



**Municipality of Anchorage**  
**10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries Project**  
**Boundary Advisory Committee**

***MINUTES***

Monday, May 1, 2023  
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

***Meeting #4***

Hybrid Meeting Held In-person and Virtually in Microsoft Teams

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m.

**A. Roll Call**

A quorum was present.

*Present:* Matt Burkholder  
Care Clift  
Melinda Gant, *Chair*  
Darrel Hess  
Al Milspaugh  
Stan Moll  
Michael Packard  
Emily Weiser  
Charlie Welch

*Excused:* Mark Butler  
Karl von Lührte  
Carolyn Ramsey  
Carmela Warfield

*Staff:* Tom Davis, Senior Planner, Planning Department

*Guests:* Joan Henry, Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council  
John Henry, Old Seward/Oceanview resident  
Janet Walton, Fairview resident  
Rosemary Karish, South Addition resident  
Kristen Newby, South Addition resident  
Ted Gardeline, South Addition resident  
Kathleen Plunkett, Russian Jack Community Council

**B. Review of Agenda**

The agenda was approved without changes.

**C. April 24, 2023 Minutes**

The draft minutes from April were not yet available.

**2. Boundary Study Areas with 1 public comment each, for immediate approval as a group, of the recommendation for “Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.”**

*Chair Melinda Gant* asked if Committee members wanted to pull any of Boundary Study Areas #7, #9, #19, #11, #17, #18, #36, and #38 for discussion before voting. Committee members pulled Study Areas #7, #9, and #19 for discussion.

*Charlie Welch* moved to recommend “Option A: No Change” for the Boundary Study Areas not pulled for discussion, including Study Areas #11, #17, #18, #36, and #38. *Michael Packard* seconded.

***The motion to recommend “Option A: No Change for Study Areas #11, #17, #18, #36, and #38 was approved unanimously.***

The Committee discussed Boundary Study Areas #7 and #9. *Care Clift* explained that the Scenic Foothills Community Council board unanimously agreed to annex Study Area #7 plus all the area southeast of Chester Creek and Chanshtnu Muldoon Park. *Ms. Clift* discussed the land uses in the area and the rationale for this proposal. *Darrel Hess* suggested postponing a decision until the next meeting to give time for Northeast Community Council to respond, and *Ms. Clift* agreed. *Emily Weiser*, in reviewing *Ms. Clift*’s proposal, suggested consideration for Patterson Street and DeBarr Road as an alternative boundary to Chester Creek, as that would be simpler and easier to follow. The Committee members and staff discussed the elementary school attendance area boundaries.

*Tom Davis* explained that the new proposal by Scenic Foothills Community Council to expand Study Area #7 also falls within Boundary Study Area #6 regarding Northeast Community Council, and said he would bring #6, #7, and #9 as a coordinated group back to the Committee at the next meeting.

*Charlie Welch* moved to table further deliberations on Boundary Study Areas #7 and #9 until the next Committee meeting, after getting input from Northeast Community Council. *Michael Packard* seconded.

***The motion to postpone deliberations on Boundary Study Areas #7 and #9 until the next meeting passed unanimously.***

The Committee discussed Boundary Study Area #19. *Stan Moll* moved to recommend Option A, to retain existing boundaries. *Al Milspaugh* seconded the motion.

*Charlie Welch* and *Darrel Hess* spoke in favor of the motion. *Mr. Welch* reported that Fairview’s leadership expressed opposition to transferring areas north of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Fairview, and that Mountain View’s leadership is deferring to Fairview’s position. *Mr. Hess* explained that Fairview’s neighborhoods are closest to the study area. Fairview has been very active for the past 30 years with the social service providers in its area north of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

*Janel Walton*, a resident of Fairview who attends its Community Council meetings, commented that she was not sure she agreed with opposition to the proposed boundary change, and that she had not heard of the issue being brought up at Fairview's general membership meetings. *Ms. Walton* commented that although the area north of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue to Ship Creek has historically been a part of Fairview for a long time, 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a natural boundary. She believed most people would not think of that area as being a part of Fairview, but rather assume that area is a part of Downtown or Mountain View.

