



**Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting Agenda
Zoom Webinar and Telephonic**

August 13, 2020, 6:00 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present:

Christine Woll, Chair
Betsy Brenneman
Kirby Day
Michael Heumann
Laura Martinson

Tahlia Gerger
Patty Ware
Daniel Glidmann
Nathaniel Dye

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Karena Perry, Vice Chair, Ricardo Worl, Jill Ramiel, and Iris Matthews

Staff:

Beth McKibben, Senior Planner
Alexandra Pierce, Planning Manager

Assembly Members:

None

I. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:13 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

a. June 11, 2020 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting

MOTION: By Mr. Day to approve the June 11, 2020, draft minutes.

The motion passed with no objection.

b. July 16, 2020 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting

MOTION: By Ms. Brenneman to approve the July 16, 2020, draft minutes.

The motion passed with no objection.

III. Public Participation – None

IV. Steering Committee Updates

V. Draft Chapter 5 – Land Use, Neighborhoods, & Housing

Ms. McKibben gave a brief overview of what would be discussed at this meeting, including an update on action items and what items have been checked off that list. She stated that Staff was requesting feedback from the Committee on if the Housing and Land Use sections should be combined in Chapter 5. Staff felt this would make sense, since the section is dedicated to the residential neighborhoods, but wanted input from the Committee.

Ms. Woll felt that it made sense to combine the Housing and Land Use sections into Chapter 5.

Ms. Brenneman asked for clarification on what information this chapter would contain.

Ms. McKibben stated that Chapter 5 would include Housing, but Staff had hoped to be more specific with the recommendation on how to address housing in the individual subdistricts.

Ms. Pierce noted that a lot of the chapters are intertwined and some of the language may need to be worked on, along with edits to titles and headers, to make it more clear for what each chapter focused on, and what information was included. She stated that Chapter 5 would be centered around the legal framework regarding the management of land use, along with overlay districts, guidelines, items entrenched in Code, what the nature of housing looks like downtown, how housing is provided, and how to increase affordable housing. Some items have more legal aspects to them, while others are more conceptual. Staff can work to make this clearer for readers.

Due to the amount of material that would be included in Chapter 5, if the Housing and Land Use sections were combined, Ms. Martinson thought it might be better to separate the sections.

Ms. McKibben thanked the Committee for their input and stated that Staff would use this information to put the chapter together. She then moved forward to discuss the Missing Middle Housing concept. She noted that a speaker had presented information on this at the CBJ Housing and Building Forum that took place in February, and offered to send the presentation to anyone that was interested in reviewing it. Ms. McKibben stated that Missing Middle Housing is a range of multi-unit, or clustered housing, types – compatible in scale with detached single-family homes – that help meet the growing demand for walkable urban living. The general concept is a way of increasing density so that doesn't feel different from the existing development; The Comprehensive Plan and other plans include policies with an emphasis on increasing housing and density. Missing Middle Housing is one way this increase could be accomplished within existing neighborhoods. Ms. McKibben asked for thoughts on this concept.

Mr. Day asked if this concept was to be used in neighborhoods where there is also commercial activity, similar to how Auke Bay has been developed.

Ms. McKibben stated that it could be used in that way. She stated that it would create more walkable areas, because the buildings would be closer together. She also noted that denser development means the cost of services goes down, and the value of land would go up, so there are economic advantages that come with this concept, as well.

Ms. Ware stated that she felt this type of development would be a nice addition to Juneau. Something like this, if the guidelines were followed correctly, could work in the Willoughby District, as well, where lots of open space could be utilized. She expressed some concerns that if zoning changes are proposed there is potential for a fair amount of public pushback. A lot of people might not like the denser housing development, even though it works well in other cities. However, Ms. Ware felt this was a good idea and it had a lot of potential to help Juneau.

To touch on the Alternative Development Overlay District (ADOD) rezoning proposal for downtown Juneau, Ms. Pierce stated that it does align with the Missing Middle Housing concept. The idea is to create zoning that matches what is already on the ground. It supports the idea of the Missing Middle Housing by creating more options for people living, and wanting to develop, downtown.

Ms. Martinson expressed support for the Missing Middle Housing concept, and felt that this is exactly what Juneau is missing and lacking. She believes that there is usually push back for anything new that is proposed, but if it is presented in the right way, this could be a well-thought-out concept for Juneau.

