

**Lemon Creek Area Plan
Steering Committee
Meeting Minutes
Gruening Park Rec Room**

April 20, 2017 at 6pm

Steering Committee Members:

Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair	Dave Hanna
Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission Liaison - LATE	Mark Pusich
Tom Chard	
Daniel Collison – VIA phone	NOT PRESENT
Wayne Coogan	Stephen Johnson, Chair
Sandra Coon	Patrick Quigley
Susan Erben	Michael Short

Staff:

Jill Maclean, Senior Planner AICP, CDD	Rob Steedle, Director, CDD
Teri Camery, Senior Planner, CDD	Alexandra Pierce, Project Manager, P&R
Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant, CDD	

Members of the Public:

Chuck Caldwell	Carol Fleek
Amy Sumner	Bill Fleek
Dylan Quigley	Gretchen Pikul
Marcy Larson	

I. Roll Call (6:00pm)

Completed at 6:08

II. Approval of Minutes; March 16, 2017 and March 30, 2017

Mr. Pusich moved to approve the March 16, 2017 minutes

Mr. Coogan seconded

Ms. Erben – friendly motion to add the written testimony as an attachment to the minutes.

Mr. Pusich accepts

Mr. Hanna – friendly motion to correct on p 2 editing “housing” not “hosing”

Mr. Lukshin – friendly motion to correct Llewellen Lechancy’s name

Passed, as amended, with unanimous consent

Mr. Hanna moved to approve the March 30, 2017 minutes

Mr. Coogan seconded

Ms. Erben – friendly motion to add written comments to the record

Mr. Hanna accepted

Ms. Erben – friendly motion to add the comment made at the end of that meeting “Ms. Erben stated that she thought the meeting went really well and that it was easier to keep comments under two minutes than she thought, and that she didn’t think motion [with speaking time restrictions] was necessary; people could just try to keep their comments to the two minutes.”

Mr. Hanna accepted

Ms. Coon wondered if staff had addressed Mr. Edwards comments from the last meeting.

Ms. Maclean stated that staff made changes in the chapter that reflected his comments

Mr. Lukshin called the question

Motion carried – Mr. Chard abstained

III. Discuss Tabled Motion – Speaking Time Limits (10 minutes)

Mr. Hanna moved to enact the following rules: (tabled from previous meeting)

Members wishing to speak on a subject or to a motion will restrict their speaking time to two minutes. Time will be kept by a person appointed by the chair.

Unless they are out of order, speakers will not be interrupted.

All members will be given a chance to speak at which point members will then be given one minute for rebuttal or additional comments.

Speaking time is not bankable. You may not speak to one minute at first and have two minutes for follow up. If you choose not to speak on the first round you will have a minute at the follow up period.

Chair will appoint a monitor to track on paper who speaks on a subject. Whose turn to speak first will rotate with each new subject.

The chair will use the agenda to determine discussion topics.

Mr. Hanna spoke to his motion: it seemed that the last meeting went well without rigid rules, but even after we deducted the discussion on this motion we went an hour longer than planned – there is a need for this motion.

Ms. Erben brought written testimony (see attached)

All paused to read

Mr. Lukshin gave staff a moment to comment

Mr. Coogan: thanks for the comments – Roberts Rules of Order are there to give equity, this suggestion is not severe and we need some more order and need to get the work done

Mr. Collison felt that most of the meeting went well last time generally observing the 2 minute rule, doesn't see the need for this restriction – for many steering committee members this is the first time in a body like this, I like the idea of restricting to 2 minutes, but don't think it's needed at this time based on the last meeting

Mr. Lukshin can appreciate where Mr. Hanna is coming from, but does not support the motion.

Discussion is important, and hopes to keep the meeting moving as the chair. Appreciate the idea, but can't support the motion

Mr. Pusich: this motion is a culmination. Nervous that the meetings could devolve again and it sounds like everyone can work with this proposed change

Mr. Lukshin clarifies; we didn't really operate like this at the past meeting

Mr. Pusich was it timed?

Ms. McKibben had a timer and raised her hand to mark times throughout the meeting. For the most part people were within the two minutes

Mr. Hanna asked to call the question

Mr. Lukshin called question

Motion carries

aye – Mr. Hanna, Mr. Chard, Mr. Pusich, Mr. Coogan –
nay – Mr. Collison, Mr. Lukshin, Ms. Erben
Ms. McKibben will keep time for this meeting

Mr. Chard moves to approve the agenda with a slight adjustment to allow for public comment on the Neighborhoods & Housing chapter now. Other comment would remain at item VIII.

