ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE AGENDA

August 4, 2025 at 6:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

Assembly Committee of the Whole Worksession - No Public Testimony will be taken.
https://juneau.zoom.us/j/95424544691 or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 954 2454 4691

A. CALL TO ORDER

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land and wish to honor the indigenous people of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. *Gunalchéesh!*

C. ROLL CALL

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. **2025-05-12 Special Assembly Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes - Draft**

2. **2025-07-14 Assembly Committee of the Whole Meeting Minutes - Draft**

   [These minutes will be added to the packet under Supplemental Materials prior to the Monday, August 4 meeting date]

F. AGENDA TOPICS

1. **Consideration of Shelter Safety Zone Options**

2. **Ordinance 2025-13(b) - Ranked Choice Voting (RCV)**

3. **Burns Building/City Hall Move**

G. EXECUTIVE SESSION

1. **Executive Session - Updates on Labor Negotiations**

   The City Manager recommends the Assembly recess into executive session to discuss an update to collective bargaining negotiations, the immediate knowledge of which would adversely affect the finances of the municipality.

   Suggested Motion: *I move that the Assembly enter into Executive Session to discuss collective bargaining negotiations, the immediate knowledge of which would adversely* *affect the finances of the municipality and ask for unanimous consent.*

H. STAFF REPORTS

I. NEXT MEETING DATE - September 8, 2025, at 6PM

J. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

K. ADJOURNMENT

ADA accommodations available upon request: Please contact the Clerk's office 36 hours prior to any meeting so arrangements can be made for closed captioning or sign language interpreter services depending on the meeting format. The Clerk's office telephone number is 586-5278, e-mail: city.clerk@juneau.gov.

SPECIAL ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE *DRAFT* MINUTES

May 12, 2025 at 12:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

Assembly Committee of the Whole Worksession - No Public Testimony will be taken.

https://juneau.zoom.us/j/95424544691 or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 954 2454 4691

A. CALL TO ORDER

Mayor Weldon called the meeting to order at 12:00 p.m.

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Mr. Kelly provided the following land acknowledgement: We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land and wish to honor the indigenous people of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. Gunalchéesh!

C. ROLL CALL

Assemblymembers Present: Mayor Beth Weldon, Deputy Mayor Greg Smith (Zoom), Wade Bryson, Paul Kelly, Ella Adkison, Neil Steininger, and Maureen Hall

Assemblymembers Absent: Christine Woll

Staff Present: City Manager Katie Koester, Deputy Manager Robert Barr, City Attorney Emily Wright, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Meeting Tech Kevin Allen

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Approved by unanimous consent

E. AGENDA TOPICS

1. GLOF Inundation Maps and HESCO Barrier Installation Phase 1A and 1B

Release of Glacial Lake Outburst Flooding (GLOF) Inundation Maps

Inundation Maps website link: https://juneau.org/engineering-public-works/flood-inundation-maps

Manager Koester stated that the purpose of today's meeting was to formally present the inundation maps with the Assembly and the community. She noted that Michael Baker International would be presenting data, and that attendees also included personnel from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the National Weather Service, and the Central Council of the Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska. She further explained that, based on the data and staff assessment, there is a need for additional barrier work, which should begin as soon as possible.

[Alicia Hughes-Skandijs arrived at 12:03 pm]

Garret Jager, the Surface Water Manager with Michael Baker International, provided an overview of the firm's experience in surface modeling, noting their role as a FEMA technical service provider for over 50 years. He explained that early on early in the project two key issues were identified: the existing flood inundation maps were inadequate, and the HESCO barrier onset plan required re-evaluation.

Mr. Jager explained that a two-dimensional water surface model was the best tool, as the original maps were one-dimensional. He said a 2D map looks at the lateral spread of water out into the flood plain and how it might navigate islands or objects, which was aided by the Light detection and ranging Radar (LiDAR) data that was collected.

Mr. Jager explained that the selected modeling software, HEC-RAS—developed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers—is widely used for floodplain mapping. He clarified that the current model represents an initial effort and that further refinement will continue. Data from the 2023 and 2024 events, provided by community partners, enabled the Corps to calibrate and validate the model.

Mr. Jager explained that the hydrology data was supplied by the National Weather Service, which has experience in glacier outburst flood modeling and has developed hydrographs for these events. Additional data was supplied by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) stream gauge, which serves as the elevation reference for the models.

Mr. Jager also noted that the models are being updated to incorporate tidal influence, as the tides can reach as far as Montana Creek. Simulations were conducted with the HESCO barriers so they could compare existing conditions with barrier conditions. He informed members about the assumptions and limitations of the model, including reliance on local input and anecdotal data, the inability of LiDAR to penetrate water, and variability in basin release volumes. He noted that underground storm water infrastructure was not included in this model, though major culverts were. He explained that events exceeding 19-20 feet are beyond the upper end of the USGS rating curve, making predictions for such scenarios uncertain. He concluded with a brief walkthrough of the updated flood maps.

Mr. Smith asked if atmospheric river rainfall events were accounted for in the models. Mr. Jager responded that they have taken the largest release of volume that the National Weather Service (NWS) has produced for an outburst event and supplemented it with rainfall discharge.

Mr. Jager continued guiding members through the map and concluded his portion of the presentation.

Mr. Barr informed members about a new *Juneau Glacier Flood Dashboard* website, developed in partnership between the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) and the University of Alaska Southeast. He highlighted new interactive features, including elevation and flood stage tools, designed to help users understand potential water depths in various areas. Although no official launch date has been announced, the goal is to publish the site as soon as possible. He also noted that the existing Suicide Basin webpage on the National Weather Service (NWS) site, including the basin camera, will remain active.

2. Consideration of HESCO Phase 1A & 1B

Mr. Smith sought confirmation that these proposed barriers, at the 17-foot stage, would protect and prevent inundation in the area that was flooded last year.

Manager Koester confirmed that it’s correct that, at the 16-foot elevation, HESCO barriers would have no upstream or downstream impacts. She referred to the map of Phase 1A inundation protection at 18 feet. and noted that flooding still occurs near the end of the current barriers. She stated that given the presence of commercial and public infrastructure in the area, staff believed it was necessary to extend the barriers to Brotherhood Bridge. She explained that the city has the budget to complete the project and would not require additional appropriations or orders for more barriers. She noted that the project has two phases, and her goal was to receive direction from the Assembly on Phase 1A at today meeting, with direction on Phase 1B expected in two weeks. She added that immediate direction was needed today because the contractors are done with Phase 1 of installation and if the city doesn’t keep moving then it would lose the ability to do this project to extend the barriers.

