1	STATE OF ALASKA
2	THE LOCAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION
3	BEFORE COMMISSIONERS: Lynn Chrystal - Chair John Harrington Robert Harcharak Darroll Hargraves Lavell Wilson
5	Laveli wiison
6	DEGLETOWN WEREING
7	DECISIONAL MEETING
8	REGARDING ALLAKAKET DETACHMENT AND CONCURRENT ANNEXATION PETITION
9	Allakaket, Alaska
10	October 14th, 2014
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
- - 1	

25

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1

2	ADMINISTRATIVE	
3	1.	Call to order02
4	2.	Roll call and determination of quorum02
5	3.	Acknowledge of guests and staff present03
6	4.	Local Boundary Commission chair remarks03
7	5.	Approval of agenda04
8	NEW BUSINESS	
9	1.	Comments by members of the public concerning matters that are neither on the agenda nor pending before the commissioner04
11	2.	Decision regarding the Allakaket detachment and concurrent annexation petition04
12	3.	Comments from commissionrs and LBC staff40
13	4.	Adjourn44
14		
15		
16		
17		
18 19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
- 5		

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

PROCEEDINGS

(On record - 4:17 p.m.)

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. We'll call the meeting to order. We're now moving into the decision statement. We adjourned from the previous thing, we're going to -- basically kind of starting a new meeting right now. So could we have a call to order, please, from the staff?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Chair. Commissioner Harrington?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson?

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Hargraves?

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Harcharak?

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: Here.

MR. WILLIAMS: Chair Chrystal?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Here. And we do have a quorum.

MR. WILLIAMS: The time is 4:17.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: 4:17. Okay. Sounds good. And acknowledging staff present at this Allakaket site?

MR. WILLIAMS: Brent Williams, LBC staff.

MR. ENINGUWOK: Brice Eninguwok, LBC staff.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Now is there any other conference site out there besides Barrow? Okay. Don't hear any. Okay. At this time we're going to move into the

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

1	decisional statement part. We'll be going through several
2	motions to get to the final result. We hope it will be the one
3	you want.
4	MR. WILLIAMS: Approve the agenda, sir?
5	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Oh, I'm sorry. Well, I haven't got
6	to that yet. I'm still above that where it says commission
7	okay. Do we have a motion to approve the agenda, please?
8	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: So moved.
9	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Second.
10	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Commissioner Harrington moved.
11	Commissioner Wilson seconded the motion to approve the agenda.
12	Could we have a roll call vote on that, please?
13	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Chair. Commissioner Harrington?
14	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.
15	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson?
16	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Yes.
17	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Hargraves?
18	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Yes.
19	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Harcharak?
20	MR. ENINGUWOK: Commissioner Harcharak, the question
21	has been raised do you move to approve the agenda?
22	COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: Yes.
23	MR. WILLIAMS: Chair Chrystal?
24	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes. The agenda has been approved.
25	Moving on to new business. Once again, any comments from

Τ	somebody here concerning matters that are not on the agenda
2	tonight? Okay. Hearing none. Okay. We're now going to move
3	into the decision regarding the Allakaket detachment and
4	concurrent annexation petition. We have two motions that have
5	been posted for us we recommending that they both be passed.
6	would entertain a motion on Option Number 1.
7	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Mr. Chairman?
8	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes, sir.
9	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: I'm Commissioner Hargraves.
10	And I move to amend the petition for detachment and the
11	concurrent annexation to the City of Allakaket for a local
12	option petition. Sir?
13	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: From. Not for, from.
14	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: From a local option petition
15	through a legislative review process. That the petition in its
16	present form does not meet the detachment standards for a local
17	action petition because there are no voters living in the
18	territory proposed for detachment who may vote on the proposed
19	detachment. That's my amendment.
20	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Anybody wish to second the
21	amendment made by Commissioner Hargraves?
22	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Second.
23	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. We have a motion from
24	Commissioner Harrington. Any discussion?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: If this is the full motion or

25

Τ	is this a motion with an additional added, I don't do it.
2	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: No, I don't think we need an
3	additional item added to it. I'm not sure what you mean.
4	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: That could be a second
5	amendment on that
6	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: But you've had something to
7	this and
8	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Any discussion on this? So
9	basically this moves it from a local option to a legislative
10	review, is that correct
11	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Yeah.
12	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL:in so many terms? Okay.
13	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Chair Chrystal, that's correct.
14	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. If we have no further
15	discussion could we have a vote on the motion? Okay. Go
16	ahead.
17	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Please. I got a little
18	fouled up. We have the original composed motion and we added
19	some additional language to that over and above what the
20	original motion was, is that correct?
21	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Well, we just read the proposed
22	motion right here at the top. That was
23	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: There should have been a
24	motion to
25	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Amend. That's what you did.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: And then you have it in the motion that I....

2.2

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: You said a motion to accept the petition.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Well, so now we have a different language.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: We've obviously got some kind of a problem here. What is it?

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: You can't amend something that doesn't exist.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: That's why -- the problem is we had two different motions on the table, one was shorter than the other. That's what's my concern was. I was a little confused as to what was happening here.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: I guess I'm confused myself.

MR. ENINGUWOK: This is Brice. So the motion introduced right now is that there is a half a motion from the.....

