

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

**August 7, 2017 at 6pm**

**I. Roll Call, 6:00 pm**

**Steering Committee Members Present:** Stephen Johnson, Chair; Susan Erben; Sandra Coon; Dave Hanna; Mark Pusich; Wayne Coogan; Daniel Collison

**Steering Committee Members Absent:** Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission Liaison; Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair; Patrick Quigley; Michael Short; Tom Chard

**Community Development & CBJ Staff Present:** Jill Maclean, AICP Senior Planner; Allison Eddins, Planner II; Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant

**II. Review Comments Received from Public Comment Period**

Mr. Johnson stated his intentions on how to go through the process. Mr. Pusich asked for a point of order about how to incorporate public participation. Mr. Collison clarified by saying the committee ought to let the public discuss before a vote was held on each item.

Ms. Maclean explained the public comments document in front of the committee, and outlined the first comment from Mr. Heumann.

Ms. Coon asked about Comprehensive Plan maps not agreeing/overlapping. Ms. Maclean clarified that this refers to a later comment.

Mr. Collison asked about the Riveredge Park condos land donation for a park – were there other contributions above and beyond the land? Ms. Maclean said they were to provide easements for open space and put in the trail. They did this and maintained it for some time and maintenance was supposed to be taken over by CBJ, she said. Language that speaks to “playground or trail” and “funds or in-kind services” makes it appear that the developer met what they were supposed to do.

Mr. Collison asked that staff verify that the developer met their contributions, and that the city does not consider that the developer needs to contribute more. Ms. Erben suggested that whatever can be cleared up ought to be put in writing. Instead of stating that we are 90% sure, we should be totally sure and state that they have met their obligation, she said. There will be less gray area, and she advocates that the committee find this for sure. Mr. Coogan said he felt the committee was getting in the weeds and if the committee were to do this for them why not do it for others? Mr. Pusich said that if they have their Certificate of Occupancy, they should have satisfied the conditions. They have maintained it for many years, he said, and suggested the committee move on.

Mr. Coogan said he thought blight shouldn't be taken lightly because property values are affected. He said he didn't know if there is anything more to be done at this stage, but it should be acted upon and not just talked about.

Ms. Maclean said she believed this was addressed in the document. Ms. Erben and Ms. Coon both said that if the committee wants to change something there needs to be specific suggestions for language changes at this meeting. Mr. Coogan stated that if Ms. Maclean thinks it has been addressed then he is satisfied.

**MOTION: by Mr. Collison to amend Chapter 4 Neighborhoods and Housing Goal 1 and Chapter 6 Natural Resources and Recreation Goal 3 by adding an action: "Retain easement at Riveredge Park condos for public trail and park associated with the rezone of this area. Develop trail and park area." - Timeframe is short-term; Lead Responsible Party is CBJ P&R. Mr. Hanna Seconds.**

Mr. Johnson opened the motion for discussion. He stated that the blight issue is already covered.

Ms. Maclean clarified that any comments that the public provided to us – we stated where they were already addressed in the plan. Only addressed things not in the plan.

Ms. Erben said that she feels strongly that we give this public input the seriousness that it deserves. Maybe we could make it stronger.

Ms. Maclean took offence at the suggestion that the committee and staff need to give more time and energy into this. She stated that everyone has worked very hard on these topics and have compiled this document with a lot of care. If there are specific suggestions please share them, but we have put a lot of work into these already.

Mr. Coogan: here is the quote: reads from the Lemon Creek Area Plan.

Ms. Erben said she thinks we could do more.

Mr. Coogan: I don't think it really could – this covers the general problem and doing more is inappropriate.

Mr. Collison: as I understand it there's one motion on the floor and that has to do with the park and the trail. He stated that if Ms. Erben has language that she would like to add to motions she should do so, but her concern seems to be different than the motion on the floor.

Discussion about how the chart is formatted and how to go through the public comments.

Mr. Hanna friendly **this would be the only part of Mr. Heuman's comments we take and move on after this motion passes.**

Mr. Collison did not accept.

Mr. Collison let's talk about this motion and move on – if it's more about this item that's fine.

