ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES
LANDS AND RESOURCES COMMITTEE
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
MINUTES
January 29, 2018 5:00 PM
City Hall, Assembly Chambers

I. ROLL CALL

Chair Mary Becker called the meeting to order at 4:58 pm.
Members Present: Mary Becker; Beth Weldon; Rob Edwardson; Jerry Nankervis
Liaison Present: Paul Voelckers, Planning Commission; Weston Eiler, Docks and Harbors; Chris Mertl, Parks & Recreation
Staff Present: Greg Chaney, Lands Manager; Dan Bleidorn, Deputy Lands Manager; Rachel Friedlander, Lands and Resources Specialist; Rorie Watt, City Manager

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Jerry Nankervis noted that no minutes were included in the packet so he recommended the agenda be adjusted to remove approval of minutes. Staff noted that the November 20, 2017 minutes and the December 4, 2017 minutes will be presented at the February 26, 2018 meeting. Hearing no objection, the agenda was approved as amended.

III. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

Chair Becker asked if any members of the public were present to give testimony on non-agenda items. Kelli Grummet, one of the six applicants for the Cornerstone Facility on Hurlock Ave., began to introduce Al Paul, a former inmate, who attended to show the importance of re-entry housing for community members, when Chair Becker clarified to Ms. Grummet that since this was an agenda topic item, this could be discussed later on in the meeting. Ms. Grummet emphasized that she wanted to introduce Al Paul to the Committee as an example of a former inmate who had turned his life around and Chair Becker allowed it so.

IV. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Indian Point Update
Mr. Watt addressed the Committee with a review of his January 26, 2018 memo. Mr. Watt emphasized that tonight's meeting should be to determine the Assembly process for addressing this topic by using the five points recommended in his memo.

1. Confirming whether the historical record is sufficiently complete

Mr. Voelckers said he noticed there was a 1968 record of the federal transference of the land initially to the City and was curious if there was any record of the City's ask and underlying reasons for the Indian Point property. Mr. Watt replied this would have been upon formation of the Borough and the Borough would have been receiving lands from the State. Mr. Watt said staff could search in the archives to see if any documentation exists on intent.
Mr. Mertl said it was hard for him to judge if all the information was there, and was unsure if he could answer Mr. Watt's question concerning if this information makes up a complete historic package.

Mr. Edwardson said he felt this packet was sufficiently complete and that with any land use issues, one can "continue to keep digging down forever to try and find the last document written." This information addresses the chain of title and sufficiently documents the claim for the request (to transfer ownership of CBJ property on Indian Point to Goldbelt Heritage), said Mr. Edwardson.

Mr. Watt agreed with Mr. Edwardson that the packet information was "sufficiently complete", and Chair Becker confirmed with the Committee that there was general agreement of the provided historic information being sufficient.

2. ***Deciding whether the Committee needs additional information***

Ms. Weldon said her question was: If the City transfers ownership through trade or not, can the City put a condition on the property that it be preserved and maintained in its natural state, with limited recreational use, and still be accessed by all general community members. Mr. Watt replied in any land conveyance, there are generally several ways to go about the process and that the conveyance can be restricted. Mr. Watt said staff can provide the committee with information regarding land conveyance methods and restrictions.

Mr. Mertl asked if there was information regarding zoning and allowable uses and what could happen on this property if it were transferred. Mr. Watt said he thought the question was what is the current zoning designation, and under the current zoning designation, what could occur on the property, and depending on how the land is conveyed, could those zoning requirements endure or change. Mr. Mertl said that would be a great summary.

3. Considering whether to bring the Federal Government into the discussion, more specifically:

a. Whether CBJ has an opinion about the National Park Service's ownership of a portion of Indian Point.

b. Whether the Federal Government should be a trade partner with CBJ as part of a larger conveyance/trade package Government's failure to identify the significance of Indian point led to the land selections by the National Park Service, NOAA and the Greater Juneau Borough

Mr. Watt acknowledged he was asking the Committee a leading question, and said in his view, land is always difficult since there is a limited amount for every use, purpose, and owner. Mr. Watt said the question he put out was regarding the Park Service's ownership of a portion of Indian Point and whether the Federal Government should be a trade partner with CBJ. Senator Sullivan told Mr. Watt that land issues were something he would be willing to work on, so Mr. Watt said the City should take him up on his offer.

