	Midtown	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
390	Midtown	Neutral	Yes	Go back to the original boundaries of Spenard and NorthStar CC's that incorporated midtown residential areas into these more residential council areas. The split was at 36th. We tried to get this passed some years ago, but the business owners all opposed it. We want a council with other active residents, not business owners who only have financial interests in the area and live elsewhere.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Too small	North Star	I live within the Community Cou	Before last year

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
136	Mountain View	Agree	Yes	The far west portion of the Mountain View Community Council border seems more aligned, purpose-wise, with the industrial area of the Government Hill Community Council with the Railroad area. Most of MVCC is primarily residential or retail.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
161	Mountain View	Agree	No				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
253	Mountain View	Agree	Yes	The commercial area on the western edge of the MVCC does not participate in the council, in my experience over the last 15 years. They are more strongly tied to the Downtown CC and the Fairview CC--they are close to the Fairview Rec Center. It would make more sense for the MVCC to end at Reeve Boulevard as its western-most boundary. Also, the area colloquially referred to as "South Mountain View" ought to be considered for incorporation into Mountain View, as it is more closely tied to Mountain View than Russian Jack Park's territory, which extends / incorporates the area of Boniface and Northern Lights. The South Mountain View area is roughly from Bragaw/Glenn south to Costco @ Debarr, then east to Pine St, then north back to the Glenn/McCarrey St. Lastly, the Muni ought to formally forward the MVCC's 2013 and 2022 formal resolutions to the Alaska Redistricting Board, requesting that Davis Park be included in the Mountain View House & Senate districts. This would help greatly.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaria,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of bo	This year (in 2022)
254	Mountain View	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
47	North Star	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
72	North Star	Disagree	Yes	Merge to North Star and Midtown.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_,other	What happen on North Fireweed impacts what happens on South Fireweed and vice vers	Too small	Midtown	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
85	North Star	Disagree	Yes	North Star Community Council is the smallest Community Council by area and also lacks the social cohesion and natural boundaries of larger council areas (Spenard, Mountain View etc). As a North Star resident, I wonder about the rationale for separating Fireweed to Chester Creek from other adjoining neighborhoods into its own entity. I would open up for discussion: 1) Expanding the southern boundary of North Star CC to Northern Lights to incorporate both sides of Fireweed Lane and surrounding business as we look toward a Fireweed Lane redesign. 2) Absorbing North Star CC into Spenard (West of Arctic) and Midtown (East of Arctic) CCs along the Romig/Central Middle School Boundary line.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too small		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
88	North Star	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
116	North Star	Strongly disagree	Yes	I attended a community council meeting and decided I would never to so again as the entire meeting was overtaken by an assembly member who acted as though this was the perfect opportunity to take over the meeting agenda. Very few people were able to get a word in as the topics shifted from one to the next. ALSO, this community council area (boundaries) are way too small when compared to appropriately sized other council areas. This council should be merged with a re-sized Spenard CC.	Use_clearly_identifiable_bound a,Maximize_opportunities_for_ all_,Provide_representation_fo r_all_	I cannot understand why this "way too small" community council has continued over the years. Others who should serve as managers to this process know this, but it continues.	Too small	Spenard	I am a non-resident owner of re	Before last year
125	North Star	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
414	North Star	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
14	Northeast	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
40	Northeast	Neutral	Yes	the Northeast Community Council is one of the largest in Anchorage if not the largest and should be broken into two councils	Align_the_district_with_areas_ s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_ bounda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
44	Northeast	Agree	Yes	NECC is the most population dense community council in Anchorage. NECC should be split to create two smaller community councils. This would give more representation to eastside voices.	Maximize_opportunities_for_al l_,Provide_representation_for_ all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
54	Northeast	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
90	Northeast	Neutral	Yes	HD 18 includes all of JBER and north anchorage, the small part of ne Muldoon does work for my residence with the NECC, but also encompasses four other community councils. It has become too disjointed and spread out for assembly, school board, and legislative members to attend meetings adequately.	Align_the_district_with_areas_ s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda,Maximize_opportunities_f or_all_,Provide_representation _for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
99	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	The West side of NECC should be considered as part of RJCC. Possibly west of Beaver.	Align_the_district_with_areas_ s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
114	Northeast	Strongly disagree	Yes	The NECC area is considerably diverse and has effectively left out people who live in "my" area of town; other areas of NECC would probably say the same thing. I have attended community council meetings but discovered easily that issues that concern me are of no interest to those living in other areas (and conversely). The community council boundaries must be redrawn. I do not attend NECC meetings conducted at a location at the very extreme opposite side of the general area.	Align_the_district_with_areas_ s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda,other	NECC officers are politically aligned in unison and away from my interests. Favor is shown to those on the side of the political spectrum that comports with the elected CC officers.	Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
122	Northeast	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
126	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	It feels like there's a natural separation from the Glen highway to Debarr, then Debarr to northern lights. Up to Boniface seems correct though.	Use_clearly_identifiable_bound a		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
133	Northeast	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
140	Northeast	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
158	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	Residents have been arguing about splitting NECC for years and the Board blocked an effort to create a new council covering Turpin to Boniface. Additionally a council for that area should include the area around RJSP	Align_the_district_with_areas_ s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_ bounda,Maximize_opportunitie s_for_all_,Provide_representati on_for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
160	Northeast	Strongly agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
186	Northeast	Strongly disagree	Yes	The boundaries need to be more closely aligned with the Assembly districts. The boundary should be Turpin, like the assembly district. The new North district consists of portions of 10 different community councils. It makes no sense.	Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Provide_representation_for_all_other	State above	Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
189	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	I live in Nunaka Valley Neighborhood and feel that we should be part of the Russian Jack community council, we are closer to them than we are to the other neighborhoods in the NorthEast I don't even know most of the community council members of Northeast but two people while I have met many of the Russian Jack Park community council members just doing volunteer work around our neighborhood or taking walks. So it feels like we are closer to them as community.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
202	Northeast	Neutral	No				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
212	Northeast	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
214	Northeast	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
233	Northeast	Strongly disagree	Yes		Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Provide_representation_for_all		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
235	Northeast	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
285	Northeast	Neutral	Yes	Too large for this area. It encompasses many different neighborhoods. Muldoon, Chester Valley, Nunaka Valley, Fox Hall, etc.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
308	Northeast	Neutral	Yes	Because of the large amount of officials required to attend our meeting at the NECC, along with other community council meetings that are scheduled for the same time, I propose combining HD 18 and HD 17 to create a new North Anchorage Community Council.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
333	Northeast	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
408	Northeast	Agree	No				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
418	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	Community Council Boundaries should better align with the Assembly district boundaries.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Provide_representation_for_all		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
39	Old Seward/Oceanview	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
45	Old Seward/Oceanview	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
137	Old Seward/Oceanview	Disagree	Yes	Oceanview east of Old Seward should be folded into the Huffman CC.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
138	Old Seward/Oceanview	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
241	Old Seward/Oceanview	Agree	Yes	Add the area of C Street on the West, O'Malley/Minnesota to the North, New Seward Highway to the East, and Klatt Road to the South to the Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council Boundary. When you look at the map, this small area seems naturally joins the OSOV CC area rather than the Bayshore area. Currently, the North boundary stops at Klatt Road. The North Boundary should include the area to O'Malley/Minnesota Drive as above.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
318	Old Seward/Oceanview	Disagree	Yes	extend to Minnesota / Omalley	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_Provide_representation_for_all		Too small	Bayshore/Klatt	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
360	Old Seward/Oceanview	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
361	Old Seward/Oceanview	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
391	Old Seward/Oceanview	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
410	Old Seward/Oceanview	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
422	Old Seward/Oceanview	Disagree	Yes	The area adjacent to the Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council area, currently contained within the Bayshore/Klatt CC, extends from C Street east to New Seward Highway and from Klatt Rd. north to O'Malley Rd. This area is demographically and geographically similar to the rest of the OSOVCC; residents shop in the same businesses (Huffman Center), go to the same schools. It is not separated from the rest of the CC by any major thoroughfare. Furthermore, this area does not seem to be as well connected to the bulk of Bayshore Klatt CC, given its separation by a maze of parkland, commercial development, and transportation corridors. I propose annexing this area into the OSOVCC.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_Provide_representation_for_all		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
34	Rabbit Creek	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
36	Rabbit Creek	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
42	Rabbit Creek	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
67	Rabbit Creek	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
91	Rabbit Creek	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
112	Rabbit Creek	Disagree	Yes	Upper hillside concerns align much more closely with Bear Valley area than mid-hillside and lower Potter marsh areas. Goldenview Drive north could merge into Bear Valley for example.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
174	Rabbit Creek	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
207	Rabbit Creek	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
220	Rabbit Creek	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
240	Rabbit Creek	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
252	Rabbit Creek	Strongly agree	No			This response is based on a discussion with the Rabbit Creek Community Council at their November 10th, 2022 meeting.	In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
278	Rabbit Creek	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
306	Rabbit Creek	Disagree	Yes	rabbit creek.	Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
312	Rabbit Creek	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
314	Rabbit Creek	Neutral	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
328	Rabbit Creek	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
362	Rabbit Creek	Neutral	Yes	Boundaries should be shrunk to the confines of the board members' own properties so they will stop trying to dictate what everyone else can do with their own land.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
12	Rogers Park	Strongly agree	Yes	Include additional neighborhoods to the south that are facing the same issues related to roadway widenings, interchange development, and homeless transitional housing.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_	Boundary could be expanded to include Tudor. It seems like many meeting topics focus more on what is happening in the Rogers Park School then what the community is facing from road projects, homeless, and other issues.	Too small	Tudor Area	I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
24	Rogers Park	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
27	Rogers Park	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
35	Rogers Park	Disagree	Yes	Rogers Park neighborhood is physically separated from the College Village neighborhood by a large road and intersections (Northern Lights Blvd and Benson Blvd). These neighborhoods are not cohesive. College Village is next to B-3 zoning, which has been a public issue over the past few years. Rogers Park neighborhood is next to other residential zones and open space/public land. The community council does little outreach to College Village and none to Stephens Apartments, which fall within the Rogers Park Community Council area. The opinions and values of Rogers Park neighborhood usually take priority over the other areas within the community council area, leaving little representation for the other neighborhoods.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
89	Rogers Park	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
106	Rogers Park	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
117	Rogers Park	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
132	Rogers Park	Agree	Yes	I live in Anchor Park. Since our current House legislative district changed, Airport Heights might be more appropriate than Rogers Park. Technically, Anchor Park was built at the same time and style as many airport heights homes. Yes, Chester Creek separates the neighborhoods. Either RPCC or AHCC is fine, our little corner neighborhood is 'the odd one out'. In general, community councils should be similar in size. For example, Northeast CC is significantly larger than most other community councils.	other	See above.	In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
183	Rogers Park	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
215	Rogers Park	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
232	Rogers Park	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
287	Rogers Park	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
326	Rogers Park	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
