

# Municipality of Anchorage



P.O. Box 390  
Girdwood, Alaska 99587  
<http://www.muni.org/gbos>

*Suzanne LaFrance, Mayor*

*GIRDWOOD VALLEY SERVICE AREA BOARD OF SUPERVISORS  
Briana Sullivan & Mike Edgington, Co-Chairs  
Jennifer Wingard, Brian Burnett, Kellie Okonek*

## **November 14, 2024 GBOS HLB Work Session RE: Girdwood Industrial Park Minutes Draft**

**1:30 p.m. via Microsoft Teams & Girdwood Community Room, 250 Egloff Rd.**

This meeting is being held via teams with in-person attendance at the Girdwood Community Room

The Girdwood Board of Supervisors, its committees, and subcommittees are subject to the Alaska Open Meetings Act as found in Alaska Statute 44.62.310 and Anchorage Municipal Code 1.25 - Public Meetings. The Girdwood Board of Supervisors operates under the Girdwood Public Meetings Standards of Conduct.

Call to Order 1:35 p.m. Mike Edgington, GBOS Co-Chair

Land Acknowledgement: The Girdwood Board of Supervisors acknowledges the indigenous peoples of Alaska, whose land we reside on. The community of Girdwood, situated between the areas known to be Dena'ina and Alutiiq homeland, respects the people who were stewards of this land for generations. We commit to the continued stewardship of this land and are grateful to be part of a wider community that seeks to maintain a sustainable use of Girdwood Valley for present and future peoples.

Roll Call Mike Edgington (ME), Kellie Okonek (KO), Jennifer Wingard (JW)  
HLB attending: Tiffany Briggs, Emma Giboney, Nicole Jones Vogel (HLB contractor)  
Disclosures: None stated

### **Agenda Revisions and Approval**

GBOS HLB Work Session on the Girdwood Industrial Park Agenda Approved KO/JW

### **Agenda**

Welcome and Introductions

1. Girdwood Industrial Park Development Ideas (presented at the HLBAC October meeting and MOA GBOS Quarterly Meeting 10/28/24)

See meeting packet for presentation that covers these more comprehensively.

Over the last year HLB has been completing feasibility studies based on four scenarios for development of the Girdwood Industrial Park 6-057F. HLB has a preferred option based on this study and has draft language for the HLB Work Plan for 2025, however there is still significant opportunity for public input.

Criteria for analysis of the 4 options involves a wide variety of key elements, which was informed with input by the community and GBOS.

1. Disposal of property as-is: least lift by HLB, retaining land in the wetlands and setbacks. This is not optimal in HLB opinion because disposal of the entirety at market rate would not meet the community's needs in the future. Income: \$2.3M.

2. Disposal with platting of reconfigured lots (not requiring improvements or limited improvements)  
Staff preferred alternative, HLBAC recommendation also.

Create newly platted lots with minimal infrastructure/improvements. Existing cul-de-sac would become dedicated ROW providing option for future development of Phase III. Four lots created would be valued between \$251,000-\$503,000. Costs are \$194,000; revenue is \$1M Tract A is used by GVSA, value is \$327,000. Possible that this would be handled via land exchange.

Tract C involves potential for ROW or Public Use Easement in the future. Additionally, this site is large enough to potentially include more than one user. ROW or PUE could allow for future development of land outside of the scope of this study (into Phase III).

3. Removed from study scope due to high cost with limited benefit (discussed later)

4. Full build out of Phases II and III.  
\$3.7M cost, after sale the cost is -\$1M

This achieves more, smaller lots and is comparatively expensive, due to need for sewer lift station etc. with disposal of all the lots.

#### Questions/Comments

- Possible to hybrid #2 and #4?  
This is basically option 3 – development of this requires lift station, so cost is high. Increase of costs but less benefit.
- Development of Phase I with AWWU funding created the current situation of undeveloped/undevelopable Phase II and Phase II with no way to continue, while community need is ongoing. Concern to address this from longer term perspective.  
Mismatch in language between community perspective of investment and HLB perspective of profit/loss
- Desire to protect existing permittees with First Right of Refusal.  
Phase I required waiving of code that would have required disposal to highest bidder.  
There is no plan currently to do this for Phase II/III.
- Community and Economic Impacts don't appear as criteria used by HLB in evaluating the various options.  
Encourage staff and GBOS to further engage the community prior to consideration of a project to be promoted in the HLB Annual work plan. Permittee states that they have not been consulted and meetings that were promised have not taken place.
- Concern for underestimation of costs of replat.
- Option 2 is too limiting and doesn't provide for enough lots for existing uses. 3 Lots available for the existing uses, let alone possibly opening it up for competitive bid. Option 4 has lots that are too small for many users and are expensive compared to funds that investor would recoup from activity at the lot.
- Appraisals don't seem to match the useable space of the lots. Largest lot has the most wetland with little useable space without significant fill. Smallest lot has already been significantly filled and has more usable space but appears as having the lowest value.

#### Future steps:

Option 2 initiate conveyance in 2025, Option 4 start of conveyance is unknown, due to need to find funds.

HLB Work Session next week.

HLB Work Plan will be open for public comment in Jan.

**Public Comment:** None

Adjourn 2:30PM