

Appendix D-1

MEETING MINUTES - TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Girdwood, September 8, 1999

[Note: The 9/8/99 Transportation Advisory Committee meeting and the 9/9/99 Commercial Areas Advisory Committee meeting were open to the public and were the opportunity for public comment on plans presented at a larger public meeting on 9/7/99. That initial public meeting opened the third series of public work sessions in the master planning process. At that meeting, the consulting team explained the draft plans and, because of the length of the presentation, asked the audience to hold their questions and comments until the advisory committee meetings. Therefore, there are no minutes for the 9/7/99 meeting.]

Participants +/-40

Jim Charlier, transportation consultant, facilitated the meeting.

Role of a Master Plan (Jim Charlier)

Not a project plan – “structure plans”. What kinds of land uses and demands will occur where – make sure the infrastructure and corridors are developed to support those in the long-term. MP is important so that, as development occurs, you know what to ask of a developer, such as where he should provide roads. MP is also a project list – funding applications for infrastructure, trails, detailed design, etc. Important to assume a MP has to be revisited and revised every 4-5 years; you’re never really done with it.

Norm Starkey - Send the draft report to GBOS and P&Z

Planning Process (Tom Nelson)

Girdwood Area Plan (GAP) identified general goals and objectives and laid out a general land use pattern. Didn’t give specific direction for individual areas of the community. Greater specificity needed especially in transportation (important in a destination resort) and in commercial areas (historically, GW has different commercial areas that serve different functions and aren’t linked. No cohesive community or resort base, can’t support or reinforce each other.) Need to define primary uses, design, and strong linkages.

What to expect: These are preliminary recommendations. Team will finish by end of month based on this input. Draft will go before Urban Design Commission, Land Use Committee, P&Z. All will pass on their recommendations to the MOA Assembly, who will formally review it in early 2000 (and adopt it). May result in some amendments to the GAP to make them consistent.

Norm – The adoption of a new plan would take precedence over any earlier document.

TJM – will the document determine whether there will be a rail spur? No – still a general guidance tool, but it identifies what the MOA’s policy would be. NEPA

process must be followed because Fed money will be used. TJM – what level of specificity is appropriate? What kind of recommendations are we looking for? TN - Enough to assess whether an idea is good. We have more info in the New Girdwood Townsite and can be more specific there in defining uses and how buildings should relate to each other, how parking works, etc.

TN – draft Land Use Code also coming up at the end of the month. Want to make sure that the design recommendations that deal w/ orientation, use, design, etc are consistent.

JC – the reason for doing an illustrative plan is to identify issues, not to be so specific about exactly where things go.

TJM – need to discuss snow management in the plan.

Bill Schwartz – need to show where we might store snow (they dump it now in the area where the new commercial area will be). Also need to show ideas for the parcels at the north end of the NTS. Why did we concentrate so much where we did? TN – HLB is looking for direction on their lands to the south.

What infrastructure is going to be needed to support this commercial growth? Underground utilities, sewer interceptor, electric, water, etc. Need to address. TN – need to determine where utility boxes will be placed. JC – that's a later step, but the issue can be identified in the Master Plan.

Isn't there somewhere in Girdwood that we can put a commercial center that isn't in the floodplain?

JC - This was a question in earlier meetings and has been talked about, but the sense of the community was that this was still where people wanted their center to be.

TRANSPORTATION MODES (Charlier)

Questions we'd like the group to address: Are there needs or issues we haven't addressed? Are there elements that should not be in the plan? If so, what are the alternatives? What advice do you have on timing and phasing?

Roads and Streets Plan

Need emergency service redundancy. (Linda Bennett – Old Girdwood Townsite should be called Original GWTS.) Need to know what to ask developers for. Why isn't the western collector in the GAP? TN – should have been. JC – need to add connectors, shorten Gold going east; eliminate southern bridge over Glacier Creek. These aren't site-specific recommendations, only recommendations for needed connections.

