

MINUTES

PLANNING COMMISSION COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU Michael Satre, Chair

January 31, 2012

I. CALLED TO ORDER

Chair Satre called the meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC)/Committee of the Whole (COW), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 5:02 p.m.

Commissioners present: Karen Lawfer, Jerry Medina, Nathan Bishop, Benjamin Haight, Nicole Grewe, Dennis Watson, Michael Satre

Commissioners absent: Marsha Bennett, Dan Miller

A quorum was present.

Liaison present: Carlton Smith, Assembly Liaison to the PC

Staff present: Dale Pernula, CBJ Community Development Department (CDD) Director; Greg Chaney, Beth McKibben, CDD Planners

II. REGULAR AGENDA

Title 53 Revisions & CBJ Land Management Plan (LMP)

Memorandum from Heather Marlow, Lands Manager

Ms. Marlow provided a slide of goals listed in her memorandum to the PC, dated January 26, 2012, of the Land Management Plan (LMP) and Title 53 revisions. The Land and Resources Department (LRD) staff currently does not have much interaction with the PC, but they do with the CDD staff, the City Manager, and the Lands Committee. They are familiar with many City plans that the CDD, PC, and CBJ Engineering work with, and there is quite a bit of overlap among them in terms of the LMP. The LMP has not been updated since 1999, and it has strong references to the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan). Cynthia Johnson the Deputy Land Manager is also present who will assist her in the presentation.

LMP revisions

She will introduce content of the LMP and identify contributing information, resources, and departments involved in its update, as follows:

- Executive Summary:
 - The CDD and LRD will rewrite the Executive Summary after the LMP has been reviewed.
- Table of Contents:

- Will be rewritten by the LRD after the LMP has been reviewed.
- Goals & Objectives:
 - The LRD, CDD, PC, and Assembly will update this section.
 - The Affordable Housing Commission (AHC) was formed since the 1999 LMP:
 - The AHC works on housing issues and strategies to meet the demand for housing
 - She provided a 1-page fact sheet from the AHC documenting the 2010 Juneau Housing Needs Assessment Study (JHNAS), which is posted on the CBJ website that:
 - Lists work the AHC is following up on
 - Will tie into the LMP
 - Should tie into the Comp Plan
 - She, Mr. Pernula, and Ms. McKibben currently staff the AHC
- Changed Circumstances, 1995-1998 – Implications for Plan Update:
 - The LRD, CDD, and PC will update this section.
 - The Comp Plan was updated and approved in 2008, and the PC will soon revise changes to be integrated into the plan.
 - The Parks & Rec Comp Plan has had updates and the LRD staff worked with them in doing so.
 - Utility Extensions:
 - Quite a bit of sewer and water systems were installed since 1999, which will be added to the LMP.
- Supply and Demand – Land:
 - The LRD while working with CDD and the Assessor's database will update this section.
 - Former CDD Planner Susana Montana prepped the last Comp Plan update when she researched private and public holdings of property, which were near transit, were appropriately zoned, had utilities, and were sufficiently sloped so the LRD will integrate that work while updating this section.
 - CDD and the state have projections, which the LRD will incorporate.
- Supply and Demand – Housing:
 - The LRD and CDD with help from the Assessor, the AHC, and the Juneau Economic Development Council (JEDC) will be updating this section.
 - The JHNAS already refines the housing problem, so the focus points for supply and demand are:
 - The significant supply of housing is currently >\$350,000
 - The demand for housing is for <\$250,000
 - City contracts with the JEDC for a Housing Coordinator who is tasked with updating this information every two years:
 - The last update was in 2010, and new data will be provided for 2012 to be integrated into the LMP.
- Options for Stimulating Housing Market:
 - The PC and Assembly are interested in participating in updating this section, along with other entities.
 - Ideas from JEDC:
 - Financing options
 - Director Brian Holst worked on housing development in Europe, which he would like to share
- 1995-1998 – Land Disposals Re-evaluated:

