
TURNAGAIN COMMUNITY COUNCIL

Council Meeting | March 7, 2022, | 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

Virtual Zoom Meeting

Chaired by Anna Brawley, TCC President

WELCOME & APPROVE AGENDA, MINUTES

- The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m. Approximately 24-38 people (members and guests) attended.
- Rules for membership: must be 18 or older. Must live or own property in Turnagain. Turnagain attendees are considered voting members the evening of their first meeting.
- Zoom Guidelines: All attendees must sign in with their first and last name and designation of member or guest. When not speaking or presenting, keep personal microphones on Mute. Use the “Raise Hand” function on your Zoom screen if you wish to speak. Please be brief, respectful and relevant to the subject at hand.
- Pet Redmond moved to approve the agenda as presented. Carolyn Hall seconded.
 - Vote: no objection. Agenda approved.

MEETING OBJECTIVES

1. Share information about this proposal; what’s known, what’s unknown and what is on the table.
2. Share information about development and historical intent for these parcels (W. Northern Lights widening, 1980s).
3. Provide first opportunity for community to ask questions, share concerns, raise questions and identify priorities regarding these parcels. What do you want to see done with this land?
4. Council will discuss next steps, specifically, what TCC will present at the March 15, 2022, Assembly meeting.

ANNA BRAWLEY, TCC - PRESENTATION ABOUT LAND PARCELS UP FOR DISCUSSION; HISTORY OF AREA AND WIDENING OF WEST NORTHERN LIGHTS BLVD. (Please see materials attached to minutes.)

ADAM TROMBLEY, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, MOA. (Please see materials attached to minutes.)

Question: Anna Brawley. What is the rationale in the ordinance? Why is the MOA looking to sell these properties?

A. Trombley: The 2040 Land Use Plan that is passed by the Assembly is a guiding document for how we handle land. Anchorage has a tremendous need for housing. “When I see inventory sitting in MOA real estate for...30 years or something, not doing anything, and they are parceled out, they are zoned for R0 or R1a and a developer comes to me to ask if the land can be sold, to a large extent, I am bound to notify the Assembly via the 2040 Land Use Plan. That’s the rationale.”

Question: Cathy Gleason. Where did Mr. Trombley dig up his documents? Were they found before the development of proposal of 2022-21, and, if so, why were they not included in the proposal as a “where-as? “Or were they actually not dug up until after we asked for more information, post the March Assembly meeting in February?”

A. Trombley: Most documents were in MOA inventory, “found afterwards.” No plat notes; nothing indicated that they could not be sold. “I didn’t have to go through this process until you guys asked me to.” Asked Municipal Attorney to see if they looked through their data base. MOA Attorney found no dedication of park land. MOA surveyor: no documentation that they were to be park land. Letter provided to TCC: no AIMS, dedicating land to park land. No Assembly action. Lots 5P and 6P which reference “park purposes,” not “park LAND.” Provides access to pedestrian bridge. Also, West Anchorage District Plan,

MOA shown to be “low to medium density.” Never indicated that it was to be maintained as open space or to be park land in any way.

I. JAY BROOKS, Developer

“When I developed Turnagain Crossing - Rustic Goat and the apartments - my objective was to experiment. Parking limitations obviously became a problem that I didn’t anticipate.” Brooks then call Turnagain Community Council - Mark Wiggin and Cathy Gleason, and both West Anchorage Assembly representatives - Number of people onsite the day it became under contract. “I wanted to build a coffee shop and a place where I could get a beer. I wanted something simple and I wanted to build apartments. And the [TCC] came back and said no, what we really want is more of a cafe, with a hostess or a host, and we want something a bit more significant.” Brooks then spoke with Tim Gravel, Kaladi Brothers, who agreed to do a restaurant. Brooks created a website for community buy-in. Wants to do this the same way. “I was hoping it was going to be a community based thing.” The parking was an issue. We put together the land lease on the parking lot. During this time, Brooks thought he was being sensitive to the community, but people were picketing. Painful. “I was trying to do something that was respectful. I do not want to go down that road again.” Basically now it’s a pressure-relief valve for streets around there.

