

## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMISSION CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU Michael Satre, Chair

#### REGULAR MEETING February 14, 2012

#### **I. CALLED TO ORDER**

Chair Satre called the regular meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 7:00 p.m.

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

A quorum was present.

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

#### **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

January 10, 2012 – Regular Meeting  
January 24, 2012 – Regular Meeting

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Miller, to approve the January 10 and 24, 2012 regular PC minutes, with corrections.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered.

#### **III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

Bonnie Mallard, [No house number # provided] Cohen Drive, she is concerned about the proposed cruise ship dock. She has been annually transiting that area daily from June until November for the last 10 years, as she operates a gill-net tender for Taku Smokeries, and sells her long-line fish to them as well. Chair Satre apologized for interrupting Ms. Mallard, explaining that the cruise ship dock application is currently an active case. Mr. Pernula said that case was scheduled to be re-presented to the PC on the next agenda, although the applicant pulled it to review other options for the location of the southern float, and even though that case has not yet been rescheduled it is still pending because it was continued from a previous PC meeting. Chair Satre said the PC had concerns with that project, which is the reason they continued that case so further information and review could be provided. The appropriate time for Ms. Mallard and others to provide testimony would be after that case has been noticed and re-presented to the PC. Ms. Mallard thanked the PC, stating that she must have been misinformed. Ms. Bennett suggested that those present to testify on that same case are able to provide written

comments via staff to the PC. Chair Satre agreed, adding that written comments could be submitted via email or letter through Ms. McKibben who is the CDD Planner working on this case.

#### **IV. PLANNING COMMISSION LIAISON REPORT**

Mr. Smith said he enjoyed the PC/COW meeting tonight. The Assembly starts their full budget cycle and will be meeting on a weekly basis starting tomorrow night. He would still like to engage the idea of the PC meeting with the Assembly perhaps sometime this spring. Chair Satre said the PC wishes to do so as well, but their agendas have been quite full so far this year, although they will attempt to designate time to meet with the Assembly later this spring.

#### **V. RECONSIDERATION OF THE FOLLOWING ITEMS** - None

#### **VI. CONSENT AGENDA**

Chair Satre announced that there are two items on the Consent Agenda, as USE20122001 previously removed by the applicant. He inquired if there is public comment on these items. No one from the public had comments, and no one from the Commission had questions.

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Watson, to approve the Consent Agenda, as presented.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered and the two cases below were approved as presented by the PC.

##### **AAP20120001**

A Conditional Use permit (CUP) for an accessory apartment on a lot not served by public sewer.

Applicant: Brad Cure

Location: 7348 North Douglas Hwy

**Staff recommendation:** That the PC adopt the Director's analysis and findings and grant the requested CUP, AAP20120001. The permit would allow the development of an accessory apartment within an existing residence.

##### **AME20110006**

A Text Amendment to rewrite Title 53 - Real Property: Chapter 53.09.010 Policy; Article I: Status Maps and Resource Inventory; Article II: Classification; and Article III: Plan.

Applicant: Heather Marlow, CBJ Lands and Resources Division

Location: Boroughwide

**Staff recommendation:** Based on discussions at the Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting, staff recommends that the PC forward the proposed Ordinance to the Assembly with a recommendation for adoption.

#### **VII. CONSIDERATION OF ORDINANCES AND RESOLUTIONS** - None

#### **XI. OTHER BUSINESS** - Heard out of sequence

##### **INQ20110012**

Information about the US Coast Guard's Downtown Juneau wind turbine. – *Discussion Item only.*

Applicant: US Coast Guard (USCG)

Location: 345 Egan Drive

Presentation and PC discussion

Mr. Chaney said the USGC is not required to obtain a City permit for the wind turbine because all projects on federal property are exempt, but they wish to provide the PC background on the research they have completed with their wind turbine so he invited Sudie Hargis to do so.

Ms. Hargis said she is the Energy Specialist for the USCG, and has been in Juneau since 1989. She provided a PowerPoint presentation, stating that the City expressed interest in finding out how the turbine is working, including any lessons they have learned with the project so the Commissioners might be able to address appropriate issues later on.

