

# Appendix B

## 10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries

### Boundary Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes and Action Summary



Municipality of Anchorage  
Planning Department

Appendix B  
Table of Contents

<i>Description</i>	<i>Page</i>
1. Action Summary	1
2. FCC Boundary Committee Letter	9
3. Committee Minutes, February 27, 2023	13
4. Committee Minutes, April 3, 2023	19
5. Committee Minutes, April 24, 2023	27
6. Committee Minutes, May 1, 2023	33
7. Committee Minutes, June 12, 2023	43
8. Committee Final Meeting, Staff Notes, September 26, 2023	53



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

*Action Summary from Boundary Advisory Committee Meetings*

**Meeting #1**

Monday, February 27, 2023  
6:30 – 8:00 p.m.

**Meeting #2**

Monday, April 3, 2023  
6:30 – 8:00 p.m.

**Meeting #3**

Monday, April 24, 2023  
6:30 – 8:00 p.m.

**Meeting #4**

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

**Meeting #5**

Monday, June 12, 2023  
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

The Boundary Advisory Committee for the 10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries project completed its review of the 39 Boundary Study Areas that were identified based on the project's initial outreach to community councils and the public. The following pages provide a summary of the Boundary Advisory Committee's recommendations regarding each of the Boundary Study Areas.

Minutes from the Boundary Advisory Committee meetings documenting its deliberations are provided in the later sections of this Appendix B to the December 9, 2024, public hearing draft *Report and Recommendations*. More information regarding each of the Boundary Study Areas, including applicable boundary review criteria and other options considered for boundaries, is available in Part 2 of the *Report and Recommendations*.

## **CHUGIAK-EAGLE RIVER – BOUNDARY STUDY AREAS #1 - #3**

### **1. Chugiak Community Council District**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries. In the future, if the local community shows sufficient interest to support creating a separate community council for a part of the area covered by Chugiak, then consider establishing such a council district at that time.

### **2. Eagle River and Eagle River Valley**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 24, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

### **3. North of Eagle River Loop Road to Eagle River**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

## **TURNAGAIN ARM – BOUNDARY STUDY AREAS #4 - #5**

### **4. Girdwood Community Council District**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by a vote of 10 in favor and 1 opposed on April 24, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries and organizational structure.

### **5. Portage Valley Community Council District**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option C (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option C: Merge the Portage Valley Community Council district into the Turnagain Arm Community Council district. Residents, property owners, and businesses in the Portage Valley area would receive representation from the Turnagain Arm Community Council.

**ANCHORAGE BOWL – BOUNDARY STUDY AREAS #6 - #39**

**6. Northeast Community Council District**

**and**

**7. North of E. Northern Lights Boulevard to Foxhall Drive**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option G (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option G: Adopt an Assembly Resolution in support of the establishment of a separate community council to serve the Northeast neighborhoods south of DeBarr Road, once a voluntary association from that area meeting the requirements of AMC subsection 2.40.030B requests recognition by the Assembly. Northeast Community Council would focus on representing the areas north of DeBarr Road. Until such a voluntary association receives recognition from the Assembly, Northeast Community Council should continue to represent its existing district area with no changes to boundaries.

**8. West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option B (by a vote of 8 in favor and 1 opposed on June 12, 2023).

Option B: Transfer the area between Baxter Road and Boniface Parkway from University Area Community Council to Scenic Foothills Community Council.

**9. Scenic Foothills Community Council**

Staff believes that a Boundary Advisory Committee intended to recommend Option A, *No Change*, and on June 12 the members and staff assumed that they had voted for this recommendation in April or May. However, through a staff error, a vote on this item was never placed on the agendas, so the Committee was not able to make a recommendation. (*June 12 minutes, page 3, fourth paragraph.*)

**10. University Area Community Council**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A with a clarification to its wording (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries, except where the Committee recommends in other Boundary Study Areas.

**11. College Village**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**12. Tudor Area Community Council**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option C (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option C: Merge the Tudor Area Community Council district into the University Area Community Council.

**13. South of Tudor Road and East of Lake Otis**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**14. West of Reeve Boulevard**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**15. Penland Park and Brighton Park**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**16. Anchor Park**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option B (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option B: Transfer Anchor Park Subdivision on the northeast corner of Lake Otis Parkway and E. Northern Lights Boulevard from Rogers Park Community Council to Airport Heights Community Council.

**17. Eastridge**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**18. 24<sup>th</sup> Avenue West of Lake Otis Parkway**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**19. Fairview North of 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**20. Fairview East and West of Gambell-Ingra Corridor**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**21. Sitka Street Park**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**22. North of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Ingra and I Streets; and North of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue east of Cordova Street**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by a vote of 7 in favor and 1 opposed on May 1, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**23. West of Cordova Street from 9<sup>th</sup> to 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by a vote of 6 in favor and 2 opposed on May 1, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**24. A and C Street Corridor South of 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option B (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option B: Transfer the area between A and C Street, 15<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Chester Creek from Fairview Community Council to South Addition Community Council.

**25. Northwest of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and L Street**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**26. North Star Community Council District**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**27. Romig Park Near Hillcrest Drive**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**28. Midtown Community Council District**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by a vote of 10 in favor and 1 opposed on April 24, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**29. Spenard Community Council District**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**30. Turnagain Community Council District**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**31. West of Fish Creek to Wisconsin Street**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.



**32. Spenard Beach Park**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option C (by a vote of 7 in favor and 2 opposed on June 12, 2023).

Option C: Include Spenard Beach Park in both Turnagain and Spenard Community Councils, by overlapping their district areas in the park.

**33. South of Dimond Boulevard to 92nd**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option B (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option B: Transfer all areas south of Dimond Boulevard from Taku Campbell Community Council to Bayshore/Klatt Community Council.

**34. Bayshore/Klatt Community Council District**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**35. South of O'Malley Road to Klatt Road, East of C Street**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option B (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option B: Transfer the area of C Street on the west, O'Malley Road on the north, 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**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**37. East of Elmore Road from 104<sup>th</sup> Avenue to DeArmoun Road**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on June 12, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**38. Higher Elevations of Rabbit Creek Community Council**

The Boundary Advisory Committee recommends Option A (by unanimous vote on May 1, 2023).

Option A: No change. Retain existing boundaries.

**39. Undetermined Boundary Study Areas**

The Boundary Advisory Committee concurs with the recommended Option A (by unanimous vote on April 3, 2023).

Option A: No changes to boundaries based on the [survey questionnaire] responses.

February 15, 2023

To the Federation of Community Councils Board of Delegates and Community Councils Executive Boards:

Thank you to the Community Council officers, members, and Federation delegates who responded to our online survey questionnaire since it opened in November or who helped find volunteers for a Boundary Advisory Committee. The following is an update regarding the *10-year Review of Community Council Boundaries* project:

**For Updated Project Information.** Every 10 years, the Municipality reviews community council boundaries and seeks input on whether any boundaries between the community council districts should be adjusted. This 10-year review was initiated in November with visits to the Federation and an online questionnaire. For more information, its overall requirements, and upcoming meetings, visit our [project web page](#). It includes **White Paper #1**, which summarizes the public process requirements and boundary review criteria.

**Public Questionnaire Responses – Identifying Boundary Study Areas.** Many thanks to the several hundred people who responded to the online survey questionnaire or who emailed comments to me. That feedback is the basis for identifying boundary study areas. Last week, the Community Councils Center broadcast a mass public info alert that the questionnaire comment deadline is extended to Friday, February 17. The online questionnaire closes at 5 p.m., so please take a few minutes to respond to this brief questionnaire if you have not already, or encourage others to do so. **White Paper #2** (*forthcoming*) will summarize the public feedback and list the resulting Boundary Study Areas.

**Boundary Advisory Committee.** The Planning Department and the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) are responsible for consulting with the community councils and recommending any proposed boundary adjustments to the Assembly. Because of the number of questionnaire responses and Boundary Study Areas identified by respondents, the Planning Department organized a *Boundary Advisory Committee*, with help from the Federation delegates and Community Council officers in finding volunteers. The Boundary Advisory Committee is a geographically representative group of 12 Community Council members. Its purpose is to serve as a sounding board, giving feedback to the Planning Department and the PZC regarding proposed changes to boundaries. Committee meetings will be noticed and open to the public.

To solicit volunteers, staff emailed the Federation's updated (12/27/2022) master contact list of officers on January 5, seeking volunteers or suggested names. Community Councils Center staff, the Municipal Ombudsman, the chair of the Chugiak-Eagle River Advisory Board, a former Assembly member and HALO official, and several Community Council officers were contacted for help in finding volunteers to ensure representation for certain parts of the Municipality. Twelve people volunteered for the Committee (roster attached), and its first meeting is scheduled for Monday, February 27.

**Your Community Council's Role.** With the Committee's advice, the Planning Department will prepare and within several months release a draft set of recommendations as to the Boundary Study Areas. There will be at least a 2-month period seeking public comments from the Community Councils in the form of resolutions from your council and addressed to the PZC. The PZC will then hold a public hearing. Please contact me at (907) 343-7916 or [tom.davis@anchorageak.gov](mailto:tom.davis@anchorageak.gov) if you have any questions.

