

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

**May 22, 2017 at 6pm**

**I. ROLL CALL, 6:02 PM**

**Steering Committee Members Present:** Stephen Johnson, Chair; Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission Liaison; Susan Erben; Sandra Coon; Dave Hanna; Patrick Quigley; Michael Short; Mark Pusich; Wayne Coogan; Daniel Collison; Tom Chard

**Steering Committee Members Absent:** Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair

**Community Development Staff Present:** Jill Maclean, AICP Senior Planner; Beth McKibben, AICP Planning Manager; Marjorie Hamburger, Administrative Assistant

**II. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – None**

**III. APPROVE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CHAPTER, GOALS AND ACTIONS**

Ms. Maclean reviewed the changes made from the last meeting in the draft chapter and asked for comments about these changes.

Ms. Coon asked about including employees for AEL&P in the table about the major employers in the area (pg. 2).

Mr. Pusich noted that the numbers on the page 6 table should indicate they are acres.

Mr. Hanna and Mr. Pusich reminded staff about having an industrial land map included. Ms. Maclean noted this.

Mr. Collison hoped Jill could identify the average salary for private and public sector employees. He thinks there is a difference, and page 2 has a reference to the private sector mitigating impacts from the loss of public sector jobs. Although there are a similar number of jobs, there might be discrepancy in salaries, he thinks. Ms. Erben commented that the Department of Labor's Research and Analysis has this sort of data. Mr. Collison asked if the loss of 600 jobs is from CBJ or the state. Staff did not know.

Mr. Coogan asked if the information about CBJ included in this chapter is or will be repeated in every neighborhood plan. Ms. Maclean said that it depends on the committee working on the plan. Is there a template for these plans, Mr. Coogan asked. No, said Ms. Maclean. The chapters might be similar but the content not necessarily.

Mr. Johnson noted that all the area plans coalesce into the Comprehensive Plan, eventually. Mr. Coogan said this may present some logic issues for folks looking for data which might be found only in one plan, such as Lemon Creek, but not in the Douglas plan, for example.

Mr. Collison noted that no one would argue that loss of government jobs is significant to all of the borough, however this plan only looks at the impact to the Lemon Creek area. Mr. Chard suggested keeping information specific to this area plan. For example, he is a landlord in Lemon Creek and is interested in how the loss of jobs might affect his ability to rent his apartment.

Mr. Coogan continued his line of inquiry looking at the plan's drafted goals. The plan "goes area wide", for example, on the issue of freight costs into CBJ, which is not specific to Lemon Creek. Therefore, he postulated that the promotion of mining development could be beneficial to the Lemon Creek area.

**MOTION:** *Mr. Coogan moved to add an action item promoting mining in Juneau. No second.*

**The motion was not considered.**

Mr. Johnson questioned the language in the chapter that discusses undeveloped land as some land is not developable. In the Neighborhoods and Housing chapter there is already language about the difficulty of development in general, said Ms. Maclean. Mr. Johnson reiterated that he wants the language to be consistent. Ms. Erben suggested including another table indicating how much land is easily developable. Ms. Maclean said there are too many variables in that question. Mr. Collison noted that CBJ has information about what makes a property developable.

Ms. Maclean said that Mr. Voelckers asked for there to be a tie in between the narrative and the conclusion. The conclusion is okay, Mr. Voelckers said. Page 2, line 71-81 is an important issue but "is a sleeper". There is an opportunity for more support services for employees working in the area. Mr. Voelckers said he thinks some of those items can be restated as part of the conclusion about additional support infrastructure. As it stands now, the narrative discussion is too much out of context, according to his editorial assessment, said Mr. Voelckers.

Ms. Erben noted that the 2016 employment average is cited on page 2. Then, on page 6, there is a contradiction because it says we want restaurants but the inclusion of the quote from the Land Management Plan says otherwise. Mr. Hanna disagreed that this language says restaurants are not wanted. Rather is just states a fact about current land usage, he said.

