ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
March 2, 2020, 6:00 PM.
Assembly Chambers - Municipal Building

MINUTES

I. ROLL CALL

Deputy Mayor Maria Gladziszewski called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. in the Assembly Chambers.

Assemblymembers Present: Mayor Weldon (telephonic), Maria Gladziszewski, Loren Jones, Rob Edwardson, Wade Bryson, Carole Triem, Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Michelle Hale and Greg Smith (telephonic)

Assemblymembers Absent: None.

Staff present: City Manager Rorie Watt, Deputy City Manager Mila Cosgrove, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Chief Housing Officer Scott Ciambor, Finance Director Jeff Rogers, Public Works & Facilities Interim Director Robert Barr, Port Director Carl Uchytil, Community Development Director Jill Maclean, CDD Planner Beth McKibben, CDD Planner Irene Gallion, Museum Director Beth Weigel, Museum Public Programs Coordinator Elissa Borges

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. January 6, 2020 Assembly Committee of the Whole Draft Minutes

MOTION by Ms.Triem to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2020 Assembly Committee of the Whole meeting and asked for unanimous consent. *There being no objection, the minutes were approved.*

B. February 10, 2020 Assembly Committee of the Whole Draft Minutes

MOTION by Ms. Hale to approve the minutes of the January 6, 2020 Assembly Committee of the Whole meeting and asked for unanimous consent. *There being no objection, the minutes were approved.*

IV. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Affordable Housing Fund Process

Chief Housing Officer Scott Ciambor gave a presentation on the Affordable Housing Fund Program. The packet contained a memo from Mr. Ciambor setting out three decisions the Assembly should consider in order to fully implement the JAHF program.

1) Determine the funding amount available for the initial competitive round;
2) Confirm a timetable for Round One; and
3) Confirm a review committee structure.

Mr. Ciambor answered questions from Assemblymembers regarding various aspects of the program, terminology, and fund amounts and who would be eligible to receive the grants.

Mr. Jones said that the Assembly has not really had a chance to discuss the details and one of those details is the grant amount of $50,000.

Assemblymembers then discussed the JAHF program proposals, grant amounts, the competition, the use of funds and leveraging dollars, who was eligible to apply and what that might look like.

MOTION #1 by Mr. Jones to accept the $50,000 grant level provided the first year of the program was limited for downtown housing only.

ROLL CALL VOTE on Motion #1:
Ayes: Jones, Bryson
Nays: Edwardson, Hale, Hughes-Skandijs, Smith, Triem, Gladziszewski, Weldon
Motion failed 2 Ayes:7 Nays

Additional discussion took place on the program, and whether the downtown area should be prioritized over other areas of town.

MOTION #2 by Ms. Triem to add downtown housing to the list of priorities in the evaluation criteria as found on packet page 23 and add a new bullet item for Box #2 on the scoring sheet as downtown housing.

Ms. Hale objected and said she thought they should try to let the process work without micromanaging a piece of it and not incentivize some areas of town over others. Additional discussion took place about what that might look like in the evaluation criteria and how the scoring might be changed.

ROLL CALL VOTE on Motion #2:
Ayes: Jones, Bryson, Hughes-Skandijs, Smith, Triem, Gladziszewski
Nays: Edwardson, Hale, Weldon
Motion passed 6 Ayes:3 Nays

They then went through the three decisions requested as follows (and found on page one of Mr. Ciambor's memo - packet page #13).

1) Determine the funding amount available for the initial competitive round. As of July 1, 2020, the Juneau Affordable Housing Fund will have $1,325,400 available for use toward the creation of the affordable and workforce housing units in the City and Borough of Juneau. *This amount was affirmed by unanimous consent.*

2) Confirm a timetable for Round One. Staff recommended establishing an annual competition timeline similar to other CBJ processes for grant funding, like the CDD Block Grant process and would begin July 2020. Discussion took place regarding the reasoning behind the timing/calendar. They agreed that the consistency piece is the most important. *The timetable referenced in the memo passed by unanimous consent.*

3) Confirm a review committee structure. Ms. Gladziszewski noted that Mr. Ciambor's memo suggested the committee would include one member of the local housing development or banking community who is not associated with any potential JAHF applications to assist in ranking and review of applications.