Thank you,

Tom Davis, AICP  
Senior Planner - Urban Designer

**Attachment:** Boundary Advisory Committee Roster

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

**M E M B E R S**

Member Name	Subarea of Representation or Other Committee Position	Home Community Council or Other Organization
Melinda Gant	Northwest Anchorage Committee Chair	Government Hill
Matt Burkholder	At-Large Committee Member	Huffman/O'Malley
Mark Butler	Northwest Anchorage	North Star Community Councils Center
Care Clift	Northeast Anchorage	Scenic Foothills
Darrel Hess	Ex Officio Committee Member	Municipality of Anchorage Ombudsman
Karl von Lührte	Chugiak-Eagle River	South Fork
Al Milspaugh	Northeast Anchorage	University Area
Stan Moll	Southwest Anchorage	Old Seward/Oceanview
Michael Packard	Turnagain Arm and Girdwood	Turnagain Arm
Carolyn Ramsey	Northeast Anchorage	Airport Heights
Carmela Warfield	Southeast Anchorage	Hillside
Emily Weiser	At-Large Committee Member	Airport Heights
Charlie Welch	Northeast Anchorage	Mountain View

Project staff: Tom Davis, Senior Planner, Long-Range Planning Division, Planning Department

Project staff contact info: (907) 343-7916 or (907) 343-7921; [tom.davis@anchorageak.gov](mailto:tom.davis@anchorageak.gov)

Project web page:

<https://www.muni.org/Departments/OCPD/Planning/Projects/Pages/CommunityCouncilBoundariesReview.aspx>

# MUNICIPALITY OF ANCHORAGE



Planning Department

(907) 343-7931

*Mayor Dave Bronson*

February 21, 2023

To Boundary Advisory Committee Members:

Thank you for volunteering to serve on the Boundary Advisory Committee for the 10-Year Community Council Boundaries Review project. I look forward to our first meeting on Monday, February 27. Attached are several documents for that meeting. The overall information clearinghouse for the project is the [project web page](#), which Planning Department staff will keep updated. **White Paper #1**, available on the web page (and attached), summarizes the objectives and public process requirements for this project.

A list of the members is attached. To find volunteers for the committee, the Planning Department emailed the Community Councils Center's master contact list of officers on January 5, seeking interested officers or suggested names. Planning staff also contacted the Community Councils Center, the Municipal Ombudsman, the Chair of the Chugiak-Eagle River Advisory Board, a former Assembly member and HALO official, and several individual Community Council officers for help in finding volunteers to ensure representation for all parts of the Municipality. I am grateful for this geographically representative group of 12 active community council members who have volunteered and collectively bring so much experience as officers or committee members in your community councils.

The role of the Boundary Advisory Committee is to provide advice and feedback to the Planning Department and the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) in preparing their recommendations for proposed changes to community council district boundaries. The Boundary Advisory Committee's recommendations will also be forwarded to the Anchorage Assembly.

The Boundary Advisory Committee will provide valuable advice and feedback at key points in the process regarding:

- Identifying options for resolving boundary study areas that have been identified by the public. (The boundary study areas identified by the public will be listed in White Paper #2.)
- Applying the project's set of *boundary review criteria* (from White Paper #1) to each of these boundary study areas, to find a preferred, recommended option for resolving the boundary issue.
- Ensuring an open, inclusive process that incorporates comments from community councils and members of the public who wish to contribute.

For each of the above, you will receive working draft options and recommendations from staff in advance of meetings. The committee will discuss and may agree, recommend changes, suggest different options, or request further information. White Paper #1 (attached) and White Paper #2 (forthcoming) will provide the list of *boundary study areas* and the *boundary review criteria* to apply to each boundary study area.

Your knowledge and perspective regarding the needs of community councils and your experience helping lead community council organizations will be vital to the success of this project. I appreciate that many of you have also been involved with the Federation of Community Councils and other community-wide service organizations. As a result, you bring a broader perspective that includes the welfare of community councils in general.

The following page gives some details about the committee meetings, potential "field team" visits, and the boundary study areas.

Mailing Address: P.O. Box 196650 • Anchorage, Alaska 99519-6650 • <http://www.muni.org/planning>

**Committee Meetings.** To be inclusive and transparent, meetings will be publicly noticed and open to the public. There will be an opportunity for the public to speak. Agendas and meeting packet materials will be provided to you in advance and posted on the project web page. The meetings will be in a hybrid format, so that you and the public may attend either in-person or remotely via Microsoft Teams.

Committee meetings will follow the Roberts Rules of Order with an agenda of business items, like a community council or municipal board or commission meeting. Melinda Gant, an active member and former president of Airport Heights Community Council, has agreed to serve as Chair. Planning staff will provide draft meeting minutes and technical assistance in drawing up committee recommendations. When acting on its recommendations, the committee will make motions, take votes, and have its recommendations documented in a written Resolution.

**“Field Teams”.** If staff and committee members find that any boundary study areas merit field visits with stakeholders to improve our understanding of the neighborhoods and boundary issues in question, staff can organize opportunities for staff, committee members, and other interested members of the public to visit those areas as additional “field teams” that report back to the committee.

**Boundary Review Criteria. White Paper #1,** attached, provides the boundary review criteria to use in evaluating each of the boundary study areas.

**Boundary Study Areas.** The Planning Department solicited comments regarding community council boundaries from the community councils’ officers and members from November 4 through February 17. This included posting an online survey questionnaire that the Community Councils Center distributed in two public information alerts in November and February to its 9,500-member email contact list.

The feedback and information from community council officers and members, individual Assembly members, the Municipal Ombudsman, and the Community Councils Center has provided the basis for the “boundary study areas” – i.e., where there is an identified issue or a suggested change to a community council district area or its boundary with a neighboring community council – to be considered in the 10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries project. **White Paper #2 (forthcoming)** will summarize these public comments and questionnaire responses, and list the boundary study areas.

Thank you again for participating on this committee on behalf of the community councils, Municipality, and the public. I look forward to working with you.

Please contact me at (907) 343-7916 or [tom.davis@anchorageak.gov](mailto:tom.davis@anchorageak.gov) if you have any questions.

Sincerely,



Tom Davis, AICP  
Senior Planner - Urban Designer

**Attachments:**

- Boundary Advisory Committee Member List
- Boundary Advisory Committee – February 27, 2023 Meeting Agenda
- White Paper #1: Boundary Review Criteria



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

*MINUTES*

Monday, February 27, 2023  
6:30 – 8:00 p.m.

*Meeting #1*

Hybrid Meeting Held In-person and Virtually in Microsoft Teams

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

**A. Roll Call**

A quorum was present.

*Present:* Matt Burkholder  
Mark Butler  
Care Clift\*  
Melinda Gant, *Chair*  
Darrel Hess\*  
Karl von Lührte  
Al Milspaugh  
Stan Moll  
Michael Packard  
Carmela Warfield\*  
Emily Weiser\*  
Charlie Welch\*

*Excused:* Carolyn Ramsey

*Absent:* none

*Staff:* Tom Davis, Senior Planner, Planning Department  
Craig H. Lyon, Director, Planning Department\*

*Guests:* Lyn Franks, Treasurer, Northeast Community Council

**B. Review of Agenda**

The agenda was approved without changes.

**2. Introductions**

*Chair Melinda Gant* facilitated a round of self-introductions by the meeting attendees, including staff. The Committee members and guest introduced themselves:

- *Matt Burkholder*, member at-large of this Committee, chaired Spenard Community Council in the 2000s, chaired Huffman/O'Malley Community Council around 2015, and more recently served as the president of the Federation of Community Councils (FCC), and was also president of HALO.
- *Michael Packard* is president of Turnagain Arm Community Council.
- *Al Milspaugh* is vice-president of University Area Community Council and is also its delegate to the FCC and on one of its committees.
- *Stan Moll* is a member and former treasurer of Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council.
- *Melinda Gant*, chair of this Committee, is a member of Government Hill Community Council and has served on its leadership as treasurer, vice-president, secretary, and president. She also regularly attends Midtown Community Council meetings for work projects and attends Downtown Community Council meetings as a business representative.
- *Karl von Lührte* is a 15-year member of South Fork Community Council and has served on its leadership as vice-chair and chair. He is also formerly with the U.S. Air Force.
- *Mark Butler* is vice-president of North Star Community Council, and serves as manager of the Community Councils Center.
- *Charlie Welch* is a member and longtime resident of Mountain View Community Council.
- *Carmela Warfield* is president of Hillside Community Council, a member of the municipal Budget Advisory Commission and Heritage Land Bank Advisory Commission, serves as a board member of HALO, and is an FCC delegate.
- *Emily Weiser*, member at-large of this Committee, is also member at-large of Airport Heights Community Council.
- *Darrel Hess*, ex officio member of this Committee (i.e., a non-voting member), has been involved with community councils for many years and served as president of Fairview Community Council for 5 years. As the municipal Ombudsman, he reviews community council bylaws and is responsible for reminding the Municipality to carry out its 10-year reviews of community council boundaries.
- *Care Clift* is treasurer for Scenic Foothills Community Council.
- *Lyn Franks*, meeting guest, is treasurer of Northeast Community Council.

### **3. Role of the Committee; Meeting Format**



*Tom Davis* referenced the 2-21-23 introduction letter to the Boundary Advisory Committee, in the meeting packet, that provides information about the role of the Committee in this project.

*Chair Melinda Gant* directed the attendees' attention to the three bullet points on the first page of the introduction letter, as the areas of advice and feedback that the Committee should focus on. She believed that if the Committee sticks to the format of what its role is, it can quickly get through the process and review the draft reports from staff.

*Chair Gant* explained that the Committee meeting format will be public meetings, recorded, and minutes provided. The Committee process will include providing the Committee's recommendations regarding the Boundary Study Areas to Planning staff, who will compile the package and submit that to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), through a public review process. Once the PZC has completed its review, the recommendations will go to the Assembly for final approval.

*Mark Butler* urged that any recommendations should first go to the Community Councils and Federation. Community councils should get an opportunity to provide feedback to the Planning Department and the Boundary Advisory Committee before any formal recommendations are submitted to the PZC, since the boundary issues pertain to community councils. *Mr. Davis* clarified there will be several points of involvement by community councils. Where a boundary issue has been identified, staff will reach out to the community councils. Later, after formal recommendations are made, there will be at least two months of public review when staff will request community councils to provide written comments in formal resolutions. *Chair Gant* added that there have been several notifications that have gone out to community councils requesting their comments, and that there will be a second pass through the community councils. (*Note: This topic was discussed further under agenda item 6 below.*)

*Tom Davis* discussed "field teams." He referenced page 2 of the introduction letter to the Committee. If staff or Committee members determine that a field visit with interested members of the affected community council would be helpful for understanding the boundary area in question, staff can organize these "field teams" that can walk the area and then report back to the whole Committee.

