



Citizen Advisory Committee Meeting #12

Location: Planning Conference Room 170 (NW entry/stairs),
Planning and Development Center, 4700 Bragaw Street

Date: August 27, 2007 6:00 pm to 9:00 pm

MEETING NOTES

1. Introduction – agenda review, introductions of CAC, consultants, guests, public attendees

Committee

- David Lappi
- Carol Fries
- John Reese - absent
- Lori Davey
- Niel Thomas
- John Weddleton
- Chris Hamre - absent
- Connie Yoshimura - absent
- Dee High - absent
- Victor Mollozzi - absent
- Fred Jenkins - absent
- David Beveridge
- Wayne Westberg

Community member(s)

- Robert Regis

Staff

- Chris Beck – Agnew::Beck
- Tanya Iden – Agnew::Beck
- Dan Billman – HDR Alaska
- Tamas Deak – KPB
- Cal Kerr – Northern Economics
- Cathy Hammond – Muni
- JoAnn Contreras - Muni

2. Review Issues, Goals, and Choices report: Survey (Northern Economics-Cal Kerr)

- Cal Kerr gave overview of the Survey results.

Discussion:

- Question about how to represent in the findings the fact that people don't really know correct answers to specific questions. For instance, people were unaware that their area is served by and LRSA but then answered detailed questions about road maintenance.
- Skipped questions – is it a case of is “respondent fatigue,” or were people unclear about the question. Were certain questions skipped more than others?
- Observation that the average amount that people indicated they were willing to pay for water hook-up was not even remotely close to what water hook-up would actually cost.

- Vast majority of respondents have lived in Anchorage longer than they have lived on the Hillside – observation that people clearly choose to live there and that is why they are happy.
 - Respondents in area E appear to be the least satisfied. A lot of new development may not be the cause of dissatisfaction. The area is too diverse and large to say this is true- some are uncomfortable with the report making this conclusion.
 - Cal Kerr concluded by stating that focus groups are a good idea to get a little more depth on the survey.
 - CAC comments on the survey results due by August 31, 2007
3. Review Issues, Goals, and Choices report: Land Use (Agnew::Beck-Chris Beck)
- Chris Beck gave overview of the Land Use Section of the Issues, Goals & Choices report.

Discussion:

- Population Characteristics (p.3): several CAC members were uncomfortable with including salary and housing price data in the report. There was a feeling that the data didn't paint the whole picture. Concern that there are many lower income people living on the hillside, who built their houses long ago, out-of-pocket and they are somehow disenfranchised by the income information.
Suggestions:
 - Surrogate for household income could be education but it doesn't compare well with housing value.
 - State the high end and low end of the median income range.
 - Mention that high housing value means Hillsideers pay more property tax but don't have the same services.
 - Combine G, I & H block groups to match survey results
- Land Use and Zoning (p.4): Suggestion was made to define "large lot" as well as add a new column to the table that would indicate the average acreage per parcel for each category – i.e. Single family 0.92 acres/parcel.
- Physical Suitability for Development (p.5): Map needs to better show the suitability of the vacant land.
- Pending Subdivisions (p.7): Legacy Pointe is not on the map because it was not factored into the remaining development capacity analysis. Map will be updated to show this potential project.
- Section C: Tamas Deak is working with the Muni Planning Department to complete this section. It has been challenging to determine the best way to share this information.
- Section D – Green "Natural" Infrastructure
 - Include examples in the Report – i.e. Cuddy Family Park's pond serving a drainage function and avoiding 5 million in downstream culvert upgrades.
 - Focus more on the economic benefits - capitalizing on existing natural systems has economic benefits.

- Brief discussion of the history of Chester Creek Greenbelt, and existing “green infrastructure” system in Anchorage
 - Brief discussion about incentives for preserving green infrastructure. Density bonus – how do you determine what it should be? Would bringing in public water & sewer be an incentive? (Negative reaction from the group, talk of AWWU fabricating assessment districts to obtain 51% of vote). Rather than incentives if the MUNI simply enforced drainage easements and regulations a lot of green infrastructure could be preserved.
 - Include discussion about how green infrastructure preservation requires different approaches for vacant and developed land. This led to talk about Fish Creek and how the main is now going back and purchasing easements from adjacent properties to protect the creek. Very expensive after the fact.
 - CAC generally supportive of Green Infrastructure approach
4. Policy Committee PowerPoint
- A lot of discussion around the well/ wastewater slide. Suggestions to make it better include:
 - Make the Y axis go up to 10 (which is the EPA cut-off)
 - Take the word “wastewater” out of the title (implies that it is wastewater which is raising nitrate levels – but this has not been unequivocally determined.)
 - Compare the Hillside to another watershed