I. Call to Order

Commission Chair Tim Trawwer called the meeting to order at 11:35 a.m.

Commissioners Present:
Tim Trawwer, Chair
Jim Fredrick, Commissioner
Peggy Looney, Commissioner
Brad Quade, Commissioner
Ron Tenny, Commissioner
Wende Wilber, Commissioner

Staff Present:
Robin E. Ward, Executive Director
Nicole Jones-Vogel, Land Management Officer
Kristy Despars, Land Management Officer

Commissioners Absent:
Kati Capozzi, Vice-Chair (Unexcused)

II. Approval of the February 8, 2018 Agenda and December 14, 2017 Meeting Minutes

Commissioner Jim Fredrick moved to approve the agenda as presented. The motion was seconded and approval of the agenda passed unanimously. Mr. Fredrick moved to approve the minutes of December 14, 2017, the motion was seconded and the item passed unanimously.

III. Director’s Report

Ms. Robin Ward commended Commissioner Ron Tenny for utilizing the Collector mapping application to provide HLB property inspections. The EPA Brownfields Grant committee meeting will be on February 14th and we’re extending an invitation to developers to learn about the available programs and how to submit applications for site assessments. We’re trying to accomplish a lot of outreach for this great program. Our expert is Nicole Jones-Vogel and any questions can be directed to her.

IV. Appearance Request

a. Jeff Urbanus, Project Management & Engineering, Watershed Division will provide a presentation on the proposed amendment of Title 21 regarding stream setbacks.

Jeff Urbanus, Project Management & Engineering/Watershed Management shared that the proposed amendment of Title 21 regarding stream setbacks was before the Planning & Zoning Commission for public hearing on Monday and the public hearing was extended. The changes were amended in 2014, but there were some inconsistencies between large and small stream setbacks, which resulted in the
currently proposed changes. There have been numerous comments both supportive of larger setbacks and supportive of smaller setbacks. One approach was a universal setback, however in our research it was found that larger streams need larger setbacks. So, basically we have a variable setback based upon the stream. Secondly, we based it on the pattern of surrounding development, whether it is in an urban setting with previous development or abutting natural undeveloped landscape. Mr. Urbanus shared a multitude of benefits to the community and the health of the watershed of having stream setbacks. We’re proposing a two phase determination. Every stream begins with a 25’ setback and then evaluation of pervious types of impacts, such as trails, platforms, gardens, etc. would be allowed in an additional setback of 25’ to 75’ dependent upon stream. Existing development would be grandfathered in. Mr. Urbanus gave examples of specific streams and the proposed setbacks and types of uses that would be allowed or not allowed. Mr. Urbanus shared additional AMC language changes. Chair Trawver asked if there were commissioner questions.

Commissioner Brad Quade inquired about the working group that was supposed to address the more complex questions that were posed. Mr. Urbanus stated that he had not gotten back to the Planning group to see what that would entail, but assumed that would be internal only, and would have to defer to the Planning group on that. One issue that proved to be contentious, but was not intended, was during the 2014 amendment, the Hillside District Plan called for all stream setbacks to be 50’. We supported that, but there has been some unintended consequences where we wanted to stay away from universal setbacks and proposed 25’ setbacks on the smaller streams. Some smaller streams begin and end in a natural area, but along the stream, it flows in ditches along the roadway or down between two houses with lawn on either side. In terms of what we’re proposing and staying consistent, from a Watershed Management perspective, it’s a difficult argument to say that should be a 50’ setback. One reason why we went to a transitional setback is when you have a 25’ setback and you’re building a house, where do you put it – at 25’1”? We did intentionally propose larger than 50’ setbacks on the Hillside, and that appeared to be the source of contentious testimony on Monday. Hopefully that can be addressed prior to going to the Assembly next month. Commissioner Wende Wilber and Chair Trawver thanked Mr. Urbanus for the detailed presentation and his work on the project.

