

AGENDA

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

July 17, 2012
Assembly Chambers
5:30 PM

I. CALL TO ORDER

Acting Chairman, Dan Miller, 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 5:30PM.

Commissioners present: Dan Miller, Marsha Bennett, Ben Haight, Nathan Bishop, Jerry Medina, Karen Lawfer

Commissioners absent: Michael Satre, Dennis Watson, Nicole Grewe

A quorum was present.

Staff present: Greg Chaney, CBJ Community Development Department (CDD) Acting Director; Benjamin Lyman, CDD Planner.

Others present: Kirk Duncan, Director of Public Works Department

II. REGULAR AGENDA

- A Text Amendment of Title 49 and of the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan) for the 2012 Update.
 - Chapter 8: Transportation
 - Chapter 12: Public and Private Utilities and Facilities

Mr. Lyman presented updates to chapters eight and twelve of the CBJ Comp Plan. Mr. Lyman said that one heading of the chapters will be dealt with at a time for the review today. Regarding chapter 8, transportation, some concerns came up with the Public Works Department. Only the new sections of the public and private utilities and facilities will be discussed tonight. Kurt Duncan, the Director of the Public Works Department is in attendance to provide feedback, as well.

Chapter eight has some substantial changes but is mostly an update to newly adopted plans and on data. There is new emphasis on transit policies located after the more general information. There may be a need to look at rearranging some sections. After talking to the Public Works (PWD) and the Engineering Department, there may be a need to invest in the urban services

mentioned within the Comp Plan, and transit services will need to be there to support that and it should be put in the Comp Plan to serve as a reminder.

Regarding page 113-114, Mr. Bishop clarified that Area Wide Transportation Plan (AWTP) priority #2 has to do with the priority of bus services in 2001 during the making of the AWTP.

Ms. Lawfer said she would like to see more information on snow removal in bus stops and walkways. It can be a horrible winter season for transportation when there is a lot of snow. Kirk Duncan joined the meeting and said language should be in the plan that discusses added resources for bus stop maintenance on the state rights of way.

Mr. Bishop had edits to cut down part of a section of the policy by eliminating the last half altogether. Mr. Lyman noted the changes and said that it applies to the livability to the existing neighborhoods, and asked that it apply to the livability to all neighborhoods.

Ms. Bennett appreciated the idea of buses and routes as it increase the chances for population retention in Juneau.

Mr. Miller has seen an improvement in the bus stop snow removal since he began serving on the Planning Commission. The goal of the AWTP should include improving snow removal at bus stops and transportation maintenance. Mr. Lyman noted that the AWTP was put together jointly by the CBJ and the state DOT/PF. There has been talk about updating the plan, but it would be a difficult process. As it would be good to update the AWTP, it may be difficult with regard to the resources necessary to do so.

Ms. Lawfer said that even though the city has enforcement with regard to snow maintenance, it still may take three to four days to finally get the snow removed. As homeowners and property owners should be required to take care of snow, the city's snow removal plan is also crucial. Mr. Lyman agreed and said that ROW maintenance could be improved in chapter 12 along with some mention in chapter 8 as an Implementing Action (IA) and/or a Standard Operating Procedure (SOP). Mr. Haight agreed with the comments and said that it is also a serious safety issue.

Regarding pages 115-116, Ms. Lawfer said that #3 on page 116, pedestrians and bicycles should include winter season concerns.

Regarding page 117-118, Mr. Bishop referred to 8.1-IA1 and said that he thinks it should be broken into three different IAs. There needs to be more of an emphasis on improvements. Mr. Lyman suggested adding park and ride under 8.1-IA3(e) for Mr. Bishop's concern.

Mr. Miller discussed ways for keeping future maintenance and costs down, which could be a hindrance to future subdivision developments. He suggested adding DG#5, "consider relaxing standards in order to stimulate private and public investments in a much needed infrastructure." If Peterson Hill is going to be developed, he asked who would pay the costs for the road. If there is no guideline, there would be no support for such a project. Mr. Bishop suggested changing the words for 8.1 DG2 from "adequate" to "affordable" in development standards. Ms. Lawfer said

that if you don't have any transportation other than vehicular transportation, there cannot be affordable housing. The HUD subdivision behind Floyd Dryden is a good example of vehicle needs, which increases the cost of living.

Mr. Lyman noted that there is no policy about non-motorized transportation in the Comp Plan, which means no implementing actions or SOPs. Mr. Bishop suggested that snow removal item be included in the non-motorized transportation section. He would also think of IAs later on and will forward them to Mr. Lyman.

