

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

June 28, 2017 at 6pm

I. ROLL CALL, 6:06 PM

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

Steering Committee Members Absent: Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair; Patrick Quigley; Michael Short

Community Development & CBJ Staff Present: Jill Maclean, AICP Senior Planner; Beth McKibben, AICP Planning Manager; Allison Eddins, Planner I; Marjorie Hamburger, Administrative Assistant; Dan Bleidorn, Lands & Resources

II. APPROVE MINUTES

April 27, 2017 Draft Minutes

MOTION: *Mr. Pusich moved to approve the April 27 minutes. Mr. Coogan seconded.*

The minutes were approved with Ms. Coon abstaining.

May 8, 2017 Draft Minutes

MOTION: *Mr. Pusich moved to approve the May 8 minutes. Mr. Collison seconded.*

The minutes were approved with Ms. Coon abstaining.

May 22, 2017 Draft Minutes

MOTION: *Mr. Collison moved to approve the May 22 minutes. Mr. Pusich seconded.*

The minutes were approved with Ms. Coon abstaining.

III. APPROVE DRAFT LEMON CREEK AREA PLAN FOR PUBLIC DISTRIBUTION AND COMMENT PERIOD

Ms. Maclean stated that the goal of this meeting was to look at any substantive changes or errors in the draft plan. Mr. Johnson said Mr. Quigley had a comment about the second access recommendation in the transportation chapter concerning Mr. Voelcker's recommendation of two lane access. That was what was in the minutes, said Ms. Maclean.

Mr. Collison said that what was before the committee is a compilation of what has already been approved, but what has not been discussed is the responsible party assignments re: tasks and goals. He said he would like the bulk of the meeting's discussion to focus on this topic. Do we have responsibility for this, asked Mr. Johnson? We have city staff that does this stuff, he said. Mr. Collison reiterated that the only thing that should be new to the committee is the assignment of responsible parties. He said he felt no need to discuss again what is in the plan.

Mr. Voelkers asked if the executive summary had been reviewed. He felt it was important to look at that for some wordsmithing. Ms. Erben said she had input on spots where something was left up to staff and perhaps things were captured incorrectly such as some history of the area and some areas where there phrasing likely happened in the editing process. Has anyone sent this to Joe, asked Mr. Johnson? "If people have not put their comments and problems in writing, I don't want to look at it," said Mr. Johnson. Ms. Erben said she did not understand that written comments were expected. Ms. Maclean said she can still take email comments and that there is still another week or so for revisions before the plan goes out to the public for comment. Ms. Maclean stated that comments concerning accuracy, dates, etc. can be incorporated if received by Wednesday, July 6. However, wordsmithing is difficult to do via committee, said Ms. Maclean, and she commended Bhagavati for the work she has done to give it one voice.

Mr. Coogan confirmed that it will be only a draft given out to the public. There will be more opportunities to have community members correct inaccuracies, he stated. Ms. Maclean suggested that comments from the public might be important for the committee members to hear and review prior to deciding whether or not to incorporate changes in the document. This review of public comment will take place at the August 7th meeting.

Mr. Collison noted that the executive summary is new and seconds Mr. Voelkers' suggestion about reviewing this. Also he feels it would be appropriate to discuss in depth the goals that the committee feels rise to the top of the priority list. Mr. Pusich said he thinks coming to consensus about the goals would be a challenge at this point. He said he felt this was already something committee members should have done as homework, but they weren't reminded to do so or it was not stressed, apparently, he said.

Mr. Chard suggested that if there were conversations that need bringing up, that these be delineated at this point so that the time at tonight's meeting doesn't devolve into minutia and staff doesn't have what they need to prep the document for the public.

Mr. Voelkers suggested adding a new page such as "implementation priorities" as an accompaniment to the executive summary. However it would be hard to parse out those priorities, he said. Mr. Voelkers suggested having each committee member put 10 dots on their personal priorities, then staff can see what rises as the top 10 priorities. He suggested this would be helpful to the Assembly or Parks & Rec Department, for example, when they are establishing priorities for actions in the Lemon Creek area. Mr. Collison added that he already had begun identifying 2 or 3 goals per chapter that he felt rose to the top. He suggested that others do the same on their own and then forward to staff to crunch the data/suggestions. Would this be helpful to do after the public comment period, asked Mr. Collison? Ms. Maclean said she feels the group is educated well enough as a committee, and she has confidence in their input based on what has been worked on for all this time. Ms. Erben said she is worried that there would be some public outcry if the Steering Committee is put forward as the voice of the plan and the priorities for Lemon Creek. Ms. Maclean responded that the group has been engaged for a year and a

half in developing the plan and every opportunity has been given to the public to participate. Also, she stated, opportunities to testify will happen at the Steering Committee's next meeting, at the Planning Commission hearing and also at the CBJ Assembly meeting before the plan is officially adopted.