#### **4. Overall Project Requirements and Boundary Review Criteria**

*Chair Gant* requested staff to go over the overall project requirements and boundary review criteria with the Committee. *Tom Davis* summarized White Paper No., 1, as provided in the meeting packet. White Paper No. 1 contains the public process requirements for 10-year community council boundary reviews. *Mr. Davis* explained that, although a Boundary Advisory Committee is not required by code, the Planning Department appreciates being able to call up this Boundary Advisory Committee for its advice because of the number of Boundary Study Areas the public has identified.

*Mark Butler* asked for assurance that the public comment period would not be during the summer, when many community councils are not in session to be able to respond. *Mr. Davis* confirmed that the two-month review period would not occur during June-July-August, since getting feedback from community councils is the purpose of the review. He explained that it will be important for community councils to provide their comments to PZC in the form of a resolution adopted by the community council. Planning staff can provide technical assistance in preparing resolutions.

*Mr. Davis* explained that the Boundary Advisory Committee is providing advice to staff in preparing the Planning Department's recommendations to PZC. However, the Committee is also welcome to submit its own resolution of recommendations to PZC. The Committee may find it disagrees with some of the Planning Department's boundary recommendations.

*Mr. Davis* summarized the boundary review criteria provided in White Paper No. 1, beginning on page 3, going through the guiding principles numbered 1 through 7 in that document. Those seven guiding principles are derived from the specific code standards and provide more specific criteria that are easier to use. *Chair Gant* responded that it was her understanding that we will apply the 7 guiding principles to each of the Boundary Study Areas. *Mr. Davis* confirmed.

In discussing guiding principle no. 6, "optimal size," *Mr. Davis* explained that small community council districts are legitimate as community councils if they are active and engaged in representing their neighborhood. *Stan Moll* asked if there is an enumeration of the number of residents in the community councils available. *Mr. Davis* responded he would seek updated population numbers for the Committee, if census block group population data has been released from the 2020 Census.

*Mr. Davis* reported that staff has received questions regarding whether the recently reapportioned Anchorage Assembly districts are used as criteria for changing boundaries. He explained that although 10-year boundary reviews occur after the decennial U.S. Census and Assembly reapportionment, the fundamental boundary criteria come down to "natural communities" and community desires as to boundaries. Political districts are not in the code criteria for defining neighborhoods or community councils. If all other factors are equal, political district or service district boundaries are a secondary consideration, however they do not override the main criteria.

Committee members further discussed if state and local political districts should be a consideration. *Care Clift* asked if there is consideration for using the updated State House of Representative district boundaries? Sometimes there are multiple state senators, representatives, and Assembly members reporting at community council meetings. It can be onerous for the elected representatives to have so many community council meetings to attend. Her observation was that it seems strange to have one community council in multiple political districts without coordinating. *Darrel Hess* responded that although staff could provide a map that overlays political boundaries as information or a secondary factor for consideration, it would be problematic for the Committee to use political boundaries as a major factor. *Mr. Hess* explained that there are 38 community councils and only 6 Assembly districts. Legislative boundaries frequently run through the middle of neighborhoods because legislative boundaries are not neighborhood oriented. *Karl von Luhrte* added that White Paper No. 1 on page 3 reads, "Community council districts are not determined by legislative districts." *Mr. Luhrte* did not support spending time on legislative boundaries as a boundary criteria. *Al Milspaugh* added that legislative boundaries change more often, so it would not make much sense to follow them. *Mark Butler* agreed. He stated that community councils are a neighborhood-focused organization, as established in the Municipal Charter, and should remain neighborhood-focused to allow neighborhood members being able to participate in their neighborhood.

*Mr. Butler* added that guiding principle no. 1 from White Paper No. 1, to preserve existing boundaries unless there is a reason to change, is important when considering proposals for changes.

## 5. Questionnaire Responses and List of Boundary Study Areas

*Tom Davis* presented the initial draft of White Paper No. 2, including a main document and three 11x17 tables as Appendices A, B, and C, that were emailed to Committee members earlier this evening and provided as hardcopies at the meeting. *Mr. Davis* summarized the public survey questionnaire responses and the list of Boundary Study Areas as provided in the initial draft of White Paper No. 2.

*Mr. Davis* explained that the Boundary Study Areas identified in the initial draft White Paper No. 2 arose from the survey questionnaire responses and other public comments. There are 38 Boundary Study Areas listed. Many community councils will find that some part of their district is included in at least one of the Boundary Study Areas. A Boundary Study Area does not necessarily mean any changes to a community council district will be recommended. A “Boundary Study Area” means that a community council boundary has been identified for further evaluation as part of this project, based on public comments. To consider the public comments, White Paper No. 2 will apply the *boundary review criteria* from White Paper No. 1 to assess each Boundary Study Area. After assessing a Boundary Study Area, the recommendation could be “no change.” The Boundary Advisory Committee may find that it does not need to spend much time on some Boundary Study Areas.

*Mr. Davis* explained that the initial draft White Paper No. 2 will be revised and expanded to:

- Summarize how Planning staff solicited public comments to identify Boundary Study Areas.
- Document the email comments received in addition to the survey questionnaire responses.
- Provide information about each Boundary Study Area and the community councils affected.
- Summarize all questionnaire responses from members of the affected councils.
- Apply the boundary review criteria to assess the Boundary Study Area and identify options.

*Chair Melinda Gant* recommended also providing an easier way for people to be able to look up their community council in White Paper No. 2, so people can quickly find which Boundary Study Areas affect their own community council, and the public comments on which the study area is based. If the Committee recommends a boundary change, there should be an easy way for the public and the community councils to track if their community council districts are affected by a potential change in boundaries. *Al Milsbaugh* agreed and suggested including a list of all the community councils that provides a cross-reference to any Boundary Study Areas and public comments about that council. If there are no comments affecting a council, it could indicate such. *Mr. Davis* agreed to provide that.

*Stan Moll* suggested the maps that will be used to illustrate proposed boundaries could also identify the affected community councils using map symbols. *Mr. Moll* suggested including citywide maps that show all the study areas, in addition to area-specific maps for individual study areas. *Mr. Davis* agreed.

## 6. Schedule and Next Steps

*Mr. Davis* indicated that the next Committee meeting is scheduled for March 13. (*Note: The meeting was later rescheduled to April 3.*)

*Marc Butler* commented that this 10-year review process is magnitudes larger and more procedural than the previous process 10 years ago. This time we have essentially requested comments from individuals, rather than just asking the community council boards. Some of the Boundary Study Areas

come from only one or a few individuals. It raises the question of whether such comments reflect the general will of the rest of the community council members, and whether the Boundary Study Area is valid just because one or a few individuals suggested it? There must be some logic in the comments. *Mr. Butler* is aware only 3 or 4 community council district boundary areas that are absolutely a hot issue, according to the boundary review criteria in White Paper No. 1, that we should be talking about extensively in this process. In other cases, the issue is more of a question, and he would need to study a map before responding. If we are going to take the comments of only a few people proposing to make changes, the community council broader membership may respond by expressing they like their boundaries just as they are. The Boundary Advisory Committee should hear from the community councils in evaluating the merits of proposed changes. Getting comments from individuals to identify Boundary Study Areas as has been done is great, but now we should hear from the community councils and get their input.

*Stan Moll* responded that he has visited 4 different community council meetings in the past two months and reported that those community councils are aware of this process. He believes they are waiting for a signal that “now” is the time to discuss it. Based on the Committee’s discussion this evening about the process it seems to him like the community councils will have until September or October to weigh in, and that this process is on the right track.

*Chair Gant* added that it is important for this public process to value and consider each comment from the public who responded to the questionnaire, that staff should put the analysis together, and in the public process the community councils will have the opportunity to prepare their resolutions and weight in. The public process as it is laid out will bring out their positions. *Al Milspaugh* commented that sometimes it is a conundrum when only a few people express their views for the community, but the broader community does not get involved or comment.

*Darrell Hess* agreed it is important to value and consider each public comment, as community councils are about maximum participation. However, it also happens that there may be just one or two people that have an issue with a boundary in a community council district of 10,000 people. It is great to have the community evaluate their comment. But this process needs the community councils to weigh in before the recommendations are submitted to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) or Assembly. It is important to know what the position of the community council is before this moves to PZC. It will otherwise be difficult to convince the Assembly to approve a boundary change that is opposed by the community council that currently represents the area proposed for change.

## **7. Public Comments**

*Lyn Franks* expressed that the meeting has been very informative, because it gives her a sense of how the process will work and what the expectations are going forward, for preparing a resolution with the members of Northeast Community Council. She is looking forward to working with everyone.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:03 p.m.



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

*MINUTES*

Monday, April 3, 2023  
6:30 – 8:00 p.m.

*Meeting #2*

Hybrid Meeting Held In-person and Virtually in Microsoft Teams

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

**A. Roll Call**

A quorum was present.

*Present:* Matt Burkholder  
Mark Butler  
Care Clift\*  
Melinda Gant, *Chair*  
Darrel Hess  
Karl von Lührte  
Al Milspaugh  
Stan Moll  
Michael Packard\*  
Carolyn Ramsey\*  
Emily Weiser  
Charlie Welch

*Excused:* Carmela Warfield

*Absent:* none

*Staff:* Tom Davis, Senior Planner, Planning Department  
Kristine Bunnell, Long-Range Planning Manager Planning Department\*

**B. Review of Agenda**

The agenda was approved without changes.

**C. Approval of February 27, 2023 Minutes**

The February 27 minutes were approved without changes.

### **3. Briefing and Review of Information Materials**

#### **A. Project Update**

*Tom Davis* gave an update regarding the outreach to the Federation Board of Delegates and to individual community councils.

#### **B. Project Update**

*Tom Davis* summarized the March 31 revised draft White Paper No., 2, as provided in the meeting packet. White Paper No. 2 contains the analysis of the nearly 40 study areas. There is a table of contents inside the front cover which provides the page numbers of each study area. There is also an index to community councils, on page 8, the provides a list of boundary study areas for each community council in the Municipality. Some community councils have no boundary study area, others are potentially affected by as many as six study areas.