MOTION #3 by Mayor Weldon that the review committee include staff plus two people - 1 representative from the local housing development community, 1 member of the banking community.

Objection by Ms. Hale who said that Mr. Ciambor ran the senior housing proposal through an internal staff review process.

Mr. Ciambor said there are a number of ways they could review this. It could be done through a staff review process similar to the Community Development Block Grant review process or it could be done with a small committee with members from the banking and housing development community on the committee.

The committee then discussed the terminology related to the types of bankers and/or those familiar with real estate. The committee asked the Mayor for clarification on the intent of her motion. Mayor Weldon clarified that she preferred one member to come from the local housing development community and one member from the banking community as they would have experience with local housing and local banking knowledge.

Mr. Edwardson said he didn't object but that there are a lot of different flavors of bankers and asked if it should be specified that it should be someone familiar with commercial and residential construction for banking. Mayor Weldon said that is what she was assuming and would include that in her motion. Mr. Bryson clarified that "commercial lenders" is the terminology the Mayor was searching for. *Hearing no objection, that motion, as clarified, passed by unanimous consent.*

MOTION #4 by Ms. Triem that the Committee of the Whole forward to the Assembly Finance Committee a recommendation of expending $525,400 in the first year of the Affordable Housing Fund grants. *Hearing no objection, that motion passed by unanimous consent.*

B. Franklin Dock

Mr. Watt gave a presentation regarding the Franklin Dock Proposed Floating Berth and Seawalk Negotiation. Ms. Gladziszewski asked the Manager to explain what action was needed from the committee at this time.

Mr. Watt explained that the following actions needed to occur:
1) An ordinance drafted allowing Mr. Stoops to lease the tidelands for the construction of the floating berth.
2) Assembly to pass a motion authorizing the Manager to negotiate with Mr. Stoops re: Seawalk.
3) Answer the question of whether the Assembly is interested in leasing or trading the National Guard dock facility to Mr. Stoops.

Mr. Watt explained that on the tidelands that we own, we are restricted from selling them but we can lease them. Mr. Stoops owns tidelands "fee simple" due to grandfathered rights prior to statehood. Mr. Watt then proceeded to answer many questions from the Assembly and Assemblymembers discussed the various aspects of the ordinance, motion, and negotiation requests above.

Mr. Uchytil then provided additional detailed information about the National Guard dock, its present uses, the status of the uplands and the opportunity to negotiate for the seawalk if new infrastructure and new access was added.

Additional discussion took place re: uplands needs as well as the action the Assembly is being asked to take. Members stated that they would favor splitting the questions (1-3 above) apart and taking them up as individual actions.

MOTION #1 by Mr. Edwardson to negotiate with the original proposer in their request to lease additional tidelands to the Franklin Dock to allow construction of a floating berth. *Hearing no* *objection, the motion passed by unanimous consent.*

MOTION #2 by Mr. Edwardson to forward to the Assembly the recommendation that the Assembly directs the manager to negotiate with the original applicant for negotiation of easements to allow the extension of the waterfreont seawalk.

AMENDMENT #1 by Ms. Triem that the negotiations would prohibit lightering from large cruise ships to the National Guard dock area.

Additional discussion then took place regarding the scope of what the negotiation might include and whether the National Guard Dock would be part of any negotiations.

The meeting took a brief at ease at 8:21 p.m.

Upon reconvening, Mr. Edwardson withdrew Motion #2 and reserved his right to bring it back up again after further discussion and clarification.

Ms. Gladziszewski invited Mr. Reed Stoops to come forward to provide information and answer questions of the Assembly. She then proceeded to ask Mr. Stoops if they have any specific plans for the National Guard Dock and/or the surrounding area. Mr. Stoops explained they don't have specific plans at this time. He said they are mainly looking to obtain it to allow for clear access to upland easements but also to allow for various possibilities in the future depending on the sizes of future ships and other future unknowns. Their priority issue at this time is the floating berth which was the first issue taken up by the committee. The other issue is related because it involved adjacent tidelands. The second issue isn't on the same timeline as the first issue.