343	Rogers Park	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
344	Rogers Park	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
351	Rogers Park	Neutral	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
383	Rogers Park	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
385	Rogers Park	Neutral	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
392	Rogers Park	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
401	Rogers Park	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
407	Rogers Park	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
139	Russian Jack	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
149	Russian Jack	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
169	Russian Jack	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
310	Russian Jack	Neutral	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
353	Russian Jack	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
63	Sand Lake	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
108	Sand Lake	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too small		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
120	Sand Lake	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
123	Sand Lake	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
145	Sand Lake	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
151	Sand Lake	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
180	Sand Lake	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
201	Sand Lake	Strongly agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
236	Sand Lake	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
281	Sand Lake	Agree	No				Too small	Bayshore/Klatt	I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
292	Sand Lake	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
379	Sand Lake	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
405	Sand Lake	Disagree	No				Not sure or do not know			This year (in 2022)
22	Scenic Foothills	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too small	Basher	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
25	Scenic Foothills	Strongly agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
69	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
79	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
81	Scenic Foothills	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
82	Scenic Foothills	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
128	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
142	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
154	Scenic Foothills	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
194	Scenic Foothills	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
225	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
226	Scenic Foothills	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
271	Scenic Foothills	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
274	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
309	Scenic Foothills	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
311	Scenic Foothills	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
322	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
324	Scenic Foothills	Strongly agree	No				Too small		I am a non-resident owner or ag	This year (in 2022)
325	Scenic Foothills	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
339	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
363	Scenic Foothills	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
365	Scenic Foothills	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
367	Scenic Foothills	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
368	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Yes	Maybe extend to the west to Boniface. Our council area is quite small. Also consider extending to the north to include foxhall.	Maximize_opportunities_for_all_		Too small	Northeast	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
382	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
415	Scenic Foothills	Neutral	Yes	Our Scenic Foothills CC area is relatively small. It seems like possibly our area could be combined with the entire or parts of Northeast or University or Basher.....Possibly increase our area by expanding to Baxter Road	Maximize_opportunities_for_all_Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	University Area	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
417	Scenic Foothills	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
209	South Addition	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
230	South Addition	Agree	Yes	Include more of downtown - north of 9th Avenue; extend further east into residential areas.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
283	South Addition	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
335	South Addition	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
336	South Addition	Agree	Yes	previous boundary to the East was at C St, perhaps time to return to this	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
342	South Addition	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
358	South Addition	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
388	South Addition	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
394	South Addition	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
421	South Addition	Disagree	Yes	An analysis whether SACC boundaries should include lands north of the Park Strip (basically north of 9th in bootleggers cove) The development patterns are distinctly different, the economic relationships are more tied to downtown in that area. It would be good to study where the residents, property owners have more synergy to reach their goals. The natural boundary to the west is the Inlet and to the south is Chester Creek. Those boundaries would be worth a study to reaffirm and adjust as needed. The current east boundary is Cordova and a hodge-podge of zig zags that would worth a look for clarification.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
37	South Fork	Strongly disagree	Yes	South Fork CC's boundary should be changed to Eagle River Loop Road, and separate the Hiland Road community from the community that lives on the other side (along Wolf Drive). They are very different communities.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
404	South Fork	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
32	Spenard	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
46	Spenard	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
93	Spenard	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
94	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	It would make more sense to help the Spenard Community Council more closely match neighborhoods, for example put the rectangle north of Fireweed with the rest of the neighboring council. I'd also like to see the Spenard Community Council follow the new boundaries for the Assembly district and the state legislative districts if that works naturally. Right now some of those representatives have to hop to several meetings a month.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_,other	Allow our representatives to work with councils that more closely match their districts.	Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
100	Spenard	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of bo	This year (in 2022)
148	Spenard	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
163	Spenard	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
191	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	Spenard should extend east to the Highway, and if not that far then to C Street. The residential areas east of Arctic are not being represented by the Midtown CC area, but instead have common interests as Spenard including the mixture of commercial areas and busy roadways (Northern Lights, 36th, etc). The Spenard boundary to the west should be south of Northern Lights and East of Wisconsin St. Right now the Fish Creek Trail serves as the boundary, but the mixed residential area west of the creek called the "Spenardigan" area best aligns with Spenard's interests. Also, the Spenard Beach Park should be part of Spenard. These major roads serve as better boundaries than the current ones.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
199	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	The Midtown CC should be dissolved and divided between the surrounding community councils. There is no representation for the residents of the council, they hold their meetings in the middle of the day which assures that working people cannot attend, they haven't had a resident on their executive committee for years, they do no outreach to the residential community and the executive committee has been business owners/property owners that don't live within the boundaries. The meetings I attended had about 10 people there, mostly representatives from the Assembly, the Muni and some from agencies. There were only a couple of actual members there. I wasn't impressed and feel like they are just another Chamber of Commerce, only for Midtown.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community_councils,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Provide_representation_for_all		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
216	Spenard	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
222	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	The mid town community council is made up in part of previously Spenard Community Council area. The current board of the Midtown Community Council has its meeting at noon on a weekday ensuring residents can't come. The current board of MCC is not made up of residents, but business owners. Returning those residents and businesses to SCC would allow the residents to have a voice in their community council.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community_councils,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
251	Spenard	Agree	Yes	Include the northern area of Spenard Rd near Hilcrest Drive.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
273	Spenard	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know			Last year (in 2021)
291	Spenard	Agree	Yes				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
304	Spenard	Neutral	Yes		Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community_councils		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
356	Spenard	Neutral	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
419	Spenard	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
41	Taku Campbell	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
147	Taku Campbell	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
177	Taku Campbell	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
298	Taku Campbell	Disagree	Yes	The southern boundary should be moved north to end at Dimond Blvd.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
303	Taku Campbell	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
357	Taku Campbell	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too small	Abbott Loop	I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
53	Tudor Area	Disagree	Yes	I am currently in "Green Acres" on Young St. My area of Tudor Community Council should be moved to University Area. The Geneva Woods portion of our community council should be moved to Midtown or Rogers Park. I understand that we have a lot of political disagreements in our community council, but am disappointed that we have not been able to hold regular meetings lately. I am not volunteering, though!	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	University Area	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
96	Tudor Area	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range			Before last year
340	Tudor Area	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too small	Rogers Park	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
381	Tudor Area	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too small	University Area	I am a non-resident owner of re	This year (in 2022)
403	Tudor Area	Disagree	Yes	I live on Salem Dr. and I feel like Tudor should be a boundary line for our neighborhood and we should be combined with the Southern part of Roger's Park. The new council should be between Seward Highway and Lake Otis and Tudor and Northern Lights.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
61	Turnagain	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
71	Turnagain	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
74	Turnagain	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
75	Turnagain	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
87	Turnagain	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
98	Turnagain	Strongly agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
103	Turnagain	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
113	Turnagain	Neutral	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
141	Turnagain	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
155	Turnagain	Agree	No				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
159	Turnagain	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
162	Turnagain	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
179	Turnagain	Agree	No				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
182	Turnagain	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
203	Turnagain	Disagree	Yes	Combine Spenard and Turnagain community councils, no changes to existing boundaries.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_,other	Our 2040 land use plan calls for more mixed use development, let residential Turnagain and commercial Spenard start working together now. Spenard is the closest commercial area for Turnagain, both areas should work together in its redevelopment.	Too small	Spenard	I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
284	Turnagain	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
288	Turnagain	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
290	Turnagain	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
313	Turnagain	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
331	Turnagain	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
346	Turnagain	Strongly agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
347	Turnagain	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
348	Turnagain	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
384	Turnagain	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
395	Turnagain	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
396	Turnagain	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
397	Turnagain	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
398	Turnagain	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
413	Turnagain	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
168	Turnagain Arm	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
221	Turnagain Arm	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
224	Turnagain Arm	Agree	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
250	Turnagain Arm	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
295	Turnagain Arm	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
376	Turnagain Arm	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
23	University Area	Disagree	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
48	University Area	Neutral	Yes	Consider moving areas East of Boniface to Scenic Park CC.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
52	University Area	Agree	Yes	Let's include the area west of UAA - just like we include areas east and south of the U-Med district. I don't think university area needs to extend east of Boniface.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of re	This year (in 2022)
66	University Area	Strongly agree	Yes	Use Boniface as a boundary instead of Baxter.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
127	University Area	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
129	University Area	Neutral	No				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
146	University Area	Disagree					Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
171	University Area	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
173	University Area	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
188	University Area	Neutral	Not sure or do not know			Should align with elected official boundaries. Otherwise, too much overlap and not enough focus.	Not sure or do not know			This year (in 2022)
195	University Area	Strongly agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
213	University Area	Neutral	Yes	Should be more aligned with House Districts or Assembly Districts. UACC consists of two residential areas completely separated by a large PLI area. It feels very disjointed. The interests of the PLI land are very different from the interests of the residential neighborhoods.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
234	University Area	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
272	University Area	Agree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
275	University Area	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