Turnagain St. Improvement — waiting for years for upgrade. “I asked if we could buy the land so that the parking lot would be available in perpetuity.” Worked with previous administration. Thought that it had gone to TCC for approval to sell the parking lot. It morphed into additional land and the possibility for development. “If the TCC supports it and Assembly supports it, I would like to develop it.” Challenges are a big deal. Very narrow lot — fire safety; circulation; traffic. “I get all that.” In order to make the site work, it requires a re-plat. Re-plat will make the site forward-looking. “Mixed use allows me to create a little more complexity that serves everyone’s needs. We need housing, but a specific type of housing. Housing must appeal to people. Accessible to sunlight. Walkable and bike-able. I know this process is fluid. I will reach out to the community and we will figure out what works.” Less commercial: street tacos; ramen shops. More of a fire pit; more community like, lower density. Meandering path, nice landscaping, creating connectivity. “The likelihood of that is probably zero because I have to be flexible. It’s hard to want to spend a lot of money without community buy-in.” Let’s make sure the parking is available for Rustic Goat. After that, it’s the process of us all working together. “Hopefully, it’s not so cumbersome that I get fatigued, because it’s a complicated parcel.” Brooks regards this as a first step in the conversation. Create a community hub with some housing. “So we can make Anchorage more appealing to people who work at home, for people who have pets.”

Background and Historical Intent - Cathy Gleason (Please see attached document.)

J. Jay Brooks is “more than willing” to sit down with TCC and work with them on anything he develops in Turnagain. “I do not know why, in your document search, you [Adam Trombley] didn’t find a lot more reference to the intent. Past presidents archive documentation.” Cathy found three documents from 1984-1987, during the West Northern Lights widening process. “Everything I found is completely consistent. The intent is clear: no reference about anything but to take whatever right-of-way was left from the road project and, as already stated, taking entire property lots and the land we are talking about to the south, nobody refers to it as “excess.” Excess in the sense that as it refers to the road project. EVERYTHING I found started referring to this as a buffer; “park-like,” “community public space.” The West Northern Lights Draft Study Design Report, October 1984, indicates which alternative was chosen. Indicated that a sizable buffer would be created on the south side for noise abatement and visual buffering purposes.” “A park-like landscaped environment.” (Please see Ms. Gleason’s attached documents.)

Second document: West Northern Lights Design Review Committee. Business representation. Community Council representation. Meeting minutes describe right-of-way. “The right-of-way along the roadway is to be turned over to the Parks and Recreation Department on completion of the project.” The Committee passed a motion directing the Parks and Recreation Department to submit any and all plans for the use of the roadside right-of-way to the Turnagain Community Council for approval. (Please see attached documents.)

Actual Committee Report and recommendations in late 1984: “This land could be added to the Municipality’s park land. Access to such park land by foot and by bicycle would have to be provided, etc.” General recommendations: “Recreation in the right-of-way. Also of concern are recreation facilities.” Tennis courts. Playground equipment Picnic tables. Anything the Parks Department proposes must be approved by TCC.

1987. TCC told that the landscaping budget was cut in half. Amenities deleted. “That’s why the land looks the way it does.”

Where is the final design report? We also do not have a copy of the final landscaping design. “I think it is important to reiterate that this land, it was clear what the intent was. There was never any reason to think of it any other way.” Signs, “Municipal Parkland” were posted on these parcels for decades - and are no longer posted. This land has been used as park land by the community for decades. Why isn’t it designated as MOA parkland?

Anna Brawley stated that Tim Gravel , Operator of Rustic Goat and who holds parking lot lease, is now in attendance in the meeting.

