

ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
Meeting Minutes –March 15, 2021

The Assembly Committee of the Whole meeting, held virtually via Zoom webinar, was called to order by Deputy Mayor Loren Jones at 6:02p.m.

I. ROLL CALL

Assemblymembers Present: Maria Gladziszewski, Wade Bryson, Michelle Hale, Carole Triem, Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Greg Smith, Loren Jones, and Mayor Weldon.

Assemblymembers Absent: Christine Woll.

Staff Present: Deputy City Manager Mila Cosgrove, City Attorney Robert Palmer, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Deputy Clerk Diane Cathcart, Police Chief Ed Mercer, Deputy Chief David Campbell, Library Director/EOC Planning Chief Robert Barr, Finance Director Jeff Rogers, Public Works Director Katie Koester, Lands Manager Dan Bleidorn, Parks and Recreation Director George Schaaf, Parks and Recreation Deputy Director Michele Elfers, Community Development Department (CDD) Planning Manager Alexandra Pierce, Assistant City Attorney Sherri Layne, CDD Senior Planner Irene Gallion,

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. December 7, 2020 Assembly Committee of the Whole Draft Minutes

Hearing no objections, the minutes of the December 7, 2020 COW meeting were approved.

B. January 11, 2021 Assembly Committee of the Whole Draft Minutes

Hearing no objections, the minutes of the January 11, 2021 COW meeting were approved.

IV. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Elections Update from Municipal Clerk

Ms. Cosgrove shared that she and Ms. McEwen have been exploring options for future elections; options that often are determined by accessibility, process, and cost. There are three primary options presented to the Assembly.

Option A was described as the “Status Quo” option, which is very similar in how CBJ has held municipal elections in the past.

Option B would be to conduct a Vote by Mail Election, a process similar to how the 2020 Municipal Election was conducted, primarily due to COVID-19.

Option C was a hybrid of the two previous options, which would allow for vote centers with strong Vote by Mail features.

The full range of options for Assembly consideration were:

OPTION A: Precinct Polling Place Elections – In person Election Day emphasis with Early/Absentee Stations open 2 weeks prior to Election Day with absentee by mail or e-ballot options available similar to elections conducted prior to 2020.

OPTION B: Vote By Mail Elections

Option B-1: VBM in Juneau through creation of an Election Center with purchase of sorting equipment.

Option B-2: VBM in Juneau through creation of an Election Center with manual processing.

Option B-3: VBM in coordination with Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) similar to the 2020 Regular CBJ Election.

OPTION C: Hybrid with Vote Centers & Strong Absentee by Mail and e-Ballot options

Option C-1: Hybrid In person/By Mail (sorting equipment purchase). Vote Centers for in person voting including creation of an Election Center with the purchase of sorting equipment. All ballots processed similar to VBM election processing as mentioned in Option B-1 above.

Option C-2: Hybrid In person/By Mail (manual processing). Vote Centers for in person voting including creation of an Election Center sorting all ballots manually as mentioned in Option B-2 above.

Ms. Cosgrove added that whichever option is chosen, CBJ is in need of new voting equipment, and there is funding available in this year's budget to purchase that equipment.

Ms. McEwen described that Option B was also somewhat of a hybrid option, as it still allows for in-person voting options. She explained that Option B3 is essentially an option that closely follows how the 2020 Municipal Election was conducted: contracting the Municipality of Anchorage and utilizing election vote centers. Ms. McEwen clarified the difference between Option B and Option C. Option B would automatically send every registered voter mail-in ballot packet, whereas Option C would require voters to apply for a mail-in ballot before a ballot packet is mailed to that voter.

Mayor Weldon asked if voters would be required to submit identifying information along with their Vote by Mail ballots through Option B, or if that was only a requirement with Option C. Ms. McEwen said that it would be up to the Assembly to decide what the requirements would be for each of the options. She explained that voters did not have to provide identifiable information in their ballots for the 2020 Municipal Election but that each ballot was assigned to each voter using a unique barcode. The Assembly will need to specify in the Municipal Code what the requirements will be in order to validate a voter's identification.

Ms. Triem shared that while she was grateful towards MOA for allowing CBJ to use their election equipment, she felt hesitant about depending on another municipality for future elections. She asked if there was a possibility that there could be an agreement or contract that

would restrict MOA from suddenly choosing not to allow CBJ to use their election equipment at the last second. Ms. McEwen explained that MOA would have priority to use their own facilities, however if CBJ were to enter negotiations for a contract, MOA would do their best to honor that contract.

