

MINUTES OF THE ANCHORAGE SCHOOL BOARD
AND
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING
APRIL 7, 2005

Public Hearing of the Anchorage School Board and
Municipal Planning and Zoning Commission

1. Tim Steele called the Public Hearing open for the Joint School Board and Planning & Zoning Commission for the school site selection of the southwest Anchorage elementary school site and middle school site at 6:35 p.m.

2. Roll Call

School Board Members Present: Tim Steele, Jake Metcalfe, Jeff Friedman, Mary Marks, Crystal Kennedy, and John Steiner.

Commission Members Present: Johnny Gibbons, Bill Wielechowski, Nancy Pease, Art Isham, Greg Jones, Don Poulton, Chair.

Others Present: Carol Comeau, Superintendent; Ray Amsden, George Vakalis, Fred Johnson, Cathy Hammond, JoAnn Contreras, Robin Siegfried, and other interested persons.

3. Presentation and Site Recommendation

Cathy Hammond and JoAnn Contreras of the Planning Department gave a brief overview of the sites evaluated for the southwest Anchorage school sites.

JoAnn Contreras reported that there were six site options in two different areas in the Sand Lake area located north of Dimond on either side of Sand Lake and south of Kincaid Park. The criterion in selecting the sites for the schools included topography, size, location, potential hazards, land use and development potential. All of the areas were evaluated in the geotechnical report. The 57-acre site area was withdrawn from consideration but was included in the study for comparison. The preferred site is E1A, because it is just outside of the airport noise contour, has a higher elevation, and is well located in regards to the students who would use it. That site is located in the area that is unavailable, so Site

E1B was studied because it was offered as an alternate site. It is located at a lower elevation but is still within the Kincaid Estates Subdivision. With the buildout of the subdivision, there will be very good pedestrian access to the school. It is a 15-acre site and it is a viable alternative. Site M1 for the middle school, which overlaps site E1A in the larger area of the 57-acre site, also is not available for consideration for purchase. Site M2 at the northeast corner of Dimond and Sand Lake Road, although a smaller site is recommended for the middle school. Originally 32 acres were offered for consideration and subsequent to evaluation a modified configuration of 26.8 acres was offered for a middle school site and it can accommodate a middle school prototype. This site has good access off Sand Lake Road. Utilities will need to be installed. There will be some additional cost for a lift station and storm drain system. The preferred site for elementary school is E1A, but it is not available so we are recommending Site E1B for the elementary and Site M2 for the middle school, which are both available.

Carol Comeau reported that if these sites are purchased the district will continue to watch the enrollment in the area. It's unknown when the buildings would actually go to the voters for approval of the bonds. The elementary is the biggest problem right now for all of the surrounding schools. It is critical to acquire some sites to be prepared to move with construction.

George Vakalis added that the district staff has looked at this and supports the two recommendations going forward.

4. Public Hearing

The Public Hearing was opened by Anchorage School Board President, Tim Steele.

Susan Ritter stated that she lives at 8610 Summers Place and is a member of the Sand Lake Community Council, which she is representing tonight. Ms. Ritter is also the PTA President at Kincaid Elementary School. Ms. Ritter stated that she has many concerns about the location for numerous reasons and reviewed some of the comments heard in terms of site selections. Ms. Ritter commented that the council did not have time to review the booklet because it was given to the members after their meeting. They have concerns about voting on this project tonight without