It was suggested that Monday morning, July 3rd be the deadline for committee members to get info to Ms. Maclean about their top action priorities. Discussion ensued about logistics and how many dots each person should be allocated. Mr. Johnson said he thought it would be a terrible mistake if all chapters' actions were not included. Mr. Coogan suggested that members could rank all 70 actions in priority order. Mr. Chard pointed out that members should only put one dot per item, versus loading any single item with more than one dot per person.

Ms. McKibben suggested that members pick their top three priorities for each chapter. This would be simple for everyone and for staff to process, she said. Mr. Collison suggested that **staff create a score sheet for members to complete, picking their top 3 action item priorities per chapter.**

Mr. Chard said he hoped that the results can be presented in such a way as to indicate that these are top priorities of the committee at this time, but that all goals in the plan are priorities.

Ms. Coon indicated that she will need a hard copy of the score sheet since she will not have internet access for a while. Ms. Eddins said she can deliver the score sheet to Ms. Coon's daughter.

MOTION: Ms. Coon moved that each member identifies their top 3 priorities from each chapter and returns a scoring sheet to staff by 8 am, Monday, July 3, 2017. Mr. Pusich seconded.

The motion was approved by unanimous consent.

Mr. Johnson recognized Mr. Bleidorn from Lands and Resources. Ms. Maclean pointed out that committee members have hard copies of Mr. Collison's memo as well as the emailed comments sent by Alec Venechuk, CBJ's quarry manager, that were received by staff.

Mr. Johnson noted that the committee has already discussed gravel extensively and intended to instruct the city to make this resource available to the public. The resource belongs to the citizens, he said.

Mr. Coogan said he had comments in response to Mr. Venechuk's email. Mr. Bleidorn said that the comments sent by Mr. Coogan are useful to further the conversation. Mr. Coogan said that there is a whole array of materials that can be used for fill. What dictates which fill to use is less about the product and more about where the product is located, he said. Mr. Coogan said that if the city is willing to discuss making sand and gravel available to the public, he suggests that things be left as they are for the moment because there would still need to be a public process before anything were to occur. Mr. Bleidorn said he thinks there would have to be a system put in place to handle things such as liability. Mr. Coogan said this is already in place at locations like Stabler Point Quarry. Mr. Collison said he has questions about what the city will do with a resource that is limited and will at some point be exhausted. What is the life of this resource, he asked, and what is the city looking at for the future when these resources have been exhausted and are not locally available? Will the resource be exhausted at a faster rate if the public has access to that resource, asked Mr. Collison? Mr. Johnson said that the plan is only recommending having a mid-town location for the resource and that this is all that needs to be said.

Mr. Voelkers asked if the group conversations got down to details about where to locate a disposal site for organic waste. Mr. Pusich said no, it was only stated that it would be desirable to have something like this in the Lemon Creek area. Mr. Hanna seconded this and suggested leaving this topic as it is currently in the plan.

Ms. Erben said she is worried that there is a huge sentiment about the dump and she wanted Lands to know that it is important to open up any topic regarding waste for input from the public who have concerns about disposal in Lemon Creek, not just contractors.

Mr. Chard said he thinks it would be helpful to have a motion at this meeting even if not needed so that there is a clear response from the committee in regards to the emails.

MOTION: by Mr. Chard to leave the language as is in the Draft Plan regarding the gravel resource in Lemon Creek. Mr. Hanna seconded.

Ms. Erben suggested adding the page number on page 85 & page 71, Economic Development chapter, Goal 2, last action.

Motion carried with Mr. Collison opposed and Ms. Erben abstaining.

Mr. Johnson asked Mr. Bleidorn if he had any other comments for the committee. Mr. Bleidorn said his initial responses are outlined in his memo. Mr. Voelkers directed the committee to page 4 of the memo. Mr. Hanna stated that he thinks the committee already addressed the point very well. Mr. Bleidorn pointed out that most of the correctional center is not city land. He is concerned that people will be confused about Area 3. He pointed out on the map where the gravel is extracted. He wants the map to be clear about what is included in Area 3.

