

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

April 27, 2017 at 6pm

Steering Committee Members:

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

Staff:

Jill Maclean, Senior Planner AICP, CDD	Allison Eddins, Planner I, CDD
Teri Camery, Senior Planner, CDD	
Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant, CDD	Alexander Pierce, Project Manager, P&R

Agenda:

I. Roll Call (6:00 pm)

Ms. Maclean brought up a request to discuss a stretch of private lots adjoining Mr. Heuman's property near the jail. Mr. Heuman has concerns along Davis Avenue and wants debris and litter cleaned up. He has been trying to get city to address this issue. Mr. Coogan stated that Mr. Heuman wants to have an action that talks about this issue in the document. Ms. Maclean suggested the committee strengthen an applicable action in the Land Use chapter.

Mr. Chard moved to address this issue now

Mr. Lukshin seconded the motion

Motion carried unanimously

Mr. Chard would like to consider an action item of having a cleanup day, with a truck etc. to clean up the neighborhood. Mr. Coogan suggested the committee might want to list these areas specifically in the plan. Mr. Voelckers agreed with Mr. Coogan's suggestion.

Mr. Lukshin moved to add an action item in the Land Use chapter "to clean up the blighted properties along lemon Creek Road, Church Street, and between Anka Street and Tonsgard Court along Glacier Highway

Mr. Chard seconded the motion

Mr. Chard had concerns about the timeline of the plan and if 5 years from now there is another block in disrepair which won't be listed on this plan since this action highlights only specific areas – could we choose more general language that would apply more broadly? Mr. Coogan stated that these places have been blighted for so long that even 10 years wouldn't be that long in the scope of them, more interested in being specific and giving something to act on and prioritize since this hasn't improved.

Mr. Lukshin agreed with Mr. Coogan. Mr. Chard expressed his hope to operate in thinking that these things will be addressed and then we can move on. Ms. Maclean suggested the committee could add a specific action as well as some stronger general language on a previously approved action item. Mr. Coogan suggested the committee change the language as Ms. Maclean suggested, and add a parenthetical with examples. This leaves the task general but the specific examples will highlight those areas that need more work. Mr. Johnson calls the question

Carried unanimous

Mr. Voelckers stated that there might be a separate debate about an executive summary for this document that could hit the 10 main action items could make them stronger.

II. Approval of Minutes April 20, 2017 (5 minutes)

Minutes from the 4/20 meeting were not yet available.

III. Review and Approve the Natural Resources & Recreation Chapter, Goals, Actions (30 minutes)

Mr. Johnson outlined that the committee will go over the chapter first then continue to goals and actions

Mr. Short recommended that the history section on p2 change the term “flood plain” to “river delta”. Ms. Camery stated that it is listed as a floodplain for regulatory purposes. Mr. Hanna clarified that the delta is the whole area, and only one part of it is the floodplain, the committee could clarify the two in the document. Ms. Erben asked if the committee should say both to avoid any regulatory or informational issues, Ms. Maclean replied that it will probably not affect anything regulatory. Mr. Coogan suggested striking the floodplain or delta language, Mr. Hanna suggested using “river delta” in the first instance and “floodplain” in the second.

Mr. Lukshin moved to change the first use of “floodplain” to “river delta” in the second paragraph under history.

Mr. Hanna seconded

Motion carried unanimously

Ms. Erben suggested putting the year each trail was founded next to each trail to give historical weight to their age, and also cross reference to history chapter. Mr. Lukshin stated that without knowing the data it could be hard to add this here, and also stated that if this is done here it should be done in the whole document and that seems unfeasible. Mr. Coogan was not clear why this was being reiterated, seems like a lot of duplication. Ms. Erben stated that she was happy to find the history to add it to this document.

Mr. Quigley clarified that the Lemon Creek Trail is listed as being maintained by the Forest Service which is not quite accurate; Trail Mix works here as well – they ought to be included here. Ms. Pierce suggested the committee stay away from who maintains trails, could just say whose land they are on (one or some). Trial mix was created to work on trails maintained by city, state, and federal land, the committee could explain Trail Mix or simplify and leave reference to it out of the document.

Mr. Lukshin moved to explain the relationship between Trial Mix and trails in the area on the second page of the chapter

Ms. Erben seconded

Mr. Chard voiced concern that there are many associations that contribute to communities, doesn't think that this plan is necessarily the place to explain this. Mr. Lukshin agreed that not a lot of info is needed, but a bit would be good.