They have federal energy mandates to increase their use of renewable energy because the USCG consumes a high-energy rate of about \$300 million, which they are trying to reduce. In Juneau, they wanted to view the environment for the feasibility of using wind turbines to see if it would work, as they found that solar and other renewable technologies do not work here very well. They installed a 2.5 kWh wind turbine system in Juneau, and ended up getting involved with another turbine in Sitka. They have a communication site called the HLS Robert Barron located above Juneau consisting of solar panels that are completely iced over, which do not do so well so they have to run propane generators at the cost of \$25 to \$30 per gallon to get it to the site at a lot of risk to life and limb. They have about 50 high communication sites in Alaska because when boats are sinking people call them on the USGS's network. They looked at the performance metrics of turbines in terms of providing electricity, the payback, whether they are survivable here, and if they are useful. In viewing data on the Juneau and Sitka turbines over the past year, they found with the turbine at the Juneau USCG facility that people at times have unplugged the turbine to plug in cell phone chargers, but overall the data for each of the two turbines show very different wind patterns. Juneau tends to have a lot of storm patterns, and Sitka experiences a slower and steady output type of wind pattern. The turbines are running at about 5% to 10% of capacity, which is low but not less than what they expected because they did not put the turbines in just for electrical generation purposes. With a return of about \$100 to \$250 per year, the turbines are probably not going to payback in any of their lifetimes, so the benefit is non-electrical as they expected.

In terms of survivability with the Juneau turbine is that it is still running fine, but they are having difficulty getting data out to others because the interface seems to be elusive due to the fact that they are on a military network, but they still want to be able to share it.

There used to be two sides to the turbine in Juneau, but there's now one because the other sheared off in a 100-mph wind event, which is odd, they are advertised to basically be bomb proof, but the turbine didn't do so well. At Duke Island a turbine lasted only three days after they put it up, which was torn off from an island near Ketchikan due to high winds.

They have had engineering students from the Juneau-Douglas High School, and others from Mt. Edgecumbe visit the site. The first day the turbine was up and running they had 200 Thunder Mountain High School students arrive. They have had a University of Alaska-Southeast class

arrive as well. This has allowed them to talk about wind turbines, energy in general, and the USCG, so the turbine has been a great community education and public relations tool.

They have found this to be a complex process to install a turbine even though this particular one in Juneau is a simple turbine. They developed overviews to figure out where they are going, and then they tracked the process. Even though the federal agencies are exempt from regulations on federal property, they underwent the local CUP process with the Juneau turbine project because they thought it was the right thing to do.

In Sitka, they were provided with an award titled "Sitka Green Business Award," which she thinks might be a great idea for the CBJ to institute as well.

She heard that the PC was interested in noise considerations of turbines, and they found there is a lot of difference between wind turbine models. There are certain models that are solely designed for producing electricity that should be placed on a farm, not in Downtown Juneau. The Sky Stream turbine they use is a residential model, which is very quiet so a person can barely hear it and no noise complaints have been received. Turbines are loud when the wind is blowing, but the wind tends to be noisier. They recommend staying out of residential zones in terms of siting turbines, or placing them away from houses if at all possible.

They have not had any bird fatalities in relation to the wind turbine to date. They typically have had many birds on the roof of the USCG facility in the past, but they are now calling the turbine their "bird abater" because it moves the birds to neighboring roofs when the wind is blowing. A fence encloses the turbine so they expect that they would view any birds if they were killed, but they have not yet found any.

Siting turbines is key because it truly makes a huge difference, as their turbine generates about 10%, the other in Sitka about 5%, with the national average being 25% to 30% capacity, and therefore 100% capacity is unachievable. This includes noise and visual impacts of where they are sited, and whether the type of turbine will meet its rated criteria. There is a newly formed certification council that is now certifying small turbines.

They believe the benefits outweigh the cost for installing the turbine in Juneau, which has turned out to be a good public relations device. They received quite a bit of press through the media in terms of people interacting with them and asking different questions, which has been a rather engaging process.

The turbine does not produce enough electricity to power the Juneau station, but they have a restaurant and bar, so it would be rather difficult to do so. If folks are on the grid a turbine does not make sense, but if they are off the grid it does.

Mr. Haight said he assisted in the installation of a couple of turbines on mountaintops, which have been surviving fairly well. Much of the survivability is associated with icing conditions, so he wonders how they deal with icing at higher mountaintop situations. Ms. Hargis said they dealt with icing of smaller turbines on mountaintops, but all their destroyed turbines were due to turbulence, not from icing. When turbines get iced over they naturally stop, and then they start up once again after they de-ice. Mr. Haight said he viewed their new fuel cell last week. Ms. Hargis said she would discuss this topic with the PC if they determine whether it ends up being a cost-effective project. She explained that the propane solid oxide fuel cell runs all the time at

idle, or they have the option to shut it down, and then turn it back on, but they have not yet determined which method will be more cost-effective over time. Another factor yet to be determined is to evaluate whether this project will save lives and avoid the risk to life.