Appendix A-1

Table 1.1: Survey Questionnaire Responses

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?
297	University Area	Strongly disagree	Yes	Boniface to Baxter should be included in Scenic Foothills CC. I live on Baxter and I feel like the issues that arise in the University CC are not as relevant as Scenic Foothills.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
299	University Area	Disagree	Yes	The eastern area running from ENL to Baxter Rd fits in more with the Northeast area demographics.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,other	University area CC is still holding nothing but zoom meetings. I do not like those	Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
301	University Area	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting
364	University Area	Agree	Not sure or do not know				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)
370	University Area	Disagree	Not sure or do not know			Eastern area has different profile from universities or hospitals	Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)
374	University Area	Disagree	Yes		Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year
400	University Area	Agree	Yes	The downside of being bounded as we are by Northern Light and Tudor means that we do not actually get all of the news affecting areas north or south of those respective roads. Extending the boundaries south to MLK could help solve this for some of the more pointed issues involving trails. Otherwise, UACC's seem quite good.	Align_the_district_with_comuni		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A-1

Table 1.2: Comments Received by Email and Phone

Email or Phone Comment No.	Community Council District	Comment Summary	Format Received	Date Received	Source	Letter Documentation
Comment No. 425	Northeast	Northeast Community Council district is far too large. Perhaps the Nunaka Valley Area should be switched to the Russian Jack Community Council, or even formed into their own council?	Email	11/4/2022	Forrest Dunbar	n/a
Comment No. 426	Turnagain	Turnagain Community Council (TCC) Executive Board is currently taking the position that it is satisfied with TCC's current boundaries, and is not requesting any boundary areas for review. TCC Executive Board recognizes that TCC shares a long boundary with Spenard, so it reached out to the SCC Executive Board, asked if SCC intends to put forward areas for study, and offered to hold a joint meeting to discuss further any areas that impact both our areas. The SCC Board indicated they also do not intend to put forward areas for study at this time.	Email and Letter	12/5/2022	TCC Executive Board	12/1/2022 Letter from TCC Executive Board
Comment No. 427	Spenard	Spenard Community Council (SCC) Executive Board is taking the position that the boundaries of SCC should be extended to return to the original boundaries of SCC as outlined in the Anchorage Municipal Charter (AMC). This opinion is based on factors that include historical realities, current representation, and maintaining the Spenard neighborhood's character and sense of community. As outlined in the AMC in 1975, the borders for the SCC were generally between Fish Creek/Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport to the west and the New Seward Highway to the east, and portions of Northern Lights Boulevard, Fireweed Lane, and 36th Avenue to the north and International Airport Road to the South. Boundary changes in 2003 redrew these boundaries to mark Arctic Boulevard as Spenard's Eastern border and created the Midtown Community Council (MCC). In 2016, the MCC moved their meeting time from 7:00pm to 12:00pm, creating a barrier to participation from most Midtown residents. The SCC passed resolution 2017-2-1 in February 2017 in support of adding a portion of the MCC to match the map included in the AMC with the remainder of the MCC becoming part of the North Star Community Council. This resolution was drafted after talks with members of all three councils, who reported that MCC was having difficulty getting a quorum on a regular basis and recognized that MCC and SCC had common character and interests.	Email and Letter	1/5/2023	SCC Executive Board	12/29/2022 Letter from SCC Executive Board
Comment No. 428	Eklutna Valley	Eklutna Valley Community Council is opposed to any changes to its boundaries.	Email	1/5/2023	Rick Sinnott	n/a
Comment No. 429	Rabbit Creek	Rabbit Creek Community Council raised the issue of whether any boundary changes are needed for our Community Council at its November 10th, 2022 meeting. RCCC does not believe there need to be any changes.	Email	1/10/2023	Ann Rappoport	n/a
Comment No. 430	Midtown	Midtown Community Council (MCC) Executive Board supports Midtown's existing boundaries, for the following reasons. Midtown is at the beginning stages of working in cooperation with the Municipality on a Midtown District Plan. MCC is currently working to identify as many businesses in its boundaries as possible, for providing outreach and information regarding MCC activities to businesses. The current MCC President has also conducted outreach to residents to inform them of MCC's existence and activities. MCC feels that continuity is important with respect to boundaries.	Email and Letter	1/13/2023	MCC Executive Board	1/13/2023 Letter from MCC Executive Board
Comment No. 431	Girdwood	The Assembly has recognized the Girdwood Board of Supervisors (GBOS) as the community council ex-officio for the Girdwood community council district. The boundaries of the GBOS service area is smaller than the boundaries of the community council district. This means that persons outside of the service area, who are part of the community council district, cannot vote for the community councils that represents them – GBOS. This is problematic and is counter to the intent of community councils to provide maximum citizen participation. The boundaries of the service area should match the boundaries of the community council district.	Email	2/17/2023	Darrel Hess	n/a
Comment No. 432	Midtown	With respect to Midtown: It is up to the members of a community council to determine when and where a council meets – the councils are voluntary, self-governing associations and are not part of local government. Trying to dictate to a community council when and where they should meet would be overreach on the part of the Municipality. If the membership is unhappy with the meeting time and place, they can vote to change the meeting time and place.	Email	2/17/2023	Darrel Hess	n/a

Appendix A-1

Table 1.2: Comments Received by Email and Phone

Email or Phone Comment No.	Community Council District	Comment Summary	Format Received	Date Received	Source	Letter Documentation
Comment No. 433	Portage Valley	Portage Valley Community Council has not submitted revised bylaws which are required by the code changes in 2014. The Municipality has communicated with multiple individuals over the years, who have stated that they were going to get the council up and running, but they have not. This community council district could be merged with an adjacent district or districts, or the Assembly could pull recognition and it would be up to the residents and property owners to petition to establish a new council. Failing to meet the meeting requirements in the code means they should no longer be recognized.	Email	2/17/2023	Darrel Hess	n/a
Comment No. 434	Tudor Area	With respect to Tudor Area: Failing to meet the meeting requirements in the code means a community council should no longer be recognized. If Tudor Area is not making the meeting requirements (at least once per calendar quarter), the district should be merged with an adjacent district or districts, or the Assembly should just pull their recognition, and it would be up to the residents, businesses, and property owners in the district to petition the form a new council.	Email	2/17/2023	Darrel Hess	n/a
Comment No. 435	Girdwood	The Community Councils Center has received calls over the past several years from people asking why Girdwood does not have its own community council. The GBOS is a governmental entity as a service district, and makes decisions as a government entity. This seems like a different function from a community council, which is independent and advises government entities. There are people in Girdwood who want to create a community council; if people get together and propose it, then Girdwood should have its own community council.	Phone conversation	2/21/2023	Mark Butler	n/a
Comment No. 436	Portage Valley	Portage Valley Community Council is nonexistent; it has not been an active organization for years.	Phone conversation	2/21/2023	Mark Butler	n/a
Comment No. 437	Tudor Area	Tudor Area has not been meeting regularly or making quorum. The acting chair has been willing in the past to merge with another council. Merging with Rogers Park seems like a natural fit.	Phone conversation	2/21/2023	Mark Butler	n/a
Comment No. 438	Girdwood	A community council for Glacier Valley should be created. This would include Girdwood and the existing Crow Creek neighborhood, essentially all of the residents in the larger Girdwood Valley. The current Girdwood Board of Supervisors represents only those within the town of Girdwood, but doesn't include Crow Creek. We believe that we as a community need our own community council.	Email	2/24/2023	Kellie Okonek	n/a
Comment No. 439	Girdwood	A community council for Glacier Valley should be created. This would include Girdwood and the existing Crow Creek neighborhood, essentially all of the residents in the larger Girdwood Valley. The current Girdwood Board of Supervisors represents only those within the town of Girdwood, but doesn't include Crow Creek. We believe that we as a community need our own community council.	Email	2/24/2023	Brooke Lavender	n/a
Comment No. 440	Girdwood	Consider having a community council for the area of Girdwood and Crow Creek as we do not have a Community Council at present. It might be called the Glacier Valley Community Council. Both of our communities reside in the Glacier Valley bowl.	Email	2/26/2023	Grace Pleasants	n/a

Introduction

Appendix A-2 selects the 122 questionnaire responses and email and telephone comments from Appendix A-1 (Tables 1.1 and 1.2) that expressed dissatisfaction with current boundaries or suggested boundary changes be considered, and groups these comments into *Boundary Study Areas*. The Planning Department staff assigned comments that addressed the same issue or geography together into groups.

A total of 38 Boundary Study Areas emerged from the public comments. These *Boundary Study Areas* in this Appendix A-2 are the basis for identifying the *Boundary Study Areas* evaluated for the *10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries* project, in the Public Hearing Draft *Report and Recommendations*.

For a summary list and description of the 38 Boundary Study Areas, refer to Appendix A-3. For documentation of all comments received, including comments expressing satisfaction with existing boundaries, refer to Appendix A-1.

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses...

Table 2.1 in this Appendix A-2 provides the 111 questionnaire response comments that expressed dissatisfaction with a current boundary or district area. These questionnaire responses are arranged in geographical order into 38 Boundary Study Areas starting in Chugiak-Eagle River, then Turnagain Arm, and then finally the Anchorage Bowl. Within each of these three regions of the Municipality, the Boundary Study Areas are arranged geographically from north to south.

For example, within the Anchorage Bowl, the first group of 15 questionnaire responses shown are for Boundary Study Area #6, in the Northeast Community Council district. The last questionnaire response shown is assigned to Boundary Study Area #38, in the Rabbit Creek Community Council district.

When a single questionnaire response or email raised more than one boundary issue (i.e., commented about more than one boundary area), then that same response or email appears more than once in this Appendix B. For example, questionnaire response ID 107 raised boundary issues regarding Sitka Street Park (Boundary Study Area #21), the area east of Cordova Street north of 6th Avenue (included in Boundary Study Area #22, and the neighborhood west of Cordova Street south of 10th Avenue (Boundary Study Area #23). Therefore, response ID 107 appears three times in the table—one time for each of its Boundary Study Areas.

The last six questionnaire responses shown in Table 2.1 are responses that staff was unable to assign to a Boundary Study Area. These six responses did not provide enough information for staff to be able to determine the issue or boundary segment of concern, and the respondents did not provide contact information for staff to be able to request clarification. These are documented as “Boundary Study Area #39” in the Public Hearing Draft *Report and Recommendations*.

Each questionnaire response comment occupies a full row in Table 2.1:

- The first column is the questionnaire response identification number, which was automatically assigned by the Survey 1-2-3 software application (the same ID as in Table 1.1 of Appendix A-1).
- The next 10 columns provide the responses to the 10 questions in the survey questionnaire, arranged in the order these questions appeared in the survey (the same info as in Appendix A-1).
- **The last two columns on the right-hand side assign the response into a Boundary Study Area, including the name and number of the Boundary Study Area.**

Table 2.2: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Comments by Email or Phone...

Table 2.2 provides the 16 comments received by email or phone that expressed dissatisfaction with a current boundary or district. Like the questionnaire responses in Table 2.1, the comments on page 15 are arranged in order of the Boundary Study Areas to which they were assigned, starting in Turnagain Arm and ending in the Anchorage Bowl. (There were no email comments that expressed dissatisfaction with boundaries in Chugiak-Eagle River.)

Each email or phone comment on page 15 occupies a full row in Table 2.2:

- The first column is a unique identification number for the comment, which is assigned in Appendix A-1 (Table 1.2).
- The second column is the name of the community council that is the subject of the comment.
- The third column is a summary of the comment made, which staff edited for length and clarity (the same info as in Appendix A-1).
- The next four columns are information about the source of the comment (same as in Appendix A-1).
- **The last two columns on the right side provide the assignment of the comment into a Boundary Study Area, including the name and number of the Boundary Study Area.**

Index of Community Councils and their Boundary Study Areas

The summary table on the next page provides an index of all community council districts in the Municipality, with a cross reference from each community council to the Boundary Study Areas and associated comments in this Appendix A-2 that may affect or involve that community council.