Sam Daniel – 14 year resident, Lot 55A next to the platted ROW. Recommended road will run within 50 yards of his house. Lots of traffic at this

location going up and down Crow Cr Road – potential for conflict and danger – high speed coming out of town. Also, maybe 30-50' drop to the creek. Physically very difficult. JC – will be a costly road, and yes, there is a traffic/speed issue here. We need alternatives – we put it here because that's where it's platted, but we are open to other ideas. The concept here is redundancy and connection.

Norm – We want to reduce the speed limit to 30 all the way south beyond the platted lots on the east edge. TJM – Graduate the speed reduction, don't make it so abrupt a change. Speed limit history – state has guidelines about these. It was 40, community wanted it lower, state raised it to 45 because it was the “natural” observed pattern. Changed to 30 by order of the Gov.

Q: (Bill S) – have you consulted with DOT? Yes (Diana is in the audience). We aren't recommending anything that can't be implemented.

TJM – Marlow Pavilion and Forest Fair Park being surrounded with new traffic patterns. Noise issue too. Local perspective is that there's a lot of land between all the buildings.

Q: What's the max grade for roads? Generally, not more than 5-6%, with short sections max 7-8%. In Alaska, they can go up to 10-12%.

Q: What's the possibility that MOA could take over the hwy? JC – MOA doesn't have the money now, though DOT would love to transfer responsibility. But could this be a l/t objective? JC – it might push things too fast to put this recommend in the MP. If GW takes over the jurisdiction, it has to pay for the maintenance. May be enough to recommend that the highway character change to something more consistent with an in-town road.

What have we done to reduce auto traffic, not just to handle it? (Will address later in the meeting)

Other roadway recommendations – second crossing of Glacier Creek is a good idea for emergency service redundancy. Get all transportation modes (trails, transit, etc) on one map to show implications for crossings, etc.

TJM – specifically eliminate the need for traffic signals. JC – We can put in the MP that it is a community value not to have traffic signal. But to eliminate the possibility would be irresponsible; there's a reason for signals. Latest traffic volume counts in 95 showed no need.

TJM - Need to connect to the airport without going through the neighborhood. JC – would only be possible with a new road down from the Arlberg connector. Q: where is that connector?

Q: for new east subdivision road, could it swing back over Glacier Creek and combine with another proposed golf course road? TN – high value wetland there.

TJM - Any new road should be 100' wide for snow.

Linda Bennett – wants an Alyeska-Hightower connection rather than Arlberg-Crow Creek. This would solve airport access. Doesn't want Crow Creek more "roadified" than it already is. TN – would have impacts on the Iditarod Trail and Glacier Creek greenbelt. TN – reason connection was proposed: in Community Impact Study during GAP, if new 500-room hotel built, hotel would need other access; Arlberg couldn't handle it. Reason Crow Creek Road was chosen was the amount of developable land up that road and recognition of the potential for additional resort development north of the airport. Felt that it would be better to link it via Crow Creek Road. Need to revisit pros and cons. One voice endorses Hightower connection; another (Diane) likes Crow Creek.

JC – Character of Crow Creek Road to stay roughly the same. Should it be paved? Not an option to keep it completely the way it is.

Schwartz – Could Hightower connect to Crow Cr road north of HS site? Tom – terrain is tougher there. Tight to get past the school.

Q: have we considered moving the airport? Too many planes with too much residential development. Noise and safety problems. Why can't it move down to Seward Highway?

Pedestrian Plan

GIS trail layer should be used for the map. Need to make some corrections in how trails are shown. Iditarod Trail will become the main N-S spine.

Public Transit Plan

JC - The Seward Hwy has changed what Girdwood is – can't stay what it has always been. Need to find ways to achieve multi-day visitor stays to get more benefit from tourism. Circulation and retail will be important to do this. Need to think about all the potential markets for transit.

TJM – have we considered weather and how it affects transit? JC – yes.