V. Proposed Action Items and Public Hearings:


Ms. Wilber recused herself from the discussion and proposed action item due to her previous representation of HLB during the rezoning of this parcel. Ms. Ward reported this parcel was included in the Potter Valley Land Use Analysis (PVLUA) which recommended designating the north end of the tract open space and recreational lands, the southern portion undisturbed open space and to plat and rezone the central area for residential use. HLB has re-platted the parcel into 4 tracts and, by document, recorded a relocatable 60’ wide public use easement on the existing Miller Driveway, which has been there for many, many years. Per the Hillside District Plan, HLB recorded a relocatable 20’ wide trail easement. The middle portion, which is about 17.5 acres, was then taken forward to the Planning & Zoning Commission
(PZC) and on to the Assembly for rezoning to an R-6 zoning district, which is now completed and approved. So, our next step is to bring it forward to our Commission with the opportunity to dispose of this parcel and then it also has to go to the Assembly for final approval to dispose of this property by competitive bid. Ms. Ward shared copies of the one written testimony received. Chair Trawver opened up the public hearing.

Dianne Holmes stated the PVLUA has been in effect for a long time which has requirements for this parcel which are reflected in the plat. Since you are a self-supported organization, although many of us would like to have seen different zoning, we have assurances that the conditions will be upheld. We appreciate that. This is pretty much a done deal and as a landowner, you have the right to develop the property. We look forward to having the park as open space and hope that gets done very fast so we can have access to the park.

Keith Mobley stated that he’s a resident up there and the trail easement does not access the park, it accesses other private land. This is probably the third time in thirty years that they’re trying to put a trail through there. In my opinion, the park has two access points to that area on the Seward Highway. All they have to do is extend the trail up to that area in the park. One of the reasons they should not have access to that area because of flooding and the sheep habitat on the mountain above. Access should be similar to Flattop, because the sheep habitat will be ruined if there’s that many people hiking up in there. Access from the creek side doesn’t make sense because that’s all private land in there. That trail is not going to land where people are going to get into the park. Mr. Mobley stated he doesn’t have a problem with developing the property, but putting trail access in there is not smart.

Nancy Pease stated she’d like to respond to Mr. Mobley’s testimony. He is right, there are sheep up there and it’s a lovely habitat. The whole idea of the easement over this particular tract is that eventually there will be trail easements to access Chugach State Park (CSP). The CSP is landlocked for about 5 miles through this area. So, whether or not these easements are developed right now, yes, it doesn’t lead to the park yet. The idea is to put segment by segment in place so that someday there can be a public connection. It is needed. Chair Trawver asked if there were any commissioner questions.

Commissioner Looney asked if there was interest in this property. Ms. Ward responded that we have not advertised it whatsoever. Those who have known about it have been following our progress on the entitlements. I do expect that we will. We expect to sell it as a tract and development will still require adherence to the plat notes, Title 21, DCM, and the Hillside District Plan. We will still need to get an assessment of fair market value so we can set the bid amount following Assembly approval. Mr. Fredrick asked if the development of this parcel would land lock surrounding private property. Ms. Ward responded that was why we put in the 60' public use easement.

Seeing no other persons present wishing to provide testimony, Chair Trawver closed the public hearing. Mr. Fredrick moved to approve. The item was seconded and passed unanimously.

This motion: Passed 5-0 (with 1 recusal)

Chair Trawver stated that public comments had been compiled with HLB staff responses and distributed to the commission, and incorporated as Appendix F of the Plan. Commissioner Ron Tenny inquired why it did not get approved last year. Ms. Ward responded that there were quite a few amendments made at the Assembly level, and there were so many, and so complex, that we really wanted to bring it back in-house and work on it. That is one of the reasons that we had the retreats. So we could familiarize you with all of those issues and then start the plan all over again see if we could find some compromises. So what you have before you is the result of a lot of staff work and commissioner input; thank you again for showing up at those retreats and learning about all those parcels that we have.

Ms. Ward opted to provide an overview, and added that four issues have risen out of this Plan. One, a Girdwood resident had requested that we move HLB Parcel 6-040 from the 5-year Plan to the 1-year to start assessing it for potential residential development. We’ve received quite a few comments requesting that go back into the 5-year Plan and more time spent on assessing that, especially with the hydrology of the area, which is very unique in Girdwood. Checking some of the existing wells and determining what the impact would be for any new development on those existing wells. It doesn’t look feasible for public water to be brought in anywhere near reasonable rates. We’ll be looking at that and you’ll see in Exhibit F, we are recommending that we do go ahead and put it back in the 5-year Plan and do more research on it.

Another was the Girdwood Industrial Park (GWIP). It was already in the 1-year Plan and we will be focusing on that and we’ve committed to the Girdwood community residents that we will spend some time and a little bit of money researching exactly what it would take to complete all the GWIP phases. Phase I will be complete this summer. We need to research what it will take to complete Phases II and III. We will be actively working on that.