Mr. Edwardson said he appreciated the City Manager's diligence on this but that it is not necessary to involve the Federal Government as they do not own the City land that is being offered for trade and that this involvement would also mean the City would be conforming to the Federal Government's time schedule. Mr. Edwardson let the Committee know that in his experience managing land, he has never seen the Federal Government admit to making a mistake, so this would probably result in a lot of time spent with not many results.

Ms. Weldon said that she would respectfully disagree with Mr. Edwardson and that the City is just doing research at this point. Ms. Weldon said that if the City can meet with the Federal Government in a timely fashion, that would tell the City what the Feds have to say.

Mr. Nankervis said he appreciates Mr. Edwardson's comments but that it would be worth at least an inquiry.

Mr. Mertl said he is also supportive of inquiring with the Federal Government. The Park Service usually has long-term plans associated with the management of their property, and it would be good to know what their plans are for this piece of property, said Mr. Mertl. Mr. Watt said Mr. Edwardson's points about time are appropriate when working with the Federal Government and that the City will operate in separate parallel paths on this topic.

> ***4. Discussing when to take to public, oral testimony. I believe that a number of members of the public will desire to make public testimony at the appropriate time. We need to advise them when that will be.***

Mr. Nankervis suggested suspending public comment until the CBJ hears back from the Federal Government. Mr. Mertl reminded the committee that this is City parkland and that when public testimony is taken, a joint meeting should occur between Lands Committee and PRAC.

Mr. Edwardson said he would like to set a date for when to proceed, namely right after receiving comments from the Feds. Mr. Edwardson said the City could invite the Feds to make comments within sixty days and that the Committee could set a meeting right after that.

Mr. Watt said the City could get some semblance of an answer from the Feds within that time period.

Chair Becker said April 9th would be the closest Lands Committee meeting for the sixty day time period. Mr. Nankervis said he would prefer to wait until April 9th to get a report from the City Manager regarding answers he has received from the Feds. Chair Becker confirmed with the Committee that April 9th would be the appropriate Lands Committee date to receive feedback from the City Manager on the Indian Point informational requests, with the Committee choosing a following date for a hearing and concluding items. Mr. Mertl offered that the PRAC meeting be the vehicle for this topic. The PRAC meetings are the first Tuesday of the month and are not restricted to a one hour time period. Mr. Nankervis clarified with Mr. Mertl that this topic could be heard at the PRAC meeting following April 9th and Mr. Mertl confirmed it so.

Mr. Edwardson asked if the Lands Committee would be allowing oral testimony at the April 9th Lands Committee meeting and at the future joint PRAC-Lands Committee meeting. Chair Becker replied it would be good to receive public testimony after receiving the report.

Mr. Watt then summarized the tasks discussed and set by the Lands Committee.

- Schedule Lands Committee update about Indian Point on April 9th

- At the April 9th meeting CBJ staff will provide a summary of the information received from the Federal Government.

- A summary of any information available in the archives about the Borough's intent when Indian Point was selected in 1968.

- A technical memo on land conveyance methods and models including potential limiting factors and a dialog on current zoning.

- Schedule joint meeting of the PRAC and Lands Committee to receive oral testimony concerning the issue of transferring ownership of Indian Point after the meeting on the 9th.

Chair Becker asked if the method for public notice would occur through the newspaper, and Mr. Watt said the City will endeavor to get public notice out to all interested parties.

B. Juneau Youth Services Cornerstone Campus Closure - Update

Before addressing the Committee regarding the Cornerstone Campus, Mr. Chaney let the Committee know that the draft minutes for the November 20th, 2017 and December 4th, 2017 meetings will be available for review at the next Lands Committee meeting but they are currently available online.