- Consists of land disposals that have been accomplished
- Add new significant disposals since 1999
- Work with CDD on updating processes the LRD used in past land disposals:
 - Ms. Johnson was the Project Manager on the Lena Subdivision land sale of 43 lots:
 - Held 50+ public meetings to accomplish the land sale
 - Took 10 years to get the land on the market:
 - Looking to streamline the process.
 - Participated in successful disposal of lots in the Kanat'a Subdivision that increased the supply

Mr. Watson asked if revenue from land sales is placed into the Land Fund. Ms. Marlow said this is correct, and the Land Fund consists of about \$1 million, and another \$1 million in Capital Improvement Program (CIP) projects in reserves, which she does not believe they will be using that latter money for what it was identified for so the Land Fund has a potential total of \$2 million.

- Future Land Disposal Program:
 - The LRD, AHC, CDD, PC and Assembly will be involved in determining:
 - Parcels to select for disposal
 - When to dispose of parcels
 - What to reserve on the parcels
 - Protect high-value wetlands
 - Greenbelts along stream corridors
 - Public facility options
- CBJ Land Ownership Maps:
 - The LRD will work with the CDD to update these maps.
 - An index of 16 maps of CBJ parcels were retained for future public use, or will be disposed of for growth and expansion of the community, which contains different levels of detail, to which she reviewed some of them as follows:
 - Map 1 - Berners Bay:
 - They do not see a lot of activity within these 320 acres, although after Echo Cove in the 35-mile location is where they are to investigate an OHV Park project listed in the CIP
 - Map 3 – Lena Point:
 - This is an area of the Lena Subdivision where the City had a significant disposal and re-alignment of parcels, which will look much different when they update this map
 - This included several disposals, and a few acquisitions

Mr. Chaney asked if the City sold all of the Lena Subdivision lots. Ms. Marlow said they sold 34, and 2 were turned back over to the City due to lack of payment, and therefore the total is now 11 lots.

- Map 4 – West Mendenhall Valley:
 - Not very much has changed with this map, which will include a few refinements in the update of smaller parcels the City has acquired in this area since 1999

- **Parcels for Immediate Disposal:**
 - The LRD, CDD, PC, Assembly, the AHC will work on the upcoming immediate disposal list
 - Provide background information on identifying parcels for disposal
 - The process will be similar to what Ms. Montana completed during her portion of updating the Comp Plan to identify land that should be disposed of:
 - Wetlands, floodplains, hazard potential, slopes, and utilities, access, and so on:
 - Page 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 50, and 51: Highlighted parcels were sold
 - Page 48: Highlighted parcels were not sold (potentially remove recommendation to sell those for a future DOT right-of-way.)
 - Page 52: The intention was to lease the parcel to a non-profit organization for a golf course with the option of developing housing adjacent to it, which has expired. The City is now considering working with Goldbelt who is the adjacent landowner along the coast. The Alaskan Brewery has expressed interest in this area. They are studying three different corridors, including varying land development prospects for each of them.
 - Page 53: Parcel was exchanged with Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority who is the new owner. In the Switzer area they are considering options to connect parcels within a road network.
 - Page 54: Identified for disposal to the owner of the All Season Subdivision, which has not yet happened because that entity did not have a rapid development schedule, so they languished somewhat. This parcel deserves a master plan, while considering what parcels might be disposed of for development.
- **Parcels for Long-Term Disposal:**
 - The LRD, CDD, PC, Assembly, and AHC will work on the upcoming long-term disposal list
 - Hold parcels for future generations, and uses. This includes where to focus resources in the near term for meeting housing needs, and disposing of property for development:
 - She pointed out a few properties in this section, as follows:
 - Page 56: Consists of the Lena Subdivision project, with the largest parcel mostly disposed of, and other areas that may be slated as immediate disposals for some of the 11 remaining lots.
 - Page 58: Initiate some development ideas, projections, and plans in the Pederson Hill area. This property may move forward to the immediate disposal because as water and sewer are available with plans for improved road access and a bike path.
 - Page 64: Consists of the Switzer area property. A feasibility study is being done with R&M Engineering. The land west of Switzer Village is too steep to develop. The area north of Pinewood Park can be developed for residential use with access from Mountain Avenue for about 300 dwelling units. The area north of the prison should be reserved for gravel extraction and a future landfill, as the gravel extraction sites can be sold once gravel is extracted.