being given time to review the booklet. The council submitted a letter stating that it is opposed to the location of the elementary school in the hole (pit). Ms. Ritter explained that she has done research on site selection for schools in other parts of the country including New Mexico and California. The concerns that New Mexico looks at include geologic analysis - type of soil and bearing capacity, hazardous waste, environmental hazards, toxic wastes from manmade landfills, noise, smoke, railroads, and airports. In California, sites within two miles of an airport runway must be avoided, as well as contaminated soil or ground waters such as from landfills or dumps or chemical plants; and high decibel noise sources. Some of the positives California wants are safe walking areas, favorable orientation to wind and natural light, an environment free from sources of noise, air, water, soil pollution from smoke, dust and odors, and an aesthetic view from the site. Ms. Ritter commented it is her opinion the site recommended will never have value if a site is excavated in a hole. The site is totally dark in mid-winter months and dark in the afternoon for one third of the year. (The speaker commented that these are her observations.) The site is fully exposed to prevailing winter winds. The temperature inversion affects the colder temperatures within the excavated hole. There will be wind driven snow from the north. The site drainage is a concern because the existing soils do not drain well. The speaker presented photos of the inversion and drainage problems. Ms. Ritter stated there are ongoing lawsuits filed by the South Anchorage Concerned Citizens group against the development. Ms. Ritter showed a picture of a white substance she could not identify that had been dumped into the pit off Lucy Lane. The speaker commented that AS&G has been given rights to put in anything and should be considered hazardous. (The school site) will be located about a quarter mile from the exposed aquifer so there is an open water area. The flooded area has been proposed as the location of the lift station site and is about two feet under water so that needs to be addressed. The wind blows and there is dust, which would create lung and breathing concerns for people with asthma. If the airport builds another taxiway, maybe we can negotiate with them to improve the sound and the air filtration systems of the new school. She feels the Susky site is the better site and though it is not available, it should be made available. She also suggested that Kincaid Park is 3,000 acres and perhaps they need to give up 50 acres and put an elementary school and middle school there.

Tim Steele asked the speaker what she would like the board and commission members to do. Ms. Ritter replied that the council wants another open forum hearing with the community council to let the district know that they do not want the elementary school in the pit. If it means eminent domain of taking property from the developer - the viable property is there.

Nancy Pease asked the speaker if the landfill across the street is on the proposed middle school site. Ms. Ritter replied that it is. It is the AS&G site. Nancy Pease also asked the speaker which site is preferred. The speaker stated that it is the Susky site, which belongs to a former school teacher - Site E1A.

Jake Metcalfe asked the staff when the community council received the report. Cathy Hammond responded that the Planning Department staff attended the community council meeting on February 14 to present the results of the study. They did not have the published report at that time. The report was delivered to the council in February and it was posted on-line. Staff understood the council was going to make a recommendation at its March meeting. Jake Metcalfe mentioned that the district and municipality had a Joint School Site Selection Committee meeting on March 9 to review the study results.

Crystal Kennedy asked Ms. Ritter to compare the difference between the elementary site and middle school site since they approved one and not the other. Ms. Ritter replied that the middle school site is at a higher elevation and the elementary school site is in the bottom of a hole. There is no direct sunlight in that portion of the pit for two months.

Don Poulton asked Ms. Contreras and Ms. Hammond to review the site search results. Cathy Hammond reported that originally the district asked the Planning Department to look at an expanded area for possible sites. They ended up focusing on the area west of Minnesota, but options were limited—some sites not large enough, issues with wetlands, or the sites were in close proximity to other schools. Because of the development happening in the Sand Lake area the search focused on that area. Other sites were checked that appeared to meet the criteria but were not available.

Mary Marks asked Ms. Ritter if she has had further discussion with the members of the council after seeing the report. Ms. Ritter replied that she met with the council last evening and they are requesting a postponement of a vote to allow the community to look at the sites again. They want more time to absorb this and have thoughtful discussion. The opinion of the council is putting the school in the bottom of a hole is not a good place for a school.

Jake Metcalfe asked for comments from the administration regarding the request for a delay. Carol Comeau responded that she understands that the site selection committee has been well versed. There has been adequate information available. There is ongoing litigation and that will probably continue for quite some time. The administration feels this site selection needs to move forward.

Greg Jones asked if there was a Sand Lake Community Council meeting in March and whether or not the site selection was discussed. Ms. Ritter stated that it was discussed in a ten-minute discussion. The vote was taken and the vote was that they did not want the elementary school in that location.

Nancy Pease asked the staff if any air quality and temperature inversion studies have been done for this site. Cathy Hammond responded that an air quality test was not done.