*Mr. Davis* described the format of each boundary study area, and the accompanying map set referenced by the study areas. Most study areas do not show a staff recommendation yet. *Mr. Davis* also introduced an online community councils web map app that he shared onscreen during the meeting.

Responding to questions, *Mr. Davis* explained that the draft White Paper No. 2 and accompanying map set provide content for the boundary study areas to be covered on the agenda this evening. Future drafts will provide more complete information. If the Committee finds it needs more information about a study area on tonight's agenda, the Committee may request the information and table such study area for this evening.

### **3. Boundary Study Areas Recommended for Immediate Action: #1, #20, #26, #29, #30, and #39 (Proposed Recommendation: "No change. Retain Existing Boundaries.")**

*Chair Melinda Gant* requested *Mr. Davis* to introduce each of the boundary study areas for discussion and point the participants to the page number in White Paper No. 2, and asked him to walk the Committee through the individual boundary review criteria in the first several study areas.

#### **Boundary Study Area #1: Chugiak Community Council**

Committee members discussed that the Chugiak Community Council may look large extending north to south on Maps #1 and #2, but its area has low density and a relatively small population for its size. *Karl von Lührte* reported that longtime community council members in Chugiak he has spoken with indicate there would not be support for splitting Chugiak Community Council.

*Karl von Lührte* moved to keep Chugiak Community Council’s existing boundaries in agreement with the staff recommendation of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #1. *Mark Butler* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

**Boundary Study Area #20: Fairview East and West of Gambell-Ingra Corridor**

The Committee reviewed the proposal to divide Fairview east and west in Boundary Study Area #20, and staff’s recommendation. *Darrel Hess* commented that Fairview community council is a very active community council and a cohesive neighborhood despite the Gambell-Ingra corridor.

*Care Clift* moved to keep Fairview Community Council’s existing boundaries in agreement with the staff recommendation of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #20. *Karl von Lührte* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

**Boundary Study Area #26: North Star Community Council District**

The Committee reviewed the proposal to merge North Star Community Council with adjoining community council districts in Boundary Study Area #26, and staff’s recommendation. *Tom Davis* summarized the analysis using the boundary review criteria and reported that North Star has adopted a resolution requesting it retain its existing boundaries. *Al Milspaugh* commented that there is no basis for determining North Star is too small. *Mark Butler* explained that there is no logical partner to merge with in any of the neighboring community councils; it does not fit with the other community councils. *Mr. Butler* also expressed that North Star is an active, functional community council that has been getting work done for its area.

*Karl von Lührte* moved to retain North Star Community Council district in agreement with the staff recommendation of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #26. *Al Milspaugh* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

**Boundary Study Area #29: Spenard Community Council District**

The Committee reviewed the proposal to realign Spenard Community Council to follow legislative district boundaries. *Tom Davis* explained that Assembly district boundaries do not align with natural communities. *Mark Butler* added that legislative districts change over time, but the neighborhoods remain the same. *Chair Melinda Gant* referred to the Committee’s previous discussion about avoiding the use of legislative boundaries to define community council districts.

*Emily Weiser* moved to retain Spenard Community Council boundaries in agreement with the staff recommendation of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #29. *Charlie Welch* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

### **Boundary Study Area #30: Turnagain Council District**

The Committee reviewed the proposal to merge Turnagain and Spenard Community Councils. *Tom Davis* walked through the evaluation of this proposal by the boundary study area.

*Stan Moll* asked if the Anchorage International Airport, the biggest industrial business member of these community councils, has been engaged in these community councils and should be consulted. *Tom Davis* and *Mark Butler* responded that the Airport representatives regularly visit Turnagain, Spenard, and Sand Lake Community Councils, and all three community councils find themselves affected by the Airport and communicate regularly with the Airport. *Karl von Luhrte* would be concerned if there Turnagain Community Council were not an active community council to advocate for its residents, but that does not seem to be a problem. *Mark Butler* explained that Turnagain provides the Airport with opportunities to speak and vote as a member of the Community Council, although the Airport does not choose to vote.

*Charlie Welch* moved to retain Turnagain Community Council district with its existing boundaries in agreement with the staff recommendation of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #30. *Michael Packard* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

### **Boundary Study Area #39: Undetermined Boundary Study Areas**

*Tom Davis* explained that this study area comprises miscellaneous questionnaire responses received that expressed dissatisfaction with their district boundaries but did not provide enough information for staff to determine what or where the concern is to identify a specific boundary study area. These comments are documented in Appendix A and staff recommends setting them aside.

*Karl von Luhrte* moved to recommend that no changes be made, in agreement with the staff recommendation (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #39. *Charlie Welch* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

## **4. Boundary Study Areas for Evaluation and Recommendation**

*Tom Davis* explained that there is enough information for the Boundary Study Areas in this next group to identify a preferred option for each, and so brings them to the Committee for a recommendation.



### **Boundary Study Area #3: North of Eagle River Loop Road to Eagle River**

The Committee reviewed the proposal to transfer the area northwest of Eagle River Loop Road from South Fork Community Council. *Karl von Lührte* reported that South Fork Community Council is preparing to vote on a resolution stating that there is no desire based on any input that has been brought to the Community Council or its board for this proposed change. *Mr. von Lührte* explained that although the study area in question does have different, more urban characteristics from the Hiland Road neighborhood, parts of the lower Hiland Road neighborhood has similar housing densities as the area northwest of Eagle River Loop Road.

*Mark Butler* observed that South Fork is an active community council. *Darrel Hess* commented that Eagle River (the waterbody) is a strong existing boundary. *Mr. von Lührte* in response to a question reported that Eagle River Community Council has never approached South Fork about this area. *Mr. von Lührte* pointed out that most of the questionnaire responses from South Fork members supported the existing boundaries. *Chair Melinda Gant* commented there were only 2 questionnaire responses that proposed this change.

*Mark Butler* moved to retain South Fork Community Council existing boundaries in agreement with the staff preferred alternative of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #3. *Michael Packard* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

### **Boundary Study Area #14: West of Reeve Boulevard**

*Tom Davis* walked through the evaluation of this proposal and the geography of this part of Ship Creek basin relative to the adjoining community councils and reported that the area in question is somewhat peripheral to all the adjoining councils, but it is somewhat closer to the core of Mountain View than to the core of Downtown, Government Hill, or even Fairview. There are no available strong, identifiable boundaries within this study area that would facilitate dividing it up. *Mark Butler* observed that Mountain View is a functional community council and that the study area is not harmed being within Mountain View. Business owners and land owners in that area have made successful petitions and proposals getting Mountain View’s support. The Committee discussed the major land users in the area.

*Michael Packard* asked if there was consideration for creating an industrial community council for all the Ship Creek basin industrial area. *Mark Butler* responded that he has not seen industrial businesses interested in maintaining a business-focused community council. They just want to be able to have a community council to go to when they have an issue. Midtown is the only example of business interests starting a community council. *Darrel Hess* concurred that he has not seen industrial businesses interested in creating a community council.

*Mark Butler* moved to retain existing boundaries in the west end of Mountain View, in agreement with the staff preferred alternative of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #21. *Al Milspaugh* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

#### **Boundary Study Area #21: Sitka Street Park**

*Mark Butler* explained this study area is a clear zone for Merrill Field. He said he is not aware of any issue in this area that was discussed at a community council. *Darrel Hess* reported that, 20 years ago there was a lot of discussion on this boundary issue, and Fairview supported Sitka Street staying a part of Airport Heights. *Emily Weiser* commented that most of the access to the park is off Sitka Street (a local street) from Eastridge Subdivision in Airport Heights. *Carolyn Ramsey* explained that Airport Heights has done a lot of work with the improvements to Sitka Street Park.

*Mark Butler* moved to retain existing boundaries with Sitka Street Park within Airport Heights in agreement with the staff recommendation of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #21. *Michael Packard* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

#### **Boundary Study Area #27: Romig Park near Hillcrest Drive**

*Tom Davis* walked through the evaluation of this boundary study area in the draft White Paper. *Mark Butler* explained that North Star has active members from the Romig Park area, and North Star has voted unanimously in favor of keeping Romig Park area in North Star.

*Karl von Luhrte* moved to retain the existing boundaries between North Star and Spenard in agreement with the staff recommendation of “no change” (Option A) for Boundary Study Area #27. *Al Milspaugh* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved unanimously.***

#### **Boundary Study Area #28: Midtown Community Council District**

*Tom Davis* walked through the comments that recommend merging Midtown Community Council with one or more of the adjacent community councils (Spenard and/or North Star). The concerns behind the comments was that Midtown was not providing representation to its residents, because of its noon hour meeting time. *Mr. Davis* in responding to a question confirmed that providing representation is one of the boundary review criteria.

*Darrel Hess* explained that community council membership (not the Municipality) determines when a council meets. *Emily Weiser* responded that if a meeting is at noon and residents cannot attend at that time then the residents cannot vote to change the meeting time; if they are not being represented now then they aren't being represented in choosing the meeting time.

*Mark Butler* gave a brief history of Midtown and its community council. At some point 5 to 7 years ago Midtown was minimally functional and approached North Star about joining their meetings. However, then Midtown got new officers and it is functional now. *Chair Melinda Gant* concurred that she has been attending Midtown meetings and the community council is very functional, and that the Midtown executive board does not support merging or changing its boundaries. She commented that the Midtown area east of Arctic is very distinct from Spenard. *Mark Butler* explained that historically Midtown was undeveloped, but the area has grown up to be an economic center; going back to the old, historical boundaries does not seem helpful.

*Chair Melinda Gant* reported that Midtown community council has relatively few active or attending members who are residents of Midtown. 3 residents regularly attend. Most of the active members are the business community. Typically 10 to 15 members attend meetings, not including guests, and the agendas are busy.