Mr. Bryson asked whether any upcoming phases include enhancement or alteration of the original HESCO barrier line, beyond simply connecting to it.

Manager Koester responded no, the barriers are effective up to 18 feet and that Phases 1A and 1B do not include additional reinforcement. She said the reason there is no Modeling for maps at 19-20 feet is because the water would overtop the barriers. She explained that there was a 12-foot flood in October, a 14-foot flood in 2023, and a 16-foot flood in 2024, so there is reason to believe a future flood would be of equal or greater magnitude. She said that the science partners involved in the project believe that there is more volume in the basin because there is more ice available to melt, which means the total volume could grow to an unknown extent. She said that if the city extended the barrier line on all CBJ property, it could protect a significant amount public infrastructure and homes. She pointed to Phase 1B and said there is good reason for extending the barriers to the bridge, as this would help protect critical infrastructure, such as housing and grocery stores. However, she noted that this extension would require installing barriers on private property, raising fairness concerns, specifically, that some homes protected did not participate in the LID (Local Improvement District) She highlighted that there's a bigger fairness concern in Phase 1B, due to the large number of parcels that would be protected. She said she wants to bring back an areawide solution that is fair to all the residents being protected, but there are big policy questions to wrestle with. She reported that Phase 1 is currently under budget by $2 million and the city can only charge project costs to the LID for the barriers in Phase 1. She advised that they are not asking the 466 homeowners and property owners to pay for anything outside the boundaries, and that there's enough in the budget for Phase 1A at $500,000 and Phase 1B at $1.3 million. Manager. Koester explained that a budget transfer would be forthcoming to keep the projects accounted for separately under the CIP (Capital Improvement Plan).

Manager Koester acknowledged that the subject includes many nuanced elements and that map experts were available for questions.

Mr. Kelly asked about potential litigation costs being passed onto homeowners within the LID. Manager Koester clarified that LID homeowners would not be responsible for CBJ's attorney fees. However, if litigation results in financial compensation that could become part of the overall project cost for the LID.

Ms. Adkison asked whether modeling will be done for Phase 1B. Manager Koester confirmed the modeling would be done.

Mr. Smith asked whether the modeling has been done for Phase 1A. Manager Koester responded that quick modeling for Phase 1A has been completed. Phase 1A at an 18-foot event shows increased water in areas already prone to flooding. Phase 1B modeling was still pending.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs inquired about when modeling for Phase 1B would be available. Manager Koester did not have a specific timeline, but confirmed the work was underway.

Mr. Bryson asked about the potential liability to the City if neither Phase 1A nor 1B proceeded and an 18-foot flood occurred. Mr. Barr responded that damage could be in the hundreds of millions of dollars if major facilities (e.g., Field House, Thunder Mountain school, Valley Library and Pool) required renovations.

Mr. Smith asked whether any quick modeling had been done to assess the impacts of Phase 1A on the west side of the river or other developed areas downstream. Ms. Koester responded that the modeling indicated some additional water would accumulate in the Safeway parking lot, and a small number of homes on Meadow Lane would experience increased inundation.

Mr. Smith then asked for confirmation that the belief was Phase 1A would provide significantly greater protection and benefit compared to its negative impacts. He noted that the extension of Phase 1A was expected to protect considerably more property and property value than it would negatively affect. Ms. Koester confirmed this understanding, adding that a far smaller number and value of homes would be impacted. However, she cautioned that the exact magnitude of impact was difficult to predict given the limited detail of the modeling. Mr. Steininger asked whether there had been any outreach to Phase 1B property owners regarding voluntary contributions or the use of their right-of-way. Manager Koester responded that no outreach had occurred yet, as staff was awaiting direction from the Assembly. She noted that the city code does provide for a Capital Improvement by Consent process, which allows for voluntary participation by property owners. However, she acknowledged that it would be difficult to implement such a process within the current time constraints. She also suggested that a Special Tax District might be a fairer, longer-term solution given the ongoing nature of the flooding issues.

Mr. Steininger followed up by asking whether property owners already included in the existing LID (Local Improvement District) would receive a discount if a Special Tax District were established, to avoid being double charged. Ms. Koester confirmed that it would be her intention to ensure fairness in that regard.

Mayor Weldon asked when a public meeting would be held to address broader emergency preparedness measures beyond the HESCO barriers. Ms. Koester replied that no public meeting had yet been scheduled but emphasized that emergency planning, including sandbagging events and communication strategies, was actively underway in coordination with Tlingit & Haida and the city's emergency management team.

MOTION by Mr. Bryson to give the City Manager direction to move forward with Phase 1A. ***Hearing no objections, the motion was approved by unanimous consent.***

Ms. Koester, provided an update on Phase 1B including plans for outreach efforts beginning with riverfront property owners. She noted that modeling with Michael Baker International is underway to assess the downstream impacts of Phase 1B. Additionally, she plans to bring back information to the Assembly on Special Tax District options, revenue models, and long-term funding strategies.

F. STAFF REPORTS - None

G. NEXT MEETING DATE

H. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

I. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Assembly, the meeting adjourned at 1:00PM.

City and Borough of Juneau
City & Borough Manager's Office
155 Heritage Way
Juneau, Alaska 99801
Telephone: 586-5240| Facsimile: 586-5385

TO: Deputy Mayor Smith and Assembly Committee of the Whole
DATE: August 4, 2025
FROM: Robert Barr, Deputy City Manager
Emily Wright, City Attorney
RE: Shelter Safety Zone Concepts

At the July 14, 2025, Committee meeting, the Assembly requested additional information on shelter safety zone options as well as other potential tools for specifically protecting our social service provider operators in the Teal St neighborhood. Providers have expressed numerous safety concerns associated with illegal behavior occurring nearby their emergency shelters, transitional/permanent supportive housing facilities, and wrap-around supportive services facility. Further, community members who live and/or work in the area have expressed safety concerns for themselves, their families, and their co-workers. While we believe we have sufficient JPD capacity to respond to calls for service in this area, we do not always receive calls, calls received are not always actionable, and police response is by its very nature reactionary rather than a primary prevention tool. Providers have expressed an interest in a shelter safety zone as a means of preventing some of these illegal behaviors from occurring near their facilities and impacting their staff and clients.

Providers in the Teal St area have broad, but not unanimous, agreement that a shelter safety zone should be implemented without first or simultaneously identifying an alternate location where camping is permitted or additional and sufficient sheltering capacity is provided. While contract negotiations are ongoing, the Cold Weather Emergency Shelter (CWES) is currently scheduled to open at its typical date: October 15. There are also early conversations ongoing among the provider community about potential summer low-barrier shelter options, which could utilize the CWES model and site or other locations.