Q&A

1. Steve Montooth: A memorial stone for David Blake, with his birth and death dates, is located on the southeast area of one of the parcels, near the footbridge. Is it just a simple marker? Is it a memorial for the overpass? Did this have anything to do with dedicated land?
 1. C. Gleason: Hasn’t researched yet. One of the reasons this West Northern Lights project got jumpstarted in the mid-1980s: lots of kids and everyone was crossing the street. Gas station and convenience store located where the Rustic Goat is now. The street got busier. Traffic increased. Also on WNL, an at-grade railroad crossing existed. A young boy was at the convenience store and then crossed West Northern Lights Blvd. He was struck by a car and killed. People had been looking at upgrading WNL for awhile, but that incident is what initiated funding coming to the project pretty quickly. “I am assuming that that pedestrian overpass was dedicated to his memory.”
 2. Pam Wright: How has the execution and oversight of a major project and construction changed since Rustic Goat went in?
 3. Adam Trombley — Please clarify.
 4. P. Wright: — It sounded like Rustic Goat ran into issues. Can’t speak to experience, but hopes that it was a learning experience. How has oversight changed since Rustic Goat ran into its issues?
 1. A. Trombley — Not involved in Rustic Goat development. When it goes through the process, if it’s going to re-platted, it goes to the Platting Board. For re-zoning, it goes to PNZ and then back to the Assembly. All Developer’s drawing and proposals have to go through the cycle - fire access, traffic, plan review, code compliance on all buildings, traffic, including any sort of upgrade to the alley. It’s numerous. Will have to go through zoning. Parking access. Very intensive process. JJ? Why was the parking lot needed.
 2. J. Jay Brooks: Turnagain Crossing Project to help us all learn. Old zoning laws didn’t encourage mixed-use development. Zoning is R3 for Turnagain Crossing and the vacant parcels. “The parking, clearly, was something that.....we were hoping we were a more walkable, bike-able community.” MOA Building Dept has not evolved since then. Challenges are coming in. Trying to preserve Rustic Goat parking even after Turnagain St. upgrade. “It’s lessons learned.” Not much has changed. Not any easier to develop. Not any less expensive. Going to be a long process with a lot of unknowns. Let’s re-plat to make the development community-based. Trying to preserve the parking — “and that is mandatory.” If we get to the point where Adam can

sell the land, can we figure out if the land is viable? Going to require lots of public input. Might be best for some, or all, of it, to be green space.

5. Stephanie Quinn-Davidson: "I'm struck/conflicted on this." ADN said average house is \$420,000.00. What kind of income does a family need to afford this? Scary for community and city. Limited land to build on. Longstanding problem. For Mr. Trombley: rough estimate, last six months, how many parcels of land has MOA identified as parcels potentially viable for selling for development for housing? How many has he seen? How many has the Assembly seen? How many approved? If not, why were they not approved?
 1. A. Trombley: We have two sets of land holdings. : Heritage Land Bank (HLB) and MOA Real Estate. Since July, 2021, HLB land disposals — 5-6, if not more. MOA real estate — 13 individual parcels (these 12 parcels, plus the Nordstrom lot = 13 individual parcels). "These have yet to be disposed of." All have passed Assembly, "I believe, unanimously." Anytime you have land disposal, there's always controversy. "I am really glad that this is happening, for a whole host of reasons." Very good community engagement. Thank you. But there's always controversy.
6. S. Quinn-Davidson: It sounds like this is the first one where there's been some question as to whether it should move forward to disposal. Is there a common theme with other disposals in the Muni? Is there anything we can learn from?
7. A. Brawley: Is it appropriate for Assembly to set specific conditions on the sale of Municipal land when it is approved for disposal? What might that look like?
 1. A. Trombley: — It's zoned for very particular things; there are only certain things that can be done. In a way the Assembly has already indicated what I can do and what I can't. Land must be sold at fair market value. The Assembly has leeway. "That's a really good question, to be honest with you." Assembly can add things. It's their document. Doesn't know the code.
8. A. Brawley: We are submitting questions in writing, some of which may take more research. At what point are you in terms of negotiation for this property? Needs Assembly approval to dispose, but where are you in the process?
9. A. Trombley: No current negotiation. Can't negotiate in good faith until Assembly gives me authority to dispose land. Design is outside my scope; never been given authority try Assembly to negotiate. Until the sale happens, then the real estate transaction can take place.
10. Question: when did TCC find out about this?
 1. On an earlier agenda; it did follow the legal process. Introduced at one meeting. Potential public meeting; vote at next meeting. TCC not notified. Not obvious to public what "Woodland Park" means. Anna found out about it on Saturday 02/12 through a private phone call, not from a notice from the Assembly or MOA that it was on the agenda for the 02/15/ Assembly meeting.
11. Nial Williams: 1) Would like an in-depth, amortized analysis from MOA. How will this affect in a cost benefit analysis. 2) What has this developer learned since and what's his track record? 3) Have we considered a different vendor? 4) 1984 project. Why are we concerned about 38 years ago? Needs of voters are different now. 5) Pet projects. Concerned developer is trying to buy good favor with neighborhood. 6) Perturbed why our members didn't put this forward; other Assembly members. Appears to be a giant pet project. No one gets this far without clear approval from the powers-that-be. Congrats, TCC — we were the squeaky wheel and got information in Feb. We got it pushed back a month. Would like to see it pushed back again. Appreciates TCC leadership. Info should be available online.
 1. A. Trombley — 1) Cost benefit analysis of what that property is doing right now. Not generating revenue, so not broadening tax base. Appraisal process will be done. The MOA assessment is not market value. Other value if developed: property taxes of both the land and the structures on top of it. Premature to do cost benefit analysis. 2) Not put forward by any Assembly member. Trombley introduced it. Mayor submits at request of Chair of Assembly.
12. A. Brawley: Parking Lot. Tim [Gravel], what is your current arrangement? What is the lease amount? What income is being generated for the MOA?