Dave (from Alyeska) Q: have we considered a fixed (elevated) guideway (pulled by a wire rope, on tracks)? (a la Keystone? Jakes Associates transportation plan – 4 stations, 4-5 miles long; 20-year costs made it more attractive than buses)

JC – numbers don't support it now, might in the very long-term future (need to move more than 2000 people in a peak hour). But you could build it into the MP so that private developers plan and budget for it.

Q: how are we suggesting this be paid for (subsidized)? What kind of vehicles? JC – not vans. Small buses. Funding is a challenge. Can consider leveraging bus equipment as part of a rail project. Or, partner with the resort. People Mover might reconsider whether they could run a route in the valley, especially with private partners (Alyeska Resort). Best not to charge passengers (inefficient and costly). Could the hotel charge people to park up here and dedicate the money

to a bus system? (Keystone does that.) TJM – wants us to recommend free shuttles from the parking areas we want people to use; wants bike connections; wants ways to accommodate dogs on transport.

Q: is the valley entry the only location for park n' ride intercept? Earlier plans showed one in the New Townsite area. JC – this land will become too valuable, but might be good to use it as an interim phase.

TJM – is there a way to encourage people to ski home? Some of the grades are too flat. JC – development of Nordic skiing ought to be a priority.

Collector parking where proposed really impacts the view and the scenery. Could it be at the gravel pit and, later, a location for a parking structure? JC – DOT won't allow that site to be used for that purpose, and there are access problems with that site. DOT doesn't want to move its maintenance site. The MHT site solves a lot of problems for us in connecting modes of transit and in access.

Rail Spur

JC – we are recommending that this be in the MP. First, the vision the community expressed in earlier meetings was to develop strategic tourism as the economic base of the community. Second, the community wants more commercial development than local residents alone cannot support; need tourism. The default outcome here is a large residential subdivision. “No change” is not an option. Implementation of low-impact tourism (bicycling, Nordic skiing, wildlife viewing, hiking, golf) requires development of a strategy that will cause this to happen. Regardless of what JC says, this issue will come before the MOA Assembly because it's MOA land. In preparation and to give you some leverage, we felt it would be important to address it in the MP and give a clear assessment of the pros and cons and the guiding principles for implementation if it proceeds. In any case, “Do nothing” is always alt 1 in the NEPA process.

Joan: Public sentiment has been misrepresented in the partial draft. Implies that there is consent and support for the preferred rail corridor alignment. If the rail doesn't serve the community core, then rail isn't an option, not that the western alignment is the best. Needs to be written that “There is considerable lack of community support for any rail option.” Jim – doesn't know what the proportion of support is. Petition to direct GBOS to do a transportation MP gathered over 365 signatures. Julie Jonas – has the ARRC made a decision to build the spur? Bruce Carr – No. However, this is an MOA issue as well. ARRC experience is that the benefits of expanding service are positively received (i.e. ski train, etc) ARRC appreciates that there is a process that must be followed to assess the full feasibility of this idea. Yes, ARRC “is interested in the rail spur” and feel it has positive benefit to the community and meets many of the community's visions (reduce auto traffic, make the place more pedestrian-friendly, promote strategic tourism). Can be used as a tool to make the community what you want it to be.

Duane - Can we pursue a compromise? Build a transit center at the Valley Entry as a starting point? Rail riders to that point, then use local transit to get to other destinations.

Resort is the only one benefiting from this. What is their position? A: Chris von Imhoff – Rail could eliminate the need for another road from Seward Hwy – lesser of 2 evils. Truly feels that rail access is essential to reduce flood of buses and gain pedestrian friendly character. Commuter service as an alternative. Why not at least identify the corridor as a future access. Plan needs to look at rail in context of alternative options for second access.

