CBJ has attached materials and minutes from the 1-3-2018 Assembly Committee of the Whole Meeting
I. ROLL CALL

Deputy Mayor Jerry Nankervis called the meeting to order at Noon in the Assembly Chambers.

Assemblymembers Present: Mary Becker, Rob Edwardson, Maria Gladziszewski, Norton Gregory, Loren Jones, Ken Koelsch, Jerry Nankervis, and Beth Weldon.

Assemblymembers Absent: Jesse Kiehl,

Staff present: Rorie Watt, City Manager; Amy Mead, Municipal Attorney, Mila Cosgrove, Deputy City Manager; Laurie Sica, Municipal Clerk; Greg Chaney, Lands & Resources Manager; Rob Steedle, Community Development Director.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Hearing no objection, the agenda was approved as presented.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. December 4, 2017 Committee of the Whole Meeting

Hearing no objection, the minutes of the December 4, 2017 meeting were approved with a correction to complete the last sentence in the first paragraph on page 2 of 8.

IV. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Annexation

Mr. Watt said the Assembly needed to decide which areas should be included in any annexation petition and the process to be followed. He would like the COW to forward a recommendation from this meeting to the Assembly on its January 22 meeting.

Mr. Nankervis said he would like to look at the areas separately and then decide on a process. Ms. Gladziszewski asked if it is possible to do different processes for different areas. Ms. Mead said it was possible, it increased the public process, and the initial filing needed to be amended regardless.

Mr. Nankervis asked to discuss the areas for annexation first and asked about area A. Ms. Mead said A (Tracy Arm) includes the area already in the existing, pending petition before Local Boundary Commission (LBC). The pending petition could be adjusted to include only that area. Ms. Mead said LBC contacted Ms. Mead and said the petition was filed as an election petition, but recommended a legislative process instead as there are no residents in this area and they felt the legislative process was more appropriate. Whatever process the Assembly chooses, the LBC can amend the process to what it sees is the best fit.

MOTION, by Koelsch, to proceed with including area A in the annexation request. Hearing no
objection, it was so ordered.

Mr. Watt reviewed the areas included in area B (Glass Peninsula/Pack Creek). The deviation in the area beyond the model borough boundary includes the entire watershed area of Pack Creek. All the uses in the area currently relate to Juneau, including tourism and Forest Service activities based out of Juneau.

In Mr. Kiehl's absence, Mr. Nankervis referred to Mr. Kiehl's email referencing a "sliver of land" in this area and asked for clarification regarding Mr. Kiehl's intent. There was no clarification.

Ms. Gladziszewsk said the model borough boundary seemed like a logical boundary and asked about the proposed deviation. Mr. Watt provided a map of the area with more detail and said that this recommendation follows geographic boundaries, which are preferred by LBC, instead of artificial lines.

Mr. Gregory asked if there were any residents in that area. Ms. Gladziszewski said there was a forest service bunkhouse for temporary summer residence only to her knowledge.

**MOTION**, by Koelsch, to include in the annexation petition area B indicated in red on the NE admiralty island map and on Map 2 as area B, as forwarded by the Lands Committee. Hearing no objection, it was so ordered.

Mr. Watt said that the Lands Committee did not recommend adding area C (area north of Model Borough Boundary and south of Hawk Inlet on Admiralty Island) on map 2. He noted in a memo from Ms. Cosgrove that there is potential for mineral exploration in that area, and the current boundary that encompasses Greens Creek is close to the actual mining operations, and it could be important to include pending future mining development in the area for the mine to not cross borough boundaries. The model borough boundary does not follow geographic features. Ms. Gladziszewski asked if it was possible to redraw the line for area C to make it follow geographic lines.

**MOTION**, by Gregory, to include area C in the annexation petition.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked to amend the motion to include a modification to provide for a geographic boundary.

Mr. Gregory said he preferred to see the change first.

Hearing no objection, it was so ordered.

Mr. Watt reviewed area D (Funter Bay, North Peninsula of Admiralty Island, Horse and Colt Islands). This is close to the Haines Borough boundary on the west, Glacier Bay Model Borough on the Southwest and the Chatham Model Borough on the south, which may all have interest in that area. The Horse and Colt neighborhood contains several recreational properties and one business, all which have a close nexus with Juneau. There has been significant comment from Funter Bay about potential annexation.

