

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

February 13, 2018, 6:30 PM.

Assembly Chambers - Municipal Building

Assembly Work Session - No Public Testimony

I. ROLL CALL

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. January 31, 2018 Committee of the Whole Meeting

IV. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Assembly and Planning Commission - Joint Discussion

- Downtown Planning Strategy
- Comprehensive Plan Update

V. ADJOURNMENT

ADA accommodations available upon request: Please contact the Clerk's office 72 hours prior to any meeting so arrangements can be made to have a sign language interpreter present or an audiotape containing the Assembly's agenda made available. The Clerk's office telephone number is 586-5278, TDD 586-5351, e-mail: city.clerk@juneau.org

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

January 31, 2018, 5:00 PM.

Municipal Building - Assembly Chambers

Work Session - No Public Testimony

I. ROLL CALL

Deputy Mayor Jerry Nankervis called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. in the Assembly Chambers.

Assemblymembers Present: Mary Becker, Rob Edwardson, Maria Gladziszewski (teleconference), Norton Gregory, Loren Jones (left at 7:30 p.m.), Jesse Kiehl, Ken Koelsch, Jerry Nankervis, and Beth Weldon.

Assemblymembers Absent: None.

School Board Members Present: Brian Holst, Jeff Short, Andi Story, Josh Keaton, Dan DeBartolo, Steve Whitney

School Board Members Absent: Emil Mackey.

Docks and Harbors Board Members Present: Bob Janes, Weston Eiler, Mark Ridgeway, Budd Simpson, Robert Mosher, Dave Seng, Tom Donek.

Docks and Harbors Board Members Absent: David Lowell, Don Etheridge.

Staff Present: Rorie Watt, City Manager; Laurie Sica, Municipal Clerk; Bob Bartholomew, Finance Director; Carl Uchytel, Port Director; Gary Gillette, Port Engineer; Mark Miller, Superintendent, JSD; David Means, Administrative Services Director, JSD; Dr. Bridget Weiss, Director of Student Services.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Hearing no objection, the agenda was approved as presented.

III. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Assembly and School Board - Joint Discussion

Chair Brian Holst thanked the Assembly for the opportunity to meet, for funding to the cap, and for finding ways to augment the budget outside of the cap. He distributed some documents to the Assembly regarding school programs and introduced Superintendent Mark Miller, who presented a power point presentation.

Mr. Miller said the average daily membership has trended downward and is a challenge to run the school with fewer students. The salary and benefits line is heading up, as it costs more to do business each year. Personnel costs equal 90% of the budget. They have saved \$2.5 million in energy savings in the district. They budgeted to spend their reserve in FY2018 to balance the budget. There is a \$3 million budget gap in FY19. Since 2011, they have reduced \$11,035,000 in 92 full time positions and this trend can't continue. Mr. Miller spoke about trauma challenges with students and their efforts to teach to students with trauma. There is a 90% graduation rate at JDHS and TMHS, and he spoke about other student achievement milestones. About 2/3 of students at both high schools participate in

activities, which are a key to student success. He spoke about career technical education opportunities in the district.

Mr. DeBartolo spoke about budget challenges and said he would like to open a discussion with the Assembly about maintenance, to draw a clear line of where maintenance ends and capital projects begin. They would like to determine if some of the larger maintenance projects they are paying for could be considered a CIP and JSD funding could be re-directed towards education program dollars instead.

Mr. Edwardson asked for examples of projects Mr. DeBartolo was referencing. Mr. DeBartolo said they discussed a dollar cut-off, such as \$50,000 or less/over, but he would be happy to bring specific examples to a future meeting if the Assembly would like to discuss this.

Mr. Whitney said the Assembly has sent a letter to the School Board to find out if the district is willing to consider consolidating school buildings and the board is interested in this discussion. They would like to approach these ideas in the near future - following the budget season. He thanked the Assembly for funding to the cap - they hope this continues. Declining enrollment is an issue, and the biggest driver is the base student allocation, which does not reflect the increases in the consumer price index. School districts have taken a large cut from the state. It will be a rough year for the district.

Andi Story requested increased support for activities outside of the cap. She said the community supports drug testing as a pre-requisite to participate in activities. JSD has had to reduce support of the drug testing program due to the costs (\$21,000) and this would be an area of potential CBJ support. The cost for two part time activities directors and three support staff for activities is another area of potential CBJ support (\$400,000). This cost comes from the JSD general fund, which could be used for core services instead.

Mr. Gregory asked if the CBJ did not fund the positions or the drug testing, would the positions go away? Ms. Story said she did not anticipate that positions would be reduced, and based on public testimony and the support for activities in the community, that would be a difficult cut to make. The medical community supports the drug testing program continuing. Everything is open for discussion.

