

## West Anchorage Planning Group

### Meeting #3 Notes

Tuesday, October 6, 2009, 5:30-7:30 pm

City Hall, Conference Room 155

---

#### I. Introductions

##### Members Present:

John Johanson, TSAIA  
Jack Jones, for Andy Hutzell-Lake Hood  
Ed Fogels for Frank McQueary  
Peggy Auth, Spenard CC  
Cathy Gleason, Turnagain CC  
Breck Tostevin, Turnagain CC  
Dale Shaw, FedEx  
Jae Shin, At Large

##### Staff Present:

Tyler Robinson, MOA  
Thede Tobish, MOA  
Jon Issacs, URS  
Kim Wetzel, URS  
Paul Depalatis, URS

#### II. Housekeeping (5 min)

##### **Purpose of this Meeting**

##### **Products Anticipated**

##### **Ground Rules for today**

Comment: We would like the minutes and the attendees of these meetings. It will help us to be able to say who is "on board".

Comment: Turnagain CC passed a resolution stating their support of the funding for this project not being cut. Assembly member Harriett Drummod told Turnagain CC that funding was cut.

Response: The Planning Department has faced staff and funding cuts. Our intent is to finish all projects we've committed to right now. This includes the West Anchorage District Plan. There is \$20,000 of the budget held over until 2010. We need to get to the Draft Plan stage by the end of 2009.

#### III. West Anchorage Plan Update (15 min)

##### **Final Boundary discussion**

Comment: A piece of Spenard is isolated by not being in the West Anchorage Boundary.

Response: All of Spenard is within the planning boundary except the portion included in the Midtown Plan. MOA does not intend to overlap

planning boundaries. A memo is available by request that explains the planning boundary decision.

Comment: The boundary should include the tidelands.

Response: The tidelands were not included in order to make calculations of registered plats. MOA does have jurisdiction over some of the tidelands. I remember Jon agreed to include them, but does this make sense from a GIS perspective?

#### **West Anchorage Profile**

- **New Parks Map for insertion**
- **Submit written comments of any errors by October 15**

Comment: The Transportation chapter is new and it contains new noise material.

#### **IV. Issues, Goals & Possible Opportunities (IGOs) (80+ min)**

Comment: All recommendations from Anchorage 2020 that are relevant to West Anchorage should be included in the IGO Table.

Comment: Objectives should not be limited to those that are outside the jurisdiction of MOA. MOA may be able to influence other agencies or parties, and there is joint jurisdiction in some cases.

Comment: "Possible Objectives" should be called something else like "Implementation Actions".

Comment: Put the tables back together.

Response: They will be put back together after this comment period. They were separated to help demonstrate that the objectives are raw; they were not critiqued or prioritized. They may not be the best solutions to the issues yet.

Comment: Remove the use of buzz words like "northern design" where the definition by the author is not obvious by everyone. "Northern design" and any buzz word can mean many things to different practitioners.

Comment: How does the prioritization of objectives or action items occur? Does it?

Response: The methodology has not been agreed at this point.

#### **Draft Tables –**

- 1. Memo**
- 2. Strengths & Values**
- 3. Issues & Goals**
- 4. Possible Opportunities**

#### **Topic Stations**

## **Debrief – Submit written IGO comments by October 15 to**

[Kimberly\\_wetzel@urscorp.com](mailto:Kimberly_wetzel@urscorp.com)

Note: Below you will find a brief overview of some key points we heard during the IGO Table exercise. The complete notes are attached.

**Land Use:** There was a lot of interest in buffers between incompatible uses and avoiding future incompatible uses. The airport was discussed in terms of what lands it uses- particularly an efficient use of its existing footprint keeping away from its borders, not “growth for growth sake”.

**Utilities:** There was an interest in increasing environmental practices like solid waste reduction, improved/increased storm water treatment strategies, and groundwater protection.

**TSAIA:** The group was interested in the expired leases of recreational lands and desired to bring them back to good standing. It was clarified that economic competition is an issues for the airport and flexibility to develop within its boundaries is a value or goal. The group needs more information to understand existing overlay districts and what new overlay districts could achieve. There was a suggested objective to require a study of cumulative impacts before new airport development occurs.

**Transportation:** The concept of “Town Centers” needs clarification in order to determine whether and whether they are appropriate for West Anchorage. They need adequate transportation infrastructure to create them. ARRC’s plans to implement their double track would increase their neighborhood impacts. There was an interest in addressing the multi-faceted issues of snow removal, storage, sand, maintenance on our roads

## **V. Next Steps**

### **Issues & Objectives Public Workshop,**

**Thursday, October 8, 7-9pm, Calvary Church, 3800 West 80th Avenue (80th & Jewel Lake Road)**

Question: What is the format of the public workshop?

Response: The public workshop format will include a brief PowerPoint presentation to explain the process of creating the plan and that we are in the Issues & Opportunities portion of planning. The public will get to walk around to look at each topic station IGO Tables (Economic Development & Land Use, Housing & Social Issues, Transportation, TSAIA & Lake Hood, Parks Recreation & Open Space, and Utilities) to add ideas that are missing and flush out ideas about opportunities or solutions to problems.

Question: How was the Public Workshop advertised?

Response: On the website, emails to the Federation of Community Councils (which are distributed to councils within the boundary), ad in the Journal of Commerce. We rely on grassroots distribution of the meeting

notice because we know community councils do not reach all people, nor do ads. The most effective way to elicit participation is by individual invitation.

### **Next WAPG Meeting - Winter 2009 – Review Draft Plan**

It was decided the next WAPG Meeting will review the compiled IGO Tables after the WAPG, Public, and MOA staff have had time to give their input.

MOA staff offered to facilitate a ½ workshop at the Federation of Community Council meeting room to review the combined tables that have incorporated comments from the October 8, 2009 WAPG meeting and the October 9 Public Workshop.

URS will provide the tables in Word format so planning members can provide comment via track changes, email or fax.