

MINUTES
**WETLANDS REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING**

December 12, 2013, 5:15 p.m. Marine View 4th floor conference room

Meeting Summary

Board Members Present: Hal Geiger, Brenda Wright, Amy Sumner, Nina Horne, Dan Miller
Brenda Wright, Lisa Hoferkamp, Jerry Medina

Board Members Absent: Andrew Campbell

A quorum was present.

Staff Members Present: Teri Camery, CBJ Planner, Chrissy McNally, CBJ Planner; Hal Hart, Community Development Department Director

Public Present: Mac Salway, HDR Alaska; Greg Chaney, CBJ Lands Manager

Meeting called to order at 5:35 p.m.

II. October 24, 2013 Regular Meeting minutes approved with edits

III. **Agenda was approved**

IV. **Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items**

None

V. Board Comments.

None

VI. **Agenda Items**

Ms. Camery explained the Board's role to the public member present.

CBJ Lands Manager presentation on proposed Switzer and Peterson Hill Subdivisions

CBJ Lands Manager Greg Chaney introduced the proposed Switzer Creek Subdivision for the Board's early review. Mr. Chaney said he wanted to get comments before it goes to the formal survey stage. He described the proposed road alignment and the main areas, 2A and 2B. He said the subdivision would have subsidized rental units under common ownership in the D0-15 zoning district. He showed areas of mapped wetlands. He said his philosophical approach is that sensitive areas need to be in private ownership, under a conservation easement, which allows

higher density in other areas while promoting stewardship, instead of having fragments of public land that accumulate garbage. The subdivision design protects side channels that feed into Switzer Creek. He described the topography, the trail easement, drainage easements, settling pond, grassy swale, and the no-disturbance buffer at the 100-ft line from the anadromous stream, which is not located on city property. He explained that the settling pond and the swale would be permanent. He said that theoretically you could have about 100 units according to allowed density, however 40-50 is more likely with site restrictions.

Mr. Miller asked how wide the easement is on the tributary. Mr. Chaney said 50 feet. Mr Miller said you may need more settling ponds and swales through the area. Mr. Chaney said he is open to that and says that will come at a later stage of subdivision development.

Mr. Chaney said the lots will likely sell through sealed bid, unless the city gives it to a non-profit to develop. He said it could go different ways. The city would do the road construction. It would go through preliminary plat approval, then build the road, then come back for final approval. He said that if the city is lucky we'll break even. Funding comes from the Lands Fun.

Mr. Geiger said if there's disturbance uphill, it will go into the no-disturbance area. He asked if juvenile salmonids would go up the tributaries. Mr. Chaney said he doesn't know and noted that the stream goes underground. He said it's possible. Mr. Chaney noted that the wetlands in this subdivision are not mapped in the JWMP. The wetlands were mapped by R&M in 2010 or so.

Mr. Chaney then presented the proposed Pederson Hill subdivision, which is still in the conceptual phase. The proposed development is for workforce housing. The city proposes to rezone the base of the hill into two zoning districts, D-10 and D-10 S. He showed the non-anadromous tributaries to Pederson Hill Creek. He said this goes through JWMP Category D wetlands, and also impacts non-categorized forested wetlands. Ms. Horne commented that the Juneau Watershed Partnership had mapped and tested streams in the area. The contamination of the water in the area was not due to Swampy Acres, as is commonly thought, but is instead from failed septic systems.

He described it as an "old-style" subdivision similar to Casey-Shattuck downtown. The subdivision includes a Natural Area Park with a trail system. The city would likely develop single family lots like Lena and sell individual lots. Lots would be about 5,000 square feet, and would be the only D-10 SF zoning district in the borough, similar to downtown.

Mr. Chaney emphasized that there is no formal application at this stage and this will come back to the Board again. He asked Board members to send comments to him or Ms. Camery.