Mr. Keaton said the board and community do not support cutting activities. We are at the bottom without fat to cut. Parents feel drug testing is important due to the opioid issue, but it is a potential area to cut. Mr. Miller referred to the two football teams combining.

Mr. Gregory asked about the drug prevention program in school. Mr. Miller said the district has lost a counselor. JSD works with JPD in the Dare Program. They have healthcare professionals that work in that area. Mr. Keaton said the program starts early, in 1st grade. The school counselor talks with students and meets with individuals as needed.

Mr. Short spoke about the value of Pre-K (preschool) investments. The school program is great for sending kids to college. However, about half of the kids are not going to college. Who goes can be determined quite early. Many under-privileged kids come to school unprepared for kindergarten due to economic stresses. Their vocabulary is more limited. This does not get better with time. We don't have the resources to effectively address children that are under-prepared as they come in to the system. They support pre-k for the cost benefit of educating kids ages 2-5. This helps avoid more costs to the district during their school years and costs to society in the long run. This is a quality of life issue and we are interested in partnering with the Assembly to address this pressing problem.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked what "partner with us" means. Mr. Short said his personal idea is to look at some of the extra space within the facilities and use it for community wide day care. We could figure a plan for staffing. There are approximately 1000 children who could benefit from day care and about 80 day care slots in Juneau - this is a large need.

Mayor Koelsch asked if there is a preschool in every elementary school now and the answer was

yes, approximately 108 students are served. Mr. Miller said the majority are in a half-day program. Montessori has a full day program. Mayor Koelsch asked about the difference between day care and preschool.

Ms. Story said that the Montessori Borealis program increased the school's budget and it is an expensive program to operate. The cost priced out the families in need. There is no transportation for the students, and some families with limited income don't have the transportation. It is expensive but we feel it is a good investment.

Ms. Becker asked if the district has taken an inventory of classroom space that might be available for pre-K programs and had determined any costs to provide such a program. She asked the age group of pre-K.

Dr. Bridget Weiss said their focus is ages 3-4. Some money from state is 4 year old only, but the state is starting to loosen that. We are exploring full day options and parent engagement is a huge part of the program. We are trying to find cost effective ways to expand hours to 8 am - 2 pm to match the elementary hours.

Mr. Edwardson spoke about the long term benefits of pre-K and the statistics from the Best Starts program. Mr. Holst said the district is looking for synergies between the various pre-K programs that exist - Kinder Ready, Best Starts, Montessori, and he said that child care doesn't work as a business model. Effective Pre-K comes with community support.

Ms. Weldon said she understands the value of Pre-K and asked how can they get the students to pre-K if it is not mandatory? Mr. Holst said the district is required to provide care for students with disabilities age 3 and over. Transportation was a key. Ms. Weldon said she was concerned that a significant amount of funds were being spent on upper income kids.

Mr. Keaton related his personal experience with special education and said the board is 100% behind any effort to promote Pre-K education. It is a top priority on the strategic plan, on their legislative request, and it is the right path forward.

Mr. Short said he believed there was a substantial amount of space that can be made for Pre-K within the current facilities.

Ms. Story said that each site council will say that they have plans for their space. The in-school pre-school is a positive introduction for children and families to their school.

Mr. Keaton distributed JSD priorities, including a sustainable reliable state fiscal plan, relief from flat funding and an increase in the base student allocation. There are two bills under consideration to address early, adequate funding so that districts know what funds they will have from the state to work with when setting their budgets. They would like the legislature to honor the state school construction reimbursement program. They would like the state to fund early learning programs for children and support STEM, ARTS and career tech education. The school does not have a lobbyist and they asked if the city lobbyist could assist the school district. Mr. Keaton said it was important to have the previous year's BSA as a base for budgeting purpose, and they would like to be able to hold the legislature to a minimum.

Mayor Koelsch asked about teacher salaries. Mr. Miller said JSD is still at the top of the range, which has helped to retain teachers. The Juneau turnover rate is 10-12%, and in some other Alaska districts, it is 35-40% per year.

Mr. Holst said the amount of money JSD was being asked to contribute to the CBJ manager's office for city service support increased significantly last year and he asked for reconsideration of that.

Mr. Watt encouraged the school facilities committee to stay the course.

Mr. Keaton thanked the Assembly for all of its support. There are lots of successes and the Assembly should take some credit for that.

Mr. Kiehl thanked the school board and staff for the effort to accurately predict student counts. This helps the Assembly with budgeting.

Mr. Holst said the community partnerships were very helpful to the district, from science, arts and activities.

Mr. Nankervis thanked the board for their rewarding and demanding work.

B. Assembly and Docks & Harbors Board - Joint Discussion

Mr. Uchytel said there are two items they would like a frank discussion with the Assembly, the plans for the Archipelago property (the open space south of the Marine Park Parking Garage and downtown library) and the Coast Guard Cutter home porting issue.