*Emily Weiser* observed that it seems like a functional community council for businesses, but not representing residents, which is a concern. 3 questionnaire responses from its residents expressing concern is a relatively high number for its population size. *Darrel Hess* responded that 3 to 5 comments is not really a lot, and questioned how many residents would attend the meetings held in the evenings. *Care Clift* suggested to give the Midtown Community Council the opportunity to respond and indicate what the council doing to encourage residents to attend. *Chair Melinda Gant* added that staff should provide the Committee with a summary of the questionnaire responses from Midtown and Spenard, not just the responses that called for changes.

The Committee determined to continue the Midtown discussion to next meeting.

*Care Clift* moved to table the discussion of Boundary Study Area #28 regarding Midtown until next meeting. *Michael Packard* seconded the motion.

***The motion was approved by a vote of 11 in favor and 1 opposed.***

## **5. Schedule and Next Steps**

*Tom Davis* and the Committee discussed scheduling the next meeting for April 24.

## **6. Public Comments**

There were no public comments.

## **8. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

*This page intentionally left blank.*



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

*MINUTES*

Monday, April 24, 2023  
6:30 – 8:00 p.m.

*Meeting #3*

Hybrid Meeting Held In-person and Virtually in Microsoft Teams

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m.

**A. Roll Call**

A quorum was present.

*Present:* Matt Burkholder  
Care Clift  
Melinda Gant, *Chair*  
Darrel Hess  
Karl von Lührte  
Al Milspaugh  
Stan Moll  
Michael Packard  
Carolyn Ramsey  
Emily Weiser  
Carmela Warfield  
Charlie Welch

*Excused:* Mark Butler

*Staff:* Tom Davis, Senior Planner, Planning Department  
Kristine Bunnell, Long-Range Planning Manager, Planning Department

*Guests:* Lyn Franks, Treasurer, Northeast Community Council  
Lynn Lovegreen  
Felix Rivera, Anchorage Assembly  
Mike Edgington, Girdwood Board of Supervisors  
Kalie Harrison, Girdwood resident  
Peggy Auth, Spenard Community Council  
Bob Auth, Spenard resident  
Ryan Quigley, Spenard resident  
Tierra, Spenard resident

Kris Stoeher, Midtown Community Council  
Kristen Newby, South Addition resident  
Rosemary Karish, South Addition resident  
Ted Gardeline, South Addition resident  
Kathleen Plunkett, Russian Jack Community Council

## **B. Review of Agenda**

The agenda was approved without changes.

## **C. Approval of April 3, 2023 Minutes**

*Al Milspaugh* moved to approve the April 3, 2023 minutes. *Charlie Welch* seconded. A spelling error in *Emily Weiser's* name was found.

***The draft minutes from the April 3, 2023 Boundary Advisory Committee meeting were approved unanimously with the spelling correction above.***

## **2. Brief Project Update and Review of Revised White Paper #2 Materials**

*Tom Davis* provided an update regarding the public process including outreach to the Federation of Community Councils and the presidents and officers of individual community councils. *Mr. Davis* has been contacting and hearing from the boards of individual community councils.

*Mr. Davis* gave an overview of the revised draft version of White Paper #2 and maps that the Committee received in advance of the meeting.

## **3. Boundary Study Areas for Evaluation and Recommendation**

### **A. Boundary Study Area #28 in Midtown**

*Chair Melinda Gant* explained that discussion on this item was continued from the April 3 meeting. *Tom Davis* recapped the draft analysis and recommendation to retain Midtown Community Council district with its existing boundaries as presented in White Paper #2.

*Chair Gant* invited guests to comment on the item. *Bob Auth*, longtime active member of Spenard Community Council, stated that historically Spenard included Midtown and was very active in representing Midtown, addressing issues in Midtown such as the creation of the Midtown trail, Midtown Cuddy Park, and reviewing liquor licenses. Midtown Community Council was created to give businesses a voice. Businesses predominate on the board. There have not been residents in a leadership role.

*Peggy Auth*, representing Spenard Community Council, stated that in 2016 Midtown Community Council was considering dissolving and merging with the neighboring councils because of low participation. The Midtown chair at the time stated they did not have residents attending. There are still few if any residents attending even though Midtown has thousands of residents. Spenard is an active, welcoming community council and it has since discussed transferring the residential areas of

western Midtown to Spenard so that the residents of Midtown can participate. Residents are shut out because they cannot attend community council meetings that are scheduled in the middle of the business day.

*Tierra*, a resident of Windemere Subdivision in southern Spenard Community Council, stated that the president of Midtown Community Council has been more supportive of Windemere residents than Spenard has regarding their concerns about a proposal for a homeless shelter across Arctic Boulevard from Windemere. *Ryan Quigley*, another resident of Windemere, further explained that his neighborhood did not feel they were being represented or having their concerns heard about the Arctic Boulevard homeless shelter proposal until Midtown Community Council provided them opportunities. *Peggy Auth* responded that Spenard Community Council is setting aside time to take up the homeless issue.

*Kris Stoechner*, president of Midtown Community Council, stated that Midtown has been very active in representing both residents and businesses in response to issues such as proposed homeless shelters and liquor licenses. *Ms. Stoechner* has walked residential neighborhoods to reach out to residents. Midtown has shut down a liquor license and has put restrictions on others. She stated that the people who have made comments calling for Midtown to be merged or reduced in size have not talked to her or Midtown Community Council. Midtown has about the same meeting attendance on average as Spenard and is putting in many volunteer hours.

*Darrel Hess* stated that Midtown Community Council meets the municipal requirement to have open meetings and open membership. Community Councils are not a part of government and determine when and where they meet.

*Emily Weiser* moved to recommend Option C, to transfer the areas west of C Street from Midtown Community Council to Spenard Community Council. There was no second. ***The motion failed.***

*Carmela Warfield* moved to recommend Option A, to retain Midtown Community Council district with its existing boundaries. *Charlie Welch* seconded.

*Ms. Warfield*, speaking to her motion, expressed appreciation for the community council members who spoke regarding the Midtown study area item. *Ms. Warfield* found that Midtown Community Council has made progress in its outreach to businesses and to residents and has demonstrated that it is a functioning well as a community council. *Ms. Warfield* has attended a Midtown Community Council meeting as a guest, and found it was an open meeting, and attendees were a mix of Midtown residents and business owners.

*Chair Gant* stated that she regularly attends Midtown meetings and has found that Midtown has made a lot of effort to reach out to and support neighborhood residents. *Chair Gant* noted the number of survey questionnaire response comments from North Star and Spenard calling for no changes versus those proposing boundary changes and found that most respondents from Spenard wanted to retain existing boundaries. The boundary review criteria do not support a boundary change.

*Karl von Lührte* stated that Midtown has experienced ups and downs in its activity level over the past 10 years. It is beneficial to have consistency in staying active. If Midtown experiences another period of inactivity over the coming 10 years, this issue should be revisited in the next 10-year review of community council boundaries.

***The motion to recommend Option A passed with 10 votes in favor and 1 opposed.***

## **B. Boundary Study Area #2 in Eagle River Valley**

*Tom Davis* introduced boundary study area #2: Eagle River and Eagle River Valley and summarized the analysis and options as provided in White Paper #2. In response to a question from a committee member, *Mr. Davis* stated he had not received feedback from the two community councils or their executive committees about this study area, although he contacted and had a phone conversation with the president of Eagle River Valley.

*Karl von Lührte* moved to recommend Option A, no change; retain existing boundaries. *Matt Burkholder* seconded.

*Mr. von Lührte*, speaking to his motion, stated that there has not been input by either of the two community councils supporting a definitive change. Also, in response to Option B proposed by staff, the Gruening Middle School and Lions Park area is a part of both community councils, and the road access to Gruening does not seem a substantial enough reason to transfer the school area to Eagle River Community Council. *Chair Melinda Gant* agreed that transferring a middle school from one community council to another would be a substantial boundary change without input from the affected community councils. There were no survey questionnaire comments suggesting making that specific change.

***The motion to recommend Option A passed unanimously.***

## **C. Boundary Study Areas #4 and #5 in Girdwood and Turnagain Arm**

*Tom Davis* introduced boundary study area #4: Girdwood and summarized the analysis and options for this boundary study area as provided in White Paper #2 and Map #10.

*Michael Packard* stated that Option C, to expand the boundaries of the GBOS to annex Upper Crow Creek, does not solve the problem with having a government entity like GBOS operate a community council which is not supposed to be a part of government. *Darrel Hess* responded that the Assembly designated the GBOS as community council ex officio more than 20 years ago. However, ex officio is not defined in code, and his concern is that GBOS is an elected government body. This is also a representation issue for the residents of Upper Crow Creek outside of the GBOS service area boundary. Technically, they cannot vote at the community council meetings because they are outside the boundaries of GBOS. GBOS delegates its community council role to its Land Use Committee (LUC), which allows residents of Upper Crow Creek to participate and vote as members of the LUC, but from a legal perspective the GBOS should not be able delegate its role as community council granted by the Assembly.

*Mike Edgington*, speaking as a resident of the Girdwood, explained he is a board member of the GBOS but is not representing the GBOS or LUC this evening. *Mr. Edgington* stated that Upper Crow Creek Road is that only area in Girdwood Valley with residents outside the GBOS service area boundary. Recent GBOS elections indicate there are more than 800 voting members of GBOS. This is compared to approximately 47 property owners in Upper Crow Creek.

*Care Clift* moved to recommend Option C, recommending the adoption of an Assembly Resolution in support of a ballot measure that would propose to expand the boundaries of the GBOS to annex all areas within the boundaries of the Girdwood Community Council district except Chugach National Forest and Chugach State Park lands. *Matt Burkholder* seconded.