*Chair Gant* commented that the current northern boundary of Fairview does seem unusual, and that some people do not see the area near Third Avenue as a part of Fairview. There are more development projects taking place in eastern Downtown. There is a group called the Third Avenue Radicals in that area, and they see themselves as in between Downtown and Fairview, i.e., as a part of both. However, Fairview's board opposes a boundary change.

*Stan Moll* commented that the alignment of the Highway-to-Highway project through Fairview is still not settled, and suggested to leave the boundaries as they are until the community knows more about where that alignment will be.

***The motion to approve Option A, to retain existing boundaries in Boundary Study Area #19, passed unanimously.***

### **3. Boundary Study Areas from April 20, 2023 Revised Draft White Paper No. 2, for Discussion and Recommendation**

#### **A. Boundary Study Area #5 in Turnagain Arm**

*Chair Melinda Gant* introduced Boundary Study Area #5 regarding Portage Valley Community Council.

*Michael Packard* moved to recommend Option C, to merge the Portage Valley into the Turnagain Arm Community Council. *Stan Moll* seconded the motion.

*Darrel Hess* explained the municipal code establishes that, to be recognized and maintain recognition, a community council must submit bylaws for acceptance by the Assembly. That code requirement was established in 2014, and Portage Valley has not submitted bylaws and it has not reported a meeting quorum since then.

*Michael Packard* explained there are very few residents in Portage Valley, which makes quorum more difficult to meet. Portage Valley is a long drive from Bird Creek, however now they can attend Turnagain Arm Community Council meetings remotely. Being a part of an active community council would give them the opportunity to provide organized comment and get representation on issues in the Portage Valley area, such as the Alaska Railroad, road projects, or Forest Service issues. Portage Valley and Girdwood have different issues and concerns, so Girdwood and Portage do not seem like a logical combination—Turnagain Arm has more in common with Portage Valley, such as the Seward Highway traffic. *Emily Weiser* noted that Girdwood GBOS would not seem to be a logical representative for Portage Valley. The Committee discussed the geographic separateness of Portage Valley from the other Turnagain Arm Communities of Bird, Indian Valley, and Rainbow due to distance and Girdwood being in between.

***The motion to approve Option C passed unanimously.***

**B. Boundary Study Area #6 in Northeast**

*Emily Weiser* moved to table discussion of Boundary Study Area #6 until the next meeting. *Michael Packard* seconded the motion.

*Chair Gant* agreed it made sense to hold until there is further information. *Kathleen Plunkett*, a guest representing Russian Jack Park Community Council, agreed it made sense for the Committee to wait, as it would give Russian Jack an opportunity to meet first and provide its input to the Committee. *Ms. Plunkett* said she personally supports retaining Russian Jack Park's existing boundaries with Northeast but would prefer to hear first from Northeast and her community council members before the Committee decides.

***The motion to postpone further discussion on Boundary Study Area #6 passed unanimously.***

**C. Boundary Study Area #16 in Rogers Park**

*Emily Weiser* moved to recommend Option B, to transfer Anchor Park Subdivision from Rogers Park to Airport Heights. *Charlie Welch* seconded.

*Emily Weiser* explained that the Airport Heights executive board does not have a strong position but does see a case for transferring. Anchor Park is a little pocket neighborhood NE of Northern Lights and Lake Otis. It feels a little disconnected from Rogers Park because of Lake Otis Parkway, and feels a little disconnected from Airport Heights by the Chester Creek greenbelt as there is no direct trail connection across. It is like an island separated from everybody else. But Anchor Park was built as a part of Airport Heights, at the same time. It has the same look and feel to it. There is a sidewalk connection along Lake Otis Parkway.

*Chair Gant* commented that Rogers Park feels like an island unto itself, so it seems strange that it extends further eastward beyond what seems to be its natural boundary of Lake Otis, and asked if anyone knew the history of why it does so.

*Darrel Hess* commented that Lake Otis is a busy street that separates Rogers Park and Anchor Park. Even though there is a creek separating Airport Heights and Anchor Park, it is a lot easier to get past that than the arterial roadway. *Chair Gant* agreed that Lake Otis provides a much stronger definition for the neighborhood boundaries. *Care Clift* added that all 3 other corners around the Lake Otis / Northern Lights intersection are commercial, which further divides Anchor Park from the residential neighborhoods to the west and south.