While this might not be hard to solve, Mr. Heumann asked where this concept might work in Juneau in all aspects, including zoning. He has seen a number of backyards turn into houses downtown and feels the big question to answer is how much needs to be done to make this attractive to someone. This may be a big hurdle to overcome, and there will probably be pushback, but the economics are true. Land values have to be high to justify tearing a development down. Mr. Heumann would like to hear more about how and what role the City and planning department have in incentivizing it. This could be very challenging for developers to make this work.

Ms. McKibben noted that this concept is a little hard to envision when an area is built out, but she was able to give some examples. She noted that she was just introducing this concept to the Committee at this time. If the Committee likes this idea, then Staff can start moving forward with it.

Mr. Dye gave some information on the downtown rezoning effort and thought this concept was a good one.

Ms. Ware thought Mr. Heumann made a good point, and noted that some areas of the Willoughby District might be well suited for this type of development. She does not want to see any developments torn down either. She suggested the plan include where this type of development might work well.

Ms. McKibben stated that this would be helpful and the areas could be identified as opportunities.

Mr. Heumann noted that it would be important to use very specific language when incentivizing this concept, so they did not wrongfully incentivize tearing down established developments. Juneau is short on housing and this concept may help bridge the gap that is being seen.

Ms. Pierce felt that Mr. Heumann and Ms. Ware made valid points, and could see that the group is in favor of this concept. Staff would work with the concept recognizing the concerns.

Ms. McKibben agreed and moved forward to discuss Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations in downtown Juneau and explained some aspects of the zoning districts downtown. Ms. McKibben noted that there are many lots in downtown Juneau that conform to the current code and the motivation behind the ADOD is to have zoning that more accurately reflects existing development. Most of downtown is Mixed Use (MU), there is no maximum limit for density or height. This allows for a large variety of uses. While MU zones can accommodate a lot of for the concepts the Committee has discussed, the zoning does not require that developments be of mixed use. Ms. McKibben also spoke on the Recreation Service Park (RS) and D10 – Multi-family zones. She asked if the Committee wanted to recommend a denser zoning district and suggested that some language be added to reevaluate development in hazard areas, after the hazard mapping and zoning is finished.

Mr. Day asked for clarification on how far the Resource Development(RD) zone extended down past the Franklin Dock.

Ms. McKibben stated that the RD zone ended at the Rock Dump.

Mr. Dye noted that the RD zone abuts Traditional Town Center (TTC), and Ms. McKibben confirmed this.

Referring to page 6 of 16 in the draft of Chapter 5, Ms. Martinson noted that it stated “Development in the Light Commercial (LC) zoning district produces twice the property tax revenue per acre compared to development in General Commercial (GC) Zoning District.” She asked where this area of LC zone is and if this should be part of the rezoning discussion.

Ms. McKibben stated that there aren’t any GC zones downtown. This information came from work on the Economic Development Plan which was boroughwide.

Referring to page 9 of 16 in the draft Chapter and the encouragement to develop with the option of using bonus points as an incentive, Ms. Ware noted that developers rarely use the bonus points and do not always develop in the manner that is hoped for. asked if Staff knew why this might be.

Ms. McKibben felt this was a great conversation to have. She agreed that bonus points aren’t always used. One reason may be, they are outdated and need to be revised.

Mr. Dye added that bonus provisions can leave uncertainty in what you a developer could get approved for. The Auke Bay Area Plan is also recommends bonus points and the Planning

Commission is in the process of developing the zoning language. He also noted that only the Nugget Mall and Wal-Mart are in the GC zone, whereas Costco, Safeway, Super Bear, Home Depot, are all in the LC zone (in response to Ms. Martinson's question about economic value).

Ms. Martinson asked if these topics were just information for the Committee, or if it would become part of the Blueprint Downtown Area Plan material.

Ms. McKibben stated that the discussion from past plans would be added to into the appendices section, and they would not be left in the chapter.

Adding to what Mr. Dye's comments, Mr. Heumann noted that if contractors are developing something that requires Planning Commission approval, there is a fair bit of financial burden that goes into this. So, developers will want to do something that they are highly confident in, and remove as much uncertainty as possible. It's an economic trade off.

Ms. McKibben asked Mr. Heumann, as a developer, if some concepts, such as building design, were expected of developers, would that be more acceptable to them.

Mr. Heumann replied that it all depended on the cost. If it were something small and not too expensive, then it would likely be more possible. If the requirement deviated strongly from what the developer wanted to build, then one would likely not want to move forward with the development. There is always a risk with tacking on more and more requirements.