Ms. Hale recalled an option that included CBJ mailing postcards to registered voters, and those voters who wished to vote by mail would then request for a ballot using their respective postcard. Ms. McEwen said that Ms. Hale was describing Option C, and that postcards were mailed to every registered voter in Juneau (along with the mail-in ballots) for the 2020 Municipal Election. These postcards were meant to advise voters to update their mailing addresses before ballots were to be mailed out.

Mr. Smith asked for Ms. McEwen to explain the increased costs for conducting the election. Ms. McEwen explained that having a Vote by Mail or hybrid-Vote by Mail election would require a large election center than what CBJ currently has with enough room to house the necessary election equipment and process the ballots. This center would also require hiring additional staff to process the ballots and operate the election center.

There was a brief discussion regarding Election-related House Bills that are currently being considered and amended through the State legislature.

Mr. Bryson had a question regarding the lease of an election center, asking if the equipment would be permanently installed and unable to be taken down. He expressed concern about having a large scale facility for equipment which would only be used three times a year at most. Mr. Bryson advised against leasing a new facility, and suggested that they find space within an existing CBJ facility to convert into an election center.

Ms. McEwen explained the installation process for setting up election equipment, as it is a lengthy, involved process that discourages moving the equipment around after its installation. She added that the space available in the Assembly Chambers would not be adequate enough for all of the election equipment. However, that does not mean that CBJ could not find a different facility large enough to store the election equipment. There have been discussions about using other CBJ facilities as election centers in the future, but those facilities are not available as of right now.

Ms. Gladziszewski spoke to the high cost of installing a new election center in Juneau, and proposed that the Assembly shift their focus towards two options: a Vote by Mail election similar to last year's election, or a normal election similar to previous elections.

Ms. Hale suggested the Assembly focus on Option A and Option B3. Option B3 utilizes MOA's election center, and would negate the need for CBJ to set up its own election center.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs mentioned that she was pleased with how voting participation numbers increased during the Vote by Mail election, and would like to see Juneau set up its own election center in the future.

Ms. Triem echoed Ms. Hughes-Skandijs' comments, saying that while she appreciated MOA allowing CBJ to use its facility, she would not want that to be a permanent long-term option for future elections. She supported having CBJ set up its own election center.

Ms. Hale added that using MOA's election center for this year's election would not prevent CBJ from establishing its own election center for future elections.

Mayor Weldon agreed with Ms. Triem's comments, and said that she would like to see election operations come back to Juneau, and does not wish to dismiss the hybrid options. She recommended diverting focus away from Option B2 and Option C1.

Mr. Bryson agreed with Mayor Weldon, and added that he felt that bringing the ballots to Anchorage was the most difficult and riskiest part of last year's election. He said that it might be able to happen one more time, and asked Ms. McEwen if there was any difficulty during the process of transporting ballots to Anchorage.

Ms. McEwen clarified that the operation itself was not difficult, it was a matter of ballot control between CBJ and MOA. She described it as a smooth process, and hoped that process would continue to go smoothly if it were to happen again.

Ms. Hale recalled the custody seals that were placed on each of the ballot boxes, and asked Ms. McEwen if she would be able to determine if those ballots were tampered with during that process due to those seals.

Ms. McEwen confirmed that each of the ballots were delivered to the Transportation Security Administration and the Clerk's Office staff observed as the TSA inspected each box containing ballots. After inspection, each ballot box was then repackaged with tamper-evident seals and transferred through a chain of airport custody up to Anchorage.

Mr. Jones asked Ms. McEwen to clarify the drop-dead date for making a decision for the 2021 Municipal Election. Ms. McEwen said that the first deadline they must meet is the purchase of ADA-compliant machinery, and the quote that was given to CBJ will be valid for 90 days as of March 11, 2021. Ms. McEwen has 90 days to inform the company on whether or not CBJ will be purchasing that equipment for the election.

Mr. Jones spoke about deadlines, and the importance of knowing when each of the deadlines will be in effect for each election option. Ms. McEwen said that she thinks that the Assembly should reach a decision by the April 26 Assembly meeting in order to rearrange the calendar, and ensure that they have the code ordinances, and to allow for public comment.

