

**ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES
LANDS AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
MINUTES**

November 23, 2015 5:00 PM.
Assembly Chambers

I. ROLL CALL

Jesse Kiehl, Chair, called the meeting to order at 5:01pm.

Members Present: Chair Kiehl; Assembly members: Mary Becker, Jerry Nankervis, and Jesse Kiehl

Liaisons Present: Christopher Mertl

Liaisons Absent: Mike Peterson, Bill Peters

Staff Present: Greg Chaney, Lands Manager; Teri Camery, Senior Planner; Beth McKibben, Planning Manager; Rob Steedle, Deputy City Manager; Gary Gillette, Port Engineer; Greg Fisk, Mayor

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no agenda changes.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. October 26th, 2015

The minutes of the October 26th, 2015 Lands Committee meeting were approved as amended.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation on non-agenda items.

V. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Auke Bay Boatyard Lease Amendment

Mr. Gillette said Auke Bay boatyard was being moved from Statter Harbor to the loading facility, and that they already have Conditional Use and SWPP permits. The boatyard will be under the corporate umbrella of Harri Plumbing, also known as Harri Commercial Marine, he said. The former lease at DeHart's property in 2006 had a provision that if the City were to build a new haul out, Harri Commercial Marine would have the first right of refusal. Mr. Gillette commented that the better use for boatyard property at Statter Harbor is to help address congestion.

Mr. Mertl put on the record that he is on the design team for the Statter Harbor Project.

Ms. Becker moved that Lands recommend accepting the boatyard lease agreement.

Before making the motion, Mr. Kiehl wanted clarity on who uses the lift and what the use pattern of the boat lift was. Mr. Gillette responded that Docks and Harbors staff uses the lift to pull boats and then store them. The Harbor Master doesn't desire to continue that business, said Mr. Gillette, who also mentioned that the lift would be an asset to the harbor. This is a different type of boat lift since Docks and Harbors can't bring the current one over to the new location so the department is providing it for the lessee, said Mr. Gillette.

Mr. Kiehl asked if it was a federal grant that provided the lift, and if there would be any problems if it was leased by the operator to use it. Mr. Gillette confirmed it would not be a problem.

Ms. Becker asked if the City charges people to use the lift and what the changes incurred might be. Mr. Gillette responded that there is a fee to pull a boat out and prepare it for storage, and that there is also a storage fee, which will now be determined by the operator. It will be up to the operator how much they will charge; Docks and Harbor was charging less than what the commercial entities were using so that the City was not in competition with other businesses, said Mr. Gillette. Ms. Becker commented that this might be a loss for fishermen. She then asked for more information on the impact this will have on the lifting of nets into boats. Mr. Gillette responded that the boat lift wouldn't lift nets and that this would still be done at the drive down float with the cranes. Nets are still under Docks and Harbors purview. Harri Commercial Marine is only taking over boat lift and washdown pad. Ms. Becker then asked if the storage lot above Statter Harbor will be included in the move. Mr. Gillette responded that north of the Auke Bay loading facility driveway will be the boatyard and everything else is under Docks and Harbors purview. Ms. Becker asked if the City has charged people to use that lot, Mr. Gillette responded that Harbors has charged for this service in the past and that this will stay the same. Harri's will not do general storage of items like crab pots, but they will store boats, said Mr. Gillette. Docks and Harbors will store crab pots on their property.

Mr. Nankervis asked for clarification on Mr. Gillette's statement that the City charges less so that they aren't in competition with other operators, and if he meant "charges more". Mr. Gillette confirmed Mr. Nankervis' suggestion.

Mr. Kiehl asked if the move from the current to the new boatyard is currently in process. Mr. Gillette said yes, and that the operator is essentially in control but that the paperwork did not get done before it was desired for the operator to move out there. Docks and Harbors is still planning to do some facilities work for them, which will not be completed until spring. The covered area to work on boats, other storage, and the shop in Auke Bay are all owned by the

City, but are in bad repair; the City will not move these items to the new facility and will instead construct new facilities.

Mr. Kiehl asked what the interim plan was until the next phase has funding for the area being vacated. Mr. Gillette responded that Docks and Harbors is moving forward with updating the master plan to not have the boat yard there. The existing master plan has the boat yard, float, and bus station for the commercial-charter community and since the boat yard will be moved out, the department will be moving forward with consultants to help with the design of the next phase. There would be some interim period for parking and staging until the department gets it constructed, said Mr. Gillette.

The Lands Committee moved forward the Auke Bay boatyard lease agreement to the Assembly with a motion of approval.

B. Preliminary Draft Juneau Wetlands Management Plan Update

Ms. Camery had CDD comments to bring before the Lands Committee and is seeking the Lands Committee's support for the key elements requesting revision. The top three items are:

- 1) A new implementation chapter that includes Goals and Objectives and wetland categorization options for future research
- 2) A new section that specifically addresses how to interpret fish habitat scores and a table of wetland areas with the most valuable anadromous stream habitat
- 3) A new section that addresses the "scientific lifespan" of the wetlands assessments and specific wetland functions addressed in those assessments, to ensure the long term scientific integrity of the document and to determine when the plan needs to be updated.