Ms. Brenneman suggested that if bonus points were not being used to help embody the traditional styles, then it may be good to take a step back from them. She felt that it may be important to determine if guidelines and requirements are good or bad, and then try to work options for bonus points.

Ms. Woll stated that she agreed on an abstract level.

Mr. Dye noted that development in Juneau has been less single-family homes and more common wall developments, and sidewalks have become very expensive. He also pointed out that storage is prohibited on the first floor of buildings in the MU and MU2 zoning districts. However, there may be other ways to encourage other development. The Table of Permissible Uses (TPU) could be very useful for incentivizing other types of development, instead of rezoning.

Mr. Heumann feels that Juneau is in a weird situation. Some things may seem feasible for developers and specific features could be mandated, but somethings seem unreachable, because they can become so expensive. It may be worth asking people how far they are willing to go and spend, to get a better idea of how to move forward.

Ms. Pierce summarized that while bonus provisions can be helpful, underlying regulations and what items are actually feasible need to be considered. If bonus provisions are going to be retained, then a long hard look needs to be given at how to make them successful. Ms. McKibben agreed.

Ms. Woll asked for more information on what the impact would be regarding the recommendation about requiring true mixed use

Ms. Pierce stated that it is something Staff introduced with the concept of the Neighborhood Commercial (NC) zone in Auke Bay which does not allow single-family residential, MU does not require mixed use right now, it is allowed. This also relates to the Missing Middle Housing concept and provide a way of integrating more housing into downtown.

Ms. McKibben noted that there are a couple different ways this could be accomplished, and gave some examples. Staff wanted guidance as to whether the concept should be included in the plan, and that the details would be worked out later.

Mr. Dye stated that vertical development was being encouraged in Auke Bay, so bonus points were being used to incentivize this, which brings more certainty for developers.

Ms. Brenneman asked if the guidelines at the beginning of the chapter could have some strength added to them to give them more power.

Ms. McKibben replied that this could be done, and more discussion could be given to making some of the guidelines into action items.

Ms. Brenneman asked if there was a legal way to limit Airbnbs and other options like that. She was thinking it may be good to limit them in certain areas.

Ms. McKibben stated that she did not know the answer at this time, but would look into it and gather more information.

Mr. Dye noted that Airbnbs are not allowed in certain districts.

Ms. Pierce added that this is a very hot topic at the moment, and from what she has seen it is very difficult to enforce the limitation of Airbnbs.

Regarding the Missing Middle Housing concept, Mr. Glidmann asked if the house that was recently built near the Northern Lights Church was within the existing zoning laws.

Ms. McKibben stated that she was unfamiliar with this house. So, Ms. McKibben and Mr. Glidmann agreed to discuss it at a later time.

Ms. McKibben moved forward to discuss D18 and D5 zoning. She noted that there is some discussion around this in the draft chapter., Some areas of D18 zoning near the high school don't accommodate mixed use development. D5 zoning is low density. She asked for the Committee's thoughts on this.

The Committee and Staff discussed what areas of downtown Juneau are in which zone, to get a better idea of which areas could be improved if they were an LC zone.

Mr. Day noted that the area where the Franklin Dock resides is zoned Waterfront Industrial (WI). He asked if someone were to build a dock near the U.S. Coast Guard station along the waterfront, would it be zoned Waterfront Commercial (WC).

Ms. McKibben replied that this would be discussed more when the Waterfront and Rock Dump subdistricts were examined.

Ms. Brenneman asked what the legal relationship was between Indian Village in the Aak'w Kwaan district and the City.

Ms. McKibben stated that it depended on the ownership. Properties deeded from the Federal Government into Native ownership are not subject to zoning or taxation. When those properties are sold they are no longer in "restricted deed" status and become subject to zoning. In the Village, the Tlingit and Haida Central Council has been purchasing restricted deed lots, and more of the area is subject to City & Borough of Juneau regulations.

Ms. Pierce noted that Staff had asked some open-ended questions. She asked if the Committee had any questions on the packet materials, explanations of the different districts, or any other details.

Ms. Martinson felt that the section where Steering Committee feedback was requested was very helpful. She thought it may be good to take each area and look at it with the vision on the same page, to try to keep everything in the right perspective. While it seemed simple to break everything apart and keep the same mindset, she felt this was harder than expected.

Ms. Pierce stated that there had been some struggles with trying to produce all of this information in a virtual format, but Staff is open to suggestions and feedback.

Ms. McKibben noted that she could break everything down more, for easier viewing.