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Yeah.

MR. ENINGUWOK: It's a motion to amend the petition before -- because you kind of accepted the petition on its face. We can place a motion to accept the petition until these motions are placed. So the first motion is to -- for this commission to change the petition from a local action to a legislative review petition, if that makes -- for clarity. So

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

1	that's the motion on the floor right now.
2	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: I do have a question similar to
3	Commissioner Hargraves. How can we amend the petition when we
4	haven't even
5	MR. ENINGUWOK: We'll show that as accepted for
6	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Accepted, so therefore we can amend
7	it?
8	MR. ENINGUWOK: It's been accepted for filing.
9	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay.
10	MR. ENINGUWOK: And it's up to this only the
11	commission can change the petition process from a local action
12	to a legislative review. You cannot accept the petition as it
13	is, you cannot place a motion to accept the petition yet.
14	These motions
15	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: So this motion is amending the
16	petition?
17	MR. ENINGUWOK: Correct.
18	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Which has already been filed.
19	Or
20	MR. ENINGUWOK: It's been accepted for filing as a
21	local action.
22	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay.
23	MR. ENINGUWOK: But in order to process the petition
24	you still want to process it as a local action, you have to do
25	option number 2.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: No, I don't think anybody -- don't even bring that up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Well, we need to address the fact why -- option number 2 I think is not an acceptable response and I think clearly with -- this community would like to annex that area. There is nobody living in the detachment area so it cannot possibly meet some of the requirements of a local action detachment. Therefore we cannot approve this as it sets unless we amend it. We are amending it for a That will cost the local community much legislative review. less than attempting to put on an election. For my question today, asking if anyone is opposed, nobody in this audience seemed to be opposed. If there was opposition of any sort I would be willing to do something different, but I see there is no local opposition to this annexation. The most efficient process that we can give this community is to go with the legislative review process so we can continue not forcing anybody to do anything additional. We take it from here, move it on, make sure all of the steps are met and make sure that the rest of the petition meets those requirements, but once having done that then the -- if it passes this community will be united shortly after the legislative session begins unless some act of God from the legislature changes something. really would not expect that. This seems to be the most efficient and effective motion.

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

1	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: This motion. Okay. I agree.
2	Anybody else? Can we hear a vote on that motion then?
3	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Chair. Commissioner Harrington?
4	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.
5	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson?
6	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Yes.
7	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Hargraves?
8	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Yes.
9	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Harcharak?
10	COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: Yes.
11	MR. WILLIAMS: Chair Chrystal?
12	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes. So the motion passes. The
13	next item is the suspension of 3 AAC 110.425, which my
14	understanding tells me that by suspending this then the City of
15	Allakaket cannot be required to hold some kind of a special
16	meeting before they even sent the petition. Is that correct?
17	MR. WILLIAMS: This is Brent Williams. That's pretty
18	much correct, Chair. For a legislative review petition a
19	hearing is the petitioner, in this case the City, is
20	required to hold a petitioner (sic) before it is submitted to
21	the Local Boundary Commission. However, the commission has
22	just changed the petition from one form to another, so how can
23	city have held a hearing beforehand, because back then it was a
24	local action petition.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right.

25

MR. WILLIAMS: So it is still required, however, so 1 2 that LBC has a motion before it to suspend that regulation so that the city is not required to hold that hearing beforehand. 3 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: 4 Right. 5 MR. WILLIAMS: Its come and gone. 6 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. So I would entertain a 7 motion to suspend 3 AAC 110.425. COMMISSIONER WILSON: So moved. 8 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Moved by Commissioner Wilson. 9 have a second? 10 COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Second. 11 12 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Second by Commissioner Harrington. Discussion? 13 COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: We'd like it read into the 14 15 record. CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: I think that would be a good idea. 16 Would you read that in for your motion then? 17 18 COMMISSIONER WILSON: I, Commissioner Wilson, move to suspend 3 AAC 110.425 for the petition for detachment from and 19 20 concurrent annexation to the City of Allakaket. Strict 21 adherence to the regulation would work in investus and would not serve relevant constitutional principles and the board 22 public interest under 3 AAC 110.660. 23 All right. And this is --24 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL:

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

25

agreeable to the second?

1	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.
2	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Questions? Comments?
3	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: We are stuck with a set of
4	regulations and requirements but the process of having a
5	hearing in a detachment area that has nobody is on its face
6	relatively absurd. We should have I mean I think we would
7	have automatically suspended this regulation, had they
8	requested it, beforehand. So I don't see this as an after the
9	fact issue. This is just one of those clean up the record
10	issues that make sure that it passes all of our regulations and
11	all of the city regulations and laws so that this can move
12	forward expeditiously.
13	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Absolutely. Questions, comments?
14	Okay. Could we hear a vote? Roll call, please?
15	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Chair Chrystal? Commissioner
16	Harrington?
17	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.
18	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson?
19	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Yes.
20	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Hargraves?
21	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Yes.
22	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Harcharak?
23	COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: Yes.
24	MR. WILLIAMS: Chair Chrystal?
25	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes. Okay. The motion passes.