Mr. Uchytel said the state of the harbors is strong. He distributed their monthly news letter and said the board is proud of their accomplishments. He said they are doing the will of the community in an efficient manner. There are few times the board needs to get input from the Assembly. They would like direction from the Assembly regarding forward progress at the Archipelago property, which was discussed at the December 4 Committee of the Whole meeting. Since then we have had a property appraisal. Last year the board created an urban design plan for the area from Marine Park to Taku Dock in light of the completion of the 16b project. We knew the ships would need more support. We started a public process on the plan. We did not know that Morris Communications no longer wanted to sell the property, but would be willing to partner to develop the area. The board approved the urban plan on November 30 and presented it to the Assembly. We have made one modification - the open area seaward of the People's Wharf was planned for the USS Juneau memorial, but at the last meeting, the board agreed to leave that area for some public purpose. The Archipelago lot is 1.6 acres and the port has control over .4 acres. We need to provide bus staging area in the area to the ships and this has been re-affirmed with the cruise industry locally. There is also a need for open space and deckover. Horan and Co. arrived at a value of the land at \$275 per square foot and submerged lands at \$55 per square foot. We are working with Morris Communications. They have a vision for retail space, including food vendors, and we have done some engineering to confirm that the bus staging will fit/work. Morris has sent an email that they feel we are at a good starting point and that they are willing to cooperate with the board and the Assembly. We believe we have lot lines and an appraisal and this is a buy/sell opportunity that would cost CBJ \$2.1 million for the property. We also have conceptual costs to build out the bus staging onto submerged lands and a wooden deckover for pedestrians at about \$15 million. We are ready to do an RFP for engineering services for the design of the bus staging and deckover. Mr. Gillette displayed property layout and preliminary plans for the use of the Archipelago property.

Mr. Jones asked for an explanation of the deckover and parking and asked about "B" parking. Mr. Uchytel said the cruise industry has confirmed the need. There are times the brickyard is empty, but this is an ask from the industry. There is no "benefit" to us, but we do know it is a need from the cruise industry. He said the land acquisition cost is \$2.1 million and the construction cost is \$15 million, which includes the bus parking and the deckover. Mr. Jones asked about the cost of the project to build it for the flood surge. Mr. Gillette said that all of the projects done in the area have addressed that issue. No horizontal members can be below the flood stage elevation and habitable space has to be above it, so all structures, such as the visitors center and port/customs building are all above flood elevation and all of the structures below are designed, engineered and certified to withstand the flood forces without horizontal members.

Mr. Uchytel explained the lot layout and said that the bus layout is designed for 25 passenger busses, rather than the larger motorcoaches. He pointed out the property line dividing the seaward area for CBJ and the landward area with commercial retail space for the Morris Group. He showed the current landownership layout and compared the land buy/sell arrangement that needed to happen, to

take the "patchwork" of properties and consolidate the parcel into two lots.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked about the cost and the sequence of the RFP asked about the funding source, and what does CBJ get for the money. Mr. Uchytel said the property transaction could be before the Assembly in March. On Monday, they are ready to go out with an RFP for engineering services, which takes about six weeks for the selection process. CBJ gets a parking lot and additional staging area along seawalk. The Board thinks this will make the seawalk more appealing and it will be a good attribute for the CBJ. It is not a money-maker, but assists the cruise industry. Mr. Bartholomew has ideas for funding using a variety of sources including remaining funds from 16b, dock fund balance, port development fee, state marine passenger fees, local funding including sales tax money, harbor funds, and he is working out a plan. The industry needs 12-15 B zone (less than 18 passengers) vehicles. We are now looking at the length of a vehicle to determine what a B zone is and we have done calculations to determine turning and parking. This area, when developed, will free up areas for the larger coaches in other areas.

Mr. Edwardson asked if it is appropriate for the COW to give approval for a project for a plan that the Assembly has not approved yet. The Assembly reviewed this previously and asked that six subject areas be addressed and five other categories of issues were addressed, and he thought the COW would see an edited plan to review and not a memo, so that they would have to try to make the connections between all of the different documents. He was surprised that at the Docks and Harbors Board meeting he attended that there was an expectation that an RFP would be released after this COW. Mr. Watt said at the last meeting, Mr. Watt's memo tried to break down the decision points for the whole project. Previous to this Assembly being seated, money was appropriated into a CIP for land acquisition and preliminary development of this property in the amount of approximately \$3.5 million, as Mr. Uchytel said are remnants from the 16b project. Those funds can be used to advance the project. If the Assembly approves the project it will come back as an ordinance authorizing the land acquisition and sale, to the Finance Committee for a funding package. If the professional services contract exceeds \$100,000, it would need approval by the Assembly. In the long run the Assembly would approve the bid award. There are a number of procedural steps the Assembly needs to take. The Board believes they have enough of a project to advance the design forward with the expectation that you will see these procedural pieces move forward. Mr. Watt said the land deal makes sense to clarify the property lines. B zone staging makes sense due to bigger docks and greater staging needs and there is no flat land available, deckover will be required. Further deckover may still be a question, but there is enough justification to move the project forward to the design stage. The big question for the Assembly will be the funding package.