Another one was on the Hillside, 2-126 through 2-135. Today none of those are in the 1-year or the 5-year Plan and I believe one of our commissioners will be making an amendment for that.

And the last one is on the west side of Anchorage, where the Clitheroe Center is today – formerly the old compost area, which we have cleaned up about 95%. That is actively being looked at for a fairly large treatment center campus. Today we don’t have a lot of information on it, they will probably be looking for a long-term ground lease where they will build the infrastructure and the buildings, but we’ll ground lease it to them. Chair Trawver asked who would be developing it. Ms. Ward indicated that we don’t know that yet. This is expected to be run under the umbrella of a non-profit that will offer quite a few different treatment programs that will go together. Right now we don’t know what that would look like yet, but they are very actively doing the assessment and the planning, etc. Because of that activity, we do feel it’s time to bring that into the 1-year Plan. We’ll be looking at an Intra-Governmental Permit for Public Use (IGPUE) in that area for the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail. The IGPPUE would convert to an easement if the properties were ever sold. We are promoting this to the 1-year Plan so that we can start working on that.
Ms. Ward stated this is just an overview; those were the larger things that came up. Chair Trawver opened up the public hearing.

**Julie Raymond-Yakoubian** provided testimony for HLB Parcel 6-011 and the Girdwood Nordic Ski Club trails alleging that there was work done outside the trail easement that resulted in damage. **Ms. Raymond-Yakoubian** stated the damage should be repaired prior to granting them another easement which has already been done. Since a second easement on a different parcel has been granted, her recommendation was that second easement either be rescinded or put on hold until mitigation is done on the existing trails for the previous work they’ve already completed. She stated she’s not familiar with process on how to get that done, but thinks it should be very clear in this Plan of what the repercussions are when managers who are provided easements don’t follow what the guidelines are for what they’ve been approved for. For example, with the existing 5K Loop, it’s wider than 80’ in some locations – and it’s supposed to be a 30’ easement. Gravel was taken from next to the trail and there are large divots outside of the easement where gravel was used to build the trail. The Winner Creek trail, which runs parallel to the 5K Nordic Loop trail, the viewshed has been completely destroyed. All you can see, in the summer, is this giant road running next to it. Mitigation should be done on existing trails before any trails are put in and this should be outlined in the Plan. And this should not just be for the 5K Loop, but for all land managers of any trails if they don’t stay in the easement that is granted to them. **Ms. Raymond-Yakoubian** also commented on the staff response provided via Appendix F regarding surveying, stating the survey work should be done prior to any further construction of trails on Parcel 6-011.

Mr. Tenny commented the Nordic Ski trail is an asset, but it’s definitely wider than it was supposed to be. There are spots that are 100-150’ wide. Another mistake that was made is that Winner Creek trail should be relocated so that it’s not visible from the Nordic Ski trail. The reason why it’s visible is because there was a gully in between. Looking back at the Trails Committee, we didn’t really have a good understanding of exactly where the trail was going to be. There are members of the Girdwood community that are pro-trails, but there are others that do not support such large trails. Mr. Tenny shared he understood **Ms. Raymond-Yakoubian’s** point, but on the same token, you look at the cat-track trail and the many different types of trails, there is some merit to be said about the next trail to go in. I think the Trails Committee is working on placing the centerline in an appropriate spot. The solution is for that little area where they overlap should be relocated.

Ms. Wilber commented that the language **Ms. Raymond-Yakoubian** is requesting should be in the lease document, this is a planning document. The language, in the event they don’t comply, should be in the lease, or the easement. **Ms. Ward** further commented that if it isn’t, it should have been. That is the appropriate place for that. Chair Trawver expressed concerns that it should be in any easement document that crosses HLB lands. Mr. Tenny commented that surveys for trail easements are extremely expensive, but there’s GPS technology that can get within 10’. Her concern is about Stumpy’s trail, a riverfront trail, which is where this new trail is supposed to go in. **Ms. Wilber** stated that this would be a good topic to discuss at a later meeting to ensure this type of language is in all leases and trail easements going forward. Chair Trawver agreed and stated if this is a problem than staff need to remedy it. Commissioner Brad Quade inquired if approval could be delayed. **Ms. Jones-Vogel** stated that the commission had already supported the action to go forward with the Assembly for the trails with certain conditions that needed to be addressed prior to any trail construction. Those conditions have not yet been met and Assembly approval for the easement has not been authorized yet for the future new trail. **Ms. Wilber** stated that
seems to be outside of the Work Plan and should be picked up at our next meeting, to explore more, review those conditions, and see if we need take further actions to address those concerns. Chair Trawver agreed and added the review of the already constructed trails.