Additional discussion took place regarding the process in CBJ Code and what the timelines would be involved as well as the public process involved and what the competitive process would be. They also discussed what the process and timelines would be for a lease from DNR. Mr. Watt said that he and Mr. Uchytil have asked DNR those questions but have not received that information from DNR.

Assemblymembers expressed their concern regarding the public process and if other proposers might want to also negotiate for this area. They also expressed their concerns with respect to giving up control of part of the waterfront.

MOTION #2 by Mr. Edwardson to forward to the Assembly the recommendation that the Assembly direct the manager to negotiate with the original applicant for easements to allow the extension of the waterfront seawalk.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Mr. Edwardson to clarify if his motion includes the National Guard Dock or not. Mr. Edwardson said it could or couldn't include the dock depending on what is in the best interest of CBJ during the negotiations. He said he would prefer to leave his motion as is but if someone wanted to amend it, that would be fine too.

Additional discussion took place with Ms. Hale expressing her concerns about process and that this was the first time they are hearing about this or receiving any information on this request. Mr. Edwardson clarified that the process is in the code and that in past instances of this process, while the Assembly passed a motion allowing the manager to enter into negotiations there was nothing in that process that committed the Assembly to final action if they didn't agree to what was negotiated. Other members then discussed the process as provided in the code as well as in the Assembly Rules of Procedure.

When asked, Mr. Edwardson clarified that his motion is to forward a recommendation to the Assembly at its meeting on March 16 to direct the manager to negotiate with the original applicant for easements to allow the extension of the waterfront seawalk.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION #2

Ayes: Edwardson, Bryson, Triem, Smith, Jones, Hughes-Skandijs, Weldon, Gladziszewski
Nays: Hale
Motion carried 8:1.

C. Morris Letter/Parking

Mr. Watt recognized Planning Commissioner Arndt for his stamina in sticking through the meeting. Mr. Watt recommended the Assembly forward this matter to the Planning Commission to work on with at least items 1-3 in his memo as follows:

1. Forward consideration of parking code amendments to the Planning Commission.
2. Direct CDD and Planning Commission to only work on the issue globally, for all of downtown, not specifically for Archipelago development.
3. Ask the Planning Commission to invite code amendment comments from the public.

Mr. Watt said he didn't think the Assembly was wanting to take the time at the late hour to begin tackling #4 which was "Tonight, or at a later date, consider providing some guidance to CDD or the Planning Commission."

Members then asked questions of Mr. Watt and also discussed some of the particulars with respect to the Archipelago process that had been before the Assembly prior to it going to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Hale said that she wanted to add an item #5 that any discussions involved with parking in the downtown area that provides for considerations of public transportation to be a key element in those provisions.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon for the Planning Commission to consider global parking code amendments with the opportunity for the public comment and ask them to prioritize this issue due to the time constraints. (Memo recommendations 1, 2, 3 & B)

AMENDMENT by Ms. Hale that the Planning Commission include public transit in their consideration for example, fee in lieu of parking applied towards Capital Transit.

Ms. Hale then simplified her amendment as follows:
AMENDMENT by Ms. Hale that the Planning Commission include considering public transit.

Mayor Weldon objected to the amendment. Ms. Weldon said she appreciates Ms. Hale's reasoning but she doesn't want to tie the Planning Commission to any restrictions in their consideration of this matter.

Mr. Jones expressed his concern that Ms. Hale's amendment would fall under #4 and they had agreed that they would not be taking up #4 at this time and he too would have a number of questions and suggestions when they take up #4. Other members also provided their comments on the timelines and process for when and how #4 and Assembly discussion on this might take place.

Ms. Hale clarified that her amendment was to provide the Planning Commission with the instructions to include improving public transit in their considerations of the parking issue.

