CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
July 8, 2019, 6:00 PM.
Assembly Chambers – Municipal Building

MINUTES

I. ROLL CALL

Deputy Mayor Maria Gladziszewski called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. in the Assembly Chambers.

Assemblymembers Present: Mary Becker, Rob Edwardson, Maria Gladziszewski, Loren Jones, Carole Triem, Michelle Hale, Wade Bryson, Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, and Mayor Beth Weldon.

Assemblymembers Absent: None.

Staff present: City Attorney Robert Palmer, Deputy Manager Mila Cosgrove, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Fire Chief Rich Etheridge, Finance Director Bob Bartholomew, Lands Manager Greg Chaney, Deputy Lands Manager Dan Bleidorn, Housing/ Homelessness Coordinator Irene Gallion, Library Director Robert Barr, Engineering/ Public Works Director Mike Vigue.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Ms. Becker asked to add a presentation to the Mayor to the agenda. Ms. Gladziszewski assigned that item to the agenda following approval of the minutes.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Assembly Committee of the Whole DRAFT Minutes, April 29, 2019

MOTION by Ms. Becker to approve the minutes with corrections. *Hearing no objection, the minutes of the April 29, 2019 Assembly Committee of the Whole meeting were approved as corrected by unanimous consent.*

Ms. Becker then presented a plaque to Mayor Weldon from the Viking Orion upon its inaugural voyage to Juneau.

IV. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Centennial Hall & New JACC Discussion

Ms. Hale reported that they held a number of Public Works and Facilities Committee (PWFC) meetings to discuss the new JACC project. Historically, there had been a lot of work done on the new JACC but there had not been a lot of work done looking at Centennial Hall. Early in the year, MRV Architects was contracted to do a rapid project to provide an analysis and provide options for improvements to Centennial Hall. She said that Mr. Paul Voelckers from MRV was present and ready to give the COW an update on their findings and in the audience were Bruce Botelho and Susan Bell who would be available for questions about the new JACC if committee members had questions. Ms. Hale noted that the PWFC did not provide specific recommendations as they sought input from COW members but that she was willing to put forward motions for action by the committee once they had a chance to receive the information from Mr. Voelckers and discuss the matter.

Mr. Voelckers gave a brief overview of the project and the public meetings held meetings with the steering committee made up of Juneau Arts Humanities Council members, JACC management and stakeholders. They also conducted an online poll with approximately 130-170 responses. MRV prepared a series of four conceptual options. The options ranged from major new spaces, and other options to remodel with just a few tweaks. In working with Dawson Construction and McDowell Group, they put together an overview cost estimate/shopping list for the Assembly to review and to be able to make their decisions upon. The PWFC asked them to reorder the list in a ranking priority order and this list is only two days old so the PWFC did not have the time to review and discuss the priority order. Mr. Voelckers said they did separate the building issues from the macro site issues when they prepared the options and the priority list. He also clarified that they put ordered the list in such a way that the items closer to the beginning of the list would provide for a phased approach such that the order they appear in the list is a logical progression of the order the work could be accomplished.

Assemblymembers posed a variety of questions of Mr. Voelckers and discussed the Centennial Hall project in depth. They also discussed the timing issues, the conceptual options and which options they may wish to consider. Ms. Gladziszewski asked if any of the members wished to have Mr. Botelho or Ms. Bell come before the committee to answer questions. None of the members indicated a wish for that but Ms. Triem did request to ask questions of Travel Juneau Executive Director Liz Perry.

Ms. Triem asked Ms. Perry to explain how Travel Juneau would market Centennial Hall through the construction phase. Ms. Perry explained that Travel Juneau market Centennial Hall during construction phases so that groups could use the facility as soon as it was approved for occupancy.

The committee then discussed a variety of options for the ties between the new JACC and Centennial Hall and how the breakout rooms might be shared between the two facilities. Committee members asked Ms. Perry for her input on the proposed plans as well as the priority list. Ms. Perry said that they were in general agreement with the priority list but they also would appreciate an opportunity to look at the proposals in greater depth.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked the committee how it wished to proceed with the two project plans, the ballot options and the direction they wanted to take going forward.