Mr. Jones asked if the Law Department could assist the Assembly through the process of getting the final votes on the ordinances needed by April 26th. Mr. Palmer said that some of the options presented before the Assembly might be adjustable through the Clerk's Policies and Procedures. He added that the Law Department can work with the Clerk's Office on drafting ordinances based on the COW's decision tonight.

MOTION by Ms. Gladziszewski to forward Election Option B3 to the Assembly for consideration for the 2021 Regular Municipal Election.

Amendment #1 by Mayor Weldon to also include Option B1 for consideration by the Assembly.
Hearing no objections, Amendment #1 was adopted by unanimous consent.

There was a discussion about providing clarification that Options B1 and B3 would be forwarded to the Assembly for consideration with B3 being done in 2021 if possible. If it was determined to be not possible for 2021, it was decided upon to consider it for the 2022 Regular Election.

Hearing no objection to the amendment or the motion, the motion passed as amended by unanimous consent.

B. Fireworks Ordinance (Draft Ordinance 2021-03 COWv2)

Mr. Palmer gave an explanation on the existing language and amendments of the draft Fireworks ordinance. Referencing a chart presented in the agenda packet, Mr. Palmer compared the current Fireworks Ordinance to the Proposed Fireworks Ordinance, and what it would do to the existing policy. The existing policy's definitions on saleable and non-concussive fireworks makes for what Mr. Palmer described as a complicated situation.

He explained that the draft ordinance is almost identical to the existing policy, with the exception of its allowance of saleable, concussive fireworks on New Year's Eve and the Fourth of July. The draft ordinance also includes a difference when it comes to retail sales. This ordinance includes amendments that would allow for the retail sale of fireworks outside of the fire service area boundary, but prohibit retail sales of fireworks inside the fire service area boundary.

Mr. Palmer recommended forwarding this to another COW meeting to ensure that the draft ordinance is cohesive before introducing it for public hearing.

Ms. Hale added that the intent of this ordinance would be to produce a brochure similar to the one that currently exists, to help residents understand the guidelines and boundaries of fireworks usage. Ms. Hale described her intent as wanting to allow people to have fun, while protecting neighborhood residents from having to deal with excessive noise.

Mr. Bryson asked Mr. Palmer to clarify if the draft ordinance would effectively remove all fireworks from residential areas (including bottle rockets and roman candles) or would it just

remove highly-concussive fireworks. Mr. Palmer clarified that people are permitted to use different kinds of fireworks in residential areas than they can outside of that area.

Ms. Gladziszewski mentioned that she only wanted to prohibit excessive “booming” fireworks, and spoke against banning all fireworks from residential areas.

36.80.010 – Fireworks Control. Mr. Palmer explained the Title 19 shall govern the storage of fireworks, which is a point of clarification on how fireworks are stored. He wished to make clear that this draft ordinance does not interfere with Title 19.

Mr. Palmer continued detailing the draft ordinances changes, such as the geographical use of non-concussive fireworks and the definition of “non-concussive.” Mr. Bryson asked for further clarification on what types off fireworks have been prohibited. Mr. Palmer said that the existing ordinance defines concussive fireworks as roman candles, bottle rockets, helicopter rockers, firecrackers, mines, and mortars. These types of fireworks would be prohibited year-round in residential areas.

Mr. Palmer confirmed that the definition of “non-concussive” used in the ordinance is verbatim from the State law, however the definition of “concussive” has been slightly modified. He added that one of these modifications was at the request of the Juneau Police Department to allow for officers to identify the difference between the two types of fireworks. This includes any firework with an inside tube diameter greater than three-quarters of an inch to be identified as concussive. Fireworks that are also identified as concussives are roman candles, bottle rockets, helicopter rockers, firecrackers, mines, and mortars – regardless of inside tube diameter.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked if definitions used in the ordinance were found in the National Fire Protection Association’s definition of firework types, or were they added by the Law Department. Mr. Palmer explained that Items A through K of the ordinance are directly stated in Alaska State Law, and the only modification made was to categorize the definitions of “concussive” and “non-concussive” fireworks. Ms. Gladziszewski asked if a bottle rocket would be categorized as a concussive sky rocket. Mr. Palmer confirmed that would be the correct categorization, and they are categorized as concussive due to the 2016 CBJ Assembly Policy on Fireworks.

Mr. Bryson asked if it was possible for CBJ to directly list in the ordinance the types of concussive fireworks that are prohibited within CBJ Fire Code limits. He added that putting bottle rockets, black cats, and roman candles on the concussive list could cause contentions within the community. Mr. Bryson also suggested banning the use of mortar fireworks, as they are the fireworks that cause the most complaints.