ROLL CALL VOTE on Amendment
Ayes: Hale, Edwardson, Triem, Smith
Nays: Bryson, Hughes-Skandijs, Jones, Gladziszewski, Weldon
Motion failed 4:5

Ms. Gladziszewski asked if there was any objection to the main motion. *Hearing none, the **MOTION** by Mayor Weldon for the Planning Commission to consider global parking code* *amendments with the opportunity for the public comment and ask them to prioritize this issue due to the time constraints. (Memo recommendations 1, 2, 3 & B) passed by unanimous consent.*

D. Museum Update

Mr. Watt said that the Assembly asked for an update on the Museum proposal. Mr. Watt provided two memos in the packet and explained the process on developing a campus plan similar to what was done at Dimond Park.

The committee had a lengthy discussion regarding the City Museum and the parking ramifications including the fee in lieu of process, the potential use of parking garages, public transit and all the interconnected pieces and challenges that might be faced if/when CBJ decides to develop any new structures in the downtown area such as the museum or a new City Hall.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon to forward the Museum Concept as a City Project Review to the Planning Commission for public comment and work down the funding steps as outlined in the Manager's memo.

Objection by Mr. Jones. Mr. Jones said that he is not in favor or spending any money on this project and there would not be anything to go to the Planning Commission unless there was funding provided to spend on a project that would be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Additional discussion took place regarding funding needs for CBJ and Mr. Watt answered questions from the Assembly about process and potential funding sources and whether CBJ should be involved in this project at all.

Mayor Weldon said that while she appreciates the concerns members have raised, she was putting forward a motion to enable a process by which the public could weigh in on this concept and process.

Additional discussion took place on the public process of what may or may not go into that location.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION
Ayes: Weldon, Triem, Smith, Bryson
Nays: Edwardson, Hale, Hughes-Skandijs, Jones, Gladziszewski
Motion failed 4:5

Ms. Hale noted that the vote on this motion clearly demonstrates why they need to have the conversation regarding the second memo for the Assembly to meet with the Planning Commission to discuss the Downtown Infrastructure Plan Concept in April or when the Assembly receives an update from the Blueprint Downtown planning process.

MOTION by Mr. Smith that the Assembly direct staff to solicit ideas and public comment to determine the public's desire for development of CBJ's portion of the Archipelago Lot.

Mr. Jones objected for the same reasons he stated earlier.

Additional discussion took place about what giving direction or non-direction to staff would mean. Mr. Watt suggested the Assembly take his two memos and give them to the Blueprint Downtown and see what they come back to the Assembly with.

ROLL CALL VOTE ON MOTION
Ayes: Triem, Smith, Bryson, Hale, Hughes-Skandijs, Edwardson, Gladziszewsi
Nays: Jones, Weldon
Motion passed 7:2

ADDITIONAL AGENDA ITEM:
Mr. Watt said in response to the Coronavirus issue, he is suggesting they hold a Special Assembly Committee of the Whole public information session on Monday, March 9 at 6p.m. which would be broadcast on KTOO. They would be inviting representatives from the hospital and Mr. Tibbles from CLIAA, to speak as a panel to the COW. Mr. Edwardson asked if anyone representing the US Coast Guard would be present. Mr. Watt said they were invited to participate in the radio spot earlier that day and they declined to participate and he didn't think they would be wanting to participate in the COW meeting.

Additional discussion took place regarding what CBJ could be doing to help coordinate the questions from the public and the various things that will need to be considered when the first cruise ships arrive. Ms. Hale said that this is an ever evolving issue and what might be appropriate today may not be an appropriate response tomorrow or a week from now.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that if anyone from the Assembly or public had questions that they wanted addressed at that meeting to please forward them to the City Manager's office.

OTHER BUSINESS:
Ms. Cosgrove noted that Ms. Maclean had asked that the Assembly be reminded that there would be a meeting on Tuesday, March 10 at 5p.m. at which there would be a full recap of the Auke Bay Vision Plan and what they did in terms of public process for the rezoning.

Mr. Bryson said that the Full Assembly sitting as the Human Resources Committee needs to set a date for interviewing applicants for the Planning Commission. They set the meeting for April 30 at 5:30p.m.

Ms. Cosgrove reminded members to wear their Census Counts pins.

Ms. McEwen reminded members that there was a joint Assembly and Planning Commission meeting set for March 31 with start time to be announced.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 9:47 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth McEwen, MMC
Municipal Clerk