**Douglas Penn** provided testimony that not all comments were represented here, stating he had sent in comments on behalf of his wife and they’re not included. **Mr. Penn** stated he had forwarded comments to Commissioner Ron Tenny and that public comments are important and this is concerning. Ms. Ward stated that if the comment came to our office, you would’ve gotten an email saying we received it and it would be incorporated. **Mr. Penn** stated that his comment did receive an email back, but that his wife’s comment did not – and they were emailed within 5 minutes of each other. Chair Trawver expressed public testimony is important, there can be email issues, and believes staff have been doing their best. Chair Trawver thanked him for bringing attention to this. **Mr. Penn** stated that the subject of his actual comment is redundant because staff have already moved Parcel 6-040 back to the 5-year Plan, for the biggest reason is the impact to the current water wells. It’s prudent, if HLB is looking for residential development in the area, to wait until there’s access to city water. **Mr. Penn** stated he realized it’s cost-prohibitive to do that, but dropping more wells in will impact the water of the existing wells. Putting future development in front of current residents isn’t right. We can’t drop our wells deeper, the pressure is already at a bare minimum. There’s already existing properties that have to share wells because there isn’t enough existing pressure. There isn’t enough water in the area to sustain existing wells. The other comment was, as you’ve probably seen from the GBOS, is to put the Industrial Park back into the 1-year Plan. **Mr. Penn** stated that this is not only his personal view, but that of the entire Girdwood Board of Supervisors that is a priority for the community. So, we’d like you to put that back into the 1-year Plan. It’s necessary for contractors to be able to provide services to the valley. **Mr. Penn** stated that the HLB mission is to benefit current and future citizens and developing Parcel 6-040 is counter-productive to the HLB mission at this time. **Mr. Penn** stated that currently residents use the property to access trails and if 6-040 is developed that trails be included. Chair Trawver commented that the commission visited the Industrial Park area during one of the retreats, and if there are activities to be done, it isn’t a big deal to move it from the 5-year Plan to the 1-year Plan with public notice. Ms. Jones-Vogel stated it is in the 1-year Plan and staff propose to revise the header on page 24 from “Girdwood Industrial Park Subdivision Phase I Improvements” to “Girdwood Industrial Park Subdivision”.

**Jerry Fox**, as a citizen not representing GBOS, provided testimony that the Girdwood Industrial Park is extremely important to the Girdwood community and we prefer HLB to focus on that than Parcel 6-040. Girdwood needs more residential land and that’s hard financially. HLB was trying to do Holten Hills and I think it’s financially infeasible right now. I think there was a project out in Crow Creek and that turned out not to be viable. I don’t know why this project, 6-040, would be viable. What we need is residential land that is low and moderate income and that is extremely hard to do if you have to put in infrastructure. You put in infrastructure on that project, and those lost are going to be $200,000 and that’s not what we need. We’ll end up with 2nd homeowners that come in and buy those, and then they rent them out, and that’s not what we need. **Mr. Fox** stated we need places for low income people in the future and doesn’t know how we can do that. **Mr. Fox** stated that he’s also concerned, like the rest of the people in the area, about the water in the area if 6-040 is developed - what are we going to do about the existing wells? **Mr. Fox** stated his support on GWIP Phases II & III and expressed that we will do anything that is needed to help.
Ann Rappoport provided testimony supporting Parks & Recreation management of conservation of Parcels 2-128 through 2-136, east of Potter Marsh and adjacent just north of the Seward Highway. Together those represent half of the water going into Potter Marsh, which is a state critical habitat there. Every time there is more development, it reduces the permeable surface for water to go through. Every year there is 100,000 visitors, so it is an economic boon to it being in its natural state. Ms. Rappoport stated she understood that is not an available option now due to administrative or cost issues. Instead, it would be great if HLB would just put them in a conservation status. I see also that they are being managed as open space with the protection of water quality – Great. Ms. Rappoport stated her fear is that does not protect those areas for the long term and supports placing them in conservation status to protect them for the long term. This is for the health of the watershed, the wildlife, and the fish. This is the last open space that goes from the sea level to the tundra. Developing small lots like on Goldenview prevent moose from moving about, and we all appreciate going to Potter Marsh and seeing the wildlife moving about in their habitat.