Ms. Hale reiterated her point of having an easy to understand flyer available for residents to know which fireworks are permitted for use in preparation for the Fourth of July.

Mayor Weldon asked Mr. Palmer to explain why Items 6 through 16 did not include a time restriction like Item I, Line 18 has included. Mr. Palmer mentioned that the Assembly has the option to impose a time restriction to firework usage if they deemed it necessary.

36.080.020 – Fireworks Prohibition and Exceptions. Mr. Palmer went on to explain the exemptions to allow the use of fireworks in certain areas outside of the fire service area. Item 2(i) allows for year-round use of fireworks outside of the fire service area, which is defined as out the road past Cohen Drive. This would allow for the use of both concussive and non-concussive fireworks between 10:00am and 10:00pm every day of the year. Mr. Palmer also defined Outer Point of North Douglas as outside of the fire service area and past the boat ramp on North Douglas. This definition includes Eaglecrest as within the fire service area. The use of both concussives and non-concussives are permitted in this area only during New Year’s Eve and the Fourth of July.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked for an explanation for Eaglecrest’s involvement in their status as a fire service area. Mr. Palmer explained that Eaglecrest has requested that they be allowed to dictate when fireworks are used on Eaglecrest property, and for it to be prohibited unless otherwise allowed.

Mayor Weldon wished to clarify that this ordinance restricts fireworks usage only to a specific part of North Douglas, and not the entirety of Douglas Island. Mr. Palmer confirmed that the area between the North Douglas boat ramp and the end of Douglas Highway as a permitted place for firework usage only during New Year’s Eve and the Fourth of July.

Mr. Palmer explained Item 3(i) which allows for firework usage outside of the fire service area on any private land. Both concussives and non-concussives are permitted as long as there is direct permission given by the property owner.

Mr. Jones mentioned that firearms are not permitted to be fired a quarter-mile away from a road, and asked how far the road service area extended past the shoulder of the road.

Mr. Palmer answered that he believed that the general rule was a half-mile away from the road.

36.80.030 – Fireworks Use Permit. Mr. Palmer explained that he deleted the word “appropriate” from the language in Line 22 as he felt that it looked redundant in the ordinance.

Another language change was made in Lines 19 and 20, putting “must” instead of “should” which would require the fire chief to provide an explanation.

36.80.040 – Sale of Fireworks. Mr. Palmer described a change in language from an “and” to an “or” in the fireworks retail permit. This change would allow for someone to sell fireworks with a permit outside the fire service area, otherwise the sale of fireworks is prohibited inside the fire service area.

Mr. Bryson expressed concern with forcing the sales of fireworks to be outside of the fire service area. He said that doing so would make it more hazardous for those to get out the road to purchase fireworks, and a higher liability for those selling the fireworks. Mr. Bryson suggested allowing permitted sales of fireworks to happen in a reasonable location within the fire service area. He asked for the reasoning behind the logic of having fireworks sales be conducted outside of the fire service area.

Mr. Palmer explained that the current CBJ policy code states that fireworks need to be stored properly, and said that there may be places within the fire service area where adequate storage capacity exists.

Ms. Hale explained that there are safety concerns within the fire service area depending on the location of sales.

Ms. Gladziszewski questioned the purpose of limiting the sale of fireworks to outside of the fire service area, and asked for clarification as to why that is.

36.80.045 – City & Borough of Juneau Retail Fireworks Permit. Mr. Palmer introduced language for a new Juneau retail fireworks permit that he drafted with the Fire Chief. He described the overarching concept as follows: if someone wants to sell fireworks, they would first need to get a permit from the State, then they would present that permit to the Fire Chief. The Fire Chief would then evaluate the criteria, and if the criteria was met, a permit would then be issued.

Mr. Palmer and Mayor Weldon identified five preliminary conditions that need to be met for retail firework sales: retail sales must take place outside of the fire service area boundary; retailers must obtain a permit issued from the State; the Fire Chief must approve of the permit; retailers must only sell saleable fireworks; and sales are only permitted to take place when the Juneau Area Fire Danger level is at Low or Moderate. The permit is effective for twelve months, similar to the State permit. The Fire Chief may temporarily revoke the retail permit if the Juneau Area Fire Danger level is at High, Very High, or Extreme. The Fire Chief may revoke a fireworks permit upon violation of any of the aforementioned conditions, a violation of this chapter, or a violation of Alaska Statute 18.72 or Title 19. Mr. Palmer clarified that a violation of this chapter would include the sale of non-saleable fireworks or dangerous fireworks are that not legal to sell in Alaska.