Motion carries – unanimous consent

IV. Approve Neighborhoods & Housing Goal 2 Action 1 (10 minutes)

4.5 – PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Public did not have any comments – Mr. Lukshin gave a quick outline of the status of approving the chapter

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of fixes in the chapter from the previous meeting – all goals and actions except Goal 2 Action 1 were approved.

Mr. Hanna moved to accept the Neighborhoods & Housing chapter as amended with the changes in the narrative and the goal as stated

Mr. Coogan seconded

Mr. Coogan – friendly motion page 15 goal 2, change the word equitable to equivalent.

Mr. Collison if we change that word to equivalent are we mandating something that we can't follow up on? – equitable can be fair and reasonable

Mr. Coogan amended to keep the word "equitable" and change the following word to "with" (not equitable to)

Mr. Lukshin asked Ms. McKibben if she had any advice on the wording

Ms. McKibben stated that it doesn't make a lot of difference

Mr. Voelckers agreed with Mr. Coogan's friendly amendment

Mr. Voelckers – friendly motion to add the word "new" directly after "develop" at the beginning of the action.

Mr. Hanna accepted both friendly amendments

Ms. Erben expressed confusion about D5 zoning at Vista Del Sol

Ms. Maclean clarified that that subdivision was zoned in the past and thus, cannot be altered at this time, the idea is to move forward with more dense housing

Mr. Collison – friendly motion to change the beginning of the action to read "Develop targets for new housing"

Mr. Hanna accepted the friendly motion

Mr. Lukshin called the question

Motion carried – unanimously

V. Discuss Design Workshop Output – Prioritize Items (20 minutes)

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of the output from the workshop including a prioritized list of future projects for the area. Mr. Voelckers added to overview explaining that this information could

inform a graphic if the committee decides that is what it wants. This is a call for the committee to decide what it would like to see in the graphic before production begins.

Mr. Collison: if we are giving input on this prioritization why isn't the prioritization in the chapter? And should there be an action item about further neighborhood discussion on recreational activities?

Ms. Maclean didn't want to assume that the committee would want these items as actions. Hopefully the future discussions regarding recreational activities will be taken up in the Parks and Recreation Master Plan or other plans – could have more discussion in further contexts, but not for the Lemon Creek Steering Committee

Mr. Collison stated that the charrette should be at least included in the plan, perhaps as an appendix perhaps with a goal to follow up further

Ms. Maclean clarified that the results of the charrette will be in an appendix to the plan. This list would also be an appendix of the plan. Right now we are asking for some direction on how to create a graphic if that is desired.

Mr. Chard if this is in an appendix – items that are included in chapters could be highlighted or cross referenced where they are located in the body of the plan

Mr. Voelckers wonders if a couple of items may create tension. Basically the graphic holds most or all of these items, but won't show prioritization, but we can also have the narrative so we know what is coming.

Mr. Hanna advocated for a graphic with this list of priorities referenced as Mr. Chard suggested above as an appendix. He does not see a need to prioritize these as a body, but the document should be a part of the document

Mr. Coogan sought clarification about what the X's on the graphic meant. Mr. Voelckers explained that the X's were indicators of how many of the four tables at the Charette came up with the same ideas. Mr. Coogan clarified further that the more X's an item had, the more support it had.

Mr. Coogan wants to know if there will be another time to revisit this list and possible graphic

Ms. Maclean stated that now is the time to discuss and decide

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of chapters for the full plan

Mr. Hanna encouraged having a disclaimer that this came from public input at the design charrette, and note that the Steering Committee did not prioritize these items (unless in chapters –ed. note)

Mr. Collison asked if there should there be a narrative that goes with this charrette information? Can the graphic identify which items were more popular?

Mr. Voelckers clarified that the decision is about if the committee wants to own this information or stick it in as an anecdotal, incidental thing. There is more power if it is adopted by the committee. Most of the items are less controversial; many suggestions had been raised before the charrette so we can choose which parts we want to codify as part of the committee

Mr. Coogan is the charrette product meant to apply to our whole work product or just to the Recreation section?