Ms. Grewe asked what percentage of electricity the turbine generates at the Juneau USGC facility. Ms. Hargis said it is close to 2%, and realistically that particular turbine could power a small household or cabin if it were sited properly. In addition, a new model of turbine about double in size as their current one is now being manufactured that would generate sufficient electricity for a reasonably sized house. Therefore, doing so is probably worthwhile as a residential turbine, but it would not meet the need for commercial buildings, although they are not interested in installing a huge 100 kWh turbine in Downtown Juneau because they want to continue to be a good neighbor.

Mr. Watson asked if Ms. Hargis has been in contact with the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) who has a turbine as well. Ms. Hargis said she has, and the NOAA facility Engineer used to work for the USCG. She explained that NOAA's original vertical-access turbine was located on their downtown pier, which was placed on a non-secure foundation so it ended up nearly vibrating their pier apart, and they had to relocate it to the NOAA facility out the road. The USGC is probably going to loan NOAA one of their spare Sky Stream turbine heads, which will allow them to compare the data of the two turbines. Mr. Watson said they are also testing another process on the east coast in relation to electrical tidal generation. Ms. Hargis said they are not interested in pursuing that any time soon. Tidal generation is not a mature technology, which creates many issues with marine life for it to produce the amount of electricity that people would need, but it tends to produce at a very low electrical output at this time.

Chair Satre thanked Ms. Hargis, stating that it is interesting to see this taking place in Juneau whether it is turbines, ground-source heat pumps, experiments with solar power, and so on. It is critical to this region to move forward with energy resources, so it is great to see these experiments are taking place on a small scale, and hopefully they can apply them at a larger scale where appropriate in the future. Ms. Hargis said in terms of renewable resources and technologies, they have been involved with the Southeast Alaska Integrated Resource Plan process. In Juneau, they are looking ahead to trade out their burners at the USCG station with biomass pellet boilers, which might have a lot of promise, including that she is hearing good aspects about air-to-air heat pump generation as well.

## **VIII. UNFINISHED BUSINESS** (Heard out of sequence)

### **USE20110027**

Installation of a new 119-foot tall telecommunication monopole at Spruce Meadows RV Park.

Applicant: WesTower Communications

Location: 10200 Mendenhall Loop Road

Chair Satre said this case was continued from the November 9, 2011 PC meeting, and he was not in attendance, although he read the minutes and requests staff to present the report in regards to local authority to regulate and potential property value impacts previously requested by the PC. In addition, he would like to re-open public testimony to only address new information items, to which the PC agreed.

Staff report:

Mr. Chaney said a question was whether the City could regulate wireless telecommunication towers based on concerns about health effects, so staff met with Deputy Attorney Jane Sebens. After conducting research, Ms. Sebens provided a memo stating that the City is not empowered to regulate based on health effects at this time. If people are interested in regulating communication towers based on health effects, they need to talk to the congressional delegation, including that the federal government established that the term “environmental effects” also includes “health effects.”

Another question was potential property value impacts in the neighborhood with the installation of this tower. He explained that the standard is “substantially” decrease, not whether it would have some negative impact. The applicant hired Horan & Company from Sitka who is a noted appraiser who completed quite an extensive review and ended up finding that there would be no measurable impact, and his report is found in the packet. He was somewhat uneasy with this and wanted to obtain a neutral third-party review, so he provided Mr. Horan’s report to the City Assessor who found that the research is adequate and the answer by Mr. Horan is fairly conclusive. Both the City Assessor and Mr. Horan found that there would be no “measurable” impact, which is different than “substantially” decreasing property value.

An additional comment was recently provided from an adjacent property owner who requested that the tower be sited further back on the subject property, which he deferred to the applicant. However, the property value impacts were based on the current proposal, so moving the tower further back on the property would be for some other reason than this.

Ms. Bennett said the work staff conducted has clarified outstanding and ambiguous issues, which include the combination of the Horan appraisal and analysis, the local legal opinion, as well as the California material that consisted of many cases. Mr. Chaney clarified that this was primarily due to Ms. Sebens’s work, although he thanked Ms. Bennett for saying so. Chair Satre said this is the information the PC needs to move forward to further deliberate on this case, and he thanked staff for arranging for this to happen.