1. T. Gravel: \$1,000.00 a month. Roughly. We have a lease. We have three 3-year leases on parking lot land.
13. A. Brawley: To confirm, the lease is with Rustic Goat?
 1. Gravel: Yes.

COUNCIL DISCUSSION

Adam Trombley: Offered to share slides of this property going back to the 1950s. (Please see TCC website for posted slides.)

Comment: Pat Redmond — Ms. Redmond has been here for 50 years. It was her understanding that the land was to be open space of some kind. Because of the access and steepness of slopes, it would be difficult to develop anything. Everything will have to come through the alley or go through Barbara St. or 29th St. and come back out to Turnagain St. When all that land was taken, because the lots were not going to be regulation size, they had to take the whole plot. Otherwise, the lots would be too small for anything allowed at the time. That's why the land parcels on both sides of the road are the way they are. "I do remember that Tony Knowles was governor; he re-opened the road. It was the most expensive road in the state at the time — because we had to take properties to put in the road and involve federal, State, Railroad agencies and organizations."

N. Williams: It's important that we understand that those who came before us had a reason and an intent for the community that should be duly respected. If it was intended for green space, it's clear that the people of the community meant it to be for "We the people." Outdoors. Recreation. To give this to a special interest group should give great pause. I move that we go with the initial intention of this space and to have the Council's position reflect the original framer's intention for the land."

P. Wright: "Point of order. Aren't we in discussion?"

C. Gleason: "Could he repeat the motion, please?"

N. Williams: "I move that the TCC position reflect the original framers' intention for this parcel of land. If this was meant to be a green space, it should be included as a "whereas" in any resolution we put forward."

Steve Montooth seconded the motion.

Anna Brawley recommended that we hold the motion and not take a formal position at this time.

Ms. Gleason: Appreciates Niall's and Steve's perspectives on this. As a TCC Board member, thinks we want to be careful about how we guide on this. It is not early in the process regarding the intent of the land decades ago. Regarding the Assembly, it's now an extended public hearing. Having said that, she has come up with a lot of questions that we would like answered. One out of 20 is where is the Parks Department in all of this? Sent out an email today to Josh Durand — didn't expect him. "I'd like to have more from the Parks Department relevant to this discussion."

Stephanie Quinn-Davidson: "In terms of speaking to the motion, I would not be supporting it." Concerns about the intent of the 1980s - very different situation then. This area was housing. Then things changed and it became open space. I think now there's potential for new intent. Would like to have community input before taking a formal stance.