Mr. Edwardson said this area is basically protected area, what is the virtue of CBJ annexation? Mr. Watt said if area D is annexed, the private properties in that area are subject to property tax, zoning, school service (not transportation), in addition to areas that are protected from development in the Admiralty Monument. The state anticipates that all areas will be in a borough eventually and CBJ should include the areas into its borough that make the most sense.

Mr. Edwardson asked if there is any future cost to the city due to annexation - such as how much will it cost CBJ to provide services compared to the gain in any taxes. Mr. Watt said there will be property tax, business sales tax if there are any businesses, planning and zoning development applications, provision of school services, no fire protection and the land is not in the fire service area, but CBJ would respond with emergency services such as ambulance, and some police response, depending
on the level of crime. The argument made is that people residing in these areas use CBJ services now, such as roads, hospitals and airports.

Ms. Weldon asked if the other boroughs mentioned as model boroughs are actively seeking borough status. Mr. Watt said not that he was aware of that and he spoke about the disincentive to borough formation in school funding. CBJ did not anticipate the Petersburg borough filing its annexation when it did, and CBJ's petition was put in a secondary position to that of Petersburg.

Ms. Mead said the LBC, on its own accord or by the legislature, may form a borough and its entire purpose is to "borough-ize" the state.

Ms. Weldon said there are several emails from Funter Bay residents that opposed borough formation. There are old state docks there and if CBJ annexed this property, does this become a borough responsibility? Ms. Mead said yes.

Mr. Nankervis asked if the state has a timeline for borough-ization. Ms. Mead said no.

Mr. Jones said that 30 years ago there was significant discussion about LBC initiating boroughs but he does not recall that this has ever happened, and questioned whether that was a real concern. Ms. Mead said this is a different environment, as there has not been a derth of petitions coming to the LBC. The one time LBC initiated boroughs was the Model Borough Boundary establishment.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked if something was happening now that would encourage borough-ization - what likelihood will some other borough scoop this up- if it is going to be in a borough, it should be in Juneau’s. Ms. Mead said the reason for this discussion was based on the Petersburg annexation petition. The model borough boundaries provide no guarantee of inclusion of an area into a borough. She had not heard of any recent direction to LBC to borough-ize.

Mr. Jones said the majority of objections come from Funter Bay, Horse and Colt Islands. If the petition is filed and it is granted, what legal recourse does the Assembly have to carve out the areas for specific services such as planning and zoning, and taxation at a different rate - what kind of rules could we set to provide more satisfaction to those residents.

Ms. Mead said as a Home Rule Borough, school, taxation and planning are required. All other services are extra. We are required to charge a certain tax rate areawide, and there are additional service areas that can be added on to the areawide tax rate. Mr. Watt said a borough is required to charge 2.6 mills for schools. He explained the current base rates and additional service area rates.

Mr. Edwardson asked if the petition could annex Funter Bay and create a service area in which the residents of Funter Bay would not be required to pay for the required services, and would only have to pay for the services that they received.

Ms. Gladziszewski reviewed the existing mill rate from the budget book.

Ms. Edwardson referred to a bill that extends emergency services beyond borough boundaries. Ms. Mead said she would return information to the Assembly on that topic.

Mr. Jones said he was looking at ways to not charge for services not provided, but to cover costs such as the dock repair. These seem to be naturally different from other locations and asked if there was a way to "grandfather in" these areas.

Ms. Becker asked about any obligation to inform the residents about what the taxes would be before the request was submitted to LBC. Ms. Mead said there is a public hearing required, the information submitted is put into the application, and there is plenty of opportunity for discussion and then the LBC makes a decision.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked if Shelter Island pays the same base mill tax rate as other property owners
in Juneau and Mr. Watt said yes, the 6.9 mill tax rate. Mr. Watt said he owns property on Shelter Island.

**MOTION, by Becker, to include map area D into the annexation petition.**

Ms. Weldon asked how many permanent residents are living in Funter Bay. Audience members reported 30 property owners with 2 full time residents.