Cathy Gleason, Turnagain Community Council (TCC) President, provided written testimony to the commission and apologized for any typos as some of the TCC comments were typos or grammar related. Ms. Gleason reported that TCC provided comments every year and this year did not get the 45-day notice. She stated she’d been in contact with HLB about that. Ms. Gleason explained there were a lot of comments provided and requested consideration of a delay in voting so the commission could review them. TCC takes their comments very seriously and hoped for the incorporation of their requests. One item Ms. Ward had touched on is the Clitheroe Center and the plans taking place, reiterating that we don’t know all of what’s going on, but we do know it’s going, and it should be both in the 1-year and the 5-year Plan. With regard to municipal entitlement lands, we feel strongly about that because there are some of those parcels that belong to the state now, that are being used as parks, like Little Campbell Lake and areas near Kincaid, and so forth. So, we feel very strongly that those should be transferred to the Municipality. We’re asking for more emphasis in the 1-year and 5-year Plans with regard to continuing to work toward acquiring them from the state. Ms. Gleason stated especially those that have long time use as parks and then to transfer them to Parks & Recreation; hopefully within this six year time period. We’ve been requesting for many years that those parcels west of the airport, the Tony Knowles Coastal Trail, the Sisson Loop trail, these three parcels that are not under a lease be dedicated to parks. These are internationally known trails and a huge wildlife refuge corridor. We strongly feel these should be transferred to Parks. When we’ve brought this up before, staff have said that Parks needs to ask for that, and Parks has no money. John Rodda says Parks has no money. What we’re trying to come up with is some rationale that’s new to you. One is the 2040 Land Use Plan which was approved by the Assembly last year, does designate the northeast portion of 4-033 as Community Facilities and Institutions. That’s where Clitheroe Center is and they’re likely to expand it with their proposal. The TCC supported that. The rest of those parcels: 4-032, 4-033, and 4-034 for the coastal trail are natural open space. And Sisson trail are long time use for the public for park and recreation purposes is now designated as park or natural areas. So now is the time, you’ve got directive from the Planning Department, the Assembly, the 2040 Plan to transfer those and get them into dedicated park status. This governmental agreement that Ms. Ward referred to and it’s in the Plan, we know nothing about it. Our council has not been in any kind of dialogue or discussion about that. I have some recommended language. The effort by the Assembly last year before the 2017 draft was postponed indefinitely, Assemblyman John Weddleton did propose an amendment and specific language that was reviewed and approved by the Assembly Attorney, Mr. Gates, to be inserted in this plan. Unfortunately this draft does not have that at all. So, I don’t know how it was
not taken into consideration, at least not with dialogue with us. We would really appreciate that you would insert that language that was proposed last year. In the meantime, we have a lot of dialogue with the council about this intra-governmental agreement, because, as Ms. Rappoport pointed out, we don’t get long-term protection with an easement dedication. That’s not what we need, as pointed out in the letter. There’s an action item in the West District Plan to get that protected. I think everything is in place to give you that confidence for moving forward with our recommendations, which is in sync with every plan that’s in place now.

Nancy Pease thanked staff for the point by point response and the respectful forum for our comments. With regard to the comments I sent in, there was sort of a bypass of one of my comments, regarding Parcels 2-128 thru 2-136, the east side of Potter Marsh, the staff response in part states those parcels are outside of the P&R service area. Ms. Pease showed the park service area map indicating the parcels are within the service area boundary and requested that be corrected. But that wasn’t really the request, which is that they be transferred to P&R. We all understand that P&R isn’t being funded or adding conservation status lands right now. But the desire was to have in the Work Plan, as Ann Rappoport said, let there be language that shows a long-term commitment to have conservation values and to have conservation management to these lands. That is what the PVLUA showed, but it’s never really been recorded or reaffirmed in the Work Plan. That was the intent of the remarks I had submitted with specific language be put in the Work Plan that they’ll be managed as natural open space, with uses restricted to park and recreational uses, according to the PVLUA — or words to that effect — something long-term — something that commits to open space and conservation. There’s this one sentence over here on the table, and I don’t know if this is new proposed language from staff. Ms. Ward responded that language comes from a commissioner and will be proposed after the public testimony. When this comes up, I would say, this is better, but it doesn’t cite the PVLUA, which is a specific adopted plan which gives real details of intent. Also, it says currently managing these properties. What I hope this statement will say is that they will be managed in the long-term or for the indeterminate future. Because what we’re trying to do is recognize its conservation value and commitment to, so that when large tracts with watershed come up, there can be a contiguous plan. We know there’ll be development, but that there’ll be corridors that will be considered into a broader plan. So it’s important that the status of this land be confirmed as with high conservation values and preservation intent for any money or public-private partnership. And I hope that you give TCC all the time they need, it’s unfortunate they weren’t informed.