P. Wright: Asked to provide a statement before we make a vote and commented that she thinks motion is premature.

Dan Gleason: "I would like to say that I appreciate the motion." Thinks it is premature. "What we need to do is go a different route here and tell our Assembly people that we would like to postpone this indef-

initely so we can have more time to gather all the facts and make sure we are working in conjunction with MOA and the private developer so we understand full ramifications.” Mr. Gleason supported Ms. S. Quinn-Davidson’s thoughts that the intent has possibly changed regarding this land.

Mike Schecther: Spoke briefly to the motion. Original intent of 1980 in a city of 174,000 should mean “very close to nothing to us 40 years later.” City is larger. City has radically different problems, issues. “It doesn’t make sense to chain ourselves to what a lot of people thought 40 years ago who are not going to be users for the next 40 years.”

Mr. Montooth: “In brief, I would like pull back on my second of the motion. My major concern is that we get ahold of more people in the community. I’ve talked to 11 people and what they think about going to this property. They talk about some of the dangers of finding syringes in the neighborhood and around that park. Severe drop off from park to Northern Lights Blvd. We do need to take time to get the community involved in some of these decisions.”

Anna Brawley moved for a vote on the motion. “If the motion fails, we will continue discussion on the proposal at this time.” Kathleen Bielawski seconded.

Vote

For — 6

Against — 18.

Motion fails.

Discussion continues.

Mimi Beck: “I’m in favor of having more housing. I’m not opposed to having some park land on that tract. Room for compromise. The Assembly needs to know that if we get rid of the land, we need assurance that there’s a reasonable amount of density in that little tract in order to trade off for loss of park land.”

Brian Evans directed questions to Tim Gravel. 1) How many parking spots does Rustic Goat need to be at capacity? 2) What is realistic? How many spots?

Anna Brawley stated that Mr. Gravel had left the meeting. Anna will submit Mr. Evans’ questions to Mr. Gravel.

B. Evans: Also, what revenue increase, how many more employees, increased tax base?

A. Brawley: For Rustic Goat or for the proposed development?

B. Evans— The new potential development.

P. Wright: “Given that there’s still multiple questions, but that there’s a recognized need that needs have changed. Execution and oversight need to reach some kind of consensus — reduction in listings in Turnagain area in last six months has fallen by 44%. Also in the last six months, the selling price of homes in Turnagain has increased 41%. During that same period, we are now off 21% in volume generated by real estate. Real estate generates somewhere from 20-25% of GDP. Statistics support the need and access to our area. Affordable housing and style of housing leads to diversity in a neighborhood. Makes for a better overall. Penetration of current park space in our area needs to be looked at as well. Area 10 average price of a home has gone up \$20,000.00 in the last six months alone. I think we need to review that the land taken and the average price of that land when Northern Lights Blvd was widened probably needs to be considered as a diversity issue that needs to be addressed in our own area, given that the price of housing has gone up so high.”

Bob CJ: Did not vote because he's not a current TCC member. Lives on the west side for decades, but now lives on the east side. Was very involved in the expansion project on McCrae Rd. and W. 35th. We had the Neighbors for a Safe Community and worked with the MOA for over a year to reduce the impact because it was one of the more challenging corridors left in the MOA's list of roads that needed developing. Another one was Turnagain. "And the reason that's been so can-kicked for so long is because it's going to be so painful and so public and no administration really wants to tackle it. So it gets moved back and moved back. And that's because they are likely going to have to take property, and there will be a lot of noise. If they don't take property, then there won't be parking and pedestrian improvements that are needed because it's a dangerous route. When this development went in, it was imagined as something smaller, with less traffic, and, of course, it grew. That is how things happen. This one ended up taking....for a parking lot, an area that was, and is, and has been considered, a park by all the neighbors in the area. I walked and canvassed every home in a two-block radius on the south side of that strip of land that we are discussing right now. And I bumped into very few people who thought it was a good thing to do for parking. Most of them were against it. The ones that were for it were for it because of the noise and all the attention that the parking had been allowed to be a problem so that there could be a convenient solution. "Gosh, we've got this big problem. I guess we'd take this land for park land and use it for parking. And let's give 'em a lease and everybody will forget about it over time." Which is what I think has been going on here, because now we're finding out a month in advance - at the earliest - some of us event today, that this is even going on. So, it can't be a problem if it just suddenly appears on the Assembly's agenda. These guys have work sessions on Mondays and Tuesdays, so we have very little time to have input. You need to make a decision tonight and you need to make sure that you can all be fully informed."