Regarding pages 120-121, Ms. Lawfer asked the reason for the narrative for the Transit First Policy. She was not sure if that was the appropriate area for it. Mr. Lyman said that some of the details of the financial section were included to discuss the fairs involved.

Mr. Medina noted that data is valuable information but should perhaps be put somewhere else, as it will be outdated later on.

Ms. Bennett said that the people who decide on the CIP projects seem to side on the big projects, rather than the smaller ones that would benefit those who could use systems such as the bus system. The projects that get funded meet the needs of the middle and upper class and not the lower classes. The potential security risks are over the top and we should consider the local concerns rather than spending so much time on how the tourist, legislators, and other communities are going to be, and we should know that our tax base is on those who live here. There is a lot of poor planning that goes into a lot of the CIP decisions.

Ms. Bennet said she would like to remove "low hanging fruit" mentioned on page 121. She likes the comparison of rates and it might be the only way that people will be taken to the service mentality for the people who live here.

Mr. Miller said the information provided in the section was valuable; however, he is also not sure that it belongs in the body of the Comp Plan. There may be a worthwhile inclusion of the data as an example.

Mr. Haight said perhaps a footnote could reduce the emphasis on this section, where it is still noted in the document. Also, other costs for road maintenance are not addressed here. There are some items not taken into account in this document.

Mr. Medina said that a table of prior years' data could also be used in order to see trends. Mr. Lyman said that there are a lot of different ways for Comp Plans to be made; a good way to adjust the Comp Plan detail could include sidebars of data in appropriate places of the plan. Ms. Lawfer asked that if the Assembly were to adopt the Comp Plan, the sidebars would be updateable. Mr. Lyman said it would be through an ordinance, which is easier than a major update.

Ms. Bennett liked the table mentioned by Mr. Medina as it would go well with the table in the economic section, if it is small and vivid enough for a comparison. Sidebars are interesting in a

book, yet she questioned what to do with the size of pages when viewing it online. Mr. Miller said that sidebars would make the Comp Plan easier for those who do not refer to it regularly.

Regarding pages 123-124, Mr. Bishop said there are a lot of discontinuous bike lanes within the borough. A new IA or DG could be recommended to identify the discontinuous bike lanes and prioritize improvements to connect them.

Ms. Lawfer asked if the 2009 data was the most up to date. Mr. Lyman he had just recently learned that there are some data from 2010. This staff report was already published by the time he learned that there were some new maps.

Mr. Haight noted that some sections could be a component of the non-motorized transportation section, which is earlier in the Comp Plan. Mr. Lyman agreed and said that some policies are combined. Transit users typically walk or ride their bike more so than single occupancy vehicle travelers and some policies could be combined.

Mr. Miller said that 8.2 IA5 seems strict. Mr. Lyman said it was a way to make sure that all users of those systems could be separated from vehicle traffic. The current Auke Bay system includes a DOT plan that is intended to improve safety through the area, where some neighbors and citizens who are concerned to prevent the plan. All aspects are there in the plan to look at all the transportation users. Complete Streets is identified by a national organization that is under federal DOT now in order to accommodate everyone's safety. Ms. Lawfer suggested text that includes that "we utilize a Complete Streets approach identified by DOT."

Mr. Miller is concerned about the rules and he would hate to put in an IA involving the word "utilize," where complying with those rules is impossible. Though he agrees with the concept of the implementing action, perhaps it could go by the Engineering Department, if necessary. Mr. Lyman said he would bring his concerns to Rory Watt, the Engineering Director. The project that Mr. Miller speaks of would not have been impacted much by those rules, as it is not a transit route; it has pedestrian sidewalks with on-street parking. The utility poles on the sidewalks are an issue, however, as wheelchairs and strollers have difficulty passing by them. Mr. Lyman said that he believes that the Complete Streets approach would not have changed the design and rules for the 12th Street project or any of the other recent CBJ road reconstruction projects.

Regarding pages 124-125, Ms. Lawfer noted the closeness between DOT and the city with regard to transportation planning. She suggested that a guideline be created regarding the whole subarea of transportation that addresses how the city could work better with the state before money is spent on projects. This guideline could be an introduction in the Comp Plan before the first subarea is mentioned. Mr. Lyman suggested language for a single implementing action as: "a coordinated planning process between the city and state regarding specific transportation plans" to be put under the subarea of Transportation Needs in policy 8.3. Mr. Bishop suggested taking 8.3 IA-1 and putting it just after the policy and before the Downtown subarea section. Mr. Lyman clarified that the language that is to read after the policy goes as such: "The CBJ government should continuously establish transportation improvement priorities that could be included in the next revision to the AK DOT/PF STIP Needs List." He would then remove the

remainder and add a CIP coordination section. Ms. Lawfer said it is important to look at the subareas while looking at how the city and DOT could work together.