Mr. Coogan asked Mr. Hanna, in your mind when he says gravel and water, is this sandy gravel? Yes, more or less replied Mr. Hanna. Given the way projects are going, is it a non-sequitur, asked Mr. Coogan? The sand being extracted is primarily for pipe bedding material, which is not a big volume of material, said Mr. Pusich. So, therefore, it will be a long time before we run out, asked Mr. Coogan? Yes, said Mr. Pusich.

Ms. Maclean reminded the group that this map came out of the community design workshop and represents a small amount of visioning from the public.

Mr. Collison said he remains confused about the area behind the Pinewood subdivision. Area 3 is much more rugged than what is portrayed here, he said. He doesn't know if homes could be put up in this area due to the terrain. But it won't look like that after all the extraction has occurred, said Mr. Hanna.

Is it possible to have a note with the map to indicate that it is conceptual, to avoid confusion, asked Mr. Bleidorn?

Ms. Erben said that the focus of the design workshop was trails and recreation activities; there wasn't a lot of input about housing and not all table groups gave input on housing during the workshop. Mr. Voelkers noted that this does not reflect that 100% of the participants felt a particular way. Mr. Voelkers asked what is the concern about showing this conceptual, compiled design in this way in the plan. Ms. Erben said she is concerned that the mood and comments are reflected accurately from people's work

on that day. Ms. Maclean read from the draft plan the description of the design workshop process and the drawings that emerged and are included in the plan. Mr. Voelkers said he thinks the results from the workshop are something to “get the juices going” and are not a strategic threat to any further thinking and planning.

Mr. Hanna said that the committee has worked on all these points, and he thinks it is time to move to approve the draft, not rehash what has already been decided upon. Ms. Erben said she thinks differently, some things are new and didn’t yet get discussed. Mr. Chard said he believes the drawing is clearly a rough, conceptual idea, and he wouldn’t base his personal property development on what he sees. He said he thinks the language states this clearly and agrees with Mr. Hanna that it is time to move on.

Mr. Coogan stated that he heard a concern and an excellent response from Mr. Voelkers. Ms. Erben said she would feel better if Area 3 is left off the map. She said at the time the map was presented she understood that committee members could touch on it later, but now it is past later and she is being told it is too late. A number of committee members stated that if Ms. Erben had these concerns, she should have submitted these already in writing to staff and the committee. Mr. Johnson suggested she missed her chance in not having already done so.

Mr. Hanna said the box only says potential housing and what more needs to be said? Mr. Bleidorn discussed the zoning in the area. Mr. Johnson said the group specifically stated D10 for the area under discussion. Mr. Collison said it might be appropriate to roll any of these comments into the public comment period, but it is time to approve the draft so that the process can move into the public comment period.

Ms. Erben asked if Mr. Bleidorn felt the need to explain anything else about his comments. He said he thinks there is time and opportunity to provide comments during the public comment period or directly to the Assembly. He said he feels was helpful to bring them to the committee at this meeting so no one is blindsided later.

MOTION: by Mr. Chard to incorporate Mr. Bleidorn and Mr. Venechuk’s comments into the record for the public comment process. Mr. Collison seconded.

Ms. Maclean suggested that it would be sticky if committee members gave their own comments as members of the public. The question was put to Ms. McKibben. Ms. McKibben suggested that members state that as an individual they have a comment, but it needs to be clear when they are and are not representing the committee. Also members ought to stand by the plan and support it as a group, she said.

Ms. Coon said she recalled that participants at the charrette were not led to believe that their comments and input would dictate development or proposals. She said she is sorry if Ms. Erben feels her input was not included. Ms. Coon said she feels that the information on the diagram is not cast in gold. All kinds of changes will happen over time and with continued input, said Ms. Coon.

Mr. Voelkers said he hears what Ms. Erben is concerned about and if there are issues that are under-stressed or over-stressed then this should be shared immediately. Ms. Maclean said she will fix small, insubstantial things and send out large items for the group’s consideration.

Friendly amendment to correct the plan via comment 3 in Mr. Collison's memo into the plan – correction here.

Motion passed with unanimous consent.