Review of Wetland Methodology Deliverables

Ms. Camery explained that the deliverables presented in the packet are from this summer's wetland methodology work with Dr. Adamus, the final products from the Scope of Work that the board helped develop earlier. She explained that some of the deliverables were sent to the Board earlier, such as the Peer Review Workshop notes. Ms. Camery explained that though the contract was extended a full month until the end of November, the deliverables have already

been approved and Dr. Adamus is no longer under contract. The purpose of today's review is to make sure that the Board is informed about the final products and so the Board can move toward final approval of the wetland methodology, as required by the federal grant. The wetland methodology is the basis for the JWMP Update, and the RFP for the update will be released in early January.

The Board expressed disappointment in the Task Three deliverable which required three sites with previous scientific measurements. Mr. Geiger and Ms. Hoferkamp said Dr. Adamus' memo needs more detail and explanation. The Board wondered if Dr. Adamus had asked enough people for information, and Ms. Hoferkamp would like to know exactly what he needs so she can provide it for him next time. Mr. Geiger said that he wants evidence that's consistent, not just evidence that nothing refutes.

Ms. Camery went through the rest of the deliverables, and the Board commented that many of the final products were not detailed and presented in a professional manner. Ms. Camery said that she would pass these comments along to Dr. Adamus and would let Dr. Adamus know that the Board was disappointed.

Ms. Horne asked if it was necessary for the Board to review the deliverables since the contract with Dr. Adamus is closed. Ms. Camery reiterated that the review was to inform the Board about the deliverables, but that even with a month extension to the contract there was insufficient time to get the deliverables to the Board for comment before the contract closed. Ms. Horne requested that in the future if the Board is asked to review something, that it be done within a meaningful timeframe.

Ms. Camery emphasized that the wetland methodology has gone through extensive scientific review in the last three years in Southeast Alaska, through grants from SEALTrust, and is used extensively throughout the state of Oregon. She stated that CBJ's contract with Dr. Adamus is the final stage in a long process of review, and noted that agency representatives in the Habitat Mapping Working Group strongly support the methodology.

Board members commented that they needed a bound hard copy of all the work related to adoption of the WESPAK-SE method before they could approve the methodology and that they did not want to simply defer to previous recommendations. Ms. Camery and Ms. McNally agreed to develop an Executive Summary which thoroughly documents the research behind the WESPAK model before the WRB signs off on the method. Ms. Camery also said that she would send the Board the more detailed documents from Dr. Adamus regarding the repeatability assessment. She also reminded the Board about the peer review notes and the Oregon repeatability study which she had sent to the Board in previous months.

The Board expressed appreciation for the Task 10 Deliverable, the Short Guide to WESPAK, and thought that the photographs were especially helpful.

Update on Juneau Wetlands Management Plan Request for Proposals

Ms. Camery said that she had changed her approach, and concluded that there was little value to be gained from applying the wetland assessment method to small private parcels that are unlikely to ever need mitigation. She said instead, the RFP would focus on public lands and large privately-owned vacant parcels that are likely to be developed in the next 10-20 years. She said that using the method on these parcels would require getting landowner permission, but she hoped that landowners would see the method as a useful planning tool. Mr. Miller stated that the city could use the method just as Mr. Chaney has, to identify high and low value wetland areas. Ms. Camery agreed, stating that this could help the city determine which lands could be set aside for mitigation, which would allow other properties to be developed. Private landowners could use the method the same way.

VII. Pending Permits and Updates

1. Board Vacancy

Ms. Camery reminded the Board that there is still a vacant seat. She said that she has talked with several people no one has applied yet.

2. Southeast Alaska Watershed Symposium Nov 4-6, 2013.

Ms. Camery said that this was an interesting workshop with talks on many fish-habitat related issues, and that Ms. Horne and Mr. Geiger had been very involved with it. Mr. Geiger gave a presentation on restoration efforts.

VIII. Planning Commission Liaison Update.

Mr. Medina provided an update on the Honsinger Pond re-zone and the DOT project regarding the Trout Street intersection.

IX. Next meeting: Tentative Thursday January 16, 5:15 p.m. City Hall conference room #224.

The meeting was adjourned at approximately 7:35 p.m.