Mr. Pernula stated that if the PC wishes to re-open public testimony it will take an affirmative vote of at least six Commissioners, and he recommends that the PC do so solely on new information covered tonight. Chair Satre asked if any Commissioners object to re-opening public testimony, to which there was none.

#### Public testimony

Alissa Haynes, representing WesTower Communications, said the applicant hired Mr. Horan from Sitka to address potential property value impacts. Mr. Horan interviewed several neighbors in the adjacent area of the proposed tower installation site to address any concerns, including speaking to residents who provided testimony at the last PC meeting. In addition, Mr. Horan interviewed real estate agents familiar with the market cycles in Juneau in relation to how property values are potentially impacted, and he found there would not be substantial impact to adjacent properties by the tower facility. The environmental concerns were addressed by Ms. Sebens, which were referred back to the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996.

The proposed site for the communication tower was decided upon after holding discussions with the landlord in relation to the applicant’s coverage objections to provide adequate signal transmission, and for it to be screened from the neighborhood and be harmonious. The site is currently 350’ from rear property line of the neighborhood, so a substantial buffer will be

provided as the trees are between 80' to 90' in height within a dense forested area where the majority of trees will be retained. It is unlikely that the tower would be able to be seen, except for perhaps a small portion on top, but the tower will be painted to match the environmental area. She and a co-worker drove to the site and confirmed this earlier today. Ms. Haynes said moving the tower to the rear of the site as was requested by a nearby property owner would not be feasible in terms of the coverage objections by the applicant, nor would it fit within the landlord's development plans for the business they operate onsite.

Hildegard Sellner, 10229 Herron Way, said she owns this property on Herron Way, which she rents, and she currently resides at 2002 Hughes Way in the Fritz Cove area. She spoke at the November 2011 PC meeting. She would like to the tower sited as far back on the subject property as possible because she is concerned about potential health effects. Her husband and mother passed away from cancer. Cancer is rapidly rising because of environmental toxicity, and many think this is a non-controversial issue because even though such impacts might be legal they probably are not healthy. The house she owns in the area is currently too large for just herself, but she might wish to live in it in the future, but if a tower is allowed to be installed in the nearby area she does not think that she will do so. Chair Satre stated that the PC appreciates Ms. Sellner's comments and public testimony provided on this case.

Public testimony was closed.

Commission discussion - None

Staff recommendation: That the PC adopt the Director's analysis and findings and grant the requested CUP, USE20110027. The permit would allow the development of a 119-foot tall tower. The approval is subject to the following conditions:

1. Prior to issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall indicate a type of dark green or brown paint to be used for the monopole and all accessory structures.
2. Prior to the removal of any vegetation related to this project, the applicant shall work with staff in avoiding the removal of any trees over 12 inches in diameter where practical.
3. Prior to issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall submit a fixture design of the utility lights showing a full cut-off design.
4. Prior the issuance of a Building permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the CDD from a radio frequency expert indicating the structures comply with electromagnetic radio emission levels set by the FCC.
5. Prior to receiving an Occupancy permit, the applicant shall submit a letter to the CDD from a radio frequency expert indicating the structures as constructed and at optimal emission levels comply with electromagnetic radio emission levels set by the FCC.
6. If the generator exceeds 55 dBA levels at the closest residential property line, a separate CUP shall be required.
7. Use of a barbed wire fence shall not be allowed with this project.

Advisory Condition:

1. The applicant shall be responsible for obtaining an approved wetland fill permit from the US Army Corps of Engineers.

Commission action:

**MOTION**: *By Mr. Watson, that the PC adopts the Director's analysis and findings and grants the requested CUP permit, USE20110027. The permit allows the development of a 119-foot tall tower, subject to the conditions outlined by staff, as presented.*

Mr. Bishop spoke in favor of the motion, as he believes the PC has to move this case along. On the other hand, he is disappointed that the PC has not yet received the telecommunication ordinance back from the Department of Law. He feels remiss in moving this case forward without that ordinance, stressing that he would like to see it as soon as possible.