Mr. Edwardson said he didn't know how he valued the project as he had not seen a plan with the changes the Assembly had requested. I like the plan and ideas but the processes are in place for a reason. If we authorize funding for a project with a plan we have not approved, we may paint ourselves into a corner by spending money to develop the plan, then it may be wasted money if we don't move forward. Mr. Watt said he understood the concern. The next step would be a 30% design and a cost estimate that can inform a funding package.

Ms. Becker asked about the property lines and Mr. Gillette explained the existing property plan layout and he said that they went into this without allowing the property lines to limit the design as there was a cooperative partner, so the property lines will change and he explained the future property lines and described the parcels that would need to be purchased and sold in an agreement.

Mr. Kiehl asked about agreements with the Morris Company regarding easements and if open space will remain open space. Mr. Uchytel said there has been no discussions about easements. Mr. Gillette said there were meetings with Morris. There is no signed agreement but they have been supportive. They are looking at structures to allow a flexible rent rate but we are trusting that they will follow through. We can't say it will be exactly like this layout, but they are caring for a complimentary nature of businesses. There has to be some level of trust.

Mr. Kiehl asked about if there was any commitment from the Morris Company to commence work in a certain time. Mr. Gillette said they were wanting to move even faster than CBJ is able to move, and

wanted an opening in 2019 but have put it out to 2020. They are still on board if we can keep moving forward. They want this to happen.

Mr. Kiehl asked about the discussion of decking over a parcel south and any efficiencies to do that project. Mr. Gillette said that is leased to a private entity and at this time the lessee does not have the funds or interest to do that. That property is close to ours but there are some physical limitations and it may need to be done at a future date from the water side.

Mr. Kiehl said we are not looking at a plan, we are looking at a real estate deal, and if we don't have commitments, only a concept, why are we discussing putting in \$15 million worth of infrastructure after \$2 Million of land purchase to hope it goes the way it is described. It seems we should buy the land and spend half as much on developing a B zone.

Ms. Weldon asked how much will the parking be fill and how much is deckover. Mr. Gillette described the plan. Ms. Weldon asked why we can't figure an equal swap rather than paying them \$2.1 million. Mr. Uchytel said it is a coordinated effort, more than a partnership. Mr. Gillette said Morris would spend \$20 million plus on their development, and they were trying to be efficient with the parcel. They own the land so they get to choose the pieces they want.

Mr. Jones said he agreed with Mr. Kiehl, that it doesn't look like we are implementing a plan but it looks like a real estate deal. He had assumed in listening to Morris and the public, Morris would have a single contractor, do the staging, the deckover and the parking and it would be our responsibility to reimburse them the costs. Now I hear we are doing the engineering, the parking, the deckover, and it would be difficult to have two different contractors on the same site. He asked how the project would be coordinated.

Mr. Uchytel said Morris Communications will say that they can do the entire project as a public private venture and then bill us our portion. It is too complicated within our ordinance to do something like that. We will have to run it as two projects. The design and build out may be done by two separate contractors. It will be a challenge but they will have to work together.

Mr. Jones asked about the recent charter amendment approved by the voters and if this would help some of these issues. There was a lot of discussion about decking over other areas and the other areas of the plan and a lot of money is being spent on this one area. DOT is concerned about access on South Franklin. He would like to know more about the funding mechanism. If they want this done in 2020 we have to get moving and this feels like we are being put under a gun on a plan we haven't approved yet. Mr. Jones left the meeting.

Ms. Gladziszewski shared her concerns and said she was not aware of the cruise industry's needs and did not understand if this is the highest and best use of this property. She supported a land deal but was not sure about spending that much money for bus staging.

Ms. Weldon said that the Assembly had questions about a plan and we have not had answers. This is the time we are supposed to hear from the board, and she wanted to know what the members think.

Mr. Ridgeway said they are happy with staff's work. the industry has presented us with a need. Morris has an interest in developing their land. The process is clunky but we appreciate staff's efforts to move us forward.

Mr. Janes spoke about the industry needs for the future and parking is one of those anticipated needs - we are being told that we will need this - it is not a perfect solution - we don't want to take up waterfront space for bus parking, we don't like the traffic onto South Franklin and crossing guards - we know this is all clunky. We are doing what we feel we are obligated to do and this is an opportunity that popped up with a private land owner that seems to be workable. Until we have a more secured plan and engineering costs, to give you the numbers you need for decision making, we would like to move forward with engineering to get that, and we need your blessing to do that. We have the funds to do this. It may seem a waste of money but we may have 250,000 more people in town in the next

five years, and we will be happy that we have tried to address this.