Mr. Johnson – friendly motion to add the term “currently” before “trail mix”

Mr. Lukshin accepted the amendment

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carried, Mr. Chard and Mr. Coogan opposed

Mr. Short would like to include language about how trails cross private property etc.

Mr. Hanna pointed out that the Lemon Creek trail has two trailheads

Mr. Coogan suggested that going forward the committee make one motion for a whole page after discussion

Mr. Johnson move to change the language on p 2 as discussed above

Mr. Chard seconds

Motion carries unanimous – Mr. Coogan opposed

Mr. Chard page 4, paragraph 2 grammar check. Ms. Maclean added parks/greenspace to title. Added some more information. Ms. Camery made a small edit on initialisms. Mr. Voelckers asked that the committee consider the last paragraph could be its own paragraph with a “public workshop” heading so it can be found easily. Mr. Chard stated that the last paragraph on p4 is confusing, maybe have an ending “so, we’ve addressed that in the actions” or something like that.

Mr. Coogan suggested adding a sentence to the parkland area “it should be acknowledged that the entire neighborhood is sitting in what could be considered natural parkland”. Ms. Erben opposed this suggestion, that description applies to the whole borough, but some people want a swing set park. She would like to put number of people who participated in the charrette to add some weight to that section. Mr. Johnson stated his preference to state that the charrette was well attended and public, keep exact numbers out. Mr. Hanna if we make that charrette area a separate pp the two paragraphs address all of the things we were just discussing. If we want to add those that’s fine, but what we have works well.

Mr. Coogan stated that Juneau’s situation is not a fair comparison from to other places such as Los Angeles because we’re so close to natural forests all the time. Mr. Chard liked what Mr. Hanna said because it talks to access, we’re trying to say that the Lemon Creek area lacks parks, could have a sentence of natural beauty all around us as a compromise. Mr. Hanna suggested the paragraph could be changed to add “and enjoys ready access to Tongass National Forest” and have a period after.

Mr. Quigley asked about natural area parks designation. Ms. Pierce explained that natural area parks are separate from “parks” and recommended the committee stay away from the term “natural area”. Mr. Hanna clarified that the plan is asking for developed parks not natural area.

Mr. Johnson moved to approve the page with the changes discussed above.

Mr. Lukshin seconded

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of edits discussed

Carried unanimous

Mr. Chard asked for an update on Sigoowu Ye Park. Ms. Pierce noted that that the fence is being fixed, the trees are scheduled to be trimmed, and there is a bike rack.

Ms. Erben would like to see picnic tables with a roof that would shield the rain. Ms. Maclean stated that that should be listed as an action item.

Mr. Johnson moved to accept the page

Mr. Lukshin seconded

Motion carried - unanimous

Mr. Hanna suggested the committee insert the word “mainly” before what Vanderbilt creek is being impaired by. Mr. Lukshin stated that all of that is covered in the sentence before. He added that the culvert at the end of Mountain Avenue is important to address. Ms. Erben would like to break the sentence into 3 paragraphs, one for each creek, and then sum it up at the end. Ms. Maclean clarified that the document will be further word smithed later and that this time is meant to focus on the content.

Mr. Short asked if salmon lay eggs in lemon creek, Mr. Hanna answered that some do, but they’re not very successful, however it is used by salmon as a migratory channel and a raising place.

Mr. Short was unclear about what a “perched culvert” is, Mr. Chard suggested adding the definition.

Mr. Chard stated that the URL in first paragraph concerned him since they can frequently change, suggested citing the site.

Mr. Quigley stated that the culverts by western auto impede salmon and that DoT may be planning on addressing this issue. He would like something added in this document about that same issue. Mr. Hanna clarified that those culverts don’t go to Vanderbilt – one is dry, other goes under Chinese restaurant. There was some debate about which culverts impede fish or not. Ms. Maclean stated that she will check with Ms. Sumner and find out. Mr. Johnson suggested the chapter could have an action item about all of these. Ms. Erben suggested the committee could do an inventory and specifically list these.

Mr. Coogan moved to move forward with the above issues – we will readdress culverts in goals and actions

Mr. Lukshin seconded

Motion carried unanimously

Ms. Erben stated that on p8 in the right hand last paragraph, lemon creek is not included. Ms. Camery stated that this paragraph is about wetlands and lemon creek is not affected.