1 We'll now move on to the -- this is the kind of cumbersome part 2 that's kind of boring. 3 COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Mr. Chairman? CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes, sir? 4 COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Do we have, in this process, a 5 motion to approve that petition? 6 This is Brent Williams. You don't have 7 MR. WILLIAMS: one now. You could do one now. Because you're going to 8 9 introduce a motion to approve the petition, it needs to be in 10 the positive. And then you're going to go through the standards and at the end you're going to decide whether to 11 12 approve, amend or deny the petition. COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: So there needs to be a motion. 13 Mr. Chairman, I move that we approve the petition for 14 15 detachment and concurrent annexation in Allakaket, and that we proceed with reviewing the standards. 16 Second. 17 COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: 18 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. We have a motion from 19 Commissioner Hargraves, second from Commissioner Harrington. 20 Any other questions, comments? Okay. 21 COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: At this point we'll go through 22 the standards and then vote on them? MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Commissioner, that's correct. 23 24 COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: (Indiscernible - simultaneous 25 speaking).

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: All right. This is the boring part. Let's see. Are there any -- yes, sir?

MR. WILLIAMS: You can vote on -- sorry. No, I guess you're -- sorry, go ahead. My bad.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Are there any regulations to be suspended before the petition standards can be addressed? And we just did that. All right. Okay. If yes, restate the proposed suspension for the record. And that was the motion to suspend 3 AAC 110.425. Does everybody agree with that?

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Right.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. So we did that. If yes, condition or amendment for the record. And we did that already. Okay. Moving on to 3 AAC 110.257, the standards for detachment from the city. Okay. Number 1, it meets the applicable standards under the constitution of the State of Alaska. Number 2, it meets the standards of 3 AAC 110.257, 3 AAC 110.260, 3 AAC 110.900, and 3 AAC 110.970, and number 3, is in the best interest of the state. Do we agree on this? Hearing no argument.

Okay. The next item is maximum local self government. Does the proposed detachment promote maximum local self government? And in determining whether it promotes local self government the commission of the State of Alaska will (sub 10) for city detachment to an unorganized borough....

MR. WILLIAMS: Chair, if I may. 257, you will answer

that after going through everything else. Okay? That's why there's not a yes or no box.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. Right. Okay. Going back to where -- okay. (A), the proposal would diminish the provision of local government to the territory and population being detached, or detrimentally effect the capacity of the revenue city to provide local government services, and local government needs of a detached territory and population can be adequately met by another existing local government. So therefore that does not apply, is this correct, Mr. Williams?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Says another word there.

MR. WILLIAMS: Right. Under 10, it's only something you have to consider in determining where the proposed detachment promotes maximum local self government. All you need to do is consider 10(a) and (b), consider it, but overall you decide yes or no, does the proposal promote maximum local self government. You do have to consider 10 before you can get there.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: And we have consider it, is that correct? Everybody agree to that? Okay. 110.982, minimum number of local government units. Does the proposal for detachment promote minimum number of local government units? Among the factors to be considered in determining whether the proposed boundary change promotes a minimum number of local

government units, in accordance with Article X, Section 1, constitution of the State of Alaska, the commission will consider, for city detachment, whether the detached area by itself is likely to be incorporated as a new city? And it's pretty obvious that will be no. Does everybody agree with that? Okay. 3 AAC 110.....

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: The detached area would not be considered as a new government, that's true. But that doesn't preclude it from being included in another government if they choose to move in there. That's right.

MR. WILLIAMS: All that (9) says is that the detached portion by itself -- just itself, could that be a new city on its own? And the staff's recommendation is that no, that cannot function by itself, nobody lives there....

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right.

MR. WILLIAMS:as a city by itself.

MR. ENINGUWOK: Therefore the regulation is met.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: So -- correct.

MR. ENINGUWOK: Okay.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: 3 AAC 110.260, the best interest of the state. Is the detachment of the proposed territory in the best interest of the state? In determining whether detachment from a city is in the best interest of the state under Alaska statutes 29.06.040, the commission may consider relevant factors including the health, safety and general welfare of the

proposed remnant city and territory after detachment; the ability of the proposed remnant city to efficiently and effectively provide reasonably necessary facilities and services after detachment; the reasonably anticipated potential for, and the impact of future population growth or economic development that will require a local government regulation in the territory after detachment.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Can we solve those three and review them quickly?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: We probably could. Yeah, unless anybody's got some comments about all of these, we could.....

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: With nobody living there, the health and safety and welfare of that remnant is a moot issue in my mind. The proposed remnant, effectively no services will be provided there unless....

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: And this is in the best interest of the state.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: And clearly the best interest of the state in all of this is to get this whole issue resolved and get the governments looking at everything in a consolidated view. So anyway, those are my comments are those first three.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. And the next item....

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: I heartily concur with you,

Commissioner Harrington -- this is Commissioner Harcharak -
everything you just said.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right.

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: It's a (indiscernible) and we'll get this straightened out for everybody there.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Absolutely. Okay. The next item is pretty much the same thing. Will the territory's requirements for local government services be adequately met following detachment? Well, there won't be any local government service required since there's nobody there. Is that right? Okay.

Has the petition proven that it will not create non-contiguous parts of the city or enclaves within the city?