Community Council District Name	Boundary Study Areas that May Affect the Community Council	Reference to the Public Comments that Formed the Basis for the Boundary Study Area (by page # in this Appendix A-2)
Abbott Loop	#33	Page 38
Airport Heights	#15, #16, #17, #18, #21	Pages 31-33
Basher	#9	Page 28
Bayshore/Klatt	#33, #34, #35	Page 38-39
Bear Valley	#38	Page 39
Birchwood	none	--
Campbell Park	#12, #13	Pages 29-30
Chugiak	#1	Page 25
Downtown	#19, #22, #25	Pages 32-34
Eagle River	#2, #3	Page 25-26
Eagle River Valley	#2	Page 25
Eklutna Valley	none	--
Fairview	#14, #19, #20, #21, #22, #23, #24	Pages 30-34
Girdwood	#4, #5	Page 41
Glen Alps	none	--
Government Hill	#14	Page 30-31
Hillside	#37	Page 39
Huffman/O'Malley	#36, #37	Page 39
Midtown	#26, #28, #29	Pages 34-37, 42
Mountain View	#14, #15, #19	Pages 30-32
North Star	#26, #27, #28, #29	Pages 34-37
Northeast	#6, #7	Pages 26-27, 41
Old Seward/Oceanview	#33, #34, #35, #36	Page 38-39
Portage Valley	#5	Page 41
Rabbit Creek	#38	Page 39
Rogers Park	#11, #12, #16, #17, #18	Pages 29-30, 32
Russian Jack	#6, #15	Pages 26-27, 31
Sand Lake	none	--
Scenic Foothills	#6, #7, #8, #9	Pages 26-28
South Addition	#22, #23, #24, #25	Pages 33-34
South Fork	#3	Page 25-26
Spenard	#26, #27, #28, #29, #30, #31, #32	Pages 34-38
Taku Campbell	#33	Page 38
Tudor Area	#11, #12	Pages 29-30, 42
Turnagain	#30, #31, #32	Page 37-38
Turnagain Arm	#4, #5	Page 41
University Area	#8, #9, #10, #12, #13	Pages 27-30

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response ID Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
261	Chugiak	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Chugiak	1
260	Eagle River	Disagree	Yes	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley should be one	Provide_representation_for_all		Too small	Eagle River Valley	I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
262	Eagle River	Disagree	Not sure or do not know			I think the area around Eagle River High school and up by Walmart that appear to be in different districts should be together.	Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
184	Eagle River	Strongly disagree	Yes	JBER to Eklutna	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Provide_representation_for_all		Too small	Eagle River Valley	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
84	Eagle River Valley	Disagree	Yes	The Eagle River Valley community should start from the intersection of Mile Hi AVE and Eagle River Road and east of there. West of that is Eagle River proper.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_communi		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
257	Eagle River	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
268	Eagle River	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
409	Eagle River	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
200	Eagle River Valley	Neutral	Not sure or do not know			Our community council includes different kinds of residential areas, property types, and lot sizes. Some of the concerns for people up valley aren't necessarily the same as people closer to ER proper.	In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
266	Eagle River	Disagree	Yes	Area that includes Lions Park, Parkview terrace, Gruening School, and the Max Center area need to be added to ERCC	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too small	Eagle River Valley	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
296	Eagle River	Neutral	Yes	My neighborhood is more aligned with the Eagle River Valley Community Council. I live in the Eagle Ridge Subdivision	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_communi,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Eagle River and Eagle River Valley	2
37	South Fork	Strongly disagree	Yes	South Fork CC's boundary should be changed to Eagle River Loop Road, and separate the Hiland Road community from the community that lives on the other side (along Wolf Drive). They are very different communities.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_communi,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	North of Eagle River Loop Road to Eagle River	3

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response ID Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
262	Eagle River	Disagree	Not sure or do not know				Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	North of Eagle River Loop Road to Eagle River	3
40	Northeast	Neutral	Yes	the Northeast Community Council is one of the largest in Anchorage if not the largest and should be broken into two councils	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
44	Northeast	Agree	Yes	NECC is the most population dense community council in Anchorage. NECC should be split to create two smaller community councils. This would give more representation to eastside voices.	Maximize_opportunities_for_all_l,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
90	Northeast	Neutral	Yes	HD 18 includes all of JBER and north anchorage, the small part of ne Muldoon does work for my residence with the NECC, but also encompasses four other community councils. It has become too disjointed and spread out for assembly, school board, and legislative members to attend meetings adequately.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda,Maximize_opportunities_f or_all,Provide_representation _for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
99	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	The West side of NECC should be considered as part of RJCC. Possibly west of Beaver.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
114	Northeast	Strongly disagree	Yes	The NECC area is considerably diverse and has effectively left out people who live in "my" area of town; other areas of NECC would probably say the same thing. I have attended community council meetings but discovered easily that issues that concern me are of no interest to those living in other areas (and conversely). The community council boundaries must be redrawn. I do not attend NECC meetings conducted at a location at the very extreme opposite side of the general area.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda,other	NECC officers are politically aligned in unison and away from my interests. Favor is shown to those on the side of the political spectrum that comports with the elected CC officers.	Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
126	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	It feels like there's a natural separation from the Glen highway to Debarr, then Debarr to northern lights. Up to Boniface seems correct though.	Use_clearly_identifiable_bound a		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
158	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	Residents have been arguing about splitting NECC for years and the Board blocked an effort to create a new council covering Turpin to Boniface. Additionally a council for that area should include the area around RJSP	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunitie s_for_all,Provide_representati on_for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
186	Northeast	Strongly disagree	Yes	The boundaries need to be more closely aligned with the Assembly districts. The boundary should be Turpin, like the assembly district. The new North district consists of portions of 10 different community councils. It makes no sense.	Use_clearly_identifiable_bound a,Provide_representation_for_ all_other	State above	Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
189	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	I live in Nunaka Valley Neighborhood and feel that we should be part of the Russian Jack community council, we are closer to them than we are to the other neighborhoods in the NorthEast I don't even know most of the community council members of Northeast but two people while I have met many of the Russian Jack Park community council members just doing volunteer work around our neighborhood or taking walks. So it feels like we are closer to them as community.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Northeast	6
233	Northeast	Strongly disagree	Yes		Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Provide_representation_f or_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Northeast	6
235	Northeast	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	Northeast	6
285	Northeast	Neutral	Yes	Too large for this area. It encompasses many different neighborhoods. Muldoon, Chester Valley, Nunaka Valley, Fox Hall, etc.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda,Maximize_opportunities_f or_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	Northeast	6
308	Northeast	Neutral	Yes	Because of the large amount of officials required to attend our meeting at the NECC, along with other community council meetings that are scheduled for the same time, I propose combining HD 18 and HD 17 to create a new North Anchorage Community Council.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
408	Northeast	Agree	No				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
418	Northeast	Disagree	Yes	Community Council Boundaries should better align with the Assembly district boundaries.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Provide_representation_for_a ll_		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northeast	6
368	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Yes	Maybe extend to the west to Boniface. Our council area is quite small. Also consider extending to the north to include foxhall.	Maximize_opportunities_for_al l_		Too small	Northeast	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	North of E. Northern Lights Boulevard to Foxhall Drive	7
415	Scenic Foothills	Neutral	Yes	Our Scenic Foothills CC area is relatively small. It seems like possibly our area could be combined with the entire or parts of Northeast or University or Basher....Possibly increase our area by expanding to Baxter Road	Maximize_opportunities_for_al l_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	University Area	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8
48	University Area	Neutral	Yes	Consider moving areas East of Boniface to Scenic Park CC.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8
52	University Area	Agree	Yes	Let's include the area west of UAA - just like we include areas east and south of the U-Med district. I don't think university area needs to extend east of Boniface.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of re	This year (in 2022)	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8
66	University Area	Strongly agree	Yes	Use Boniface as a boundary instead of Baxter.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response ID Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
297	University Area	Strongly disagree	Yes	Boniface to Baxter should be included in Scenic Foothills CC. I live on Baxter and I feel like the issues that arise in the University CC are not as relevant as Scenic Foothills.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8
299	University Area	Disagree	Yes	The eastern area running from ENL to Baxter Rd fits in more with the Northeast area demographics.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,other	University area CC is still holding nothing but zoom meetings. I do not like those	Too large		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8
370	University Area	Disagree	Not sure or do not know			Eastern area has different profile from universities or hospitals	Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8
368	Scenic Foothills	Agree	Yes	Maybe extend to the west to Boniface. Our council area is quite small. Also consider extending to the north to include foxhall.	Maximize_opportunities_for_all_		Too small	Northeast	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8
146	University Area	Disagree					Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	8
22	Scenic Foothills	Neutral	Not sure or do not know				Too small	Basher	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Scenic Foothills	9
415	Scenic Foothills	Neutral	Yes	Our Scenic Foothills CC area is relatively small. It seems like possibly our area could be combined with the entire or parts of Northeast or University or Basher....Possibly increase our area by expanding to Baxter Road	Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	University Area	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Scenic Foothills	9
23	University Area	Disagree	Not sure or do not know				Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	University Area	10
188	University Area	Neutral	Not sure or do not know			Should align with elected official boundaries. Otherwise, too much overlap and not enough focus.	Not sure or do not know			This year (in 2022)	University Area	10
213	University Area	Neutral	Yes	Should be more aligned with House Districts or Assembly Districts. UACC consists of two residential areas completely separated by a large PLI area. It feels very disjointed. The interests of the PLI land are very different from the interests of the residential neighborhoods.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	University Area	10

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
35	Rogers Park	Disagree	Yes	Rogers Park neighborhood is physically separated from the College Village neighborhood by a large road and intersections (Northern Lights Blvd and Benson Blvd). These neighborhoods are not cohesive. College Village is next to B-3 zoning, which has been a public issue over the past few years. Rogers Park neighborhood is next to other residential zones and open space/public land. The community council does little outreach to College Village and none to Stephens Apartments, which fall within the Rogers Park Community Council area. The opinions and values of Rogers Park neighborhood usually take priority over the other areas within the community council area, leaving little representation for the other neighborhoods.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	College Village	11
354	Campbell Park	Neutral	Yes	I feel more like Tudor Area and Campbell Park should merge. Tudor meetings are dead compared to Campbell Creek.	Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	Tudor Area	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Tudor Area	12
12	Rogers Park	Strongly agree	Yes	Include additional neighborhoods to the south that are facing the same issues related to roadway widenings, interchange development, and homeless transitional housing.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_	Boundary could be expanded to include Tudor. It seems like many meeting topics focus more on what is happening in the Rogers Park School then what the community is facing from road projects, homeless, and other issues.	Too small	Tudor Area	I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	Tudor Area	12
53	Tudor Area	Disagree	Yes	I am currently in "Green Acres" on Young St. My area of Tudor Community Council should be moved to University Area. The Geneva Woods portion of our community council should be moved to Midtown or Rogers Park. I understand that we have a lot of political disagreements in our community council, but am disappointed that we have not been able to hold regular meetings lately. I am not volunteering, though!	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	University Area	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Tudor Area	12
340	Tudor Area	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too small	Rogers Park	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Tudor Area	12
381	Tudor Area	Agree	Not sure or do not know				Too small	University Area	I am a non-resident owner of re	This year (in 2022)	Tudor Area	12