Ms. Woll suggested that Committee members email Staff with their suggestions and comments on how to present the information, to better suit the needs of everyone.

Ms. McKibben felt this would be very helpful. She then moved forward to discuss Placemaking. She stated that this had been discussed in great detail in Chapter 6. For this chapter does the Committee have specific recommendations for the individual subdistricts? If so, please send her those suggestions. She noted that there is not much information in the draft chapter regarding the history of the Highlands, and asked the Committee to let her know of any reliable material they may have.

Ms. Brenneman stated that she may have some information and would pass that on to Staff.

The Committee and Staff then reviewed what they would like to discuss at the next meeting, including the remaining sub areas, the introduction of Chapter 2, review of implementation table for the Parks, Open Space, and Recreation chapter, and scheduling future meetings.

Ms. Pierce asked if the Committee would like to see the implementation tables and information in an email first, and could decide at the next meeting if they would like to discuss them yet, or not.

The Committee agreed this would be good.

Ms. McKibben stated that the next meeting was scheduled for August 27, 2020, and Staff would work with the Committee to schedule more meetings.

The Committee thanked Staff and praised them for all their effort in presenting this information in a virtual format.

VI. Committee Comments

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m.

Next Meeting Date: August 27, 2020, 6 p.m., Zoom webinar and telephonic.



**Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting Agenda
CBJ Assembly Chambers**

September 17, 2020, 6:00 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present:

Christine Woll, Chair
Karena Perry, Vice Chair
Betsy Brenneman
Kirby Day
Daniel Glidmann
Jill Ramiel

Tahlia Gerger
Michael Heumann
Laura Martinson
Ricardo Worl
Nathaniel Dye
Patty Ware

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Tahlia Gerger, Daniel Glidmann

Staff:

Beth McKibben, Senior Planner
Alexandra Pierce, Planning Manager

Assembly Members:

None

Members of the Public:

Pat Race, owner of Alaska Robotics Gallery
Crystal Worl, co-owner of Trickster Company

I. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:06 P.M.

II. Approval of Minutes

a. August 27, 2020 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting

MOTION: By Mr. Worl to approve the August 27, 2020 minutes. Mr. Heumann seconded.

The motion passed with no objection.

III. Public Participation

Pat Race & Crystal Worl – Mural on the Rockwell Building

Ms. McKibben explained that Ms. Worl and Mr. Race are working on a mural for the Rockwell building. They presented their concept to the Historic Resources Advisory Committee (HRAC) a few weeks ago, and thought the Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee would like to hear about it since the Committee has discussed murals as part of placemaking.

Mr. Race, who is the co-producer, said this project started in 2018. They have met with many groups since then. He shared a rough draft of an Elizabeth Peratrovich mural as it would be depicted on the side of the Rockwell building. He has had many conversations with people over the years, such as HRAC, the Downtown Business Association, and the downtown Rotary Club, who all want to do something with the wall. Ms. Worl has enlisted the help of Sealaska Heritage Institute (SHI) for planning and grant writing, and artist Lauren Brevner, who has helped with designing the image.

Ms. Worl, who is the Project Producer, said Lauren Brevner is based in Vancouver, BC. She met Ms. Brevner a few years ago, as she has been traveling to British Columbia the past three years to apprentice under Robert Davidson, who is an artist who specializes in Haida and formline design. Ms. Brevner's art specializes in women who are warriors, leaders, and important people in history. Ms. Worl's components will be the formline designs, which will be a modernized version of the formline crest. Mr. Race approached her two summers ago about the mural. This year she was awarded a Rasmuson Individual Artist Award, and decided to use the funding for this project.

Mr. Day asked how the design currently coincides with the Franklin Food Court – does some of it get covered up?

Ms. Worl said they talked to Dave McCasland, the owner of the food court. Mr. McCasland has a hut installed that cannot be moved. They discussed how they would address the scaffolding to paint on the wall and decided to paint the mural about ten feet up from ground-level so the food court would not obscure it.

Mr. Day asked if there was to be an accompanying message.

Ms. Worl said the piece would be commemorating Elizabeth Peratrovich as an advocate and a Tlingit icon figure. They intend to have a plaque visible nearby that describes what Elizabeth Peratrovich did to pass the first anti-discrimination law in America. The plaque will also give information about her, as well as about the artists and the intention of the piece.

Ms. Martinson asked when they thought it would be completed.

Ms. Worl said they intend to repair and prime the wall in early spring of 2021. They intend for Ms. Brevner to paint the wall with Ms. Worl in the summertime. They are hoping to have it ready for Celebration next summer, and to have an unveiling or opening ceremony.