Other memos shared at our last meeting[1] provide further background and context. The remainder of this memo focuses on safety zones and related policies that have been implemented in other municipalities for the Assembly's consideration and discussion. The municipalities mentioned below are not the only communities that have struggled through and considered or implemented exclusionary zones. A quote from an article in the Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare[2] rings true with our experience: "With… cuts to social services [insert: at the federal level], as well as policies that shift national distribution of aid for the poor to the state level, welfare benefits dry up in economically distressed periods, widening inequality and creating more unsheltered homeless people. The new economic transformation of society has resulted in new spatial regulations on local levels." Staff feel compelled to note that local, Assembly directed, public funding for supportive services has been increasing rapidly over the past decade[3], far outpacing inflation; however, a combination of a lack of federal and state support, demographic shift, disparate local efforts regionally, and increasing economic inequality appear to be far outpacing our local efforts.

---

[1] https://juneauak.portal.civicclerk.com/event/1193/files/agenda/10824
[2] Bancroft, Karen H. (2012) "Zones of Exclusion: Urban Spatial Policies, Social Justice, and Social Services," The Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare: Vol. 39: Iss. 3, Article 5.
DOI: https://doi.org/10.15453/0191-5096.3684
Available at: https://scholarworks.wmich.edu/jssw/vol39/iss3/5
[3] In FY14, CBJ had $155k in spending related to addressing homelessness. In FY24, the same number was just over $5M, with a peak in FY21 at $7.7M associated with additional COVID support. These dollars fund sheltering, permanent supportive housing, and community grants to related social services agencies.

The Teal St operators have cited **Bellingham's** legislation as a model which could be implemented locally. Key points of Bellingham's code[4] include:

- A prohibition against sitting or lying on a public sidewalk or any other object placed upon a public sidewalk between 7 am and 9 pm in specific zones:
  - Central Business District
  - Fairhaven Business District
- A prohibition against sitting or lying on a public sidewalk, street, curb, parking lot, parking stall, planting strip, street median, landscaping bed, and many other similar types of structures within the shelter protection area.
  - Exceptions: Medical emergencies, utilization wheelchairs and similar devices, commercial use of permitted on-street vendors, parades/festivals, rallies/demonstrations, sitting on publicly provided seating, sitting while awaiting a public bus.
  - Requirement: That law enforcement notice be provided, prior to enforcement
  - Geography: Enforcement is stricter in the zone than in the business districts or elsewhere.

Anchorage recently passed similar legislation[5]. The ACLU has expressed concerns regarding this legislation and there is currently litigation from 2023 and 2025 that is ongoing. Key points of the new legislation include:

- Prohibited camping on public or private land:
  - Within 200 feet of certain public trails
  - Within 200 feet of certain waterbodies
  - Within 500 feet of playgrounds, athletic fields, maintained fields, schools, licensed childcare facilities, recreation centers, permit based campgrounds, or licensed homeless shelters

- Anchorage's new legislation also prohibits certain types of construction on public land.

Ashland, Oregon, took a slightly different approach. They first created two enhanced law enforcement areas – one in their downtown area[6], and a second along and adjacent to a major thoroughfare[7] by finding that those areas were particularly and/or disproportionally affected by unlawful behavior.

They then instituted a three-strikes rule where once individuals were convicted of three misdemeanors or felonies in one of the enhanced law enforcement areas, they would then be expelled from that specific area for a period of time. A rule like this would prove challenging to enforce given our limited prosecutorial capacity.

Other municipalities have approached this topic from alternative angles, such as:

- Portland, Oregon: prohibits camping[8] when alternate shelter is available or has been offered. Places restrictions[9] on camping otherwise.

[4] https://bellingham.municipal.codes/BMC/10.24.070
[5] https://library.municode.com/ak/anchorage/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TIT8PECO_CH8.45TR_8.45.015PRCAPRPR
[6] https://ashland.municipal.codes/AMC/media/10.120.010.B.1_ExhA.pdf
[7] https://ashland.municipal.codes/AMC/media/10.120.010.B.1_ExhB.pdf
[8] https://www.portland.gov/code/14/a50/150
[9] https://www.portland.gov/code/14/a50/160

- Eugene, Oregon: defines specific areas[10] where camping is not allowed, including within 1000 feet of an educational facility.

- Boulder, Colorado: broadly bans camping without consent[11] in combination with supportive outreach and connection to services[12]. There is ongoing litigation on this legislation. It was upheld by lower courts and is currently on appeal.

- Denver, Colorado[13]: similar to Boulder in broadly banning camping without consent and additionally legislates officer responsibilities and requirements for notice and connections to social service partners when prior to conducting enforcement.

Recommendation:

Discuss and provide additional direction and/or determine what additional information needs exist.

If the Assembly is interested in introducing legislation, staff will need guidance on:

a) Boundaries? Is the safety zone for just the Teal Street Center and Glory Hall area? Radius/how large? Do you want to include other areas and/or a broader no camping ordinance?
b) What are the different rules that would apply? For example, no camping, no sitting/lying on public sidewalks, increased mandatory minimum penalties.
c) Other terms such as a sunset date.

---

10 https://eugene.municipal.codes/EC/4.815
11 https://library.municode.com/co/boulder/codes/municipal_code?nodeId=TIT5GEOF_CH6MIOF_5-6-10CALOPRWICO
12 https://bouldercolorado.gov/services/public-spaces-management
13 https://library.municode.com/co/denver/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=TITIIREMUCO_CH38OFMIPR_ARTIVOFAGPUORSA_DIV1GE_S38-86.2UNCAPUPRPRPR

Presented by: The Manager
Presented: 02/03/2025
Drafted by: Law Department

ORDINANCE OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

Serial No. 2025-13(b)

An Ordinance Amending the Election Procedures Code to Include General Procedures for Ballot Count, Relating to Ranked Choice Voting.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE ASSEMBLY OF THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA:

Section 1. Classification. This ordinance is of a general and permanent nature and shall become a part of the City and Borough of Juneau Municipal Code.

Section 2. Amendment of Chapter. Chapter 29.07, Election Procedures, is amended by adding a new section to read:

Chapter 29.07 ELECTION PROCEDURES

***

<u>**29.07.155 General procedures for ballot count, ranked choice voting.**</u>

<u>(a) All regular or special elections shall be conducted by ranked-choice voting.</u>

<u>(b) When counting ballots, for single member races, the Election Official or designees shall initially tabulate each validly cast ballot as one vote for the highest-ranked continuing candidate on that ballot or as an inactive ballot. If a candidate is highest-ranked on more than one-half of the active ballots, that candidate is elected and the tabulation is complete. Otherwise, tabulation proceeds in sequential rounds as follows:</u>

<u>(1) If two or fewer continuing candidates remain, the candidate with the greatest number of votes is elected and the tabulation is complete; otherwise, the tabulation continues under (2) of this subsection;</u>

(2) Votes cast for the defeated candidate shall cease counting for the defeated candidate and shall be added to the totals of each ballot's next-highest-ranked continuing candidate or considered an inactive ballot under (g)(2) of this section, and a new round begins under (1) of this subsection.