Mr. Lyman said that an IA in 8.3 was omitted, without discussion, during drafts of the 1996 update. It was decided that the policy would be added back in. The Commission agreed with including it back in.

Regarding pages 125-126, Ms. Lawfer asked about the first sentence regarding the Lemon Creek area, and suggested that references be inserted regarding that information. Such language could read “as monitored by Capital Transit.” Mr. Lyman explained that inbound Transit users get off at the Nugget Mall and transfer to the express bus to downtown. By the time that the first empty bus from the Nugget Mall arrive into town, after riding through the Lemon Creek area, the bus is full again.

Ms. Bennett said that Davis Avenue was an important corridor and she said that the newly added section regarding Davis Avenue was well done.

Regarding pages 127-128, Ms. Bennett appreciated the mention of the crosswalks. Mr. Lyman said DOT was looking at using pedestrian refuges as medians in that reconstruction. Mr. Bishop said refuges should be included in the Auke Bay area, as there are a lot of pedestrian uses there.

Ms. Lawfer said that public transportation to the ferry terminal should be provided, as she observes a lot of travelers walking on the side of the road from Auke Bay to the ferry terminal. Mr. Lyman said that urban services, which include the area between Auke Bay and the ferry terminal, should not be provided beyond the urban service boundary. Ms. Lawfer said CBJ should work with DOT regarding non-vehicular traffic and public transportation needs between Auke Bay and the ferry terminal. Mr. Miller said that it could also be mentioned to promote Juneau as a hub for visitors, and that there is an economic need to provide transportation between the ferry terminal and the rest of the community.

Mr. Medina said that there is not much mention about Auke Bay’s transportation needs. The intersection at Deharts is terrible and he understands that the roundabout plans have been moved. Mr. Lyman asked how the intersection plan could specifically be mentioned in the Comp Plan. He noted the Douglas Bridge congestion solution and said that specific projects should not be included in the Comp Plan. Mr. Medina noted that pedestrian access should be improved in that area, as it does not accommodate pedestrians safely.

Mr. Bishop said Auke Bay has a lot of traffic which continues to grow. A bypass was emphasized in the past and it should be referenced again in detail. Mr. Lyman said a particular state project should not be endorsed in the Comp Plan. Mr. Bishop suggested that they have an implementing action whereby the city continues to explore a bypass road above Auke Bay from the Mendenhall Valley, namely the Goat /Peterson Hills area.

Ms. Bennett said she was following the Friends of Auke Bay activities and she thinks there is a definite desire to consider Auke Bay as a village. The whole section on page 127, which lumps the valley and Auke Bay is historically inaccurate. Mr. Lyman agreed that they are not the same

subareas. Many of the Implementing Actions have Auke Bay with very little mention of the valley. He will split them out accordingly.

Mr. Bishop said that they should address the historical transportation issues in Auke Bay, as well, for the purposes of opening more lands in that area for development. Ms. Lawfer would like to include the historical growth of UAS to Mr. Bishop's idea.

Mr. Miller said that the boating industry is more commercialized with tourism and it is hard for a local to find a spot at the dock to park. Traffic is not friendly for locals in the Auke Bay area, yet it is safe for visitors. He agrees with the idea to explore more options for the transportation development in the Goat and Peterson Hills area.

Regarding pages 128-131, Ms. Lawfer said that there are two very distinct areas on Douglas Island and the narrative should be broken down as the issues get mixed. Regarding the Implementing Actions, public transportation on North Douglas should be considered for improving. She suggested, "a periodic review of potential use of transportation on North Douglas Highway."

Ms. Bennett referred to the section that discusses the secondary route to Egan Drive where no alternative exists for bicyclists. She found that to be an important idea to complete bike trails, as there is a lot of bicycle traffic in that area. She stated that there is a difference between the bridge and the causeway, and there is an EIS for the North Douglas crossing. Mr. Lyman said it was a shame when the West Douglas Development Working Group ballot measure failed. He asked if Ms. Bennett would be amenable to using the word "crossing," rather than "bridge." Ms. Bennett said she would and said that there should be some mention of the EIS that was associated with the bridge project. Mr. Lyman said that the EIS was never completed. He said he would put in a section regarding the EIS that was begun, the community preferred alternative, and some of the work that has been done on the project. Mr. Miller said that the new paragraph should be better located as a sidebar as an explanation of timeline issues.