Ms. Worl said a benefit of SHI's involvement is that they are familiar with grant writing and funding sources. This is important, since she would like to bring an apprentice to the project, as well as teach a workshop related to the project with Ms. Brevner.

Ms. Perry asked about the ownership of the building.

Mr. Pace said that they are working on an agreement with the building owner. Considering that the mural may be an impermanent installation of three to five years, the lot next to it might be developed.

Ms. McKibben asked if they have any plans for more murals.

Ms. Worl said she is talking to the Alaska Mural Project, based in Anchorage, which is working to put more murals in downtown Anchorage.

IV. Steering Committee Updates

None.

V. Draft Chapter 5 – Land Use, Neighborhoods, & Housing

a. Rock Dump, Waterfront and Harbor Subdistricts

Ms. McKibben said she would like the Steering Committee to focus on Rock Dump, Waterfront, and Harbors Subdistricts.

The Rock Dump is zoned Industrial. Waterfront Industrial, by contrast, has an emphasis on water uses. Industrial zoning does not allow for residential uses, and only allows for one caretaker unit per site. The activities taking place at the Rock Dump are important for the infrastructure of Juneau, and are not likely to change in the immediate future. Ms. McKibben said she would like to discuss what the future of this area might look like. She pointed out that the Seawalk would not continue all the way through the Rock Dump, and instead would turn into a recreational trail.

Mr. Day suggested finding a better name than the Rock Dump. He sees pitfalls for residential uses due to so many industrial uses.

Ms. McKibben said this is why housing is not allowed in industrials zoning districts: light, noise, traffic at odd hours, dust, fumes, etc.

Ms. Brenneman asked what the Little Rock Dump is.

Ms. McKibben said it is off the map, past the Rock Dump.

Mr. Dye said the Little Rock Dump is all Docks and Harbors storage and mining claim.

Ms. Brenneman suggested incorporating landscaping and benches in the recreation corridor that connects to the Rock Dump. She said that industrial uses are not ideal for waterfront, and suggested recommending that this area work towards not becoming Residential or Mixed Use rather than Industrial. Eventually it would be an ideal location for housing, but she recognizes that industrial uses are not compatible with housing.

Mr. Dye said how that recommendation is made is important. It is important to articulate what the land designation should be if it does change in the future. He recommended suggesting what future uses would be appropriate.

Regarding the Waterfront District, Ms. McKibben said the current Mixed Use (MU) and Mixed Use II (MU2) land designations allow for mixed uses but do not encourage or compel it. She asked if the Steering Committee wants to recommend changes that encourage or compel mixed uses in those zones.

Mr. Heumann said requiring it seems like too much. He supported incentivizing it. The structure of the incentives is the most important part.

Ms. Pierce said that at this stage, with the level of the plan, they are not making recommendations about specific incentives. It is important to note, however, that incentives need to be carefully evaluated.

Ms. McKibben affirmed that the past discussions they have had about mixed uses are appropriate for the Waterfront District. There have been discussions about partially or completely removing Merchants Wharf, and enlarging Marine Park as a village green.

Ms. Ware asked how that would be possible, since Merchant's Wharf is privately owned. She asked if the City would have to purchase that piece of property to demolish it.

Ms. McKibben said yes, something like that would happen.

Ms. Pierce said the City should look at purchasing part of all of it and turn it into a venue that would be valuable for the waterfront.

Mr. Dye said there are blurred lines with private property ownership. He expressed concern about being too prescribed in housing requirements in Mixed Use areas.

Mr. Heumann said he would be sad to see anything happen to Merchant's Wharf. It is difficult to talk about the subject without referencing Docks and Harbors Plans. He stated he would like to talk to Docks and Harbors because they have a say in how the waterfront is developed.

Ms. Ware said the central area of Marine Park is currently wasted by not having any seating or a village green area.

Ms. Brenneman expressed mixed feelings regarding Merchant's Wharf. She said she does not think the whole area should be a village green, and that there needs to be commercial space. Ms. Ramiel said if the plan is going to be aspirational and long range, they should be able to look at new uses for Merchant's Wharf. She encouraged the Steering Committee not to forget more visionary concepts.

Mr. Day agreed with Ms. Ware about missing the amphitheater and concerts at Marine Park; they were torn out due to the problems downtown. Until the City fixes those, it is difficult to talk about how to get back to the way Marine Park used to be.