Ms. Erben noted that the section beginning on line 229 discussing moving goods says Lemon Creek has a transportation problem whereas this is a Juneau-wide problem. She suggested adding a note to say these issues are borough-wide. Mr. Collison would add that the cost of getting goods into Juneau has gone up considerably since we now have a single shipper. He suggests adding that exploring alternative shipping arrangements is desirable.

Mr. Quigley called attention to the information about zoning in the chapter. Ms. Maclean noted that even though an area is zoned industrial it is not necessarily being used in that way. Mr. Quigley asked if it is a foregone conclusion that the area behind Home Depot should not be used for commercial purposes. Mr. Hanna said it would be stupid to zone residential in that area. It should be for heavy usage. Mr. Quigley didn't see a list of which properties are being talked about in the chapter. Mr. Coogan asked how could Home Depot be called anything but a store; it is not an industrial use? Maybe

the table on page 6 should be changed to indicate vacant land, rather than type of current use, he suggested. Mr. Quigley asked if it is clear that this is land which includes that which is already in use and also has land available for development. Is this clear to the reader, asked Mr. Coogan?

Mr. Voelckers liked this point, and said he thinks it better to have a list of what is available for use. Just indicating acreage doesn't mean land is available for development, he said. Mr. Chard said he thinks that the table wants to capture how industrial land is being used. He noted that CBJ is trying to update the table of permissible usage. Maybe this table could help that effort, he asked?

Mr. Collison said it seems the committee is trying to distinguish between available and unavailable land including those parcels already developed or those difficult to develop. Of that quantity, what is private land and what is owned by CBJ, he asked? Furthermore, which CBJ parcels are available for development? He noted that CBJ cannot insist that a private owner release land for development, so he suggests focusing on which public lands are available for development.

Ms. Erben thinks that somewhere in the plan the public needs to know where else in the borough are industrial lands besides Lemon Creek. Can the Lemon Creek Area plan include a sentence summarizing these other places? She thinks that in order to look at Lemon Creek as a site for development, one might need to know what else is available in the borough.

Mr. Collison thought the map could represent both available and public/private lands. An accompanying table could include information on acreage, he suggested. Mr. Chard said he thinks that would be a lot of work for the Lemon Creek plan. Instead, he suggested, a review of CBJ-wide zoning is a better place for this kind of discussion. It is too large a discussion for this plan. Ms. Maclean said it would be easy to add in acreage and list other areas in the borough, but specific parcels mentioned ought to be limited to the Lemon Creek area.

Mr. Coogan asked if on the table on page 6, is there only 220 acres in all of Juneau currently zoned Light Commercial? He suggests that there should be some language indicating that the reader needs to be careful when reading the table. Mr. Voelckers said he also believes it is tricky to interpret this table. Relative to the Lemon Creek Area, there is very little available industrial-zoned land versus rural, he said. The city needs to judiciously use what they have, he commented.

Mr. Johnson noted that lines 344 and 345 sum up the situation being discussed. This committee is saying it wants to keep industrial use in Lemon Creek, he said. Mr. Collison wanted to know how this fits into the context of the borough as a whole. Is Lemon Creek being asked something that other neighborhoods are not being asked, he wondered.

Ms. Maclean replied that CBJ doesn't own much industrial land that is developable. The CBJ Lands Department finished creating the Lands Management Plan in 2016 and the acreage next to the Home Depot store is discussed there. The Plan recommends this area to be zoned for industrial use.

Mr. Collison said he didn't understand from the narrative that CBJ's industrial-zoned land is mostly in Lemon Creek. This needs to be made clearer, he noted. Also, it should be clear that CBJ land in Lemon Creek is slated for disposal, as per the Assembly, he said.

**MOTION:** *Mr. Coogan moves to delete the table on page 6. Mr. Hanna seconds.*

Ms. Erben said she does not agree with this motion. She wants the plan to include information about the borough as a whole and to indicate how Lemon Creek fits into the overall plan. Mr. Johnson said he understand that but sees no reason to include that information in the Lemon Creek plan. Ms. Erben countered that once this information is known, it allows the committee to make recommendations about Lemon Creek usage.