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response ID Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
403	Tudor Area	Disagree	Yes	I live on Salem Dr. and I feel like Tudor should be a boundary line for our neighborhood and we should be combined with the Southern part of Roger's Park. The new council should be between Seward Highway and Lake Otis and Tudor and Northern Lights.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Council	Before last year	Tudor Area	12
52	University Area	Agree	Yes	Let's include the area west of UAA - just like we include areas east and south of the U-Med district. I don't think university area needs to extend east of Boniface.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of re	This year (in 2022)	Tudor Area	12
190	Campbell Park	Strongly disagree	Yes	The neighborhood on the south side of Tudor Road bounded by Elmore rd, Lake Otis Rd, and Campbell creek should be part of the UMed as this is the community all lands in this area serve. The development for the UMed area is also pushing onto the south side of Tudor. The Campbell Park community council does not characterize this area as well as the UMed community council does. I formally request the boundary for UMed be extended to this area.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_community,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Too large		I am a non-resident owner of bo	Last year (in 2021)	South of Tudor Road and East of Lake Otis Parkway	13
280	Campbell Park	Neutral	Yes	West Campbell area should run New Seward, Tudor, Lake Otis, and Dowling. The folks of Campbell north of Lake Otis have little in common with the south of Lake Otis folks., and belong to a separate neighborhood.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large			Before last year	South of Tudor Road and East of Lake Otis Parkway	13
400	University Area	Agree	Yes	The downside of being bounded as we are by Northern Light and Tudor means that we do not actually get all of the news affecting areas north or south of those respective roads. Extending the boundaries south to MLK could help solve this for some of the more pointed issues involving trails. Otherwise, UACC's seem quite good.	Align_the_district_with_community		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Council	This year (in 2022)	South of Tudor Road and East of Lake Otis Parkway	13
387	Campbell Park	Strongly disagree	Yes	Recent redistricting has placed my State Representative and State Senator outside the area of the Council boundaries. An adjustment of the Community Council boundary to coincide with that of 20 and J would be appreciated.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_boundaries		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Council	This year (in 2022)	South of Tudor Road and East of Lake Otis Parkway	13
136	Mountain View	Agree	Yes	The far west portion of the Mountain View Community Council border seems more aligned, purpose-wise, with the industrial area of the Government Hill Community Council with the Railroad area. Most of MVCC is primarily residential or retail.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Council	This year (in 2022)	West of Reeve Blvd	14

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
253	Mountain View	Agree	Yes	<p>The commercial area on the western edge of the MVCC does not participate in the council, in my experience over the last 15 years. They are more strongly tied to the Downtown CC and the Fairview CC--they are close to the Fairview Rec Center. It would make more sense for the MVCC to end at Reeve Boulevard as its western-most boundary.</p> <p>Also, the area colloquially referred to as "South Mountain View" ought to be considered for incorporation into Mountain View, as it is more closely tied to Mountain View than Russian Jack Park's territory, which extends / incorporates the area of Boniface and Northern Lights. The South Mountain View area is roughly from Bragaw/Glenn south to Costco @ DeBarr, then east to Pine St, then north back to the Glenn/McCarrey St.</p> <p>Lastly, the Muni ought to formally forward the MVCC's 2013 and 2022 formal resolutions to the Alaska Redistricting Board, requesting that Davis Park be included in the Mountain View House & Senate districts. This would help greatly.</p>	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		In an optimal size range		I am a non-resident owner of bo	This year (in 2022)	West of Reeve Blvd	14
104	Airport Heights	Disagree	Yes	Move Penland Park to Mountain View	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)	Penland Park and Brighton Park	15
181	Airport Heights	Strongly agree	Yes	The residential complex at corner of Glenn Hwy and Bragaw on west side may need to go to Mt. View.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Penland Park and Brighton Park	15
206	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	West side of Lake Otis as part of Roger's Park. North of DeBarr as part of MountainView.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Penland Park and Brighton Park	15
49	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	The Anchor Park neighborhood south of Chester Creek seems like it might be more appropriate as part of the Airport Heights CC .	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Anchor Park	16
205	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	Move residences east of lake Otis,and north of northern lights from Rogers park to airport heights	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Anchor Park	16
372	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	Home on the North East corner of lake Otis / Northern Lights should be added. 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis(one house, many lots, should be added.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Anchor Park	16

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
132	Rogers Park	Agree	Yes	I live in Anchor Park. Since our current House legislative district changed, Airport Heights might be more appropriate than Rogers Park. Technically, Anchor Park was built at the same time and style as many airport heights homes. Yes, Chester Creek separates the neighborhoods. Either RPCC or AHCC is fine, our little corner neighborhood is 'the odd one out'. In general, community councils should be similar in size. For example, Northeast CC is significantly larger than most other community councils.	other	See above.	In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Anchor Park	16
206	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	West side of Lake Otis as part of Roger's Park. North of DeBarr as part of MountainView.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Eastridge	17
372	Airport Heights	Agree	Yes	Home on the North East corner of lake Otis / Northern Lights should be added. 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis(one house, many lots, should be added.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	24th Avenue West of Lake Otis	18
279	Fairview	Neutral	Yes	North of 5th Ave should be part of another community council. Also potentially the area in-between A and C St, and 15th through Charles Smith Memorial Park. The area north of 5th is all commercial (to my knowledge) and I feel that whole commercial strip has more in common with itself then it does with the communities it crosses into. The square bounded by A, C, 15th, and the park are kind of geographically cut off from the rest of Fairview. I think that they have easier access by walking/driving into the South Addition Neighborhood then the do with Fairview.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Fairview North of 5th Avenue	19
77	Fairview	Disagree	Yes	Gambell is a clear separation point that splits Fairview. The east side has the Senior Center and the Rec Center. It has sidewalks, traffic calming, and landscaping. While the west has the Sullivan and all the vagrancy issues that come with it. We have few sidewalks & essentially no traffic calming or landscaping. West side also has the Crazy Horse strip club. While it's not been an issue, I am just making a point. The difference between the two is very obvious from the ground.	Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	Midtown	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Fairview East and West of Gambell-Ingra Corridor	20
286	Fairview	Disagree	Yes	Currently, West Fairview is cut off from East Fairview by the Gambell Ingra couplet. Fairview west of Gambell is geographically more connected to south addition and downtown. Ideally, the Gambell Ingra couplet would be modified to be less of a blight on this community.	Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Fairview East and West of Gambell-Ingra Corridor	20

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response ID Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
107	Fairview	Agree	Yes	The western boundary between 9th and 15th Aves should go to C Street as it is more of a natural boundary than the current boundary of Cordova Street. North of Memorial Park Cemetery, the western boundary of Cordova Street should continue until Ship Creek. On the east side, the Sitka Street boundary should continue south from Merrill Field until Chester Creek.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Sitka Street Park	21
121	Downtown	Strongly disagree	Yes	Extend East to Ingra South to 15th west to I street	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	North of 15th Avenue between Ingra and I Streets	22
107	Fairview	Agree	Yes	The western boundary between 9th and 15th Aves should go to C Street as it is more of a natural boundary than the current boundary of Cordova Street. North of Memorial Park Cemetery, the western boundary of Cordova Street should continue until Ship Creek. On the east side, the Sitka Street boundary should continue south from Merrill Field until Chester Creek.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	North of 15th Avenue between Ingra and I Streets	22
119	Fairview	Agree	Yes	During the last redrawing , or maybe the time before we lost a section of west Fairview to South Addition that was a more natural fit into Fairview's geographic space. But whatever. Don't want to rock the boat. Just saying.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)	West of Cordova Street from 9th to 15th Avenue	23
336	South Addition	Agree	Yes	previous boundary to the East was at C St, perhaps time to return to this	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	West of Cordova Street from 9th to 15th Avenue	23
421	South Addition	Disagree	Yes	An analysis whether SACC boundaries should include lands north of the Park Strip (basically north of 9th in bootleggers cove) The development patterns are distinctly different, the economic relationships are more tied to downtown in that area. It would be good to study where the residents, property owners have more synergy to reach their goals. The natural boundary to the west is the Inlet and to the south is Chester Creek. Those boundaries would be worth a study to reaffirm and adjust as needed. The current east boundary is Cordova and a hodge-podge of zig zags that would worth a look for clarification.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bou nda,Provide_representation_fo r_all_		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	West of Cordova Street from 9th to 15th Avenue	23

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
107	Fairview	Agree	Yes	The western boundary between 9th and 15th Aves should go to C Street as it is more of a natural boundary than the current boundary of Cordova Street. North of Memorial Park Cemetery, the western boundary of Cordova Street should continue until Ship Creek. On the east side, the Sitka Street boundary should continue south from Merrill Field until Chester Creek.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	West of Cordova Street from 9th to 15th Avenue	23
279	Fairview	Neutral	Yes	North of 5th Ave should be part of another community council. Also potentially the area in-between A and C St, and 15th through Charles Smith Memorial Park. The area north of 5th is all commercial (to my knowledge) and I feel that whole commercial strip has more in common with itself then it does with the communities it crosses into. The square bounded by A, C, 15th, and the park are kind of geographically cut off from the rest of Fairview. I think that they have easier access by walking/driving into the South Addition Neighborhood then the do with Fairview.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	A and C Street Corridor South of 15th Avenue	24
230	South Addition	Agree	Yes	Include more of downtown - north of 9th Avenue; extend further east into residential areas.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	Northwest of 9th Avenue and L Street	25
421	South Addition	Disagree	Yes	An analysis whether SACC boundaries should include lands north of the Park Strip (basically north of 9th in bootleggers cove) The development patterns are distinctly different, the economic relationships are more tied to downtown in that area. It would be good to study where the residents, property owners have more synergy to reach their goals. The natural boundary to the west is the Inlet and to the south is Chester Creek. Those boundaries would be worth a study to reaffirm and adjust as needed. The current east boundary is Cordova and a hodge-podge of zig zags that would worth a look for clarification.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Northwest of 9th Avenue and L Street	25
72	North Star	Disagree	Yes	Merge to North Star and Midtown.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_,other	What happen on North Fireweed impacts what happens on South Fireweed and vice vers	Too small	Midtown	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	North Star	26