Mr. Donek said we are eating an elephant one bite at a time. We would like the opportunity to develop the land and we are not asking for \$15 million at this point.

Mr. Uchytel said he does not want to get ahead of the Assembly and the Board needs to understand the concerns. He said the Morris Company was offering a world class facility development to make something impressive and we have not asked if we do nothing, what happens to their development plans. They are looking for assurances in the same manner that the Board.

Mr. Nankervis asked if the Docks and Harbor Board needed the Assembly's approval to issue an RFP. Mr. Watt said no. The prior appropriation was made and he asked if the Assembly objects to the Docks and Harbors Board spending funds to get a 35% plan, cost estimate, funding package proposal and draft purchase and sale agreement for the land, anticipating that the cost would be up to \$200,000. Funds were available for this purpose.

Mayor Koelsch said the Assembly appoints people to boards to get things done and they have returned with the intention of letting us know they want to move forward. He asked the cost to get a 30% design. Mr. Uchytel said \$200,000. He asked if the board can come back at that point with that design and more information and answers to all of the questions posed. Mr. Uchytel said yes, they wanted to reassure the Assembly that they were acting responsibly. Mayor Koelsch said he believed the Board was acting responsibly with the intention of address the demands placed on the community by the tourism industry and he applauded the Board for its work.

Mr. Kiehl said the board can't sell, purchase or trade land or include the project in the six year CIP without prior review of the Planning Commission. He was not looking to micro-manage the work of the Board and he appreciated the work, but this project is a large one. The last piece of open waterfront is a bigger community question than the charge we give to the Docks and Harbors Board. He would be more comfortable if it went to the Planning Commission first. This is an exciting project and I agree we need the B Zone. Lets make a decision about if this is a route we want to go before spending \$200,000.

Mr. Janes said this plan came out of months of public hearings for the property from Marine Park to Taku - we heard the public wants access to the waterfront, open space, clear views between South Franklin and the waterfront - so this plan came out of many public hearings. We feel fortunate that the Morris group is willing to be cooperative in how they are developing their property. This is an opportunity and if we are given the blessing to spend \$200,000 to get a real plan with real dollars we would appreciate this. He hoped to move forward fairly quickly.

Mr. Edwardson said he likes the plan and the ideas but we need the plan with specific information. We have given direction and we haven't gotten the product from the direction given. We need to look at this wholistically, and until we see this, I don't want to spend the money. He said he did not want to miss any opportunities.

Mr. Nankervis said the Assembly was trying to balance the charge to the Assembly with the charge to the Harbor Board. He appreciated the opportunity to discuss this and the Assembly has to do the best thing for the most people with the funds, which is a large amount of money. With 16b we have brought more tourists in and we have not done shore side development to match that and we do need to plan ahead for that. If there is a way to come to an agreement with the Docks and Harbors Board, Assembly and the Morris Group, that would be good.

Mr. Uchytel asked for more specifics of what the Assembly wants to hear.

Mr. Watt said his best advice was to give consent to the Docks and Harbors Board to spend \$200,000 to get a detailed plan. I think we will be frustrated without professional design services and a detailed cost estimate, and the Planning Commission will need these specifics to review. Mr. Watt was willing to work with Mr. Uchytel to return a product to the Assembly. The Assembly appropriated about

\$2 million to the Archipeligo project a few years ago.

Mr. Bartholomew said the budget tracking the 16b project for 6 years has had a line item for the Archipeligo property and it has been a part of the budget and the funding plan, without specifics. Mr. Bartholomew said Mr. Edwardson was talking about a plan from Marine Park to Taku Docks. The plan the managers are discussing are the plans for the Archipeligo property specifically. He wanted to get clarity on which plan is being discussed.

Mr. Mosher said he has a concern that the commitment from Morris is rock solid.

Mr. Edwardson would like the urban design plan to be changed in the manner that the Assembly had requested to understand if the Assembly should move forward with this piece.

Mr. Seng said some of these comments touch on my question - is this Urban Design Plan a plan or a concept. The consensus was that it was a concept, from the "brickyard" to Taku Smokeries. There are costs, things are not glued into place, it is an idea, and an idea that we, as the Docks and Harbors Board, believe could span many years. It is a starting point for the journey, from what we gather from the business, the industry and the public. Along the way to a plan, things change. Morris Company comes in and says this "albatross" hanging around your neck for ten years, this empty lot, we would like to do something with it. We find ourself at the point of concept into action. The issue we are dealing with is how to respond to the Archipeligo lot. What Morris Company proposes brings more value to the community than just 15 bus parking spaces for \$15 million. It is a public/private partnership - he spoke about the differences between government and private business and this is a new way of operating - we need to be flexible.