Mr. Collison said CBJ owns 40 acres of industrial-zoned land and 20 acres are in Lemon Creek. The Land Management Plan was approved by Assembly and prioritizes that land for disposition. He understands the difficulty of putting together a map of all Lemon Creek showing both private and public industrial-zoned parcels.

Mr. Quigley suggested removing also the paragraph quoted from the Land Management Plan, if the table is removed. Leaving that quote there skews the narrative towards developing industrial land, he thinks. Mr. Johnson noted that the Planning Commission and the Assembly adopted the 20 acres as industrial. Six months ago the committee had consensus about keeping the business side of Lemon Creek a priority in this plan, Mr. Johnson said. Therefore, he wants to keep the Land Management Plan language in, as it is already a done deal. Mr. Hanna would like to keep in the paragraph language about what has happened in trends. He thinks this verbiage plus a map would state the character of what is going on in Lemon Creek.

Ms. Erben stated she wants to keep the table because with it the plan can include caveats and other explanations about what is developable.

Mr. Collison said the key thing is to identify how much CBJ land is available for industrial uses and what the intended use is for the land behind Costco. The map would show this. Are we going to remove the table with the corollary to identify what land is available for industrial uses, he asked?

**The motion is called for a vote. The motion passes 8 to 3, with Ms. Coon, Ms. Erben and Mr. Quigley opposed.**

Mr. Chard asked if the recent decision about the Honsinger area rezoning impact the Lemon Creek numbers. That parcel is not in the Lemon Creek boundary area, said Ms. Maclean.

**MOTION:** *Mr. Chard moved to instruct staff to do the following: Incorporate language stating that the committee recommends keeping the 16-20 acres behind Home Depot zoned industrial, make reference to the committee's support of the goal of updating the Comp Plan's Table of Permissible Uses, and include a map to provide context about CBJ-owned industrial-zoned property in the Lemon Creek area. Mr. Hanna seconded.*

**Mr. Johnson offered a friendly amendment:** The goal of updating the Table of Permissible Uses should be added to the Lemon Creek action plan. Mr. Voelckers noted that it is nice if the narrative leads to a goal, so he agreed it would be helpful to have this be an action item as well.

**Mr. Chard accepted the friendly amendment to his motion.**

**The motion was called and approved with unanimous consent.**

Mr. Collison suggested another addition to the narrative. For line 245 on page 5, there is no context in the narrative about why a new flood study is needed, he said. He would like to see reference to an obstruction that was removed on lower Lemon Creek which has impacted the flooding potential of the creek. Mr. Collison would like to include language to clarify that this change leads to the need for a new flood study. Mr. Hanna suggested that the sentence could start “due to major changes in the lower Lemon Creek area there may be a need for . . .” Mr. Hanna explained that this has to do with the removal of a bridge. Mr. Collison said he thinks this should be spelled out. Mr. Johnson asked if this language should say that there is a lower risk of flooding now, due to the bridge’s removal.

**MOTION:** *Mr. Hanna motioned that line 250 begin, “Given the removal of the old bridge on lower Lemon Creek, a new study of this flood hazard . . . Mr. Pusich seconds.*

**Motion passed with unanimous consent.**

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Hanna to approve the narrative with all changes. Mr. Short seconded.*

**Motion passed with unanimous consent.**

Discussion on Goal 1:

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Hanna to amend the last action item under Goal 1 to read: Promote additional freight and transportation services for importing / exporting needs (replacing “additional barge services”). Mr. Short seconded.*

**Motion passed with unanimous consent.**

Mr. Chard asked about short-term permits. Isn’t that part of the problem? We should support industry by refraining from the use of restrictive short-term permits, said Mr. Coogan. Mr. Chard said some businesses operate in good faith and are getting killed by these short-term permits. On the other hand, some businesses ought to have these restrictions, he said. Mr. Short noted that a permit can include conditions that would make it clear when a business is out of compliance. He noted that gravel extraction permitting is an on-going job to keep up with. The city has the ability to write the permits that include a public comment period, he said. During this process, conditions can be included in such a way as to extend the length of the permit.