Ms. Camery said CDD is pleased with Bosworth Botanical Consulting's work on the assessment, and the next draft is due February 2016. The draft will go before the Wetlands Review Board, the Planning Commission, the Assembly, and the Lands Committee, and then move to get final approval of plan. The basic approach is to approve the document as a resource inventory, with a formal approval then expanding the assessment with the goals and objectives.

Mr. Nankervis asked how "scientific lifespan" will be defined. Ms. Camery replied that she wants to know how long the scientific validity of the assessments can be trusted before they need to be redone due to environmental factors. Mr. Nankervis followed up with how the City gets that included will be important, and Ms. Camery replied an answer may not be possible and instead there will be a fallback option.

Ms. Becker asked if the results of this update will give better clarity of what wetlands can be used for and for what purpose. Ms. Camery confirmed Ms. Becker's question and said that the priority areas were chosen on development potential and that the assessment will identify high value and low value wetlands for development. Ms. Becker replied if the goal is to get more useable wetlands and Ms. Camery confirmed yes.

Mr. Mertl inquired what was to happen as the assessment involves a management aspect to it, and what the proposed schedule for review would be. Ms. Camery replied that it will flow out of the goals and policies of the assessment, which the next draft will have. Mr. Mertl then asked if there is a schedule based on the grant, or if it is only inventory and assessment. Ms. Camery replied that the grant needs a plan, which is why goals and objectives were added. The grant expires in June, with the next draft due in February. The grant tasks call for another round of public presentations, and after the grant ends, CDD will finish out the plan.

Mr. Kiehl asked if the City was able to come up with a method for property that weren't carefully studied in the assessment, and that since there was an intensive study on all these parcels, if this method could be used for unsurveyed lands. Mr. Kiehl also asked if it will take the same intensive level of study of LIDAR and scientific tests to assess unsurveyed lands. Ms. Camery replied that the general goal is to show the utility of the wetland assessment process on City land so private property owners can see the usefulness of this approach. Any property owner can come to the City and request LIDAR data. In terms of how the City might work with wetland information on private properties, in the future the City can look for more grant funding to expand private property assessments.

Mr. Chaney said so much of the ground work has already been laid out for future assessments adjacent to what CBJ has already assessed. The City has LIDAR, which is helpful for topography and vegetation, so if a private property owner went to a consultant and had their property assessed for wetlands, the City has all this hard work done, so it will make it much more efficient and less expensive, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Mertl said a private developer would still have to hire someone on the ground to do a wetlands inventory and delineation, and that they still have to meet Corps and local requirements. Ms. Camery confirmed this as correct.

Mr. Kiehl said he would look out for, and appreciate knowledge concerning, if it is getting easier or harder to get permits for wetland development as the assessment is moved to the management phase.

The Lands Committee moved to support the three key elements in the Juneau wetlands assessment that needed revisions.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Chaney outlined the below projects to the Lands Committee:

- Stabler's Point Quarry has been mined of almost all the easily reachable rock so the City has to decide either to blast down or go further back into the mountain for more rock. Lands does not have permission from the Planning Commission to do either so Lands is putting in a new conditional use permit request to expand the quarry and is just beginning to work on the parameters of what that permit might be.
- The Lands Management Plan is at the Planning Commission level. The Commission had a lot of discussion internally and wants to do a very detailed review of the plan, which may take up to 4 months.
- Renninger subdivision has been recorded so it is a real subdivision now. CBJ could actually sell property now that there are lots. CBJ awarded the bid for the road, which will be built this spring. There is an appraisal being completed to establish the fair market value. Lands has been approached by nonprofits to purchase lots for less than fair market value price. The question is: what will the disposal process look like? Sealed competitive bid was an effective model for Lena but there may be some other ways of going at it, especially if there is a nonprofit with a compelling mission statement. Next Lands Committee we will have the proposal and fair market value. For the development of the Renninger subdivision, R&M projected the cost per dwelling unit to be \$29,000 with the potential for 49 units being built. Instead of this number, the project is coming in at \$6,000 per unit with the potential for 189 units being built. In most cases, projects cost more than predicted. This is good.
- For the road to West Douglas, Lands is toying with different ideas of how to avoid the "end of the road syndrome" and the things that end up happening at the end of the road where no one is there to police it. Mr. Chaney will present more ideas at the next Lands Committee meeting.

Mr. Nankervis asked what size road is being developed for the Renninger subdivision. Mr Chaney replied that it will be constructed as a standard street with sidewalks on both sides, 26 feet of pavement, and curb, gutter and power stubbed to each property with street lights, and safe routes to schools. Mr. Nankervis replied that he had concerns since the code revision specifies putting in narrower streets to get people to use their driveways. Mr. Chaney replied that when planning for Renninger started, it was before

the subdivision code got revised so the standards that were in place at that time were used.

Mr. Kiehl asked if there is a significant difference in cost per unit of rock for Stablers Point quarry blasting down as opposed to going back into the mountain. Mr. Kiehl commented that the City should end up with flat land instead of a pit. Mr. Chaney replied that it's more expensive going down. There is less room to work in the bottom since as the quarry gets deeper the floor gets smaller, making the process complicated and more expensive. There are a lot of reasons why going back into the mountain would be more efficient, said Mr. Chaney. It also creates more room for people to work on the floor, and its safer. Unfortunately if the City does go straight down, the quarry will be mined out in the next year or two.

VII. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

There were no liaison reports.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45pm