



Municipality of Anchorage

Planning Department

Memorandum



Date: April 28, 2023
To: Community Councils Boundary Advisory Committee
From: Tom Davis
Subject: Additional Boundary Study Areas and Information for Meeting #4

Newly Completed Boundary Study Areas. This memorandum primarily provides the draft staff analysis and recommendations for 6 Boundary Study Areas which are on the agenda for Committee discussion in Meeting #4, on Monday, May 1. The analysis for these Boundary Study Areas was incomplete in the April 20 revised draft White Paper No. 2. The analysis is provided in this memorandum to allow the Committee to carry out its deliberations and actions on these 6 study areas in addition to the unfinished study areas carried over from Meeting #3.

These additional study areas appear starting at the bottom of this page, and include:

- Study Areas #11, 17, #18, #36, and #38, to be discussed on Monday in agenda item 2.
- Study area #35, to be discussed on Monday in agenda item 4.

Response to Question about Population Figures. This memorandum also responds to a question from a member of the public regarding the population figure provided on page 26 of the April 20 revised draft White Paper No. 2 for Boundary Study Area #24. The White Paper indicates there are 110 residents Boundary Study Area #24. According to 2020 U.S. Census data provided by an ESRI, Inc. GIS map data layer, 17 of these residents live along the south side of 15th Avenue, between A and C Streets. The remaining 93 residents live south of 16th Avenue between A and C Streets, where there is a Salvation Army residential facility near Charles Smith Memorial Park.

Corrections to the April 20 Revised Draft White Paper No. 2. The member of the public also pointed out that the draft White Paper No. 2 discussion regarding Boundary Study Area #23 misspelled Denali Elementary School. That misspelling will be corrected.

There is also an error in reporting the number of questionnaire respondents from Rogers Park, Boundary Study Area #16 (page 20). There were 21 respondents from Rogers Park, not 25.

BOUNDARY STUDY AREAS:

11. College Village (Map 4)

1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the College Village neighborhood out of Rogers Park Community Council district.

To assess options, Planning staff identified an option to transfer College Village to Tudor Area Community Council district.

(Source Comments in Appendix B: 35.)

Boundary Review Criteria:

- **1. Stable Boundaries.** Retain existing district unless the criteria that follow show a reason to change.

- 2. *Representation*: Rogers Park is an active, geographically focused community council that meets in College Village at Rogers Park Elementary.
- 3. *Natural Communities*: Shared commercial areas west of LaTouche Street.
- 3. *Natural Communities*: Shared Rogers Park ES attendance area.
- 4. *Identifiable Boundaries*: Northern Lights Boulevard; 36th Avenue.
- 5. *Community Desires*: The Rogers Park executive board has responded in writing that it opposes the proposed change.
- 5. *Community Desires*: 21 members of Rogers Park sent questionnaire responses:
 - 14 agreed that existing boundaries align with natural communities, 3 disagreed, and 4 were neutral.
 - 13 said no changes to boundaries should be considered; 5 were not sure; and 3 said that changes to boundaries should be considered.
- 6. *Optimal Size*: The total population of Rogers Park is 2,638;
- 7. *Sharing Information*: Shared Assembly and legislative districts.

Options and Recommendations:

- *Option A (Recommended)*: No change. Retain existing boundaries.
- *Option B*: Transfer College Village to Tudor Area Community Council district.

17. Eastridge (Map 5)

1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer Eastridge Subdivision southeast of the intersection of 15th Avenue and Lake Otis Parkway from Airport Heights Community Council to Rogers Park Community Council district.

(Source Comments in Appendix B: 206.)

Boundary Review Criteria:

1. *Stable Boundaries*. Retain existing district unless the criteria that follow show a reason to change.
- 2. *Representation*: Airport Heights is active and representative in this study area.
 - 3. *Natural Communities*: Study area shares 15th Avenue/DeBarr Road corridor, Alaska Regional Hospital, and Merrill Field Airport issues in common with Airport Heights.
 - 3. *Natural Communities*: Eastridge is in the Airport Heights ES attendance area.
 - 3. *Natural Communities*: Eastridge has a distinct development pattern, subdivision layout, and housing type from the rest of Airport Heights, and is somewhat similar to Woodside East townhouse subdivision in eastern Rogers Park.
 - 4. *Identifiable Boundaries*: Chester Creek and Hillstrand Pond.
 - 4. *Identifiable Boundaries*: Lake Otis Parkway; Sitka Street Park open space with Sitka Street.
 - 5. *Community Desires*: 21 members of Rogers Park sent questionnaire responses:
 - 14 agreed that existing boundaries align with natural communities, 3 disagreed, and 4 were neutral.
 - 13 said no changes to boundaries should be considered; 5 were not sure; and 3 said that changes to boundaries should be considered.

