

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

May 4, 2015, 5:00 PM.

Assembly Chambers

I. ROLL CALL

Jesse Kiehl called the meeting to order at 5:05pm.

Members Present: Jesse Kiehl; Jerry Nankervis; Mary Becker; Kate Troll

Other Assembly Members Present: Karen Crane; Mayor Sanford; Loren Jones; Debbie White

Liaisons Present: Bill Peters; Gerry Landry; Mike Peterson

Staff Present: Greg Chaney, Lands Manager; Jessica Beck, Lands Specialist

Public Present: Eric Clark, Representative from Christ Evangelical Lutheran Church

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

There were no agenda changes.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. March 23, 2015

The minutes of the March 23, 2015 Lands Committee meeting were approved.

IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was no public participation on non-agenda items.

V. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Land Trade with Christ Evangelical Lutheran Church to Provide Right-of-Way Access for Pederson Hill Subdivision

Mr. Chaney: Eric Clark, from the church, is in attendance. I've got a lot of information, but I'm going to run through it quickly. Let me know if you have any questions. The Pederson Hill area was recently rezoned from D1 to D10 and D10SF. There has been a lot of discussion on the D10SF area, but the D10 area is about twice the size. That is looking forward to the in the mid-to-long term future. In the near term, this property doesn't abut the right-of-way. First we need to get access. We have a major subdivision plat for the area, a concept, not drawn by an engineer. It gives an idea of the size of lots, about 100 ft. by 50 ft. wide. There is another area that could be turned into a multi-family area. 200 single-family homes is the grand vision. This access is critical for that. We have another access up here, but the problem is that it's on the uphill side. If you want to build gravity fed storm drainage and sewer lines, you have to work from the low point and start up. The drainage works well to that point. When talking to DOT, they wanted a four-way intersection. This proposed land trade is across from Sherwood Lane. The soil is a lot shallower farther up, but the church wasn't interested in trading property. We don't have enough money set aside right now to complete the whole thing. Phase I is the initial phase. Phase 2 would require the second access. Phase 3 would need enhanced water pressure. Phase 4 requires a partnership with the University. We could look at doing a public private partnership for some of it. The one thing we know for sure is that we need access. We looked at options for the intersection. One would be to go this way to the north of the church and the other would swoop down below the church. DOWL looked at both for soil depths and everything. One is muskeg-y. The other option is not as deep but it's longer, so costs for developing the routes are equivalent. We asked the

church. They preferred the option below the church. This is the proposed intersection. The church would be up on the hill with the road below. We talked about an equal area land trade. We would trade .9 acres of our property for .9 acres of their property. It gives them room to expand in the future and it gives us access. We reached a memorandum of understanding and had DOWL draw up a plat. It didn't turn out to be quite the rectangle I thought it would be. It's got a little jog, but it's still equal area. The Planning Commission heard this on April 14th and recommended in favor of the land trade. Fish and Game has mapped an anadromous stream that ends in the church. I imagine the fish sitting in the pews. It is an old map that has been digitized. We had a modern look at the drainage here. If you go there there's a lot of standing water, but over here it's full on streams. It's possible when the church was built, the water was a stream that has been diverted. This is another way to look at it. There's a general marshy area and this is the area we're proposing to build the road. There are topo lines showing the same thing. We'll have to look at how far up the fish actually swim when we do that subdivision. This is how far Fish and Game have said they swim. We'll have to work out those details. The Wetland Review Board was generally supportive of the idea. There are forested wetlands. We'll need to go through the Army Corps of Engineers at some point.

In November 2014 I wrote a memo about the subdivision and how we can stimulate the housing market. There are a lot of ways to go at it. At Lena we've been selling them by sealed competitive bid. To stimulate housing, we could sell by lottery where everyone would know the price. Then we could offer a rebate, if they build a house and get certificate of occupancy within 2-3 years of purchase, then we'd give a purchase refund of about 20%. For developers we could sell a block of 5-10 lots and also sell individual lots. If people want to buy them, build on them and then sell them, then great, the community would get more housing. The rebate would be a hit on the Lands Fund but it's also bringing in funds via property tax.