Speaker, Tim Potter, of DOWL Engineers and a representative for Anchorage Sand and Gravel, offered clarification of Ms. Ritter's comments. The Anchorage Sand and Gravel site is an 80-acre site at the northeast corner of Sand Lake Road and Dimond Blvd. The area at the corner is almost at street grade and is approximately 4 1/2 to 5 acres in size. That area was always destined to be held as a commercial corner, knowing that the Sand Lake gravel pit area would be developed residentially at some point. AS&G did offer the southern portion of the site for consideration for the middle school site and drew the line very carefully after doing a lot of engineering and planning work to identify how much larger they could make their fill site and meet the current and future fill needs for the municipality, since it's really the only site he is aware of that is approved by conditional use process for non-buildable material dump site. Approximately 20 years ago, AS&G went to the Planning and Zoning Commission after going to the community council

many times and got approval for a fill permit to fill the empty hole. There were a significant number of conditions for operational requirements incorporated into that approval. They have gone back to the community numerous times to get extensions and back through public hearings. The conditional use controls the type of materials that are acceptable. There are stumps, organic peat, silt, sand, clay, concrete, and concrete with rebar cut off. There is no pavement material or general garbage. There is an on-site representative from AS&G whenever any dumping activity takes place. There are environmental hazardous materials criterion required before any material is accepted, it's done in great detail and AS&G has prided itself in making sure that this project has been carried forward in a safe manner over the last 20 years and continues to make that commitment to the community. Annual reports are required by the municipality, and AS&G is prepared to show those in topographic form, aerial photo form and fill quantity locations on its site. That report is submitted to the municipal code enforcement manager on an annual basis every January for 20 years. Due to the need for a middle school site and AS&G's desire to potentially go back and enlarge its fill site through a conditional use process and modification, they were restrictive as to where the footprint could go. That's why the middle school site is less than 30 acres, just because of what is needed to make the fill work. It is not a dumpsite with hazardous materials. P&Z required 20 years ago, that a conceptual master plan be prepared to show how the property could be redeveloped. AS&G proposed that there could be a soccer field complex developed there over time on the approximately 50 acres that would be at grade north of the middle school site. DOWL Engineers, on behalf of AS&G, did prepare an alternative site plan for consideration and strongly suggested that the school district and municipality, through Parks and Recreation coordinate and plan, as far as field planning and utilization and consider the soccer field at Jade Street Park be turned into two more ball fields and that the soccer field that would then be developed on the middle school site could be jointly used by Parks and Recreation during off-school hours and the summer. That leaves more material on the site for grading that would result in a lower cost for development and easier handling of onsite drainage issues.

Nancy Pease asked the speaker to clarify the reduction of the cost. The speaker stated that the overall cost could be less if there were a coordinated effort to share some of the field capacity. On paper, all the elements proposed for the middle school can fit on the site that AS&G had

said they could accept for consideration. The speaker suggested that with a significant park with a baseball complex and a soccer field on it now and a parking lot, we should be looking at better overall balanced facilities and looking at costs of operation and construction.

Mr. Potter stated that when looking at the elementary site, he would recommend that location, as far as integration into the neighborhood, is the key thing. It is worth going back and negotiating or leaving room to negotiate to get that. Mr. Potter feels Site E1A is the appropriate place for an elementary school in the development context of Sand Lake Road Kincaid, and Dimond. It is the donut hole in the donut and that's where the elementary school should be. It should be totally integrated in the heart and soul of the neighborhood. There is an issue of viability versus feasibility versus availability and they are all different issues. Sometimes availability can change with negotiation. Mr. Potter's recommendation is to be creative, think for the future and if a bigger site has to be purchased as part of the negotiation, including the ugly pit to the north, consider it. There are things to do with that ugly pit that could be done in a very creative fashion. The speaker's recommends that the group tonight recommend approval of Site E1A with Site E1B as a second site choice and ASD attempt, with the city's help, to negotiate for E1A first and if that becomes unworkable, there is a backup site to.

Don Poulton asked staff if this is something that can be done. Cathy Hammond replied that it has been done before, in 1993 for the Kincaid Elementary site.