Mr. Hanna said he wants to support industry by advocating for the use of longer-term permits where appropriate, such as Conditional Use Permits. He suggests that the wording be in the affirmative for this action item.

Mr. Collison asked why it has been used in the past like this. He cited the example of the asphalt plant on Sherwood Lane that was granted a 2-year permit. Mr. Hanna said he thinks it was done like this to allow the city to maintain control, but he thinks this could have been done via conditions to the permit rather than granting the permit for only 2 years. It is very restrictive, he said.

Mr. Johnson commented that sometimes there is a reason for a limited permit length, but he feels it is job specific. Ms. Maclean said right now marijuana permitting is limited because it is a brand new use with an unknown future. Ms. McKibben said city code for gravel extraction includes a 10 year review. Marijuana has a 3 year review, she said. This requirement might go away in time as the community

becomes more comfortable with this type of business, said Ms. McKibben. Asphalt regulations are specific to that activity, she noted, and this is not just dreamed up by the Planning Commission; there are other entities that factor into these regulations. Mr. Voelckers said that as a commissioner himself, there is interest in having a reasonable timeline to ensure the opportunity to review of how things are going for the health and well-being of the community. He doesn't see 10 years as unreasonable for a gravel extraction permit.

Mr. Collison said he now understands that the 10-year permitting cycle for gravel extraction is in code and so it is not necessary to discuss this point further. Therefore, what does this action item regarding the reduction of short-term permits relate to if not to gravel permits? Mr. Hanna said a specific example is the Miller permit for an asphalt plant out the road.

Ms. Erben said she has questions about marijuana permitting and is not sure she would want that type of use to apply to this goal for less short-term permitting in this case. If the long-term permitting support is specific to gravel extraction, she suggests that the plan say that explicitly. Mr. Coogan cautioned that the group does not know yet what this action might apply to in the future. For example, what if someone wants to manufacture bricks, he said.

Ms. McKibben explained that using the asphalt plant example, there is nothing in code about the length of time for review. If the city was reviewing a plant in Lemon Creek, there may be some effect if there was a recommendation of a 2-year term limit. Mr. Johnson wondered if it is a problem that this land is zoned for this use and there is an arbitrary application.

Mr. Coogan said he thinks there are enough safeguards in the process as it stands.

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Coogan to delete the fourth action item under Goal 1, concerning the reduction of the use of short-term permits. Mr. Chard seconds.*

**The motion passes 9 to 2, with Mr. Hanna and Mr. Short opposed.**

Mr. Lukshin spoke regarding the action item about transportation services and wondered what might be realistic for the committee and the city to do to promote this without coming up against private industry. Ms. Maclean responded that at this point, it is not known who would be the responsible parties for such a call to action but could likely be private entities as well as CBJ. One idea is that the city could develop a port for freight, said Mr. Coogan, and be in competition with nay-sayers in the private sector.

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Hanna to approve Goal 1 with the removal of action item 4 and the amendment of action item 5. Mr. Johnson seconded.*

**The motion passed with unanimous consent.**

Discussion on Goal 2:

Mr. Coogan said he wants people to think about the disposal of 20+ acres. He said, isn't this already lost to commercial uses? The Brewery is industrial. Skookum is industrial. Several committee members refuted Mr. Coogan's notion by noting that, for example, the brewery is industrial as well as Skookum Sales & Recycling. Mr. Coogan said in his opinion this really is a light commercial area and "somebody

allowed the fox into the hen house.” It was zoned industrial but is populated by commercial activity, he said. Why not have the plan just say we want to comingle industrial and commercial uses, he asked.