Appreciates Cathy Gleason's historical information because it didn't come from MOA. "Yet it's there and we knew about it, even back in that time. So the parking is a big issue. But there's a need for open space. It's one thing to say that we need housing now, but what's really going on is an economic question to developers. Because it's more expensive to develop vertical, high density housing if you're taking existing property to do it. And that's what the MOA has come down to. A developer who wants to make the most profit is going to look for an empty property or empty land that doesn't have a building that needs to... be lost revenue that you have to pay for and then demolish it. So, open land, everyone's been looking at it constantly. And yet, as we get more densified, and as the surrounding area around this current park gets densified, residents need adjacent nearby open space for recreation. I met many older folks who can't make it to Balto park. They can't get to Lynary. They are cut off from the closest area to be outside. You are taking that away from people with a shortsighted idea of "oh, we need to have some high-density housing." Let's put the high density housing somewhere else in a thoughtful way, and not just do it in the way that lessens the costs to developers. Jamie is a good guy. He's a visionary. But he's looking at empty land first. What we need as neighbors and as a community is nearby adjacent small parks and open space."

Jenny Blanchard: Appreciates information and history of this project. Lots of places in the city that need more park space. We have a lot of park space and green space in Turnagain. Don't have enough land in this city for everyone to have a park nearby. We should really be thinking of prioritizing housing. We lost a lot of housing when West Northern Lights was widened. Sounds like they started to work on making it a park, but they didn't finish the process of designating parkland. So it's still up for disposal. Looking at all of the housing, it's not getting better. Would support having at least medium-density housing on these parcels.

Dan Gleason: "I would like to make a motion to have the Assembly postpone the ordinance indefinitely until we can review all of the info and come up with a better position on this as a community council."

Niall Williams seconded the motion.

Discussion. Cathy Gleason. A wise move for TCC to take at this time. Could talk about historical intent. I think there's merit in considering other land uses. I do not want to see TCC support something that we regret. If you put anything east of the parking lot, how is the traffic going to be resolved. Turnagain

Crossing did generate tension. It increased traffic. Ask the Assembly to put it away, so we can start fresh with a new discussion, weighing the pros the cons, in a thoughtful way. So we can consider the effects of development or to retain this land as park land. Supports motion.

Stephanie Quinn-Davidson: "I support taking more time. I have concerns about asking the Assembly to postpone indefinitely. If this ordinance is killed, it cannot be brought back. It's a proposal to dispose of the land and not development in a certain way. Would encourage TCC to set a date. How long do we want to take? If you asked to postpone indefinitely, it will be difficult to bring forth the same ordinance instance. It will kill it. Seems like intent is to get some time to work on it. Postponing indefinitely will not actually achieve intent.

Jon Isaacs: I would vote against postponing indefinitely. Thinks we have information we need to make the most informed decision. Would be interested in seeing the plat. What are the rights-of-way? Let's hear from the Parks Dept. Let's request specific information. Postpone 60 days. Has a problem with it "indefinitely," and would vote against it.

Dan Gleason: - I would offer a Friendly Amendment — postpone a certain amount of time. Maybe 60, 90, 100 days. It's not time-sensitive.

Pam Wright: "It's time sensitive if you don't have a house to live in."

A. Brawley: Not discouraging putting a date on it, but 60 days from now will be in early May. Ninety days will be early June. Looking at trying to resolve in the spring or taking it up in the Fall. Would Brooks be contemplating purchasing it a year from now?