36.80.050 – Possession of Fireworks. Mr. Palmer said that in the previous version, each person was limited to 25 gross pounds of fireworks; this draft ordinance changed that language to allow for 150 gross pounds of fireworks per person. With this increased number, the storage and transport of these fireworks must be in accordance with Title 19, as well as State and Federal laws.

Ms. Triem asked Mr. Palmer to explain what the Title 19 requirements were for the storage and transport of fireworks. Mr. Palmer explained that it would depend on the volume of the fireworks being stored and transported. The technical aspects of Title 19 and the hypothetical situations in which large amounts of fireworks are being stored or transported can vary. Mr. Palmer said that he could get back to Ms. Triem with more exact specifications regarding Title 19 at the next COW meeting. Ms. Triem said that she would like to fully understand what the requirements are before making a decision regarding the storage and transportation of a large amount of fireworks.

Ms. Hale clarified that fireworks are often sold in large packs of up to 125 pounds that contain a whole variety of fireworks. She said that they chose to increase this number in order to limit the amount of packs one could possess to help address illegal sales.

Mr. Bryson felt that this number was significantly higher than it needed to be, and expressed concern about variety packs of 125 or more potentially including large-scale mortar fireworks. He suggested that this number could be lowered to 100 or 75 pounds. Ms. Hale appreciated Mr. Bryson's comments, but mentioned that the use of mortar fireworks outside of the fire service area would be permitted per this fireworks ordinance.

Mayor Weldon questioned why there seemed to be no age restriction with this chapter of the ordinance, and asked if it was dropped. Mr. Palmer confirmed that this draft of the fireworks ordinance does not restrict the sale of fireworks to those under the age of eighteen. He added that if the Assembly wished to impose that as a condition, they would need to add that amendment. Ms. Hale explained that she chose not to set an age restriction for the sale of fireworks due to the fifteen, sixteen, and seventeen year olds who do use fireworks. She said that she did not want to criminalize normal behavior.

36.80.060 – Miscellaneous Fireworks Provisions. Mr. Palmer expanded this section to include a more clear definition of alcoholic intoxication by using the language found in the Driving Under the Influence provision. He also clarified the language regarding those intoxicated under marijuana or controlled substances. Ms. Hale added that this also applies to the sale of fireworks, fireworks may not be sold to someone who is clearly intoxicated or under the influence.

36.80.070 – Definitions. Mr. Palmer defined concussive, saleable fireworks as any firework with an inside tube greater than $\frac{3}{4}$ inch or one of the following items: Roman candle, sky rocket or bottle rocket, helicopter-type rockets, mines, mortars, and firecrackers. Mr. Palmer added that the Assembly was able to change these definitions, as these were taken from the 2016 Fireworks Policy.

Mr. Palmer emphasized the definition of designated public property as regulated CBJ property, and regulated state and federal property with their express consent. This definition allows the Assembly to decide where fireworks can be used.

If the Assembly decided to take no action, then the Eaglecrest Board and the Docks & Harbors Board are permitted to decide if people can use fireworks on their respective properties. For example, Docks & Harbors Board could designate the Echo Cove Boat Launch as an area in which fireworks can be used. Mr. Palmer reiterated that this is only the case if the Assembly choose not to act on the definition of designated public property.

Mr. Palmer shared that there had been no changes made to the definition of non-concussive saleable fireworks. He said that he took this definition from the 2016 Fireworks Policy.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked for additional clarification on the definitions used in the draft ordinance. Mr. Palmer explained that Items A through K were derived from the list featured in Alaska State Statute regarding what is defined as a saleable firework. He compared that list to the 2016 Firework Policy, and divided the two into clear definitions for the draft ordinance.

Section 3. Amendment of Section. Section 03.30.053. Mr. Palmer explained that this section illustrates the civil infractions for using fireworks in violation of this code. He compared this offense as similar to a speeding ticket, and made the fines increase gradually through a “stair stepped” approach through repeated offenses.

