

10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries Project

White Paper #2: Boundary Study Areas

**Appendix C:
Summary Table of Boundary Study Areas**

**Revised Draft
March 23, 2023**



Municipality of Anchorage
Planning Department

Project Information:

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

This page intentionally left blank.

Introduction

This **Appendix C** is a summary table of the 38 Boundary Study Areas identified from public comments in Appendix B. Appendix C provides a brief description of each Boundary Study Area and the proposed boundary change(s) from the public comments. It also indicates the total number of comments that called for the Boundary Study Area, and cross-references back to those source comments as documented in Appendices A and B, which are available on the project web page.

Appendix C also identifies the community councils that are potentially affected by each Boundary Study Area, in the middle three columns of the table. The community council district that is the main subject of the comments or that currently represents the Boundary Study Area in question is listed first. The neighboring community council district(s) whose boundaries may be affected by any potential changes are listed next, to the right of the first community council.

The Boundary Study Areas in Appendix C appear in the same order as in Appendix B and in White Paper No. 2. They are numbered and organized geographically starting in Chugiak-Eagle River, then Turnagain Arm, and finally the Anchorage Bowl. Within each of these three regions of the Municipality, the Boundary Study Areas are arranged geographically from north to south.

Boundary Study Areas

A “Boundary Study Area” means that a community council district boundary has been identified for further evaluation in this *10-Year Review of Community Council Boundaries* project. A Boundary Study Area may include all or a part of a community council district or certain boundary segments where the public comments suggest consideration for changes.

The Boundary Study Areas are to be evaluated in White Paper No. 2. White Paper No. 2 applies the boundary review criteria from White Paper No. 1 to assess each Boundary Study Area and identify options for addressing the boundary issue.

A Boundary Study Area does not necessarily mean any changes to a community council district will be recommended. After assessing a Boundary Study Area, and requesting feedback from affected community councils, the staff recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) and Assembly could be “no change” – i.e., to preserve the existing boundary.

See White Papers No. 1 and No. 2 for information about the public comment process, the boundary review criteria, and the evaluation of Boundary Study Areas. Additional information is available on the project web page.

Index Table of Community Councils (at right)

The index table at right provides a cross-reference from each community council district in the Municipality to the Boundary Study Area(s) in this Appendix C that may affect that community council.

<i>Community Council District Name</i>	<i>Boundary Study Areas that May Affect the Community Council (by Boundary Study Area No.)</i>
Abbott Loop	#33
Airport Heights	#15, #16, #17, #18, #21
Basher	#9
Bayshore/Klatt	#33, #34, #35
Bear Valley	#38
Birchwood	none
Campbell Park	#12, #13
Chugiak	#1
Downtown	#19, #22, #25
Eagle River	#2, #3
Eagle River Valley	#2
Eklutna Valley	none
Fairview	#14, #19, #20, #21, #22, #23, #24
Girdwood	#4, #5
Glen Alps	none
Government Hill	#14
Hillside	#37
Huffman/O’Malley	#36, #37
Midtown	#26, #28, #29
Mountain View	#14, #15, #19
North Star	#26, #27, #28, #29
Northeast	#6, #7
Old Seward/Oceanview	#33, #34, #35, #36
Portage Valley	#5
Rabbit Creek	#38
Rogers Park	#11, #12, #16, #17, #18
Russian Jack	#6, #15
Sand Lake	none
Scenic Foothills	#6, #7, #8, #9
South Addition	#22, #23, #24, #25
South Fork	#3
Spennard	#26, #27, #28, #29, #30, #31, #32
Taku Campbell	#33
Tudor Area	#11, #12
Turnagain	#30, #31, #32
Turnagain Arm	#4, #5
University Area	#8, #9, #10, #12, #13

This page intentionally left blank.