Mr. Watson said the Juneau-Douglas School District is contemplating a future elementary school near the DZ Middle School. Ms. Marlow said the zoning in the study area is D-15, and the potential of developable acreage and such zoning could potentially provide

over 2,000 housing units. She does not think that realistically those 2,000 housing units would be built, but they are looking around the DZ Middle School area for the potential of siting about 100 residential units and/or retaining that area for a future elementary school. Portions of this property might be moved to immediate disposal.

- Process for Disposing of Large Tracts:
 - The LRD, CDD, and PC will work to streamline this section.
 - Contemplate more of a concise type of process, rather than 10 years and 50+ meetings such as was the case with the Lena Subdivision project, which might include:
 - Development master plans
 - Target CIP improvements into large tracts for strategized development, not only of new land but to also include existing land
- Methods of Disposal:
 - The code authorizes land to be disposed of in a variety of ways, which are very prescriptive on how many days, advertising, minimum bids, and so on, which include the following:
 - Lease;
 - Lottery sale;
 - Auction;
 - Over-the-counter sale;
 - Negotiated development sale;
 - Sealed competitive bid; or
 - Land exchange.
 - The LRD completed quite a bit of disposals in the history of the City, but they have not tied them to desired AHC goals, for instance:
 - Possibly increase the affordable housing supply by 400 units in the next two years, dispose of 30 acres, and tie in a requirement for at least 10 units being brought online within five years of disposal, or some sort of combination such as this.
- Lands Retained for Public Purposes:
 - The LRD will work with other City departments to update this table.
 - The table contains an inventory of City properties retained for public purposes not intended to be sold but may be leased for uses consistent with the master plan, such as:
 - Airport-related uses
 - Parks
 - Harbors
 - Public facilities, some of which include:
 - Airports
 - Fire stations
 - Schools
 - Hospitals
 - Maintenance shops
 - As an example of how the LRD uses this table:
 - Page 78: In the Mendenhall Valley for parcels 454 and 455, if something comes up in relation to the Public Works Maintenance Shop, it would be their responsibility, such as to plow the snow and deal with any potential junk car that might get dropped on their site. This is the same for the School District for parcel

460, which is an industrial park they use for a warehouse and offices. Docks & Harbors is another entity that generates revenue off of their leased lands to pay for operational costs.

- This table is helpful for staff to be able to determine which department is responsible to maintain their properties at their own expense, and is why it is important for this list to be complete and accurate.
- Land Acquisitions:
 - The LRD will work with City departments and review plans and requests to update this section, which will be presented to the PC. If the PC has parcels they want to identify, that would be fine as well.
 - The City will acquire private land for public purposes identified on page 95.
 - They already acquired some of parcels, so this section needs updating:
 - For instance, these items can be removed when the LMP is updated:
 - Montana Creek Greenbelt is under the Juneau Youth Services ownership, and the LRD has tried multiple approaches to obtain the section of trail corridor, which would either be purchased by the City or for a right-of-way trail easement, but the City has yet to complete that section of the trail.
 - Whittier Street Government Complex (National Guard Armory) is an acquisition that was recently accomplished, which was renamed to the Juneau Arts and Culture Center.

Mr. Watson asked if this latter property was donated by the state, or if that transaction was via a land exchange; Ms. Marlow said the City purchased that land for over \$2 million for the JACC.