Mr. Chaney gave a summary of the JYS use history of the Cornerstone Campus. They were licensed for 16 beds but had emergency capacity for 20 beds. Juneau Youth Services returned the facility back to the CBJ on January 26th 2018. The City leased the building to Juneau Youth Services (JYS) for $1 a year and JYS paid for all utilities as well as maintenance. For all practical purposes, JYS operated the facility independently of the City.

JYS spent $4,300 a month on maintenance. As long as the building remains vacant, the city will be responsible for maintenance.

Mr. Chaney then reviewed four options associated with the outcome of how to handle the Cornerstone Campus building as outlined in his January 25, 2018 memo.

- Use by CBJ – No City Departments were interested.
- Disposing of the property for fair market value.
- Lease property for fair market value.
- Dispose of property for less than fair market value for the purpose of providing a service that is supplemental to a service that could be reasonably be provided by the State or City and Borough. This is the issue for discussion tonight.

Mr. Chaney then reviewed the series of events before the Request for Proposals application was due.

- December 4: Lands Committee adopted a motion of support for soliciting letters of interest for potential uses of the property.

- Lands received an appraisal on December 14th that indicated the property would have more value if all the buildings were removed and the property was sold for residential development. Appraised value was $350,000.

- Lands housed an open house for interested organizations on January 8th. Roughly 30 people attended, representing 10 community groups.

- Lands also provided extra tours outside of the open house, 7 additional organizations participated.

On January 16th there were 6 organizations who submitted applicants for the property. Applicants were required to include a $500 application fee so these are all pretty serious applications.

These applications included:

- Alaska Legacy Partners LLC
- Kelli Grummett dba "Aunt Margaret's House"
- The Gehring Nursery School
- Juneau Cooperative Christian Ministry dba "The Glory Hole"
- Polaris House
- Prama Home Inc.

Ms. Weldon asked if the applicant would bear the cost of renovations and building maintenance, and Mr. Chaney replied that so far, all the proposals would come up with the funding for that.

Mr. Chaney gave a brief overview of each of the six applications, and said staff would provide more information focused on zoning to the Committee at a later date. Mr. Chaney emphasized that the Assembly could also offer the property for sale by sealed competitive bid as an option.

Mr. Chaney then recommended that the Committee begin the next Lands Committee meeting about ½ hour early, at 4:30pm, to give each applicant time to present. Chair Becker then suggested a special meeting for February 12th.

Mr. Voelckers asked if there would be similar concerns with Alaska Legacy Partners as with Gehring Nursery when it comes to subsidizing a private business with City dollars. Mr. Chaney replied that question should be addressed to the applicant, and that it is Assembly judgement.

Chair Becker addressed the audience and stated that the Committee wasn't going to be taking public testimony at this time but that there would be a chance on another day.

Ms. Weldon clarified that Aunt Margaret's House proposed workforce housing, not Alaska Legacy Partners Inc.

Ms. Weldon indicated she had some questions for the applicants. For example, Ms. Weldon said she would be not be interested in selling the building for a dollar to Alaska Legacy, but she would be interested in leasing the building for a dollar to both Alaska Legacy and Gehring Nursery School. Ms. Weldon said she would not be interested in hearing Gehring Nursery School's request unless they had more detail in their application. Ms. Weldon also wanted to look at how the Glory Hole was going to take Cornerstone's capacity for 20 beds and turn it into 38-40 beds.

Mr. Chaney said that if the Committee has concerns it would be good to ask the applicants directly. Ms. Weldon said that is what she was doing by listing these concerns now so the applicants could respond later.

Ms. Weldon said she would not look at Prama's application unless they could find paid staff and not a volunteer.