Mr. Miller spoke in favor of the motion, although he has a different view than his fellow Commissioners about the proposed telecommunication ordinance because some of the information provided by Ms. Sebens gives him hope, as it states that jurisdictions cannot discriminate against certain carriers. Even so, wireless facilities seem as though they are getting discriminated against versus wired facilities because driving along the Mendenhall Loop Road there are wires hanging everywhere, including poles leaning every which way. That said, wireless towers tend to get the ire of everyone, but in this case the tower will be hidden among trees so he is glad to see this case move forward. When the telecommunications ordinance is presented to the PC, he hopes it will not be discriminatory.

Mr. Haight said he echoes his fellow Commissioners. He commends the applicant for taking measures to conceal the tower and yet provide required coverage that the neighborhood demands.

Ms. Bennett said she hopes that with these legal opinions and the history of tower growth, including developments such as they have in California that the Department of Law should start moving forward with the telecommunication ordinance. She feels that this will be a good project, and is glad Mr. Horan was chosen to perform the analysis on potential property value impacts, as he is a very competent person who she has previously worked with.

Chair Satre thanked staff for providing the information the PC requested on this case.

Roll call vote

Ayes: Lawfer, Medina, Bishop, Haight, Grewe, Bennett, Miller, Watson, Satre

Nays:

Motion passes: 9:0; and USE20110027 was unanimously approved as presented by the PC.

**IX. REGULAR AGENDA** - None

**X. BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT** - None

**XI. OTHER BUSINESS** - Previously heard out of sequence

**XII. DIRECTOR'S REPORT**

Upcoming meetings

Mr. Pernula stated that two weeks from tonight the PC is going to be presented with legal training session by the City Attorney. Staff also scheduled the cruise ship dock case, but the applicant chose to review various options that may require some adjustments, so it was removed from the next agenda. He believes in its place they will schedule a public hearing on the draft Willoughby District Land Use Plan.



They will have drafts from staff for the Comp Plan update done this week, which will be provided to the PC to parse out to a committee within a couple of weeks. Mr. Watson asked if the revisions by staff would be highlighted; Mr. Pernula offered to do so.

The Assembly requested that the eagle nest ordinance be re-reviewed by the PC, which they intend to forward to the Title 49 Committee. The ordinance was recently assigned to a staff person who is currently on vacation, but it will be re-presented to the PC in the very near future. Chair Satre said Bill Hanson of the US Fish & Wildlife Service (FWS) was present when the Assembly last reviewed that ordinance, and their offices are in the same building so they agreed to informally meet to discuss the ordinance. He said Mr. Hanson also offered to attend the Title 49 Committee meetings to provide appropriate input from the FWS.

Mr. Pernula said the review by the Subdivision Review Committee (SRC) of the subdivision ordinance is complete, which consists of >100 pages. Once the edits are incorporated, staff will provide the ordinance within a couple of weeks simultaneously to the PC and a few developers to review, including having it codified by law. If there are modifications by any of those groups, staff will schedule a mutual informational gathering by these parties in order to move it along in a timely fashion. Mr. Watson said he would like to attend such meetings with the groups when they are scheduled; Mr. Pernula offered to keep him informed of upcoming meetings.

Mr. Bishop requested a status update on the noise and telecommunication ordinances. Mr. Pernula said the noise ordinance has been held up for several months on a legal opinion as to whether the City is pre-empted from regulating marine transportation into Juneau, as doing so might be interfering with interstate commerce. If the PC is not provided an answer fairly soon, he would like to remove such language regulating marine transportation at this time, and then deal with that later. Mr. Bishop echoes that sentiment, although he is not convinced that the City is unable to regulate marine transportation in some fashion, but he would like to see the noise ordinance move forward in any case. Ms. Grewe commented that municipalities regulate marine transportation in relation to interstate commerce in all coastal communities along the west coast. Therefore, she finds it difficult to believe that Juneau is the first community trying to figure out whether they can relate this industrial activity on the waterfront. Mr. Pernula stated that the draft telecommunication ordinance was provided to the CBJ Department of Law, and they hired a consultant firm in Florida called Cityscape. Cityscape planners and consultants reviewed the proposed ordinance who have dealt with similar issues in many locations, and staff will discuss what they came up with via telephone tomorrow.

### **XIII. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES**

Mr. Haight said the Juneau Commission on Sustainability (JCOS) held an organizational meeting to form subcommittees, and they will hold another meeting tomorrow to start making this work.