Ms. Pierce said she does not think what people are talking about is mutually exclusive. They can have a village green area with some commercial activity. Merchant's Wharf is an old building that is not in great condition. At some point, that site will need to be redeveloped somehow, whether it is revitalized or changed in some other way. The City could work with the owners to create an area that combines village green area with commercial space.

Ms. Martinson said, for her, it all comes down to programming.

Ms. Pierce said having a vibrant downtown brings people into public spaces, making those spaces active. This deters people from engaging in negative behaviors. The more positive development, whether it's programming or events or public activity, the better.

Ms. Ramiel said there are cities that pay their business associations to hold events in parks. This is mutually beneficial because the businesses do well, and when there are people in the parks, there are fewer issues with them.

Ms. Brenneman said we should always be looking at a place for the public to access the water for kayaks and canoes.

Ms. Matthews said it is critical to address the intersection of homelessness and downtown vitality. In the visioning report, addressing homelessness was the most important issue identified by the public. Economic vitality and solving homelessness goes hand in hand.

Regarding the subport, Ms. McKibben said the Waterfront Plan and the Subport Revitalization Plan both talk about the subport being a gateway into downtown. The Waterfront Plan includes a cruise ship dock as one of the options for development.

Ms. Martinson said having a recommendation in place before they start developing is important. Norwegian Cruise Line has said they want to do something that benefits the community year round, so having some direction would be helpful.

Ms. Woll said the Visitor Industry Task Force had some specific recommendations that are worth revisiting.

Ms. McKibben said the Waterfront Plan makes recommendations for building design and heights. It calls for lower building height on the waterfront side than the street side, which is not mandated under the current zoning. The Steering Committee could endorse these recommendations.

Ms. Martinson agreed that it is important to have access to the water and to maintain sight lines to the water.

Ms. McKibben said the majority of the Harbors area is publicly owned. Some of the land is owned by Docks and Harbors, some by the University of Alaska Southeast, and some by the State of Alaska, with a couple areas of private land. Docks and Harbors has the most impact over future development.

Ms. Woll said her impression was that the Docks and Harbors Plan feels more accessible to pedestrians. She thought there would be placemaking opportunities.

Mr. Day asked if the zoning in this area allows for commercial use like retail. If the expansion of the harbors goes forward, having a marine-related store there would make sense.

Ms. McKibben said it is zoned Waterfront Commercial, which allows for water-related commercial and office spaces, as well as hotels. Everything that the Docks and Harbors Master Plan recommends is achievable in the zoning that exists today.

Ms. McKibben said the waterfront overlay design guidelines are not that different from the ones in the Willoughby District: screened parking, parking located behind buildings, windows and doorways at the front, recommendations for height, etc.

Ms. Brenneman suggested that the 14-year-old Waterfront Masterplan might not be relevant anymore.

Ms. Pierce said the Visitor Industry Task Force addressed the age of the Waterfront Masterplan frequently. Some of the things are no longer feasible, but the prescribed program for the Seawalk is something they have been following. They are still within the planning horizon for this plan.

Ms. McKibben said the planning area is bigger than the Willoughby District and the waterfront overlay, so their guidelines need to be expanded. Those two sets of guidelines are a good starting point since there is a lot of overlap.

Mr. Dye said it might be worth recommending a new zoning district that stretches through most of the Waterfront Commercial zones as well as some MU and MU2 districts, and that focuses on and encourages pedestrian-oriented development with access to the waterfront. This would incorporate those design standards in a more unifying way.

b. Priorities, goals, actions & recommendations

Ms. McKibben reported that the highest priorities identified by the Steering Committee are:

- Encouraging more and diverse housing
- Preserving public access to shoreline and waterfront areas
- Encouraging mixed use of the downtown waterfront
- Seawalk Phase 4, Marine Park to Subport extension

- Turning Willoughby Avenue into a pedestrian-oriented retail district
- More public space and pedestrian-friendly areas, public investment in streets
- Promoting small businesses

Ms. McKibben said many of the priorities were repetitive because they come from 20 years' worth of plans. One of the points of the Blueprint Downtown area plan is to knit together all of the preexisting plans and focus on what is relevant and important.

Ms. Pierce said the underscoring message is that the City has done a lot of planning over the years and many plans says the same things, so it's time to implement those recommendations.

Ms. Martinson asked if the COVID-19 pandemic is relevant to the Blueprint Downtown area plan, and if there is an appropriate place or section to address ways in which our community can be pandemic-resilient.