(c) For multi-member races, when counting ballots, the Election Official or designees shall initially tabulate each validly cast ballot as one vote for the highest-ranked continuing candidate on that ballot or as an inactive ballot, tabulating until a candidate receives more than one-half of the active ballots. That candidate is elected to the first seat. The highest-ranked candidate is then removed from the results and tabulation is repeated to find the highest-ranked candidate, who is placed in the next seat. This process continues until all seats are full. Seniority under CBJ 11.15.015, for multi-member races, will be designated in the same order that the seats were awarded.

(d) When counting ballots,

(1) A ballot containing an overvote shall be considered an inactive ballot once the overvote is encountered at the highest ranking for a continuing candidate;

(2) If a ballot skips a ranking, then the next ranking shall be counted. If the next ranking is another skipped ranking, the ballot shall be considered an inactive ballot once the second skipped ranking is encountered; and

(3) In the event of a tie between the final two continuing candidates, the procedures prescribed in Charter Section 6.6 shall apply to determine the winner of the election; in the event of a tie between two candidates with the fewest votes, the tie shall be resolved by lot to determine which candidate is defeated.

(e) The Election Official or designees may not count an inactive ballot for any candidate.

(f) In this section,

(1) “Continuing candidate” means a candidate who has not been defeated;

(2) “Inactive ballot” means a ballot that is no longer tabulated, either in whole or in part, because it does not rank any continuing candidate, contains an overvote at the highest continuing ranking, or contains two or more sequential skipped rankings before its highest continuing ranking;

(3) “Overvote” means an instance where a voter has assigned the same ranking to more than one candidate;

(4) “Ranking” or “ranked” means the number assigned by a voter to a candidate to express the voter's choice for that candidate; a ranking of “1” is the highest ranking, followed by “2,” and then “3,” and so on;

(5) “Round” means an instance of the sequence of voting tabulation in an election;

(6) “Skipped ranking” means a blank ranking on a ballot on which a voter has ranked another candidate at a subsequent ranking.

***

Section 3. Effective Date. This ordinance shall be effective January 1, 2026.

Adopted this ________ day of ________________________, 2025.

____
Beth A. Weldon, Mayor

Attest:

____
Breckan L. Hendricks, Municipal Clerk

Assemblymember Adkison and Assemblymember Steininger

Amendment____.

2025-13: An Ordinance Amending the Election Procedures Code to Include General Procedures for Ballot Count, Relating to Ranked Choice Voting.

29.07.155 General procedures for ballot count, ranked choice voting.

(a) All regular or special CBJ Assembly elections for single member races shall be conducted by ranked-choice voting.

(b) When counting ballots, for single member races, the Election Official or designees shall initially tabulate each validly cast ballot as one vote for the highest-ranked continuing candidate on that ballot or as an inactive ballot. If a candidate is highest-ranked on more than one-half of the active ballots, that candidate is elected and the tabulation is complete. Otherwise, tabulation proceeds in sequential rounds as follows:

***

~~(c) For multi-member races, when counting ballots, the Election Official or designees shall initially tabulate each validly cast ballot as one vote for the highest-ranked continuing candidate on that ballot or as an inactive ballot, tabulating until a candidate receives more than one-half of the active ballots. That candidate is elected to the first seat. The highest-ranked candidate is then removed from the results and tabulation is repeated to find the highest-ranked candidate, who is placed in the next seat. This process continues until all seats are full. Seniority under CBJ 11.15.015, for multi-member races, will be designated in the same order that the seats were awarded.~~

Assemblymember Kelly

Amendment____.

2025-13: An Ordinance Amending the Election Procedures Code to Include General Procedures for Ballot Count, Relating to Ranked Choice Voting.

Section 2. Amendment of Chapter. Chapter 29.07.040, Candidate Districts is amended to read:

29.07.040 Candidate districts.

(a) Assembly seats will be designated 1A, 1B, 1C, 2A, 2B, 2C, Areawide A, and Areawide B.
i. In 2026, seats 1B, 2B, and Areawide B will be on the ballot;
ii. In 2027 seats 1C, 2C, and the Mayor will be on the ballot; and
iii. In 2028 seats 1A, 2A, and Areawide A be on the ballot.
Races will continue in this manner going forward.

(b) School Board Seats will be designated seats A-G.
i. In 2026 seats A and B will be on the ballot;
ii. In 2027, seats C, D, E will be on the ballot; and
iii. In 2028 seats F and G will be on the ballot.
Races will continue in this manner going forward.

~~In any election of school board members or any election of assemblymembers involving a multimember district, the candidates receiving the highest number of votes shall be deemed elected to the vacant seats. If vacancies exist on the school board or within a multimember assembly district for seats with different terms, the candidate receiving the highest number of votes shall be deemed elected to the seat with the longest term and the candidate with the second highest number of votes shall be deemed elected to the seat with the next longest term until all seats are filled in that order.~~

Section ~~2~~3. Amendment of Chapter. Chapter 29.07, Election Procedures, is amended by adding a new section to read:

Chapter 29.07 ELECTION PROCEDURES

***

29.07.155 General procedures for ballot count, ranked choice voting.

(a) All regular or special elections shall be conducted by ranked-choice voting.

(b) When counting ballots, ~~for single member races,~~ the Election Official or designees shall initially tabulate each validly cast ballot as one vote for the highest-ranked continuing candidate on that ballot or as an inactive ballot. If a candidate is highest-ranked on more than one-half of the active ballots, that candidate is elected and the tabulation is complete. Otherwise, tabulation proceeds in sequential rounds as follows:

(1) If two or fewer continuing candidates remain, the candidate with the greatest number of votes is elected and the tabulation is complete; otherwise, the tabulation continues under (2) of this subsection;

(2) Votes cast for the defeated candidate shall cease counting for the defeated candidate and shall be added to the totals of each ballot's next-highest-ranked continuing candidate or considered an inactive ballot under (g)(2) of this section, and a new round begins under (1) of this subsection.