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate – no public comment.

**Mr. Johnson calls for vote**

**Carries – unanimous**

Ms. Erben asked for more time.

Mr. Hanna: respectfully no, we have had time before now – if you are not prepared we should move on.

Mr. Johnson moves onto the next line, comments made by Margaret O'Neal

Ms. Maclean outlines staff work on sheet, all issues are covered in the Plan. No staff recommendation to change.

**MOTION: by Mr. Hanna to adopt findings of staff and move on. Mr. Johnson seconds.**

Ms. Coon: I think it was addressed.

Mr. Collison **friendly amendment** after seeing a lot of comments relating to D10 SF I came up with new language. In Ch4, Goal 2, Actions 4 and 5 add "which would be more compatible with existing D5 zoning in adjacent Pinewood Park subdivision".

Mr. Hanna **accepts**.

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate – no public comment.

**Mr. Johnson calls question**

**Passes – unanimously**

Ms. Maclean outlined the next comment, from Richard Harris, and staff findings. She clarified that the boundaries were chosen through the public process, that's why the Ridgeview Subdivision is included in the study area. Staff has made sure these recommendations all comply with the Comprehensive Plan.

**MOTION: by Mr. Hanna to adopt staff's findings and move on. Mr. Pusich seconded.**

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate – no public comment.

**Mr. Johnson calls question – Motion carried with Mr. Coogan opposed**

Ms. Maclean outlined the comment from Daniel Nore and staff findings, additionally she Outlined CBJ comments about the area, these are noted in the CBJ Comments section of the document.

Ms. Coon stated that on the corner of Pine and Central off of Glacier Highway it is extremely dark at night. Mr. Johnson said this may be covered on the new DOT road plan.

Ms. Coon said that since these people made comments – it should be addressed.

Mr. Pusich asked Ms. Maclean, didn't we talk about this in the document?

Ms. Maclean – not sure immediately, did talk to public works about this.

Mr. Collison requested that if someone had a specific motion, they please bring it forward.

**MOTION: by Mr. Pusich to adopt comments and staff's findings. Mr. Collison seconded.**

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate:

    Marcy Larson – increased light and safety is something that the Alaska Brewing Company has talked about. Streetlights are important especially when you have children.

Ms. Erben said this was true, especially when there are needles and drug users that can take our neighborhood down in a second. Unfortunately I didn't prepare that much, she said, but I think that it's a shame if we don't address because people have made the comment that we ought to address it.

Mr. Coogan **friendly** we ask staff to find the appropriate place to put the recommendation that the city explore neighborhood residents concerns regarding street lighting. (Ms. Maclean suggested it could go into Chapter 4, Goal 1)

Mr. Pusich **accepted**

Mr. Collison asked Mr. Coogan if his suggestion is for the narrative or a goal

Mr. Coogan left it up to staff

Mr. Hanna: Ms. Maclean has already identified a good spot – might also include in Ch 5, Goal 3 – but we should leave it up to them.

**Mr. Johnson called the question**

**Motion carries - unanimous**

Ms. Maclean outlined comment from Anonymous and staff findings. Outlines CBJ comments about the area.

Ms. Erben wants to clarify who is CBJ employees etc from emails.

Ms. Coon clarified that this question about environmental issues was brought up by an anonymous commenter.

Ms. Erben: they need to complain to another place – city should pass comment on to DEC.

Mr. Johnson asked Ms. Maclean if she would pass the comments on to DEC.

Ms. Maclean said she would.

**MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to adopt comments and staff findings. Mr. Pusich seconds.**

Mr. Johnson invites public to participate – no public comment.

**Mr. Johnson called the question**

**Motion carries - unanimous**

Ms. Maclean outlined comments from John Blasco, representing Alaskan Brewing Co. and outlined staff comments.

Ms. Erben: what is the DBA

Downtown Business Association

**MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to adopt staff findings and recommendations. Mr. Collison second.**

Mr. Coogan “encourage common walls” have we talked about that?

Ms. Maclean – yes, outlines a bit of what was talked about – more wrapped into density question regarding topography of the land

Mr. Collison: Mr. Hanna is your motion about the whole line or just the recommendation?