***The motion to recommend Option B, to transfer Anchor Park to Airport Heights, passed unanimously.***

**D. Boundary Study Areas #22, #23, #24, and #25 in Downtown, Fairview, and South Addition**

Boundary Study Area #22 was discussed, as follows.

*Tom Davis* explained the geography and comments behind Boundary Study Area #22, which basically includes two separate areas. It includes the areas north of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Ingra and I Streets, and the areas north of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue east of Cordova Street, so it is a bit disjointed. *Mr. Davis* explained that it is essentially what should have been two study areas that got bunched together into one. Basically, the first commenter proposed transferring a lot of the neighborhoods south of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue from South Addition and Fairview into Downtown—that Downtown should grow to

include most of South Addition and western Fairview. A completely different commenter, from Fairview Community Council's board, proposed transferring the areas of Downtown east of Cordova Street that 20 years ago were once a part of Fairview Community Council back to Fairview.

*Michael Packard* moved to recommend Option A, retain existing boundaries. *Charlie Welch* seconded.

*Darrel Hess* responded to a question regarding the history of why areas east of Cordova Street were transferred to Downtown 20 years ago. He recalled that there were a couple of business owners that pushed for that boundary change so that they could be in Downtown. *Mr. Hess* did not support revisiting the boundary decision of 20 years ago. He said that the Third Avenue Radicals group that is active in that area consider themselves a part of Downtown not Fairview.

There was further discussion about the rationale behind the comments. *Mr. Hess* noted that there are very few residents in the area east of Cordova Street in Downtown. *Kristine Bunnell* commented that some of the properties east of Cordova Street are in the Downtown District Plan area and are within the Downtown zoning districts. *Janel Walton*, resident of Fairview, did not support changing the boundary and suggested that the same criteria should be applied here as in Boundary Study Area #19.

***The motion to approve Option A passed, with 7 votes in favor and 1 opposed.***

Boundary Study Area #23, the area west of Cordova Street between 9<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> Avenues, was discussed as follows.

*Charlie Welch* moved to recommend Option A, retain existing boundaries. *Emily Weiser* seconded.

*Darrel Hess* explained that the area west of Cordova Street including the A and C Street Corridor was historically part of Fairview, and 20 years ago 115 residents in that area signed a petition that they wanted to become a part of South Addition and the Assembly approved the boundary change. It is important to hear what South Addition thinks of this, as some of those residents who signed that petition still live there.

*Chair Gant* opened the discussion to meeting guests. Several attending South Addition residents commented in favor of retaining the existing boundaries. *Ted Gardeline*, South Addition resident, expressed that the current alignment of the homes west of Cordova Street with similar neighborhoods in South Addition seems consistent with the "natural communities" boundary review criteria. He said that Cordova Street, like A and C Streets, is a higher traffic street and provides a natural boundary. The more than 100 residents signing the petition 20 years ago, and the position of the South Addition executive board that the area still belongs in South Addition, follow the "community desires" criteria. As a resident of the area, he does feel that the area is somewhat like an island "in between" the two community councils.

*Kristen Newby*, South Addition resident in the study area, stated that her neighborhood (Pilots Row/Block 13) is a designated historic area and is naturally a part of South Addition. *Rosemary Karish*, a resident in the same area, stated that she feels a part of South Addition and explained that she talked with 13 households in that area who endorse remaining in South Addition.

*Darrel Hess* explained that the reason that the boundary deviates from Cordova Street a half block north of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue to include Central Lutheran Church in Fairview is because when the current boundary was being decided 20 years ago this church was adamant that it wished to remain a part of Fairview. *Mr. Hess* did not see merit in re-hashing this boundary issued decided 20 years ago. He stated that although A Street may be a stronger natural boundary than Cordova Street, community

desires are also an important factor: more than 100 people signed a petition; and the church expressed its desire.

*Tom Davis* drew attention to the large undeveloped parcel on the south side of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue, abutting the north property line of the Central Lutheran Church. He reported that in his correspondences, board members of both South Addition and Fairview thought it would be appropriate to consider “Option B” to transfer this property to Fairview while keeping the residentially occupied neighborhood north of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue between A Street and Cordova Street in South Addition.