~~(c) For multi-member races, when counting ballots, the Election Official or designees shall initially tabulate each validly cast ballot as one vote for the highest-ranked continuing candidate on that ballot or as an inactive ballot, tabulating until a candidate receives more than one-half of the active ballots. That candidate is elected to the first seat. The highest-ranked candidate is then removed from the results and tabulation is repeated to find the highest-ranked candidate, who is placed in the next seat. This process continues until all seats are full. Seniority under CBJ 11.15.015, for multi-member races, will be designated in the same order that the seats were awarded.~~

(d) When counting ballots,

(1) A ballot containing an overvote shall be considered an inactive ballot once the overvote is encountered at the highest ranking for a continuing candidate;

(2) If a ballot skips a ranking, then the next ranking shall be counted. If the next ranking is another skipped ranking, the ballot shall be considered an inactive ballot once the second skipped ranking is encountered; and

(3) In the event of a tie between the final two continuing candidates, the procedures prescribed in Charter Section 6.6 shall apply to determine the winner of the election; in the event of a tie between two candidates with the

fewest votes, the tie shall be resolved by lot to determine which candidate is defeated.

(e) The Election Official or designees may not count an inactive ballot for any candidate.

(f) In this section,

(1) “Continuing candidate” means a candidate who has not been defeated;

(2) “Inactive ballot” means a ballot that is no longer tabulated, either in whole or in part, because it does not rank any continuing candidate, contains an overvote at the highest continuing ranking, or contains two or more sequential skipped rankings before its highest continuing ranking;

(3) “Overvote” means an instance where a voter has assigned the same ranking to more than one candidate;

(4) “Ranking” or “ranked” means the number assigned by a voter to a candidate to express the voter's choice for that candidate; a ranking of “1” is the highest ranking, followed by “2,” and then “3,” and so on;

(5) “Round” means an instance of the sequence of voting tabulation in an election;

(6) “Skipped ranking” means a blank ranking on a ballot on which a voter has ranked another candidate at a subsequent ranking.

***

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
DRAFT - MINUTES

July 14, 2025 at 6:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

Assembly Committee of the Whole Worksession - No Public Testimony will be taken.
https://juneau.zoom.us/j/95424544691 or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 954 2454 4691

A. CALL TO ORDER

Deputy Mayor Smith called the Assembly Committee of the Whole to order at 6:00p.m.

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT - Read by Assemblymember Hall

We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land and wish to honor the indigenous people of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. *Gunalchéesh!*

C. ROLL CALL

Assemblymembers Present: Mayor Beth Weldon, Deputy Mayor Greg Smith, Assemblymembers Wade Bryson, Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Christine Woll (on Zoom), Paul Kelly, Ella Adkison, Neil Steininger (on Zoom), and Maureen Hall.

Staff Present: City Manager Katie Koester, Deputy City Manager Robert Barr, City Attorney Emily Wright, Engineering & Public Works Director Denise Koch, Deputy City Attorney, Municipal Clerk Breckan Hendricks, Meeting Tech Kevin Allen

Others: DOT Regional Director Christopher Goins, DOWL Engineer Steve Noble, and Fairweather Science Consultant Laura Young.

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - Manager Approved by unanimous consent

E. AGENDA TOPICS

1. Juneau Douglas North Crossing (JDNC)

Deputy Mayor Smith introduced the Juneau-Douglas North Crossing (JDNC) project, emphasizing its status as a top city priority. City Manager Katie Koester invited Alaska DOT Regional Director Christopher Goins, CBJ Engineering Director Denise Koch, and DOWL engineer Steve Noble to present.

Director Goins explained that due to the project's complexity, DOT chose a Planning and Environmental Linkages (PEL) study to narrow alternatives before entering the NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act) process. The PEL study is now complete and under DOT review. Director Koch emphasized the bridge's long-standing importance for access, economic growth, and housing, especially on Douglas Island, and noted strong community interest dating back decades.

Mr. Noble described the PEL process, which included extensive public engagement. From an initial wide range of route options (level 1), five build alternatives (Salmon Creek, Twin Lakes, Vanderbilt, Sunny Point (A&B) and Mendenhall Peninsula and one no-build option (level 2) with the exception of Mendenhall Peninsula were recommended for further study. Alternatives crossing the Mendenhall Wetlands ranked lower due to environmental concerns, and the costly Mendenhall Peninsula route was dropped. Noble noted that the NEPA phase will bring more detailed environmental and technical review, with field data informing final decisions. He explained that, as a next step, it may take 3-5 years to do the preliminary engineering and NEPA phase

Mr. Kelly asked Mr. Noble to speak more to the environmental impacts and what design elements they plan to incorporate to mitigate those impacts.

Mr. Noble explained that the scope of the NEPA process has yet to be fully defined but outlined what is typically included for a project of this scale. He noted that the process begins with a scoping phase involving agencies, stakeholders, and the public to identify key issues to be addressed. Based on that input, a fieldwork plan is developed, usually including at least two seasons of field studies, particularly focused on bird habitat and fisheries. He added that while existing data from prior studies, including recent wetland evaluations, may streamline certain efforts, agency feedback so far indicates that multiple seasons of data collection will likely be required.

Mr. Noble listed several environmental and regulatory areas expected to be studied in detail, including fisheries, wetlands, bird habitat, cultural resources, noise, visual impacts, and right-of-way ownership, particularly where properties may fall under protections. He also highlighted the need for coordination with the U.S. Coast Guard, which will influence bridge design based on navigability standards and required clearance.

Mr. Kelly further inquired what sort of design elements would be incorporated to mitigate the environmental impacts. Mr. Noble responded that while the NEPA process will fully evaluate options, the team has already begun considering likely environmental concerns. For example, all alternatives crossing the refuge are currently priced assuming full structural support to minimize hydrological disruption. He also noted opportunities to address existing fish barriers, such as substandard culverts at Salmon and Lemon Creek, as well as design considerations for aesthetics, lighting, and noise to reduce impacts on adjacent properties.

Mayor Weldon asked about the cost of the Mendenhall Peninsula option. Mr. Noble explained that due to the complexity of the bridge design, he could only provide an estimated range of $1.1 billion –to $1.5 billion. Mayor Weldon asked if it would make a difference if this was a navigable waterway. Mr. Noble responded yes, lowering the bridge to non-navigable standards could significantly reduce costs. He explained that the high price is primarily due to the required height and length of the bridge, and assumptions based on USGS data regarding bedrock depth. Without site-specific geotechnical data, cost estimates vary widely. He noted that even if the bridge could be lowered, the overall cost would still likely be at least double that of other alternatives due to the route's length and complexity.