- Pedestrian Seawalk consists of various parcels. They are in negotiation for acquisition of two parcels to enable the Seawalk to be continuous between the Juneau-Douglas Bridge and the Franklin Dock.
- Other lands they are seeking that should be added to this section, for instance are:
 - She heard that the fire department would like property in the Lemon Creek area for a fire station. They have fire service maps showing that they need to be within a 3-mile radius of certain densities of population, and the Lemon Creek area does not have service that meets the insurance requirement. If the fire department were to locate a fire station in the Lemon Creek area, many residents could foresee reduced fire insurance rates.
- Land Fund:
 - The LRD will update this section.
 - As mentioned earlier, the Land Fund actually consists of about \$1 million, including potentially re-designating another \$1 million for various projects in the CIP:
 - The industrial subdivision work has taken place next to Home Depot and Costco for the remainder of the gravel pit area.
 - Concrete Way industrial area was developed, which absorbed quite a bit of the demand for industrial land. The opinion she received from an appraiser was that it was probably not the best time to put that property on the market, as they are still pushing sand piles around and they have some utility for it, so she has not moved forward with that CIP project. Therefore, there might be a better allocation for those CIP funds from the Land Fund than working on that industrial subdivision.

- The other options might include:
 - Affordable housing
 - Land acquisition
- Recommendations:
 - The LRD, PC, Assembly, and AHC will update this section, some of which might include:
 - Recommendation 1: Dispose of land according to the priority list:
 - This relates to following-up work by the reviewing bodies of the goals, and then summarizing desired outcomes.
 - Recommendation 2: Modify CBJ's financing terms:
 - This may continue, or be modified, but she is not yet sure how.
 - Recommendation 3: Develop partnerships for the subdivision of selected large tracts of CBJ land:
 - The recommendations will probably be a summary of the input by the bodies as they update the LMP.
- Appendices:
 - The LRD, PC, and Assembly will be involved in updating this section.
 - Appendix A – Guiding Policies:
 - Land Classification:
 - Consists of edits proposed for Title 53. The LMP describes land classification in an approachable manner in terms of its purpose.
 - However, while the LRD went through the LMP reviewing the inventory of parcels, they found that they do not make reference to land classification.
 - They are not using land classification in the LMP now.
 - They are using guidance from the Comp Plan as factors considered for disposals, rather than land classification, some of which include:
 - Utilities
 - Access
 - Slopes
 - Availability of developable land
 - Zoning
 - Wetlands
 - They are recommending deleting the concept and Title 53 code reference to land classification in the LMP.
 - Land Management Plan:
 - This section lists principles and policies established in the code for the LMP on CBJ properties, which are relatively similar to those that are covered in the Comp Plan through zoning and Title 49, so there are duplications.
 - Comprehensive Plan:
 - The PC provided an update to the Comp Plan a couple years ago, and they plan to complete a review fairly soon.
 - The policies may still be applicable and the PC might want to add more, but it's possible some of this language has been amended.
 - Appendix B – Development Costs:

- She forwarded this section to CBJ Engineering requesting them to update pages 114 and 115 in particular, which are tables listing assumption costs for the Subdivision Construction Cost Analysis for Urban Standards, and another for Rural Standards.
- When she presents the Pederson Hill and Switzer area plans to the PC, they will see from those work products that consultants reviewed those areas to provide similar assumption cost tables, which will be real-time information to start to making decisions from.

Chair Satre said the Commissioners appreciate the outline of the LMP, including Ms. Marlow mentioning sections where the PC might provide input moving forward.

Mr. Watson stated that since the City has other land where they harvest gravel at from time to time, he asked if the current plans by the City prohibit industrial land near Home Depot and Costco to be purchased by a developer. Ms. Marlow said the City is using the existing gravel pit in Lemon Creek to perform small gravel extractions, and they have yet to complete a reclamation plan. If that land were to be sold later on, it would probably depend on which developer made the right proposal, including hearing what the intention is. Chair Satre stated that part of the reasoning for changing Title 53 is to provide the LRD the ability to give potential developers of the City an appropriate response, rather than doing so by following a 10-year outdated LMP. Ms. Marlow commented that it might be appropriate for the City to plan for a large industrial subdivision and put those lots online to the highest bidder, which the LRD has been discussing.