Mr. Potter added that he believes the party that owns both sites is willing to sell E1B and not E1A because the apparent value to a homebuilder or developer would be higher in E1A. It's good material, it is up higher, it's east to the mountains, it has good solar exposure and a good location. Mr. Potter believes it is just a matter of price and negotiation.

John Steiner asked if E1A is proposed as the preferred site, would it be doable, or would we be limited to acquiring E1A and wouldn't be able to negotiate to resolve this problem as part of that acquisition.

Greg Jones commented that he posed that question to Robin Ward and she believes there is, through the Land Bank, some leverage to create a win/win to try to acquire the site. John Steiner asked staff that because

these areas are designated with lines on a map, if we recommend one site, is there a possibility of a larger acquisition, perhaps not by the district, but through the land bank that would enable us to do that, or would it require us to redraw these lines to be able to accomplish that. Cathy Hammond replied that the areas would have to be replatted. The boundaries are drawn by the engineers as part of the technical analysis. The boundaries that are on there are to represent the areas that were evaluated. It has happened during negotiations in the acquisition process, that the actual boundaries of the site are be tweaked.

The Public Hearing portion of the Joint Session of the Anchorage School Board and the Municipal Planning and Zoning Commission closed at 7:18 p.m.

Meeting of the Municipal Planning and Zoning Commission
April 7, 2005

1. The Municipal Planning and Zoning Commission was opened by Chairman, Don Poulton at 7:20 p.m.

2. Roll Call and Disclosure

Commission Members Present: Johnny Gibbons, Bill Wielechowski, Nancy Pease, Art Isham, Greg Jones, Don Poulton, Chair.

Commissioner Members Excused: Toni Jones, Jim Lottsfeldt, and Meg Simonian

Others Present: School Board Members: Tim Steele, President; Mary Marks, Vice President; Jeff Friedman, Crystal Kennedy, Jake Metcalfe, Macon Roberts, and John Steiner, Carol Comeau, Superintendent; Ray Amsden, George Vakalis, Fred Johnson, Robin Siegfried, and other interested persons

There were no conflicts to be disclosed by the commission members.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

ACTION:

Moved by: Greg Jones
seconded by: Art Isham

That the Planning and Zoning Commission forward the staff report to the Anchorage School Board on the Southwest Anchorage elementary and middle school site selection with the following recommendation: #1. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommends Site M2 for the middle school. #2. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommends the selection of the site in the area of the designated Site E1A as the preferred site for the elementary school and further, that if acquisition cannot be arranged for that

site, that Site E1B be an acceptable back-up site.

Mr. Jones spoke to his motion by stating that the discussion before the boards tonight demonstrates there is an acceptable site for the middle school. It is not a perfect site but will meet the needs of the community as well as the needs of the facility. Mr. Jones believes that in the case of the elementary school is the fact that the deciding factor of this site's selection is the developer's decision to sell the property. If the recommended site is selected, that would become the reason we would locate the public facility on that site. That is not the appropriate criteria for locating public facilities. We have heard from the community and the professional staff that the appropriate site is E1A or something in that location and we should figure out how to get it.

Nancy Pease agreed with Mr. Jones' comments and stated that she has concerns with E1B as a back-up site, specifically the solar exposure and air quality and inversion. Since it is in proximity to the airport and also in proximity to major roads, Ms. Pease would be reluctant to approve it as a backup site without knowing that the air quality is suitable. Mr. Jones commented that he accepted Ms. Pease's comment as a friendly amendment. Ms. Pease proposed as a friendly amendment that approval of Site E1B be contingent on the approval of the air quality measures at that site, especially referring to the air traffic and build-out of the residential area. Art Isham seconded the amendment.

Mr. Johnny Gibbons stated that he intended to support the motion and amendment as put forward. Mr. Gibbons thinks that the need for the schools in that area has been demonstrated and the need will only increase in the future. Mr. Gibbons further stated that because he sits on the Planning and Zoning Commission, he is aware of the lack of land available in the Anchorage Bowl so he feels it is important to acquire any land that is somewhat suitable when it is available. Mr. Gibbons stated that he feels there have been adequate technical studies on the proposed sites sufficient for the commission to put this forward.