*Darrel Hess* responded, explaining that 20 years ago when Fairview and South Addition negotiated this boundary, 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue was set to become the boundary, and the large undeveloped parcel was to stay in Fairview. Then, a week before the Assembly was to vote on it, two of the petitioners from the South Addition neighborhood advocated to the Downtown Assembly Member to include the large undeveloped parcel on the south side of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue in the area to be transferred to South Addition. The two petitioners did not trust Fairview to ensure it would be developed properly. *Mr. Hess* said he was Fairview’s president at the time, and Fairview’s board decided that they were not going to fight over that vacant parcel.

*Emily Weiser* commented that she would not be comfortable transferring the vacant parcel back to Fairview (“Option B”) without knowing what kind of development will eventually go on the vacant parcel. She supported Option A, no change.

*Janel Walton*, resident of Fairview, commented that most Fairview residents assume areas just west of Cordova are more naturally a part of Fairview than South Addition. The stronger natural boundary is at A Street, or even potentially C Street. The neighborhood between A and C Streets is cut off from the surrounding neighborhoods. She believed that most people assume that AWAIC, the women’s shelter between A and C, is in Fairview not South Addition. The Denali Elementary School attendance area including western Fairview uses A Street as its western boundary. Making A Street the boundary seems natural and the current boundary seems like a bizarre jig-saw. *Ms. Walton* continued, that the strangest part of the current boundary was that it zig-zagged around certain property lines to not include the large undeveloped parcel south of 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue in Fairview. That empty lot attracts homeless camps and needs to get developed and be in a community council that will support it getting developed.

*Tom Davis*, responding to a question, explained that the current zoning is R-4, and the future land use designation for this site in the city’s Comprehensive Plan supports rezoning to even higher density mixed-use, such as mid-rise apartments with a corner retail shop. He explained that one reason why both South Addition and Fairview board members told him they believe it is more appropriate to transfer that parcel to Fairview is that the anticipated type of housing development there would be more consistent with what Fairview proposes in its neighborhoods. Also, the board members believed that 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be a more appropriate boundary than continuing to use a rear property line.

***The motion to recommend Option A passed, with 6 votes in favor and 2 opposed.***

Boundary Study Area #24, the A and C Street corridor south of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue, was discussed as follows.

*Emily Weiser* moved to recommend Option B, to transfer the area between A and C Street south of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Fairview to South Addition. *Care Clift* seconded.

*Emily Weiser* noted that White Paper #2 documents that both community council boards supported this transfer and that issues in this area affect South Addition. She believed that, in looking at the map, the area is more isolated from the Fairview neighborhood by the Mulcahy sports park and geographically it seems to fit better with South Addition.

*Chair Melinda Gant* opened the discussion to meeting guests from the two neighborhoods. *Rosemary Karish*, a resident of South Addition, said that the area contains few residential dwellings and is mostly commercial office buildings and the Salvation Army facility. She did not think a commercial office area aligns with South Addition, which is made up of residential homes.

*Darrel Hess* thought that the reason Fairview board members were willing to transfer the area out of Fairview may be that it has few residents and the businesses and non-profits there do not interact with the Fairview Community Council. Perhaps both boards think that A Street is a more natural boundary. *Tom Davis* responded that a South Addition board member also expressed that South Addition is impacted by what goes on in this area and spillover activity from Mulcahy Park area, and would benefit from having its district boundary fronting A Street across from Mulcahy Park.

*Stan Moll* suggested transferring the area further east with apartments SE of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and A Street to South Addition. *Darrell Hess* explained that 20 years ago there was discussion about transferring the area between A Street and Cordova Street south of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue from Fairview to South Addition but it was determined to not be a good idea, in part because it would split up that high-density neighborhood and the sports complex.

*Chair Gant* commented that A Street seems to be a strong, simple natural boundary. *Charlie Welch* responded that C Street is also a strong natural boundary—they seem to be equal barriers.

***The motion to approve Option B, to transfer the area to South Addition, passed unanimously.***

Boundary Study Area #25, northwest of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and L Street, was discussed. *Tom Davis* reported that the South Addition board proposed that the Municipality consider transferring Bootleggers Cove from South Addition to Downtown, for reasons documented in White Paper #2. *Chair Gant* and staff discussed if such a transfer would affect the recently adopted *Downtown District Plan* or the *South Addition Neighborhood Plan* currently under development.