Mr. Johnson stated that although commercial activity can occur on industrial-zoned property, the reverse is not true. Unless there is a change to the allowable use table, that 20 acres could be commercial, he said. But if it is zoned commercial, it can’t be used for industrial uses. Ms. Erben said she thinks it unwise to regulate so much as to cut off the nose to spite the face. If a Target store wants to come in, people will be in favor of that for jobs as well as retail opportunities, she said. Ms. Erben said she would like to see an ATV park in that area and that CBJ should give someone the land for that sort of development.

Mr. Coogan said he stands corrected.

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Hanna to state as an action item support for the disposal of 20 acres of CBJ industrial zoned land. Mr. Short seconded.*

Mr. Chard asked for clarification. He asked, does saying this indicate we want to get rid of this land as soon as possible to first acceptable buyer? Mr. Coogan said there is a faction in Juneau that wants to retain this land for some future CBJ use. By saying this, we say we disagree with that faction and want to dispose of the land for use soon, he said.

Mr. Collison confirmed that the Planning Commission and the Assembly have already signed off on disposal of this land, zoned industrial, with the understanding that another box store would be allowable. About the only thing that would not be allowed is residential use, other than a caretaker unit, said Ms. Maclean.

**NOTE: IT APPEARS THIS MOTION WAS NOT CALLED TO A VOTE.**

Mr. Chard recollected comments from the public about safety issues on the action item regarding transition zones. Ms. Maclean said the Planning Commission looks at these safety concerns when considering applications.

Mr. Collison remembered that a couple of years ago there was an application for asphalt plant to be located in the 20 acres under discussion, but it was withdrawn because it was too close to the condos across the creek. This was a determination by the Department of Environmental Conservation, said Mr. Short. Mr. Collison asked, then, if zoning this area as industrial, how close to residential areas can such activities be? Mr. Chard said the Planning Commission will figure this out when reviewing specific applications.

Mr. Johnson suggests changing the wording on the sixth action item from an “earthen disposal” facility to “organic waste.” Organic waste is an industry standard term. Mr. Short said his company takes care of organic waste themselves and disposes of it in Hidden Valley. Mr. Coogan said that the dump will accept it but to a limited degree. Mr. Voelckers asked if it is appropriate to address the topic in this chapter. Mr. Johnson said he brought up the topic because having such a facility could promote business in Lemon Creek; it would be an economic factor to have this disposal in the area. Hauling to a place that doesn’t cost a fortune to bring it too would promote residential development, he said.

Mr. Coogan asked if the plan could instruct the city to make this service available to the general public. Also he would like to see the suggestion that the city sell its gravel to individuals. Mr. Hanna said Mr. Coogan is correct. They could include in the plan the recommend that CBJ gravel be made available for private purchase. Mr. Hanna said this would make home development more economically feasible.

Mr. Voelckers said he is persuaded by this argument and now feels this topic belongs in this chapter, but perhaps it should be mentioned in other places as well. He said he thinks this should be strengthened in the language as an opportunity for the Lemon Creek area. Ms. Erben said public involvement indicates that everyone hates the dump. If we include a back haul in the area, she feels it needs to look pretty.

Mr. Chard said that given this discussion, he thinks a paragraph is needed in the narrative regarding these issues. The verbiage should explain why it makes sense to couple the sale of gravel with an organic waste disposal facility for the benefit of Lemon Creek. He said the issue of encouraging CBJ to sell to private citizens should be spelled out.

Mr. Collison asked for some historical perspective about why CBJ does not sell its gravel before advocating action to do so. He said he keeps hearing that gravel resources are at a premium in the city. If we make this available for private purchase, what would be available for public uses, he asked. Ms. Maclean, Ms. McKibben, and Mr. Voelckers all stated that they don't know much of the history around this practice. Mr. Collison would like this information brought back to the group. Mr. Voelckers said he thinks there are two different action items being discussed – dumping organic waste and selling gravel.

Mr. Hanna said he thinks that the city did not get into the practice of private sales because they did not want to compete with the private sector. However, there used to be quite a few private gravel extraction enterprises around the borough, he said. Now there are very few privately owned pits. Also, said Mr. Hanna, CBJ usage and the standards for some of their projects have changed, lessening the demand for gravel for the city. Meanwhile, demand for gravel from the private sector has grown, making for an opportunity in Lemon Creek, he said.

