ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA

August 29, 2018, 6:00 PM.
Assembly Chambers - Municipal Building

Assembly Work Session - No Public Comment

I. ROLL CALL

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

Assemblymembers Present: Mayor Ken Koelsch, Jerry Nankervis, Mary Becker, Rob Edwardson, Maria Gladziszewski, Loren Jones, Jesse Kiehl

Assemblymembers Absent: None.

Staff present: City Manager Rorie Watt, Deputy Manager Mila Cosgrove, Acting Municipal Attorney Robert Palmer, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Airport Manager Patty Wahto, Airport Architect Catherine Fritz, JPD Chief Ed Mercer, Deputy Chief David Campbell, CSO Bob Dilley, Finance Director Bob Bartholomew, Community Development Director Jill Mclean, CDD Planning Manager Beth McKibben, HRRM Director Dallas Hargrave

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Hearing no objection, the Assembly Committee of the Whole agenda for August 29, 2018 was approved as presented.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

None.

IV. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Airport North Terminal

Airport Manager Patty Wahto gave a presentation regarding the Airport North Terminal project. She mentioned that the terminal continues to grow and that the next phases are in alignment with the 2005 Master Plan with an update to costs in 2017.

Phase I of the project included the renovation and expansion the areas from 1984 and that project was completed in 2012 for a cost of $23 Million.

Phase II is a proposal to replace the pre-1984 areas of the North Terminal including the elevator and escalator with an estimated cost of $38 Million.

Ms. Wahto then gave an overview of public process to date on Phase II of the project along with challenges they have with funding the full phase II project. She noted that they would have had to increase lease rents in order to make up the differences in funding Phase II since large portions of that project would not be eligible for FAA funding or GO Bond funding. Those rental increases would have been cost prohibitive so last fall, the airport came up with an idea to truncate the north end, branch off and let the small regional carriers do their own things on small lease lots. The small carriers and the board approved that concept in November 2017 and the Airport pursued this in January with a consultant, McCool, Carlson, Green. By June, they received their environmental approvals but then in July, they came up with a different concept.

The new concept was to keep it as Phase II but in a little bit more abbreviated form than what had been proposed in the 2005 Master Plan. The board had approved the conceptual design and then in August they came up with a cost of the conceptual design at $21.6 Million. They had held multiple stakeholder workshops in March - June as well as presentations to community groups. The key differences with this new concept include demolishing all pre-1984 portions of the existing terminal (north wing and "knuckle"); replacing and relocating the elevator, escalator, and stairs and constructing new 2-story space for regional passenger services, airport administration, US Customs, FAA Air Traffic Control Tower and its support operations. It would remove all air cargo from the building and they are looking for a parallel access point for deliveries so they are not in front of the main terminal. It does not address the taxi stands or the regional air cargo or special tourism sector.

When discussing the funding sources, she explained that this project would tie up all other funds for 3 years and nothing else could be funded with federal CIP dollars during that time. It would also tie up passenger fees for five years, which is currently being accumulated at about 1.2 million per year, and use the $6 million GO Bond funds previously approved by voters. She also explained that in looking at the whole project, they are eligible for approximately 70% federal funding. Maintenance and things such as the concession areas are not covered by federal dollars and they have to be careful whenever they make changes as they still need matching dollars for any of the federally funded areas.

Ms. Wahto explained the anticipated timelines involved and has been working with Finance staff to line up the money and cash flow piece. She said that they are looking at the design being done this fall, then taking it to the Public Works and Facilities Committee and Planning Commission in the Spring and if everything lines up, they anticipate being able to start demolition next fall.

Ms. Wahto responded to a variety of questions regarding the project concepts and details which will be worked out during this next year. In elaborating on what will not be included in this project, Ms. Wahto explained that the specialty lease areas such as for the Bear Creek outfitters will not be included and the hope is to move all cargo and freight services out of the terminal.

When asked about what the next steps are, Ms Wahto said they will be working up the conceptual design, look at relocation of the existing services during the reconstruction, and working with Finance staff on the cash flow details, including looking into the possibility of revenue bonds.

B. **Comprehensive Plan Memo from Planning Commission**

Community Development Director Jill Mclean gave a brief overview of the Planning Commission's recommendations about how best to proceed in reviewing/updating the Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan).

She gave the history of the current Comp Plan as well as the work of the recent ad hoc Comp Plan subcommittee. She also explained the differences between just a review of the plan and a thorough update. The committee recommended a full update and noted the need to clarify subsequent plans such as Auke Bay and Lemon Creek plans and how they fit into the overall picture with the full plan. She said the new Comp Plan also needs to have an implementation table similar to the Lemon Creek Plan and that is lacking in the current Comp Plan.

She noted that the current plan did not include a long term vision 30-50 years and they feel an update should include that along with extensive community dialogue. In looking at which direction to recommend, staff and the ad hoc committee compared 14 communities' plans across the country to the current CBJ Comp Plan. They looked at whether or not to use consultants or do the work in house and they gathered information from the American Planning Association and Architectural

Association as well. The result of this was to forward a recommendation for a full rewrite with community input. A lot has changed in Juneau in the local economy as well as the work of CBJ since the Comp Plan was done in 2008 and 2013 so for those reasons, the Planning Commission recommended moving forward with a holistic rewrite.

Ms. Maclean answered a number of questions from Assemblymembers including those touching on who will be doing the work (consultants with a staff project manager and public meeting assistance from the planners), how it will be made available to the public (online and in paper formats), how much it may cost (to be determined and sent to the Assembly Finance Committee for review), and whether it was a complete rewrite or an update (a very thorough update).