Title 53 (Existing ordinance with draft edits)

Ms. Johnson said she will review the sections of existing ordinance that apply to the LMP, including proposed amendments to these portions of code.

- Article II: Classification System – 53.09.100-53.09.130 & Article III: Plan – 53.09.150-53.09.170

She referred to page 4 of the memorandum, and page 102 of the LMP, stating that she will be showing the PC the interface between the ordinance and the LMP. These are elements of the ordinance that guide them for development of the LMP.

She referred to page 7 of the ordinance, 53.09.150 – Land management plan, subsection (a), which states, “The planning commission shall ~~draft and~~ recommend to the assembly a land management plan for ~~all parcels classified other than reserved use...~~” This makes reference to the classification to develop a LMP, and how the plan can be developed in stages. Subsection (c) relates to using 13 principles on pages 7 and 8 when recommending changes to the plan. Those similar principles are also listed in the LMP on pages 102-104, including on page 2 under Goals and Objectives.

She referred to page 9 of the ordinance, subsection (d), which states, “In developing its recommended plan ~~to implement the policies in light of the principles~~ outline in this section, the planning commission should consider, but without limitation, the following *factors*.” The 14 factors listed on pages 9 and 10 drill down to the actual contents of the LMP, and most of them are addressed in different pages of the plan, but some are not for various reasons in regards to the land disposal and development discussion.

She referred to page 10 of the ordinance, 53.09.160 – Contents of the plan, subsection (a), which states, “The plan shall contain the following elements,” with those 8 elements being listed on pages 10 and 11. Subsection (a) refers to a proposed 10-year, long-term disposal schedule. It is important to keep in mind how the current structure exists in code in relation to how it’s reflected in the LMP. A key component of Title 53 is the 10-year land disposal schedule so a great deal of emphasis in the code is not just on the LMP, which she will discuss later about the vision for the LMP, and then with the short-term and immediate disposals being provided in the biennial report. On page 11, subsections (5) and (6) are referenced in the LMP on pages 95-97 under Land Acquisitions.

Ms. Marlow said it was helpful to her when she reviewed page 7 of the ordinance under 53.09.150 – Land management plan, which lists the 13 principles that are similar to language in the Comp Plan on what they should and shouldn’t do with municipal land. They are not proposing changes to this section at this time, but it’s possible that changes could be made to better tie it to the Comp Plan. She referred to subsection (d), which lists 14 factors similar to language referenced in the LMP, but not all of those factors are cross-referenced.

Content and Structure of an Updated LMP with Title 53 Amendments

Ms. Johnson said they are proposing to:

- Eliminate the classification system reference because it’s a redundant process:
 - In the LMP:
 - This served a good purpose back at the time when the City acquired 19,000+ acres of state land in a short time period
 - Provided a great opportunity to create a framework for deciding how to management those properties
 - The Comp Plan now addresses this in much greater detail
 - Zoning now applies throughout the borough
 - The City now has a Parks & Rec Comp Plan
 - Feasibility studies will provide a greater level of detail for future planning purposes and management
 - Eaglecrest is now undergoing its own land management plan
 - In the ordinance:
 - 53.09.150 – Land management plan:
 - (a):
 - Rather, they will add descriptive terms to describe “management intent,” as their intent is to manage property for different types of uses.

Ms. Lawfer stated that if they eliminate the reference to the classification system and add “management intent,” she asked if they intend to include multiple use. Ms. Johnson said they will as this encompasses very large tracts of land. When more feasibility studies are developed for subdivisions, they will also incorporate various considerations of the 13 principles listed under 53.09.150 in greater detail than the current classification system provides. Ms. Marlow referred to page 64, Parcels for Long-Term Disposal, of the LMP showing the Switzer area, which contains 4 to 5 different zoning designations. Therefore, that property will be subdivided and rezoned to match respective zoning districts, and then they will identify individual uses for them. This is the case for most of the larger City tracts of disposable land, and is an outcome they would like to see happen as an activity. Ms.