Mr. Koelsch amended the motion to put all of area D into the annexed area with the exception of Funter Bay. He said this is the area of most concern, and the Assembly can come back to this area later, when we can make it more fair to people who are that far away from the borough now.

Ms. Becker asked if it would be difficult to annex in the future if another borough showed interest. Ms. Mead said it puts CBJ in a secondary position, similar to when the Petersburg borough filed its initial petition. Ms. Mead said that LBC has the final review over borough boundaries.

Ms. Gladziszewski said it might be difficult to draw such a small area and she would rather spend time on fair taxation of remote properties. She objected to the motion.

Mr. Edwardson said he thought there were more than two permanent residents on Horse and Colt, and it may not be fair to them if Funter were left out, so he opposed the motion.

Roll call:

Aye: Nankervis, Weldon, Koelsch
Nay: Becker, Edwardson, Gladziszewski, Gregory, Jones

Motion failed, 3 ayes, 5 nays.

Hearing no objection, the main motion passed.

Ms. Mead spoke about the process - by election, or by legislative review. Both require the same petition, the same public hearing, and everything up to the final LBC decision. If the LBC approves, legislative review requires filing the matter with the legislature, which has 45 days to disapprove or it is effective. The local option requires a vote of the people within the annexing borough and the areas to be annexed and it must be passed by a majority vote of both areas.

The Assembly discussed the issue of voting.

**MOTION, Gregory, to include areas A, B, and C in one area for legislative review and area D in a separate area also for legislative review.**

Mr. Jones asked if he could determine the number of registered voters in Funter Bay and Horse and Colt Island by the next meeting and Ms. Mead said yes.

Mr. Nankervis objected to the motion and passed the gavel. He did not see the reason to separate the areas if there is legislative review for both.

Mr. Edwardson said he supported the motion as D stood a chance of being more controversial and did not want to stall the process.

Ms. Mead said the LBC could amend the local petition, and forward what it thought was best to the legislature.

Ms. Becker thought it could appear that we had too many reservations regarding D.

Roll call:

Aye: Edwardson, Gregory, Jones, Koelsch
Nay: Becker, Gladziszewski, Nankervis, Weldon
The motion failed, 4 ayes, 4 nays.

*MOTION*, by Jones to seek legislative review for areas A, B, C, and D in a combined annexation petition to the LBC. Hearing no objection, it was so ordered.

Mr. Watt said that the matter would be returned to the Assembly in the form of a resolution for public hearing at the January 22 regular Assembly meeting.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 1:10 p.m.

Submitted by Laurie Sica, Municipal Clerk
ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
January 3, 2018, 12:00 PM.
Assembly Chambers - Municipal Building

Assembly Worksession - No public testimony - Tentative Agenda
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III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES
   A. December 4, 2017 Committee of the Whole Meeting

IV. AGENDA TOPICS
   A. Annexation

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
DATE: December 1, 2017

TO: Jerry Nankervis, Chair, Assembly Committee of the Whole
FROM: Mila Cosgrove, Deputy City Manager

RE: Annexation Update

Background:

On February 22, 2016 the Assembly Committee of the Whole reviewed the option of incorporating additional areas into the Juneau Borough. After weighing various courses of action, the Committee voted to pursue annexing the unclaimed area between the southern Juneau border and the new northern edge of the Petersburg Borough. (Map 3, Area A). Staff informed the Assembly that if there was a desire to annex additional lands, CBJ would be best positioned to do it in a single petition for the following reasons: annexation petitions are substantial undertakings, there is efficiency in bundling more than one area in an application, and the first applicant tends to have a significant advantage in the process. As a result, during the December 3, 2016 Assembly Retreat the issue was referred back to the Lands Committee for further discussion.

The issue of Annexation was brought before the Lands Committee on January 30th, 2017. The Lands Committee unanimously approved forwarding the topic to the Committee of the Whole with the recommendation of expanding the borders of CBJ’s annexation application to match the areas identified as A, B and D in attached Map 3. The Lands Committee also directed that the COW should discuss when and how to include neighboring communities in the discussion of expanding the borough boundaries.