Absent a specific and pervasive showing to the contrary the commission will presume that territory proposed for detachment that would create non-contiguous parts of the city, or enclave, does not meet the standards for detachment. And we have nothing there. So.....

MR. WILLIAMS: Again, Chair, these are the only things that we all may consider not limited.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. Okay. And where do we go here? Okay. Do we need to run through these other ones here right below it? Anybody got any comments on them? We're still talking about the detachment, right? Yeah. Can we move through halfway down there?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Sure.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Nobody's got any comments?

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

1 Okay. MR. WILLIAMS: At the end all you need to decide is 2 whether.... 3 COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Looks like I have a different 4 5 (indiscernible). I quess I was just given a different set of stuff there. 6 7 At the end all you need to decide is MR. WILLIAMS: whether the proposed detachment is in the best interest of the 8 9 state. 10 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: And it is. I think we all agree a hundred percent. 11 COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yeah. 12 Okay. Moving on to city annexation CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: 13 standards. 3 AAC 110.090. This is the need. Does the 14 15 territory.... MR. WILLIAMS: Chair, we've got 263. 16 17 MR. ENINGUWOK: There's one that's below.... 18 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: We go over that now? 19 MR. ENINGUWOK: It must be 20 Okay. Under legislative review, 3 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Territory that meets the detachment standards 21 AAC 110.263. specified 3 AAC 110.257, 3 AAC 110.260, may detach from the 22 city by the legislative review process if the commission also 23 24 determines that any one of the following circumstances exists.

25

Okay.

Number 1, the health, safety and general welfare of city residents is or will be endangered by conditions existing or potentially developing in the territory, and detachment will enable the city to regulate or control the detrimental effects of these conditions.

Number 2, it is impossible or impractical for the city to extend facilities or services to the territory.

Number 3, residences or property owners within the territory have not received, and do not reasonably expect to receive, directly or indirectly, the benefit of city government without significant additional tax contributions.

Number 4, the commissioner determines that specific policies set out in the constitution of the State of Alaska, Alaska statutes 29.04, 29.05 and 29.06 are best served through detachment of the territory by the legislative review process, and that detachment is in the best interest of the state.

Any one of the following existed, and I think number 4 certainly qualifies. Is that correct?

MR. WILLIAMS: We found.....

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: So that should take care of that one.

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah, correct.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: So they don't have to have 1. So but the rest of them do too. Are we good to go on that one?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Where was I? I was on city annexation standards, I believe. 3 AAC 110.090(e), does the territory....

MR. WILLIAMS: Chair, this is Brent, if I may. Maybe a statement if at this point the commission has found that overall that the city detachment standards have been met, or not met, before we go into annexation.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: If you prefer, yeah. We certainly agree that city -- detachment standards have been met. Anybody got any disagreement?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Without the comments of the audience, in the past we've taken three or four hours to go through what we've just done in about 15 or 20 minutes. So understand that some things in particular got lost a little bit, clearly our intent here is to examine every one of these issues and I think as you probably heard, and as I would say for the record, we think the detachment issues have been met appropriately.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. Thank you. Okay.

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Mr. Chairman, I concur with that statement completely, yeah. We're going through it fast but I think it's understandable that it's pretty clear where we stand.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Well, when you really get down to it we're talking about a little sliver of land that nobody

lives on, you know, so it's not a real huge issue.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Does the territory exhibit a reasonable need for The territory must exhibit a reasonable need city government? In this -- we're talking about the for city government. In this regard the commission may consider annexation now. relevant factors including, number 1, existing or reasonably anticipated social or economic conditions including the extent to which residential and commercial growth of the community has occurred, or is reasonably expected to occur beyond the existing boundaries of the city during the 10 years following the effective date of annexation. Number 2, existing or reasonably anticipated health, safety and general welfare conditions. Number 3, existing or reasonably anticipate economic development. Number 4, adequacy of existing services. Number 5, extraterritorial powers available to the city to which the territory is proposed to be annexed, and extraterritorial powers of nearby municipalities; and number 6, whether the residents or property owners within the territory receive or may reasonably expect to receive, directly or indirectly, the benefit of services and facilities provided by the annexing city. Any comments on that?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: I would say definitely yes on all of that. Clearly when you see that the city is operating as a unified body, even though they are in separate areas, they have demonstrated by their activities and by their behavior the

need for city government in this entire area.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Everybody agree with that?

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: I certainly do. Okay. Can essential municipal services be provided more efficiently and more effectively by another existing municipality service provider? Under (b), the territory may not be annexed to a city if the essential municipal services can be provided more efficiently and more effectively by another existing city or by an organized borough on an area wide basis or non-area wide basis, or through a borough service area, that in the determination of the commission was established in accordance with Article X, Section 5, constitution of the State of Alaska. And I think it is obvious that municipal services cannot be provided effectively by anybody else because there isn't anybody else. Everybody agree with that?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Right. There isn't anybody else.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. Okay. Other character, 110.100. Is the territory compatible in character with the city? In this regard the commission may consider relevant factors, including the land use, subdivision platting and ownership patterns, salability of land for residential, commercial or industrial purposes, population density, cause or recent population changes, suitability of the territory for

reasonably anticipated community purposes, existing and reasonably anticipated transportation patterns and facilities, and natural geographical features and environmental factors. I think it's obvious the character is compatible with the city. Disagreement? Okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Moving on to resources, 3 AAC 110.110. Does the economy within the proposed extended boundaries of the city include the human and financial resource necessary to provide essential municipal services on an efficient cost effective level? In this regard the commission may consider relevant factors, including (1), reasonably anticipated functions to the city in the territory being annexed, reasonably anticipated new expenses of the city that would result from annexation, actual income and the reasonably anticipated ability to generate and collect local revenue and income from the territory, feasibility and plausibility of those aspects of the city's anticipated operating and capital budgets that would be effected by the annexation through the period extending one full fiscal year beyond the reasonably anticipated date for completion of the transition set out in 3 AAC 110.900.