Mr. Jones said he appreciated the work done so far but he encouraged the Assembly to step back and look at the bigger picture to ask the policy questions and also how that might fit into the overall financial feasibility. He suggested they come up with a total dollar amount and see how the two projects might work with that amount to come up with a compromise as to the actual outcome of the two projects. He distributed a proposal to raise the Hotel-Motel Bed Tax to 12% and at the same time, exempt those businesses who currently charge bed tax from the CBJ sales tax. This proposal would raise approximately $1.2 million per year. That would give a revenue stream to financial planners so they can decide how much, if any, they wish to fund bonds for Centennial Hall. He said this amount plus .1 mils would be able to fund bonds for $12-15 million to go towards Centennial Hall. He said that there is already $4.5 million in sales tax that was already scheduled for Centennial Hall that could be moved to the New JACC. He said that they could then suggest they might want to consider, if the financial projections from

Finance staff are a basis, that there might be $3.5-4.5 million in sales taxes over the next three to four years that would be unallocated and that could be added to the joint projects. His said that if the Assembly were to consider the policy around that as a complete package, that would allow them to leverage the economic driver that the arts adds to the local economy. It would also allow them to limit the amount of debt that property owners would be burdened with while still providing for great facilities for the community.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that she realizes that there will likely be various proposals coming forward for the items to be placed on the ballot and she asked what the timing of meetings would be in order to pass ordinances to place questions on the ballots.

Members then proceeded to discuss intricacies of funding options related to bonding, bed tax funds and sales tax funds as well as the ownership of the buildings by CBJ vs. the management agreements in place with JAHC for the management of those buildings.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs asked about the constraints of reallocating funds from one project to another and also how ballot proposals might best be put before the voters.

Ms. Gladziszewski explained that the ballot language always expresses “Assembly intent” but for her, if they were to decide to redirect funds from a previous ballot question to another project, she would want to go back to the voters to get their approval for that kind of change. She asked Mr. Palmer to provide the legal process for the ballot questions.

Mr. Palmer explained that there are three components to the question.

1) The ballot language when sales tax questions are put before the voters includes the fact that it is the “intent” of the Assembly to use these funds for these projects and that keeps these funds from being “dedicated funds.” It is a moral promise to the voters.

2) The Assembly has the authority currently to exempt the hotel bed tax from sales tax, however, the Charter prohibits any increase to a tax without voter approval.

3) He said that currently, the overall effective rate of the bed tax is that it is 12% but that is based on a 7% bed tax on top of the regular sales tax of 5% so to change that so the bed tax is 12% for just the bed tax would require voter approval.

Ms. Becker asked for clarification about the use of the bed tax funds and how those funds were allowed to be used.

Mr. Palmer explained that the Assembly has the authority to use the bed tax for whatever public purpose it feels is needed. He stated that in the ballot measures, we indicate how we intend to use that tax and it is not a legal promise but rather a moral promise to the voters. He explained that in Mr. Jones’ proposal, there is a split of roughly 4/7th of the funds would go to Travel Juneau and 3/7th would go to Centennial Hall. He said that would be in keeping with a very old tradition but the Assembly could change that if they wished to.

Additional discussion took place regarding the historical resolutions and contracts with JCVB (Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau, now known as Travel Juneau) and Mr. Palmer explained that what staff has been able to find to date was not necessarily by resolution but was in the first contract with JCVB in 1980. There is no contract currently in place with that language. Mr. Jones explained that they looked at three historic resolutions about the bed tax and that none of them reference a $4/7^{th}$ and $3/7^{th}$ split. The only reference they could find with that split historically had been in a memo from former Clerk Patty Ann Polly to the Committee on Committees in 1993.

