



# ASSEMBLY HUMAN RESOURCES COMMITTEE MINUTES

March 9, 2026 at 5:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

---

## A. CALL TO ORDER

Chair Kelly called the Assembly Human Resources Committee Meeting to order in the Assembly Chambers and via Zoom at 5:00 p.m.

## B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT – Read by Assemblymember Brooks

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

**HRC Members Present:** Chair Paul Kelly, Christine Woll, Maureen Hall, and Nano Brooks

**HRC Members Absent:** None

**Staff/Others Present:** Mayor Beth Weldon, Deputy Municipal Clerk Di Cathcart, City Attorney Emily Wright, Deputy City Manager Robert Barr, and Meeting Tech Kevin Allen

## D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – agenda approved as presented

## E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – minutes approved as presented

### 1. 2026-02-09\_Assembly-HRC\_Minutes - Draft

## F. AGENDA TOPICS

### 1. Personnel Board Appointments

Per [CBJ Code 44.05.060](#), the Personnel Board is composed of five members appointed by the Assembly. All appointments shall be for staggered three-year terms. Two seats shall be designated for members with a background in labor, two designated for members with a background in management, and one for a member of the general public.

**Personnel Board [Roster](#)**

***MOTION:*** by Assemblymember Woll that the Assembly Human Resources Committee forward to the full Assembly for approval, the reappointment of Nadine Lefebvre and the appointment of Miguel Rohrbacher, both to the Labor Representative Seats on the Personnel Board for full terms beginning immediately and ending January 31, 2029, and asked for unanimous consent. ***Hearing no objection, motion passed.***

## 2. Juneau Human Rights Commission Draft Resolution relating to Increasing Engagement on CBJ Boards & Committees

The Juneau Human Rights Commission (JHRC) drafted a resolution related to increased engagement on CBJ boards and committees for the Assembly Human Resources Committee (HRC) to review. The HRC reviewed the resolution at its February 9, 2026, meeting and decided to keep the resolution in the HRC for additional work by Assemblymembers Woll and Brooks.

This agenda topic could move to Standing Committee Topics if the committee would like a flexible timeline to work on the resolution.

The committee discussed the Juneau Human Rights Commission draft resolution related to boards and committees. They agreed that it's an important topic and had some reservations about making the recommendations in the resolution too specific. Staff noted they would make some general amendments to have the resolution follow the current CBJ standard formatting and language for legislation.

Ms. Woll brought forward two amendments.

**Amendment 1:** Motion by Ms. Woll to direct the Law Department to draft a Resolution modeled after "*A Resolution Encouraging Increased Engagement in CBJ Boards, Committees, and Commissions*" and forward to the full Assembly with the following lines removed: NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City and Borough of Juneau shall explore and consider implementing practices that encourage broad and diverse participation on CBJ boards, committees, and commissions, including but not limited to:

1. Establishing clear and consistent funding to support the effective operation of CBJ boards, committees, and commissions;
2. Identifying, articulating, and communicating both tangible and intangible benefits of service to prospective members;
3. Establishing processes to actively invite and recruit individuals from underrepresented groups;
4. Improving and maintaining an accessible online presence with current and comprehensive information for all CBJ boards, committees, and commissions;
5. Developing and executing a public-facing media and outreach campaign highlighting the opportunities and benefits associated with civic participation.

and asked for unanimous consent. **Hearing no objection, Amendment 1 passed.**

**Amendment 2:** Motion by Ms. Woll to direct the Law Department to forward with the Resolution the associated letter authored by the Juneau Human Rights Commission, with an added addendum that reads:

The Human Rights Committee also recommends to the City and Borough of Juneau to explore and consider implementing practices that encourage broad and diverse participation on CBJ boards, committees, and commissions, including but not limited to:

1. Establishing clear and consistent funding to support the effective operation of CBJ boards, committees, and commissions;
2. Identifying, articulating, and communicating both tangible and intangible benefits of service to prospective members;
3. Establishing processes to actively invite and recruit individuals from underrepresented groups;
4. Improving and maintaining an accessible online presence with current and comprehensive information for all CBJ boards, committees, and commissions;
5. Developing and executing a public-facing media and outreach campaign highlighting the opportunities and benefits associated with civic participation.

and asked for unanimous consent. ***Hearing no objection, Amendment 2 passed.***

**Amendment 3:** Motion by Mr. Brooks to remove the last Be it further resolved clause [*Be it further resolved that the City and Borough of Juneau will recognize and promote organizations that encourage employee involvement in local boards, committees, and commission as models of community engagement and civic stewardship*] and asked for unanimous consent. ***Hearing no objection, Amendment 3 passed.***

**MOTION:** by Mr. Brooks to forward the Juneau Human Rights Commission Resolution as amended to the Assembly Committee of the Whole for further discussion and asked for unanimous consent. ***Hearing no objection, motion passed.***

**3. Resolution XXXX A Resolution Repealing and Reestablishing the Assembly Rules of Procedure.**

This draft resolution is brought to the HRC by Assemblymember Brooks for consideration.

Mr. Brooks spoke to his reason for bringing these proposed changes related to public testimony forward, which would allow for people to give public testimony during Committee of the Whole and Finance Committee meetings. He noted there are people that would like to give input during those meetings when there is discussion related to money or refining ideas. With the current environment and increased public interest, reverting that rule would allow for people to have more say on the record.

Ms. Woll said it looked like the proposed change would be that the Chair or a majority of committee members could, without public notice, allow for public testimony at their discretion, as opposed to opening up those meetings to public testimony. It would still be up to the Chair

or a majority of members, but it would be without public notice. She asked Mr. Brooks if he could speak to that since it seemed similar to how we do it now, except with less notice.