- 5. *Community Desires*: 30 members of Airport Heights sent responses:
 - 26 agreed that existing boundaries align with natural communities; 1 disagreed;
 - 6 said changes to boundaries should be considered.
- 6. *Optimal Size*: Not investigated;
- 7. *Sharing Information*: No shared Census Tract or legislative district.

Options and Recommendations:

- *Option A (Recommended)*: No change. Retain existing boundaries.
- *Option B*: Transfer Eastridge Subdivision from Airport Heights Community Council to Rogers Park Community Council.

18. 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis Parkway (Map 5)

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.

(Source Comments in Appendix B: 372.)

Boundary Review Criteria:

- 1. *Stable Boundaries*. Retain existing district unless the criteria that follow show a reason to change.
- 2. *Representation*: Both community councils are active in representing their respective areas.
- 3. *Natural Communities*: No local street connectivity from E. 24th to either Rogers Park or Airport Heights neighborhoods.
- 3. *Natural Communities*: Shared lot lines with abutting properties in Rogers Park.
- 4. *Identifiable Boundaries*: Chester Creek and Hillstrand Pond; Lake Otis Parkway.
- 5. *Community Desires*: Rogers Park executive board indicated to staff that it defers to the preferences of the two property owners, one of which owns the only home on east 24th Ave.
- 5. *Community Desires*: 21 members of Rogers Park sent questionnaire responses:
 - 14 agreed that existing boundaries align with natural communities, 3 disagreed, and 4 were neutral.
 - 13 said no changes to boundaries should be considered; 5 were not sure; and 3 said that changes to boundaries should be considered.
- 5. *Community Desires*: 30 members of Airport Heights sent responses:
 - 26 agreed that existing boundaries align with natural communities; 1 disagreed;
 - 6 said changes to boundaries should be considered.
- 6. *Optimal Size*: There is one house and 8 vacant lots on the south side of 24th Avenue.
- 7. *Sharing Information*: Shared state House and Senate district with Rogers Park. Shared Census Block, Block Group, and Tract with Rogers Park.

Options and Recommendations:

- *Option A (Recommended)*: No change. Retain existing boundaries.
- *Option B*: Transfer the residential lots on 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis Parkway from Rogers Park Community Council to Airport Heights Community Council.

35. South of O'Malley Road to Klatt Road, East of C Street (Map 8)

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.

(Source Comments in Appendix B: 241, 318, 422.)

Boundary Review Criteria:

- 1. *Stable Boundaries*. Retain existing district unless the criteria show a reason to change.
- 2. *Representation*: Not investigated.
- 3. *Natural Communities*: Study area shares a geographic focus on Old Seward Highway commercial corridor and Huffman Town Center in common with Old Seward/Oceanview;
- 3. *Natural Communities*: Local street connectivity with Old Seward/Oceanview.
- 3. *Natural Communities*: Neighborhood development pattern and household characteristics shared in common with Old Seward/Oceanview neighborhoods across Klatt Road;
- 3. *Natural Communities*: Study area is in the Mears MS and Dimond HS attendance areas; Old Seward/Oceanview is in the South HS attendance area.
- 3. *Natural Communities*: Study area is in Klatt ES attendance area; however, ASD has discussed transferring it to Oceanview ES.
- 4. *Identifiable Boundaries*: O'Malley Road (freeway); Klatt Road (collector street);
- 4. *Identifiable Boundaries*: C Street, with a commercial zone and parkland on west side of C Street; Seward Highway;
- 5. *Community Desires*: Initial consultations indicate that Old Seward/Oceanview's board does not seem to oppose this change; Bayshore/Klatt's board has not yet responded to outreach;
- 5. *Community Desires*: 10 Bayshore/Klatt members sent questionnaire responses:
 - 8 agreed that current boundaries align with natural communities; 1 was neutral; 1 disagreed.
 - 5 said no changes to boundaries should be considered; 4 were not sure; and 1 called for dividing up the district.
 - 6 said the district is in an optimal size range; 3 were not sure; 1 said too large.
- 5. *Community Desires*: 11 members of Old Seward/Oceanview sent questionnaire responses:
 - 8 agreed that current boundaries align with natural communities. 2 out of 3 who disagreed recommended extending the community council northward to O'Malley (Study Area #35).
 - 10 said the district is in an optimal size range and 1 said it is too small.
- 6. *Optimal Size*: Bayshore/Klatt's population is nearly 12,000. Old Seward/Oceanview's population is nearly 9,000;
- 7. *Sharing Information*: Assembly West and South districts have a boundary on C Street and West Klatt Road; Both councils are in same state legislative district.