Q: Did we look at light rail and isn't there a better rail technology? JC – yes, we looked at monorails and light rail. They just aren't feasible in this situation. Q: are you saying that light rail isn't an option because we can't afford it? JC – No. Light rail has overhead electric power. Usually done where there are many stops in a short distance, with need for rapid acceleration. It requires substations every ½ mile, and visual impacts usually generate community opposition. Gross environmental impact is about the same as regular rail. ARRC equipment today is not light rail; no opportunity to shift from one line to another. No advantage is gained here with light rail. Steel on steel powered by mobile diesel units is where most agencies are going. Don't need to run 40 miles of overhead wire to power this system. Management of air pollution from diesel units is a valid issue. You might look for a specific trade-off in reduction of diesel buses in the valley.

Norm – get an intermodal center first and a ski train to that point, and also a bus system first. (Norm outlined all the conflicts with trails and roads.) Could there be potential freight use of the spur?

Q: wouldn't an internal bus connection be a better marketing tool for the community? Rail spur doesn't have any access to the core. JC – really important to understand that the only physically acceptable alignment is the 1A alternative, which has no connections at the core. That's why we're recommending the internal transit and making it a condition of the rail. Q: Rail alignment bypasses the commercial opportunities in the core. JC - Stations in the NTS have too many impacts. But how do you spread out the benefits of visitors coming by rail? Want to see an impact assessment of how much benefit this will give (traffic reduction, etc).

Q: how would people in Anchorage get to the ski train? Dimond Center, and other.

Q: Norm – how would the train cross Crow Creek Road? On-grade? Bruce Carr – we don't know.

Keith Tryck – this process was intended to give us more information and data to make this decision. Appreciates this draft. Should reduce some of the concerns about rail.

Ann: Q: how many buses will this take off the road? Need more data to make the decision.

Keith – who's to say the rail will make people stop using buses? JC – a condition could be that the municipality limit the number of tour buses. If RR manages the visitors' program rather than Holland America, maybe tourists will have more time to spend here. JC – you aren't getting any benefit from tourism today in the valley. You need to change that. Chris – not true to say hotel guests don't benefit the community. They do – flightseeing, overflow business. Bruce Carr – generally true that tourists aren't spending enough here. Cruise lines definitely have a stranglehold on tourist expenditures. Half the cruise passengers leave the boat and go straight home. The cruise lines consider Southcentral a transfer, not an attraction. Girdwood needs to offer them something to do.

Linda Bennett – Remember that map only identifies a rail corridor to be set aside. Supports starting with a valley entry multi-modal center.

Q: Are you going to include what we say and our ideas? JC - We're trying.

Comment: Like the guiding principles to help them if the rail happens. Thinks we are listening to them, even though he doesn't support the rail option.

Jim Barnett – Seward venue will be augmented by a Whittier venue, which has more potential to bring visitors into Girdwood, with more bus traffic. ARRC is discussing how they can attract some of these passengers off the buses. Imagine the potential impacts of this growing tourist base on Girdwood.

Mike Finnegan. Q: Can't see recommending a rail when it will impact the residential potential along the west side of the highway (HLB land). We need these properties on the tax rolls. JC – shouldn't have a marketing or financial impact on the value of that real estate. Location of the RR vis-à-vis the collector road is essential. The MP needs to look at how these two relate. MF: "This is a one-time opportunity to do it right."

TJM: MP needs to include population projections. What would you suggest if Fed funds not available for rail? What else could accomplish our objectives w/o rail? Issue – people walking on the tracks (safety); security for passengers, wildlife. Quiet Girdwood Valley is a major selling point. Noise is a huge impact. Girdwood needs a community center that was denied by Anchorage. Doubts the reasons Jim gave for supporting the rail spur (strategic tourism).JC– there isn't another equally effective option to bring good eco-tourists to the valley, but at the very least develop a good trail system, summer and winter.

Q: Lots of comparisons to other top US ski resorts and building it into a great destination. What's the target market? JC – baby-boomers who are spending a lot on vacations and interested in outdoor activities.

Q: can we get funding for bus transit without the spur? JC – you could try, but your odds aren't good. Formula grant system sends a certain amount of money to Anchorage transit, which has many needs. Girdwood wouldn't be the highest

priority in the Anchorage system. Coat-tailing on the railroad has better chances because it's intermodal and has high political support. Probability seems low that we can get bus transit without rail.