Lynne Doran, in reference to Parcel 6-040, there are two things that need to be considered if it becomes feasible to move forward, that a) they consider the newly remodeled elementary school, so that if they’re bringing in homes, that consider the children have somewhere to go to school, of families that move into that area. It was very difficult to get that expansion done for our school — it took more than 10 or 15 years. I think that strong consideration be given to that. And, b) I’m a homeowner also, across from the Industrial Park and as a neighbor, I’d like some sort of a corridor or a greenbelt or something be put in place to allow for the feeling of separation between new development and old development. It would keep the small community sense intact that we have in our little area. And it sounds like this is something that would be way down the road, but I think those two things would be of concern and interest to me if it were to get developed. Chair Trawver stated it’s never too early to make those comments.

Seeing no other persons present wishing to provide testimony, Chair Trawver closed the public hearing.
Chair Trawver asked if there were any commissioner questions. Chair Trawver asked if staff had confirmation that notices were given. Ms. Ward stated that we did find out that we normally send it to the Federation of Community Councils who would then send it out to all of the community councils, and it appeared that did not happen this time. We have talked about this internally, so we not only send it to the community council and the FCC, but that we will in turn send it to every community council. So, we make sure that every community council gets actually notified. Ms. Wilber inquired when the community council got notification. **Ms. Gleason** stated that TCC never did. Ms. Jones-Vogel stated that the Federation did not send out the notification and in our code in public noticing there’s some parts of it that require us to notice every community council prior to the 45-day public review period, where we post it on the website. The language, it relates back to the public notice requirement that we do for all of our other proposed action items, like disposals or impact to the Fund. We do a 14-day notice on the property, we send it to the nearest homeowners within 500’, and we do that process. So, it doesn’t make sense to do that for our Work Plan – if we put out notices on every property that would be impacted by our Work Plan, we wouldn’t have any time to do our Work Plan. So we think that changing our policies on how we’re going about doing that could be done better. We did send it to the FCC and anybody that has asked to be on our list. They did get notified and they get notified of every action. Some community councils are on the list and they did get notified. Chair Trawver asked for confirmation that staff received the TCC letter with comments in detail yesterday. Ms. Jones-Vogel stated they were received 11pm last night. Chair Trawver asked if it were true that staff have not had a chance to respond to all of these comments. Ms. Jones-Vogel stated we have yet to issue a response. Chair Trawver stated he was concerned. Ms. Looney stated she didn’t feel comfortable about it and suggested postponement of the vote to get a chance to take a look at these. Chair Trawver agreed and stated that if TCC had been given notice, that their comments would’ve been received on time. Chair Trawver recommend to the commissioners to delay the resolution, just to have time to review it, and hopefully approve the Work Plan in March. Ms. Wilber stated she’d like to make additional comments on the Work Plan before postponement of the whole thing. I’d like to have some discussion, just so that people wouldn’t have to come back later, especially the folks who have come from Girdwood. Chair Trawver concurred. Ms. Wilber referenced an amendment on the table, so to speak, to address some of the language concerning the watershed issue. Parcels 2-128 thru 2-136 aren’t even in the 1-year or the 5-year plan. So that means in the next five years, nothing is going to happen on these parcels. However, this issue does keep coming up. To offer some clarification, Ms. Wilber suggested under proposed projects, on page 32, that we add that “HLB is currently managing these properties as open space with the protection of water quality and that any future actions on these parcels would be evaluated in manner consistent with the Hillside District Plan and other adopted plans. Key considerations would include evaluation of appropriate land uses, accesses, and watershed management.” Ms. Wilber stated that she had not initially considered adding the PVLUA, however would have no qualms adding it next to the Hillside District Plan and other adopted plans. I offer that comment or change to the Plan to acknowledge the concerns about watershed management in the area. Mr. Fredrick sought clarification that’s the Potter Valley Land Use Analysis and Ms. Wilber confirmed and added 1999. Mr. Fredrick suggested an amendment addressing Ms. Pease’s concern for a longer-term view for management for water quality. Ms. Wilber stated the reason she said currently evaluate for land use purposes is that it isn’t in the 5-year plan, it isn’t anywhere that we’re even looking into these lands. So it is getting managed for water quality right now. I guess I want to see maximum flexibility. These are great parcels and as the Hillside gets greater development, there’s some underlying large parcels and there may be some opportunities for land swaps or exchanges in the future that actually be more effective for a wildlife corridor or could benefit the watershed. So, as some of these other parcels