J. Jay Brooks: "This initiative was just to preserve the parking. There isn't any market rate housing being developed." No profit in it. Interest is because he builds places he likes to go. Knows it won't be profitable. Not in a hurry. Wants it to be responsible and well designed. Green space can be integrated into it. It's a conversation. "It could be someone else. It might not be me." Open process.

Pat Redmond moved to extend the meeting for 15 minutes
Stephanie Quinn-Davidson seconded.
Motion passed.

A. Brawley: Motion on the floor: TCC recommend that Assembly postpone voting on this issue indefinitely. Friendly amendment — not indefinitely, but for 60, 90, 120 days. July 7, 2022? To move forward, we need to resolve time-frame, then vote on the motion.

Pat Redmond moved to amend the motion to October, 2022. Jon Isaacs seconded. Nial Ferguson also seconded.

Dan Gleason agreed to the friendly amendment

Nial Ferguson: "I think we should stick with the initial motion to postpone indefinitely to gauge members' interest. Whenever information is withheld from Turnagain Community Council, there's a reason. That, I find concerning. That's why I'd like this tabled indefinitely especially until after the election, as five seats could flip."

Pat Redmond: "The problem with it indefinitely, as Stephanie said, that kills it completely."

Cathy Gleason: The way this ordinance is written is a non-starter for us to have an opportunity to try an amendment that.... This ordinance is very clear that that whereas his land is vacant, not in use, no one cares about it and to go ahead and say, "let's go ahead and work on it for several months, the sale of all of these parcels no matter what, and then when they say...[INAUDIBLE]. I prefer postponing this particular ordinance that had zero community council input. Nobody came and approached us and said, "what do you guys think?" But now we are thinking and talking. Thinks it would be a much better process to

Turnagain Community Council

shelve it and create a new ordinance No rush. When it's appropriate. Then we have a chance to get all of these questions answered and have a community dialogue. Have a presentation from Parks. And Assembly reps. Much cleaner. Postpone indefinitely. Doesn't mean we can't work with administration and Assembly to come up with a new ordinance [INAUDIBLE].

Bernard Richard stated he thinks that a new ordinance may be more important. Agrees strongly with Cathy Gleason's suggestion to postpone.

Stephanie Quinn-Davidson: "It doesn't procedurally kill it if it's postponed indefinitely. It's a tool that's often used to not bring things back. It's more work procedurally. If our intent is to gather material, I don't see it as an issue of putting a date on that. That forces us to actually make it happen and it forces the Muni to make it happen. "When you do it indefinitely, things can get lost."

Austin Quinn-Davidson: "Procedurally, I'd suggest that it makes more sense to put a date you'd like a decision postponed to. Kameron says the same. Anna just testified. The Assembly asks testifiers, especially community councils, and that is something she will have to answer. The Assembly will ask her for a date."

Amendment proposed for this motion. If not a friendly amendment, it comes up for a vote. Pat Redmond repeated her motion to delay until October, 2022.

Jon Issacs seconded. This motion changes the indefinite postponement to Oct. 11, 2022.

Vote:

For - 14 [NOT SURE IF THIS VOTE WAS ACTUALLY 13]

Against - 3

Amendment passed.

Main motion — for TCC to recommend to Assembly the postponement of voting on the ordinance until the October 15, 2022 meeting.

For —15

Against - 1

Motion passes.

Anna Brawley offered a recap. "This is what we will be testifying at the March 15 Assembly meeting on behalf of Turnagain Community Council. TCC doesn't represent the entire neighborhood. If you have thoughts, you should send testimony to the Assembly. Or sign up to testify, in person or by phone."

Motion to adjourn: Pat Redmond.

Second — Jon Issacs.

Austin Quinn-Davidson: "That's a really long postponement. I'm not sure our colleagues will be in favor of such a long postponement. You should be ready to say why."

CLOSING

- The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 p.m.
- **Next meeting: Thursday, April 7, 2022 at 7:00 p.m.**

Minutes prepared and submitted by Secretary Kathleen Bielawski on 03/22/22.

*If you have corrections or edits to this document, please submit them to tccpresident@yahoo.com by the Monday before the next Council meeting: **Monday, April 4, 2022.***