ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE 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.