Mr. Simpson said he has a conflict on this matter as he has represented the Morris family for over 40 years. Nothing like this was expected a year ago, so he has had to abstain from participation in this topic. Knowing and working with the Morris family, when they say they are going to do a world-class project, they will do that - unless they have to move on to another project in another community because they can't move forward in a timely manner.

Mr. Eiler said there is a great deal of good news in the newsletter. Some of my piers, young entrepreneurs, have approached me with ideas to do more development. We found in doing this plan we have fish biting right away. He supported the Mayor's comments on spending the funds to get a more formal plan together.

Mr. Nankervis acknowledged the good things that have been happening in the harbors and the work of the board, which is appreciated. He supported the comment of having someone nibbling on a line - this is something new - and much of the idea is appealing. Do we as a city accommodate the cruise ships on the land side? This is a part of a bigger concept plan and all is subject to change. I have concerned that we will well-intentionally fritter away an opportunity.

MOTION, by Weldon, that the Docks and Harbors Board proceed with the RFP for the Archipelago property with preliminary design and to receive answers regarding the questions asked about the Archipelago plan.

Mr. Edwardson objected. He said the subset of information from engineering on the Archipelago property would not necessarily provide the answers he sought regarding the Urban Design Plan.

Mr. Kiehl asked for the funding source. Mr. Bartholomew said the bulk of the remaining funding in the unspent 16b project funds are port development fee funds. The sources that were included in the project were state marine passenger fees, bond funds, some city passenger fees and some port development fees, and the majority of the unspent funds are port development fees and some dock fund balance. Mr. Kiehl was not sure that the Assembly can spend 100% cruise ship money on all the elements of this. He would like to hear from the attorney and get answers from the questions from the December 4 COW meeting.

Mr. Seng asked for clarification on whether the Docks and Harbors Board has the authority to spend the \$200,000 to do the design plan.

Mr. Ridgeway asked if it would be possible to separate the Archipelago project from the Urban Design Plan, based upon the events with Morris. A lot of staff work went into the Urban Design Plan.

Mr. Edwardson said he was not sure how the Archipelago plan related to the Urban Design Plan. It seems this plan is pivoting on the Archipelago lot and was there any need for the Urban Design Plan if so?

Mr. Janes said as a participant in the Urban Design Plan - we tried to arrive at a plan to meet the need so the community as a whole, including citizens, businesses, and the cruise industry. There are more needs that we can meet in that skinny stretch. At the same time we began talking with the Morris Group and found we can meet some of the needs if we can put the Archipelago component in - including food carts, open space, and it was a divine miracle that it all happened at once.

Mr. Uchytel displayed the urban design plan and he listed the elements of the plan. This plan is a validation of how the Seawalk is being used now and for all intents and purposes, the Archipelago project is the urban plan.

MOTION, to clarify the existing motion, by Weldon to authorize the \$200,000 for the design (RFP).

Ms. Weldon said hopefully the information from the design would answer some of the questions.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked to ensure the accountability of the funding source.

Mr. Uchytel suggested that the Docks and Harbors Board, at its next meeting, would appropriate \$200,000 from the Dock Fund Balance and be done.

The Assembly took a short break to contact the city attorney on the phone.

MOTION, by Weldon to withdraw her previous motions. Hearing no objection, it was so ordered.

MOTION, by Weldon, to spend \$200,000 on the Archipelago plan, funding source from FY18 Dock Fund Revenues not collected from cruise ship fees and charges.

Mr. Edwardson objected.

Roll call:

Aye: Becker, Gregory, Nankervis, Weldon, Koelsch

Nay: Edwardson, Gladziszewski, Kiehl

Motion passed: 5 aye, 3 nay.

Mr. Uchytel asked for a moment to discuss the Fast Response cutters, Coast Guard assets and jobs in Juneau. He hopes that Juneau can be pro-active in this area.

Mr. Watt said that he had received some information from the federal lobbyist trying to track this issue and a way into the Coast Guard. Mr. Uchytel drafted a letter for the Mayor, which was sent to the Admiral asking for an opportunity to meet and present the best case. The Admiral will meet with the Mayor on Monday and we may be at the point of needing to offer some type of base housing, and we are discussing various ideas. We are talking to our lobbyists and our delegation and we have not had a chance to sit down and talk about this with the Assembly.

Mr. Uchytel said we are also working to get state and federal jobs to Juneau through NOAA and the Alaska State Troopers marine services.

Mr. Kiehl asked if the Board has done any planning for finalizing a funding plan for the last phase of

Aurora Harbor. Mr. Donek said it is on the boards list.