Bill Wielechowski announced that he will support the motion for the reasons stated by Commissioners Jones, Pease and Gibbons.

Art Isham announced that he will support the motion and he likes the opportunity to negotiate for the preferred site.

Mr. Poulton reported that he will also support the motion and particularly likes the fact that there is a primary and a backup site option.

VOTE:

Ayes: Poulton, Jones, Gibbons,
Isham, Pease, Wielechowski

Nays: None

MOTION AS AMENDED PASSED

Mr. Jones moved to adjourn and the motion was seconded by Mr. Isham.

The meeting of the Planning and Zoning Commission adjourned at 7:34 p.m. April 7, 2005, by unanimous consent.

Meeting of the Anchorage School Board
April 7, 2005

1. The meeting of the Anchorage School Board was opened at 7:35 p.m. President, Tim Steele presided.
2. Roll Call

School Board Members Present: Tim Steele, President; Mary Marks, Vice President; Jeff Friedman, Crystal Kennedy, Jake Metcalfe, Macon Roberts, and John Steiner.

Others Present: Commission members, Johnny Gibbons, Bill Wielechowski, Nancy Pease, Art Isham, Greg Jones, and Don Poulton, Chair; Carol Comeau, Superintendent; Ray Amsden, George Vakalis, Fred Johnson, Cathy Hammond, JoAnn Contreras, Robin Siegfried, and other interested persons.

3. CONSENT AGENDA

ACTION:

Moved by: John Steiner
seconded by: Crystal Kennedy

That the School Board accept the recommendation of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the staff report on the Southwest Anchorage elementary and middle school site selection be forwarded to the Assembly with the following recommendation: #1. Site M2 for the middle school. #2. Selection of a site in the area designated site Site E1A as the preferred site for the elementary school and further, that if acquisition cannot be arranged for that site, that Site E1B be an acceptable back-up site, contingent upon the satisfactory resolution of an air quality study for that site.

Carol Comeau commented that in further review and listening to this discussion, she thinks this is a much better way to approach this and we will have a stronger point to make our case of this being a good site.

Jeff Friedman mentioned his concern in addition to the air quality and other items mentioned about E1B by the Planning and Zoning Commission. In the work session it was pointed out that the traffic analysis suggested that the middle school and elementary school not be on same piece of property and he thinks that same analysis would apply if one is across the street from one another, in fact the traffic might be even worse. If we are approving M2 as the middle school, putting an elementary school directly across is likely to exacerbate the traffic. Mr. Friedman commented that he is not sure that E1B is acceptable at all.

AMENDMENT:

Moved by: Jeff Friedman that we delete E1B as an alternate.
seconded by John Steiner (for
purposes of discussion)

John Steiner asked the administration if the amendment is adopted and Site E1A cannot be acquired through negotiations, what affect would that have on the district in terms of not having a backup. George Vakalis responded that it would mean that there would be no backup, however, we have gone through this before and there are solutions to dealing with traffic. Even though it was recommended not to have the two schools next to each other you have separation and two different directions in which vehicles, buses and everything else can enter into that property. In fact, there is a major access into the land by accessing down in here (pointing to the map). You have a real long slope and you can access down here. So you do have separation. With this amendment the district would not have a backup.

VOTE ON AMENDMENT:

Ayes: Steele, Friedman
Nays: Kennedy, Metcalfe, Steiner,
Roberts, Marks

AMENDMENT FAILED

Jake Metcalfe reported that he will support the motion and thinks Mr. Potter's idea to negotiate for Site E1A is a good suggestion.

John Steiner stated that he agrees with Mr. Metcalfe and thinks it is desirous for the developer to have a good place for a school. If he had a school down in a hole, it would actually devalue his entire development. There may be some negotiating room for that. Mr. Steiner appreciates Mr. Potter's suggestion and feels it has some real possibility.

Macon Roberts commented that traffic is with us and it's a given. The district worked out a plan for the traffic problems at Spring Hill and Hanshew so it does not concern him. Mr. Roberts appreciated Mr. Potter's comments as well.