*Mr. Edgington* stated that although GBOS cannot delegate its role as community council ex officio to the LUC from a legal perspective, it does so in practice. The LUC operates the same way as a community council and has the same representation and membership as a community council would



have for voting purposes. One reason why residents of Girdwood strongly supported this model of organization in 2015 when they last voted on this issue, and are likely to indicate support for it again as the LUC and GBOS have each begun discussing this item for a vote, is that if Girdwood strictly followed the community council model where property owners and business owners have voting rights, there are far more non-resident business and property owners than residents in Girdwood. So, any vote of the community council could be a majority comprised of non-residents. That has been a delicate topic in Girdwood. The current organizational model works for Girdwood. *Mr. Edgington* had no objection to Option C, to expand the boundaries of GBOS, however he raised several points about Option C:

- Annexation to GBOS would increase taxes on Upper Crow Creek properties.
- Annexation would require a positive vote from both the existing GBOS area and the area to be annexed.
- If there is a “no” vote, then the annexation would fail. Then what would happen in that case?

*Darrel Hess* asked if the LUC allows absentee property owners and business owners to have voting rights. *Mr. Edgington* responded that it does, its membership rules are no different from community councils in Anchorage. However, the GBOS membership is residents only. The GBOS and LUC have a process in which if there is a difference of opinion between the GBOS and LUC on a land use matter, then both the resolutions from GBOS and LUC are forwarded to the decision-making body (PZC; Assembly). The opinion of the LUC is never suppressed but it is not the only opinion forwarded if the GBOS body elected by residents disagrees.

*Care Clift* asked *Mr. Edgington* his personal preference for which Option shown in White Paper #2 is best. *Mr. Edgington* responded that his own first choice is Option A, the simplest. He has no objection to Option C. He also sees potential for Option D because of common interests between Upper Crow Creek and other Turnagain Arm communities, but Option D should be up to the residents of Upper Crow Creek. Upper Crow Creek, Bird, and Indian are all suffering side effects from the housing problems in Girdwood. *Mr. Edgington* stated that he disagrees with Option B, and Option E does not seem sustainable.

*Michael Packard* stated that Option C would probably not be acceptable to property owners in Upper Crow Creek because it would result in higher taxes with little improvement in public services. GBOS members tax themselves for road services. Committee members asked questions about and discussed existing and potential service areas in Upper Crow Creek. Upper Crow Creek is a part of the Turnagain Arm police service area, which is different from the Girdwood police service area. Upper Crow Creek receives APD service in emergencies only. Girdwood receives regular police patrols under its contract with the Whittier police department. Upper Crow Creek is outside of any fire or parks service area. It does not have a road service area, but instead has a volunteer group that contributes to winter maintenance of Crow Creek Road. *Mr. Packard* concluded that he reviews police calls for the Turnagain Arm police service area and there have been no calls for police services from the Upper Crow Creek area.

*Chair Melinda Gant* called for a motion to extend the meeting. *Karl von Luhrte* moved to extend the meeting to 8:30 p.m. *Michael Packard* seconded. ***The motion to extend the meeting passed unanimously.***

*Carmela Warfield* asked what the expense would be of holding a ballot measure regarding expanding the GBOS service area according to Option C. *Darrel Hess* responded that a special election would be unlikely so it would likely be on the 2024 ballot. *Emily Weiser* asked if there would be future

opportunities for the community to bring forward proposed changes if Option A were approved as part of the current boundary review process. *Mr. Davis* responded affirmatively.

*Kalie Harrison*, a resident of Girdwood, expressed that Option A is most appealing to her. The Upper Crow Creek residents also have options for representation but should be involved in changes to how they are represented. The current LUC process is one person one vote, and there are often resolutions passed, which get forwarded to GBOS. Most often GBOS agrees with the LUC. Taking Girdwood back to the community council model would be going backwards. The current structure of the GBOS working with the LUC provides extra value. Residents can elect their GBOS representatives, whereas community councils are group projects determined by whoever attends a particular meeting.

*Chair Gant* then asked for a vote on the motion to recommend Option C for boundary study area #4. ***The motion to recommend Option C failed, with one vote in favor and 10 opposed.***

*Matt Burkholder* moved to recommend Option A, no change, to retain the existing boundaries and organizational structure. *Carmela Warfield* seconded.

*Michael Packard* stated that the current structure has been somewhat of a mess for 20 years, and this 10-year review process seems like an appropriate time to resolve the problem. *Chair Gant* stated that future housing development in the Crow Creek area may affect this conversation in the future, however as of today there have been no major developments or changes in the conversation on this issue in the past 20 years, leading her to support Option A for now. *Carmela Warfield* stated that the Committee has heard from a member of the Girdwood community who said that they have a great functioning system in place, and a member of GBOS who has shared what their processes are.

***The motion to recommend Option A passed, with 10 votes in favor and 1 opposed.***

Committee discussion on agenda items 3c (Portage Valley Community Council), 3d, 3e, and 3f was postponed to the subsequent meeting.

#### **4. Schedule and Next Steps**

The Committee discussed scheduling its next meeting for Monday, May 1, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m.

#### **5. Public Comments (*none*)**

#### **6. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 p.m.



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

*MINUTES*

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

*Meeting #4*

Hybrid Meeting Held In-person and Virtually in Microsoft Teams

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

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

**A. Roll Call**

A quorum was present.

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

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

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

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

**B. Review of Agenda**

The agenda was approved without changes.

**C. April 24, 2023 Minutes**

The draft minutes from April were not yet available.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Boundary Study Area #22 was discussed, as follows.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

**5. Schedule and Next Steps**

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

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

**7. Adjournment**

The meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.

*This page intentionally left blank.*



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

*MINUTES*

Monday, June 12, 2023  
6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

*Meeting #5*

Hybrid Meeting Held In-person and Virtually in Microsoft Teams

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 6:03 p.m.

**A. Roll Call**

A quorum was present.

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

*Excused:* Mark Butler  
Karl von Lührte  
Carolyn Ramsey

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

*Guests:* Kathleen Plunkett, Russian Jack Community Council

**B. Review of Agenda**

*Chair Melinda Gant* proposed adding an item 3.E. to address unfinished Boundary Study Area #25. *Care Clift* proposed adding an item under section 4 regarding criteria for community councils to show their participation levels. *Al Milspaugh* moved to approve the agenda with the two proposed changes. *Michael Packard* seconded.

***The motion to approve the agenda as modified passed unanimously.***

### C. Minutes

The draft minutes from April and May were not yet available.

#### 2. **Boundary Study Areas for immediate approval as a group, of the staff recommended option as provided in the June 9, 2023, Revised Draft White Paper No. 2.**

*Chair Gant* asked Committee members wanted to pull any of Boundary Study Areas #15, #31, #37, and #34 for discussion before voting. None were pulled for discussion. *Chair Gant* observed that the four study areas were brought forward by only one questionnaire responder each and that the boards of the affected community councils opposed any boundary changes.

*Charlie Welch* moved to approve the staff recommendations for Boundary Study Areas #14, #31, #37, and #34. *Matt Burkholder* seconded.

***The motion to approve the staff recommendations for Boundary Study Areas #15, #31, #37, and #34 passed unanimously.***

#### 3. **Boundary Study Areas from June 9, 2023, Revised Draft White Paper No. 2, for Discussion and Recommendation,**

##### A. **Boundary Study Areas #6, #7, and #9 in Northeast and Scenic Foothills**

*Michael Packard* moved to approve Option G for Boundary Study Areas #6 and #7, as provided on page 16 of the June 9, 2023, revised draft White Paper No. 2. *Emily Weiser* seconded the motion.

*Michael Packard* spoke to the motion, and explained that DeBarr Road seems like a good dividing line, as it's a huge separator between neighborhoods. *Chair Gant* noted that she had attended the most recent Northeast Community Council meeting, where the community council including all 20 or so members attending opposed changing Northeast's boundaries in a straw vote. *Care Clift* responded that 20 people is a small group, and not necessarily representative of the neighborhood desires as to boundaries. A resolution will be voted on at their next meeting. People who do not feel represented or welcome are not showing up to the meetings.

*Emily Weiser* added that a relatively large number of questionnaire respondents (16) said that Northeast is too big. She believed that the people who don't attend the meetings and vote are the ones who don't feel they are a part of the community council.

*Care Clift* commented that Option G is a more drastic change than what Scenic Foothills is proposing in Option C. *Darrel Hess* responded that Option G would not change any boundaries or split the council. Option G recommends that the Assembly create a new community council in the future *after* people from the neighborhood petition to become a community council. That would give opportunity for people who do not feel represented to come forward, hold meetings, submit bylaws, and petition to be recognized as a new community council. They would need to make the effort to initiate a community council. *Carmela Warfield* responded that people who do not feel represented also have the opportunity run for officer positions at Northeast and become active, regardless of where they are within the district.

*Stan Moll* supported Option G more than Option F. He said that splitting Northeast between north and south makes more sense than splitting it east-west, because Turpin/Baxter is not as strong of a boundary. The areas north and south of DeBarr are different from one another.

*Tom Davis* explained that either Option F or G would leave a future group of residents the opportunity to suggest a different boundary for initiating a new community council. *Darrel Hess* added that community councils can bring forward proposed boundary changes or initiate new community councils outside of the 10-year review process. He pointed to the merger of two community councils on Hillside several years ago and the creation of Midtown Community Council in 2004 as examples.

***The motion to recommend Option G for Boundary Study Areas #6 and #7 passed unanimously.***

*Tom Davis*, in response to a question about Boundary Study Area #9, said that the Committee had recommended Option A, no change to boundaries, in Study Area #9.

## **B. Boundary Study Areas #8, #10, #12, and #13 in University Area, Tudor Area, and Campbell Park**

*Tom Davis* explained the geographic interrelationships between these four boundary study areas. The Committee then determined to address them individually. The Committee discussed Boundary Study Area #8 first, as follows:

*Emily Weiser* moved to recommend Option A, no change to boundaries in Boundary Study Area #8. *Charlie Welch* seconded the motion.

*Emily Weiser* explained her motion by noting that the president of University Area Community Council (UACC) is already concerned about having enough residents to run the community council, and that losing the residents in study area #8 would negatively affect its ability to function.