Mr. Watt spoke about work to do preventative maintenance at the Auke Bay Lab property and both UAS and Docks and Harbors are poised to make the best use of the property.

IV. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

Submitted by Laurie Sica, Municipal Clerk



(907) 586-0715
 CDD_Admin@juneau.org
 www.juneau.org/CDD
 155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

DATE: February 8, 2018
TO: CBJ Assembly and Planning Commission

FROM: Beth McKibben, Planning Manager, AICP
 Jill Maclean, Senior Planner, AICP

SUBJECT: *Blueprint Downtown Juneau*

Beth McKibben
Jill Maclean

The CDD Planning Division recommends creating “*Blueprint Downtown Juneau*”. After considering several options for undertaking a plan for downtown Juneau, we recommend the Blueprint, rather than a traditional area plan, since many plans have been undertaken for downtown Juneau, or include downtown Juneau, since the 1980s. The Blueprint approach differs from a traditional plan in that the history and existing conditions have been well-documented in downtown. What is missing is a community vision of how downtown Juneau should continue to grow and develop, how to harness the opportunities while addressing the challenges, and ensuring that downtown continues to be a place to live, work, and visit. We recommend using the existing plans, and the time and effort that was spent to create them, as the foundation for *Blueprint Downtown Juneau* – an action-oriented strategy to enhance downtown, leverage assets, create placemaking opportunities, update zoning, and develop a community vision for downtown Juneau, built from a dynamic public engagement process.

Blueprint Downtown Juneau

Visioning & Values

The community visioning piece of the Blueprint will focus on identifying common values and priorities necessary to create downtown Juneau for the next 20 years. The community visioning process may include:

1. Intensive public process to develop a long-term vision for sustaining downtown Juneau as the state capital, as an economic driver for Southeast Alaska, and as a cultural, social, and governmental center for the Borough through:
 - a. Steering Committee and focus groups
 - b. Neighborhood walking tours and neighborhood meetings
 - c. Soliciting public engagement through social media and community events – such as the Juneau Maritime Festival– to gather ideas on downtown, and inform the public about other ways to participate and ask questions of CDD etc.
2. Identifying Key Opportunities and Challenges by:
 - a. Involving residents, property owners, business owners, developers, and visitors to identify opportunities and challenges
 - b. Working with the core business district, the residential neighborhoods, and the shoulder areas (Rock Dump and Norway Point) to identify opportunities as a means to extend downtown Juneau, and its user base, encourage more year-

Blueprint Downtown Juneau

February 8, 2018

Page 2 of 3

round uses, and improve connectivity

- c. Identifying opportunities and challenges may:
 - i. Inform Capital Improvement Projects
 - ii. Include a review of existing zoning

Implementation Strategies for Creative Growth – “Knitting together past initiatives”

Implementation Strategies will focus on synthesizing existing plans related to downtown Juneau, such as:

1. Developing a complete list of action items from each existing plan
2. Engaging the public to determine which actions from existing plans have been completed and which are still outstanding; which actions are still relevant and which are no longer relevant; and to identify the gaps.
 - a. Similar to the Lemon Creek Area Plan, a Work Plan will be developed of the actions, with responsible parties and timeframes for accomplishment.

Zoning for Downtown Juneau

Blueprint Downtown Juneau will include a review of the current zoning that regulates those areas of the downtown that are located outside of the Alternative Development Overlay District (ADOD). This zoning diagnostic will be part of the public outreach process, and may identify areas to update and revise existing zoning regulations and/or identify new zoning that supports the community’s vision for the downtown. The zoning diagnostic may create actions that become part of the Blueprint’s Work Plan. The zoning diagnostic may identify updates to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Maps in order for proposed zoning to conform to the Comprehensive Plan.

Additionally, the ADOD for downtown Juneau expires August 1, 2019. Staff is engaged in an effort to develop new zoning for the areas located within the overlay. This effort will run concurrent with the *Blueprint Downtown Juneau* planning process. Similar to the zoning diagnostic conducted through the Blueprint, the ADOD process may identify updates to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Maps in order for the proposed zoning to conform to the Comprehensive Plan. Community Development staff will work together in public outreach efforts to lessen the burden on residents of participating in both of these efforts and ensure that each process informs the other, creating complementary planning and zoning results.