*Rosemary Karish*, a resident of South Addition, expressed that Bootleggers Cove has been a part of South Addition for decades, and she found it surprising that it would be considered to become a part of Downtown. It is primarily residential, and South Addition historically has been active in representing this area. *Kristen Newby*, South Addition resident, takes walks in Bootleggers Cove and it has a residential feel rather than feeling like Downtown. *Ms. Newby* did not think residents had much knowledge of this boundary review process. *Ted Gardeline*, South Addition resident, commented that L Street is a demarcation line. East of L Street is definitely in Downtown. The area west of L Street has the Inlet views, the homes, a different community. It is next to Downtown but not a part of Downtown.

*Chair Gant* said that she was a former resident of Bootleggers Cove. Although she worked in Downtown and walked there nearly every day, she never felt that her neighborhood in Bootleggers Cove was a part of Downtown. The bluff slope creates a separation between Downtown and Bootleggers. *Al Milspaugh* and *Stan Moll* agreed that Bootleggers Cove feels different from Downtown and more a part of South Addition.

*Chair Gant* asked *Kristine Bunnell* if, during the *Downtown District Plan* process, there was discussion about Bootleggers Cove being a part of Downtown. *Ms. Bunnell* responded there was not.

*Darrel Hess* said that a lot of people he knows who live in South Addition consider Delaney Park and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue as the natural northern boundary of South Addition. He believed that one advantage of transferring the area to Downtown is that Downtown struggles to engage residents because there are few residents in Downtown, and this transfer would transfer more than 700 new residents into Downtown. *Chair Gant* responded that it is not certain if the residents of Bootleggers Cove want to be a part of Downtown. And she has attended Downtown Community Council meetings regularly for 10 years and does not recall Downtown discussing Bootleggers Cove as part of South Addition.

*Darrell Hess* responded that the public hearing process will give residents opportunity to weigh in. Staff suggested providing South Addition's board an opportunity to gather more comments from residents of Bootleggers Cove. Committee members also noted that Downtown has not weighed in.

*Michael Packard* moved to table further discussion on Boundary Study Area #25 until the Committee gets more information about what the residents in the area prefer. *Charlie Welch* seconded.

***The motion to postpone passed, with 6 votes in favor and 2 opposed.***

*Stan Moll* moved to extend the meeting to 8:15 p.m. *Al Milspaugh* seconded. ***The motion to extend the meeting passed unanimously.***

#### **4. Boundary Study Areas from April 28 Memorandum, for Discussion and Recommendation**

##### **A. Boundary Study Area #35 in Bayshore/Klatt**

*Emily Weiser* moved to recommend Option B, to transfer the areas SE of C Street and O'Malley Road from Bayshore/Klatt to Old Seward/Oceanview. *Al Milspaugh* seconded.

*Joan Henry*, president of Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council, explained that the neighborhoods north of Klatt Road are more a part of the neighborhoods south of Klatt Road and are geographically isolated from Bayshore. She believed they would be better represented by Old Seward/Oceanview. C Street is a more natural boundary.

*Stan Moll* added that during his time on the board of Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council one of the other board members moved across the street to the north side of Klatt Road, and could no longer serve on the board because technically they were in Bayshore. *Mr. Moll* found that did not make sense because he had considered the area north of Klatt Road to be a part of the same neighborhood as the area south of Klatt Road. The residents both north and south of Klatt Road shop at the same stores on C Street and along Old Seward and are considered neighbors, a part of the same community. They are separated by distance from Bayshore. *Chair Gant* added that the large open space west of C Street isolates the study area from Bayshore.

*Stan Moll* concluded that in his correspondence with the president of Bayshore/Klatt regarding the proposal he did not sense any opposition. *Tom Davis* added the president of Bayshore/Klatt had also indicated to staff that he thought the transfer of this area made sense and did not oppose the transfer.

***The motion to recommend Option B, to transfer Boundary Study Area #35 to Old Seward/Oceanview, passed unanimously.***



**5. Schedule and Next Steps**

The Committee discussed scheduling its next meeting for Monday, June 12, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

**6. Public Comments** (*none*)

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.