

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

**December 15, 2016 at 6pm**

**Steering Committee Members:**

Stephen Johnson, Chair  
Michael Lukshin, Vice-Chair  
Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission Liaison  
Tom Chard  
Daniel Collison  
 Wayne Coogan

Sandra Coon  
Susan Erben  
Dave Hanna  
Mark Pusich  
Patrick Quigley  
Michael Short

**Staff:**

Jill Maclean, Senior Planner, Community  
Development  
Bhagavati Braun, Administrative Assistant

Michele Elfers, Chief Landscape Architect, Public  
Works  
Rob Steedle, Director, Community Development

**Others Present:**

Eric Vance, Capital Waster Management  
Loren Jones, CBJ Assembly Member

**Agenda:**

- I. Roll Call (6:00pm)  
Completed at 6:05
- II. Ground Rules (2 minutes)  
Ms. Maclean introduced the CBJ employees present and went over the ground rules.
- III. Approval of Minutes (5 minutes)  
**Mr. Pusich moved to approve December 1, 2016 minutes**  
**Mr. Lukshin seconded**  
**Motion carried**
- IV. Confirm the Area Plan Boundaries (10 minutes)  
Ms. Maclean described changes made to the draft boundaries  
Ms. Coon told the board for Tamarac Trails about this plan, they were glad to know about it and feel included  
Ms. Erben would like to see pictures of the far boundaries that are toward Hidden Valley to know what is out there  
Discussion about a subdivision that is out towards Hidden Valley  
Mr. Chard wanted to know what happens to the land outside of the Lemon Creek boundaries.  
Ms. Maclean answered about the Housing Action Plan (HAP) and other area plans that may happen in the future.  
Mr. Lukshin pointed SC Members to a map within their binders.  
**Mr. Lukshin moves to accept the boundaries as amended by staff**  
**Mr. Pusich seconded**  
**Motion Carries**

V. Discuss and Reach Consensus on the Draft Vision Statement (15 minutes)

Ms. Maclean introduced the combinations and working drafts of the Vision Statement.

Discussion about using "Lemon Creek" or "CBJ" as the actor, some of the issues in LC are Borough wide issues that should be addressed collectively.

Ms. Erben wants to highlight Lemon Creek because Lemon Creek has to keep itself nice, not leave it to the city to dump undesirable things on us.

Ms. Coon disagrees, there needs to be a place for the Prison and other institutions and that residents of Lemon Creek chose to buy property here knowing what the surrounding uses were. We chose to buy a house in this area.

Ms. Erben believes these burdens should be spread throughout Juneau, not all plopped into Lemon Creek.

Ms. Erben would like to see quality of life in neighborhoods put into the Vision Statement.

Mr. Johnson thinks that the draft statement addresses Ms. Erben's concerns.

Mr. Chard pointed out that the draft statement shifts subjects from the plan to the community, keep subject consistent.

Mr. Hanna added a second paragraph to address "the community" and "the plan" being brought together.

The Steering Committee continued to adjust the wording of the Vision Statement.

**Mr. Hanna moved to leave second paragraph as is.**

**Mr. Short seconded the motion.**

Mr. Hanna: objected to the motion - wants to strike "natural and developed".

Ms. Erben stated that it is important to highlight natural features of Lemon Creek and would like to see that wording in the Vision Statement.

**Motion failed.**

**Mr. Chard moves to strike "natural and developed".**

**Mr. Hanna seconded.**

Ms. Erben believes that the term "positive features" is subjective, wants to have "natural" in the Vision Statement.

Mr. Lukshin asked what were we striving to do originally?

Ms. Maclean answered that consensus was reached at last meeting to combine Mr. Hanna and Mr. Coogan's suggestions into one Vision Statement that is 6 lines or less. Keep future tense and positive, while acknowledging that there is work to be done.

Ms. Erben: likes the proposed Vision Statement better than Mr. Coogan's.

There was some debate over original statements.

Steve: calls question.

**Motion to strike "natural and developed" carries.**

Mr. Lukshin would like to see "quality housing" stated in the Vision Statement before "walkable".

**Mr. Hanna moves to accept the paragraph with the change.**

**Mr. Pusich seconds.**

**Motion made by Mr. Hanna carried.**

**Mr. Lukshin: moves to accept this modified vision statement as the defining vision statement for this group**

**Mr. Pusich seconded**

Mr. Chard made a friendly amendment to add "with grammar changes".

Mr. Chard's change was accepted.