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Chard to add to the narrative a paragraph that talks about coupling the haul to and from Lemon Creek (gravel and organic waste), to recognize that these activities lower the cost of site construction, to put in some narrative indicating a desire that the backhaul site not turn into another dump, aesthetically, and to encourage public use and access to these resources. Mr. Hanna seconded.*

Mr. Coogan said he will vote for Mr. Chard's motion because he has faith in the system. There would be good debate before something actually happened, he said.

**The motion was called and passed 8 to 3 with Mr. Quigley, Ms. Erben, and Mr. Collison opposed.**

Mr. Chard noted that the corresponding action item will need to incorporate this narrative language as well.

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Coogan to add another action item under Goal 2 to say: Make CBJ gravel and organic waste disposal resources in Lemon Creek available to the private sector. Mr. Pusich seconded.*

Is this advocating happening on city land, asked Ms. Erben? Mr. Coogan said we are just saying do this, however you can.



**The motion was called and passed 10 to 1 with Mr. Collison opposed.**

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Chard to strike the first two action items under Goal 2, as he feels they are irrelevant. Mr. Collison seconds.*

**Motion passed with unanimous consent.**

Mr. Collison suggested a change to the action item concerning the (flood) feasibility study. He proposed that a new study of the flood hazard area be commissioned that would include but not be limited to: 1) an evaluation of the flooding potential in light of the removal of a bridge on lower Lemon Creek and 2) an evaluation of whether gravel extraction activities along Lemon Creek are an effective strategy to mitigate flooding hazards.

Mr. Chard said he would not want to limit the scope of the study to these two things. Ms. Erben suggested the wording could say the study should include but not be limited to these two evaluations. Mr. Johnson said he thinks the study is desired because it would be tied to property owners' insurance coverage. Mr. Chard said this language is already found on page 5 in the narrative and the action item is directing the city to commission the study. Mr. Coogan said this is about FEMA control. There is risk that insurance costs might actually increase based on some finding, he said.

Mr. Collison wanted to reword his proposal from above. Mr. Chard suggested saying "consider doing this study because we believe it will lower our rates". The question was asked about how these mapped hazard areas came about in the first place. Mr. Pusich said that in 2013 FEMA did the study. Mr. Voelckers said the city can restudy areas. Mr. Pusich said there is a format one follows that includes the Community Development Department. How can this be articulated to the city, asked Mr. Coogan.

Mr. Coogan asked if the city can do a study under FEMA guidelines and then decide to ask FEMA if the outcome is what they want. Would FEMA listen to the city, asked Mr. Coogan? Ms. McKibben said the process would be the same as an individual property owner pursuing the question. Mr. Voelckers said FEMA considers something a flood plain until it is determined otherwise; they take a conservative approach. He thinks it would be a good direction for the city to facilitate its own study. Ms. Maclean said she thinks it is one thing for a property owner to do a study and decide to disregard it whereas it would be problematic for the city to just put aside results it doesn't like.

Mr. Collison said his intention for the motion is to assume responsibility for a study. In light of Ms. Maclean's point, does staff know of instances where cities have undergone this process, he asked. Mr. Voelckers said he does not think a wordy explanation is needed but leave the action item as an encouragement to investigate looking into current flood risks. Mr. Chard suggested it could be a two-phase plan. The first phase would be to determine feasibility of a study and, if looks good, move into a second phase.

Mr. Pusich said he thinks property owners cannot wait too long because they are already paying high rates for flood insurance monthly.

Mr. Collison said he wants to know if gravel extraction does in fact mitigate flooding risk. He would want this confirmed by a study. Ms. Coon said she thinks property owners want to really know the risk.

Mr. Chard asked if gravel extraction takes place with the belief that it reduces the risk of flooding and that turns out to not be the case, does this impact the gravel extraction enterprise? There has been confusion in the past, said Mr. Collison, about whether or not flooding risk is impacted by gravel extraction.