Mr. Hanna: all of it

Mr. Johnson asks AK Brewing about common walls

John Blasco – workforce housing, enjoyable and attractive, is what we would like to see. Could be affordable and good for people who could be our employees. Encouraging workforce housing style.

Ms. Erben I like to keep it to two homes (e.g.: duplexes), without bringing our property downhill

Ms. Coon stated that common walls won’t necessarily bring property values down

Mr. Pusich disagreed with Ms. Erben: I don’t think we’re taxed with limiting development – I think the brewery is asking for us to be open to workforce housing, we shouldn’t be getting that restrictive.

Ms. Erben I think it’s important that we protect our neighborhoods and not make them very dense, and we’ve let the city do all these high zonings, and our value is going to go down like crazy. I feel like we’re held up against the wall and the city is saying “you have to do this” and I think this is just going to go downhill. We didn’t get any D5. I feel like we’re in a corner.

**Mr. Hanna amend – the comments are valuable, and the recommendation for common wall dwellings are good, on Ch 4, Goal 1 add “this may include allowing common-wall development in some zonings”**

Mr. Collison ask the chair if we could ask the Brewing Co. if our motion address their concerns.

Mr. Blasco – yes

Ms. Larson – yes, we mostly had questions, we think they have been well addressed. We would add the word “economic” before “incentives” in the staff recommendation. She also asked a question about LCBA and a difference with DBA

Loren Jones clarified that the DBA sets their own rules, not a City entity.

Mr. Johnson clarified that the LCBA doesn’t exist

Ms. Larson: but it’s referred to in the plan

Ms. Maclean – the Plan recommends the creation of the Lemon Creek Business Association (LCBA) it is understood that it doesn’t currently exist. Outlines where it falls into the plan. Hopes for how they might influence the city and the Lemon Creek area.

Mr. Coogan **friendly** add “optional” after “potential”

**Mr. Hanna did not accept**

**Mr. Collison friendly add “economic” to motion in chart (as suggested by Ms. Larson above).**

**Mr. Hanna accepted**

Mr. Hanna clarified: it’s just suggesting that this could be done. If may never happen, if it does it could have these people, but it doesn’t have to.

Mr. Coogan **friendly** strike responsible party JEDC or Chamber from what is in the table.

**Mr. Hanna did not accept**

Marcy – was there a place for community center?

All – no

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries - unanimous**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Llewellyn Lutchansky and Staff recommendation.s

**MOTION: *Mr. Hanna move to find staffs findings thorough and accurate and adopt findings as they are. Mr. Collison seconded.***

Mr. Hanna believe these comments may be due to a breakdown in communication because we were talking about more than low income housing – I think our work was misinterpreted and we did address all housing.

Mr. Coogan: no staff recommendation so there will be no action here.

General agreement

Ms. Erben would like to see the addition of senior upper and medium income housing.

Mr. Hanna doesn't see the need.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – Ms. Erben against**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Leo Lutchansky and Staff recommendations.

Mr. Collison stated that there was no specific language suggested, and no place to put this.

Ms. Maclean: this is more support and identifying that we reviewed and looked at it, no actual proposal.

Mr. Collison: is there actually language in the Goals and Actions specific to advocating for the output of the public workshop?

Ms. Maclean: the actions hit on everything, but there is no action actually advocating support for the Vision Plan.

Mr. Collison I could support an action item about supporting the Vision Plan, something like “Support (the development and maintenance of) open space and trails as depicted in the Lemon Creek Area Vision Plan”

Mr. Johnson: if all of the issues it addresses are in the Plan separately we don't have to do this. I don't want to adopt the vision plan solidly because it's fluid.

Mr. Coogan Chapter 6, Goal 3, Actions 1 and 4, don't these cover the issues?

Mr. Collison agreed, it looks like the actions already speak to this.

Ms. Maclean these actions were ones that directly came from the chart from the public design workshop. It is the plan combined.

Ms. Erben suggested adding “**including input from the Lemon Creek Area Vision Plan**” at end of Goal 3, Action 1 think it makes it stronger if it's named.