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
85	North Star	Disagree	Yes	North Star Community Council is the smallest Community Council by area and also lacks the social cohesion and natural boundaries of larger council areas (Spenard, Mountain View etc). As a North Star resident, I wonder about the rationale for separating Fireweed to Chester Creek from other adjoining neighborhoods into its own entity. I would open up for discussion: 1) Expanding the southern boundary of North Star CC to Northern Lights to incorporate both sides of Fireweed Lane and surrounding business as we look toward a Fireweed Lane redesign. 2) Absorbing North Star CC into Spenard (West of Arctic) and Midtown (East of Arctic) CCs along the Romig/Central Middle School Boundary line.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too small		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	North Star	26
116	North Star	Strongly disagree	Yes	I attended a community council meeting and decided I would never to so again as the entire meeting was overtaken by an assembly member who acted as though this was the perfect opportunity to take over the meeting agenda. Very few people were able to get a word in as the topics shifted from one to the next. ALSO, this community council area (boundaries) are way too small when compared to appropriately sized other council areas. This council should be merged with a re-sized Spenard CC.	Use_clearly_identifiable_bound_a,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_Provide_representation_for_all_	I cannot understand why this "way too small" community council has continued over the years. Others who should serve as managers to this process know this, but it continues.	Too small	Spenard	I am a non-resident owner of re	Before last year	North Star	26
251	Spenard	Agree	Yes	Include the northern area of Spenard Rd near Hillcrest Drive.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Romig Park near Hillcrest Drive	27

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response ID Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
56	Midtown	Strongly disagree	Yes	Midtown CC used to have its northern half part of North Star CC and the southern half part of Spenard CC. About 20 years ago, Assembly member and business owner Dan Coffey pushed to create the mid-town CC. Unfortunately, it has become a voice of only commercial property and business owners and not reflective or inclusive of the people who live there. When I was president of it, we spent time and effort talking with these neighboring CC's about taking us back, so we'd be part of a greater residential group. They were both willing. Our CC vote failed by 1 vote out of about 12 people in attendance, with all the residents voting for and all the business/commercial people voting against it. I even tried to get the business folks to form their own Chamber of Commerce, like the Spenard businesses have (or join theirs), but they weren't interested in developing their own organization. I was part of NECC for years and know how important one that represents all who live in the area is.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Provide_representation_for_all_other	Have a critical mass of residents as well as businesses.	Too small	North Star	I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	Midtown	28
172	Midtown	Strongly disagree	Yes	The council is dominated by businesses and refuses to change to accomodate residents who actually live within yhe boundaries. Either carve out the neighborhoods of discipline the council making it a true community council.	other		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Midtown	28
390	Midtown	Neutral	Yes	Go back to the original boundaries of Spenard and NorthStar CC's that incorporated midtown residential areas into these more residential council areas. The split was at 36th. We tried to get this passed some years ago, but the business owners all opposed it. We want a council with other active residents, not business owners who only have financial interests in the area and live elsewhere.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Too small	North Star	I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	Midtown	28
191	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	Spenard should extend east to the Highway, and if not that far then to C Street. The residential areas east of Arctic are not being represented by the Midtown CC area, but instead have common interests as Spenard including the mixture of commercial areas and busy roadways (Northern Lights, 36th, etc). The Spenard boundary to the west should be south of Northern Lights and East of Wisconsin St. Right now the Fish Creek Trail serves as the boundary, but the mixed residential area west of the creek called the "Spenardigan" area best aligns with Spenard's interests. Also, the Spenard Beach Park should be part of Spenard. These major roads serve as better boundaries than the current ones.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Midtown	28

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
199	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	The Midtown CC should be dissolved and divided between the surrounding community councils. There is no representation for the residents of the council, they hold their meetings in the middle of the day which assures that working people cannot attend, they haven't had a resident on their executive committee for years, they do no outreach to the residential community and the executive committee has been business owners/property owners that don't live within the boundaries. The meetings I attended had about 10 people there, mostly representatives from the Assembly, the Muni and some from agencies. There were only a couple of actual members there. I wasn't impressed and feel like they are just another Chamber of Commerce, only for Midtown.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com_muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Midtown	28
222	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	The mid town community council is made up in part of previously Spenard Community Council area. The current board of the Midtown Community Council has its meeting at noon on a weekday ensuring residents can't come. The current board of MCC is not made up of residents, but business owners. Returning those residents and businesses to SCC would allow the residents to have a voice in their community council.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com_muni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Midtown	28
94	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	It would make more sense to help the Spenard Community Council more closely match neighborhoods, for example put the rectangle north of Fireweed with the rest of the neighboring council. I'd also like to see the Spenard Community Council follow the new boundaries for the Assembly district and the state legislative districts if that works naturally. Right now some of those representatives have to hop to several meetings a month.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_f or_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_,other	Allow our representatives to work with councils that more closely match their districts.	Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Spenard	29
203	Turnagain	Disagree	Yes	Combine Spenard and Turnagain community councils, no changes to existing boundaries.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com_muni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_,other	Our 2040 land use plan calls for more mixed use development, let residential Turnagain and commercial Spenard start working together now. Spenard is the closest commercial area for Turnagain, both areas should work together in its redevelopment.	Too small	Spenard	I live within the Community Cou	I have not attended a meeting	Turnagain	30

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
191	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	<p>Spenard should extend east to the Highway, and if not that far then to C Street. The residential areas east of Arctic are not being represented by the Midtown CC area, but instead have common interests as Spenard including the mixture of commercial areas and busy roadways (Northern Lights, 36th, etc).</p> <p>The Spenard boundary to the west should be south of Northern Lights and East of Wisconsin St. Right now the Fish Creek Trail serves as the boundary, but the mixed residential area west of the creek called the "Spenardigan" area best aligns with Spenard's interests. Also, the Spenard Beach Park should be part of Spenard.</p> <p>These major roads serve as better boundaries than the current ones.</p>	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	West of Fish Creek to Wisconsin Street	31
191	Spenard	Disagree	Yes	<p>Spenard should extend east to the Highway, and if not that far then to C Street. The residential areas east of Arctic are not being represented by the Midtown CC area, but instead have common interests as Spenard including the mixture of commercial areas and busy roadways (Northern Lights, 36th, etc).</p> <p>The Spenard boundary to the west should be south of Northern Lights and East of Wisconsin St. Right now the Fish Creek Trail serves as the boundary, but the mixed residential area west of the creek called the "Spenardigan" area best aligns with Spenard's interests. Also, the Spenard Beach Park should be part of Spenard.</p> <p>These major roads serve as better boundaries than the current ones.</p>	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Spenard Beach Park	32
298	Taku Campbell	Disagree	Yes	The southern boundary should be moved north to end at Dimond Blvd.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Use_clearly_identifiable_bounda,Maximize_opportunities_for_all		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	South of Dimond Boulevard to 92nd Avenue	33
371	Bayshore/Klatt	Disagree	Yes	Bayshore/Klatt should be divided into 2 separate Community Councils	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Bayshore/Klatt	34

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response ID Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
241	Old Seward/Oceanview	Agree	Yes	Add the area of C Street on the West, O'Malley/Minnesota to the North, New Seward Highway to the East, and Klatt Road to the South to the Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council Boundary. When you look at the map, this small area seems naturally joins the OSOV CC area rather than the Bayshore area. Currently, the North boundary stops at Klatt Road. The North Boundary should include the area to O'Malley/Minnesota Drive as above.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	South of O'Malley Road to Klatt Road, East of C Street	35
318	Old Seward/Oceanview	Disagree	Yes	extend to Minnesota / Omalley	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all_		Too small	Bayshore/Klatt	I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	South of O'Malley Road to Klatt Road, East of C Street	35
422	Old Seward/Oceanview	Disagree	Yes	The area adjacent to the Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council area, currently contained within the Bayshore/Klatt CC, extends from C Street east to New Seward Highway and from Klatt Rd. north to O'Malley Rd. This area is demographically and geographically similar to the rest of the OSOVCC; residents shop in the same businesses (Huffman Center), go to the same schools. It is not separated from the rest of the CC by any major thoroughfare. Furthermore, this area does not seem to be as well connected to the bulk of Bayshore Klatt CC, given its separation by a maze of parkland , commercial development, and transportation corridors. I propose annexing this area into the OSOVCC.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da,Maximize_opportunities_for_all,Provide_representation_for_all_		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	South of O'Malley Road to Klatt Road, East of C Street	35
137	Old Seward/Oceanview	Disagree	Yes	Oceanview east of Old Seward should be folded into the Huffman CC.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni,Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da		In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Oceanview East of Old Seward Highway	36
166	Huffman/O'Malley	Disagree	Yes	Huffman/O'Malley should stop on the east at Elmore Road. Uphill from Elmore is a much different neighborhood than downhill from Elmore.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	East of Elmore Road from 104th Ave to De Armoun Road	37
112	Rabbit Creek	Disagree	Yes	Upper hillside concerns align much more closely with Bear Valley area than mid-hillside and lower Potter marsh areas. Goldenview Drive north could merge into Bear Valley for example.	Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_com muni		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	Last year (in 2021)	Higher Elevations of Rabbit Creek	38
306	Rabbit Creek	Disagree	Yes	rabbit creek.	Use_clearly_identifiable_boun da		Too large		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Staff could not determine a boundary study area.	
89	Rogers Park	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Staff could not determine a boundary study area.	

Appendix A-2

Table 2.1: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Questionnaire Responses that Called for Changes

Questionnaire Response I.D. Number	Select the Community Council where you live, own real property, or own a business having premises within the Community Council.	Do your Community Council district boundaries align with the actual neighborhoods, or "natural communities," in its part of town?	Should any changes to the boundaries of your Community Council district be considered?	What changes should be considered?	What are the reasons for these boundary changes to be considered?	Other	Is your Community Council too large, too small, or in an optimal size range to afford all community members the opportunity for participation and representation in an active, engaged Community Council?	If you think your Community Council is too small, which Community Council would prefer it merge with or expand into?	What kind of member are you in this Community Council?	When did you last attend a Community Council meeting in this Community Council?	Planning Department staff assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on questionnaire responses	Boundary Study Area No.
183	Rogers Park	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Staff could not determine a boundary study area.	
139	Russian Jack	Strongly disagree	No				In an optimal size range		I live within the Community Cou	This year (in 2022)	Staff could not determine a boundary study area.	
405	Sand Lake	Disagree	No				Not sure or do not know			This year (in 2022)	Staff could not determine a boundary study area.	
374	University Area	Disagree	Yes		Align_the_district_with_areas_s,Align_the_district_with_comuni,Maximize_opportunities_for_all_,Provide_representation_for_all_		Not sure or do not know		I live within the Community Cou	Before last year	Staff could not determine a boundary study area.	