Appendix C: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Boundary Study Area (Study Area Number and Name)	Description	Community Council Districts Potentially Affected	Total Number of Comments	Source Comments: Questionnaire response I.D. Numbers and Email/Phone Comment Numbers from Appendices A and B <i>(Listed in the order the comments appear in the Appendix B tables)</i>
#1 Chugiak Community Council District	1 questionnaire response indicated that the Chugiak Community Council district is too large to afford all members the opportunity for participation and representation.	Chugiak	1	261
#2 Eagle River and Eagle River Valley Community Council Districts	10 questionnaire responses indicated that the Eagle River and/or Eagle River Valley Community Council districts do not or may not reflect actual neighborhoods or natural communities. 2 of the responses recommended that the Eagle Ridge Subdivision, Parkview Terrace Subdivision, Gruening Middle School, and Eagle River Lions Park area southwest of Eagle River Road and Eagle River Loop Road be transferred from Eagle River Valley Community Council to Eagle River Community Council. One of the responses indicated the natural boundary is farther east, at Mile Hi Avenue and Eagle River Road. One of the responses recommended to merge the two community council districts. The other responses did not recommend specific changes.	Eagle River Valley	10	260 262 184 84 257 268 409 200 266 296
#3 North of Eagle River Loop Road to Eagle River (the waterbody)	2 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer the Eagle Nest Subdivision, Eagle River High School, and Wolf Den Drive area northwest of Eagle River Loop Road from South Fork Community Council to Eagle River Community Council.	South Fork	2	37 262
#4 Girdwood Community Council District	5 commenters (including the municipal Ombudsman and the Community Councils Center manager) indicated concern that the boundaries of the GBOS service area is smaller than the boundaries of the Girdwood community council district. The Municipality has recognized the Girdwood Board of Supervisors (GBOS) Land Use Committee as the community council for Girdwood. Persons living outside of the GBOS service area, who are part of the community council district, cannot vote for the community council organization that represents them (GBOS Land Use Committee). 3 of the emails indicated that the GBOS represents residents within the town of Girdwood, but not residents in Crow Creek. 1 of the responses recommended that the boundaries of the service area should match the boundaries of the community council district. 4 of the responses recommended to establish a separate community council organization from the GBOS service district, to include all of Girdwood including the Crow Creek neighborhood.	Girdwood	5	431 435 438 439 440 <i>(on page 15 of Appendix B)</i>
#5 Portage Valley Community Council District	The municipal Ombudsman and the Community Councils Center manager indicated that the Portage Valley Community Council has not submitted revised bylaws required by municipal code changes in 2014. There has not been an active community council meeting quorum for years. Failing to meet these requirements means this community council should no longer be recognized by the Municipality. The commenters recommended to consider an option to merge it with an adjacent community council district.	Portage Valley	2	433 436 <i>(on page 15 of Appendix B)</i>
#6 Northeast Community Council District	16 responses indicated that the Northeast Community Council district is too large to afford all members the opportunity for participation and representation, and recommended to either divide it into two separate community council districts or transfer parts of it to an adjacent community council district. Some of these commenters recommended to divide Northeast into east and west districts with a few specifying using Turpin Street, Beaver Place, and/or political districts as boundaries. 1 of the commenters recommended to divide Northeast into north and south districts using DeBarr Road as a boundary. 4 of the commenters recommended to transfer western portions of Northeast Community Council (including Nunaka Valley) to the Russian Jack Community Council district or merge those western areas with parts of Russian Jack.	Northeast	16	40 44 90 99 114 126 158 186 189 233 235 285 308 408 418 425
#7 North of E. Northern Lights Boulevard to Foxhall Drive	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the Foxhall Drive area north of E. Northern Lights from Northeast Community Council to Scenic Foothills Community Council district.	Northeast	1	368