Lawfer said doing so makes more sense, rather than designating larger disposable tracts as being multiple use. Chair Satre stated that in the past the LRD used a classification system, but now it will be up to them to manage such lands within a framework by working with CDD and the PC in relation to appropriate rezoning in the future.

- (d):
 - This section is the basis for long-term decisions for the City, which will continue to be an important part of the LMP.
 - (4):
 - They will eliminate the reference to classification, but maintain its remaining elements.
- 53.09.160 – Contents of the plan:
 - (a)
 - (1):
 - This subsection currently refers to a 10-year, long-term disposal schedule, and their goal is to eliminate this from the LMP by creating a biennial report every 2 years, which will allow them to:
 - Be more nimble and responsible to the PC and Assembly by presenting land disposals on a more frequent basis, rather than having static information per the longer term LMP.
 - Instead of having a 10-year disposal schedule, they will revise this language to state, “A long-term disposal schedule identifying which parcels should be transferred to private ownership.” This will be part of the LMP for a long-term visionary disposal plan.
 - (2), (3) & (4):
 - They have eliminated these subsections, but they will end up in the biennial report.
 - (5):
 - This subsection will be retained in the ordinance, and will also be included in the biennial report.
 - (6)
 - Will provide minor revisions to the language of this subsection, which will become an important part of the LMP in the future.
 - (7)
 - Although this subsection is being eliminated in the ordinance, they are proposing that it be retained in the LMP by proposing that it be for a “long-term” disposal schedule, and omit the “retentions and acquisitions” reference.
 - (8)
 - A newly added subsection. Over the years they noticed that this is an important aspect to closely match to the CIP schedule for infrastructure development of the long-term land disposal schedule.
 - (b):
 - Proposing that the LMP be updated every 10 years rather than three years, which they intend to use as a reference and visionary document.
- 53.09.170 – Assembly action on plan:
 - The major change is to make the notice requirement consistent with those for ordinances, rather than through the existing cumbersome process.

- 53.09.180 – Biennial status report:
 - This is a substantial change. The City Manager will present the biennial report on land disposals and acquisitions to the Assembly every two years, including a projection for the upcoming two years.

Mr. Pernula said land disposals tend to “come in waves” like when they put the Lena Subdivision parcels on the market and sold them, and then minimal activity seems to take place later on for several years. Ms. Johnson said the LRD in fact juggles multiple projects at once. As an example, the first year they conduct fieldwork and soils analyses, the next year they hold public hearings, and the following year is when work on the title reports and subdivision sales start occurring. In addition, they work on multiple projects at the same time, with each being at varying stages of the process. Although they are not conducting any sales at the moment, Ms. Marlow has been extensively conducting fieldwork, scheduling feasibility studies, and obtaining analyses for subdivision disposals to determine where those might best occur.

- The biennial report will keep the PC, Lands Committee, and Assembly well-informed as to:
 - Where they have come from;
 - Where they are; and
 - Where they are going

Mr. Haight said some of the statistical aspects of the biennial report should continue to be incorporated into the LMP, such as the supply and demand of land and housing. Ms. Marlow said that would be part of the analysis that would go into the biennial report and background information to form staff’s recommendations. They will continue to have a housing needs assessment conducted every two years, which will provide them statistics on how close they are at meeting the housing demand, including working with the CDD in doing so.

- They want to incorporate a couple of changes based on previous comments provided by the PC at recent meetings, which include:
 - (a)(3):
 - In regards to land disposal activities for the next two years, provide an analysis for the ability of the Land Fund to support this.
 - Provide status updates not previously reported to the PC, such as on City quarry and gravel sales.
 - They will add a subsection that states that the biennial report will be reviewed by the PC, and after a public hearing on the biennial report the PC will transmit its recommendations to the Assembly, and upon review the Assembly would adopt it by ordinance.
 - The biennial report will look back two years, including forward two years.