Mr. Voelckers stated that the drawing would be comprehensive; the information falls generally under a few chapters

Mr. Lukshin suggested that it could go into public participation chapter

Ms. Coon suggested the committee codify this information. Mr. Chard agreed and stated that of these items there are ones already included in our chapters, if we list them like we talked about earlier, it would show how much we, as a committee, value them.

Ms. Erben stated that it is important to show that we are listening to the public and to preserve the public record as it was produced

Mr. Chard moved to cross reference the work in the summary table to work in each chapter

Mr. Hanna seconded

Mr. Lukshin – friendly motion to add this product to the public participation chapter

Mr. Chard accepted the friendly amendment

Mr. Pusich – friendly motion to include the four graphics from the charrette

Mr. Chard accepted the friendly amendment

Mr. Coogan – friendly motion to change title to say “how the charrette output is integrated with the plan”

Ms. Maclean clarified that the section will have a paragraph that will portray that information

Mr. Coogan withdrew his motion

Mr. Collison asked what weight do we put on this? Suggesting that we create an action item that this process is continued – if that happens where would that action item be?

Mr. Chard stated that once we go through the exercise of cross referencing – we will see which items are not included and decide what we want to do from there. We can decide if we want to incorporate them at that time, or if they are not a priority

Mr. Lukshin added that there will be a chance to review the public participation later as well

Mr. Collison stated that he sees the charrette as the beginning of a longer process and would like to say we support and advocate the continuation of the charrette process. Mr. Chard stated his agreement.

Mr. Collison asked Ms. Maclean where such an action item would be.

Ms. Maclean stated that after the Lemon Creek Area Plan is adopted, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan will be continuing and could be a good place to continue this process; this plan will inform that plan.

Mr. Lukshin called the question

Motion carried – unanimous

Mr. Voelckers clarified that the committee has not resolved if there will be a final graphic to codify these but this doesn't have to be decided now.

VI. Natural Resources & Recreation Chapter

a. Discuss the chapter (30 minutes)

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of the chapter and goals

Mr. Lukshin invited public participation

Chuck Caldwell – Vice President of Trout Unlimited, and the Chair of the Habitat Improvement Committee. Likes p 6, but it talks about headwaters of Switzer creek etc. The headwaters are great, but they are blocked so that the anadromous fish cannot get to the headwaters. A

- 50 foot buffer may not be enough depending on the conditions of the creek – dislikes the term minimal in this context.
- Amy Sumner** is with Juneau Watershed Partnership, a nonprofit that works throughout CBJ to protect streams. Also on p 6 Vanderbilt creek is listed as impaired for residues, would like more attention drawn to that. Wondered why the wetland information is from previous wetland plans. Ms. Camery clarified that the new wetland plan has not yet been approved, it is currently in draft form. The current update to the wetland plan focuses on CBJ land. Ms. Sumner encourages that the new information be incorporated in this chapter. Additionally the goals to protect and maintain natural resources focus on Switzer but an action to help recover impaired water bodies would be a good addition, these do address some of these impairments, but it may be a better more broad way. Suggest the committee might look at the Juneau Watershed Partnerships website for a list of ideas for mitigation
- Marcy Larson** from Alaska Brewing Company pointed out that to headings on p 5 were switched. Had some concerns about verbiage: Lemon Creek trail isn't really talked about but it's an important resource to scientific research and should be incorporated.
- Dilan Quigley** echoed Ms. Larson above that the introduction doesn't include the Lemon Creek trail, which is a federal trail. He would like to see Lemon and Vanderbilt creeks included in Goal 1 along with Switzer creek.
- Ms. Maclean brought the committee's attention to a written document that committee member Patrick Quigley submitted in absentia which shared some of the concerns that Mr. Quigley voiced.
- Mr. Chard brought up other plans that are going on right now, such as the update to the wetlands plan. He proposed that we might have a call out box that points to other plans that might further Lemon Creek Plans
- Mr. Pusich suggested a change to the graphic on p 3 maybe try to identify the parks – perhaps some hatching or boundaries around current parks and recreation areas. He also stated his appreciation for Mr. Quigley's comments on Vanderbilt creek as an impaired water body – good to support the corridor and the wetlands associated with it
- Mr. Coogan asked for clarification about the goals and actions
- Ms. Maclean explained that once a chapter is approved we will draft in the other columns which would identify responsible parties, timeframes, and funding. These could be CBJ or other entities
- Mr. Coogan expressed concern about cost to the city and who should be responsible for each of these actions.
- Mr. Lukshin asked for any editorial comments on the narrative
- Mr. Hanna would like to change some verbiage in the history section: gravel mining has been happening "intermittently" since the early 60's. He also suggested staff make changes that were noted earlier from public comment.
- Mr. Collison, looking at p 12 gravel extraction, suggested that if it is used for flood abatement it should be noted. Ms. Camery clarified that flood abatement is one of many reasons for the extraction and is not the key reason. Mr. Collison suggested that it still be referenced.
- Mr. Voelckers spoke about p 8: the public value and cherish the wetlands and homes that are so close. It could be worth adding how valued they are by the residents and amplify that they're important buffers.
- Ms. Erben agreed with Mr. Voelckers, and with the public comments, adding lemon and Vanderbilt creeks to Switzer is important. She suggested that on p 8 there be a list of all important studies. Storm water drainage is important to reference as well as other items