Mayor Weldon thanked Mr. Jones for coming up with a proposal to suggest ways to fund these projects. Members then began discussing a variety of methods for funding the projects using bed tax, general obligation bonds, and revenue bonds and/or a combination of a variety of those options. Members also raised concerns that the MRV plan proposal is a benchmark that has already been agreed upon and that was not yet agreed upon by the Assembly. Other concerns expressed included looking at the big picture vs. getting into the micromanagement of the actual plan details. The concerns expressed also touched on the need for the Assembly to look even further out at the financial picture of the municipality as a whole and how these projects fit into the needs vs. wants categories especially considering what is going on with the state's budget picture.

Additional discussion took place and an additional Committee of the Whole meeting was scheduled for Monday, July 15 at 5:30p.m. to continue the discussion and look at all possible ballot options and funding mechanisms as well as to what extent ballot questions would be tied together or to be left as separate projects.

B. Pederson Hill Subdivision Update and Lot Sale Method Discussion

Lands Manager Greg Chaney gave a presentation on the Pederson Hill subdivision. It was originally conceived as an 87-lot subdivision but in 2017, they pared it down to make it more manageable and split it into three phases. They are anticipating this first phase will have an ordinance ready for introduction at the next Assembly meeting for the sale of the first lots. They are required to sale the lots at Fair Market Value (FMV) and the minimum values will be determined by appraisal. They are currently awaiting the appraisal of the lots, which is done by a private appraiser and not conducted by the City Assessor. City financing will be available for all the lots. Based on discussions at the Affordable Housing Commission, the Planning Commission and the Assembly Lands Committee, they are proposing the lot sales to be conducted using three different methods as explained in the packet.

1) Sealed competitive bids (similar to what they have done in all their most recent land sales).

2) Sale a block of six lots together to any developer wishing to bid using the same competitive bid process as option 1 above.

3) Sell lots through a lottery process for Fair Market Value amounts.

Any lots not purchased through the above processes, would be available for over the counter purchase.

Mr. Chaney said they are requesting the COW to request an ordinance for introduction at the next regular Assembly meeting for the proposal of selling the Pederson Hill subdivision using these land sale methods.

Mr. Edwardson said he liked the idea of the lottery and asked Mr. Chaney about the block sale to developers and if he had any data from other sales that might indicate how soon those block sale properties might have houses built on them and ready for sale to the public. Mr. Chaney said that their experience with the Lena subdivision was that they only sold the lots individually but some developers did purchase contiguous properties to allow for the development of those lots in tandem. He suggested they are likely to see approximately one-year lag time from the time of purchase to the time of houses being built on these lots.

Additional discussion took place and Mr. Chaney answered a number of questions from members about the lottery process as well as the timing of the three sale methods. He explained that they would likely do the sale in two stages with the lottery being first and then the sealed bid method.

Mr. Chaney also address questions about shared access and explained that the six lots being sold as a block would have shared driveway access in pairs such that there would be three total driveways coming out to Karl Reishus Blvd.

Mayor Weldon asked how CBJ is recouping the costs of the project. Mr. Chaney explained that with phase 1 they are not anticipating a recoup of the full cost of the project. The access road was the main expense for the full development. He said that they looked at what the city assessor estimated their average lot sales might be. He said when the build it all out, they will likely recoup the costs from the full project but that will not be case with just the phase 1 portion.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon to move this to the Assembly recommending the lot sale strategy as proposed in the memo. *Hearing no objection, the motion carried.*

C. Ordinance 2019-29 An Ordinance Amending the CBJ Code to Allow for the Consumption of Marijuana by Smoking and Edibles in Licensed Marijuana Retail Facilities with an Onsite Consumption Endorsement

Mr. Palmer explained that this ordinance was introduced at the last Assembly meeting, referred it to the COW for additional discussion and set it for public hearing at the next regular Assembly meeting.

Mr. Palmer distributed copies of an excerpt of the codification of SB63 as contained in AS 18.35.301, and specifically addressed sections (d) and (g) which dealt with the allowance of smoking in retail smoking or e-cigarette stores or in private clubs. He explained that these provisions in state law allows for smoking of tobacco but our second hand smoke ordinance in CBJ code currently prohibits those uses.

