1	BEFORE THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU	
2		
3	MICHAEL A. DAU AND CINDY DAU,	
4	MICHAEL A. DAU AND CINDI DAU,	
5	Appellants,	
6	vs.	Appeal of:
7	CBJ PLANNING COMMISSION,	Notice of Decision CDD File No. USE2012-0019
8	Appellee,	
9	and	
10	SECON (COLASKA, INC.),	
11	Appellee/Intervenor.	
12		
13		
14	DECISION ON APPEAL	
15		
16	I. Introduction.	
17	Michael and Cindy Dau have appealed to the Assembly a Conditional Use Permit issued by the	
18	CBJ Planning Commission to Secon (Colaska, Inc.) to mine gravel from a patented mining claim in	
19 20	the streambed of Lemon Creek close to the Dau's home in Rivers Edge Condominiums. The main	
20	focus of the Dau's challenge is the noise and vibration caused by gravel mining close to their home.	
21	The appeal process is governed by the CBJ Appeals Code (CBJ 01.50), the CBJ Charter, and relevant	
22 23	case law from the Alaska Supreme Court.	
23 24	The appeal was timely filed; the Assembly accepted the appeal and appointed Assemblymember Karen Crane as Presiding Officer; a pre-hearing conference was held with the parties at which Secon	
27	was allowed to intervene as an appellee; and a briefing schedule was set. Motions were filed by the	
25	was allowed to intervene as an appellee: and a b	riefing schedule was set Motions were filed by the
25 26		
25 26 27	parties and decided by the Presiding Officer reg	riefing schedule was set. Motions were filed by the arding the final content of the record on appeal; all gument was conducted at which all parties provided

1	argument as to why the Commission's decision should be affirmed, modified, or reversed. The		
2	Assembly met twice in closed session to deliberate. <sup>1</sup>		
3	II. Issues on Appeal.		
4	By motion decided by the Presiding Officer, the issues on appeal were modified from Appellant's		
5	Notice of Appeal pursuant to CBJ 01.50.050(a)(2), and are set forth below:		
6 7	1. The proposed mining project is not compatible with the surrounding neighborhood due to noise, intensity, and resulting property damage.		
7 8 9	2. Evidence of vibration damage to homes from past gravel extraction activities, and resulting loss of property value, was presented at the hearing. Planning Commissioners failed to adequately consider this evidence and provided inadequate safeguards when the permit was approved.		
10	3. Relevant public testimony was not adequately considered by Planning Commissioners.		
11	2 <b>III. Burden of Proof and Standard of Review.</b> 2 CBJ 01.50.070, Standard of review and burden of proof, provides:		
12			
13 14	(a) The appeal agency or the hearing officer may set aside the decision being appealed		
15 16	(1) The appellant establishes that the decision is not supported by substantial evidence in light of the whole record, as supplemented at the hearing;		
17	(2) The decision is not supported by adequate written findings or the findings fail to inform the appeal agency or the hearing officer of the basis upon which the decision appealed from was made; or		
18 19	(3) The appeal agency or the hearing officer failed to follow its own procedures or otherwise denied procedural due process to one or more of the parties.		
20	(b) The burden of proof is on the appellant.		
21	//		
22	//		
23	//		
24	//		
25	<sup>1</sup> The Open Meetings Act does not apply to governmental bodies performing a quasi-judicial function.		
26	AS 44.62.310(d)(1).		
27	Michael A. Dau and Cindy Dau v. CBJ Planning Commission and Secon (Colaska, Inc.) Decision on Appeal Page 2		

## IV. Conclusion.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

11

12

13

14

15

The CBJ Charter, Section 3.12(f)(1), provides: "The prevailing vote of at least five members shall be required for official action." In this case, after briefing by the parties, oral argument, and two substantial sessions of deliberation on the question, the Assembly was unable to reach a prevailing vote of at least five members on a decision resolving this appeal.

Accordingly, with no official action by the Assembly to set aside or modify the Commission's decision under CBJ 01.50.070, the appeal is deemed denied.

8 This is a final administrative decision of the City and Borough of Juneau. It may be appealed if 9 such an appeal is filed pursuant to the Alaska Rules of Court with the Juneau Superior Court *within 30* 10 *days* from the date it is distributed to the parties.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated this 12 day of June, 2013.

Municipal Clerk

ASSEMBLY OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

mren Crane, Presiding Officer

16

17 18

19

20

21 Distributed:

Attest:

Laurie J. Sica.

22 23 24

25

26

27 Michael A. Dau and Cindy Dau v. CBJ Planning Commission and Secon (Colaska, Inc.) Decision on Appeal

13/2013 to Dan's + Secon CDD staff + Assembly via email. FIM