**The motion made by Mr. Lukshin carried**

VI. Reach consensus on Land Use Chapter, Goals and Actions

a. Discuss the chapter (10 minutes)

b. Presentation by CBJ Public Works – Recycle Works, Michele Elfers

Ms. Maclean stated that there is concern over landfill issues – don't want to lose all the work here by recommending removal and having it not pass the Assembly

Ms. Maclean then turned the discussion over to Ms. Elfers

The Recycle Works program educates the public about recycling, land fill, long term growth & CBJs role in solid waste of the city

Ms. Elfers gave an overview of the need for solid waste disposal and CBJ Solid Waste Management study

CBJ's use of solid waste – where it goes, where it could go

Ms. Elfers will be putting her presentation for tonight on the Recycle Works website – will give to committee

The following points were made:

Landfill is not owned by CBJ

Collection not owned by CBJ

CBJ may not collect garbage

CBJ has no say in where the garbage goes

CBJ MAY take control of recycling

Mr. Collison asked why CBJ doesn't have authority

Ms. Elfers explained that garbage collection is regulated by the Regulatory Commission of AK which regulates services and rates

CBJ cannot compete with private business so there would have to be compensation to current company

Cost got too high – negotiations fell through

Could start the process again

Mr. Steedle stated that negotiations fell apart in 2012.

Ms. Elfers answered the questions: What are our options? What do we do with our trash? New landfill? (This will be logistically difficult)

The CBJ did a 1993 landfill location study. They options are to:

Ship garbage to lower 48 – this will likely happen

Transfer station may be built to – ship the garbage down south

Multiple studies – studies say that in SE AK or Juneau there is not enough trash to make this economically viable

No need to make that energy with hydropower is around!

Mr. Jones mentioned that the SE Conference studied the idea of Juneau shipping garbage to another SE community a few years ago – no community wants to use up their land and the thought was that there would not be enough trash to make this economically viable – still comes up at SE conference agenda, but hasn't been pushed

Ms. Coon wanted to know if the gasses produced could be burned off to reduce the smell.

Ms. Elfers stated that this is on the table –

Solid Waste Action Plan Progress – can be found online

Glass is recycled by CBJ – we reuse by grinding up and using for road-base – not gravel etc.

CBJ can look at what we can do in the future when the landfill reaches the end of its lifespan

Mr. Vance would like to invite anybody who has questions about the landfill to come over and talk – can show the landfill, want to be a good neighbor, be part of the community. Mr. Vance highlighted a few new technologies that Capital Waste Management might look into.

A high amount of waste stream could be recycled to downplay the landfill.

Mr. Voelckers asked Mr. Vance to please elaborate on the 20 year termination date

Mr. Vance explained the side slope requirement, defined footprint, and that the date could change based on more or less waste coming in. The landfill is required to get a new permit every 5 years. This 20 year prediction is pretty solid

Capital Waste Management will manage the site for 30 years after it is closed – maintain and report on the fill – after it gets capped

Mr. Collison stated that deterioration of the waste could take longer than 30 years – who is responsible after 30 years?

Mr. Vance responded that organic waste deteriorates very quickly – so much moisture. Decomposition happens pretty quickly – methane production already heavily declined in some parts. Gas will be much reduced after first 2 or three years after capping

Mr. Hanna stated that he was on a solid waste working group – wanted to have mandatory recycling so landfill would continue longer in a cleaner manner – could be more than 20 years if we divert waste to recycling and composting

Mr. Hanna believes that the community shouldn't be asking that the landfill be closed- just get it to be a better part of our community. Mr. Hanna went on to say that Mr. Vance is always very responsible – they are trying to do their best – they've made progress by leaps and bounds, feels confident that they will continue to improve and encourage improvement rather than removal.

Mr. Chard wanted to express his appreciation for Mr. Vance being here and recognized all the good work that is being done by Capital Waste Management, but that maybe it's time for better solutions to Juneau's waste management issues because the status quo is no longer acceptable for the residents of Lemon Creek. .

Mr. Collison stated that reclaiming the landfill as a park space could be a part of this steering committee's purview.

Mr. Vance stated that this has happened in other cities. Often the private management company will turn over the land to city and community to create recreation without tall buildings or big trees. Motocross Park would be good.

Mr. Chard asked Mr. Vance how the LC Steering Committee could help Capital Waste Management

Mr. Vance told the committee that communication is key; and that he had not had a complaint in a long time. If there are any issues he would like for the committee and the community to let him know..

Mr. Collison wanted to know if an engineer from Capital Waste Management could come to a future Steering Committee meeting.