Mr. Palmer said that if the Assembly wants to explore these, they would also need to make changes to the existing CBJ Code in addition to the ordinance that is before them at this time.

Mr. Edwardson said that these establishments are not similarly situation for the places where people used to smoke. He said that people would go to bars and restaurants and they would only be smoking as a coincidence of their food and entertainment activities. He said that in contrast to that, people would be going to these establishments for the sole purpose of buying and smoking only and he asked if Mr. Palmer had looked into that.

Mr. Palmer explained that he did and we are constrained and limited by state law on this piece. If the Assembly were to allow smoking of marijuana, it could only allow in a manner to be consistent with the state laws. Those are the sideboards if the Assembly wanted to liberalize its smoking ordinance. The challenge is to figure out how to walk the fine line between the intent of the Assembly to allow for onsite marijuana consumption both indoors and outdoors consistent with state law. The balance act is to recognize that marijuana is still illegal under federal law but that tobacco smoking outdoors is allowed under certain circumstances. Staff have tried to figure out ways thread the needle to minimize litigation risk with our current second hand smoking ordinance while still trying to authorize some type of marijuana consumption. In light of that, the four options available to the Assembly are:

1) Change the current ordinance to allow for consumption of edibles only;

2) Possibly allow marijuana consumption outdoors only, consistent with state law;

3) To amend our existing second hand smoking ordinance to allow tobacco consumption and then also allow for marijuana consumption indoors; or

4) Try to differential tobacco smoking from marijuana smoking which is hard to do as demonstrated in the packet materials.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that there are some marijuana business members in the audience could come and answer if members had any. She asked if any members had questions for staff or members of the audience.

Ms. Triem said that her vision was for them to be able to pass an ordinance that would allow for onsite consumption of marijuana consistent with CBJ Code and State law which would in essence mean they could only consume it outdoors but she did not want to specifically state outdoors only. She asked if that would be possible.

Mr. Palmer explained that it does need to be specific on this one. He explained that state law authorizes marijuana consumption both in a freestanding building and in an outdoor special place at a retail store. He said if the Assembly wants to allow for onsite consumption, they need to be explicit to say that onsite consumption is only allowed in a retail store in an outdoor site in a special place and we need to say that marijuana consumption indoors is prohibited.

Additional discussion took place regarding what legally could be done to limit marijuana and tobacco smoke to comply with state law as well as not to place our second hand smoking ordinance in jeopardy.

Mr. Bryson shared a recent experience he had during a police ride along. They encountered a member of the public who was smoking marijuana products that they had purchased and upon being informed that they could not smoke it in public, they asked where they could go to smoke it. He said the officer responded that they could go up into the woods to smoke it and Mr. Bryson felt that was the worst possible answer our city should be giving. He asked if they could hear from the business members in the audience about their opinions on this ordinance and possible solutions to the issue.

Ms. Gladziszewski invited the business members to come forward to answer questions from the Assembly.

Mr. Jennifer Canfield said she is one of the owners of the Green Elephant, which includes a cultivation and retail facility located at 101 Mill Street off Thane Road. She said she was at the meeting to answer questions but she also shared that people are smoking marijuana everywhere: on the beaches, in the neighborhoods and downtown, in the woods and at this stage they are primarily speaking about providing for legal places for tourists to have on site consumption. She said locals are primarily smoking out in nature, in their own homes or properties but she said that while long term, they may be looking at something for locals similar to bars but that would be quite a ways into the future. She said the current need is for a safe and legal place for tourists to consume marijuana. She shared that if they limit onsite consumption to just edibles; it is not likely to go anywhere.

Ms. Hale asked if the Assembly did pass an ordinance that were to allow for outdoor onsite consumption, if their business would be able to accommodate that. Ms. Canfield said that they might be the only establishment that could do that. She said there is a possibility that Rainforest could as well but she did not think other businesses could. She then went on to explain the differences between smoking and vaping, which are significantly different.

