



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

**August 27, 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  
Iris Matthews

**Steering Committee Members Absent:**

Patty Ware

**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**

**III. Public Participation**

**IV. Steering Committee Updates**

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

**a. Continued discussion about future land use in Aak'w Kwaan District and Downtown**

**b. Introduction to Waterfront District**

**VI. Introduction to Chapter 2 Implementation**

**VII. Committee Comments**

Ms. Woll asked where Staff was at with the draft of Chapter 5.

Ms. McKibben stated that Staff had not gotten too far with new language in the draft. They had left off with land use in the Aak'w Kwaan, Glacier Avenue, and downtown Juneau area. She asked how committee would like information presented.

Ms. McKibben summarized information from the previous meeting for members who missed had not been able to attend. Specifically, mixed-use zoning, placemaking, recommended actions from the visioning report, and maps. She also introduced topics for this meeting, including neighborhoods and waterfront, as well as an implementation table. Ms. McKibben provided a recap of land use designations, dimensional standards, and zoning districts and discussed existing land use patterns downtown and Missing Middle Housing, as well as design guidelines. Ms. McKibben discussed the Committee's preference from the last meeting for incentives, instead of guidelines or requirements and asked for additional placemaking ideas or if the Committee would like to move on from this.

Ms. Brenneman asked about open meetings, communication, and how comments are incorporated. Ms. McKibben explained the Open Meetings Act and how sending comments to Staff works.

Ms. Brenneman asked about the readability of the maps. She prefers the maps shown during the beginning of the Committee's work and asked if it was possible to see those again. She also asked about "cheat sheet" printouts for maps, dimensional standards, and land use designations and expressed concerns about incentivizing using bonus points. Ms. Brenneman suggested that the CBJ try a different methodology for incentives.

Ms. McKibben offered printouts and different types of maps. She also suggested that the Committee have a deeper discussion about incentives. She thinks the bonus points can work, but what is currently in place won't work for a variety of reasons.

Ms. Pierce suggested making a general recommendation.

Mr. Day suggested a placemaking initiative at the Telephone Hill Park. He thinks the area has potential to be revitalized. He also suggested Cathedral Park and Warner's Wharf.

Ms. Martinson suggested programming as an incentive for locals to use a space, and that the current situation would be different with sufficient programming. She suggested additional placemaking in the South Franklin area to draw more locals to the area, and more play areas or family destinations for locals.

Ms. Ramiel agreed with Ms. Martinson. Ms. Ramiel stated that she has a lot of questions and comments about Chapter 5, but had missed the last two meetings. She asked who would implement placemaking.

Ms. McKibben referenced Chapter 6, and said that the idea is to reemphasize placemaking and talk about suggestions specific to the sub districts. The effort is to link the concepts in Chapter 6 to individual areas. She also noted that there would be a comprehensive list of who would do what in the implementation chapter.

Ms. Brenneman mentioned the concrete area on the Archipelago Lot and noted that it looks like you could put water and an ice rink there in the winter. Some might consider the Rock Dump as the “gateway” to downtown, if you’re arriving by water. She suggested that it could be improved around the south edges with benches, a walkway, or landscaping, and noted that it is the first thing millions of people see when they come into Juneau on the cruise ships. Ms. Brenneman suggested that Gold Creek could be revitalized with keeping the area clean and improving the area across Parkshore, and the concrete near Foodland could be removed so people can see salmon spawning.

Ms. Gerger said the Seawalk reminds her of Myrtle Edwards Park in Seattle, which has interactive sculptures. She suggested that Juneau could model parts of the Seawalk off that park and engage local artists.

Ms. Woll agreed and said there are places in that park that incorporate natural habitat and seal haul outs. She stated there isn’t really anything like that in Juneau, and it would be neat to incorporate the marine area.

Ms. Ramiel asked about the gym in the Terry Miller building and if it is community space.

Ms. Brenneman confirmed that the gym is still there and is supposed to be for community use.