Section 4. Amendment of Section. CBJC 67.01.090. Mr. Palmer clarified that this amendment only applies to Parks & Recreation CBJ Property, and cleared up the question on whether a firework can be considered a “missile.” Director Schaaf explicitly requested the term “firework” to be specifically identified as being prohibited on Parks & Recreation property. However, the Assembly, by resolution, may designate any area of Parks & Recreation property for fireworks during specific times.

Ms. Gladziszewski said that she would like to differentiate between big mortars and firecrackers, and said that bottle rockets and firecrackers could be allowed in residential areas for the Fourth of July. She also proposed allowing fireworks usage at Eaglecrest only for New Year’s Eve and the Fourth of July.

Mr. Bryson spoke to the difference between mortars and other fireworks, and advocated for removing mortar fireworks.

Mr. Smith expressed interest in looking into prohibiting the sale of fireworks to those under the age of eighteen, but not prohibiting the use of fireworks to that population.

Mayor Weldon asked Mr. Bryson to clarify his proposal, as the use of mortars in residential areas was already not permitted under this ordinance. Mr. Bryson said that the current ordinance removes too many fireworks, such as black cats and roman candles, and he would like to ban the highest-concussive firework.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs asked for clarification on if Mr. Bryson’s and Ms. Gladziszewski’s suggestions were to simply add back firecrackers and bottle rockets, or if they were wanting to

add more fireworks than that. Ms. Gladziszewski confirmed that she wanted to just include bottle rockets, firecrackers, and roman candles. She recommended adding a third category for fireworks that are concussive, but not excessively loud.

Ms. Triem expressed concern about the potential danger and risk of wildfires that may result from pushing people out the road to use fireworks.

Mayor Weldon responded to Mr. Smith's concerns, saying that the State of Alaska already requires those who purchase fireworks to be over the age of eighteen, but she would like to see something that requires that those who use concussive fireworks to be over eighteen.

Ms. Gladziszewski said that Ms. Triem's concern further justifies why she would like to see Eaglecrest and Echo Cove added as potential places for fireworks usage.

Mayor Weldon proposed adding a sixth condition for Retail Firework Sale Permits for retailers to be bonded and insured to prevent firework-related hazards from going uninsured.

Ms. Gladziszewski echoed Mr. Bryson's earlier comments about reducing the possession of fireworks to 75 gross pounds instead of 150 gross pounds.

Mayor Weldon thanked Ms. Hale and Mr. Smith for their hard work in developing this draft ordinance and for trying to reach a compromise for this difficult issue.

The Committee of the Whole took a break at 8:35p.m. and the meeting resumed at 8:45p.m.

C. Bond Project Priorities

Ms. Cosgrove explained that Engineering/Public Works Director Katie Koester polled the Assemblymembers and provided a list of the feedback received. The State Legislative Delegation and Federal Delegation have both requested the Assembly state their current priorities in regards to the bond projects.

Ms. Koester shared that her goal was to discuss and adopt the priority list featured in tonight's agenda packet. She reported that all Assemblymembers responded to the poll, which was significant in ensuring that the numbers were calculated accurately. In addition to discussing next steps, Ms. Koester will also send a copy of the priority list to U.S. Senator Lisa Murkowski as part of her information gathering exercise.

Mayor Weldon asked about the car crusher, and whether or not it would be efficient as it is based on weight instead of size. Ms. Koester mentioned that CBJ staff and Recycle Works have been requesting a car crusher for a while now, and noted that Juneau's limitation on shipping junk vehicles is based on weight. Therefore, a car crusher would not necessarily allow for more cars

to be shipped. However, she added that a car crusher could potentially be useful in the future for different endeavors.

Mr. Smith asked Ms. Koester if she had received any guidance from Sen. Murkowski's office on project size or types of project, i.e. economic projects. Ms. Koester explained how the Assembly could complete the project request form process, and described it as part of Sen. Murkowski's outreach to constituents.

Mr. Smith asked if this process was an annual prompt and not tied to any federal infrastructure package. Ms. Koester said that it was not tied to any specific infrastructure package that she was aware of, although that is not to say that it could not have been or could not be tied to one in the future.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs asked if the car crusher would help with storage challenges. Ms. Koester said that a car crusher could help with storage concerns, but it also comes with other challenges to make sure it does not result in any environmental and/or operational issues.

Mr. Bryson asked about the current status of the Skookum car crusher, which used to crush cars into blocks. Ms. Koester explained that CBJ has three years left in its contract with Skookum, and are still currently able to crush cars.