Ms. Grewe said the disadvantage of doing a biennial report is that the City will be adopting another document supposedly to guide decision-making, but they might be “tying the hands” of the members of the Assembly and PC unless some of them feel rebellious against what has been indoctrinated and enshrined in other City approved plans. This might be triggered by the changeover in the membership these bodies experience every several years. Ms. Marlow said the City currently works with a biennial budget, so the LRD planning is really supposed

to be looking forward using two-year increments. The CIP planning takes place on an annual basis, and they are supposed to look into the future for one year. The description of the Land Fund analysis under section (a)(3) will almost be similar to a CIP for land in terms of what the Land Fund can support as activity for the next two years. As an example, they could do a two-year master plan for Pederson Hill, conduct surveying work on Blueberry Hill, and then plan a land sale for the remaining lots at the Lena Subdivision, which might be options the Land Fund could support over the next two years. Even so, these are types of products they would likely include in the budget as part of the work plan, but they have to be accountable for such deliverables to the City Manager and Assembly. A biennial plan would work well with the method in which the City does business now, so doing so would not be “tying the hands” of members of the PC or the Assembly. Mr. Satre commented that the biennial report would provide a two-year review of real-time information, rather than by reviewing an outdated 1999 LMP that hopefully becomes a more responsible reference in the future.

Mr. Watson said comments have been made by others that the City has a lot of land they will not dispose of for constructing housing, and if so, such land would be too expensive. He performed a few rough calculations and found that the City has under its jurisdiction 9,784.64 acres for parcels >5 acres of remote acreage. In addition, the City has all sorts of acreage <5 acres around the borough. Out of these 9784.64 acres, he is assuming the City will make land available to construct housing in the biennial report, but if they provided lots for >\$45,000 the developers are probably not going to be able to construct home on those parcels and sell them for <\$250,000. Ms. Marlow the LRD currently does not use the 5-acre thresholds listed in the LMP. She explained that the City has property due to tax foreclosures that they have held onto for a couple of years to see if respective landowners are able to possibly prove up on them to return them back to those people. She previously mentioned her methods of disposal stating that they need to perform changes in the way they do business to accomplish goals they end up setting. The current demand is for 400 affordable housing units, and performing disposals that do not tie into that interest of getting those many units online may need to be via a change in business practices that they currently perform. She is anticipating that the priority of goals for disposal is that they would tie into some sort of public policy. For instance, this might be for more industrial land on the books, to get affordable housing projects started, and so on. The Assembly could then demonstrate that they’ve listened to people and heard what their needs are, and they would be proposing disposals of City land that are directly tied to needs and values of this community.

General discussion

Chair Satre stated that in moving forward prior to updating the LMP, the revised ordinance has to be approved by the Assembly. Ms. Marlow said she is currently working on accomplishing those tasks in terms of feasibility studies for the Pederson Hill and Switzer area, and meeting with the AHC on ways they might perform disposals that tie into the affordable housing demand, which then ties into components of the LMP.

Chair Satre asked if the Commissioners are now more comfortable in their review process of the LMP, ordinance, and biennial report. Mr. Haight said these are corporate documents for caring for City land, and he likes the idea of removing the reference to the classification system from the LMP, which will streamline the process.

Mr. Watson said Parks & Rec has numerous small parcels of land around the borough in residential areas, and there is no way that they are going to come up with the money or use most of that land, which poses a hindrance to infill. Ms. Marlow said there was quite a bit of platting activity completed in the late 1970s and 1980s when the Riverside Drive area and larger subdivisions were being initiated along the Mendenhall Back Loop Road. The PC and developers at that time identified lots in subdivisions that were platted for open space and playground use, so the City does not have the ability to sell such lots that were designated on plats to be reserved for those purposes whether they are constructed or not. The Parks & Rec Comp Plan has policies and statistics to support that there is an undersupply of small neighborhood parks, in particular in the West Juneau and South Douglas areas. There are other larger tract holdings such as stream corridors that developers have donated to the City, which they do not have a better classification for other than to designate them as open space or park areas. Some of those holdings might have a bit of developable uplands, but the thought is that eventually parking lots might be constructed that include playgrounds, and so on. Should Mr. Watson wish to provide her some examples, she offered to research them further to provide a future status update as to particular parks or playgrounds on a parcel-by-parcel basis.