Ms. Triem asked Mr. Palmer about to clarify if our smoking ordinance treats smoking and vaping the same. Mr. Palmer said that both vaping and smoking are treated the same under our current code.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked if vaping has a byproduct that goes into the air. Ms. Canfield said that there is but that it far less obnoxious than the exhaust from tour buses that go through our tow or the exhaust from the wastewater treatment plant right next to their business.

Mayor Weldon asked how they would protect workers from smoke and from vaping.

Ms. Canfield explained her experience working in bars in Fairbanks and by no means wants to expose any of her employees to smoke. She explained that laws prohibit employees from being in the area where smoking or vaping is happening in marijuana areas.

Additional discussion took place regarding the science related to residue, airflow, and ventilation loops. Ms. Canfield gave an example of the ventilation hood that is used in the glass blowing studio next to their facility and that ventilation system replaces the air in the area every 90 seconds. Mr. Bryson asked if she or Mr. Wilcox has had any experience with onsite consumption in any other locations.

Mr. Benjamin Wilcox is a part owner of Top Hat concentrates. They do not have a retail place at this time but he is hoping they will have a retail place soon. He gave information about a recent trip he took to San Francisco at which they allow onsite consumption. He explained that CBJ followed California laws with respect to the no smoking ordinance. He explained that 20 years later, California has already modeled marijuana use in a manner that he recommends we follow.

Mayor Weldon asked if California allows for both vaping and smoking. Mr. Wilcox said that yes they do allow for it but it is more likely a business choice and the space they have available. Mr. Bryson asked if Mr. Wilcox noticed what type of ventilation system they had in use and what the facility layouts looked like and if there were any areas of separation.

Mr. Wilcox said the only separation was in the waiting room. Once you left the waiting room, it was all one contiguous area. He said there was maybe 8 feet of floor space between the purchase counter and the area. He said the ventilation system may not have been as loud as the glass blowing studio Ms. Canfield mentioned. There was no real aroma or evidence of smoke as he was waiting in line. He did not personally use the space as he used it outside walking around. He said the after effects of vaping is the same as a fog machine. He does sell concentrates and his product is one that is made for discreetness. He then went into detail on the process used in vaping.

Ms. Gladziszewski thanked Mr. Wilcox and Ms. Canfield for coming and answering questions.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that the ordinance is before the body if they wished to take any action, otherwise, it will be going to the next regular Assembly meeting for action.

Mr. Jones gave information about the regulations adopted by the Marijuana Control Board which gives local governments the option to opt out of onsite consumption. The Assembly has the right to protest any application based on local ordinance. In addition, he has heard a lot about this giving people the right to consume and he pointed out that what was passed in the original initiative under AS17.38.040, says that it is unlawful to consume marijuana in public... and there is a fine of up to $100 for persons violating that law. He said he understands police officers may not wish to impose those fines and it probably would not collect it. Mr. Jones distributed an amendment to the Order, which would allow for edibles only and no smoking onsite.

MOTION by Mr. Jones to amend Ordinance 2019-29 as follows:

Amendment to Ordinance 2019-29. An amendment to only allow consumption of edibles at a marijuana retail store with an onsite consumption endorsement. Onsite smoking of marijuana would continue to be prohibited.

1. **Delete the proposed addition to Section 3 regarding CBJC 36.60.030(a)(2).** This would return the code back to the existing language. The words in italics were the original proposed additions in Ord 2019-29 when it was introduced:

"36.60.030 Exceptions; areas where smoking is not prohibited.

(a) Unless otherwise prohibited by State or Federal law, smoking is not prohibited in the following places:

…

(2) ~~*An establishment licensed under AS 17.38 that is freestanding if the consumption is in accordance with regulations adopted by the Marijuana Control Board created under AS 17.38.080*~~ Reserved;

…"

2. **Add the following qualification in Section 4 regarding CBJC 42.20.230(b)(4).** This would clarify only consumption of edibles is allowed. Words in underlining and in brackets are the proposed amendment.

"42.20.230 Consumption of marijuana in a public place prohibited.

(a) Consumption of marijuana in a public place is prohibited.