Mayor Weldon spoke in regards to the Federal funding, and shared that she would like to send Centennial Hall Expansion Project and 2nd Channel Crossing Project to the Federal level. She said that she picked those two projects because each of them are in need of substantial funding.

Ms. Gladziszewski shared that she would like to move Centennial Hall Expansion and the 2nd Channel Crossing up towards the top of the priority list. She mentioned that the Assembly has discussed 2nd Channel Crossing for years, while it is not a shovel ready project, it is something every person who ran for Assembly has supported. Ms. Gladziszewski was surprised to see the North Douglas Launch Ramp up so high on list, considering they have never discussed it.

Ms. Triem agreed with moving the 2nd Channel Crossing up the priority list. She said that she could be convinced to move that project above the car crusher.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs brought to the attention of the Assembly that many constituents at Docks & Harbors Board meetings have voiced their concerns regarding the condition of the North Douglas Boat Ramp. She also spoke in favor of the 2nd Channel Crossing project.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs suggested asking for more money for the Lemon Creek Bike Path project, rather than funding millions towards Centennial Hall, which has already received millions in funding in the past.

Ms. Hale spoke to the concerns that the public had about the Centennial Hall project regarding

its funding coming from CBJ, and mentioned that receiving federal funding from the project could help it receive more support.

Ms. Triem mentioned that the Lemon Creek Bike Path was at the top of her priority list. She also stated that these projects were identified as priorities with the anticipation that it was done with the State G.O. bonds in mind. If this list were to be used for other purposes, she would have prioritized it differently under a different context.

MOTION by Mr. Smith to keep the Legislative Priority List the same as found on page 69 and would like to see a separate list sent to Sen. Murkowski as follows: Lemon Creek Bike Path at \$8,000,000, the 2nd Channel Crossing at \$50,000,000 and Centennial Hall Expansion/Civic Center at \$25,000,000.

Objection by Ms. Gladziszewski. She suggested that Mr. Smith bifurcate the motion as she agreed with the second part of his motion, but not the first.

Mr. Smith withdrew his previous motion to make a new motion.

MOTION by Mr. Smith to submit a list to Sen. Murkowski three projects: Lemon Creek Bike Path at \$8,000,000 for the Lemon Creek Bike Path, the 2nd Channel Crossing at \$50,000,000 and Centennial Hall Expansion/Civic Center at \$25,000,000.

Ms. Hale commented on whether the Assembly should ask for \$200,000,000, or if the Assembly should be modest and ask for \$50,000,000. Ms. Koester said that it would be acceptable to leave the dollar amount blank and to give general direction to accomplish a significant phase of the project. She also recommended that CBJ staff could come back with a more educated estimate for funding requests.

Objection by Mr. Jones. He said that he tried to avoid this item on Friday, due to the fact that there are a lot of people out there who want to do a lot of things. He said that this is not the process the Assembly needs to use, and would prefer a process that involved more people to be involved with this decision.

Mr. Bryson related this list as being similar to writing a letter to Santa Claus, and thanked Mr. Jones for his candid comments.

Roll Call Vote to forward the Lemon Creek Bike Path, the Centennial Hall Expansion Project, and the 2nd Channel Crossing Project to Senator Murkowski:

Ayes: Smith, Hughes-Skandijs, Bryson, Hale, Triem, Gladziszewski, Mayor Weldon.

Nays: Jones.

Motion passed. Seven (7) Ayes, One (1) Nay.

MOTION by Mr. Smith to forward the list as written on page 69 of the packet to the Legislative Delegation as the Assembly's 2021 Priority List.

Objection by Ms. Gladziszewski for purposes of an amendment.

AMENDMENT #1 by Ms. Gladziszewski to move the 2nd Channel Crossing Project up above the North Douglas Launch Ramp to be Item #4.

Objection by Mr. Jones.

Roll Call Vote on Amendment #1:

Ayes: Gladziszewski, Bryson, Hale, Triem, Weldon.

Nays: Smith, Hughes-Skandijs, Jones.

Amendment adopted. Five (5) Ayes, Three (3) Nays.

Hearing no objections to the motion as amended, the motion passed by unanimous consent.

D. Visitor Industry Task Force Report Implementation Plan – Mr. Jones provided notice to those online or watching that this agenda topic will be postponed to the next COW meeting.

E. Other Items – None.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:21p.m.

Minutes drafted by Administrative Assistant Lacey Davis and respectfully submitted by Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen this 10th day of May, 2021.