- stated above. Would like to see a view shed between pinewood and Gruening Park discussed as well as small neighborhood parks.
- Mr. Lukshin noted that Kingfisher Park (listed on p 3) has no parking lot
- Ms. Pierce clarified that Kingfisher Park is on JPD land and not an official park.
- Mr. Lukshin brought up p8 which discusses various classes of wetlands – would there be value of color coding value of wetlands?
- Ms. Camery noted that the 2008 plan which classified wetlands like above is still in effect, however we can no longer enforce these because the code regulations no longer align with federal law.
- Mr. Lukshin if it's not enforceable why do we have it?
- Ms. Camery – it needs to be changed in a large code upgrade
- Ms. Maclean – there have been revisions that haven't been added yet.
When we talk about relevant plans and studies we have looked at CBJ studies, Ms. Erben had talked about further studies and thought we should include them here – what does the group think about including these without a full review?
- Mr. Chard wondered about how to include existing plans, some may be incorporated, and some might just be referenced
- Ms. Coon would like to have drafts dated so everyone can know they're looking at the correct version
- Mr. Chard appreciate public comment – suggests we follow up on Ms. Sumner's info.
- Ms. Camery stated that there are an unlimited list of plans that could be cited, and asked how far does the committee want to take it this document?
- Ms. Maclean suggested that the plan might include websites with lists of plans for further reference
- Ms. Erben emphasized that it is good to have more plans to use as a tool and as resources since we're not experts.
- Mr. Hanna echoed Ms. Maclean's comment to put links to agencies or organizations but stated that there are too many plans and studies to incorporate.
- Mr. Collison regarding Kingfisher pond: is that part of a wetlands mitigation effort? If so let's reference that
- Ms. Camery stated that she didn't think it is part of an effort but would be happy to re-check
- Ms. Pierce clarified that there has been some talk about reviving Kingfisher as a park; there is quite a bit of beaver activity there and the park is in disrepair.
- Ms. Maclean stated that staff would address the issues that were expressed above in the next version of the chapter

b. Discuss the goals and actions (45 minutes)

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of goal 1

- Mr. Pusich suggested adding "Best Management Practices" after storm water in the 4th action
- Ms. Coon requested clarification of the term "permanently protect" listed in action 2. The committee and staff clarified this statement.
- Mr. Voelckers suggested the term "re-plat" instead of "consolidate" in action 2
- Ms. Erben suggested staff differentiate between Switzer Creek which is not impaired and others that are impaired. She would like to see an action that would work toward Lemon and Vanderbilt creeks coming off the impaired list. She would like to address the view shed in an action and include Mr. Caldwell's comments (above) about stream buffer size. Additionally she would like to add other wetland assessments. She noted that Goal 1 only talks about

water and wondered about other natural resources, trails for example, would be a good addition. Mr. Lukshin suggested trails might fit in goal three.

Mr. Coogan asked who owns the lots and what their value is. Ms. Maclean answered that the CBJ owns the lots and they are currently controlled by Parks and Recreation. They are designated as wetlands and are thus, not buildable. Ms. Pierce added that as part of the Parks and Recreation Master Plan that is currently under way, the Parks and Recreation Department has been asked to look at the natural area parkland and identify parkland that could be disposed to Lands & Resources and dispose of those parcels. This will be addressed in the upcoming plan.