Appendix A-2

Table 2.2: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Comments by Email and Phone

Email or Phone Comment No.	Community Council District	Comment Summary	Format Received	Date Received	Source	Letter Documentation	Assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on comment responses	Boundary Study Area No.
Comment No. 431	Girdwood	The Assembly has recognized the Girdwood Board of Supervisors (GBOS) as the community council ex-officio for the Girdwood community council district. The boundaries of the GBOS service area is smaller than the boundaries of the community council district. This means that persons outside of the service area, who are part of the community council district, cannot vote for the community councils that represents them – GBOS. This is problematic and is counter to the intent of community councils to provide maximum citizen participation. The boundaries of the service area should match the boundaries of the community council district.	Email	2/17/2023	Darrel Hess	n/a	Girdwood	4
Comment No. 435	Girdwood	The Community Councils Center has received calls over the past several years from people asking why Girdwood does not have its own community council. The GBOS is a governmental entity as a service district, and makes decisions as a government entity. This seems like a different function from a community council, which is independent and advises government entities. There are people in Girdwood who want to create a community council; if people get together and propose it, then Girdwood should have its own community council.	Phone conversation	2/21/2023	Mark Butler	n/a	Girdwood	4
Comment No. 438	Girdwood	A community council for Glacier Valley should be created. This would include Girdwood and the existing Crow Creek neighborhood, essentially all of the residents in the larger Girdwood Valley. The current Girdwood Board of Supervisors represents only those within the town of Girdwood, but doesn't include Crow Creek. We believe that we as a community need our own community council.	Email	2/24/2023	Kellie Okonek	n/a	Girdwood	4
Comment No. 439	Girdwood	A community council for Glacier Valley should be created. This would include Girdwood and the existing Crow Creek neighborhood, essentially all of the residents in the larger Girdwood Valley. The current Girdwood Board of Supervisors represents only those within the town of Girdwood, but doesn't include Crow Creek. We believe that we as a community need our own community council.	Email	2/24/2023	Brooke Lavender	n/a	Girdwood	4
Comment No. 440	Girdwood	Consider having a community council for the area of Girdwood and Crow Creek as we do not have a Community Council at present. It might be called the Glacier Valley Community Council. Both of our communities reside in the Glacier Valley bowl.	Email	2/26/2023	Grace Pleasants	n/a	Girdwood	4
Comment No. 433	Portage Valley	Portage Valley Community Council has not submitted revised bylaws which are required by the code changes in 2014. The Municipality has communicated with multiple individuals over the years, who have stated that they were going to get the council up and running, but they have not. This community council district could be merged with an adjacent district or districts, or the Assembly could pull recognition and it would be up to the residents and property owners to petition to establish a new council. Failing to meet the meeting requirements in the code means they should no longer be recognized.	Email	2/17/2023	Darrel Hess	n/a	Portage Valley	5
Comment No. 436	Portage Valley	Portage Valley Community Council is nonexistent; it has not been an active organization for years.	Phone conversation	2/21/2023	Mark Butler	n/a	Portage Valley	5
Comment No. 425	Northeast	Northeast Community Council district is far too large. Perhaps the Nunaka Valley Area should be switched to the Russian Jack Community Council, or even formed into their own council?	Email	11/4/2022	Forrest Dunbar	n/a	Northeast	6

Appendix A-2

Table 2.2: Identification of Boundary Study Areas from Comments by Email and Phone

Email or Phone Comment No.	Community Council District	Comment Summary	Format Received	Date Received	Source	Letter Documentation	Assignment of Boundary Study Areas based on comment responses	Boundary Study Area No.
Comment No. 434	Tudor Area	With respect to Tudor Area: Failing to meet the meeting requirements in the code means a community council should no longer be recognized. If Tudor Area is not making the meeting requirements (at least once per calendar quarter), the district should be merged with an adjacent district or districts, or the Assembly should just pull their recognition, and it would be up to the residents, businesses, and property owners in the district to petition the form a new council.	Email	2/17/2023	Darrel Hess	n/a	Tudor Area	12
Comment No. 437	Tudor Area	Tudor Area has not been meeting regularly or making quorum. The acting chair has been willing in the past to merge with another council. Merging with Rogers Park seems like a natural fit.	Phone conversation	2/21/2023	Mark Butler	n/a	Tudor Area	12
Comment No. 427	Midtown	Spenard Community Council (SCC) Executive Board is taking the position that the boundaries of SCC should be extended to return to the original boundaries of SCC as outlined in the Anchorage Municipal Charter (AMC). This opinion is based on factors that include historical realities, current representation, and maintaining the Spenard neighborhood's character and sense of community. As outlined in the AMC in 1975, the borders for the SCC were generally between Fish Creek/Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport to the west and the New Seward Highway to the east, and portions of Northern Lights Boulevard, Fireweed Lane, and 36th Avenue to the north and International Airport Road to the South. Boundary changes in 2003 redrew these boundaries to mark Arctic Boulevard as Spenard's Eastern border and created the Midtown Community Council (MCC). In 2016, the MCC moved their meeting time from 7:00pm to 12:00pm, creating a barrier to participation from most Midtown residents. The SCC passed resolution 2017-2-1 in February 2017 in support of adding a portion of the MCC to match the map included in the AMC with the remainder of the MCC becoming part of the North Star Community Council. This resolution was drafted after talks with members of all three councils, who reported that MCC was having difficulty getting a quorum on a regular basis and recognized that MCC and SCC had common character and interests.	Email and Letter	1/5/2023	SCC Executive Board	12/29/2022 Letter from SCC Executive Board	Midtown	28

Introduction

Appendix A-3 is a summary table of the 38 Boundary Study Areas identified from public comments in Appendix A-2. Appendix A-3 provides a brief description of each Boundary Study Area and the proposed boundary change(s) from the public comments. It also indicates the total number of comments that called for the Boundary Study Area, and cross-references back to those source comments as documented in Appendices A-1 and A-2.

Appendix A-3 also identifies the community councils that are potentially affected by each Boundary Study Area, in the middle three columns of the table. The community council district that is the main subject of the comments or that currently represents the Boundary Study Area in question is listed first. The neighboring community council district(s) whose boundaries may be affected by any potential changes are listed next, to the right of the first community council.

The Boundary Study Areas in Appendix A-3 appear in the same order as in Appendix A-2 and in Part 2 of the *Report and Recommendations*. They are numbered and organized geographically starting in Chugiak-Eagle River, then Turnagain Arm, and finally the Anchorage Bowl. Within each of these three regions of the Municipality, the Boundary Study Areas are arranged geographically from north to south.

Table 3.1: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Table 3.1 provides the information forming the basis for the Boundary Study Areas addressed in the Public Hearing Draft *Report and Recommendations*. A “Boundary Study Area” means that a community council district boundary was identified for further evaluation in this *10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries* project. A Boundary Study Area may include all or a part of a community council district or certain boundary segments where the public comments suggest consideration for changes.

The Boundary Study Areas are evaluated in Part 2 of the *Report and Recommendations*. Part 2 of the report applies the boundary review criteria from Part 1 of the report to assess each Boundary Study Area and identify options for addressing the boundary issue.

A Boundary Study Area did not necessarily mean any changes to a community council district would be recommended. After assessing a Boundary Study Area, and requesting feedback from affected community councils, the staff recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) and Assembly most often is “no change” – i.e., to preserve the existing boundary, as provided in Part 2 of the *Report and Recommendations*.

See the *Report and Recommendations* for information about the public comment process, the boundary review criteria, and the evaluation of Boundary Study Areas.

Index of Community Councils

The index table at right provides a cross-reference from each community council district in the Municipality to the Boundary Study Area(s) in this Appendix A-3 that may affect that community council.

Community Council District Name	Boundary Study Areas that May Affect the Community Council (by Boundary Study Area No.)
Abbott Loop	#33
Airport Heights	#15, #16, #17, #18, #21
Basher	#9
Bayshore/Klatt	#33, #34, #35
Bear Valley	#38
Birchwood	none
Campbell Park	#12, #13
Chugiak	#1
Downtown	#19, #22, #25
Eagle River	#2, #3
Eagle River Valley	#2
Eklutna Valley	none
Fairview	#14, #19, #20, #21, #22, #23, #24
Girdwood	#4, #5
Glen Alps	none
Government Hill	#14
Hillside	#37
Huffman/O'Malley	#36, #37
Midtown	#26, #28, #29
Mountain View	#14, #15, #19
North Star	#26, #27, #28, #29
Northeast	#6, #7
Old Seward/Oceanview	#33, #34, #35, #36
Portage Valley	#5
Rabbit Creek	#38
Rogers Park	#11, #12, #16, #17, #18
Russian Jack	#6, #15
Sand Lake	none
Scenic Foothills	#6, #7, #8, #9
South Addition	#22, #23, #24, #25
South Fork	#3
Spenard	#26, #27, #28, #29, #30, #31, #32
Taku Campbell	#33
Tudor Area	#11, #12
Turnagain	#30, #31, #32
Turnagain Arm	#4, #5
University Area	#8, #9, #10, #12, #13

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix A-3

Table 3.1: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Boundary Study Area (Study Area Number and Name)	Description	Community Council Districts Potentially Affected	Total Number of Comments	Source Comments: Questionnaire response I.D. Numbers and Email/Phone Comment Numbers from Appendices A and B (Listed in the order the comments appear in the Appendix B tables)
#1 Chugiak Community Council District	1 questionnaire response indicated that the Chugiak Community Council district is too large to afford all members the opportunity for participation and representation.	Chugiak	1	261
#2 Eagle River and Eagle River Valley Community Council Districts	10 questionnaire responses indicated that the Eagle River and/or Eagle River Valley Community Council districts do not or may not reflect actual neighborhoods or natural communities. 2 of the responses recommended that the Eagle Ridge Subdivision, Parkview Terrace Subdivision, Gruening Middle School, and Eagle River Lions Park area southwest of Eagle River Road and Eagle River Loop Road be transferred from Eagle River Valley Community Council to Eagle River Community Council. One of the responses indicated the natural boundary is farther east, at Mile Hi Avenue and Eagle River Road. One of the responses recommended to merge the two community council districts. The other responses did not recommend specific changes.	Eagle River Valley	10	260 262 184 84 257 268 409 200 266 296
#3 North of Eagle River Loop Road to Eagle River (the waterbody)	2 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer the Eagle Nest Subdivision, Eagle River High School, and Wolf Den Drive area northwest of Eagle River Loop Road from South Fork Community Council to Eagle River Community Council.	South Fork	2	37 262
#4 Girdwood Community Council District	5 commenters (including the municipal Ombudsman and the Community Councils Center manager) indicated concern that the boundaries of the GBOS service area is smaller than the boundaries of the Girdwood community council district. The Municipality has recognized the Girdwood Board of Supervisors (GBOS) Land Use Committee as the community council for Girdwood. Persons living outside of the GBOS service area, who are part of the community council district, cannot vote for the community council organization that represents them (GBOS Land Use Committee). 3 of the emails indicated that the GBOS represents residents within the town of Girdwood, but not residents in Crow Creek. 1 of the responses recommended that the boundaries of the service area should match the boundaries of the community council district. 4 of the responses recommended to establish a separate community council organization from the GBOS service district, to include all of Girdwood including the Crow Creek neighborhood.	Girdwood	5	431 435 438 439 440 (on page 15 of Appendix B)
#5 Portage Valley Community Council District	The municipal Ombudsman and the Community Councils Center manager indicated that the Portage Valley Community Council has not submitted revised bylaws required by municipal code changes in 2014. There has not been an active community council meeting quorum for years. Failing to meet these requirements means this community council should no longer be recognized by the Municipality. The commenters recommended to consider an option to merge it with an adjacent community council district.	Portage Valley	2	433 436 (on page 15 of Appendix B)
#6 Northeast Community Council District	16 responses indicated that the Northeast Community Council district is too large to afford all members the opportunity for participation and representation, and recommended to either divide it into two separate community council districts or transfer parts of it to an adjacent community council district. Some of these commenters recommended to divide Northeast into east and west districts with a few specifying using Turpin Street, Beaver Place, and/or political districts as boundaries. 1 of the commenters recommended to divide Northeast into north and south districts using DeBarr Road as a boundary. 4 of the commenters recommended to transfer western portions of Northeast Community Council (including Nunaka Valley) to the Russian Jack Community Council district or merge those western areas with parts of Russian Jack.	Northeast	16	40 44 90 99 114 126 158 186 189 233 235 285 308 408 418 425