Mr. Hanna we had this discussion earlier and there was a lot of agreement that the vision isn't very clear and not a universal agreement, let it be a guide, not a dictate. I would not vote for that motion. It's critical that we include the vision, and the basic ideas of what are desired, which the plan does.

Shouldn't muddy the waters.

Ms. Erben “continued input” is listed, it makes is stronger if we name it.

**MOTION: *Ms. Erben moved to add “including input from the Lemon Creek Area Vision Plan” at the end of Goal 3, Action 1. Ms. Coon seconded.***

**Mr. Johnson called the question**

**Motion carries – Mr. Johnson and Mr. Coogan opposed**

Ms. Erben suggested that staff add ideas about density/street construction be integrated into the Plan where appropriate.

Mr. Pusich: the city has laws and regulations about these – these things to make the neighborhood “more attractive” these are already in play. There may be exceptions, and the laws here may be changed, it might not be feasible.

Ms. Erben expressed concerns about sidewalks and underground utilities, buried storm drainage.

Mr. Pusich clarified these issues for Ms. Erben.

Ms. Erben asked staff to find a place in a goal to say that we would like to strive that all utilities are going to be underground.

Mr. Collison: Ms. Erben is identifying a motion to act on. If no one is willing to second let’s move on.

**MOTION: Ms. Erben moves to direct staff to find a place in a goal or someplace that would add a little part about “to direct the city to do what it can for buried utilities” “to achieve buried utilities wherever possible”**

**Ms. Maclean asks to interject.**

Ms. Erben OK

Ms. Maclean this type of requirement would be difficult legally to implement these only in the LC area Additionally if we look under land use goal Mr. Johnson, action Mr. Coogan, action Ms. Erben, these get at the issues. What you’re saying plus more.

Mr. Johnson do we have a second?

**Mr. Coogan seconded**

**Mr. Coogan friendly should be at least 48 inches deep**

**Ms. Erben not accepted**

**Mr. Johnson called the question**

**Motion fails – Ms. Erben in favor**

Ms. Erben would like to change “Lemon Flats” to “Lemon Valley”. It may have been used, but it’s not a common term.

**MOTION: Ms. Erben moves to change “Lemon Flats” to “Lemon Valley”. Mr. Coogan seconded**

**Mr. Johnson called the question**

**Motion fails – Ms. Erben in favor**

**MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to adopt staff’s review and strike the recommendation. Mr. Hanna seconded.**

Ms. Erben doesn’t want more waste in the Lemon Creek area. Is it going to be a second dump?

Mr. Hanna: Mr. Lechansky could be misinformed. It’s not another garbage dump. Mr. Hanna gives some more detail, it’s not toxic, it’s not a garbage dump, regulated by DEC, relatively benign materials.

Mr. Coogan ready to vote – concerns of public member are unfounded.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – Ms. Erben opposed**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Brady Fink, and Staff recommendations.

**MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to adopt staff’s review. Mr. Pusich seconded.**

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – unanimous**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Steve Haaviq and Staff recommendation – needs to be a borough wide issue – it’s at a higher level, and is being addressed.

**MOTION: Mr. Coogan motion to adopt Staff review. Mr. Pusich seconded.**

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – unanimous**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Irene Gallion and Staff recommendations.

**MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to adopt staff review. Ms. Coon seconded.**

Ms. Erben worried that she is the first person to say the dump is a benefit. Everybody hates it.

Ms. Maclean – outlines CBJ Engineering and Public Works (E&PW) comment which addresses the dump.

Mr. Pusich: should we take action on that as well now?

Mr. Collison: I'm saying let's accept this one and move on.

Mr. Coogan motion is to accept Irene's comment line, the E&PW line really isn't telling us anything that's new under the sun. We covered the dump thoroughly in the Plan. Sounds like E&PW is saying to leave well enough alone, it looks like this comment is tempering the need to change landfill.

Ms. Maclean clarified that the E&PW recommendation would make no change to actions – it would be integrated in the chapter for context.