Regarding page 133, Ms. Bennett said he should combine out the road community with the Auke Bay community, rather than having the out the road community with the Thane community. Ms. Lawfer said they should consider avalanche hazards with Thane, which is not an issue for out the road. Also, there should be a section that addresses mining possibilities in the future. Mr. Lyman clarified that they will separate Auke Bay from the Mendenhall Valley, out the road from Thane, and they will combine Auke Bay with the out the road community. They will not combine Douglas with North Douglas, as the IAs for North Douglas could be separated.

Regarding the Regional transportation system, pages 132-133, Mr. Bishop suggested adding an IA to SOP-3 that references the need for rapid transit by the AMHS to the ferry terminal that is coordinated with the ferry schedule. All members of the PC agreed with that suggestion.

Ms. Bennett said that there ought to be some consideration about multiple uses, especially around the airport area, where there is a plethora of fencing. Airport dike trail users have not been consulted about the fence placed there. Mr. Miller said that the Wetland Review Board did

a site visit and they noted that hunters are allowed but dogs are not. The place provides for many issues.

Regarding pages 133-135, Mr. Miller noted the heading, "The CBJ is Alaska's Capital City." He wondered why this was toward the very end of the transportation section. He requested that it being moved toward the front.

Ms. Lawfer suggested moving page 134 before page 133. She stated that marine transportation is also just as important. If it began with the CBJ is the capital city, it should also include marine transportation which includes regional transportation. Mr. Lyman said that the way the chapter is currently, it could be reorganized so that it makes sense. Start with the CBJ is Alaska's Capital City, mention air transportation, then marine transportation, following up with regional transportation and end with local transportation; following that, detail the transportation by the subareas in Juneau.

Mr. Haight said that air transportation has a wind monitoring system, which should be reflected here. This monitoring system is being turned over to the FAA as of this week and they will be maintaining it from here on. He suggested that the PC note their support for continued improvements on that monitoring system. Mr. Haight would send Mr. Lyman language for that section.

Mr. Medina noted the regional towns should be included, such as the villages of Kake and Petersburg, and Elfin Cove.

Mr. Bishop said Alaska Airlines still has a monopoly on air travel in Juneau and he said it would be good to work toward broader air transportation services. Ms. Lawfer said that the development of aviation safety is a concern, as well, and suggested that they insert language that refers to providing affordable air transportation, or alternatives in air transportation. Mr. Miller suggested that the language include that the CBJ provide business tactics that promoted open competition with different carriers. He said he is unfamiliar with the business that Alaska Airlines does with the city regarding fees or taxes, but he said that those costs may inhibit another carrier from coming to Juneau.

Regarding 8.5, Ms. Lawfer suggested splitting some SOP's up, as IAs 3-5 do not have to do with the safety of passengers or crew. Mr. Lyman said that though Juneau International Airport (JIA) once accommodated several large commercial carriers, the amount of space currently needed by Alaska Airlines for luggage screening took up all the space for a second airline, and now there is no space at JIA for a second large commercial carrier. It could be put in as a policy to include a second carrier, but the newly remodeled airport would need revising again. Mr. Chaney said that this could be an item to put in the Comp Plan that could be evaluated in the future.

Mr. Haight said that there are projects in place for the north terminal, which could be an opportunity to address future development. Mr. Bishop suggested language for future airlines that includes, "working to promote and develop additional carriers to serve the regional needs of Juneau and southeast Alaska."

Regarding page 139-140, Ms. Lawfer has concerns regarding 8.7 on page 140. She clarified that this was in the energy chapter previously. Mr. Lyman affirmed that and said that it had not been reviewed yet beyond its transfer from the energy chapter to the transportation chapter. She wanted to know what AEL&P was doing regarding electrical charging stations. Mr. Lyman said it was a pilot project that was noted in IA4.