*Al Milspaugh* supported Option B. He explained that he is an officer of UACC and that UACC has good geographic representation of officers. UAA is also an active participant at council meetings. UACC has a couple of officers on its board who are from the area east of Baxter Road, who feel that they are more a part of Scenic Foothills than University Area. Boniface Parkway is a natural boundary, a four-lane arterial that has commuter traffic and is harder to walk across than Baxter Road. *Mr. Milspaugh* continued, reporting that a few years ago he and another officer had walked the neighborhood east of Boniface to encourage people to become active in UACC, and found there was not much interest there in participating in UACC. *Care Clift* added that people from that area have attended Scenic Foothills meetings at times.

*Emily Weiser* responded that she had once lived on one of the dead-end cul-de-sacs on the east side of Boniface, and did not at that time feel a part of Scenic Foothills. She felt more a part of University Area. There were no street connections from where she was living to areas east.

*Chair Gant* asked if anyone knew the history of the how the boundary came to be at Baxter Road. *Darrel Hess* surmised that there may have not been many residents in the Boundary Study Area when the council districts were formed many years ago. *Stan Moll* asked about the distribution of the population of UACC, and suggested consideration for dissolving UACC by transferring its eastern portion including all of Boundary Study Area #8 east of the UMED campuses to Scenic Foothills, and the western portion to community councils to the west. There was also discussion about a merger of UMED and Scenic Foothills.

*Al Milspaugh* responded that there has not been any discussion at UACC regarding merging with Scenic Foothills. *Mr. Milspaugh* continued, explaining that concerns about adequate population or

losing existing officers is not a boundary review criteria. The “natural communities” boundary criteria calls for community council districts based on neighborhoods. Community councils should draw their officers from the neighborhoods within their boundaries.

***The motion to recommend Option A failed by unanimous vote.***

*Al Milspaugh* moved to recommend Option B, to transfer the area east of Boniface Parkway to Scenic Foothills. *Emily Weiser* seconded.

*Al Milspaugh*, speaking to his motion, said that Boniface Parkway is a natural boundary. People east of Boniface have expressed concerns about why they are not a part of Scenic Foothills, and. *Chair Gant* asked if there is concern about losing so much population. *Al Milspaugh* responded that, other than a couple of board members, there have been few participants from the area in question. *Chair Gant* noted that Scenic Foothills has a concern that it is too small, and that Option B might help solve their problem. *Emily Weiser* added that the Committee will next be considering adding Tudor Area to UACC which will add some population to UACC.

***The motion to recommend Option B passed, with 8 votes in favor and 1 opposed.***

The Committee next discussed Boundary Study Area #12, Tudor Area Community Council, as follows:

*Darrel Hess* commented that Tudor Area is very small, and inactive. *Mr. Hess* explained that Tudor Area has struggled for years. *Tom Davis* explained that he had corresponded with the acting chair of Tudor Area, Todd Butler, and included what he learned from Todd Butler and a few others in White Paper No. 2. *Mr. Davis* reported that Tudor Area has resumed meetings in 2023, however only 2 or 3 people are attending. *Darrel Hess* explained that Todd Butler has made herculean efforts for many years but Tudor Area is so small that he has had trouble getting enough people engaged to make it viable. *Chair Gant* asked what the history of the area was that led to the creation of this community council however no attendees were familiar with that history.

*Al Milspaugh* offered that UACC would not object if people in Tudor Area want to join UACC.

*Emily Weiser* moved to recommend Option C, to merge Tudor Area Community Council into UACC. *Michael Packard* seconded.

*Emily Weiser* explained that Option C will be mutually beneficial. It will allow Tudor Area to be a part of a community council that is already active, and will help address concerns about whether UACC will have enough people to run its community council. *Al Milspaugh* responded that UACC has not had any problems remaining active, and reiterated that the people in Boundary Study Area #8 (discussed above) have not participated much. The relative populations of Tudor Area Community Council and Boundary Study Area #8 were then discussed.

*Stan Moll* asked why Rogers Park Community Council was not interested in combining with Tudor Area. *Tom Davis* reported that he has asked the Rogers Park board this question but it has not yet met to respond. *Darrel Hess* explained that Rogers Park, in general, is a very old and self-contained, insular neighborhood. *Al Milspaugh* added that *Rogers Park* is a strong, active community council. *Stan Moll* concluded he supports merging Tudor Area with UACC because Rogers Park opposes being merged, while UACC will apparently be happy to have Tudor Area join.

*Emily Weiser* noted that the only negative aspect of merging Tudor Area into UACC was that it looks less clean on the map than does merging Tudor Area with Rogers Park—Tudor Area will look “tacked on” to the west end of UACC. However, beyond the aesthetics of the map, the roadways form a natural set of boundaries around the combination of Tudor Area and UACC. 36<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a



strong boundary. *Chair Gant* added that in her experience the Tudor Area district feels like it is a part of the University area.

***The motion to recommend Option C, to merge Tudor Area into University Area, passed unanimously.***

The Committee next addressed Boundary Study Area #10, University Area Community Council, as follows:

*Emily Weiser* moved to recommend Option A with a clarifying adjustment to its wording to: No changes to UACC boundaries, except where the committee recommends in the other Boundary Study Areas. *Michael Packard* seconded.

***The motion to recommend Option A with the clarified wording passed unanimously.***

The Committee next addressed Boundary Study Area #13, South of Tudor Road and East of Lake Otis, as follows:

*Carmela Warfield* moved to recommend Option A, no change. *Emily Weiser* seconded.

*Al Milspaugh* noted that Campbell Park is trying to be active and address community issues in its area, although they do not have a big area or population. *Carmela Warfield* noted that Kevin Fimon, an officer of Campbell Park's board, is an experienced community council federation leader and mentor. If as documented in White Paper #2 the preference of Campbell Park's board is to retain its existing boundaries, and that the board is working hard to actively represent its existing district areas, that she would support their preference.

*Darrel Hess* commented that UACC will still receive notice and be asked to comment about municipal public facility decisions south of Tudor Road, such as regarding the proposed Navigation Center for people who are homeless, even if the UACC district does not include the areas south of Tudor. *Al Milspaugh* said that UACC is already involved in the Navigation Center issue.

*Emily Weiser* commented that she would be concerned about reducing the population of Campbell Park Community Council and its capacity to remain active if neighborhoods south of Tudor Road were to be transferred to UACC.

***The motion to recommend Option A, no change, passed unanimously.***

### **C. Boundary Study Area #32 in Turnagain**

Boundary Study Area #32, Spenard Beach Park, was discussed as follows.

*Tom Davis* explained that representatives from Turnagain and Spenard Community Councils had recently agreed to jointly propose to share Spenard Beach Park between Turnagain and Spenard by overlapping their district boundaries. *Mr. Davis* reported that Turnagain's general membership has voted and approved a resolution in favor of the proposal. The Spenard representative is bringing the idea to Spenard's general membership for consideration. Turnagain Community Council's chair did not think Option B, for each community council district include half the park, would make sense. The Planning Department staff therefore had added Option C, to share Spenard Beach Park, to the list of options for this Boundary Study Area in White Paper No. 2.

*Charlie Welch* moved to recommend Option C, to include Spenard Beach Park in both Turnagain and Spenard Community Councils, by overlapping their district area boundaries in the park. *Care Clift* seconded.

*Emily Weiser* said that she liked that the two community councils are working together on this item, and since the name of the park is Spenard it makes sense that Spenard Community Council would have some ownership over it. Therefore, if it is technically allowed to share an area between two community councils, she would support Option C.

*Carmela Warfield* asked if community council boundaries have ever overlapped in this manner, or could they be allowed to? *Darrel Hess* responded that he believed they could if the Assembly approved it. He continued that, since there is no population or businesses in the proposed overlap, there does not seem to be any harm. *Mr. Hess* and *Emily Weiser* added that, if PZC and Assembly support a different option besides Option C, they can do so.

*Carmela Warfield* asked, if the boundaries of community council districts are supposed to be unique, can the Boundary Review Committee establish a new precedent by recommending an overlap in this location? Is this recommendation unique to this area, or should we consider that it will lead to proposed overlapping boundaries in other areas? *Tom Davis* responded that it could set a precedent in other areas. He explained that there have been boundary disputes between community councils in the past over other public lands and facilities. He also cautioned that overlapping districts could present problems for municipal administrative functions, for example for sending out public notices or maintain geographic information databases.

Committee members discussed what the downsides of Option C could be. *Chair Gant* suggested that one downside could be if the two community councils develop different visions for the park in the future. Could this overlap create problems regarding who makes decisions in this area? *Darrel Hess* responded that community councils are only advisory and do not make decisions about what happens at the park.

*Matt Burkholder* added that since Spenard and Turnagain are each individual community councils, it is ok if they have their own opinions on the overlapping area. *Mr. Burkholder* noted that there are no residents in this park and the community councils are cooperating—two factors that could set a precedent for making similar decisions in the future.

*Chair Gant* and *Darrel Hess* noted that if at some time in the future the overlap is found to not be working well, anyone can propose to change the boundaries back again.

*Darrel Hess* noted that Option C might be a precedent for public facilities, such as parks and airports. In the future, community councils could have overlapping boundaries if it makes them feel that they have a vested interest in such facility. *Care Clift* gave an example of a recent dispute over a park, and pointed out that no community council has ownership over a public park. However, *Chair Gant* and *Al Milspaugh* responded with different examples in which community councils were very active in the development and maintenance of the parks in their districts and had a strong sense of ownership.

***The motion to recommend Option C, to include Spenard Beach Park in both community councils, passed with 7 votes in favor and 2 opposed.***

#### **D. Boundary Study Area #33 in Taku Campbell**

Boundary Study Area #33, south of Dimond Boulevard to 92<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, was discussed, as follows.

*Tom Davis* introduced this Boundary Study Area and the proposed boundary change supported by the officers of both community councils. *Mr. Davis* and *Stan Moll* reported that the presidents of Taku

Campbell, Bayshore/Klatt, and Old Seward Oceanview had met with them and had agreed to support the transfer of Boundary Study Area #33 from Taku Campbell to Bayshore/Klatt.