How does the equal area land trade pencil out? Based on old assessments, .9 acres of land, our land \$7,742 for .9 acres and the church \$11,262 for .9 acres. With sewer hookup being about \$3,500 it makes it about equal.

Mr. Nankervis: It's interesting to look at some of the way to get them out there. You're idea, 20% off the sale price. For the developers, the tax abatement for subdivision development - I'm wondering if this property would qualify for that.

Mr. Chaney: If you're the developer, you can subdivide but wouldn't pay tax until they sell or something like that. It doesn't affect us because we don't pay property tax.

Mr. Nankervis: If we have a developer buys 5 lots in a row. Would they be paying taxes on them?

Mr. Chaney: My answer would be that they pay taxes on it. I hadn't really thought about that.

Generally if you buy land you pay taxes.

Mr. Nankervis: If we subdivide it.

Mr. Kiehl: If we were to sell large blocks and then someone else subdivides it, then that would be applicable. Not something for tonight, but something we should discuss.

In terms of coming back to the question of access, is it still your understanding that we're going to build the road and utilities.

Mr. Chaney: Once we own the land, we could either build the road ourselves, or we could develop a public private partnership. What I'm concerned about with building the road is that there's no money in this. It's super expensive with no return. If they were to take a larger chunk, maybe it would pan out eventually. If they subdivide and build houses it's kind of a wash. We may be able to get a partner, may not, but we still need access. We'll still be on the hook for this part.

Mr. Kiehl: The analysis that previous Lands Committees looked at was City funding to build the road to the property lot to the subdivided pieces.

Mr. Chaney: That's the impression I've been moving forward under. We could entertain options from the private sector. The process for going to go out to get partners and developing those agreements takes time. I thought we wanted to get lots on the market. Or we can get proposals. If we were to do it in phases, the first phase is expensive. But as a private sector developer it would be more attractive to build around that. I can do some analysis if needed. As far as the access, I don't see another way around it.

Mr. Kiehl: This access vs. the other access. The rough estimate is that the two potential routes would have comparable costs to construct. Do you have a rough estimate of how much?

Mr. Chaney: I don't feel comfortable quoting the numbers. I've been told with a lot of variables. We don't know what we're going to get into in terms of soils. There will be a lot of engineering to get in there. It's probably 1/4 to 1/2 a million to get access to the site. We're going to have to

improve the intersection. The road has to be built to a high standard because it accesses the whole subdivision.

Mr. Jones: I don't want to delay the land swap, but DOT is getting ready to improve the road to Auke Bay. On that side of the highway there is the pedestrian path all the way out. How would that impact how the road might get designed for that intersection? Does that need to be part of DOT's plans? Is that an issue we need to think about now?

Mr. Chaney: We're already talking with DOT but they're already laying down the pedestrian path right now. That train already left the station.

Mr. Landry: PRAC was involved with that in getting the bike path. The bike path will be put in and part of development. I think it's in this year's funding.

Mr. Chaney: It won't be too difficult to re-engineer that area.

Mr. Landry: The new access that goes there is a trail that comes from Montana Creek access to within 50 yards of that. It dead ends at a closed gate. It would be nice to have a connection into that trail.

Mr. Chaney: This is a path here; it's intended to be a path for people from Swampy Acres to connect into the horse trail. It's not ideal to have a horse next to traffic. This will be the first part built. That is one feature. If you had school children, they could walk from here across the bridge to Riverbend or the high school.

Mr. Jones: Where are the nearest bus stops? The Comprehensive Plan there were some issues about incentives for developers for transit oriented development. There are some things CDD can do to enhance the development. I'm curious if this would be close enough to an area to be an asset to the development.

Mr. Chaney: I don't know exactly where it is. I think it's within a .25 mile.

Mr. Landry: There is one sign at the Sherwood Lane.

Mr. Chaney: It's definitely close to transit.