Q: how long will the train trip take? Whittier shuttle goes 12 miles in 45 minutes. This trip is 4.7 miles.

Q: Is this a good time to get a petition together? JC – Surveys can be challenged.

Julie Jonas – would like to see more information on the financial feasibility of the rail spur. People are concerned that this won't be confined to low-impact tourism. Fear that the spur will wreck the very qualities people came here to see. (Moose Meadows as a sanctuary) JC- nothing happens in transit in the US that isn't 80% supported by Fed funds for capital investments. Regardless of the system chosen, you would look for fed funding. Question is where you get money for operations; can't get this from Fed funds – this is a source that can dry up. Have opportunity for local appropriations, but this is iffy. Railroad subsidy or the resort could be looked to as an O&M partner. Potential to look at a sales tax. Equally difficult for bus as for rail.

TJM – to Chris von Imhoff – would the resort consider helping to fund the community center? Chris - Resort is already spending a lot on the community (church, radio station), can't commit. JC – resorts don't like to spend money but they like to invest money. See if we can help the resort get more for their investment in shuttle vans. Would we put the spur here if the resort weren't here? JC –get resort assistance to fund parts of the transit system, such as the multimodal station at the hotel.

Mike Finnegan Q: can we look at alternative powering (fuel cells)? Is there money out there to fund systems that use alt fuels? JC – well's running dry, but keep looking at this.

Appendix D-2

MEETING MINUTES - COMMERCIAL AREAS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Girdwood, September 9, 1999

Introduction (Sherry Dorward)

- Purpose of drawings: concepts and strategies, not site or building design
- Primary elements –circulation patterns, space allocated for various functions
- Summary of what we heard in previous meetings; new townsite should be the downtown

Land Use Regulations (Chris Beck)

- Master plan deals with vehicular circulation, pedestrian circulation, parking, land uses, etc.
- Design guidelines (standards, land use code) - deadline for submittal of draft for public review is currently 10/1/99, but should it be delayed a couple of weeks?
- Tom N. – it will be difficult to review both documents (code and master plan) at the same time, but staff is committed to deadline unless community is willing to allow some delay to get these in sync.
- Sherry D. – example of how the two documents are related: master plan may recommend character and small scale of downtown buildings; guidelines in code would then have specific limits on the size of buildings.
- Q: what will the public review process be?
- Chris Beck – normal process for public comment prior to adoption
- Tom N. – if the land use code can be delayed, then the two could go out together. A number of public hearings would be held, including Land Bank, Bd of Supervisors, Planning Bd. then the drafts would go on to Municipal Assembly for approval; it'll create confusion if they are not in sync.
- Norman – the code needs to be done on the Oct. 1 schedule; might be more confusing to have both documents come at the same time (they should be in sync.)
- Tom N. – both documents will be voluminous reading
- Norman – it will be hard for people to deal with both at the same time
- Thomas John – thinks they should be done at the same time; but they should have adequate time (6 months?) to review the documents.
- Continued discussion of pros and cons of timing. Does it make sense to have them come forward as a single package, but give people more time to digest them?
- Discussion continued to Bd. of Supervisors meeting

Overview of Commercial Areas (Sherry)

- What we heard from people at previous meetings (quick summary) including that the new townsite is where the “center” should be
- Each commercial node has a role within the community:
 - Valley Entry – circulation, parking roles

Original Townsite – keep character, residential, etc.