Appendix C: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Boundary Study Area (Study Area Number and Name)	Description	Community Council Districts Potentially Affected	Total Number of Comments	Source Comments: Questionnaire response I.D. Numbers and Email/Phone Comment Numbers from Appendices A and B <i>(Listed in the order the comments appear in the Appendix B tables)</i>
#8 West of Baxter Road South of Northern Lights Boulevard	9 questionnaire responses indicated that areas west of Baxter Road are more aligned with the neighborhoods of Scenic Foothills Community Council than with University Area Community Council district. Some recommended to transfer the area between Baxter Road and Boniface Parkway from University Area Community Council to Scenic Foothills Community Council.	University Area Scenic Foothills	9	415 48 52 66 297 299 370 368 146
#9 Scenic Foothills Community Council District	2 questionnaire responses indicated that Scenic Foothills Community Council district is too small, and should be merged. One recommended merging with Basher Community Council, and the other recommended merging with University Area Community Council.	Basher Scenic Foothills University Area	2	22 415
#10 University Area Community Council District	3 questionnaire responses indicated dissatisfaction with University Area Community Council's district area in general. One indicated it is too large. The others indicated it is disjointed and should more closely follow Assembly or legislative district boundaries.	University Area Scenic Foothills	3	23 188 213
#11 College Village	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the College Village neighborhood out of Rogers Park Community Council district.	Rogers Park Tudor Area	1	35
#12 Tudor Area Community Council District	7 questionnaire respondents plus the municipal Ombudsman and the Community Councils Center manager indicated that Tudor Area Community Council has been having difficulty making meeting quorum requirements or is too small, and recommended to merge Tudor Area into one or more of 3 adjacent community council districts.	Tudor Area Rogers Park University Area; Campbell Park	9	354 12 53 340 381 403 52 434 437 <i>(436 & 437 on p. 15 of Appendix B)</i>
#13 South of Tudor Road and East of Lake Otis Parkway	4 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer some or all of the neighborhoods south of Tudor Road and east of Lake Otis Parkway (and north of Dowling Road) out of Campbell Park Community Council to another community council district. 1 of these responses recommended to transfer the neighborhood along the south side of Tudor Road to University Area Community Council. Another suggested considering to transfer the public lands and facilities along the south side of Tudor Road in the MLK Jr. Parkway vicinity to University Area Community Council.	Campbell Park University Area	4	190 280 400 387
#14 West of Reeve Boulevard	2 questionnaire responses indicated that the western, industrial portion of Mountain View Community Council district seems more aligned with the Ship Creek industrial areas to the west, and recommended to transfer those areas out of Mountain View Community Council district.	Mountain View Fairview Downtown	2	136 253
#15 Penland Park and Brighton Park	3 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer Penland Mobile Home Park, the Brighton Park apartments, and/or all areas north of DeBarr Road from Airport Heights Community Council to Mountain View Community Council district.	Airport Heights Mountain View Russian Jack	3	104 181 206
#16 Anchor Park	4 questionnaire responses indicated that Anchor Park Subdivision (on the northeast corner of Lake Otis Parkway and E. Northern Lights Boulevard) may be more aligned with the Airport Heights neighborhood and should be considered for transfer from Rogers Park Community Council to Airport Heights Community Council.	Rogers Park Airport Heights	4	49 205 372 132
#17 Eastridge	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer Eastridge Subdivision from Airport Heights Community Council to Rogers Park Community Council district.	Airport Heights Rogers Park	1	206
#18 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis Parkway	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the lots on 24th Avenue west of Lake Otis Parkway from Rogers Park Community Council to Airport Heights Community Council district.	Rogers Park Airport Heights	1	372

Appendix C: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Boundary Study Area (Study Area Number and Name)	Description	Community Council Districts Potentially Affected			Total Number of Comments	Source Comments: Questionnaire response I.D. Numbers and Email/Phone Comment Numbers from Appendices A and B <i>(Listed in the order the comments appear in the Appendix B tables)</i>
#19 Fairview North of 5th Avenue	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the area north of 5th Avenue out of Fairview Community Council district.	Fairview	Downtown		1	279
#20 Fairview East and West of Gambell-Ingra Corridor	2 questionnaire responses observed the differences between eastern and western Fairview and the division created by the Gambell-Ingra corridor. One of these responses indicated Fairview is too small and should be merged with another community council district.	Fairview			2	77 286
#21 Sitka Street Park	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the open space area west of Sitka Street from Airport Heights Community Council to Fairview Community Council district.	Airport Heights	Fairview		1	107
#22 North of 15th Avenue between Ingra and I Streets	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the area between I Street, Ingra Street, 9th Avenue, and 15th Avenue from the Fairview and South Addition Community Councils to the Downtown Community Council district.	Fairview	South Addition	Downtown	1	121
#23 West of Cordova Street from 9th to 15th Avenue	4 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer, or at least consider to transfer, some or all of the areas west of Cordova Street (between Cordova and C Street) from South Addition Community Council to Fairview Community Council district.	South Addition	Fairview		4	119 336 421 107
#24 A and C Street Corridor South of 15th Avenue	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the area between A and C Street south of 15th Avenue (between 15th Ave. and Chester Creek) from Fairview Community Council to South Addition Community Council district.	Fairview	South Addition		1	279
#25 Northwest of 9th Avenue and L Street	1 questionnaire response recommended a reassessment to determine the appropriate community council designation for the areas northwest of 9th Avenue and L Street, including Bootleggers Cove.	South Addition	Downtown		2	230 421
#26 North Star Community Council District	3 questionnaire responses indicated that North Star Community Council district is too small and recommended to merge it with Midtown and/or Spenard Community Councils.	North Star	Midtown	Spenard	3	72 85 116
#27 Romig Park near Hillcrest Drive	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the Romig Park neighborhood along Spenard Road (up to the Hillcrest Drive area) from North Star Community Council to Spenard Community Council district.	North Star	Spenard		1	251
#28 Midtown Community Council District	6 questionnaire responses and one email indicated that Midtown Community Council is not providing representation for its residents because it is focused on representing commercial property owners and businesses, for example by moving its membership meeting time to noon. The responses recommended to merge Midtown Community Council with North Star and/or Spenard Community Councils.	Midtown	Spenard	North Star	7	56 172 390 191 199 222 427 <i>(427 on page 15 of Appendix B)</i>
#29 Spenard Community Council District	1 questionnaire response recommended to realign the Spenard Community Council district boundaries to follow Assembly district boundaries.	Spenard	Midtown		1	94
#30 Turnagain Community Council District	1 questionnaire response indicated that Turnagain Community Council is too small and recommended to merge it with Spenard Community Council district.	Turnagain	Spenard		1	203
#31 West of Fish Creek to Wisconsin Street	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the neighborhoods south of W. Northern Lights between Fish Creek and Wisconsin Street from Turnagain Community Council to Spenard Community Council district.	Turnagain	Spenard		1	191