Mr. Vance said that this is possible but the engineers would need to be given plenty of notice. Ms. Maclean explained that the legal questions that the committee was asking about will be verified and addressed at a future meeting, and that building communication between the community and Capital Waste Management would be a good role for the LC Neighborhood Association.

i. Discuss the goals and actions (45 minutes)

Goal 2:

Mr. Lukshin presented a motion to include an action item that says “upon closure the landfill space be designated as a park or recreational area”

Mr. Quigley seconded this motion.

Mr. Collison asked if the city force a private land owner to designate that land

Mr. Hanna stated that friendly encouragement goes along away.

**The motion carries – Mr. Chard abstained from the vote**

Mr. Chard moved to add an action item “develop a communication plan and strategy to identify problems and workable solutions”.

Ms. Erben seconded this motion

Mr. Johnson called for discussion

Ms. Elfers stated that she would love to host regular meetings with members of the community and that she and Mr. Vance would be a good contact for community members to reach out to on issues regarding the landfill

**Mr. Chard motioned to add “Workable solutions” to one of the action items under Goal 2.**

**Seconded**

**The motion carried**

Ms. Erben would like to make recycling more of a priority. Mr. Voelckers suggested more aggressive wording would help.

Ms. Maclean proposed the following action item: Decrease reliance on the landfill by implementing a mandatory borough-wide recycling program

Ms. Coon made a motion to use the language Ms. Maclean proposed. Mr. Lukshin seconded this motion.

**The motion carried – Mr. Lukshin abstained**

Mr. Collison addressed the concern that language about closing the landfill could be received poorly by the PC and Assembly. Is this goal realistic?

Mr. Collison moved to strike this action item.

Mr. Chard seconded the motion.

Ms. Maclean suggested adding the following language to Goal 2: “that decrease impacts on the LC area”

Mr. Pusich reminded the Chair that there was a motion on the floor.

Mr. Johnson called for a second vote regarding the Goal 2 action item. **The motion made by Ms. Coon carried.**

**Mr. Chard made a motion to include the language proposed to by Ms. Maclean to Goal 2.**

Mr. Hanna seconded this motion.

**The motion made by Mr. Chard carried.**

## Goal 1

Discussion about zoning and how it affects land uses.

Ms. Maclean gave an overview of the section again and explained that the goal is to approve this chapter tonight so that the committee can move onto to the Housing and Neighborhoods chapter.

**Mr. Hanna made a motion to approve Goal 1 as is.**

Mr. Lukshin seconded this motion.

Ms. Erben asked in action item 2 could be made stronger.

Mr. Chard asked if by promoting MU zoning the committee would be hampering future development.

Ms. Maclean explained that MU would allow most things that are already allowed in GC and LC and would allow for more housing and has no height restriction and that any rezone would be legally noticed – prop owners given ability to protest or comment. Many current uses would be further in compliance with new MU zoning

Mr. Johnson calls the motion to a vote.

**Motion Carries**

**Mr. Hanna made a motion to adopt goal 3 as it stands.**

**Seconded**

Mr. Lukshin made a friendly amendment to the motion to split action two: “Keep residential neighborhoods intact” as one action item.

New action item: “Allow for industrial and commercial growth in strategic areas.”

Ms. Erben seconded Mr. Lukshin’s friendly amendment.

**The motion carries.**

**Mr. Lukshin made a motion to adopt goal 2 as amended**

Mr. Pusich seconded this motion.

**The motion carries**

Mr. Collison feels that it is important to see these changes in writing before we vote on them.

## VII. Public Participation (15 minutes)

Llewellyn Lechancy – mentioned that trash hanging in the trees is one of Lemon Creek’s biggest problems & partly digested trash under the trees Eric says that they’ll help clean up the yard.

The State’s budget was released with 900 fewer state positions. That is going to affect us and our housing, abandoned houses, fewer government services. Keep that in mind when we think about our future here. This is hitting us and will affect us.

## VIII. Review Order of Upcoming Chapters, Workshop & Date (3 minutes)

Next meeting will be January 12, 2017. The Steering Committee will have a draft of the Housing and Neighborhoods plan very soon.

All upcoming meeting dates are posted but keep in mind that chapter dates may change

Saturday February 4, 2017 is the tentative date for the design charrette – MRV Architects & CBJ Staff will guide participants to look at potential park locations and bike connectivity.

IX. Adjournment

**Mr. Hanna made a motion to adjourn the meeting.**

**Mr. Pusich seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried.**

**Next Meeting Date: January 12, 2016**