Number 5 is the economic base of the territory within the city after annexation. Number 6 is valuations of taxable property in the territory proposed for annexation. Number 7 is land use in the territory proposed for annexation. Number 8, existing and reasonably anticipated industrial, commercial and

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

resource development in the territory proposed for annexation. Number 9, personal income of residents in the territory and in the city, and number 10, need for and availability of employable skilled and unskilled persons to serve the city government as a result of annexation.

Brice, are you there? You've looked into the economy and the proposed budget, and what have you, after annexation, and everything meets the standards of the staff?

MR. ENINGUWOK: Correct. This is Brice. The city has been operating and providing services to the Allakaket for the last 20 years and they still have some -- they have a little bit of access each fiscal year. They are providing those services already.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. So we can safely say that under resources is yes, they do have the capacity to staff and service the anticipated annexation?

MR. ENINGUWOK: And I think it was under port that the numbers used for community revenue sharing will increase a little bit.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Any other comments? Okay. Under -- what?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Just that they have an automony as a city effectively in 20 years. This is in my mind clearly, because a functioning body they -- this is in the best interest of all concerned.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: But yes, it does meet all of these standards.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Under population, is the population of the proposed expanded boundaries of the city sufficiently large and stable to support the extension of city government? In this regard the commission may consider relevant factors including (1), census enumerations, (2), duration of residency, (3), historical population patterns, (4), seasonal population changes, (5), age distributions, (6), contemporary and historical public school enrollment data, and (7), non-confidential data from the Department of Revenue regarding applications under AS 43.23 for Permanent Fund applications, or Permanent Fund dividends. So this kind of falls under the same thing as the previous comments. So we do meet that standard, correct?

MR. WILLIAMS: Yeah. It is the staff recommendation,
Chair. And if I may, the LBC recently approved the
incorporation of the City of Edna Bay, which has a little over
50 residents.....

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right.

MR. WILLIAMS:or at least 51 voters, and
Allakaket is three or four times the size of that community.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. Okay. Under 3 AAC 110.130

is boundaries. Do the boundaries include all the land and

water necessary to provide essential municipal services on an efficient cost effective level? Sub (a), the proposed expanded boundaries of the city must include all land and water necessary to provide the development of essential municipal services on an efficient cost effective level. In this regard the commission may consider relevant factors including, number 1, land use and ownership patterns, number 2, population density, number 3, existing and reasonably anticipated transportation patterns and facilities, number 4, national geographical features and environmental factors, and number 5, extraterritorial powers of cities. Okay. Anybody have any problems with this one being a yes? I'd just point out to some of you that the standards don't necessarily to meet every single item. It just has to be preponderance of it. Okay.

Is the territory proposed for annexation continuous to the city, or does it avoid creating enclaves to the city? (b) absent a specific and pervasive showing to the contrary the commission will presume the territory that is not contiguous to the annexation of the city, or that would create enclaves in the annexing city, does not include all land and water necessary to allow for the development of essential municipal services on an efficient cost level. Okay. This one is -- yes, sir?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: It would appear, as I look at the map, clearly there are no enclaves that were created. I

can't speak to whether they have other property that meet all of their needs but it should appears that that has been met.

The boundaries are clear and clean, and I would -- it meets the standard in my mind.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. It's certainly contiguous.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. And then if the territory is not contiguous, that's the next one. We don't need to address that because we're already bypassed that. Okay. Let's see, how about the next one. Do we need to do that? Will the city be on a scale suitable for city government, and unless justified, not include entire geographic areas or unpopulated areas? (c), to promote the limitation of community, the proposed expanded boundaries of the city, number 1, must be on a scale suitable for city government and may include only that territory comprising an existing local community plus reasonably anticipated predictable growth, development and public safety needs during the 10 years following the effective date of annexation. Anybody disagree with the standards on that one?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: I would say yes, it is met and I think it is demonstrated in the petition by the idea of detaching a certain section.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Clearly they are examining

and determining what area they need and what they've decided has been justified.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. Okay. To promote the limitation of community the proposed expanded boundaries of the city, number 2, may not include entire geographic areas or large unpopulated areas except if those boundaries are justified by the application of the standards in 3 AAC 110.090, and 3 AAC 110.135, and are otherwise suitable for city government. I don't think this is an issue because they are not doing that. They're not expanding into huge unpopulated areas. So it does meet the standard. Okay. Well, yeah, it does meet the standards.

If yes to (c)(2), are those expanded boundaries justified by the application of the standards in 3 AAC 110.090.....

MR. WILLIAMS: Chair?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes, sir?