A decision was made to reach out to Angoon to discuss the potential annexation of parts of Admiralty Island. Attempts were made to arrange a meeting with their governing body, but the meeting did not come to pass. In July of 2017, Mr. Watt reported to the Assembly that communication attempts were not fruitful and suggested the issue be scheduled for the August 10, 2017 COW.

At the August 10, 2017, COW, Ms. Mead reminded the Assembly that there was a pending petition on file with the LBC for the portion of proposed expansion that Petersburg was not awarded which encompasses the land from our existing southern border to the Northern edge of the newly revised Petersburg Borough (Map 3, Area A). The petition either needed to be withdrawn or amended. The matter was generally discussed and referred to a future COW.

Subsequent to the August 10th meeting, the City of Angoon formally responded in writing stating they were opposed to CBJ annexing any additional portion of Admiralty Island.
December 1, 2017
Assembly Committee of the Whole
Annexation Update

Points of Consideration:

The Assembly has two key decisions before it: 1) what areas should the annexation petition include, and 2) what approval process should be requested when the annexation petition is filed.

What areas should the CBJ include in an annexation petition?

There are three maps attached to this packet. Map 1 shows current Borough boundaries within Southeast Alaska. Map 2 shows the Model Borough Boundaries contemplated as a result of the 1992 LBC report on Model Borough Boundaries. Map 3 identifies 4 potential areas for CBJ borough boundary expansion. The Lands Committee recommended pursuing areas A, B and D.

A. This triangular region is between the new northern boundary of the Petersburg Borough and Juneau’s southern boundary. Since this area was not included in the Petersburg Borough, Juneau seems like the only other credible candidate to incorporate this region. In the near future, annexation of this region is mostly symbolic since there are no local residents or private properties. In the long run mineral development or tourism could generate economic activity in this region. At the February 22, 2016 Committee of the Whole, the Committee adopted a motion to continue to pursue annexing this region.

B. Pack Creek, Oliver’s Inlet and the Glass Peninsula are areas where Juneau based tours, commercial fishing, guided hunts and recreational activities are common. This region has a strong connection to Juneau and is mostly contained within the Juneau Model Borough Boundary. The exception to this is the area around Pack Creek. Pack Creek is a very popular area for viewing bears and visitation to this area is managed by the USFS based in Juneau. The shaded area within the Chatham Model Borough includes the drainage area of Pack Creek and then follows the watershed of Seymour Canal north to the existing Juneau Borough boundary.

C. Area C is that portion of the Juneau Model Borough Boundary on Admiralty Island not included in Area B or D. At present, there is no significant economic or recreational activity in that region, though the potential exists for mineral exploration as an extension of current mining activity within existing CBJ Borough boundaries.

D. There are three adjacent boroughs that could potentially claim the northern portion of Admiralty Island as well as Horse and Cold Islands. This area is potentially the most contentious area to incorporate since it includes many private properties, some permanent residents and some business activity. It may be attractive to other boroughs for the same reasons.

Action requested:

A motion to forward a recommendation to the full Assembly to direct staff to pursue a modification of the existing CBJ Borough boundaries to include specific areas identified during this meeting.
December 1, 2017
Assembly Committee of the Whole
Annexation Update

What process should be used to request annexation?

There are two paths available to the Assembly to pursue annexation of lands, by legislative approval, or by vote. Both paths begin with a complete petition packet submitted to the Local Boundary Commission which reviews the packet, holds public hearings and makes a finding on the appropriateness of the proposed borough boundary revisions. If the LBC determines the petition has merit, the moving party can opt to have the boundary revision request reviewed and approved by the legislature or by a vote of the public which would include those individuals currently residing in the borough and the individuals residing in the proposed area of annexation.

Should the Assembly elect to have the petition reviewed by the legislature, the soonest that could happen would be the 2019 legislative session. Should the Assembly elect to have the petition approved by vote, the earliest that could happen would be the October 2018 Municipal election.

Action requested:

A motion to forward to the full Assembly a recommendation on how to proceed with obtaining final approval for modified boundary lines.
Map 1. Regional Map of Southeast Alaska.
Map 2. Boroughs adjacent to Juneau.