Old resort base – difficult problem, so our recommendations have dealt with circulation and parking more than with land use or design

New resort base – additional hotel, transportation elements, add more recreational activities

New Girdwood Townsite (Sherry)

- Sherry D – the plan is based on green landscape as the dominant feel for Alyeska and Hightower as the main street.
- Important to establish a consistent frontage along the street, pedestrian circulation along front of buildings; 13' – 20'
- Buildings separate from one another, not connected (like Leadville, CO)
- Make something out of the center of the square (park); don't change its character, but begin to promote it and use it (describes a number of activities that could occur there)
- Thomas John – new townsite should not be the center – just brings more traffic in; instead have the development down at the highway
- Sherry D – that's not what we heard at previous meetings
- Debate about whether the new townsite should be where commercial development should occur
- It would help to have more information about phasing; so we should do a series of overlays to show first phase, later phases, etc.; concern about damage if the wrong things happen first
- Sherry D – there is no control over this – private land owners will decide whether to develop
- This could raise issues of taking.
- Chris B - key lever is public investment; implement a development district to build pedestrian facilities, parking, etc.
- Deborah – fundamental issue: we need a vision; we never reached a consensus; what is a heart of the community; we have different ideas of what we mean by “heart of the community.” She didn't hear people say that the center should be at the new townsite. She is concerned that children should not walk past a bar on the way to school.
- Tom N. – the decision was made in the Girdwood Area Plan that the new townsite would be the center.
- Discussion of whether saying the new townsite should be the center necessarily means that there should be a lot of commercial development in the downtown.
- Should the north side and south side have the same style (as suggested – but not intended - by the color drawing) – is that really feasible? Is that more realistic for the south side, with single ownership, than it is for the north side?
- What about diagonal parking, delivery access, flood flows?
- The first thing in our recommendations should be to develop a comprehensive flood control plan for the new townsite.
- Should town square be like an alley or should it be a park? Retail on these lots should be double-loaded.

- Discussion of other visions of how the townsite should look; concern for snow removal; leave center park open, keeping in mind that there are 8 months of the year when there is a lot of snow on the ground.
- Issue of water supply; need to have wells a certain distance away from buildings; implications of this for access to the backs of the buildings.
- Duane – we haven't touched on green areas and parks. Issue of ball diamond – need adequate space for that – won't fit in a green corridor.
- Sherry D – reviewed some of our alternatives and noted that the recommended plan would move the ball diamond; also the community should do a recreational facilities plan.
- Need some landscaping in the large parking lot – concerned about view from Alyeska Highway of large parking lot.
- Sherry D – discussion of how thick the vegetation is. Also rebuilding the California Creek highway crossing to open the view with a bridge rather than a box. Also discussion of alternatives we considered and how the plan evolved.
- Marco – likes what we've done on the north side, but notes changes needed on the south side. Need for parking for fire department volunteers; don't move the road to the other side of the fire department – that won't work.
- Michelle York – would like to move the parking lot to the other side of the fire hall. In winter flood parking to make an ice skating rink.
- Sherry D – parking could be shared parking.
- XX – suggest a more radical approach to moving road (moving it further).
- Linda Bennett – why are we avoiding a traffic signal. Answer – we heard from you that you didn't want one. Have other towns taken a position that they don't want traffic signals? Yes. And we are recommending distributing traffic to avoid the traffic signal, yes, although it is also to avoid too much congestion at the Hightower/Alyeska intersection.
- Question – is the master plan regulatory in terms of building and design approval? What do we do if something comes in that isn't consistent with the plan? A: Master Plan policies and guidelines provide a basis for GBOS and Assembly to evaluate development proposals.
- What about opening up California Creek? Discussion of how much vegetation should there be; dike on California Creek, character issue, etc.
- Lewis - Are you going to have the drawing in the plan? What does it mean to connect the greenways to the park? Has a problem with the south side plan – we are destroying the tennis courts; also, what we are proposing for the Forest Fair Park is terrible – it will be backed up to commercial area and parking; we are destroying 35 years of community effort and social capital. Would like to see text about citizen involvement in decision-making for the parks and civic buildings. (Language we have in the section about the Original Townsite should be used here, too.) We need to keep in mind the public effort that went into building some of these facilities and how important they are. The changes we are proposing would destroy all of this.
- Lewis - We were charged with finding a site for radio station. The site we are showing is unsuitable. They need to move soon. The Lions would never allow the change we are showing.