Ms. Erben asked about the drop-dead comment period from committee. Ms. Maclean said Wednesday, July 5th, at the end of the day. She said the plan is going to print on Friday, July 9th. Prioritization of actions and goals is due by Monday morning, July 3rd, said Ms. Maclean.

Mr. Chard said he is concerned that there is pressure to get this out in draft form and any comments that individual members give directly to Ms. Maclean will not be able to be vetted by the group. What if comments conflict, for example, he asked? Ms. Maclean offered a compromise and suggested that if there are grammatical or factual corrections, these should be received by Wednesday. Anything that is substantive could be reviewed after the draft plan is reviewed by the public, and these could be discussed at the August 7th meeting, she said. Ms. Erben said that she wants the tone of the plan to be more positive for homeowners. Mr. Collison asked Ms. Erben to trust staff and the work that has been done. He said he doesn't think individual nit-picking is necessary to the point of slowing or stopping the process and he is not hearing this from other members of the committee. Mr. Collison said that a factual error or something that does not represent what the committee votes on is what should be brought to the committee at this point.

Mr. Chard said that if Ms. Erben has something that would benefit from discussion, Ms. Maclean suggestion about process is a workable compromise. Ms. Maclean said that if there are other comments for the meeting on the 7th they should arrive well in advance so committee members can review them and digest in a timely way prior to the August meeting.

Mr. Voelkers raised a question for thought, under the Recreation Chapter on page 51. He said he remembers that Alex Pierce who was working on the Parks & Rec master plan was waiting for this work to be done on the Lemon Creek Area. He suggested this should be added to page 51 or somewhere – a comment about the Parks & Rec master plan aligning with goals for Lemon Creek recreation stated in this plan. Also this sort of note could be a part of the executive summary, Mr. Voelkers suggested.

Mr. Voelkers suggested specific language to add to page 51 as the last paragraph in the Parks/Greenspace subsection: *“Given this, the Juneau Parks and Recreation Department has waited to complete their borough-wide master plan of future recreational improvements until the Lemon Creek Area Plan was complete and local priorities identified.”*

MOTION: by Mr. Hanna to adopt the language suggested by Mr. Voelkers. Mr. Pusich seconded.

Mr. Collison offered a friendly amendment to include a call out box about the Parks & Rec plan.

Motion passed with unanimous consent.

Executive Summary

Mr. Voelkers suggested that the third paragraph in the Executive Summary, beginning with “This plan is a step in the borough's strategy....” be strengthened. Mr. Chard asked if Mr. Voelkers had specific language in mind and Mr. Voelkers gave some written suggestions to Ms. Maclean.

Special Acknowledgements

Mr. Chard said he wants to be sure that Ms. Maclean and Community Development Department staff be acknowledged for all their work on the plan and the planning process.

MOTION: by Mr. Chard to acknowledge by name the people who have been with the Steering Committee through the whole process and to state “and other CBJ staff who helped with information”. Mr. Coogan seconded.

Motion passed with unanimous consent.

Message from the Chair

Ms. Maclean pointed out the Message from the Chair page which was added since committee members last saw the draft. This is in keeping with the Auke Bay Plan format, she said.

Responsible Party Column (Goals & Actions)

Mr. Collison said he wonders how to revive the Lemon Creek Neighborhood Association (LCNA), a listed goal on page 74. When associations become active it is often in response to a single issue of concern, he said, but he hopes to encourage an association that can be motivated and latch on to some of the action items in the plan. Mr. Collison went on to list specific action items that he felt would be appropriate for the LCNA to champion:

- Page 74 – Renaming the Lemon Creek Correctional Center.
- Page 74 – Promoting public art.
- Page 80 – Identifying routes and parcels for bike paths; enhancing pedestrian connections to Dzantik'i Heeni Middle School; advocating for bus route to Costco area; advocate for bus shelters.
- Page 81 – Re-platting CBJ owned lots.
- Page 82 – Improve Davis Meadows and Marriott Loop trails; repair viewing platform; provide recreational trail extension under Egan Drive.
- Page 83 – Provide pedestrian trail from Vanderbilt Hill; build new trail along Lemon Creek; provide new primary bike route; maintain Fun Place Park; build a pedestrian bridge; support formation of Lemon Creek Business Association.
- Page 84 -
- Page 85 – Improve bike infrastructure; improve bus transit through Lemon Flats.

Mr. Collison noted that on page 84, the action item to require sustainable development practices is assigned to LCNA, but he thinks it should be CDD.