Mr. Lukshin moved to approve the page

Mr. Hanna seconded

Mr. Quigley asked about the numerical categories for the wetlands. Ms. Camery clarified that this categorization is currently in our code but is not in conformance with federal law so it can’t be implemented. Working on a new wetlands management plan that will address that issue.

Motion carried unanimously

Mr. Chard pointed out a current property owner is SECON (first column 3rd sentence). Mr. Voelckers pointed out that SECON is also referenced at end of column. Mr. Coogan asked why we need to mention the owner. Let’s just say private and not list actual owner. Mr. Chard suggested that if it is stricken the committee should still note that it’s private property.

Mr. Chard moved to accept the page as edited with striking the property owner and including that the land is privately owned

Mr. Lukshin seconded

Ms. Erben – friendly motion to include importance of “gravel” mining in blue paragraph

Mr. Chard accepts

Motion carried unanimously

Ms. Erben add to blue “(areas that include lemon creek)”

Mr. Hanna “in the lemon creek area”

Unanimous consent to accept the page

Goals

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of goal one

Mr. Hanna suggested the committee change “correct” – not “restore” in action 2. He also asked if we could add an action under goal 1 that states “Work to ensure that future development allows wildlife connectivity between natural areas” Mr. Voelckers emphasized Mr. Hanna’s point that through corridors are important and that it is good to be specific that they are for wildlife.

Mr. Chard suggested adding “restore and maintain” after “protect” in GOAL 1

Mr. Short asked for clarification on action 3. Ms. Maclean gave some history from last meeting. Mr. Short asked is there an understanding on what the turbidity of lemon creek comes from? It starts at the headwaters – not sure how you’re going to repair it if it starts at the headwaters. Mr. Coogan suggested striking lemon creek from action 3.

Mr. Coogan suggested adding the word “area” after “lemon creek’s” in goal 1. He also suggested the

committee delete item 5 because it is redundant, many other items repeat action 5. Mr. Chard suggested striking the redundancy from each individual item and keep item 5. The committee agreed to **strike item 5**

Ms. Erben suggested adding “at the end of Mountain Avenue” to action 2.

Ms. Camery suggested the committee address culvert issues other than perched.

Ms. Erben suggested adding “and view shed” with pictures of the viewpoints and the view to action 4.

Ms. Maclean replied that this area is listed as a protected area in the document so it’s protected in that respect. Mr. Hanna voiced that this action item is specific enough. Mr. Johnson stated that view sheds can be changed by tree growth etc. so it could be hard to maintain without logging or other changes. Mr. Lukshin asked the committee leave as is, it is currently strong and simple, if Ms. Erben is asking is for enhancements and improvements they may belong in goal 3. Mr. Voelckers said he liked the current language, it achieves what you’re trying to achieve without added complexity.

Ms. Erben would like to add language listing streams/creeks, Mr. Lukshin wondered if the action item already covered this.

Ms. Erben moved to add “lemon, Vanderbilt, and Switzer creeks as well as others” in action 6

Mr. Quigley seconded

Fails – Mr. Quigley, Ms. Erben in favor

Ms. Erben suggested adding the parenthetical “(such as Vanderbilt)” in action 2. Mr. Quigley stated he thought it was going to be dealt with by DOT. Ms. Erben said if there’s no money it might not happen and she would like to highlight Vanderbilt in the plan.

Ms. Erben moved to add a parenthetical to item 2 (i.e. Vanderbilt culverts across from western auto)

Mr. Quigley Second

Motion carried – Mr. Coogan opposed

Ms. Erben moved to add a new action item: “CBJ should work with Juneau watershed project to review the watershed plans for lemon and Vanderbilt creeks and see if they need to be updated and how they can be followed”

Mr. Lukshin second

Ms. Camery appreciated the gesture, but the suggestion is out of CBJ purview; the watershed is a Department of Environmental Control (DEC) document. Ms. Maclean suggested the committee might change the wording to say “advocates for” or “promote”. Ms. Erben asked if the city could ask DEC to put it on a higher priority? Ms. Camery replied that the city could, but the DEC are operating under regulations.

Ms. Erben modified her motion to “CBJ should promote with DEC evaluating and possibly updating watershed plans for Vanderbilt and Switzer creeks”

Mr. Chard voiced his dissent to the wording “CBJ should”.