Mr. Lukshin wondered if the committee could get more information about a log culvert that was mentioned was at the headwaters of Switzer creek. Ms. Camery stated that she will follow up on this question.

Mr. Lukshin wondered why our buffer is a maximum of 50 feet. Ms. Camery clarified that the CBJ doesn't have an ordinance that allows enforcement of a buffer larger than 50 feet (there is one exception that has a larger buffer which is on city property). Mr. Lukshin suggested that this be noted in the document. Mr. Hanna added that when he was on the Wetlands Review Board the committee agonized over how to allow for more variability. He suggested that on action 3 we could say "make science based decisions" instead of "ensure full enforcement". Ms. Erben suggested that this action should also say "at least 50 foot buffer".

Ms. Erben posed questions about the parcels cited in action 2. Ms. Maclean clarified that the CBJ would like to re-plat these parcels so they are consolidated.

Mr. Chard suggested adding "enhance" or "restore" to goal 1 to highlight bettering impaired natural resources.

Goal 2

Mr. Hanna wanted to make sure the plan would preserve gravel extraction as a possibility.

Mr. Chard suggested changing the wording "(water body)" in action 1. He also posited that in action 4 the term "conditions" is not adequate maybe "exploring options and enhancing conditions" would be a good change. Mr. Voelckers second Mr. Chard's comments on action 4.

Ms. Erben suggested that action 1 highlight plant and animal life in addition to the water body and to add "and possible truck rerouting" to action 4.

Mr. Coogan would like an additional action item "ensure that the lemon creek dredging operation continues consistently for the sake of flood control"

Mr. Lukshin agreed that flood control should be highlighted, and added that covered loads may be a good idea to add to action 4.

Mr. Chard asked if highlighting the flooding issue this in this plan could create a hardship for borrowing money to purchase property in the future. It would not. Ms. Erben asked further question on flooding and the gravel extraction site, Ms. Camery stated that the planning commission hasn't made its gravel mining determinations with flood control benefit in mind.

Mr. Collison suggested that the plan acknowledge that using the quarry for flood mitigation is added to the narrative since it has been a point of discussion. Pointed out that if there is an action to preserve gravel extraction and other actions saying that the extraction will not harm the creek could be in opposition. Suggested using terminology such as "science based" and clarify that determinations should include effects to the environment.

Ms. Maclean gave some background on the creek and how things are currently mitigated. Stated staff will look at changing "ensure" in the actions.

Goal 3

Mr. Chard pointed out that the Parks and Recreation Department is working on their plan which will probably have action items, he asked if these action items live in parks plan? Ms. Maclean clarified that the steering committee is about a year ahead of the Parks and Recreation plan. Any information contained in the Lemon Creek Area Plan will help inform the Parks and Recreation plan.

Mr. Chard would like to highlight the path along lemon creek for bike and pedestrian activity

Mr. Pusich echoed Mr. Chard about thinking about the Parks and Recreation plan. He is concerned about trail access issues and specific points that need improvements. He suggested that the park inside the lemon creek neighborhood could use some help.

Discussion ensued on this topic, it was stated that the park is mostly well maintained, but could use some tree trimming to allow more light, a fence may need repair also.

Mr. Collison would like to add to the end of action 1 “with continued input from Lemon Creek residents and stakeholders and consistent with efforts to develop a parks and rec plan”. He would like to strike “boardwalk” in action 2. Ms. Pierce explained that the current wording is consistent with Trail Mix who maintains our trails. Trail Mix has been moving away from boardwalks, but she suggested we don’t limit their ability to maintain trails here.

Ms. Coon noted that during the charrette new trails were identified as possibilities. Hope parks looks at that.

Ms. Pierce we’ve received a lot of comments in this area – need to update the Juneau trails plan.

Mr. Voelckers we have an action item for almost all of the top 7 charrette – missing the bike trail. May want to add. Strong chance to influence parks plan – especially if it’s specific.

Ms. Erben echo that (bike). Could we get a picture?

Ms. Maclean – will email again.

Ms. Erben would like to see charrette comments. New action item on establishing other neighborhood parks like Churchill or Switzer, mobile home parks as well. Be more specific here.