Appendix A-3

Table 3.1: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Boundary Study Area (Study Area Number and Name)	Description	Community Council Districts Potentially Affected	Total Number of Comments	Source Comments: Questionnaire response I.D. Numbers and Email/Phone Comment Numbers from Appendices A and B (Listed in the order the comments appear in the Appendix B tables)
#7 North of E. Northern Lights Boulevard to Foxhall Drive	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the Foxhall Drive area north of E. Northern Lights from Northeast Community Council to Scenic Foothills Community Council district.	Northeast Scenic Foothills	1	368
#8 West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	9 questionnaire responses indicated that areas west of Baxter Road are more aligned with the neighborhoods of Scenic Foothills Community Council than with University Area Community Council district. Some recommended to transfer the area between Baxter Road and Boniface Parkway from University Area Community Council to Scenic Foothills Community Council.	University Area Scenic Foothills	9	415 48 52 66 297 299 370 368 146
#9 Scenic Foothills Community Council District	2 questionnaire responses indicated that Scenic Foothills Community Council district is too small, and should be merged. One recommended merging with Basher Community Council, and the other recommended merging with University Area Community Council.	Basher Scenic Foothills University Area	2	22 415
#10 University Area Community Council District	3 questionnaire responses indicated dissatisfaction with University Area Community Council's district area in general. One indicated it is too large. The others indicated it is disjointed and should more closely follow Assembly or legislative district boundaries.	University Area Scenic Foothills	3	23 188 213
#11 College Village	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the College Village neighborhood out of Rogers Park Community Council district.	Rogers Park Tudor Area	1	35
#12 Tudor Area Community Council District	7 questionnaire respondents plus the municipal Ombudsman and the Community Councils Center manager indicated that Tudor Area Community Council has been having difficulty making meeting quorum requirements or is too small, and recommended to merge Tudor Area into one or more of 3 adjacent community council districts.	Tudor Area Rogers Park University Area; Campbell Park	9	354 12 53 340 381 403 52 434 437 (436 & 437 on p. 15 of Appendix B)
#13 South of Tudor Road and East of Lake Otis Parkway	4 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer some or all of the neighborhoods south of Tudor Road and east of Lake Otis Parkway (and north of Dowling Road) out of Campbell Park Community Council to another community council district. 1 of these responses recommended to transfer the neighborhood along the south side of Tudor Road to University Area Community Council. Another suggested considering to transfer the public lands and facilities along the south side of Tudor Road in the MLK Jr. Parkway vicinity to University Area Community Council.	Campbell Park University Area	4	190 280 400 387
#14 West of Reeve Boulevard	2 questionnaire responses indicated that the western, industrial portion of Mountain View Community Council district seems more aligned with the Ship Creek industrial areas to the west, and recommended to transfer those areas out of Mountain View Community Council district.	Mountain View Fairview Downtown	2	136 253
#15 Penland Park and Brighton Park	3 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer Penland Mobile Home Park, the Brighton Park apartments, and/or all areas north of DeBarr Road from Airport Heights Community Council to Mountain View Community Council district.	Airport Heights Mountain View Russian Jack	3	104 181 206
#16 Anchor Park	4 questionnaire responses indicated that Anchor Park Subdivision (on the northeast corner of Lake Otis Parkway and E. Northern Lights Boulevard) may be more aligned with the Airport Heights neighborhood and should be considered for transfer from Rogers Park Community Council to Airport Heights Community Council.	Rogers Park Airport Heights	4	49 205 372 132
#17 Eastridge	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer Eastridge Subdivision from Airport Heights Community Council to Rogers Park Community Council district.	Airport Heights Rogers Park	1	206

Appendix A-3

Table 3.1: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Boundary Study Area (Study Area Number and Name)	Description	Community Council Districts Potentially Affected	Total Number of Comments	Source Comments: Questionnaire response I.D. Numbers and Email/Phone Comment Numbers from Appendices A and B (Listed in the order the comments appear in the Appendix B tables)
#18 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis Parkway	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the lots on 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis Parkway from Rogers Park Community Council to Airport Heights Community Council district.	Rogers Park Airport Heights	1	372
#19 Fairview North of 5th Avenue	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the area north of 5th Avenue out of Fairview Community Council district.	Fairview Downtown	1	279
#20 Fairview East and West of Gambell-Ingra Corridor	2 questionnaire responses observed the differences between eastern and western Fairview and the division created by the Gambell-Ingra corridor. One of these responses indicated Fairview is too small and should be merged with another community council district.	Fairview	2	77 286
#21 Sitka Street Park	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the open space area west of Sitka Street from Airport Heights Community Council to Fairview Community Council district.	Airport Heights Fairview	1	107
#22 North of 15th Avenue between Ingra and I Streets	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the area between I Street, Ingra Street, 9th Avenue, and 15th Avenue from the Fairview and South Addition Community Councils to the Downtown Community Council district.	Fairview South Addition Downtown	1	121
#23 West of Cordova Street from 9th to 15th Avenue	4 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer, or at least consider to transfer, some or all of the areas west of Cordova Street (between Cordova and C Street) from South Addition Community Council to Fairview Community Council district.	South Addition Fairview	4	119 336 421 107
#24 A and C Street Corridor South of 15th Avenue	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the area between A and C Street south of 15th Avenue (between 15th Ave. and Chester Creek) from Fairview Community Council to South Addition Community Council district.	Fairview South Addition	1	279
#25 Northwest of 9th Avenue and L Street	1 questionnaire response recommended a reassessment to determine the appropriate community council designation for the areas northwest of 9th Avenue and L Street, including Bootleggers Cove. Another suggested to include more of Downtown north of 9th Avenue in South Addition Community Council by extending further east into residential areas.	South Addition Downtown	2	230 421
#26 North Star Community Council District	3 questionnaire responses indicated that North Star Community Council district is too small and recommended to merge it with Midtown and/or Spenard Community Councils.	North Star Midtown Spenard	3	72 85 116
#27 Romig Park near Hillcrest Drive	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the Romig Park neighborhood along Spenard Road (up to the Hillcrest Drive area) from North Star Community Council to Spenard Community Council district.	North Star Spenard	1	251
#28 Midtown Community Council District	6 questionnaire responses and one email indicated that Midtown Community Council is not providing representation for its residents because it is focused on representing commercial property owners and businesses, for example by moving its membership meeting time to noon. The responses recommended to merge Midtown Community Council with North Star and/or Spenard Community Councils.	Midtown Spenard North Star	7	56 172 390 191 199 222 427 (427 on page 15 of Appendix B)

Appendix A-3

Table 3.1: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Boundary Study Area (Study Area Number and Name)	Description	Community Council Districts Potentially Affected			Total Number of Comments	Source Comments: Questionnaire response I.D. Numbers and Email/Phone Comment Numbers from Appendices A and B (Listed in the order the comments appear in the Appendix B tables)
#29 Spenard Community Council District	1 questionnaire response recommended to realign the Spenard Community Council district boundaries to follow Assembly district boundaries.	Spenard	Midtown		1	94
#30 Turnagain Community Council District	1 questionnaire response indicated that Turnagain Community Council is too small and recommended to merge it with Spenard Community Council district.	Turnagain	Spenard		1	203
#31 West of Fish Creek to Wisconsin Street	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the neighborhoods south of W. Northern Lights between Fish Creek and Wisconsin Street from Turnagain Community Council to Spenard Community Council district.	Turnagain	Spenard		1	191
#32 Spenard Beach Park	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer Spenard Beach Park from Turnagain Community Council to Spenard Community Council district.	Turnagain	Spenard		1	191
#33 South of Dimond Boulevard to 92nd Avenue	1 questionnaire response indicated that Taku Campbell Community Council district is too large and recommended to transfer the area south of Dimond Boulevard (between Dimond and 92nd) out of Taku/Campbell.	Taku Campbell	Bayshore/ Klatt	Abbott Loop; Old Seward/ Oceanview	1	298
#34 Bayshore/Klatt Community Council District	1 questionnaire response indicated that Bayshore/Klatt Community Council district is too large and recommended to divide it into two community council districts.	Bayshore/ Klatt	Old Seward/ Oceanview		1	371
#35 South of O'Malley Road to Klatt Road, East of C Street	3 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer the area of C Street on the west, O'Malley Road on the north, New Seward Highway on the east, and Klatt Road on the south, from Bayshore/Klatt Community Council to Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council district.	Bayshore/ Klatt	Old Seward/ Oceanview		3	241 318 422
#36 Oceanview East of Old Seward Highway	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the area of Oceanview neighborhood between the Old Seward Highway and the Seward Highway from Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council to Huffman/O'Malley Community Council district.	Old Seward/ Oceanview	Huffman/ O'Malley		1	137
#37 East of Elmore Road from 104th Ave to De Armoun Road	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer areas east of Elmore Road from Huffman/O'Malley Community Council to Hillside Community Council district.	Huffman/ O'Malley	Hillside		1	166
#38 Higher Elevations of Rabbit Creek Community Council	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer higher-elevation portions of Rabbit Creek Community Council district out of Rabbit Creek.	Rabbit Creek	Bear Valley		1	112
#39 Boundary Study Area Undetermined	6 questionnaire responses indicated dissatisfaction with existing boundaries in 5 community council districts, however staff was unable to determine their specific issue. These six responses did not provide enough information for staff to be able to determine the issue or boundary segment of concern, and the questionnaire responses did not provide contact information for staff to be able to request clarification.	Rabbit Creek, Rogers Park (2), Russian Jack, Sand Lake, University Area			6	306 89 183 139 405 374