Appendix C: Summary of Boundary Study Areas

Boundary Study Area (Study Area Number and Name)	Description	Community Council Districts Potentially Affected			Total Number of Comments	Source Comments: Questionnaire response I.D. Numbers and Email/Phone Comment Numbers from Appendices A and B <i>(Listed in the order the comments appear in the Appendix B tables)</i>					
#32 Spenard Beach Park	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer Spenard Beach Park from Turnagain Community Council to Spenard Community Council district.	Turnagain	Spenard		1	191					
#33 South of Dimond Boulevard to 92nd Avenue	1 questionnaire response indicated that Taku Campbell Community Council district is too large and recommended to transfer the area south of Dimond Boulevard (between Dimond and 92nd) out of Taku/Campbell.	Taku Campbell	Bayshore/ Klatt	Abbott Loop; Old Seward/ Oceanview	1	298					
#34 Bayshore/Klatt Community Council District	1 questionnaire response indicated that Bayshore/Klatt Community Council district is too large and recommended to divide it into two community council districts.	Bayshore/ Klatt	Old Seward/ Oceanview		1	371					
#35 South of O'Malley Road to Klatt Road, East of C Street	3 questionnaire responses recommended to transfer the area of C Street on the west, O'Malley Road on the north, New Seward Highway on the east, and Klatt Road on the south, from Bayshore/Klatt Community Council to Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council district.	Bayshore/ Klatt	Old Seward/ Oceanview		3	241	318	422			
#36 Oceanview East of Old Seward Highway	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer the area of Oceanview neighborhood between the Old Seward Highway and the Seward Highway from Old Seward/Oceanview Community Council to Huffman/O'Malley Community Council district.	Old Seward/ Oceanview	Huffman/ O'Malley		1	137					
#37 East of Elmore Road from 104th Ave to De Armoun Road	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer areas east of Elmore Road from Huffman/O'Malley Community Council to Hillside Community Council district.	Huffman/ O'Malley	Hillside		1	166					
#38 Higher Elevations of Rabbit Creek Community Council	1 questionnaire response recommended to transfer higher-elevation portions of Rabbit Creek Community Council district out of Rabbit Creek.	Rabbit Creek	Bear Valley		1	112					
n/a Boundary Study Area Undetermined	6 questionnaire responses indicated dissatisfaction with existing boundaries in 5 community council districts, however staff was unable to determine their specific issue. These six responses did not provide enough information for staff to be able to determine the issue or boundary segment of concern, and the questionnaire responses did not provide contact information for staff to be able to request clarification.	Rabbit Creek, Rogers Park (2), Russian Jack, Sand Lake, University Area			6	306	89	183	139	405	374