Mr. Coogan action item of cutting trees in the park. Add a line “ensure that we maintain these trails for the safety of those who use them” (redundant).

Mr. Lukshin 3 add marker to identify it as a park – identify where to park. Linkage non pedestrian routes from downtown. Highlight private developers who have private parks. (kudos)

Mr. Hanna work to ensure that future developments ensure connectivity between natural areas.

Mr. Chard specificity is beneficial. Might want to review these for specificity throughout document. May only want to include future actions as action items (not redundancies or things that should already be happening)

Ms. Pierce – parks plan is looking at these plans and where specific suggestions were put forth. Parks is a higher level document t- may not get into such detail – but will cite these documents in the master plan – Lemon Creek document is the place to put details of what you want.

VII. Public Participation (15 minutes)

Conducted above

VIII. Review Order of Upcoming Meetings (3 minutes)

April 27 wrap up of the Natural Resources and Recreation chapter

May 11 start the Economic Development chapter

Lemon Creek Steering Committee

Minutes

April 20, 2017

Page 10 of 10

May 18 wrap up the Economic Development chapter

Ms. Maclean gave details on the process of finalizing the plan

Mr. Chard requested Ms. Maclean send out the full timeline in an email

Mr. Pusich move to adjourn

Mr. Hanna second

Motion carried unanimously

IX. Adjournment at 9:08 PM

Comments on the Tabled Motion on Speaking Time Limits

from Susan Erben, 4-20-17

First, there is nothing set in stone that CBJ Steering Committees need to follow Robert's Rules of Order. Some people, including at least one CBJ planner, prefer a process that is less formal than Robert's Rules. But, of course, we voted as a group to follow Robert's Rules during our first committee meeting.

Second, the motion's requirements are substantially stricter than Robert's Rules. The requirements limit people to speak once in a block up to two minutes, and then only one more time in under one minute. It does not allow people to "bank" their time, such as to speak for one minute first, then for two minutes later, or save their speaking time that they didn't use in another motion, and so forth. Even whose turn it is to go first, and what order the speakers will go in is regulated.

I, for one, feed off the ideas of other Steering Committee members, and I believe others do too. Plus, one person's idea often makes a related idea pop into my head. Since I've never been on a committee like this, some of the ideas have never occurred to me. If people mention ideas I think in their last one-minute speaking time, or if I've already had my speaking time (two minutes, then one minute), or if the order of speakers doesn't align with the stars, I would have to sit still and not even express to the group that I like that idea or, other than in the end by casting my vote.

My third point is the most important. There are a good portion of LC Steering Committee members who have considerable experience being on boards and committees, and have operated under Robert's Rules for years. Many of those same Steering Committee members are very familiar with land use designations, the city's land use process, what's permissible when, land use in general, and so forth.

At the same time, there are also a good portion of LC Steering Committee members who have little, or no experience being on a CBJ board or committee, and have little or no experience dealing with a strict adherence to Robert's Rules. A good portion of the Steering Committee members came to the committee with little or no experience with land use designations and the city's land use process in general.

Many members in this latter group, including myself, have continually asked for clarification about Robert's Rules, and how something should be done during the meeting to follow the Robert's Rules process. At times, I have thrown an idea out to the group, and asked the other members how that idea would be best phrased in a motion. (Other members of this group have done that too, and people pitched in to help.)

The Steering Committee members who are veterans with boards, committees, Robert's Rules and land-use issues are primarily the industry/commercial business owners on the Steering Committee.

The Steering Committee members who have little or no experience with boards, committees, Robert's Rules and land-use issues are Lemon Creek homeowners.

If we as the Lemon Creek Steering Committee pass this motion to limit speaking times that is substantially stricter than Robert's Rules, the results of the Steering Committee at the end of our work on the Steering Committee will be skewed in favor of industry/commercial business owners, to the detriment of Lemon Creek homeowners.

Motion for rules of speaking at Lemon Creek Steering Committee Meetings

Members wishing to speak on a subject or to a motion will restrict their speaking time to two minutes. Time will be kept by a person appointed by the chair.

Unless they are out of order, speakers will not be interrupted.

All members will be given a chance to speak at which point members will then be given one minute for rebuttal or additional comments.

Speaking time is not bankable. You may not speak to one minute at first and have two minutes for follow up. If you choose not to speak on the first round you still have a minute at the follow up period.