Mr. Lukshin – friendly motion to remove “CBJ should” and replace with “promote”

Ms. Erben accepted

Mr. Coogan – friendly motion to strike “with DEC”

Ms. Erben accepts

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carried – Mr. Coogan opposed

Mr. Lukshin moved to add an action item: “work to ensure that future development provides wildlife connectivity between natural resources”

Mr. Johnson seconded

Mr. Coogan – friendly motion to replace “ensure” with “consider”

Mr. Lukshin accepted

Ms. Erben against the friendly motion because it weakens the action item. Mr. Lukshin responded that

the committee has to allow for people's rights to develop.

Mr. Hanna – friendly motion to replace “provides” with “allows” and replace “resources” with “areas”

Mr. Lukshin accepted

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carried – unanimous

Mr. Chard moved to add an action item: “remove lemon creek from the impaired waterbodies list”

Ms. Erben second

Mr. Hanna stated that the CBJ doesn't have the authority to do this. The committee could put something in about reducing pollutants, but the creek will probably remain on impaired waterbodies list because of natural turbidity. Mr. Chard suggested changing “remove” to “improve” rather than remove the item. Mr. Hanna suggested instead that the action state “work to improve storm water management in order to improve water quality of lemon creek”

Mr. Chard withdrew his motion

Mr. Lukshin posed a question to Mr. Short: are there any issues that this committee could address on Lemon Creek? Mr. Short replied that there could be better storm water management, lists a number of other items. He suggested that the city stabilize roads and ditch banks.

Mr. Short moved to add an action item “encourage hard surfacing or stabilizing slopes with vegetation and gravel to eliminate erosion affecting lemon creek”

Motion carried – unanimously

Mr. Lukshin move to accept all of the above discussion as amendments to goal 1.

Mr. Chard second

Mr. Chard clarified that this motion encompass all of the discussion and motions

Motion carried – unanimously

GOAL 2

Mr. Lukshin suggested the goal say “area” after “lemon creek's”. Mr. Coogan suggested a change to the goals name “promote responsible resource extraction in the Lemon Creek area”

Ms. Erben suggested adding “(water body)” for clarification, and that watershed best practices are followed to action 1.

Ms. Maclean noted that the previous action on goal one makes the first action item redundant and unnecessary. Mr. Lukshin stated that he thinks the new item in goal 1 speaks to items 1, 2, and 3 in goal 2 so the committee could delete these three items. Mr. Voelckers agreed and added that action 5 could also be stricken since it is covered above. Mr. Chard stated that it is important for Lemon Creek as a community to reiterate their support or emphasis on certain areas – it's ok to have some redundancy for emphasis. Mr. Short stated that the CBJ currently has over 40 conditions to meet in reference to resource extraction and companies report to DEC, Fish and Game, and more. He stated that he appreciated concerns, but through the CBJ conditional use permit process there are opportunities for the public to give feedback and comment.

Mr. Hanna moved to strike action items 1 and 5

Mr. Coogan second

Mr. Lukshin – friendly motion to also delete item 3

Mr. Hanna did not accept the friendly motion

Mr. Coogan – friendly motion strike “potential” in item 6

Mr. Hanna accepted

Mr. Coogan add “(especially below lemon creek bridge)” to the end of item 6

Mr. Hanna not accepted

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carried – Mr. Quigley, and Ms. Erben opposed

Mr. Lukshin moved to insert the word “noise” after “ensure” to item 4

Mr. Chard seconded

Discussion ensued about dust, noise, and related issues

Mr. Lukshin withdraw his motion

Mr. Chard moved to adopt goal 2 as amended

Mr. Lukshin seconded

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carried – Ms. Erben opposed

Mr. Coogan moves to approve goal 3 in entirety

Ms. Erben seconded

Mr. Chard – friendly motion to add something about a community garden

Mr. Coogan accepted

Ms. Erben – friendly motion to add “with compost facility” to the community garden action item

Mr. Coogan accepted

Mr. Lukshin asked a question about the planned roundabout near DZ, he wondered if there is a plan for adding feature there. Ms. Maclean answered that the roundabout is a DOT project coming down the pike.

Mr. Johnson called the question

Motion carried – unanimously

IV. Public Participation (15 minutes)

No public were in attendance

V. Approve Format for Design Workshop Output (20 minutes)

Ms. Maclean gave an overview

General consensus to make a drawing that encompasses a lot of the ideas that have been posited by the public

Some discussion with Mr. Voelckers about how it might go – will be reflected in drawing

Original sketches will be included as an appendix

VI. Review Order of Upcoming Meetings (3 minutes)

Change of meeting dates

Possibly may 8 and 22

VII. Adjournment

Next Meeting Date: May 8, 2017