Mr. Brooks noted that to Assemblymember Woll's point, yes, the overall intention was for people to have a baseline opportunity at those committee meetings to give public testimony and put that opportunity back in the Chair's hand of calling for public testimony, or getting it back to its original reversion, and then see if it could be refined further.

*Mayor Weldon joined the committee at the dais for the conversation related to proposed public testimony changes for Assembly Standing Committees.*

Ms. Woll asked Ms. Wright to describe what the difference would be between what we do now and what we would do in the future if these changes were to pass.

Ms. Wright responded that, post-COVID, between 2021–2023, the change was made to the resolution to remove the specific language with regard to the 24-hour notice; Mr. Brooks's proposed language would directly go back to how it used to be. She gave the example of a Finance Committee meeting that would have allowed public testimony to be called by the Chair at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting, or by a vote of the majority of the committee after a motion is made, so if you had a ton of people show up, you could make a motion at the beginning of the meeting. Under Rule 14 in the current Resolution, the Assembly already has the ability for the Chair or a majority of the committee to authorize public participation on a specific agenda item when it's in the best interest of the community. The previous resolution language was broader and didn't require public testimony be held to only a specific agenda item. In general, you're still there, but broader language would give the idea that committees are not places where no testimony is taken and instead puts it back into the realm of possibilities. The Assembly could also go to something even broader and have testimony for 20 minutes at every meeting. However, that didn't seem to be what Mr. Brooks was proposing.

Ms. Woll, to follow up for clarity, currently the Chair has to give notice that public testimony will be taken on a specific agenda item at their committee meeting for public testimony to be allowed. If we made the proposed changes, then public testimony could be given on any topic. Also, if the majority of the committee wanted to allow public testimony now or in the future, they wouldn't have to notice it, they could just do it in the meeting and is that the case now and under these proposed changes.

Ms. Wright stated that Ms. Woll was correct, they could add back in the 24-hour notice for Committee of the Whole Worksessions and the Finance Committee, and that testimony wouldn't have to be on a specific agenda item. She noted that currently no advanced notice is necessary, the Chair could just say we're going to take testimony. There is also no notice necessary for the changes proposed by Mr. Brooks. However, when staff is given advanced notice, they update the agenda and publicly notice that the Chair is going to allow for public testimony on an agenda item.

Mr. Brooks clarified that language could be added that a Chair would always allow for public testimony, unless otherwise determined either by a majority vote of the committee or by a 24-hour notice, given that there wouldn't be public testimony taken during a meeting.

Mayor Weldon thanked Mr. Brooks for bringing this topic forward and wanted to add some clarification. One reason we had limited testimony and advanced notice was to create balance to hear from both sides of an issue, instead of everyone for or against something showing up to speak, and the other side isn't given that same chance. The other main reason was to have people register ahead of time when testifying over Zoom to avoid future Zoom bombing. The previous Zoom bombs were inappropriate and targeted our female assembly.

Ms. Hall asked Mr. Brooks if he was proposing that, by default, public testimony be taken at all Assembly Standing Committee meetings; and then the default would be 24-hour notice if testimony wasn't going to be taken. She stated this seemed confusing and didn't understand the need to do such a whole-scale change when people already have the opportunity to email, reach out by phone to call any of us, or meet in person.

Chair Kelly outlined Mr. Brooks's options regarding the draft resolution, move it out of the HRC to the Committee of the Whole, keep it in the HRC for more work or continue working on it independently until you want to bring it back for discussion.

Mr. Brooks responded that moving it onto the Committee of the Whole so more people could wordsmith on it would be good. His intent was, in the spirit of public engagement and notice, that, as it sits right now, no notice needs to be given for anything and that's not the most accessible opportunity for the community. So, letting people know that we will always take public testimony means that notice never needs to be given; notice is always there, and the only thing we need to give notice for is when a committee isn't going to take public testimony.

Mayor Weldon appreciated and understood why Mr. Brooks was bringing this forward. However, she wanted to remind the committee that work sessions are the one time the body can get together to talk through an idea. She noted that it wouldn't be pertinent to have public testimony at that time.

Ms. Wright commented that she felt like she'd heard a little bit more about what Mr. Brooks was requesting and would like to make some modifications to the language and bring it back to the committee for continued discussion.

**MOTION:** by Mr. Brooks to keep the draft resolution in committee to refine the wording with the attorney and asked for unanimous consent. ***Hearing no objection, motion passed.***

**G. STAFF REPORTS - None**

**H. STANDING COMMITTEE TOPICS-FOR DISCUSSION AS MEETING TIME ALLOWS**

**1. Discussion on Boardmembers Serving Past Term End Date & Vacancies on Empowered Boards**

Included in the packet is [Resolution 2686](#) Advisory Rules of Procedure and [Resolution 2986](#) Assembly Rules of Procedure for reference.

**MOTION:** by Ms. Woll to direct staff to draft an amendment to the Advisory Rules or the Assembly Rules of Procedure that clearly defines what happens when there are vacancies on a board and someone is termed off; staff can make a recommendation to give us language to start working with, and the Assembly can then decide what we actually want to happen in that scenario. *Hearing no objection, motion passed.*

**I. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS** - None

**J. NEXT MEETING DATE: APRIL 6, 2026 @ 5PM ASSEMBLY CHAMBERS/ZOOM**

**K. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS** - None

**L. ADJOURNMENT**

With no further business to come before the committee, meeting adjourned at 5:40 p.m.