Map 3. Recommendations for areas to include in Juneau's borough annexation application.
Team:

I apologize for the e-mail. The overseas family trip I'm on was scheduled before the 1/3/18 special COW meeting got scheduled and I won't be able to call in.

I want to share my initial thoughts on the annexation thing, and I really wish I could hear the back & forth about it, because I'm not hard over on these issues. I'd benefit from the conversation. I'll have to grab the minutes before anything final comes up at the full assembly.

So, here's where my thoughts start:

1) Alaska's constitution calls for the whole state to be in boroughs eventually. Those who want to be part of no local government at all are going to be unhappy sooner or later.

2) The legislature tends to push organizing more areas when money gets tight. It's tight now. It might be best to settle these issues for our neck of the woods now - and on Southeast Alaska's terms - before the state does it for us in ways that reflect Railbelt legislators' values.

3) Our job is to work on what benefits Juneau the most in the long term, but

4) In the long run Juneau will be in trouble if we lose our strong relationships with our neighbors in the region.

So the 9/27 letter from the mayor of Angoon gives me great pause. We should only pick fights with our neighbors if we have a really good reason. The one issue on my radar screen right now that might rise to that level is the ore body at Greens Creek. I think that's what the line in Ms. Cosgove's memo about "Area C" and expansion of existing mining operations is about. I know it took a very long time to work out the issues around how to assess underground mines. I think it was scheduled for an appeal at the Board of Equalization back when I was a member, but settled while we were reading our appeal documents. The possibility of two different property tax (and potentially sales tax!) jurisdictions assessing activity at a single mine seems like a real headache for a very large employer in our region. If annexing that area avoids that kind of problem, it's worth doing.

There are other properties with very strong historic and economic ties to Juneau. The islands between Admiralty and the mainland, for instance, all rely on Juneau facilities and services.
more than they do any other. They belong in the CBJ more than any other, and they'll end up in a borough eventually, so perhaps now is the time.

Meeting the new northern boundary of the Petersburg Borough is the only easy one here. We should do that.

Put together, that has me starting out with suggesting we annex area A, only do a sliver of area B (east of the eastern shore of the Glass Peninsula) and get a geologist's opinion of how much of area C we should file for.

I have very mixed feelings about area D. Al Shaw was right when he told the Lands Committee the lumber and people who built those cabins/homes at Funter launched 90+ % from Juneau. Our e-mails the last time the possibility arose made it clear people who own cabins/homes at Funter don't want to be in a local government. See point 1, above. I guess I'm leaning toward letting those folks weigh in when a future Haines/Chatham/Chichagoff petition comes in. I suspect many will seek connection to CBJ then. As Ms. Cosgrove's memo says, we're at a disadvantage if we file second, but the principle of fighting with Angoon as little as possible nudges me that way. Also, they're almost all the voters in the area to be annexed, so if they overwhelmingly vote 'no' now, the whole package goes down no matter how interested the current CBJ electorate is in doing it.

Laurie & Beth, would you please include this with the meeting documents available to the public? I want to make sure we're square with the Open Meetings Act.

Thanks for indulging me. As i say, I could be convinced to go different directions on these issues. I look forward to noodling more on them with your ideas incorporated.

- Jesse
PETITION PROCESS FLOWCHART

Borough Annexation Petition Process by Legislative Review or by Local Option by Election

Stage 1: Filing the Petition

- A petition for borough annexation is initiated. AS 29.05.060 and 3 AAC 110.410
- Petitioner holds a pre-submission hearing for legislative review petitions. 3 AAC 110.425
- Staff returns petition if deficient. 3 AAC 110.440
- After petitioner corrects petition, staff again reviews form and content. If the petition is correct, staff accepts it for filing. 3 AAC 110.440
- Petition submitted to LBC staff. 3 AAC 110.420

Stage 2: Public Review

- Public notice and service of petition is given. 3 AAC 110.450; 3 AAC 110.460
- LBC staff issues preliminary report for public review. Public comment period on report begins. 3 AAC 110.530
- Individuals may file responsive briefs and comments in favor or opposition. 3 AAC 110.480
- Petition may file reply brief. 3 AAC 110.490
- Staff reviews submitted comments and briefs and writes preliminary report. 3 AAC 110.530
- Staff may hold informational meeting. 3 AAC 110.520