Deputy Mayor Smith asked if the other alternatives were different in traffic capacities. Mr. Noble answered that traffic volumes vary by location, with the highest projected use in the Sunny Point area. As the alternatives move north toward Mendenhall Peninsula, traffic demand drops significantly. He explained that while northern routes reduce trip length for some travelers, they are less utilized under current development patterns and zoning. He noted that a lack of a detailed master plan for West Douglas makes future projections difficult but acknowledged that increased development there could shift demand. He also pointed out that options like Sunny Point, Vanderbilt, and Twin Lakes see similar traffic levels, and those alternatives could reduce overall traffic along Douglas Highway by offering more direct access, especially for west side residents. Mr. Noble emphasized that updated traffic modeling should be revisited during the NEPA phase, particularly considering new information related to West Douglas.

Deputy Mayor Smith asked whether it would be helpful for the Assembly to weigh in early if an alternative, such as Sunny Point, appears politically unviable due to environmental or other concerns. Mr. Noble responded that public and political input is indeed a factor in determining which alternatives move forward, particularly during the NEPA phase. While such strong positions had not yet been clearly expressed, he noted that if the Assembly had firm views, it would be valuable to know. He added, however, that more data during the NEPA process would better inform those decisions. Director Goins agreed, emphasizing that because the project will require a local funding match, potentially 9–20% or more, it is especially important that elected officials provide input on politically or financially untenable options as early as possible.

Ms. Hall asked whether sub-sea tunnels have ever been explored. Mr. Noble acknowledged that tunnels were looked at early on and said the cheapest was in the $2 billion range and that they were cost prohibitive.

2. Public Camping, Community Impacts, and Ordinance 2025-28

Mr. Barr reviewed the memo included in the packet, noting that the city provides more beds per capita for those experiencing homelessness than many communities nationwide. He highlighted challenges including data limitations, a population that is rapidly changing, and some individuals refusing services or unable to comply with communal living rules. Mr. Barr emphasized that enforcement prioritizes voluntary compliance, with compassionate engagement by police and staff. He outlined four potential tools for addressing public camping impacts: a disorderly conduct code update to facilitate enforcement; creating shelter safety zones, though with challenges in defining boundaries and service access; reestablishing a summer campground, which faces significant logistical hurdles; and applying time, place, and manner regulations as a guiding framework. He noted ongoing regional discussions and Supreme Court rulings relevant to these issues.

Mr. Bryson disclosed that he serves on the Glory Hall Board of directors. Ms. Hall disclosed that she serves on the Board of Saint Vicent de Paul. It was confirmed that there was no financial gain.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs asked for clarification on how the proposed disorderly conduct ordinance differs from current enforcement practices, noting that JPD already seeks voluntary compliance and monitors encampments before taking action. Mr. Barr explained that the ordinance would give officers a clearer and more immediate enforcement tool for smaller-scale issues, such as an individual camping in a bus stop or parking garage, before impacts become significant. He confirmed the ordinance allows earlier intervention in situations that currently require more time and process to address.

Ms. Adkison asked whether, in theory, a designated campground, with adequate staffing, safety, and rules, could be a better solution than dispersed camping. Mr. Barr responded that while such a campground could improve safety for those who choose to use it, it would be difficult to find a location, would increase city liability, and it’s uncertain whether the target population would actually use it.

Ms. Woll asked about the memo’s reference to three or more tents constituting an encampment and questioned the basis for that threshold. Mr. Barr explained that while three tents is one criterion used, it's more an art than a science, and enforcement decisions also depend on the level of impacts observed. He noted that not all sites with three tents prompt immediate enforcement. Chief Bos confirmed that they have not yet broken up encampments of that size this season.

Mr. Kelly asked what discretion officers would use under the proposed and existing language regarding disorderly conduct, particularly in cases where individuals are present in public areas, but not clearly obstructing access. Chief Bos responded that officers are given significant discretion, as each situation is unique and involves various factors, such as the amount of property and how long someone has been there. Chief Bos also noted a concern with the ordinance language suggesting that the public might be responsible for asking someone to move, emphasizing that responsibility should lie with officers.

Deputy Mayor Smith asked for examples of how the proposed ordinance differs from current tools. Chief Bos explained that the ordinance would allow officers to respond immediately to certain situations, rather than waiting the required 48 hours under existing code. He cited a recent example of an individual occupying a bus stop and disrupting public transit access, an issue that couldn't be addressed promptly under current rules. The new ordinance would give officers the ability to act more quickly in such cases involving one or two individuals creating immediate impacts.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs questioned the rationale behind the ordinance recommendation, noting the memo lacked clear justification or new data showing current enforcement tools are insufficient. Robert Barr responded that the proposed changes aim to reduce the burden on JPD by providing a more immediate alternative to the time-consuming trespass process, particularly in locations like parking garages where facility managers are not onsite.

Ms. Adkison asked if there are ways to make disbursed camping less impactful. Mr. Barr answered that they have experimented but have not found any long-term solutions.

Ms. Woll expressed concern about impacts at the Glory Hall and Teal Street Center and asked if staff had discussed the proposed ordinance with them. Chief Bos said the ordinance would be more applicable elsewhere, like downtown, due to the complex issues at Teal Street. Mr. Barr added that regular meetings with local nonprofits have shown conceptual support.

Deputy Mayor Smith asked if there are other problematic matters that this ordinance could help address. Chief Bos cited problems like individuals obstructing sidewalks, stairwells, and camping in parking garages. He noted the ordinance expands language around standing, sitting, and lying, and offers a more effective alternative to a no loitering ordinance.

Mr. Bryson raised concerns about the potential closure of Glory Hall's day services due to staffing and protection issues. Chief Bos responded that such a closure would likely disperse related problems, crime, drug use, and health issues, throughout the community instead of being centralized. He emphasized the loss of basic services like sanitation and meals would have significant negative impacts. Mr. Barr noted ongoing monthly meetings with Teal Street and Glory Hall nonprofits, reporting general support for the disorderly conduct ordinance and interest in shelter safety zones. Deputy Mayor Smith added that recent meetings with service providers and city staff highlighted the complexity of the issue, resource limitations, and the need for coordinated efforts, acknowledging no easy solutions have been found yet.
Ms. Hall said the ordinance would give police an additional tool and suggested increasing police presence in the area, due to the ongoing reports of lawlessness. She

emphasized that the location is Juneau's only soup kitchen and noted that there were fewer calls when the cold weather shelter was operating.

Ms. Hall asked about the language on page 2 of the ordinance. Attorney Wright responded that it mirrors state law and noted that the city has other codes addressing indecent exposure. Ms. Hall suggested considering broader language.

Mayor Weldon asked Attorney Wright to explain her findings regarding a potential drug free zone around Teal Street. Attorney Wright explained that such zones are intended to give police additional tools to make drug-related arrests, but they can also criminalize individuals who are in the area to seek help. She noted that while some states have considerable similar measures, they are politically diverse and generally not very effective. She advised against implementing such a zone in Juneau at this time.