Mr. Mertl asked if the City has ever done anything like this before and Mr. Chaney said he was not aware of the City having an opportunity quite like this before but something somewhat similar was Second and Franklin when the parking lot was considered for a housing facility. In that case we only got one proposal so that was a lot less complicated to review. This is very challenging since these are all good concepts. Some are more detailed than others but it will be tough to select one, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Edwardson said he sees similarities between this project and Indian Point and was wondering why this project was sailing through without concern for chain of title or the opinions of neighboring land owners. Mr. Chaney said the City has clear title to this property. As far as the neighbors, it is difficult to have a neighborhood conversation when there are 6 different proposals, said Mr. Chaney.

Mr. Chaney then recommended the Lands Committee meet at 4:30pm at their next meeting to give applicants a chance to present.

Chair Becker proposed to the group that the Committee meet February 12th from noon to 1:30pm to either give the applicants a chance to present for a maximum of 8 minutes or have the Committee ask the applicants questions.

Ms. Weldon said the date and time worked for her and that she would like to hear from each applicant.

Mr. Voelckers asked if the Planning Commission would be the place to take neighborhood concerns and public testimony and Chair Becker said that her assumption was on February 12th, the Committee would select a certain number of proposals to proceed to the February 26th meeting, which is where the Committee will also hear public testimony.

Mr. Mertl said he was for presentations but that the Committee needs to tell the applicants what to present on. Mr. Mertl suggested to Mr. Chaney that he comprise a series of bullet points that each applicant should address while giving a presentation so that each applicant can be considered equally. Mr. Mertl also shared his concern that the noon to 1:30 timeframe for the 12th would be inconvenient for the public to attend. Chair Becker said she was not planning to take public testimony at the February 12th meeting, and that the 6 organizations would be at the meeting to present. Mr. Mertl then reiterated his concern for the public to receive information discussed on the 12th so that the public is fully prepared to testify on the 26th, and that a way for the applicants to present information equally be developed to ensure fairness.

Mr. Nankervis said he had concerns regarding the timing of the applicant presentations for the February 12th meeting and making time for public testimony.

Mr. Chaney suggested on the 12th the Committee hears from the applicants, and then on the 26th, the Lands Committee hears from the public from 4:30pm-6pm. Chair Becker said this makes good sense.

Ms. Weldon requested that the testimony from each of the applicants be oral and not use a computer or PowerPoint.

Chair Becker then confirmed with the Lands Committee that the Committee will hear from the applicants on the 12th from noon - 1:30pm and ask questions. Chair Becker then said on the 26th from 12-1:30pm, the Committee would discuss or choose three applicants and then take public testimony (the 12-1:30pm time was corrected to 4:30-6:00pm for February 26th).

Mr. Voelckers shared his concerns that this was a lot to accomplish in a given meeting, and Chair Becker agreed and emphasized the importance of reading the packet prior to the meeting.

Mr. Nankervis said the 12th will be for presentations, and then on the 26th, the Lands Committee will narrow the applicant pool down and also plan for a joint meeting with the PRAC. Mr. Mertl said meeting with the PRAC would not be applicable with this topic, and Mr. Nankervis realized he was thinking of Indian Point.

Chair Becker said that the Committee should really focus on selecting three applicants on the 12th.

Mr. Mertl shared he would be concerned if the Committee selected three applicants prior to receiving public testimony. Chair Becker asked what the will of the Committee was and Mr. Nankervis said he saw the value in either option: selecting three applicants and then taking public comment or taking public comment and then selecting three applicants.

Chair Becker asked Mr. Voelckers what he thought, and Mr. Voelckers replied he liked Chair Becker's soft approach of endeavoring to select three applicants on the 12th and if this cannot happen, it will defer to the 26th. Mr. Voelckers said it would be better to select three on the 12th so that the community would know who the prime contenders are. Chair Becker agreed with Mr. Voelckers opinion, and the Lands Committee also affirmed this choice.

V. STAFF REPORTS - Due to the late hour, there were no staff reports.

VI. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

There were no committee member/liaison comments and questions.

VII. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 6:07 pm.