Mr. Watson said the Public Works & Facilities Committee (PWFC) met last Monday for 2-1/2 hours, and they had a fairly good representation of members of the Assembly. The majority of the meeting involved discussing the 1% sales tax revenue in relation to \$80 million worth of proposed projects, but there is only \$40 million in sales tax revenue. Chair Satre asked if the PC has ever been involved with projects being proposed for the 1% sales tax extension outside of their normal comment duties on the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) list of projects. Mr. Pernula said he does not recall the PC ever doing so. Chair Satre stated that if any Commissioner finds a project that they strongly believe should be considered for the 1% sales

tax extension, he would have no qualms preparing a letter from the PC to the Assembly stating so if it is within the realm of their goals and priorities.

Mr. Watson continued, stating that the Assembly allocated funds yesterday evening for technical assistance on the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) floodplain maps to move that project forward. Mr. Pernula explained that during the previous PC hearings on the new floodplain maps, a former surveyor Mel Menzies pointed out differences in elevations he measured in the field in the Mendenhall Mall area versus what was shown on the FEMA maps. Staff provided that information to the consultant who prepared the FEMA maps, and they agreed that there are potential errors that may affect the accuracy of them. Staff intended to conduct new mapping with the \$1.6 million in grant funds, but that funding has been delayed for a year. Even so, staff discovered that Homeland Security will be mapping Juneau this spring, but in order for that information to be available the City will have to provide a match of \$10,000. If the City is able to do so, Homeland Security will provide LiDAR mapping in critical areas of the borough, which staff might be able to use in future discussions with FEMA. The \$50,000 the Assembly allocated last night to this CIP project includes mapping and the continued use of Dave Simpson who is a hydrologist consultant out of Seattle that disagrees with the methodology used by FEMA for mapping the floodplains. Mr. Simpson believes, e.g., in the Auke Bay area during a wind event that it is going to experience big waves, but the tops of them will break when they hit the shoreline and not carry as far inland by several hundred feet as is shown on the FEMA floodplain maps. Staff requested FEMA to undergo a scientific review panel process, and the City would provide the scientific information to them, which is when that panel could determine whether FEMA's or the City's methodology is correct. He explained that staff discovered that the State of Alaska has a liaison who is supposed to function between FEMA and local governments, but they were unaware of any of this until a few weeks ago. Therefore, staff questioned why the State liaison was not aware of this or follow-up with the City, but staff has not yet received a response. Chair Satre recalls that LiDAR mapping was conducted a couple of years ago for the City. Mr. Pernula said that LiDAR mapping was done around 2002 and there are issues with them, e.g., they show contour ridges in the area of the airport that are not actually there because that land is relatively flat, and those were previously provided to FEMA. Mr. Watson said the PC previously stressed that they wanted this process to be moved forward as quickly as possible, so the people who provided public testimony are probably under that same impression, but this FEMA mapping issue is not moving along as quickly as it was initially anticipated. Mr. Pernula said many projects have been occurring at the staff level that the PC is not aware of, such as staff holding a teleconference with FEMA officials to review their response to the comments that the public provided. The FEMA official's response to many of them were that those property owners could apply for a Letter of Map Amendment (LOMA), which is free at the FEMA level, but the property owners would be required to hire a licensed surveyor to survey individual properties. One of the local property owners attended that teleconference with FEMA who had a former LOMA for his property, which shows an elevation higher than the new number listed on the FEMA maps, yet he was told that he would now have to purchase flood insurance, so there are issues such as these that staff has to deal with.

Mr. Watson once again continued, stating that the PWFC was informed that certain homes near the Juneau-Douglas Bridge were not included in the new sewer improvement system, which the Assembly approved. In addition, the CBJ Engineering staff conducted a survey in relation to installing a new sewer system in the Mendenhall Peninsula Road area. They had about 200 responses to the survey, and the results were split in half as to whether those residents wanted City sewer service.

Mr. Bishop said the Lands Committee met last Monday and reviewed co-location on the ACS tower case in West Juneau, and a member of the Assembly felt rather strongly that co-location should be part of the lease. There were initial concerns in regards to pricing, which were taken care of later in the meeting. He supported the need for further review of co-locating, although he did not get any reaction for doing so.

[The December 12, 2011 and January 23, 2012 PWFC, including the December 12, 2011 and January 23, 2012 Lands Committee minutes were provided by staff to the PC for their perusal.]

#### **XIV. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

#### **XV. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** *By Mr. Watson, to adjourn the PC meeting.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered and the PC meeting adjourned at 8:15 p.m.