MOTION: by Mayor Weldon to forward Ordinance 2025-28, an ordinance amending CBJC 42.20.090, Disorderly Conduct, to the next Regular Assembly meeting for introduction.

Ms. Hall asked about striking the indecent exposure language previously discussed on page 2 of the ordinance. Chief Bos answered that the current verbiage is the best. Ms. Hall removed her objection.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs expressed a desire to better understand the ordinance and stated she would prefer to hold it in committee for further discussion and refinement.

Ms. Woll said her wish would be to keep it in committee.

Mr. Bryson stated the situation is becoming untenable and that Glory Hall is on track to close. He warned that inaction would lead to the same outcome.

Mayor Weldon said she is getting frequently approached with questions about addressing homelessness and emphasized action is needed now.

Ms. Hall noted that the current situation has been developing steadily since the closure of the cold weather shelter and expressed that the issues currently being discussed have been brewing since that time.

Ms. Adkison expressed support for the ordinance but noted that it does not directly help the homeless; rather, it primarily facilitates law enforcement in enforcing existing measures.

Mr. Kelly supported advancing the ordinance but proposed an amendment to refer it to another committee of the whole for further review before final approval.

AMENDMENT by Mr. Kelly to amend the motion to refer this ordinance to an additional Committee of the Whole meeting. ***Mayor Weldon objected.***

ROLL CALL VOTE ON AMENDMENT

Yeas: Hughes-Skandijs, Woll, Kelly

Nays: Adkison, Bryson, Hall, Steininger, Weldon, Smith

The amendment failed. 3 Yeas, 6 Nays.

ROLL CALL ON MOTION
Yeas: Weldon, Adkison, Bryson, Hall, Kelly, Steininger, Smith

Nays: Hughes-Skandijs, Woll

The motion to forward Ordinance 2025-28, an ordinance amending CBJC 42.20.090, Disorderly Conduct, to the next Regular Assembly meeting for introduction was adopted. 7 Yeas, 2 Nays.

(A brief at-ease was observed at 7:58PM. Returned at 8:11PM)

Deputy Mayor Smith, brought the Assembly to the next agenda item: the shelter safety zone concept. Discussion focused on ongoing concerns in the Teal Street area.

Mayor Weldon asked about the possibility of establishing a 200-foot buffer zone and whether cars involved in illegal activity could be trespassed from public parking lots. Chief Bos confirmed that police now have authority to trespass such vehicles.

Deputy Mayor Smith asked if boundaries had been considered and whether enforcement of a safety zone might simply shift issues beyond its limits. Mr. Barr noted that boundaries are ultimately a policy decision and cited other communities that use either a block radius or footage (e.g., 500 feet, as in Anchorage). He confirmed that some displacement of camping activity could be expected.

Ms. Adkison questioned what specific problems a safety zone would address beyond those already covered under existing disorderly conduct laws. Mr. Barr clarified that a safety zone could criminalize camping without 48-hour notice and increase penalties within the designated area.

Mr. Bryson asked how many organizations had requested such zones; Mr. Barr responded that, to date, only Teal Street organizations had expressed interest but noted other requests could arise.

Ms. Hall reported that the Glory Hall was in the process of moving vulnerable individuals into Forget-Me-Not Manor, which could free up shelter space. She added that private security had recently been hired at Teal Street and the Glory Hall to address parking issues and loitering.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs suggested the city create a public guide explaining how policy proposals can be brought to the Assembly agenda, noting that some residents may not understand the process as well as others.

Mr. Kelly raised concerns about constituents feeling unsafe near Teal Street services and asked whether the shelter safety zone could address behaviors beyond camping. Mr. Barr responded that it might help mitigate some issues but cautioned that effectiveness is hard to measure in advance.

Ms. Woll questioned the level of detail included in the meeting packet and asked whether this discussion was intended as a full policy consideration or an initial check-in. Deputy Mayor Smith clarified it was the latter and that staff could be directed to return with more information if the Assembly wished.

MOTION: by Ms. Woll to direct staff to bring the Assembly back more information on a shelter safety zone concept, as well as other tools to help protect service providers in the Teal Street neighborhood and asked for unanimous consent. ***Hearing no objection, the motion was adopted by unanimous consent.***

3. Hazard Mitigation Plan

[*Mr. Steininger left the meeting]*

Manager Koester provided opening remarks, noting the plan’s importance in securing eligibility for FEMA hazard mitigation grants and praising staff and consultants for their accelerated work. She clarified that the accompanying resolution would allow for minor FEMA-recommended changes without requiring further Assembly action.

Emergency Programs Manager Ryan O’Shaughnessy gave the primary presentation, joined remotely by consultant Laura Young from Fairweather Science. Mr. O’Shaughnessy explained the plan’s non-regulatory nature, its alignment with FEMA requirements, and its role in guiding community resilience efforts. He noted that the plan includes a comprehensive risk assessment and mitigation action plan and was developed in partnership with Tlingit & Haida. Public engagement began in January and continued through two public meetings and agency review. The draft includes 104 mitigation projects selected from an initial list of 187, with further changes expected following additional public comment.

Mr. O'Shaughnessy addressed the use of the Tetra Tech landslide maps, explaining that FEMA requires inclusion of the best available data. To avoid implying regulatory authority, the maps were overlaid with older data and referenced as "areas with known historic landslide risk." He confirmed that this approach had been validated by FEMA and the State, provided it was accompanied by a transparent explanation.

Deputy Mayor Smith offered a comment suggesting the title of the slide referencing landslide areas be revised to more accurately reflect that it includes only areas that have been studied, not all areas with risk. Mr. O'Shaughnessy acknowledged the feedback and said it could be incorporated before the final version.

Mr. Kelly inquired whether post-FEMA revisions would return to the Assembly for approval. Mr. O'Shaughnessy responded that this would depend on the scale of changes, but no major revisions were anticipated due to close coordination with FEMA and the State throughout the process.

Deputy Mayor Smith expressed support for the expedited process but emphasized the importance of acknowledging that most of the borough remains unmapped for landslide risk.

Mr. Kelly asked whether any changes requested by FEMA would return to the Assembly; Mr. O'Shaughnessy responded that only substantial changes would, and none were expected due to FEMA and State involvement throughout.

Ms. Woll interjected with a question directed to Manager Koester, referencing a prior conversation. Ms. Woll expressed concern about public perception following media coverage, particularly a headline suggesting that maps were removed from the hazard mitigation plan solely due to public opinion. Manager Koester clarified the background, stating that in 2022, the Assembly made a policy decision not to adopt the detailed Tetra Tech landslide maps for the mitigation plan. The Assembly's intent was to keep the maps accessible to the public with clear disclaimers, as they were not based on site-specific data such as soil sampling. The goal was to avoid giving the impression that the maps could be used to make parcel-specific determinations.