Mr. Pusich: respect your point – under Goal 2 there are still strong points about landfill. This language doesn't change our actions won't lessen our impact

**Mr. Collison amended his motion – strike recommendation – include “see CBJ engineering comments for related information”**

Mr. Coogan we don't need to add anything here. This is probably the most sensitive subject and why are we letting bureaucrats tamper with it?

Ms. Erben: the narrative was so long ago that I would have to review it.

Mr. Hanna: there is a motion on the floor which has been seconded, and it takes out the suggestion that we put that language in.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question.**

**Motion carries – unanimous**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Alex Ditcharo and Staff recommendations.

Ms. Erben wanted to know if he was public or city. (public)

**MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to accept Staff's review. Mr. Pusich seconded.**

Mr. Johnson asks public for input.

Ms. Larson expressed concern that a second access was not listed in the Plan.

Ms. Maclean clarified that the Plan does address second access a number of times.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – Mr. Coogan opposed**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from Amy Sumner, and Staff recommendations.

Question about if it was as a public person or in her capacity in a field – unsure staff will review. (Staff found that she was acting on behalf of Juneau Watershed Partnership and her comments are reflected as thus in the final Plan.)

**MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to adopt Staff review of Ms. Sumner's comments and associated recommendations, and that staff follows up and asks if she was commenting as an individual or in professional capacity. Mr. Hanna second.**

Mr. Johnson: are we harming gravel extraction with these recommendations?

General agreement: no.

Ms. Erben wants to make creeks not impaired.

Ms. Maclean: committee did agree to what is currently in the plan – after extensive discussion.

Ms. Erben would like to see more about repairing watersheds.

Mr. Coogan **friendly** – remove asking Ms. Sumner if she was commenting as an individual or as a professional. **Not seconded.**

Ms. Maclean suggestion – will call and clarify, this will change location in chart.

Mr. Coogan was pleased with this change.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carried – Ms. Erban opposed**

Ms. Erben: is there a place where we could add a couple words that we still want to work to not throw the towel in on Lemon Creek (water body).

Mr. Hanna clarified that this was in the motion that just passed.

Mr. Pusich: in addition, lists other action Ch 6, Goal 2. Covers this issue.

Ms. Maclean outline comments from CBJ Parks & Recreation (P&R) and Staff recommendations – recommendation to add item to both chapters because the issues is covered in the narrative of both chapters.

**MOTION: Mr. Pusich moves to adopt Staff findings and recommendations. Mr. Hanna seconds.**

Mr. Hanna expressed a little “heart burn” on their comments on non-motorized recreation. In public comment on P&R the highest scoring item on improvements was off-road motorized recreation.

Ms. Erben: there is the whole Borough to do that, it doesn’t have to happen in the Lemon Creek area.

Mr. Hanna expressed a general comment about P&R not listening to public on motorized recreation.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – unanimously**

Ms. Maclean reviewed comments from CBJ Engineering (E&PW) and Staff recommendations

Mr. Collison: this language has not been added yet.

Ms. Erben: where would it go so we can read that real fast?

Additional language would be located on p. 20 above relevant plans and studies.

**MOTION: Mr. Coogan moves to delete the recommendation and move that we will not regard this recommendation. Mr. Johnson seconded.**

Ms. Erben **friendly to remove the last part – leave the recommendation blank.**

Ms. Erben uncomfortable with unfamiliarity with the document

Mr. Coogan: they’re talking about the landfill in glowing terms, it’s manipulative, I have throttled back my ire.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question.**

**Motion carries – Ms. Erben opposed**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from CBJ Engineering – Quarry, and Staff recommendations.

**MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to remove recommendations from this comment, and accept the rest of the row. Mr. Coogan second.**

Mr. Hanna: when we first did this [made a recommendation to consider selling CBJ gravel to the public sector] we knew that staff would have heartburn on this and they did. I see no need to water it down.

Ms. Erben: I think we should adopt this recommendation, but I think that we should have it open enough that we aren’t tying things down.

Mr. Coogan: addressing this we have already vetted this issue thoroughly. The action says “pursue” it isn’t pinning anything down.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – Ms. Erben and Mr. Collison opposed**



**MOTION: Ms. Erben moves to add “after gathering public input” at the end of current action (Ch 7 Goal2, Action 10). No second.**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from CBJ Lands & Resources (L&R), and Staff recommendations. She added that Mr. Voelckers can add extraction area to the Lemon Creek Area Vision Plan.

**MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to adopt staff findings and recommendation not accept recommendation on conducting a community dialogue. Mr. Johnson second.**

Mr. Collison: I appreciate that they want to appreciate that they want this on the plan, but should also be on the map in the housing section.

Ms. Maclean clarified that there is an updated map which clearly defines area 3 (per L&R concerns).

Mr. Collison where would it be in the Vision Plan?

Ms. Maclean clarified that the Vision Plan is conceptual, gives general vicinity, there are no property lines so it can't get very specific.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – Mr. Collison and Ms. Erben opposed**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and Staff recommendations.

**MOTION: Ms. Erben moves to accept Staff findings and recommendations. Mr. Hanna seconded.**

Mr. Collison: there are lots of issues regarding landfill – concerned that we're adding language that puts a spotlight on bear problems; we have other concerns about the landfill.

**Ms. Erben withdraws motion**

**MOTION: Mr. Collison moves to accept Staff findings, striking recommendation. Mr. Coogan second.**

Mr. Collison clarified that the existing goal remains.

Ms. Erben gave further voice to bears not being the main problem about the dump.

**Mr. Johnson calls the question**

**Motion carries – unanimous**

Ms. Maclean outlines comments from the Alaska Department of Transportation, Southcoast Region (AKDOT&PF) and Staff recommendations.

**MOTION: Mr. Pusich moves to approve recommendation and analysis. Mr. Hanna second.**

Mr. Johnson calls the question

**Motion carries – Unanimous**

### **III. Public Participation**

Ms. Larson – proposed Vision Plan map appears several times, and it seems like that is “the plan” just an observation. Perhaps rename for clarity.

Well done. Thank you, really good finished project and impressive work.

Ms. Erben would like to add narrative comments from table 4 to the public participation chapter.

Mr. Collison: given the public comments should we change the name? Maybe “Lemon Creek Plan as envisioned by community members of the date public design workshop”

**MOTION: Mr. Hanna moves to rename vision plan “visioning done at public design workshop”**

Mr. Collison could we say “suggested recreational activities”

**Mr. Coogan second**

Some discussion about different ideas for the new name ensued.

Mr. Johnson calls the question

**Motion carries – Ms. Erben opposed**

**It was recommended that Chapter numbers be added to footers.**

#### **IV. Recommend DRAFT Lemon Creek Area Plan to the Planning Commission**

**MOTION: *Mr. Pusich moves to approve plan as modified tonight, and send to the Planning Commission. Mr. Coogan second.***

Mr. Johnson calls the question.

Motion carries – unanimous

#### **V. Review Next Steps**

Ms. Maclean outlined next steps:

The Plan will likely be heard first at a Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting at 7:00 on 9/12, this would be a work session. The public hearing will probably happen at the following Planning Commission meeting on 9/26. [These dates changed after this meeting.]

Mr. Coogan comment – as they're wrapping it up Staff have freedom to do clerical and design improvements without changing content.

Mr. Collison making neighborhood association great again. How can they group further the action items?

Ms. Maclean: there will be public notification once adopted. Neighborhood Association was listed on last notice with a call to respond if residents were interested in joining, only one response. CBJ may work with the association to get the word out, but the association should take the lead.

Mr. Collison: envisioned identifying a date and location, and the city could help advertise.

Announcement could add action items that we want to highlight. Asks about timeline for adoption.

Ms. Maclean outlined the timeline: the Planning Commission will hear it in late September, could send back to committee or recommend to the Assembly, it will then go to the Assembly for two more hearings before it could be adopted.

Mr. Collison when's the soonest it could be heard by the Assembly?

Ms. Maclean probably late November or December.

Mr. Collison would like to start revitalizing the association earlier.

Ms. Maclean clarified that the actions cannot be advertised as official city stance until adopted by the assembly – the neighborhood association could jump in and do anything at any time.

Mr. Coogan suggested using the app Next Door.

#### **VI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:15 pm.