VOTE:

Ayes: Steele, Metcalfe, Marks,
Friedman, Kennedy,
Roberts, Steiner

Nays: None

MOTION PASSED

The Anchorage School Board meeting of Thursday, April 7, 2005 unanimously adjourned at 7:42 p.m.

Jeff Friedman, President

John Steiner, Clerk

Robin Siegfried, Recording Secretary

Date Minutes Approved

MINUTES OF THE ANCHORAGE SCHOOL BOARD
AND
PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
JOINT MEETING
APRIL 7, 2005

WORK SESSION

1. CALL TO ORDER

The Work Session was called to order by Tim Steele, President of the Anchorage School Board.

School Board Members Present: Tim Steele, President; Mary Marks, Vice President; Jeff Friedman, Crystal Kennedy, Jake Metcalfe, Macon Roberts, and John Steiner (arrived at 6:45 p.m.).

Commission Members Present: Don Poulton, Chair; Greg Jones, Vice Chair; Johnny Gibbons, Arthur Isham, Nancy Pease, and Bill Wielechowski.

Commission Members Excused: Jim Lottsfeldt, Meg Simonian, and Toni Jones.

Others Present: Carol Comeau, Superintendent; Ray Amsden, George Vakalis, Fred Johnson, Cathy Hammond, JoAnn Contreras, Robin Siegfried, and other interested persons.

2. PRESENTATION OF SITES

Cathy Hammond began the presentation of the report, that was prepared by the Planning Department and the Anchorage School District on the Southwest Anchorage Site Selection Study for an elementary and middle school. Ms. Hammond described the process for the site selection and the different studies that are completed for each site. The process begins when the school district identifies the need for a school and the general area for locating it. The Planning Department then helps the district look for possible site options in that area. When looking for possible sites, we are taking a number of factors into consideration. One important factor is size. The ideal site size for an elementary school is 15 acres and the ideal size for a middle school is 30 acres. Also, the department is looking for a site that is fairly level, with well draining soils and no hazards. It is also looking for sites that have public utilities on site. Location and access are also very important. Once some possible options have been identified, the

Planning Department goes to the community council and explains the process and discusses the site options. The Planning Department then meets with the Joint School Site Selection Committee for further direction on which sites should be evaluated. Once there has been a decision on which sites will be evaluated, the district contracts to have technical studies done. The technical studies help determine the sites' feasibility for development for a school site and they also provide estimates for onsite and offsite development costs that help with the evaluation. There are geotechnical studies that look at the physical condition of the site; there is also a traffic impact analysis done. The district has a phase one environmental study done for each site to look at possible contamination on the property. For this study, the district had a noise evaluation done because of the close proximity to the airport. Once that information has been completed a report is prepared and the report consolidates all of the information that has been gathered on the sites, evaluates the information and then provides the recommendation. We then go back to the community council with the recommendation. In this case, we went to the Sand Lake Community Council in February and also went to the Joint School Site Selection Committee in February. That begins the 30-day public review period and the formal process begins with this meeting. Then the recommendation goes to the Assembly and they will take final action on the site selected. That is expected to happen in mid-May. Then the negotiation process begins between the property owner and the city.

JoAnn Contreras reported that the geotechnical study identified two different areas in the Sand Lake region with a total of six site options. Area 1 is north of Dimond Blvd., west of Sand Lake Rd and south of Kincaid. The 57-acre site was originally provided as an option. After the technical evaluation was complete, this portion of Area 1 was withdrawn as an option. The property owner offered an alternate site for an elementary school only. This site was to have been an elementary school or a second option for an elementary school and an option for a middle school that would have overlapped the site in E1A. All of the sites were compared in the study. Site E1A is the site of choice. It is well situated for the students that it will serve. It will also have (with the development of the Kincaid Estates Subdivision) roads, utilities, walkways, sidewalks, and a trail. Kincaid Estates Drive will have a trail on one side, and a sidewalk on the other. Area 2 is also a former gravel pit and offered for an elementary or middle school. There was an evaluation of the entire 32-acre site and then subsequent to the technical study, the owner modified the acreage and area configuration being offered to 26.8 acres...