Stage 3: LBC Hearing and Decision

- LBC staff issues preliminary report for public review. Public comment period on report begins. 3 AAC 110.530
- LBC staff reviews submitted comments and briefs and writes preliminary report. 3 AAC 110.530
- LBC holds decisional meeting. Option 1: LBC approves petition. Option 2: LBC amends and approves petition. Option 3: LBC denies petition. 3 AAC 110.570
- LBC issues written decision. 3 AAC 110.570
- Opportunity for reconsideration. 3 AAC 110.580
- If a petition is approved or amended, the process continues to Stage 4.

Stage 4: Election or Legislative Review

- If the LBC approves a petition, staff notifies the borough clerk. The borough will conduct the election in the borough, and the election in the area proposed for annexation. 3 AAC 110.600
- If a majority of votes are cast in favor of annexation, annexation is approved and takes effect once the election is certified. 3 AAC 110.630(2)
- Legislative Review
- LBC submits recommendation to the legislature during first ten days of a regular session. If the legislature does not disapprove the decision within 45 days, the annexation becomes effective. 3 AAC 110.610

Borough Annexation in Alaska-30
CITY OF ANGOON

P.O. BOX 189
ANGOON, ALASKA 99820
PHONE: (907) 788-3653
FAX: (907) 788-3821
c_angoon@outlook.com

September 26, 2017

Harriet Silva, Mayor
City of Angoon
PO Box 189
Angoon, AK. 99820

RE: City and Borough of Juneau proposed Annexation of Admiralty Island

To Whom It May Concern;

On April 17, 2017, the duly appointed City Council for the City of Angoon voted unanimously to oppose any further annexation of Admiralty Island by the City and Borough of Juneau.

The City of Angoon has a great history of fighting for the preservation of Admiralty Island and its natural resources. Angoon elders were a major force in establishing Admiralty Island as a protected wilderness through the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Act (ANILCA). Admiralty Islands subsistence and provisions are key to the community of Angoon's well-being.

The City of Angoon strongly opposes any further annexation by the City and Borough of Juneau and feels that since Admiralty Island is the home of the Angoon Tlingit people since time immemorial that any further annexation of any part of Admiralty Island is a front to our rich culture and history.

The City of Angoon will continue to oppose any further annexation attempts by any community or borough that is not located on Admiralty Island.

Sincerely,

Harriet Silva, Mayor
City of Angoon

C: Angoon City Council

file
CITY OF ANGOON

RESOLUTION NO. 17-02

A RESOLUTION TO OPPOSE THE ANNEXATION OF ADMIRALTY ISLAND BY THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU.

WHEREAS, The City of Angoon, has a great history of fighting for the preservation of Admiralty Island and its natural resources. Angoon Elders were a major force in establishing Admiralty Island as a protected wilderness through the passage of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA); and

WHEREAS, ANILCA’s subsistence and other Admiralty Island provisions are key to the well-being of Angoon, and;

WHEREAS, Admiralty Island is an internationally recognized treasure and has been classified as a World Biosphere Reserve; and

WHEREAS, protecting Admiralty’s fish and wildlife habitat in a natural state is essential to keeping Admiralty Island as a National and International treasure and essential for the health and culture of the Angoon People; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT: the City of Angoon opposes any proposed annexation by the City and Borough of Juneau on any portion Admiralty Island.

PASSED AND APPROVED by the duly constituted quorum of the city council this 17th day of April, 2017

SIGNED: ______________________ Mayor

ATTEST: ______________________ City Clerk Angoon

Edward Jack, Sr. Yes Jess Daniels Yes Albert Howard Yes Randall Gamble Yes
Harriett Silva Yes Pauline Jim Yes Kevin Frank Sr. Yes
TO: JUNEAU EMPIRE

FROM: Beth McEwen, Phone 907-586-0203, email: City.Clerk@juneau.org

RE: “Your Municipality” Ad Order – For Publication December 29, 2017

Please use **PO Number #109454**

Please add the CBJ LOGO, the information on the following pages, and the following TEXT about ADA accommodations to this ad:

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

Please provide a proof of the ad, and contact us with any questions.