To reiterate, Mr. Collison said he thinks the LCNA can get behind these concrete goals, if it becomes an active entity. Mr. Johnson asked what sort of teeth a neighborhood association has.

Ms. Maclean said they get notified of CBJ activities and can be as active or not as they wish. The thought is that this plan could help reinvigorate the LCNA, she said.

Mr. Chard said he thinks it is strange for the Steering Committee to task other groups, such as Trail Mix, to do things, when they haven't been seated at the table during this process. Instead he would like to see the Neighborhood Association take the initiative to state that they would like to get involved in these ways, he said. Mr. Collison said he thinks it is important for the Steering Committee to recognize the association as a useful player in the process and that they are the party to continue the process of

implementing many of the things in the plan. Mr. Chard suggested that hearing the words “responsible party” means delegating the execution of something, and he is nervous about an inactive group being charged to action without their buy-in and with taking the initiative. Ms. Erben said she thinks the wording in the plan could be softened to say “please include these groups” and/or by putting them inside parenthesis in the responsible party column.

Mr. Coogan said he is worried that if one group is identified as responsible for an action, other groups will be discouraged from doing so. He said the message should be that we need people to do this, and if you are reading the plan and are concerned, get active. Mr. Hanna said he understands where Mr. Collison is coming from but is not inclined to task one particular group or another. He also said that he believes a neighborhood association is an advocacy group, not necessarily one able to be charged with some action. Ms. Maclean suggested listing community organizations in the notes as a sort of call out to them. Mr. Collison noted that the LCNA has already advocated for some of the actions in the plan. The key thing that he hopes the community can take away is that YOU can get involved and advocate for these things, he said.

Mr. Chard asked if it is possible to call a meeting of the association during the public comment period. Mr. Collison said he cannot revive the association in the next month to be that organized as they are currently an inactive group. He suggested that when a non-public entity is cited as responsible, it be made clear that it is as a suggestion only.

Mr. Coogan advocated for dumping the responsible parties column totally. Mr. Collison said he felt strongly against this idea. Ms. McKibben suggested that there could be an expansion of page 73 to discuss organizations such as the association, or trail mix, etc. getting involved to advocate for actions they feel strongly about. She suggested adding this as text/narrative and community groups could be called out in this way. But she said she feels the implementation table should stay in the plan.

Mr. Chard said he thinks language could say something like “potential leaders or champions” so that it doesn’t seem like a done deal that one group in particular has taken charge of that action. He suggested changing the label only and not adding brackets. If it is a private group, we should not be telling them what they should or shouldn’t get involved in, said Mr. Chard.

Mr. Collison again strongly advocated for the Steering Committee to state that the neighborhood association has value for promoting and moving along many of the action items in the plan. This has been a public process thus far and should continue to be so, he said.

Mr. Johnson reminded the group that the committee did not put entities into the responsible party column. It is not ours, he said, staff has taken leadership in this area. But we are reviewing this, said Mr. Collison. Mr. Johnson replied that he doesn’t know what these entities are and that he doesn’t want to approve them. Ms. Erben said she thinks it important to keep the responsible parties column but label it “may want to be involved” as a reminder to include them or ask for comments.

Mr. Voelkers said a bane of plans is that they just sit on a shelf after all the work. He asked if the committee is discharged after the plan is done, or could this be the nucleus of a group monitoring progress, especially if the neighborhood association is not active. Maybe that group is you guys, he suggested to committee members.

Ms. Maclean said this is the will of the committee members and there was some conversation about this at the beginning. Mr. Coogan again asked why the committee was stressing out on who is going to do the goals. He said he thinks there are areas of conflict, and the group could spend hours working out who might do things. He suggested that CBJ staff do their job to figure out how to move goals along and that this column be dumped.

Ms. McKibben said that theoretically all departments should have this plan on their shelf and consult it when making plans for their department's budgets and goals. She said she feels a table makes it easier for staff to use a plan as a tool and consult it for things like Capital Improvement Projects.

Mr. Hanna said he thinks the group could get through this impasse if the chart simply titles the column "potential advocacy groups" rather than responsible parties. Mr. Chard said what the committee wants to see is implementation.

Mr. Collison said he doesn't want to charge just one individual with tasking people to execute the plan. The only things that the committee hasn't already seen is the executive summary and the task list for the action items, he said. He said he believe that this is the work left to be done by the Steering Committee.