Placemaking

Placemaking is about creating public places that promote people’s health, happiness, and well-being. Placemaking facilitates creating desirable neighborhoods and shaping their surroundings; it leverages a neighborhood’s character. Placemaking may include enhanced pedestrian connections with wayfinding signage, branding neighborhoods by creating gateways, and encouraging festivals or block parties. Placemaking encourages community engagement and activity. Working with downtown organizations, such as JEDC (specifically the Downtown Coordinator) the Main Street Program, the Downtown Business Association, the Downtown Improvement Group, and other neighborhood groups, residents, and businesses (permanent and seasonal) will be critical to the success of any placemaking initiatives

Blueprint Downtown Juneau

February 8, 2018

Page 3 of 3

Timeframe and Deliverables

Blueprint Downtown Juneau requires approximately 18 to 24 months to complete. *Blueprint Downtown Juneau* will consist of:

1. Community Vision for Downtown Juneau 2040
2. Implementation Strategy
 - a. Actions and Policies
 - b. Key Challenges and Opportunities
 - c. Capital Improvement Projects
 - d. Proposed Zoning Revisions/Updates
 - e. Work Plan identifying Actions, Responsible Parties, Timeframes (similar to the Lemon Creek Area Plan)
 - f. Comprehensive Plan updates (potentially)

Staff is enthusiastic to undertake *Blueprint Downtown Juneau*, and your input into the process is appreciated. We look forward to working with the Assembly and the Planning Commission to bring this effort to completion.



(907) 586-0715
 CDD_Admin@juneau.org
 www.juneau.org/CDD
 155 S. Seward Street • Juneau, AK 99801

DATE: February 8, 2018

TO: CBJ Assembly and Planning Commission

FROM: Beth McKibben, Planning Manager, AICP
 Community Development Department

SUBJECT: Comprehensive Plan Review

BME
Jul Maclean

Juneau has had a Comprehensive Plan since 1965; the current Comprehensive Plan was updated in 2013. Interest has been expressed by some members of the Assembly and the Planning Commission in updating the Plan at this time. The Comprehensive Plan calls for a “review” of the Plan every two years. The Plan distinguishes between a “review” and an “update” of the plan. A review is described as “one or more public sessions of discussion and examination of the Plan.” The result of the review might be the conclusion that no amendments are necessary at the time or that some mid-course corrections are in order. An update is considered to involve a holistic review of all text, policies, implementing actions, and land use maps. The 2013 plan states that both the 2008 and 2013 plans were updates. Included below are potential strategies for either an update or a review of the Comprehensive Plan.

Comprehensive Plan Update

An update involves a complete planning process, the creation of a steering committee, focus groups, significant public outreach, review of goals, policies, implementing actions, and maps. This also could include the development of a new format for the Plan. The 2013 plan organization and format are essentially unchanged since the 1984 Plan was adopted. The following are options for how an update to the Comprehensive Plan might be accomplished.

- In-house – CDD staff, with assistance from other CBJ Departments, would be responsible for all aspects of plan development.
- In-house temporary hire – a temporary position would be created for the specific purpose of managing and over seeing this project with assistance from permanent CDD staff.
- Consultant – a consultant hired through a competitive proposal process would be responsible for all aspects of plan development.
- Combination in-house/consultant – this could take several forms, with a consultant being hired to facilitate the public outreach and visioning aspects, or consultant being hired to focus on specific topics of the plan.

Comprehensive Plan Review

February 8, 2018

Page 2 of 2

Comprehensive Plan Review

The Planning Commission, with staff support, would review the goals, policies, implementing actions, and each chapter. The Commission's recommendations for updates would be forwarded to the Assembly for consideration. This process took place in 2001, and in early 2002 the Commission made specific recommendations, such as adjusting the boundary of the Urban Service Area and adding a policy direction to address storm water management. These recommendations would inform future work for CBJ staff and the Planning Commission.

Recommendation

The Community Development Department is committed to community-based planning, as evidenced by the Auke Bay Area Plan and the Lemon Creek Area Plan. Juneau residents articulate their vision and help develop a plan to shape the future. Community involvement and participation builds commitment to the effort, allows differing perspectives to help identify solutions, and ensures more accountability. Both the Auke Bay and Lemon Creek Area Plans have been identified as successful planning processes and have been well received by the community. CDD has been directed to work on a Downtown Plan now that the Lemon Creek Area Plan is complete; this downtown planning initiative is the subject of a separate memorandum. Additionally, CBJ has received grant funds to complete the Historic and Cultural Preservation Plan. The review and development of new residential zoning districts mandated by the adoption of the Alternative Overlay Development District (ADOD) (which sunsets August 1, 2019) is underway. In addition to the above planning efforts being undertaken by CDD, the Parks and Recreation Master Plan is currently being updated and a public process is occurring this year. Community input is critical for these planning efforts to be successful, and too many competing efforts may jeopardize public participation in one or all of these efforts. Additionally, completion of these planning efforts will provide a solid foundation to begin the update to the Comprehensive Plan. A comprehensive plan update that values community involvement may benefit from a short delay.

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission form a committee to review how well the 2013 Plan reflects the community now and make recommendations for areas to be updated in the mid-term. This effort will inform the Assembly and the community while not diluting the other planning work that is underway.