Options and Recommendations:

- *Option A*: No change. Retain existing boundaries.
- *Option B (Preferred)*: 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.

36. Oceanview East of Old Seward Highway (Map 9)

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.

(Source Comments in Appendix B: 137.)

Boundary Review Criteria:

1. *Stable Boundaries:* Retain existing district unless the criteria that follow show a reason to change.
2. *Representation:* Old Seward/Oceanview is an active community council and the study area in question is a part of the Oceanview neighborhood.
3. *Natural Communities:* The north half of the study area is in Oceanview ES attendance area; the south half is with Rabbit Creek ES across the New Seward Highway.
3. *Natural Communities:* Shared focus on Huffman Town Center.
4. *Identifiable Boundaries:* New Seward Highway (freeway); Old Seward Highway (arterial);
- 5. *Community Desires:* 11 members of Old Seward/Oceanview sent questionnaire responses:
 - 8 agreed that current boundaries align with natural communities. 2 out of 3 who disagreed recommended extending the community council northward to O'Malley and did not show concern with Oceanview west of New Seward Highway being in Old Seward/Oceanview.
 - 10 said the district is in an optimal size range and 1 said it is too small.
6. *Optimal Size:* Not investigated;
7. *Sharing Information:* Shared Census Tract and state House district with most of Old Seward/Oceanview.

Options and Recommendations:

- *Option A (Recommended):* No change. Retain existing boundaries.
- *Option B:* Transfer areas of Oceanview neighborhood between the Old Seward Highway and the Seward Highway from Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council to Huffman/O'Malley Community Council.

37. Higher Elevations of Rabbit Creek Community Council (Map 9)

1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer higher-elevation portions of Rabbit Creek Community Council district out of Rabbit Creek.

To assess options, Planning staff identified an options to transfer higher-elevation portions of Rabbit Creek Community Council district to Bear Valley Community Council.

(Source Comments in Appendix B: 112.)

Boundary Review Criteria:

- 1. *Stable Boundaries.*
- 2. *Representation:* Rabbit Creek is an active community council providing representation for upper elevation neighborhoods.
- 3. *Natural Communities:* The upper elevations of Rabbit Creek are not in the Bear Valley.

- *4. Identifiable Boundaries:* Goldenview Drive; Bear Valley ridgeline area with breaks in neighborhood connectivity from Bear Valley.
- *5. Community Desires:* Rabbit Creek's board responded to the original questionnaire and indicated that its community council membership discussed the district boundaries and was satisfied with existing boundaries.
- *Community Desires:* Rabbit Creek's board opposes the proposed boundary change.
- *Community Desires:* 17 members of Rabbit Creek responded to the questionnaire. 12 agreed that existing boundaries reflected natural neighborhood communities; 3 were not sure; and 2 disagreed.
- *Community Desires:* All 3 questionnaire respondents from Bear Valley agreed with existing boundaries.
- *6. Optimal Size:* Not investigated;
- *7. Sharing Information:* Not investigated.

Options and Recommendations:

- *Option A (Recommended):* No change. Retain existing boundaries.
- *Option B:* Transfer higher-elevation portions of Rabbit Creek Community Council district to Bear Valley Community Council.