Mr. Miller said he cannot agree with the emphasis stated on the 4th paragraph on page 139. It appears that CBJ Docks & Harbors (D & H) has its focus on bulk tourism these days. Local recreational mariners have been forgotten and he does not believe it is a true statement. In order to make it true, major tourism should be mentioned. Mr. Lyman said that the D & H Board should be told by the PC that they have been going in the wrong direction. This would be a good place to memorialize it, whether the Assembly keeps it in the final Comp Plan or not. The D&H Department did not have any comments when they reviewed the accuracy of this section. Mr. Haight said that they should talk to D&H about their funding before any changes are made. Sometimes funding is earmarked for tourism-specific functions or mariner-specific items. The funds also come from different places and it seems that they are striving to get their funds as much as they can. It would be good to speak with them to clarify their intentions with the docks before finalizing this section of the Comp Plan. Mr. Miller said that it should be stated that D & H is actively pursuing the funds to the best of their ability for said purposes.

Ms. Bennett said that if the funds are delineated to certain purposes, then goals get sidetracked. Mr. Lyman asked if an SOP or IA is needed in order to review project prioritization, not only by funding availability, but by larger impacts to the community and where those projects fall within the city's needs.

Moving on to Chapter 12, regarding pages 246-247, Mr. Bishop questioned SOP-2 and wonders if requiring a resident to shovel the snow off of the sidewalks is legal. There are several SOP's that he cannot believe are not currently in place regarding garbage enclosures and yard waste in drainage routes. He would like this investigated and removed if it is already in the Comp Plan. Regarding 12.10-SOP2 he does not see restricting the homeowners access to their property via a ROW; he wonders why that SOP is there and questioned if it should be removed.

Mr. Lyman said some of those SOPs were at the request of Mr. Duncan. In relation to the on-street parking requirement, it is something that CDD regularly receives requests for. There is very little of the CBJ where on-street parking is legal. It is mostly allowed in downtown Juneau and downtown Douglas, where removing a public good and turning it into a private good does not work. As soon as a public parking space is curb-cut to a private space, that space will only be used eight hours per day. Mr. Bishop said that to say that someone cannot park on one's own property is not the direction where he wants to go.

Ms. Lawfer disagrees with Mr. Bishop regarding requirements to remove snow, as it should be done on a regular basis. Perhaps ordinances could be reviewed regarding snow height limits. She also had concerns that 12.9-IA3 regarding dumping organic matter in drainage routes, should be tightened as people do it all the time and they do not realize where the waste is going.

Regarding 12.10–DG1, Ms. Lawfer said she does not know that buffers are used or mentioned anymore. Ms. Lawfer suggested removing any mention of buffers and adding a reference to ASHTO or whatever the engineering experts are. Mr. Lyman said that buffers are more necessary than ever and are currently used. He does not believe he has ever watched a presentation by the Pedestrian and Bicycle Information Council, the American Planning Association, or the American Association of State and Highway Transportation Officials who did not talk about necessary buffers. It is the norm to use street furniture, trees, etc., and there is now concern for having greater buffers for different users. He suggested rewording 12.10 DG1 to read, “Design roadway sections to use elements such as on-street parking, landscaping buffers, and other space outside the travelled way to protect pedestrians from the travelled way and to provide snow storage capacity.” Ms. Lawfer agreed to those changes.

Mr. Bishop said that he can support the idea of requiring all homeowners to remove snow. He believes it is something that has to be done by the City and not the public. Mr. Miller said if CBJ plows all the snow onto your sidewalk, homeowners are limited on where to put the snow. When the fire hydrant is covered with snow, homeowners have to remove it. We are all working together and everyone understands the issues with snow. Ms. Bennett said that some of the snow plow owners tend to plow the snow on to other people’s driveway. Mr. Miller said that the plow businesses have a bond and insurance and if you call them to tell them to stop, they will. Mr. Haight said that it is a difficult SOP to enforce due to the various bodies that might do the snow plowing onto private yards.

Mr. Medina suggested to omit the word “gang” and change to “cluster” on 12.9-IA2 regarding the location of mailboxes. He liked the idea of having a central location for mailboxes for future subdivisions for public works’ convenience. Ms. Bennett noted Radcliffe subdivision’s proposal for cluster mailboxes, which was turned down by the neighborhood. Mr. Duncan said that a snow removal tool takes the berms out of the driveways, which cannot be done due to the mailboxes. He appreciated the PC considering these issues, as it is a great forum for discussing these issues.

Mr. Chaney questioned the word “enforce” in the front of each issue for the SOPs of 12.9. Perhaps a different term or directive action SOP could be used. Ms. Bennett suggested a more cooperative or educational approach to each SOP.