MR. WILLIAMS: You can skip that because it's only if they were including large areas.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Let's see. Does the annexation petition describe boundaries overlapping the boundaries of an existing organized borough or city? And obviously it doesn't.

MR. WILLIAMS: No reason to go through that one.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Number 3 AAC 110.981(7),

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

determination of maximum local self government. Does the 1 2 proposed detachment provide maximum local self government? We already did that, didn't we? 3 COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yeah, that was..... 4 MR. WILLIAMS: That was for detachment. 5 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Right. As I say, didn't we already 6 do that? 7 MR. WILLIAMS: Not for annexation. 8 9 MR. ENINGUWOK: Yeah. The first one was just detachment. 10 So.... MR. WILLIAMS: Okay. Scratch out detachment and write 11 12 in annexation. CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Don't confuse us. 13 easily confused. 14 15 MR. WILLIAMS: All right. 16 COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: That's for sure. Even at this 17 end. MR. WILLIAMS: And the same with the next one too. 18 19 CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Does the proposed annexation promote maximum local self government? In determining whether 20 a proposed boundary change promotes local self government under 21 Article X, Section 1, constitution of the State of Alaska, the 22 23 commission will consider, number 7, for city incorporation or annexation in the unorganized borough, whether the proposal 24

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

would extend local government to territory and population of

2.5

the unorganized borough where no local government currently exists. I think we've met that standard.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: That's a standard -- that's sort of because the city is already brewing and it's time that we acknowledged the fact, yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. The next one is 3 AAC 110.982(7), the minimum number of local government units. Does the proposed annexation promote a minimum number of local government units? Among the factors to be considered in determining whether a proposed boundary change promotes a minimum number of local government units in accordance with Article X, Section 1, constitution of the State of Alaska, the commission will consider, number 7, for city annexation, whether the jurisdictional boundaries of an existing city are being enlarged rather than promoting the incorporation of a new city or creation of a new borough service area. I guess we meet that standard.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. The best of the state under 3 AAC 110.1345. In annexing the territory to the city, is it in the best interest of the state? In determining whether annexation to a city is in the best interest of the state under Alaska statute 29.06.04(a), the commission may consider 11 factors, including whether annexation, number 1, promotes maximum local self government as determined under 3 AAC

110.981; number 2, promotes a minimum number of local government units as determined under 3 AAC 110.982, and in accordance with Article X, Section 1, constitution of the State of Alaska; and number 3, will relieve the state government of the responsibility of providing local services. We clearly meet that standard.

Okay. Getting down near the end. 3 AAC 110.900, the transition.

MR. ENINGUWOK: Chair?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes, sir?

MR. ENINGUWOK: The 900 series following here is going to be for both detachment and annexation.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Does the petition contain a practical transition plan for the proposed detachment and for the proposed annexation? And under (a), a petition for incorporation, annexation, merger or consolidation must include a practical plan that demonstrates the capacity of the municipal government to extend essential municipal services into the boundaries proposed for change in the shortest practical time after the effective date of the proposed change. A petition for municipal detachment or dissolution under Alaska Statutes 29.06, or a city reclassification under 29.04, must include a practice plan demonstrating the transition or termination of municipal services in the shortest practical time after detachment, dissolution, or city reclassification.

And that has been presented to you?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Clearly since the city is already not delivering services in the detachment area, and since they're already delivering services into the annexation, this has been met. Clearly.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Clearly. Okay. Does the transition plan include the assumption of all powers, duties, right and functions provided to the territory proposed to be detached, and all functions currently provided in the territory proposed to be annexed? Each petition must include a practical plan for the assumption of all relevant and appropriate powers, duties, rights and functions presently exercised by an existing borough, city, unorganized borough, service area, or other appropriate entity located within the boundaries proposed for change. So we do have a transition plan that covers all this? So we have met that.

MR. ENINGUWOK: That's correct, Chair.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Was the plan prepared in consultation with the officials of each existing borough, city and unorganized borough service area? The plan must be prepared in consultation with the officials of each existing borough, city and unorganized borough service area, and must be designed to effect an orderly, efficient, economic transfer within the shortest practical time, not to exceed two years. Well, since we have no other borough, cities, or whatever, this

plan -- this is not (indiscernible), right? Okay.

All right. Does the transition plan include a plan for all the assets and liabilities from the territory proposed to be detached and the territory proposed to be annexed? Each petition must include a practical plan for the transfer and integration of all relevant and appropriate assets and liabilities of an existing borough, city, unorganized borough service area, or other entity located within the boundaries proposed for change. And this is met, is that correct?

Once the plan....

MR. ENINGUWOK: Chair?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes, sir?

MR. ENINGUWOK: The plan was -- to be precise, the plan is in the petition itself and we met those through our reports as stated.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: Not everything is (indiscernible). There are no assets, (indiscernible) (a) and (b).

MR. ENINGUWOK: Most of those -- talking about assets, there is a community association that was providing those before. In this case there is no community association and the city is providing those services as those assets already.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Do we need to -- at the top of page 8 there, we've got one, two, three standards to meet and I'll still address with the plan that we just talked about.

Do we need to cover each one of those individually?