Some similarities between the two areas are that they are former gravel pits. There has been surface mining in both areas; the one site that is least

affected by that is Site E1A. The full development of the subdivision will be in place prior to the construction of the school. There are some minor environmental issues, but the ones for the Kincaid Estates Subdivision have already been resolved. Site E1, E1A and E1B all meet the 15 acre requirement. M1 for the middle school in the Kincaid Estates Subdivision has 30 acres; whereas, M2 only has 26.8 acres. In the Kincaid Estates Subdivision, there will be a lift station constructed as part of the development requirement for Area 1. Area 2 will require that a lift station be part of the development cost of the school project. The Planning Department's preference, after reviewing all of the information available, is site E1A; however, since it is not available for purchase, the recommendation is site E1B for the elementary school and site M2 for the middle school. The traffic impact analysis did indicate more of an impact with two schools next to each other, thus the elementary school should be in Area 1 and the middle school in Area 2.

3. Questions/Comments from School Board and Commission Members

Bill Wielechowski questioned which sites the Sand Lake Community Council took positions on since they referenced the sites differently. Ms. Contreras responded that they did not want Site E1B for the elementary school but they did want Site M2 for the middle school. The preference is E1A for the elementary school but they did not take a vote on it.

Greg Jones asked in what manner Site E1A was withdrawn. Ms. Contreras responded that the owner withdrew it from consideration. Cathy Hammond explained that during the site search, property owners are contacted to see if the property is available for acquisition. Normally sites are not considered that will have to be condemned, unless there is no other viable alternative. Mr. Jones commented that the recommended site is one that is not preferred by the community, is not as good location wise, is not as good access wise and is more impacted by the gravel operation. A school site is better located within the community that it serves. Mr. Jones asked when it becomes nonviable. Cathy Hammond responded that for E1B, after the other sites were withdrawn in the Kincaid Estates area the district contracted to have a technical analysis and the same evaluation applied and it did find that that site was viable to be developed as an elementary school site and that an elementary school site is needed in that area and that ended up being our only option available for acquisition. Mr. Jones further commented that availability is the first criteria used. Ms. Hammond agreed it is a criteria used. Mr. Jones explained that in the 1970s the process was to do the testing before the landowner was contacted. The site considered appropriate was selected by using the criteria that Ms. Hammond outlined and then negotiations

began after the best site was selected for the community. Mr. Jones wondered how we have gotten away from that approach. Cathy Hammond responded that the district contacts the owner for right of entry to do the soils and environmental tests and that level of testing would not be possible without the property owner's permission. The department has looked at sites with unwilling developers in the past and did so when looking for an elementary school site near Jade Park ten years ago.

Jeff Friedman asked why the traffic analysis was recommending not putting two schools in same location. JoAnn Contreras replied that TIA indicated that having them next to each other may increase potential traffic impact.

Tim Steele commented that it concerns him that the sites get withdrawn because it dictates where we go. The sites are interesting and both suitable by everyone's account. The road noise is of concern more than the aircraft concerns. George Vakalis responded that on the site it is elevated and almost level with the road. There's a good gravel piece and in order to develop the site we do have a major pit. We would be taking soil to level it off. We do have a park but if you look at that separation as far as elevation between the park and the site, it is substantial. Alaska Sand and Gravel, since they own the rest of it, are filling it in and are proposing to build soccer fields for the community. There would be some road noise but that can be engineered architecturally.

Don Poulton asked if all of the property in the area had been inventoried. Cathy Hammond pointed out the wide area that was looked at, which included sites that were not large enough, development requirements were not viable, or were too close to another school.

Bill Wielechowski asked if this site would go before the voters for a bond. George Vakalis responded that it would go before the voters for a bond for construction of the school but not for site approval. The voters have previously approved the bond for the purchase of these sites.

Theresa Mayr, airport representative, explained the plane's arrival and departure patterns and the noise contour map that is in the report.

The Work Session was adjourned at 6:20 p.m.