that are upstream start to develop, I think there is some room for flexibility. I think the lands are somewhat protected through the 2040 Land Use Plan, PVLUA and the Hillside District Plan. I would like to continue to evaluate that and have some sort of flexibility that will be in the best interest of the Hillside. Chair Trawver agreed in not adding further language defining what the future holds. We don’t know. Ms. Wilber stated that she thinks this issue will continue to come up every year and it will continue to have increased pressure because of the need or because changes in development, and we continue to evaluate it until we move forward. But for the next six years, there are no plans in our Work Plan for this land. I think that’s pretty good. Chair Trawver addressed the commissioners stating we could have staff make that change. Ms. Ward stated we will take this and add it to our Appendix F and also correct the typo. Chair Trawver addressed Ms. Wilber that the amendment was stated well and addresses other items that we got in this packet. We’ve addressed the TCC notification. We’ve closed the public hearing, we don’t have to have another public hearing next month. We can have staff incorporate the comments that have now been received and provide responses into the Work Plan as Appendix F, a third one, that includes everything. Commissioner Ron Tenny stated as for Girdwood and the Plan, that one of the issues for that property (6-040) is water facilities. That’s an issue in Girdwood, many places have sewer, but no water facilities. I think it’s a waste of money and resources, unless we understand where that water is coming from in that area. It should be moved to the 5-year, but it should also be stated in there. Ms. Ward stated we could do that. Commissioner Brad Quade asked if we had documentation of why it’s not feasible for water lines. I keep hearing that it’s not feasible and it’s too expensive. Is there documentation you can provide to us? So that I understand what the options are and why we’re not going forward. Have you hired a hydrologist? Have you put that in the Work Plan? Chair Trawver stated the answer is no. Mr. Quade stated he wants to see studies, what the costs are based on, how the infeasible determination is made? Mr. Tenny stated he thought it had to do with the housing density in whether or not the home buyer could afford it. Mr. Quade said we know what the costs are and we know what the metrics are. But can I get a document that shows what it is? Ms. Wilber stated that part of this is a Work Plan and as this moves forward and that’s part of the evaluation. The Work Plan isn’t for solving all of these problems. Putting all of that effort up front is not what a Work Plan is and is not a good use of everybody’s resources in my opinion. Basically by putting this out to five years is saying that there’s not anything going to happen in the near future. Mr. Quade stated that it’s cited three times in here. Ms. Jones-Vogel added that we have some feasibility studies that report on the Holtan Hills project which we could work to make available. It basically states we would have to give a developer several million dollars in order to make that project work. We don’t have something like that for 6-040, because we’re not even talking about working on that. Ms. Ward stated we don’t have anything like that for this parcel, but we do on Holtan Hills, but that was several years ago. Mr. Tenny stated that the housing needs to be around the resort, because that’s where the water and sewer are. If we could take back some leases from the resort and develop it, we should, but the reality is we can’t. The best land available in Girdwood is around the resort. Ms. Ward stated that we were looking at land that is more easily to be developed is the section around Egloff, because we do have water and sewer there. Especially for higher density, we’ve already looked at that and that is a great area for that. And the South Townsite Master Plan needs to be amended if you’re going to do something fairly dense, but today it doesn’t allow for that. Mr. Quade said that area is cited several times and that’s great. Ms. Ward stated that area is most feasible for more dense housing, because there is water and sewer available. Chair Trawver said that we have some comments from community councils that were late that were not their fault necessarily. They were received a day or two ago, and staff have not addressed those in Appendix F. It seems prudent for them to have an opportunity to comment, in my opinion. If we feel differently, then we should make a motion otherwise. Ms. Looney
made a motion to postpone our decision on the Work Plan until March 8\textsuperscript{th}. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