Mr. Bishop stated that currently the PC is allowed to provide a three-year review of the LMP with the ability to modify and make recommendations to it, which they are now proposing to be on a 10-year basis, but PC does not have any role in reviewing the biennial report or the ability to provide modifications to it. Ms. Johnson said she recently verbally stated that they would add a subsection to the ordinance that states that the PC will review the biennial report after a public hearing on the report, and they will transmit their recommendation to the Assembly; Mr. Bishop said this is excellent.

Ms. Lawfer said she understands the PC will be tasked with the public hearing process in reviewing the biennial report. Ms. Johnson this is true, and the PC will provide recommendations to the Assembly who will also review it, and then adopt it via ordinance. Ms. Lawfer requested that the PC be provided a “dry run” of the biennial report as an example beforehand, including providing a sample of what might be involved in the actual review process by the Commissioners. Ms. Marlow said they have historically not appeared before the PC very often, although they can start to do so even though it is not called out in code.

The PC thanked Ms. Marlow and Ms. Johnson for their presentation to the PC.

Comments from Ms. Bennett

[Ms. Bennett provided written comments on affordable housing and land issues in the packet due to her absence at this COW meeting.]

III. OTHER BUSINESS

Upcoming PC and COW meetings

Mr. Pernula stated that on February 14, 2012 the PC is scheduled to hear the tower case for the Mendenhall Back Loop Road area that was previously continued, the US Coast Guard case on wind turbines, and a modification of the LDS Church case. He spoke with Ms. Marlow about scheduling a review of the Willoughby District Land Use Plan (WDLUP) at the same meeting, although she suggested the PC might instead hold a COW meeting, and then present it as a potential Consent Agenda item at a subsequent PC meeting. If they were to schedule such a COW meeting, other items might include the density bonus provisions, including the Comp Plan

review. Ms. Marlow said a Consent Agenda item could be the revised Title 53 ordinance the PC reviewed tonight as well, to which the PC agreed. Mr. Watson said he prefers to hear the tower case at the end of the meeting, and then the other cases beforehand; Chair Satre said the Commissioners are able to adjust the agenda at the beginning of the meeting if they see fit. Ms. Grewe informed the PC that she requested Ms. Marlow to report to the COW on relevant excerpts of the WDLUP, so any new Commissioners should review that plan beforehand in its entirety. It was the consensus of the PC to schedule a COW at 5:00 p.m. prior to the regular PC meeting at 7:00 p.m. on February 14, 2012.

Mr. Pernula said the downtown cruise ship dock case will be re-presented at the February 28, 2012 meeting, and legal training for the Commissioners by the CBJ Law Department if he is successful in scheduling Attorney Hartle at that time.

Mr. Watson said a joint meeting was to be scheduled between the Assembly and PC on their respective goals and priorities; Chair Satre said the details are still being worked out.

Carlton Smith expressed appreciation provided from the Assembly for all the time the PC has spent on the eagle ordinance. Mr. Satre reported to the PC that this case was presented to the Assembly last night, and they heard from many of the same people who previously testified before the PC. The Assembly started to move on the eagle ordinance, but Mr. Smith was kind enough to request that he and Mr. Pernula provide testimony to the Assembly. They explained the reasoning of the PC that resulted in a unanimous vote of 9:0 to recommend that the Assembly not move the ordinance forward. The Assembly remanded the eagle ordinance back to the PC, which will now be presented to the Title 49 Committee. The Assembly requested that the US Fish & Wildlife Service be included in the committee's review of that case, which will be re-presented later on to the PC for a recommendation to the Assembly. The Mayor requested the Assembly to take action on the eagle ordinance this year, and he informed the Mayor that the quickest the PC would get back to the Assembly is sometime this summer.

IV. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES - None

V. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *by Mr. Bishop, to adjourn the PC/COW meeting.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered and the PC/COW meeting adjourned at 7:00 p.m.