Ms. Lawfer had a wording suggestion for 12.9-SOP2: “Encourage mechanisms to promote private property owners to remove snow from and otherwise maintain sidewalks adjacent to their property, including prohibitions against disposing of snow by placing it within public Rights-of-Way, including drainage swails.” We would be looking for mechanisms available to assist private property owners to remove snow. Ms. Bennett noted the public messages given by almost every elected official about the garbage bears. She said it would be possible to do the same regarding snow removal. Mr. Miller liked the educational idea for driveways and plowing snow.

Mr. Miller said 12.9-DG1, which requires all new construction to comply with setback requirements in the Land Use Code should be omitted altogether. It is a code and should not be listed in the comp plan.

Mr. Lyman said that the Land Use chapter is next. The PC should not look at the maps in great detail until they know what the Assembly does with the ordinance that changes the rezoning restrictions. The text does not make a lot of sense without the maps, but the maps could be used as reference for the land use item, if the PC so chose. The maps and text chapter could be addressed at the next meeting, using the maps only as reference. Items, such as boundaries, will need to be addressed at a later time. Mr. Chaney said that the City Manager was very uncomfortable with this ordinance and did not want this item to go forward to the assembly, according to the City Attorney. However, Mr. Chaney said that members of the PC could try to move forward if they so choose, but he could not advise them to, as it would be contradictory to his supervisor's wishes. Mr. Bishop asked what the City Manager's hesitance was regarding moving forward on this. Mr. Chaney was not sure, though he said that the PC would be better off reviewing the maps in extreme detail rather than adopting an ordinance.

Mr. Lyman said that the PC asked for the ordinance and he brought it to the City Attorney who was comfortable with the language. He was comfortable with the legal issues and had no input on the policy issue. If pre-zoning was to be required, where the Comp Plan says what the future zone can be, the PC may generalize their uses when reviewing the maps.

Mr. Miller would like to have more accurate information, but an ordinance is needed to back it up. Ms. Lawfer asked if it is possible to ask regarding enforceability with the Department of Law. Looking at the ordinance when it was set up, she asked what that does with regard to enforceability. She said that she did not want to have a bunch of separate issues coming to the Planning Commission. She asked what the Community Development Department could do before the final land use section comes before the Planning Commission. Mr. Lyman said the appeal process is the enforcement process; it is not about a policy within the Comp Plan, it is about text in Title 49 that states rezoning must be consistent with the Comp Plan. There are plenty of non-binding items in the Comp Plan, but the paragraph in the ordinance is meant to be very strict. The problem is that when the Comp Plan map is looked at, the line width is as thick as most properties. That was the latitude that would have been granted to the PC and the assembly with the ordinance change. Lacking that, it needs to open it up for interpretation in the land use code or change what is in the Comp Plan that you then have to be consistent with. It also makes it harder to plan for where services should be provided.

Mr. Bishop noted the Comp Plan maps that have many different zones, which is not in the scope of what they are doing. Slightly changing language to "substantially conform" is a minor change and is something that should be pushed through. Mr. Miller asked if a COW meeting is in order with the Assembly. Mr. Chaney said that the PC was appointed by the Assembly and they have every right to speak to the Assembly. Assemblyman, Johan Dybdahl, served on the PC and he is very aware of what the PC has to deal with. Mr. Bishop said it would be good to go through the Lands Committee, as they want more built-in flexibility. The PC said they have the option to hold a COW meeting at any time.

Mr. Lyman said that the Land Use categories are very different from the Land Use in Chapter 10, which could be discussed. Chapter 10 addresses mixed use development in general and waterfront and industrial development in general, along with the SOPs. This may still be a good

thing to address, but he does not want it to be too attached to the closely-related question of those actual categories. Mr. Miller asked if Mr. Bishop knew when it would be discussed with the CBJ Lands Committee. The PC could draft a letter to the Lands Committee expressing their interest in the ordinance, and explain the difficulty in this task at hand, as well as the inaccuracy one could expect with the project. Mr. Lyman said that the next Lands Committee meeting is on July 23rd, which is when they were expected to address the ordinance in question. The PC meeting is on the following day, which is when Mr. Bishop should have some information on the Land Committee's direction. Mr. Miller asked if Mr. Lyman could come up with a letter to express the concerns. Mr. Chaney said it would be inappropriate for city staff to contradict what the City manager has planned. It would be better if the PC could draft the letter, as it is in their purview. Mr. Bishop will write a letter that the PC is unanimously in support of the ordinance.

Mr. Lyman thanked the PC for their hard work on these chapters.

III. OTHER BUSINESS-

IV. REPORT OF REGULAR AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES-

V. ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: *by Bishop to adjourn the COW meeting.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered and the COW meeting adjourned at 8:30pm.