(b) For purposes of this section:

…

<u>(4) Public place does not mean an establishment licensed under AS 17.38 that is freestanding if the consumption is in accordance with regulations adopted by the Marijuana Control Board created under AS 17.38.080 [and if the consumption is limited to edible marijuana products in quantities not to exceed 10 mg of THC to any one person per day.]</u>

…"

Mr. Edwardson, Ms. Triem, Mr. Bryson and Ms. Hale all expressed their opposition to the amendment.

Ms. Triem said she was ready to amend the ordinance to allow smoking only outdoors and to allow onsite consumption of edibles as well as outdoor smoking.

Mr. Bryson agreed with Ms. Triem's suggestion to allow for an outdoor onsite consumption. Ms. Hale said she also agreed with Ms. Triem's suggestion and that people might be able to get creative with awnings or ways to allow for protect people outside in the rain.

Mr. Edwardson also objected to Mr. Jones' motion, which is unintentionally asking them to take a vote on the ordinance itself at this time because not allowing this consumption somewhat defeats the purpose of having the ordinance before them in the first place.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs also objected to the motion to amend and agreed with Ms. Triem's compromise.

Roll call vote on Motion to Amend Ordinance 2019-29 by Mr. Jones:

Ayes: Jones, Becker, Weldon
Nays: Bryson, Edwardson, Hale, Triem, Hughes-Skandijs, Gladziszewski
Motion failed 3:6

MOTION by Ms. Triem to amend Ordinance 2019-29 to allow for onsite smoking of marijuana only outdoors and asked that Mr. Palmer draft the appropriate language to allow for edibles and outdoor marijuana smoking.

Mr. Palmer directed the committee to pages 51-54 of the packet which is an excerpt of the state regulations 3AAC 306.370 (c) and 3AAC 306.990(b)(46) relating to outdoor consumption. He suggested that if they do make changes, that they incorporate the language from the state regulation into the ordinance language. Additional discussion took place regarding vaping and smoking differences. Mr. Jones also explained that the current laws allow for vaping of buds but not for concentrates.

Ms. Triem clarified that her amendment is not making any changes to allowing for edible consumption either indoors or outdoors.

Mr. Edwardson said he objected to any changes at this meeting. He wants the ordinance as it was introduced to be brought back to the Assembly at the July 22 meeting. He may be in favor of changes at that meeting but he wants to hear from the public on the ordinance as it was introduced.

Mayor Weldon pointed out the section of the packet on page 1 that talks about the circumstance under which a person could get a contact high.

Mr. Jones said he would not be in attendance at the meeting on July 22 since he will be attending his mother's memorial service and not calling in. He supported Mr. Edwardson's concerns that the amendment be held until the July 22 meeting at which point the Assembly is likely to hear from other members of the public and industry about the ordinance as it was proposed.

Ms. Triem asked how amending it at this meeting or at the meeting on July 22 would be any different; people will still have the opportunity to testify on the ordinance. Ms. Gladziszewski said she agrees but asked the other members for their input. Mr. Edwardson said there is a body of evidence that shows that you are priming people to think differently. He said the original ordinance was proposing legalization of onsite consumption. He would like to hear the public responding to that ordinance in its original form that had been drafted in that way. Ms. Gladziszewski commented that she would like to present to the public what the Assembly feels is the best option and because they are concerned with our own smoking ordinance, she said she feels that the Assembly has an obligation to put forward its best work. If people are coming in support of the original, they will hear that too.

Ms. Becker said that if they want people to testify on the original ordinance, it will not be the original ordinance before them if it is amended at this meeting.