Ms. Matthews stated in chat: I agree with all of the ideas from Laura, Kirby, Talia and Betsy. I also love festive lighting/landscaping for the downtown core and the Seawalk. As we discuss neighborhoods, I think signage for individual neighborhood communities is a wonderful way to create community.

Ms. Gerger stated in chat: I forgot to add this, but I think we need to make the area in between the end of the Seawalk and the wharf nicer to walk through. It’s a bit grim especially in comparison to what’s next to it right now

Ms. McKibben introduced residential districts and reminded the Committee of the discussion of the Missing Middle Housing concept. She asked the Committee to think about the relationship of zoning and land use designations.

Ms. Brenneman discussed changing the Glacier area to a type of zoning that is mixed, but noted that it doesn't feel like commercial is mixed enough. She suggested that the zoning and land use designation reflect that.

Ms. McKibben asked if it would make sense to have the area as Traditional Town Center (TTC) and Mixed Use (MU), or MU2; it could also be Light Commercial (LC). She reminded the Committee that recommendations could be higher level.

Ms. Matthews stated that the Willoughby Plan and Housing Action Plan include ideas for mixed use. She suggested that the Committee emphasize housing wherever possible and asked if the plans were consistent with one another, and which takes precedent. She also asked which parts of the map don't reflect the value of the plan.

Ms. McKibben stated that the Willoughby plan was never really implemented. She asked if the group wanted to see zoning and land use designations to reflect the plan.

Mr. Worl asked if the zoning needed to be amended to encourage housing and if the parking areas could remain with housing above the existing parking lots. He felt it is important to make sure that zoning allows for it.

Ms. Martinson suggested housing potential at the Rock Dump.

Ms. Pierce stated that there are issues with a lack of industrial land.

Ms. Martinson asked if there was a way to have people live in an industrial area and be comfortable with that.

Mr. Dye said that Lemon Creek doesn't love the dump and there is language in that plan to explore options to move the dump. He suggested a few paragraphs to help clarify.

Ms. Matthews stated that industrial land isn't necessarily compatible with vibrant downtowns and the group should refocus on its mission and vision.

Mr. Day suggested that Mr. Dye weigh in on adding housing to an industrial zone.

Ms. McKibben asked the group to focus on the Highlands, Chicken Ridge, and Starr Hill.

Mr. Heumann asked about the area next to Aurora Arms, where CBJ was looking into putting in a road. He also asked if the City would consider selling land to encourage development.

Ms. McKibben stated that CBJ is holding the land until the Hazard maps are complete.

Mr. Heumann asked about undeveloped land that the City owns.

Ms. McKibben said she would make notes about that and gather more information. She suggested that the group move forward, for now. She then introduced Chapter 2 and suggested that the group discuss the concepts. Ms. McKibben described the table and how it will be use, with an example from the transportation chapter. She introduced the concept of “proposed implementer” or “implementing partner” to introduce the idea that the design is to be friendlier and recognize that implementing a plan is a partnership and there are many different actors. Chapter 2 will be the chapter that most people will look at.

Ms. Brenneman suggested in chat: I’d suggest Proposed Implementing Partners.

The Committee agreed on that recommendation.

Ms. Woll stated that she appreciated the crosswalk between the chapters and suggested a thematic grouping instead of chapter grouping.

Ms. McKibben said there are a couple of ways that could be accomplished, including grouping by the focus areas from the Visioning Report.

Ms. Matthews suggested that all the actions need to be action oriented and that we need to break things down between goals and actions.

Ms. Pierce stated that is how the Parks & Rec Master Plan is organized.

Ms. McKibben said that the goal is to make more finite recommendations.

Mr. Dye emphasized the need for a Downtown Coordinator.

Ms. McKibben introduced additional meeting dates.

Ms. Brenneman stated that she would send more edits.

## **VIII. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:47 P.M.

Next Meeting Date: September 17, 2020, 6 P.M., Zoom Webinar