Ms. McKibben said she could do some research and see what is out there. Even if they cannot include specific language for how to be pandemic-resilient, they can put that concept in there.

Ms. Martinson recommended mentioning outdoor seating or something for new buildings and public spaces, like outdoor public patios and places to gather outside year round.

Ms. Pierce suggested a section called Planning for Resiliency to address that this plan was written during a time when planners needed to consider economic energy, public and mental health, and natural disasters. The section can make broad and global statements for how to keep Juneau as vibrant as possible.

Ms. Woll said she is looking forward to going back to new versions of the chapters and making sure that everything relevant is included.

VI. Future Meeting Schedule

Staff informed the Steering Committee that they would be taking a short break from meetings. This will allow staff to put together a draft version of the plan for the steering committee to review. The next meeting will be October 29, which would give them six weeks to work on it.

Ms. Woll said they would need time to review the draft once they get it.

The Steering Committee asked about deadlines. Will they finish by the end of the year?

Ms. Pierce said that the document is quite close, although the graphics need work and time. She suggested they keep the October 29 meeting date and send it out without much time for them to review it, with the intention of walking them through the format during the next meeting. Once they receive feedback on the format and a first reaction to graphics, they will give the Committee some time with the document. That will allow staff to fix issues and build

appendices. Staff are aiming to put the draft out at the end of the year and to go through adoption early next year.

Staff said the plan's release should not be hidden by the holidays, since it is something of which they are proud. They also want to gather public comment. Staff will need to rethink how they are going to have public meetings to launch it and present it to the public.

Ms. Woll suggested bringing the consultants back in to help with that.

Mr. Day said it is difficult to roll it out and get meaningful public comment without a big meeting.

Mr. Worl asked if the area plan would be presented to the Planning Commission or the Assembly.

Ms. McKibben said once the Steering Committee is comfortable, it will go out for public review and comment, which may be incorporated into the plan. In some past plans, they have created an appendix of comments, even if they are not included. The Planning Commission will review the plan and make recommendations. Then it goes to the Assembly, where it is formally adopted at a public hearing.

Ms. Woll said parts of the Willoughby plan were not adopted: why did this happen and how does the Steering Committee ensure that this doesn't happen to the Blueprint Downtown area plan?

Ms. McKibben said that it was part of the way the contract was created. Moving forward with Auke Bay and Lemon Creek, they did it as a package.

Mr. Dye said sometimes the Assembly adopts by resolution and not by ordinance.

VII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00 P.M.

Next Meeting Date: October 29, 2020, 6 P.M., Zoom Webinar



**Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting Agenda
CBJ Assembly Chambers**

October 29, 2020, 6:00 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present:

Karena Perry, Chair
Betsy Brenneman
Kirby Day
Daniel Glidmann

Tahlia Gerger
Michael Heumann
Nathaniel Dye
Patty Ware

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Jill Ramiel, Iris Matthews, Laura Martinson, Ricardo Worl

Staff:

Beth McKibben, Project Manager
Alexandra Pierce, Planning Manager

Assembly Members:

Christine Woll

I. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 P.M.

II. Approval of Minutes

The August 13, 2020 and September 17, 2020 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting, were tabled until the next meeting to give the Steering Committee time to review.

III. Public Participation

As a new member of the Assembly, Ms. Woll said that she cannot be a Steering Committee member any longer, but that she wanted to express that it has been a pleasure to be a part of the process. She reported she was able to look at a draft copy on which she was able to comment one last time as a Steering Committee member.

Mr. Day asked if Ms. Woll could still be a liaison to the Committee.

Ms. McKibben said the Assembly does not have an official liaison, but they have had Assembly members attend. Ms. Woll is welcome to continue attending even though she would not be an official liaison.

IV. Steering Committee Updates

None.

V. Draft Plan Chapters 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8 – Introduction and Overview

Staff presented the draft version, which was in Word format with very few graphics. Staff reported that they would not have Chapter 2 ready until they complete the recommendation and action tables. There has been some reorganization to eliminate repetition. Later drafts will also incorporate appendices.

Chapter 1: Introduction

Staff reported that Chapter 1 has not changed substantially. Staff intend to include a map of subdistricts. There will also be a graphic about relevant plans and this plan's relationship to them.

Chapter 3: Juneau's History & Natural Context

Chapter 3 was reorganized by moving the history to the beginning of the chapter. The section on mass wasting was changed to Landslides and Avalanches. Language about subdistricts was moved to Chapter 5.