Mr. Watt extended thanks to the Planning Commissioners Ben Haight and Nathaniel Dye for their attendance and invited them to speak on the topic if they wished. PC Chair Haight remarked that Ms. Maclean did a good job in presenting the information that the PC put together. He noted that a project of this magnitude will take both time and money and more than what the volunteer Planning Commissioners can handle on their own. Ms. Gladziszewski noted that when she was on the Planning Commission in 2008 and they did the Comp Plan update, they had to meet weekly and went through every sentence of the plan thoroughly.

C. **Abandoned Vehicles**

Ms. Cosgrove explained that during the budget process, this topic came up as a possible funding issue. Staff was asked to look at that and report back on it with respect to expenses and process.

Deputy Chief David Campbell gave a presentation on the topic. He explained what the current practices are and the pros and cons of changing the process to a more extensive removal of junk/abandoned vehicles from public and private properties.

He and Mr. Watt answered a series of questions about funding, private property issues vs. those of abandoned/junk vehicles on public property, what constitutes an abandoned vehicle and the property owner's rights and responsibilities are with respect to the vehicle as well as what can and cannot be done by CBJ in instances where vehicles are abandoned on private property. Deputy Chief Campbell explained DUIs, the current auction process which is done through disposal under abandoned vehicle line item. He also explained that at this time, JPD is only dealing with abandoned vehicles on public land, not those on private property such as the shopping parking lots and residences.

He then explained what funding and additional staff would be required if they were to change the process by which JPD would be required to tow and dispose of all junked vehicles without private party involvement. In FY18, actual costs were $64,050 to tow from the lot to skookum. Last year the rate was $250/per vehicle. With new contract, the disposal fee has doubled to $500/year. He said that if they are looking at tow and disposal from private property it would run $670 per vehicle and those numbers could go up depending on whether it is a commercial vehicle, bus, or boat.

Mr. Edwardson asked if we are looking at making the private land owner whole and if there is any other instance in which CBJ pays to makes private property owners whole. Mr. Watt stated that, no they generally are not looking to make property owners whole. He then went on to say that CBJ has a vehicle disposal program for citizens who do follow property procedure and the best solution for the most cars is for citizens to deliver them directly to Skookum.

Additional discussion took place regarding the CBJ Code provision 36.30.230 and and the associated fines and restitution to pay for vehicle removal fees. Mr. Kiehl expressed his confusion between the CBJ code and the state statutes relating to this issue and asked the City Attorney for some clarification. Mr. Palmer explained that the CBJ code section provides one tool in the tool box and that there are other tools, but state law is really cumbersome and there are multiple statutes that interrelate. Discussion then continued relating to the fines associated with each of the types of removal as well as the auction process and how much money JPD recoups following the auction vs. how many vehicles then have to be disposed.

As an example, at the last auction, the start bidding at $100 and out of 60 vehicles at the last auction, about 25% didn't sell. There were some nice vehicles that sold that were likely related to criminal cases. The proceeds from the auctions do come back to JPD, and out of the 45 sold, JPD received approximately $15,000-20,000.

If the Assembly decided to go with a more robust program, the staffing requirements would need to be boosted to do this new process. A new CSO would cost approximately $90,000 for salary plus benefits and a new Evidence Technician/Admin Clerk position in the Records Division would cost approximately $68,000. It was also noted that an additional impound lot or expanded lot would be needed if they were to deal with the type of volume that would be associated with an expanded program.

There were two recommendations depending on which course the Assembly wanted to pursue:
1) JPD is well situation to handle an expanded program but only if the financing, staffing, and impound lot could be put into place prior to starting to manage the new procedures.
2) If they don't have the additional staff, financing or lot space, JPD's recommendation would be to stay with the process as it stands now with the private property owner being the responsible party.

Additional discussion took place along with a variety of questions pertaining to the number of vehicles as well as the cost to remove them depending on various scenarios.

MOTION by Mayor Koelsch to ask that an ordinance be brought forward to fully address abandoned vehicles on private property. Mayor Koelsch said he would like to either push it forward as an ordinance to be introduced or for the topic to go forward to the Assembly Finance Committee to be addressed in more detail.

Mr. Jones said he appreciates what the Mayor wants to do and noted the illegal dump sites all over the place. He suggested the motion might be better to say that this is an issue the Assembly wants to deal with since JPD said there are certain things need to happen before they could implement it. He suggested the next step would be for the Manager to put together a package and suggested the Mayor's motion would be better if it was changed to: "***Fine tuning to be done by administration and be brought for further review."***

Mayor Koelsch approved that amendment to his motion.

Mr. Edwarson said he is concerned with CBJ stepping in to make private property owners whole and this may open them up for other similar requests. He said he is not going to oppose the Mayor's motion at this time but he came up with different numbers that it would cost, $350,000, and asked what that would do to bump up the mil rate.

Ms. Gladziszewski stated that she did not think it was ready for an ordinance at this time. She noted that it is a significant amount of money to take on a new ongoing expense that should be taken on during the AFC budget cycle.

Mr. Kiehl stated that he did not feel a new ordinance was needed and his concerns were along those of the Manager's in which they may be making this easier for people to abandon their vehicles and it would become a reverse incentive.

Ms. Becker said she feels they need more information and doesn't think they are ready for anything yet.

Mr. Nankervis noted that it must be easy to abandon a vehicle on private property because that is what people are doing. He said he is not sure an ordinance change is needed but they do need more definitive information from the Manager for costs and staff to try to manage.

Mr. Nankervis restated the Mayor's motion as amended by Mr. Jones for the Manager to put together additional information and bring a package back to the Assembly Finance Committee or the Assembly Committee of the Whole, whichever the manager feels more appropriate. Hearing no objections, the motion as amended passed.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted this would also become a policy question for the Assembly to decide once they receive the additional information.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no additional business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 8:31p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,
Beth McEwen, Municipal Clerk