Ms. Maclean said she feels confident that CBJ staff knows enough about who does what in the city, and many departments are or will be reviewing this plan. However, she said she feels it would be appropriate to have a second column listing the "potential" groups to get involved in implementation.

MOTION: by Mr. Hanna that the implementation table be amended to read "lead responsible party" and a second column be added for the "potential advocates" of that action item. Ms. Coon seconded the motion.

Mr. Collison offered a friendly amendment that the items listed previously by him to be advocated for by the LCNA be added to the second column. Mr. Hanna accepted the amendment.

Mr. Pusich asked if a non-government agency currently is the only party in the responsible column, what happens to that cell if the agency is moved into the potential advocate column. Several responded that likely the cell would remain empty at this time.

Motion passed with Mr. Coogan objecting.

Ms. Erben requested time to share several things she would like to see changed:

- Transportation and Infrastructure, Goal 3 – add to new "potential advocates" column: LCNA, JEDC and the Lemon Creek Business Association.
- Throughout whole plan, be consistent with the name "Pinewood Park".
- Page 71, Advocate for infrastructure improvements in the commercial and industrial areas – CDD should be the responsible party and LCNA and the business association listed in the second column. Ms. Erben said she wants to add the word "and provide" after "advocate" to give it some teeth.

Mr. Hanna said it was already voted on and should be left alone. Let the interested parties go in and advocate for their area, he said.

Mr. Coogan said he felt Ms. Erben had a point to fill up the columns with acronyms.

Mr. Collison said he wanted to clarify that there are two issues at hand – adding interested parties to this action item and reviewing the maybe changing the language used. Ms. Erben said the wording doesn't reflect the gist of what the committee wants to get across, which is to encourage stakeholders to get things done, not just advocate on their behalf. She said she sees this as two items, the advocacy by neighborhood stakeholders, and the doing of it by CDD.

MOTION: by Mr. Hanna to change the word “advocate” to “provide appropriate infrastructure” on page 71 (Goal 2, second-to-last action item). Ms. Erben seconded.

Motion carried with Mr. Coogan opposed.

Ms. Erben continued with her notes:

- Page 71, Goal 3, second action item - add as interested parties JEDC and LCNA.

MOTION: by Mr. Hanna to approve and send out a revised draft of the plan for public comment. Mr. Pusich seconded.

Point of info, asked Mr. Chard, are we including Ms. Erben's comments? Yes, said Mr. Hanna, they are to be included. Mr. Collison asked that staff go through the plan and move over to the potential advocates column any private or non-governmental entity.

Motion carried with Mr. Coogan opposed.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION – None

V. REVIEW NEXT STEPS

Mr. Collison suggested that at the next meeting the committee discuss what becomes of the group after the plan has been adopted and consider if the group might play a role in reactivating the LCNA. Ms. Maclean and Ms. Eddins said they will review what the Auke Bay Steering Committee has been doing since the adoption of their plan.

Immediate Steps:

- Ms. Eddins sends out priority comment sheets. These are due back by Monday, July 3rd.
- Wed-Thursday, July 5-6, staff will incorporate grammatical changes.
- July 17-30 the plan goes out for public comment. Staff will produce and post flyers, be on the radio, etc. to rally the neighborhood to review the plan and comment.
- Copies of the plan will be placed at libraries, Gruening Park Community Center and maybe elsewhere. It will also be uploaded on-line for review.
- At the close of the comment period, responses will be pushed out to committee members a.s.a.p.
- August 7th the Steering Committee reconvenes to prepare to recommend the plan to the Planning Commission (PC).

- August 22nd the Committee of the Whole of the PC will get an overview of the plan and the process. This will not be a time for public testimony, but the public can attend.
- September 12 will be the public hearing by the PC and, hopefully, a favorable recommendation to the Assembly will be the outcome.
- Likely the plan will be sent to an Assembly committee first, then to the body as a whole. Dates for Assembly action are not yet determined.

Mr. Collison requested if it would be possible to create an on-line entity to publicize for folks to sign up and get notice about LCNA. He said he is not social media savvy. Ms. Maclean said that all public notification, postcards, etc. will indicate that people interested in learning about the LCNA can respond to Ms. Maclean, and she will forward email contacts to Mr. Collison.

Ms. Maclean reiterated that any substantial comments from the committee must be received no later than July 21. These will be included with the public comments and distributed to committee members well in advance of the August 7th meeting.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 pm.