MR. WILLIAMS: I believe that the commission could find whether 900. -- 110.900 is met, or not met. Not all of these are pertinent, so you could go through -- we don't believe that you have to go through them.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: Just as long you can say whether or not it is met.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: It has been met clearly.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: So how far down do we want to go here?

MR. WILLIAMS: Next page, sir, 910.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. 910. It'd be 110.910, statement of non-discrimination. Does the effective or proposed changes deny any person the enjoyment of any civil or political right? A petition will not be approved by the commission if the effective or proposed change denies any person the enjoyment of any civil or political right, including voting rights, because of race, color, creed, sex, or national origin. Okay. We're not worried about this one. The standards are met?

MR. WILLIAMS: Correct.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: It has been met because the answer is no.

MR. WILLIAMS: Correct.

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: All right. Under 3 AAC 110.970(c), determination of essential municipal services. Does the transition call for the identification of essential municipal services for the city? If the provision of this chapter calls for the identification of essential municipal services for the city the commission will determine those services to consist of those mandatory and discretionary powers and facilities.

MR. WILLIAMS: Our opinion is yes. There's another regulation that does call for the identification of essential municipal services, and if you find that to be true then you go on to the parts below.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. If yes, do these services consist of those mandatory and discretionary powers and facilities that, number 1, are reasonably necessary to the community? Is that correct? Promote maximum local self government?

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Correct. Cannot be provided more efficiently and more effectively by the creation or modification of some other political subdivision of the state? Met? Okay. Now the commission may determine essential municipal services for a city to include, number 1, levying taxes, number 2, for a city in the unorganized borough assessing the value of taxable property, 3, levying and collecting taxes, 4, for a first class or home rule city in the

unorganized borough establishing, maintaining and operating a system of public schools within the city as provided by Alaska Statute 14.14.005. Number 5 is public safety protection, number 6, planning, platting and land use regulations, and number 7, other services that the commission considers reasonably necessary to meet local government needs of resident of the community. Okay. We are not setting any standards, is that right?

MR. WILLIAMS: You are just finding whether or not the

MR. WILLIAMS: You are just finding whether or not the -- that there are essential municipal services and then you've already gotten through the part there that is (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Everybody happy? Okay. Even Barrow is happy.

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: You got me trapped in there.

MR. WILLIAMS: Chair, this is Brent Williams. If I may, we've gone through all the standards. We went through them quickly. I think it may be very clear to the commission and to the staff and the people in the room, but maybe down the road people look at the record, we want to very, very sure that at this point what we did for the detachment suggests that the commission discussed and emphatically say whether the standards for both detachment and annexation have been met, or not met.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Are you just looking for a statement, or a motion?

MR. WILLIAMS: Just a discussion similar to what the

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Well, I'll just say that I feel that the standards certainly are met for all purposes, for both the detachment and the annexation. And does anybody else have a comment about the same thing?

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Mr. Chairman, I concur.

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: I totally concur with you,

Lynn.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay.

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: This is Commissioner

Harcharak. And hopefully Allakaket will not have to go through any more of these machinations and, you know, paper trails and, you know, trying to work with different agencies in the state.

I think we have covered everything pretty tightly. I think

Brice and company did a good job in preparing this. I'd only regret that I am not there to interact with that 90 year old gentleman who was speaking.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Thank you, Bob. Anybody else?

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: You're welcome.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: This is a unique petition before us. I like the conciseness of it. I like the fact that the detachment was clearly identified and the reasons for the detachment were made. That the area for expansion was clearly

enjoy the humor of having council members who are elected to the city council not living in the current city but living in the future city. Clearly we are here in that situation where this city should progress and it has met all of the standards that I can conceivably think of for us to approve this annexation and detachment.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Absolutely. Anybody else? Yes sir.

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Commissioner Hargraves. I too concur that the standards have been met through the efforts and time, work of the community, the city council, the tribal organizations. And that the entire community is to be commended for sticking to the gun and making this thing come about. It's a thing that has a natural component to it. The flooding and the periodic problems that your community has experienced. So with the extent that you've met your standards I concur wholeheartedly that the petition should be approved.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Anybody else? Okay. We're moving on to the point where the decision regarding the Allakaket detachment and the current annexation petition. So I would entertain a motion to.....

MR. ENINGUWOK: The motion is already on the floor. CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay.

MR. WILLIAMS: And Mr. Eninguwok, did the motion say

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

1	that it was amended?
2	MR. ENINGUWOK: Yes.
3	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Could you read the motion
4	MR. ENINGUWOK: Commissioner Hargraves, you made the
5	motion. Could you restate the motion for us, please?
6	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Commissioner Hargraves. I
7	move to approve the petition for detachment from and
8	concurrent annexation to the City of Allakaket as amended by
9	this commission. And that we proceed with the review of the
10	standards which we have now done.
11	MR. WILLIAMS: Chair, as I understand, the commission
12	will be voting on whether to approve or not approve the
13	petition as amended by Commissioner Hargraves.
14	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: That's correct.
15	MR. WILLIAMS: Thank you, sir.
16	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. Anybody else want to make a
17	final comment before voting? Okay. Could we have a roll call
18	vote, please?
19	MR. WILLIAMS: Yes, Chair. Commissioner Harrington?
20	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.
21	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson?
22	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Yes.
23	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Hargraves?
24	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Yes.
25	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Harcharak?