- What does the community feel about the four parcels at the corner (Lions Park) – what should happen there?
- TJM - Decision was already made to put a park there to avoid commercial on that corner.
- JC - But the master plan gives us an opportunity to revisit this and establish what the use of the municipally owned land should be.
- Lewis - Radio station should be surrounded by rain forest. People should be able to walk in, see exhibits and then go out and be in the natural rain forest. They need to be close to services and utilities, community gardens and camping. There would also be a performance venue and a place to have community projects. With museum function, this would take about an acre. That would not have to be owned by the radio station, but those functions would have to be dedicated uses for lands around the radio station. (There would be no antenna on site.)
- Barry - We want this to be a residential community, not a commercial community. The Forest Fair Park should be inviolate; it is part of the heart and soul of the community. If the tennis courts, ball diamond, skate park are going to move, we need to show where they should go. All of these sites/functions work together with the Forest Fair Park – they need to be in the same place. The synergy among them is important.
- If we move the recreation and civic activities elsewhere, we are not creating a center.
- We could move Little Bears, but it was built with blood, sweat and tears. You cannot move the Forest Fair.
- What are people going to buy? What is all this commercial? Knife shops? This is not like the lower 48. We cannot even keep a health center.
- Economic viability. We need numbers in the report. We are creating a problem by putting commercial on both the north and south sides. We need to pick one side or the other. If we show something (parks, etc.) moving, we need to show where those things are going to go. Also if parks and recreational facilities move, they need to be co-located so there are efficiencies in park maintenance.
- Is there a consensus? Two concepts. One: we don't want a new commercial center on the south side to eliminate the viability of the existing townsite. Two: the park and civic uses are very important; and we don't want to destroy them.
- Skateboard park could move to other side. But it needs to be concrete and out of the flood plain.
- Could the community center be in this civic core, and could that provide a tie?
- The idea of having this high activity area (recreation) in the community center does define this community.
- Re: character - this is a place to do stuff, not just a place to buy stuff. (Gabrielle – living here is about *doing* things, not buying things.)
- The recreational activities should be inviting to visitors.
- The three small buildings that are there today need to be replaced.
- The concept of protecting the Forest Fair Park requires that there be concentric transition from wilderness to civilization around it.

- Rita Hall - Is this in addition to the 10 acres specified in the golf lease area for commercial use, or is this the 10 acres. If this is the golf course, it is not within the golf course lease area. Why would this take 20 years to build out?
- Long discussion of what the golf course lease calls for in terms of the commercial area.
- Is the area north of the new townsite currently zoned commercial? (Yes.)
- We should add a recommendation to the land use policies that we identify and preserve historic buildings and sites. This includes the elements that Barry was talking about. Some of the buildings could move because they are historic but necessary at that site. This includes more than just historic buildings.
- The park is too small. We need a bigger area for children to play.
- Keeping the road on the other side of the fire station is important to keeping the trees.
- Discussion of the location of the road around the fire house.
- Remember the Iditarod trail will be running along Glacier Creek.
- Look at alternative 1 in the package – is this closer to what we want?
- Discussion of other options for layout; walking distance of 1200 feet, etc.
- Note on unique stand of birch trees in the strip of parkland between Alyeska Hwy and the town square - needs to be preserved.
- People won't really walk from the post office to the retail. They drive when it is dark and snowy.
- TJM - How can Girdwood influence the Assembly, and how do we keep continuity going? Do we need a paid staff position?
- The master plan can be an organizing force. If the community is divided, it won't have any voice at all. If a master plan is adopted, the Assembly will honor it. They are paying for this project.
- Does this community have the tax base it needs to meet its own needs? (No.)
- Discussion of Mammoth Lakes as an example where things had to get bad before people could work together.
- What will happen if we don't achieve consensus? A lot of residential development on HLB land.
- How do we make the next step without the consulting team coming back?