Thank you for your assistance!

CBJ Municipal Clerk Office
City and Borough of Juneau
MEETING & EVENTS SCHEDULE December 29, 2017 - January 8, 2018
This listing includes meetings currently scheduled as of December 26, 2017.
For updates, please refer to: http://www.juneau.org/calendar/index.php

Friday, December 29, 2017
No public meetings scheduled at this time.

Monday, January 1, 2018
CBJ Offices Closed for the New Year Holiday.

Tuesday, January 2, 2018
Noon: Assembly Public Safety Task Force, City Hall Conference Room 224
5:15pm: Juneau Affordable Housing Commission, City Hall Conference Room 224
6pm: Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee, Chambers

Wednesday, January 3, 2018
Noon: Assembly Committee of the Whole Worksession re: Annexation, Chambers
5:15pm: Assembly Mining Subcommittee, City Hall Conference Room 224
5:15pm: Historic Resources Advisory Committee, City Hall Conference Room 224 (Rescheduled to 1/10/18)

Thursday, January 4, 2018
1:30pm: Airport Board Finance Committee, Airport Alaska Room
4pm: Eaglecrest Board, City Hall Conference Room 224
5:30pm: Treadwell Arena Advisory Board, City Hall Conference Room 237

Friday, January 5, 2018
4pm: Aquatics Board Operations Committee, Elgee Rehfeld Mertz Offices 9309 Glacier Hwy b200

Monday, January 8, 2018
Noon: Assembly Public Works and Facilities Committee, Chambers
6pm: Assembly Human Resources Committee, Chambers
7pm: Regular Assembly Meeting, Chambers
**Top 10 city stories of 2017**

City takes action against downtown campers

One of the most talked-about city actions of the year came early on. In a February Assembly meeting, Assembly members passed an amendment to an ordinance allowing the Juneau Police Department to evict or fine people sleeping on private property downtown.

Prior to the amendment, JPD was required to contact the private property owner before removing a sleeping (“camping,” as most referred to it) person from the property. The new policy began on April 15, forcing those sleeping on the streets to find another place to stay.

The action spurred a communitywide conversation about homelessness, and what can and should be done about it.

City shuts down Bergmann Hotel

In early March, the CBJ issued an order to vacate the Bergmann Hotel, a historic building that ended up being semi-permanent housing for low-income Juneau residents. The following day, the tenants were evicted and manager Charles Cotten was arrested.

The building had been run down for years, and issues included an inoperable sprinkler system, inconsistent heating, no hot water, sewage issues and more.

Though the problems were long-standing, the eviction process itself was fairly quick, and residents had a hard time finding places to stay. The Salvation Army operated an emergency shelter for many of them in the meantime, but many former Bergmann residents were left to find places to camp throughout downtown and elsewhere.

City mulls changes to mining ordinance

At the end of April, a group of businessmen sent a proposal to the Assembly requesting that the city revamp its mining ordinance to...
The analysis found that, on average, truckers employed by the ports of Los Angeles and Long Beach spent 10 hours on the road in 1938, holding them to 60 hours per week. Though questions remain about how long truckers can stay on the road without losing the right to drive, the results are consistent with the findings of the analysis. The analysis makes clear that safety laws designed to prevent drivers from exceeding maximum limits are ineffective and, in some cases, might be counterproductive.

The activity amounts to about 8.3% of the time on the road.

Three crashes following long hours
These three crashes show 14 of more hours of gate appearances without a 10-hour break.

Dots denote truck passing through a port gate.

Pacific 9 Transportation crash March 26, 2014 (West) Truck was on the clock since Sunday, 5 a.m., and had some breaks in-between, until crashing in Victorville, Calif.

Crash: 11:03 p.m.

Gold Point Transportation crash May 21, 2013 (Tues.) Truck was on the clock since the previous day at 10:53 a.m.

Crash occurred in Long Beach, Calif.

Crash: 5:00 a.m.

Performance Team Freight Systems July 11, 2014 (Thurs.) Truck was on the clock since Tuesday, July 8, with some breaks in-between, until crashing in Norwalk, Conn.

Crash: 2:20 a.m.