Manager Koester further acknowledged that although the Assembly had also voted to include a general hazard disclaimer on property tax bills, this step had not yet been implemented, admitting the oversight during her review of past meeting minutes.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs questioned the terminology shift away from "erosion," asking whether the term had become outdated. Ms. Young explained that the Army Corps of Engineers now encourages using the term “bank destabilization” as it may better support project funding efforts, though “erosion” remains in common use.

<u>MOTION</u>: by Mayor Weldon, to forward Resolution 4022 to the full Assembly with unanimous consent. ***Ms. Woll objected in order to propose an amendment.***

<u>AMENDMENT:</u> by Ms. Woll, moved to re-include the detailed landslide maps in the hazard mitigation plan.

Ms. Woll emphasized that while these maps should not be used to regulate development, they are critical to inform the public of real risks. She pointed out that similarly detailed flood maps are included in the plan and impact property values, yet no similar effort was made to exclude them.

Mr. Bryson objected. He reiterated his support for the 2022 policy direction, arguing that developers should conduct their own due diligence and that adding the maps could increase building costs or deter housing development. Mayor Weldon also objected, citing the extensive public process previously undertaken and the need for consistent public engagement. She also highlighted that any building on a slope already requires special permitting, which serves to alert property owners of potential risk.

Deputy Mayor Smith clarified that while the maps were removed from the plan, they remain publicly available on the city's website with disclaimers.

Ms. Adkison asked for confirmation that the mitigation plan was non-regulatory and that changes could still be made based on feedback from FEMA or other agencies. Staff affirmed both points, and Adkison subsequently withdrew her objection to the original motion.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs voiced support for Ms. Woll’s amendment, stating that including the most up-to-date data was consistent with the intent of a hazard mitigation plan, which is not a regulatory document. Mayor Weldon responded by noting that the issue extended beyond development; public testimony had also raised concerns about insurance availability.

Ms. Hall also opposed the amendment, emphasizing the urgency of passing the plan and suggesting any reconsideration should occur separately.

Mr. Kelly raised a question about whether including the maps might affect homeowners’ ability to obtain insurance. Manager Koester said staff had been unable to get conclusive guidance from insurers, although one assembly member, Mr. Steininger, had secured rare landslide insurance. Ms. Young added that based on her conversation with an insurance agent, financing was a key factor, cash buyers could get insured more easily, but lenders would require additional hazard coverage if a property lay within a designated hazard zone.

Ms. Woll responded that her intention wasn't to force a policy shift that evening but to reopen the conversation in time for proper consideration before the final deadline. She emphasized her discomfort with advancing a document that lacked the best available information.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs again drew a clear distinction between regulating development and presenting accurate hazard information. She cited personal experience with financing a home in a slide zone and argued that risk awareness shouldn't be sacrificed due to concerns about market impact.

Mr. Kelly added that, in light of recent catastrophic flooding events in Texas, where residents may not have been adequately warned due to removed flood maps, he leaned toward supporting the amendment out of caution.

Deputy Mayor Smith concluded by expressing his internal conflict, acknowledging the value of having comprehensive data, but expressing concern about the potential ramifications.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON AMENDMENT

Yeas: Woll, Kelly, Hughes-Skandijs

Nays: Bryson, Weldon, Hall, Adkison, Smith

The amendment failed. 3 Yeas, 5 Nays.

Mr. Kelly requested that, if changes are made, that they be brought before the assembly.

Hearing no objection to the main motion, to forward Resolution 4022 to the next Regular Assembly meeting, was adopted by unanimous consent.

4. Improvements to Meetings

Manager Koester provided an overview of proposed changes to Assembly meeting logistics, emphasizing that member feedback was varied but unified in the desire for collaboration and improved functionality. She clarified that KTOO will continue broadcasting regular Assembly meetings regardless of timing, though 6:00 p.m. is their preferred slot. Three scheduling options were presented: Option 1 - keeping the status quo; Option 2 - shifting Human Resources Committee (HRC) meetings to 5:00 p.m. and Assembly meetings to 6:00 p.m.; Option 3 - or moving all meetings to 5:30 p.m. with noon meetings for the Lands Housing and Economic Development (LHED) and HRC. Manager Koester also asked for input on the timing of executive sessions and the potential relocation of meetings due to ongoing sound issues in the Assembly Chambers.

Mr. Bryson favored Option 2, suggesting small changes might make a significant difference, while expressing reservations about the impact of noon meetings on working members. He praised executive sessions held before regular meetings for being efficient and focused. He supported moving to a venue with better sound quality if necessary.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs supported holding executive sessions earlier when feasible and also preferred Option 2. She echoed concerns about the challenges of noon meetings, especially for committee chairs needing to coordinate with staff. She supported relocating meetings due to poor sound quality and suggested exploring cost-effective alternatives like using high school facilities.

Ms. Adkison preferred Option 2, emphasizing the importance of allowing members to serve without being obligated to attend noon meetings. She supported early executive sessions when appropriate and Centennial Hall as a temporary location. She underscored the importance of the public being able to hear Assembly proceedings.

Ms. Woll agreed with her colleagues, favoring Option 2 and flexible scheduling of executive sessions based on topic and agenda structure. She supported exploring alternative venues and proposed coordinating with the Planning Commission to address shared sound issues.

Ms. Hall supported Option 2 and suggested alternating between downtown and valley locations like Thunder Mountain Middle School. She also favored flexible executive session scheduling and emphasized improving sound quality.

Mr. Kelly was the only member to lean toward Option 3 but preferred a modified version that spread out meetings to allow more time for preparation. He recognized the limitations of Option 3 as written and accepted Option 2 as a practical fallback. He supported executive sessions before meetings when feasible and proposed using high schools for better sound accessibility.

Mayor Weldon endorsed Option 2 and supported earlier executive sessions depending on the agenda. She expressed strong frustration over the lack of progress on sound improvements and urged investment in a fix. She was supportive of off-site meetings as a short-term solution.

Deputy Mayor Smith concurred with the general preference for Option 2, supported flexible executive session scheduling, and expressed interest in exploring the cost of improving the sound system. He noted that poor sound quality affects other bodies such as the Planning Commission and emphasized the need for a solution.

Manager Koester confirmed she had enough direction to move forward.

F. NEXT MEETING DATE

August 4, 2025

G. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

1. Map - Inventory of Potentially Developable CBJ Land

H. ADJOURNMENT

***There being no further business to come before the Assembly, the meeting adjourned at 9:41PM*.**