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: Yes.

MR. WILLIAMS: Chair Chrystal?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes. Okay. The motion passes unanimously. And I think somebody once said the Lord helps them who help themselves. You helped yourselves. You got this thing going and we help you along. But it started with the community and that's very important. All right. Any other comments by commissioners?

COMMISSIONER WILSON: Can we eat now?

MR. ENINGUWOK: Chair?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes, sir.

MR. ENINGUWOK: The next process from here on, we will issue a written decisional statement and we will hold another meeting in November to accept the decision as the firm decision. And then once that written decision has been accepted by this commission again, that will be the one submitted to the legislature during this coming legislative session in 2015. So.....

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Essentially what you're saying is you have to write up what we did here and we have to approve those minutes, essentially, saying that's what we did?

MR. ENINGUWOK: Correct.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: It's just a formality, it's nothing to worry about.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: For sure.

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

MR. WILLIAMS: And that meeting, it will be in -- by telephone in Anchorage. We're not reinventing the wheel but the commission has already decided. It now needs something out in writing. What's in writing will reflect what was done here today, which is to approve the petition. But the meeting in about three weeks will not be re-examining what to do, it's already been done.

MR. ENINGUWOK: It's just a formality like was stated. It's just something written that's official. That will be your official decision here. It will be a written documentation of what happened here today. The meeting is to approve that written documentation. We just want to ensure that everything we had there is the way -- the way we heard everything on record. Congratulations on this.

MR. WILLIAMS: And that meeting will be telephonically accessible and no charge as previously stated.

MR. ENINGUWOK: And I'll let you know when that happens. We haven't set the date just yet. We have a couple more meetings that we need to iron out before. So this will be sometime this November. You'll be given advance notice and an opportunity to call in and participate on that. In case we something we have written down isn't what you think happened today. If we wrote it down incorrectly, that's the time to call in and let us know. Any questions on the next process from here on out? So after that then that written decision

will be presented to the legislature within the first 10 days of the legislative session and it will be up to the legislature to essentially -- it will be up to your legislature to stop this from now on out. And historically that's not been the case, but you never know what your legislature has in mind. So from this point on it's basically up to the legislature.

COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Usually the legislature has 45 days to come to a decision. Effectively within two months of the start of the legislative session it will be approved unless something unusual occurs.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: The chance of this being.....

MR. ENINGUWOK: And if the legislature doesn't address it, your petition is approved.

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: The changes of this thing being overturned are as close to zero as you can mathematically get. You can't say, you know, 100 percent, but it's 99.999 percent.

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Mr. Chairman?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes, sir.

COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Could I ask who is the representative and the senator for this district? Who is your senator?

UNIDENTIFIED VOICE: I think we're having to elect him in November. I think right now it's Ben (indiscernible).

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Any other comments before we move to adjourn?

1	MR. WILLIAMS: Just that we expect 45 days after we
2	submit it to be approved. Roughly March 1st to March 15th,
3	somewhere in that range. Then as time goes by and we haven't
4	heard anything from the legislature we will let the petitioner
5	know. And then at that point if the legislature has not
6	disapproved it, it will be come effective. You know, you're
7	looking at early to mid March.
8	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: In order to overturn, both houses
9	of the legislature would have to do so. So okay. Unless
10	there's other comments I would entertain a motion to adjourn.
11	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Move to adjourn.
12	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Could we have a roll call vote,
13	please?
14	MR. WILLIAMS: Second.
15	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Oh, need a second. I'm sorry.
16	COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK: Second.
17	CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Okay. We got one.
18	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Harrington?
19	COMMISSIONER HARRINGTON: Yes.
20	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Wilson?
21	COMMISSIONER WILSON: Yes.
22	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Hargraves?
23	COMMISSIONER HARGRAVES: Yes.
24	MR. WILLIAMS: Commissioner Harcharak?

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

Yes.

COMMISSIONER HARCHARAK:

MR. WILLIAMS: Chair Chrystal?

CHAIRMAN CHRYSTAL: Yes. Okay. The motion passes.

And thank you, Robert, for coming on from Barrow. Thank you,
the people of Allakaket, for your kind welcome. And good luck.

I know you're going to do just fine. Okay.

(Off record)

(END OF PROCEEDINGS)

ANCHORAGE TRANSCRIPTIONS

P.O. Box 100464 ANCHORAGE, ALASKA 99501

1	CERTIFCATE
2	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA))ss.
3	STATE OF ALASKA)
4	I, Wanda Ventres, Notary Public in and for the State of Alaska, residing at Anchorage, Alaska, do hereby certify:
5 6 7	That the foregoing pages number 02 through 44 contain a full, true and correct transcript of the LOCAL BOUNDARY COMMISSION DECISION MEETING, ALLAKAKET DETACHMENT AND ANNEXATION, transcribed by me to the best of my knowledge and ability from an electropic recording
8	ability from an electronic recording.
9	That I am not a relative, employee or attorney of any of the parties, nor am I financially interested in this action.
10	DATED at Anchorage, Alaska, this 28th day of November, 2014.
11	
12	Wanda Ventres
13	Notary in and for Alaska My commission expires 07/20/16
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	

25