Chapter 4: Economic Vitality

This chapter was previously called Economic Development. Some missing data will be included in a later draft. Some information will not be in text, and instead will be incorporated into a graphic or a more visually appealing medium.

New sections include Working Waterfront and Economic Initiatives. The information on the Main Street program has been incorporated into the latter section, and has been cut down.

The Capital Facility section has been filled out to include information on utilities and how CBJ combines projects to be more efficient. Information on electric vehicle infrastructure is included as well. The section Capital City has also been added to with new data, as well as an acknowledgement of the impact COVID-19 has had on the State of Alaska letting go of leases for their State Office buildings due to moving to remote work – there is potential for this to happen in Juneau as well.

Mr. Glidmann confirmed that it is happening in Juneau.

There is a new subsection, Sustainability and Resiliency. Originally, staff were not planning to have a specific section because sustainability concepts are woven throughout the plan. However, this section explains the concept of sustainability as it relates to the plan and acknowledges the way the pandemic has changed life. Many of the recommendations in this plan, as well as in past plans, will help bolster Juneau's resiliency. Economic diversity, outdoor programming, parklets, and outdoor dining are all becoming more important as we move forward in the pandemic. The workplace is moving into a remote world, which may allow more people to move to Juneau.

Chapter 5: Land Use, Neighborhoods & Housing

Much of the background information has been taken out of this chapter and moved to appendices. Some of the subdistrict history from other chapters has been moved to Chapter 5. All recommendations will be moved into a table at the end of the chapter as opposed to at the end of each subdistrict section. A section about the subdistrict port has been added, along with some information about the AEL&P dock.

Chapter 6: Downtown Activities and Tourism

This chapter has been edited to be more concise. The placemaking background has been cut and moved to an appendix. Staff revised section Carrying Capacity to include the relevant vision statement from the visioning document. The plan talks about the idea of carrying capacity as a misnomer, however, and staff asked for the Steering Committee's opinions regarding that section.

Chapter 7: Parks, Open Space & Recreation

The Parks subsection will contain multiple maps; staff could not fit all the relevant information on a single map without it being crowded. The addition of a paragraph about Gold Creek is the biggest change to this chapter. There will be accompanying recommended actions in the table. This is the only part of the plan document that has a summary section, so they need to decide whether to delete it or incorporate summary sections into the rest of the chapters.

Chapter 8: Transportation, Streetscape & Parking

Staff removed all the background information, edited the section on Motor Vehicle Traffic to make it more simple and concise. Staff added a Level of Service graphic, and asked if it was self-explanatory or if it benefited from the information in the callout box next to it.

Ms. Ware asked if the relevant vision statements have all be included in a consistent format.

Ms. McKibben said that each chapter quotes the relevant vision statements from the visioning report. Most are quoted in the beginning on the chapter, but not all. In some cases, the breadth of the topic means it makes more sense to incorporate them within the chapter.

Ms. Brenneman advocated for more consistency. She also expressed that it was important that all of the facets of the visioning report be included in the plan document.

Staff stated that they intended for the appendices to act as a toolkit. They include, for example, forms and permits for closing streets, and information about stringing lights across streets for placemaking.

Staff asked the Steering Committee to focus their comments on:

- Any missing information; areas that seem incomplete

- The information about the Main Street program
- Moving the placemaking background information to an appendix
- The subsection on sustainability and resiliency
- Moving the subarea information from Chapter 3 to Chapter 1

Ms. Brenneman suggested going chapter by chapter rather than discussing the entire plan document during a single meeting.

Ms. McKibben said staff intend to provide the Steering Committee with the recommended actions tables to go with each chapter for the next meeting.

Ms. Pierce gave the Steering Committee a two-week deadline for comments of Friday, November 13. The deadline is flexible for those doing more intense copy edits.

VI. Future Meetings

Staff reported there are a number of committee members who are interested in a hybrid meeting, both in-person and virtually. Staff were looking into that possibility, but it was set aside once the CBJ moved to Risk Level Three. Ms. Pierce said that Assembly Chambers has a new audio system that makes a hybrid meeting more possible, provided the risk level is lowered.

The next meeting is scheduled for November 19. One of the Committee members now has a conflict on Thursdays, so moving forward the Steering Committee will consider holding meetings on a different day of the week.

VII. Adjournment

Ms. Ware motioned to adjourn. Mr. Glidmann seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 7:02 P.M.

Next Meeting Date: November 19, 2020, 6 P.M., Zoom Webinar