Mr. Nankervis: I think the church would prefer option 1. That makes the most sense to me as far as traffic flow. I know a city had a gravel pit and could get fill relatively cheap. Option 1 looks good to me.

Mr. Kiehl: Is that a motion?

Mr. Nankervis: I move option number 1 from this committee to the Assembly.

Ms. Becker: You wanted a motion on the exchange?

Mr. Nankervis: Option 1 would give us the property on the east side of the church.

Mr. Chaney: I should have included on my slide the last part of my staff report, the staff recommendation of the land trade of .9 acres between the City and the Christ Evangelical Church of Juneau.

Mr. Nankervis: I can reword that motion: We approve the .9 acres of land swap that provide option 1 access to the Pederson Hill site and forward that to the Assembly.

Hearing no objection, motion passes.

VI. STAFF REPORTS

Mr. Chaney: I have been working feverously with the Army Corps to get the wetland permit for Switzer. A month ago I was told we would have the permit in two weeks. I've been on the phone with Anchorage re-writing our report again. Today they said two weeks again. I remain skeptical but hopeful.

VII. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Liaisons Reports:

Mr. Peters: No report.

Mr. Peterson: No report.

Mr. Landry: The PRAC had their annual meeting last month. I've put some feelers out last for things they want to bring to Lands. I may have some items in the future.

Committee Member Reports:

Mr. Nankervis: I would like to know if Ms. Troll is still with us.

Ms. Troll: I do have a comment. In a previous Lands Committee meeting we requested the Planning Commission to look at residential zones for more daycare options. Since that time, myself and Debbie White have had a chance to look at ways to advance getting daycare facilities. I want to build on our previous action to consider conditional uses for daycares in D1, D3 and D5. Mr. Kiehl: The previous motion was to start a process for allowing larger daycares in all residential zones. Are you asking we dial that back?

Ms. Troll: No. I'm suggesting we provide a little more insight to let the Planning Commission know that in these particular zones it makes good sense to consider conditional use permits. We've been looking at this and we think these are some workable areas. Maybe the liaison can carry that focus or interest forward to them.

Mr. Peterson: Title 49 is working on that. I missed the last meeting. There is another Title 49 meeting this week and I will carry forward that message.

Mr. Jones: I've been asked by a couple people and I spoke with Mr. Chaney this afternoon. After the rezone to the properties on North Douglas there was discussion about what some of the plans are for the bench road. It starts on 6th Avenue that doesn't exist and goes to Eaglecrest. There was concern about the first couple miles on North Douglas highway that the zoning in that area that we bring some other type of access. I am bringing it to the Lands Committee. Mr. Chaney said that none of that road has been platted, or how that would feed into the bridge, or how people would go up onto the bench and come down. Nothing has been surveyed, platted or anything. It might be good to get some kind of report or something that we can give the people with concerns. If people know that there's a plan for the bench road, if we're going to continue to up the zoning in that area.

Mr. Chaney: Really quickly. All the work was done in the 80s when they thought we would have twice the population that we currently do. They were trying to figure out where we were going to put everyone. They thought Douglas Island is a good spot. These are very loose alignments. It would start in Douglas Townsite and connect at the end at Fish Creek Road. All this dark green is City property and it would give us tremendous property for new projects. It would be an expensive road to build. It's a big project and visionary project. If we had millions of dollars it's a good way to go. If in the future we get more residents or revenue, it's a great place for more development. The downside is that the bridge is already marginal. We would have to look at another improvement the bridge or second access across the channel.

Ms. Becker: Hasn't some of this been started at Eaglecrest? Or is that another trail?

Mr. Jones: I think that's the Treadwell Ditch Trail.

Mayor Sanford: If you're going to make recommendation to staff along the way and it's going to change directions that the Assembly has given as a whole, make sure you bring the recommendations to the Assembly so we can all vote and it comes from the whole Assembly and not just four of us. Don't change the goals of the Assembly that are already set by all nine of us.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 5:43pm.