

DRAFT MINUTES
WETLANDS REVIEW BOARD

August 17, 2017, 5:15 p.m. Valley Library Large Conference Room

Meeting Summary

I. Roll Call

Board Members Present: Irene Gallion, Amy Sumner, Lisa Hoferkamp, Hal Geiger, Nina Horne

Board Members Absent: Andrew Campbell, Percy Frisby, Dan Miller, Brenda Wright,

A quorum was present.

Staff Members Present: Tim Felstead, Planner; Alan Steffert, Engineer

Public Present: Scott Rinkenberger, Airport Maintenance Supervisor; John Mikesell, Airport Wildlife Specialist; Gretchen Pikul, Division of Water, State DEC.

Meeting called to order at 5:20 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

Minutes approved for the June 26, 2017 Regular Meeting subject to amendment

III. Agenda approved

IV. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items

Mr. Rinkenberger passed around some photographs showing trash in Duck Creek adjacent to McGivney's Bar in Mendenhall Mall. He had been asked to assist a business with a bear nuisance issue. The photographs show a refuse receptacle and what presumably were its contents strewn across the stream. Mr. Rinkenberger stated that this is a situation repeated in many creeks in Juneau and restrictions of the thinning of vegetation around stream corridors is a contributing factor to this issue since these areas become 'out of sight'.

Ms. Sumner mentioned clean-up activities undertaken by volunteers and if such locations were reported then they could be tackled by volunteers. Mr. Rinkenberger cautioned against going into the undergrowth without a JPD presence since some areas were homeless campsites.

Mr. Mikesell suggested that vegetation could be thinned effectively to open up some undergrowth areas while protecting stream habitat. ADFG had visited some sites with Mr.

Mikesell and identified where some vegetation in the buffer could be removed without harming the habitat.

Dr. Geiger stated that this seemed to be an enforcement issue. Dr. Hoferkamp wondered if non camping signs might help. Mr. Rinckenberger said that non-life safety issues such as this were not a priority for JPD to enforce. Ms. Gallion stated that JPD has cut a Community Service Officer position in the recent CBJ budget and there was less resource to deal with bear and trash issues. Ms. Gallion suggested that reintroduction of this position could be an action they should consider at the next meeting.

Dr. Geiger said that he was not sure that the trash necessarily affected fish productivity and that removing vegetation could have a great negative impact; there needed to be a consideration of the balance of impacts.

VI. AGENDA ITEMS.

1) CSP2017 0013 City Project Review of an extension of the West Douglas Pioneer Road through CBJ lands on west side of Douglas Island.

A. Staff Presentation

Dr. Felstead outlined the proposal and requested that the Wetlands Review Board review not consider if the access road should be constructed but comment on the alignment and whether impacts were being effectively mitigated for. Dr. Felstead noted that there were additional materials in response to questions posed by Ms. Gallion.

B. Board/Staff Discussion

Ms. Gallion had three questions she presented to staff prior to the meeting:

- On the second page of the Mitigation Statement – Phase II staff references the “Existing Wetlands and Proposed Preservation Area Map.” What page of the pdf is that on? I was looking for the blue color referenced as a clue, but can’t find it.
- The delineation does not mention Kina soils. The Concept Plan (1997) does in the 1A development area. I didn’t see any mapping of where the Kina soils were? Just wanted to double check given the downhill migration of the originally proposed route. (Granted, soils change over, oh, 20 years)
- Has CBJ considered ending road development at about Sta 177+00? It seems. that would provide access to Development Areas 1-A and 1-B, without taking us to a dead end next to a creek. It looks like the lowest 1,300 or so has been mapped anadromous, is it worth protecting the upstream a bit? Also, might reduce project development costs while still giving the city what they need to get the first stages of development going.

Ms. Gallion asked why this extension was being built. Mr. Steffert responded that budget was available now, it was a priority of the Assembly and will help with access for future surveys related to planning the development of the West Douglas area.

Ms. Gallion noted that Kina soils were mentioned in the West Douglas Concept Plan. Mr. Steffert said he could only speculate that it may have poor mapping but the revised route that they had followed to date and were proposing for the extension had not identified Kina soils. Dr. Felstead distributed maps that showed the revised route.

Ms. Gallion also asked about the termination of the road and if there had been consideration to end further from Middle Creek. Mr. Steffert referred back to the earlier answer. ADFG had reviewed the stream crossings. The funding for the extension was State funding that was required to be spent within a certain time period. This deadline was approaching. This extension is just another phase in the final objective of accessing to Point Hilda. Dr. Felstead repeated that the extension is an Assembly priority and the purpose of construction is not the question.

Ms. Gallion commented that the fish passages on Phase 1 had been designed by DOWL. Mr. Steffert said the fish passages had been inspected by ADFG and the next Phase would be subject to the same scrutiny.

Dr. Geiger proposed that the previous motion for Phase I, which did not pass during the WRB review of that project, be proposed again for the purpose of discussion.

The Wetlands Review Board recommends that if the project is pursued that Best Management Practices be strongly adhered to with the goal of maintaining water quality and fish passage.

Ms. Gallion amended the motion to reflect that the access road should be terminated a further distance from Middle Creek.

Further discussion followed regarding the fish passage design. Ms. Sumner asked if there were bridges considered for the next phase. Mr. Steffert said there would be no bridge crossings, only culverts since the streams were so small in size. Ms. Sumner asked about the areas of alluvial fan and that culverts and alluvial fans do not work well together. Mr. Steffert said a Forest Service soils scientist has examined the site and the alluvial fans were stable and appeared to have not moved for some time. Mr. Steffert also noted that the streams being crossed in Phase II were very different from Phase I.

Ms. Horne said the decision to build the extension had already been made and at some point Middle Creek will also be crossed. Mr. Steffert said that crossing Middle Creek will be relatively expensive. Mr. Steffert also said that the required 50ft buffers are being observed during Phase II. Ms. Horne suggested the board consider how to get most benefit from the project and that this may include an education opportunity along the route with interpretative signs. Mr. Steffert said that suggestions from the WRB on how to minimize the impact of future development on the surrounding drainages and wetlands be a more productive issue for the WRB to consider. Ms. Pikul suggested that mitigation areas could be considered as part of the ACOE wetlands permit. Mr. Steffert had suggested a mitigation area in the application to the

Army Corp.

Considerable discussion amongst all board members followed on the exact wording of a revised motion. Eventually, the following motion was proposed:

The Wetlands Review Board recommends that when the project is pursued that Best Management Practices be strongly adhered to with the goal of maintaining water quality and fish passage.

The Wetlands Review Board requests that there be:

- *Mitigation areas identified and the Wetlands Review Board be consulted on their locations.*
- *Protection for sensitive areas by restricting motorized vehicles to the surfaced road area.*
- *A study to determine appropriately sized buffers to protect sensitive areas in the Peterson Creek and Middle Creek drainages.*

Ms. Gallion proposed the motion and asked for unanimous consent. Seeing no objections the motion was passed.

VII. PENDING PERMITS & UPDATES

- 1) AME2017 0001 Anadromous Waterbody Ordinance Revision

A number of the board members asked that they be notified regarding this proposed ordinance if there is no time to bring it back in front of them. They would like to be able to comment as members of the public.

VIII. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON UPDATE

No liaison from the Planning Commission was present.

IX. SCHEDULE FOR NEXT BOARD MEETING

- September 21 meeting has been cancelled; a special meeting is possible later in the month.
- Next Regular Meeting, Thursday October 19, 5:15 p.m., **CITY HALL CONFERENCE ROOM #224**. PLEASE NOTE LOCATION.

X. ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned at 6:50pm