*Emily Weiser* moved to recommend Option B, to transfer the area south of Dimond Boulevard from Taku Campbell to Bayshore/Klatt Community Council. *Carmela Warfield* seconded.

*Darrell Hess* commented that Dimond Boulevard and Seward Highway are strong natural boundaries.

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

### **E. Boundary Study Area #25 in South Addition**

Discussion of Boundary Study Area #25, north of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and West of L Street was discussed, as follows:

*Chair Gant* explained that the discussion of Boundary Study Area #25 is a continuation from Committee meeting #4. This item had been tabled to give Downtown Community Council and South Addition residents in Bootlegger's Cove more time to provide input before the Committee makes its recommendation. *Tom Davis* reported that SACC's board is apparently reaching out to residents in Boundary Study Area #25, and that because of this Downtown's board is waiting for the outcome of SACC's efforts before deciding its own position. In absence of having more information about the community desires, the Committee determined to apply the project's Boundary Review Criteria to determine its recommendation for Boundary Study Area #25.

*Michael Packard* moved to recommend Option B, to transfer the areas west of L Street and north of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue from South Addition to Downtown Community Council. *Charlie Welch* seconded.

*Mr. Packard*, speaking to his motion, explained that Option B would increase the resident population of Downtown, giving it a larger and more diverse group of people who can be active members.

*Emily Weiser* found no compelling reason to transfer the people in this area to Downtown. The proposal to change the boundary is not coming from the residents of the affected area. She is inclined to default to Option A, retain existing boundaries.

*Chair Gant* explained that she used to live in Bootlegger's Cove and never felt a part of Downtown while living there. She explained there is a big physical barrier between Bootlegger's Cove and Downtown, because of the topography that drops off west of L Street and creates a natural divide. L Street is also a large state roadway. *Chair Gant* continued that many residents walk recreationally in the area and they tend to stay in Bootleggers or go to and from South Addition and Westchester—not Downtown. She did not support the transfer. *Darrel Hess* added that he has bicycled in the area for years he finds that it seems like Bootleggers is a part of South Addition; it has the same atmosphere as South Addition. It does not feel like Downtown to him.

*Darrel Hess* added that although there is a desire to add more resident population to Downtown, transferring this study area is not necessarily the right way to do that. There is a lot of housing being developed within Downtown.

*Stan Moll* agreed that the neighborhood identity in the Boundary Study Area is the same as South Addition and it should remain in South Addition. *Mr. Moll* and *Chair Gant* questioned why the SACC board supports consideration for transferring the area to Downtown. *Chair Gant* noted the South Addition residents who attended the Committee's previous meeting (Meeting #4) had opposed such a transfer.

***The motion to recommend Option B failed unanimously.***

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

***The motion to recommend Option A passed unanimously.***

#### **4. Schedule and Next Steps**

##### **A. Criteria for Community Councils to Show Participation Levels**

*Care Clift* explained her concern about the lack of a consistent set of minimum quorum requirements and the activity levels at community councils. During this boundary review project, a small group of people attending a community council meeting representing all of Northeast, a very large community council, took a position opposing a boundary change. *Ms. Clift* said she did not believe their position was truly representative of the community desires regarding district boundaries in at least some parts of Northeast. *Ms. Clift* suggested that the Committee recommend the Federation of Community Councils evaluate quorum requirements to develop a fair way of measuring quorum that would consider the population size of the community council.

*Darrel Hess* explained that quorums are up to the individual community councils to establish through their own bylaws. There is nothing in the municipal code about community council quorums—it's up to the individual councils, and their quorum requirements vary widely. *Ms. Clift* responded that this is a problem, because the Committee has been trying to determine if there is adequate participation levels in the community councils.

*Al Milspaugh* and *Charlie Welch* discussed that there is a wide variety of community councils, and whether the Federation's Board of Delegates could recommend or suggest generally applicable criteria for setting quorum.

*Care Clift* moved that the Boundary Advisory Committee recommend that there be more measurable criteria for participation and quorum at community council meetings. *Charlie Welch* seconded.

*Michael Packard* expressed concern for large community council areas that cannot get enough people to show up to meet some uniform threshold requirement, and could never meet quorum or vote on any action?

*Carmela Warfield* added that each community council has its own bylaws, governing documents, and elected body. But the proposed motion on the table is to establish uniform standards by which we would measure everybody. *Ms. Warfield* expressed that each community council should be able to set its parameters for its quorum, and by its elected representatives be represented. She offered a comparison to municipal elections where although there is sometimes low voter turnout, but the community respects the results of the election and the will of the people even if the percentage turnout is not what one might have desired from our fellow residents. *Ms. Warfield* concluded that, out of respect for each individual and unique community council, she would oppose the motion, because it should be up to each individual community council to establish what their quorum looks like.

*Darrel Hess* questioned who would establish or enforce uniform criteria for quorum? He explained that community councils are not a part of government. Community councils are private membership associations.

*Charlie Welch* responded that the proposed motion does not need to lead to a requirement or be enforced. Providing a matrix of different quorum thresholds or how active community councils are relative to their population size could be informational. For example, if Tudor Area Community Council (Boundary Study Area #12) cannot meet quorum, perhaps their own bylaws should have a lower threshold for making quorum. But if there are only a few people attending votes, should we consider such a community council as active as others where many more people are participating?

*Darrel Hess* explained that varying participation levels is inherent in community councils. In Fairview, for example, he found that typically only 20 people would attend most meetings, but 150 people would show up for one or two months whenever a hot-button issue came up. By the third month attendance would taper back down to 20. He believed that is how most community councils operate. You have the smaller group of hard core committed people who show up to do the work month-to-month, and then you have the larger number of people who show up only when there is a hot-button issue that affects them. *Mr. Hess* believed it's a good topic for the Federation to consider, if it is a topic that they want to look at.

*Care Clift* expressed that she did not think that the criteria should be a matter of how many people show up at each meeting, but rather how many people are active generally, such as on email or social media or whatever the council uses. There should be some way that the council can show that people from all areas of that community council district are active. For example, University Area Community Council happened to get information from several its officers that residents east of Boniface wanted to become a part of Scenic Foothills. But other community councils are probably not getting that kind of information about similar situations in their districts.

*Matt Burkholder* and *Al Milspaugh* explained that historically the Federation periodically sent mass mailers to all residents in community council areas that identified the community council and the issues it is addressing. This gave all residents an opportunity to become informed and active.

*Emily Weiser* moved to extend the meeting to 8:10 p.m. *Michael Packard* seconded the motion. ***The meeting was extended to 8:10 by unanimous vote.***

*Care Clift* concluded her arguments in favor of the motion, explaining that the Committee has been trying throughout this boundary review process to determine the participation levels of the community councils districts affected by the Boundary Study Areas.

*Al Milspaugh* explained that community councils are required to keep an attendance record of who attended their meetings.

***The motion to recommend that there be more measurable criteria for participation and quorum at community council meetings failed, with 1 vote in favor and 8 opposed.***

## **5. Public Comments (none)**

## **6. Adjournment**

*Stan Moll* moved to adjourn the meeting. *Care Clift* seconded. ***The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.***

*This page intentionally left blank.*



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

***MEETING SUMMARY (STAFF NOTES)***

Tuesday, September 26, 2023  
12:00 p.m.

***Meeting #6***

Remote Meeting Held Virtually in Microsoft Teams

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

The meeting was called to order at 12:15 p.m.

**A. Roll Call**

A quorum was present.

*Present:* Care Clift  
Melinda Gant, *Chair*  
Darrel Hess  
Al Milspaugh  
Stan Moll  
Emily Weiser  
Charlie Welch  
Carmela Warfield

*Excused:* Matt Burkholder  
Mark Butler  
Karl von Lührte  
Michael Packard  
Carolyn Ramsey

*Staff:* Tom Davis, Planning Department

**2. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**A. April 24, 2023**

*Charlie Welch* moved to approve the minutes from the April 24, 2023, meeting. *Care Clift* seconded.

The following errors were identified by the meeting participants:

- *Tom Davis* indicated there was a misspelling of Committee member Care Clift's name.

- *Stan Moll* reported that he had found some grammatical and punctuation errors, which are non-substantive (i.e., don't change the meaning).

***The April 24, 2023, minutes with the corrections bulleted above were approved unanimously.***

### **B. May 1, 2023**

*Melinda Gant* moved to approve the minutes from the May 1, 2023, meeting. *Al Milspaugh* seconded.

The following errors were identified by the meeting participants:

- *Tom Davis* reported a correction submitted by Michael Packard: On page 8, in the middle of the page, where it reads, "The motion to postpone passed unanimously with 6 votes in favor and 2 opposed, delete the word "unanimously."
- *Stan Moll* indicated there was a misspelling of Fairview on page 6.
- *Stan Moll* reported that he had found some grammatical and punctuation errors, which are non-substantive (i.e., don't change the meaning).

***The May 1, 2023, minutes with the corrections bulleted above were approved unanimously.***

### **C. June 12, 2023**

*Al Milspaugh* moved to approve the minutes from the June 12, 2023, meeting. *Charlie Welch* seconded.

No errors or needed corrections were identified in the draft minutes.

***The June 12, 2023, minutes were approved unanimously.***

## **3. OTHER ITEMS**

*Tom Davis* reported that it would take the Planning Department some weeks to compile the reports and maps to release a public hearing draft of the boundary proposals. Once that is released for public comment, there will be at least two months of public review before the Planning and Zoning Commission hearing. The Committee members and staff discussed and agreed that the public hearing draft materials should include the following:

- A cover letter from the Committee Chair verifying the committee process.
- A list of all Committee members and the guests who participated in the Committee meetings.

*Melinda Gant* asked if there were any further responsibilities or expectations of the Committee. Staff and Committee members discussed the following:

- A Committee representative would address the PZC and Assembly at their public hearings.
- A Committee representative could attend work session(s) of the PZC and Assembly.
- Committee members could review and provide feedback regarding the first section of the staff's draft report, particularly the planned overview of what community councils do.

The Committee meeting adjourned at 12:34 p.m.