Roll call vote on Ms. Triem's Amendment

Ayes: Triem, Hale, Hughes-Skandijs, Bryson, Gladziszewski
Nays: Jones, Becker, Edwardson, Weldon
Motion passed 5:4

D. CBJ Staff Report on Impacts from Governor's Vetoes [Handouts provided at the meeting.]

Ms. Cosgrove distributed a memo via red folder. She explained that when they received news of the governor's vetoes, staff began working on trying to determine what the impacts might be and this is staff's best estimates at this time. She said the numbers are still changing. The memo is separated out into three 'buckets.' The first 'bucket' is direct impacts to CBJ funding in FY20, the largest of which is a veto on school bond debt reimbursement. It also contains estimates from BRH and CCFR on Medicaid cuts. Other impacts include OWL/Live homework help Library funding as well as some impacts at the Airport for total impacts in that 'bucket' at $5.2+ million. She said that she believes the plan is to discuss the school bond debt issue at the Assembly Finance Committee meeting. She has checked with the Finance Director and we do have sufficient cash flow allocated for that purpose that will get us that far so we don't need to make any decisions between now and then but we will need to address it fairly soon after that.

Mayor Weldon asked the Finance Director what increase would be needed in the mill rate to be able to deal with just the $3.7 million for the school bond debt reimbursement.

Mr. Bob Bartholomew said that if they wanted to recover $3.7 million for the debt service, it would take 0.75 mills. He said to put that in some perspective; our current debt service mill rate is 1.2% so it is over a 50% increase in that particular component of the mill rate. It would come out to approximately 7% or 8% of your tax bill in one year.

Ms. Cosgrove went onto explain the other impacts as outlined in her memo. The next impacts are indirect impacts which are more impacts on the community such as the veto to the University of Alaska (UofA) being the largest dollar volume. What memo points out is that while funding for UAS remains largely intact, the Juneau campus does house both UAF and UAA staff as well as statewide staff. She said there is also the possibility of economic contraction associated with job loss and work force readiness in the long-run and our ability to recruit and retain a workforce out of the state to come in and fill a pipeline we may not be able to fill ourselves. There are also significant cuts to homeless and housing services. Almost $1 million impact to our local non-profit organizations providing those services. Mr. Ciambor provided information as shown in Table A to see how those impacts are split across those agencies. There are 321 senior citizens in Juneau that will lose their senior benefits. She did not include dollar estimates because she does not know the break down.

Ms. Cosgrove said there were big impacts to early childhood education and Table B from Joy Lyon has her best guess on potentially 100 more children may lose early learning support. It is uncertain if the $150,000 that JSD is receiving from the state for the Kinder-Ready program is still there but she has not been able to confirm that information at this time.

She said there would be significant cuts to Behavioral Health Treatment and Recovery Grants, Public Broadcasting and impacts to Gavel-to-Gavel. DEC Air quality monitoring may be compromised to the extent that CBJ may have some difficulty associated with our own air quality monitoring programs. There was additional staffing for legal staff associated with a spike in statewide crime. Staffing for the Public Defender office did not go through. There had been an extra position for the Law Office Assistant, which they have advocated for some time and that did not go through. There were also cuts to Alaska Legal Services.

Ms. Cosgrove said they heard earlier about the cuts to the State Council on the Arts when they discussed the JACC topic. Other cuts include the Ocean Rangers, Civil Air Patrol, and the State Recorder's office in Juneau will be closing. The closing of the Recorder's office will likely require changes to some of CBJ's ordinances for what our processes look like.

Ms. Cosgrove finished her report by touching on impacts expected in FY21. Those impacts appear to be cuts to the funding to capitalize the community assistance fund is gone as well as forward funding for K-12 education.

She said that is a brief overview of the impacts they are currently seeing and staff will continue to keep the Assembly updated on new developments as they occur.

Members discussed the Ocean Rangers program, which is paid for by passenger fees. They also discussed the focus being on economic impacts but there are much greater impacts on people's lives such as the seniors who are losing their benefits with almost no warning. Members also echoed Mr. Watt's comments that these are not cost cuts but rather cost shifts to local government.

V. EXECUTIVE SESSION

A. Appeal 2019-01: Terraces at Lawson Creek v CBJ Assessor

MOTION by Mr. Jones to go into Executive Session to deliberate on a pending appeal matter as a quasi-judicial body. Hearing no objection, they recessed into executive session at 9:22p.m.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

After coming out of executive session, there being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 10:11p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Beth McEwen, MMC
Municipal Clerk