This motion: \textbf{Passed 6-0}

V. Persons or Items not on the Agenda

Chair Trawver opened up the floor for persons not on the agenda to provide testimony. \textbf{Jerry Fox} stated that the majority of land in Girdwood is owned by HLB and we’ve been working with them since the beginning of (Girdwood Industrial Park) Phase I. There was some issues with communication at the beginning, but they’ve been working with us for years on this project and would like to thank Robin and Nicole. They’ve been outstanding in coming to Girdwood and communicating with us, since that time, since we had that problem. It has been great, and they’ve had to put up with a lot of conflicting comments from different community members and taken their guff and everything. They’re always smiling and I’d like to thank them. Chair Trawver thanked him and told staff they’re doing a good job.

\textbf{Nancy Pease} stated in case you were confused about the two submittals by the Rabbit Creek Community Council, we’re going through a little internal shake out there. Our correspondence committee submitted what was adopted and approved out there. The Chair, who is new, gave a different version that was substantively different. We’re having our next community council tonight, so we weren’t able to vote on that and get it all on one page again before your meeting here today. But that’s why you saw two copies and hopefully you’ll look at one smooth submittal in the future. Chair Trawver thanked her for her clarification.

\textbf{Julie Raymond-Yakoubian} asked for clarification on what is going on for the 5K trail easement. What I thought I heard is that staff was going to look into the existing easement for the Nordic 5K and see if there was discrepancies from the lease and what exists. I also thought I heard that this item was going to be added to the next meeting agenda. Chair Trawver stated he was not sure if we’ll take it up at the next meeting. We don’t have an agenda yet. We have asked staff to provide a review of what has happened. We’re aware of what has happened. And if necessary, they would take action, or we may take action. I think we just need a little research by the staff to tell us what’s actually happened out there. Seems strange to me, and thank you for bringing this to our attention.

\textbf{Ms. Gleason}, TCC thanked staff for the back-and-forth emails over the last couple of days. I know I sounded snippy in the emails, but it’s because this was pretty frustrating for the council and me personally. Because I take on the Community Council. Also because of the public notice which has nothing to do with this. I think this is a bigger issue for the public and other community councils. So, I just wanted to put that into context. So, when you have had a chance to provide comments, I do wish you could forward it me as well as the Commissioners. So, our Council has a chance to look at it as well. Mr. Fredrick commented that is seems like the Federation was missing in action here, as well. Ms. Ward stated that in the future we’ll just send it out to all the community councils. Chair Trawver stated it’s important for all community councils to understand that we do this every year. \textbf{Ms. Gleason} stated that she didn’t know the timing of it and was on vacation and then got the flu. Chair Trawver stated that they’re going to address your comments. Ms. Wilber stated that it’s important when we have a public comment period.
that comments are submitted through the proper channels. I’ve never heard of a commissioner assembling comments and submitting them. Mr. Tenny stated he did do that. Ms. Wilber stated that there’s a risk there because all comments should be a part of the formal record and they should come to the same place. It almost gets into ex parte communication. And just so for the appearance of fairness and representing the public good and the community of Anchorage, I think it’s good that all comments go through the official channel. Mr. Tenny stated that they came to him. Ms. Wilber said she understood, but thought it’s important the comments go through the official channel. Mr. Tenny stated that he’s trying to be more involved with community’s concerns and will make sure that comments go through official channels.

Seeing no others persons present to provide testimony, Chair Trawver went on to commissioner comments.

VI. Commissioner Comments

Seeing no commissioners wishing to provide comments, Chair Trawver moved on to the next meeting.

VII. Next Meeting

The next regularly scheduled commission meeting date will be at 11:30 a.m. Thursday, March 8, 2018 in the Permit & Development Center conference room 170, at 4700 Elmore Road, Anchorage, Alaska.

VIII. Adjournment

Following the completion of business, Mr. Fredrick moved to adjourn. The motion was seconded and approved unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 1:15 p.m.

PASSED and APPROVED on this, the 14th day of June, 2018.

Tim Trawver, Chair
Heritage Land Bank Advisory Commission

Respectfully submitted for the Heritage Land Bank Advisory Commission by:
Tawny Klebesadel, RED Office Manager
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