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Coogan to add as an action item that CBJ seek FEMA reclassification of the Lemon Creek flood plain based on the removal of a bridge below Glacier Highway and the resumption of gravel extraction in Lemon Creek. Mr. Chard seconded.*

Ms. Erben proposed a friendly amendment to add “to consider”. Mr. Coogan rejected this amendment and asked Ms. Erben to have faith that the city wouldn’t go willy-nilly.

**Motion passed with unanimous consent.**

**MOTION:** *By Ms. Erben to add “lighting and crosswalks” to the second to last action item under Goal 2 (infrastructure). Ms. Coon seconded.*

**The motion passed 10 to 1 with Mr. Coogan opposed.**

**MOTION:** *By Ms. Coon to approve goal 2 as amended. Mr. Pusich seconded.*

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Johnson to eliminate the last action item under Goal 2 (advocacy for economic development incentives). Ms. Erben seconded.*

**The motion passed with unanimous consent.**

**RETURN TO PREVIOUS MOTION TO APPROVE GOAL 2 AS AMENDED.**

**The motion passed with unanimous consent.**

Discussion on Goal 3:

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Chard to approve Goal 3 as written. Mr. Pusich seconded.*

Mr. Coogan said that on Goal 2 there is already discussion of infrastructure. He feels this is redundant coming under Goal 3. Ms. Coon said that the public really wants bike paths and walking trails all over the Lemon Creek area, so it is helpful to reiterate in this section. Mr. Coogan said he stands down.

Ms. Erben said she wants to add covered lunch facilities for the area’s workforce to the last action item. Mr. Johnson said he thinks this is not the city’s place to insure adequate lunch areas for private employers. Mr. Chard said he likes this idea but it would be better suited for the parks and rec chapter of the plan.

**The motion is called and passed with unanimous consent.**

#### **IV. REVIEW ORDER OF UPCOMING MEETING DATES**

Ms. Maclean informed the committee that they will be expected to make their final comments on the draft plan at the June meeting. Copies will be printed for the public and put out at the libraries, city hall, etc. There will be a two week public comment period. These comments will be collected and given to the committee for review in July. At that time a vote will be expected on the document so that it can move on to the Planning Commission for their recommendation.

The Planning Commission will likely have this on their agenda in August. They can recommend approval to Assembly or can kick the plan back to the steering committee for more work. They could also only recommend certain items in the plan. If passed on, the plan goes to the Assembly for reading. It may get moved into a committee. Finally, if adopted it will be added to the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Collison was hopeful that at the June meeting the committee will not go page by page through the draft like they have been doing. Ms. Maclean suggested that there should not be any surprises after all the work that has been done by the committee. She feels it would be helpful if the bulk of the meeting is prioritizing the goals. It would not be helpful to pick apart the narrative. If there are any grammar issues, those should be forwarded to staff right now as the draft is being put together for June, said Ms. Maclean

Mr. Coogan asked if the actions are listed in priority order. Ms. Maclean said only if the group wants it to be that way.

Mr. Chard asked for the public to be informed about this timeline. Ms. Maclean said after the next meeting a timeline can easily be put together.

Mr. Collison advocated for listing out the committee's top priorities. Mr. Voelckers said that having an executive summary in the document is useful and this can hit the top 10-15 issues. Mr. Collison suggested that by the next meeting, committee members identify which action items seem priority to them, for discussion.

Mr. Chard appreciated how the charrette was run so as to have priority items rise to the top.

Mr. Voelckers mentioned getting the graphics in. These will be in the draft plan, he said.

Ms. Erben wanted assurance that the committee can revisit everything in June. Ms. Maclean said yes this can happen.

**Tentative Next Meeting Date: June 19, 2017 – draft plan in entirety.**

Ms. Maclean encouraged committee members to attend the meeting on Thursday, May 25, regarding the takeover of the landfill license, but cautioned members to represent themselves if they speak, not committee.

## **V. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:48.