Chair will appoint a monitor to track on paper who speaks on a subject. Who's turn to speak first will rotate with each new subject.

The chair will use the agenda to determine discussion topics.

Jill and Allison,

Unfortunately I will be in Anchorage and cannot attend tomorrow's meeting on Natural Resources and Recreation.

I have read the Narrative you sent out and the Lemon Creek Charette Output chart. There is a lot of stuff to ponder and, if enacted, would certainly result in a higher quality of life in the Lemon Creek Area.

What dismay's me is the continued once over lightly attention paid to the opportunities and limitations of what should be done in the Vanderbilt Creek Watershed in terms of preservation and enhancement of the natural resources and recreational opportunities in the area e.g.

1. **Fish.** Vanderbilt Creek has been listed as an "impaired water body" since 1990. It is about time that significant progress is made in getting Vanderbilt, Switzer, and Lemon Creek, "unimpaired." A vote should be taken to this effect in the committee and added to the Goals and Objectives section if the committee sees fit.

I don't see anything in the materials provided that suggest that the Vanderbilt Creek Watershed should be seen as important in the same way that the Switzer Creek watershed is described. I don't see it as less important. I would make an Action motion to Goal 1 to go right below the Switzer Creek one i.e."Preserve, protect and enhance the Vanderbilt Creek watershed; specifically ensure that Vanderbilt Creek stream buffers remain undisturbed." [**It should be noted that significant infractions of stream buffer setbacks have and are occurring at several locations along Vanderbilt Creek at the present time.**]

2. **Fish and rehab of Glacier Highway this summer.** The culverts across from Western Auto are crucial to fish migration to reach rearing habitat in Vanderbilt Creek and are totally inadequate and need replacement at the present time. There us also a problem with stormwater drainage flowing directly into Vanderbilt Creek at these culvert locations. If the committee so desires, I would recommend somebody make a motion to ask DOT what there plans are in relation to these issues and see if some progress can't be made since construction along Glacier Highway is imminent. An opportunity to do something now exists and will not come again for perhaps a decade or more.

3. **Recreation. Trails.** The lower reach of the Lemon Creek Trail from Glacier Highway to Home Depot is part of a Federal Trail which has been in existence for several decades now. Part of It passes thru CBJ owned land that is currently designated as a greenbelt, CBJ Natural Park area and a salmon stream corridor. This whole lower stretch of the Lemon Creek Trail is also a significant wildlife corridor. A discussion needs to occur in terms of what these CBJ designations actually mean in terms of intentions to preserve and enhance the natural resources and recreational opportunities in the area.

4. **Wetlands.** There seem to be no end to studies showing that there are high quality wetlands in the Vanderbilt Creek Watershed. These wetlands have greatly diminished over time but, amazingly enough, the Vanderbilt Creek Watershed is still relatively intact along its eastern

boundaries. It should be seen as the highest and best use of the remaining watershed that it remain intact and conform to the sentiments in the Comprehensive Plan to “reserve wetlands and tidelands in public ownership for fish and wildlife habitat and open space/natural areas.”

5.Parks. There is a consensus on the committee, I believe, that thinks it is obvious that not enough useable park space exists in the Lemon Creek Area. Depending on the outcome of the SEAL negotiations and how the CBJ decides to use its existing public lands in the watershed, the opportunity to create more public parklands exists but I don't think I have ever heard anyone put forth any vision of what this could be. It is time to do so.

Since there is a taboo on me sending this email directly to Steering Committee members and communication has to go thru you, would it be appropriate for you to give this email to the committee yourself at the meeting?

Sincerely,

Patrick Quigley

Hi Jill,

Several things:

- 1. I cant be at meeting on the 20th.**
- 2. Feel that the dump line in Charette's Design feature item 14 (Dump) should be # 1**
- 3. As part of the resources (i.e. gravel) CBJ should use the gravel depositions available in "Area 3 " in the housing section. Grooming the area for disposal for housing after the gravel is extracted and used/sold**
- 4. There is a business that uses the water from a spring in area 3 (I think) and this water rights needs to be addressed before development.**

I am happy with the work done on Goal 2 action 1 so my vote is to accept.

Also the committee should hedge our proposal/plan language to limit ourselves to lemon creek if we somehow force other cbj compliance by language oversight. (Waynes concern at last meeting)