

SOUTH DOUGLAS / WEST JUNEAU AREA PLAN
Steering Committee Meeting
Zoom Webinar Format
Tuesday, August 2, 2022

MINUTES

Steering Committee Members Present:

<u>X</u> Carole Bookless	<u>X</u> Rebecca Embler	<u>X</u> Liz Smith
<u>X</u> Matt Catterson	<u>X</u> Arnold Liebelt	<u>X</u> Linda Snow
<u>X</u> Frank Delaney	<u>X</u> Robert Sewell	<u>X</u> Joyce Vick

☐ H. Erik Pederson, Planning Commission Liaison (non-voting)

☐ Kamal Lindoff, Property Manager, Douglas Indian Association Liaison (non-voting)

☐ Bernadine DeAris, Douglas Indian Association Liaison (non-voting)

☐ Annette Smith, Docks & Harbors Liaison (non-voting)

Staff Members Present:

X Beth McKibben, CDD Planner ☐ Scott Ciambor, CDD Planning Manager

☐ Jill Maclean, CDD Director

Agenda Items

- I. Call to order
The meeting was called to order at 5:05 p.m.
- II. Approval of July 21, 2022 Minutes
The minutes were approved by consensus with minor changes.
- III. Public Testimony on Agenda Items
None
- IV. Public Testimony on Non-Agenda Items

Liebelt made note that people may sign up for email notifications of meetings.

McKibben said she reached out the CBJ Public Information Officer about working with her to do more outreach for this planning effort.

Sewall was glad to hear that and would like the meetings to not be a secret.

McKibben said she had been through a number of planning processes and it is not unusual to not have much public participation at this point in the process.

Liebelt said it is most important to have public input at the next stage in the process when there is a draft plan.

Bookless noted consultation with the public is very important. One of the challenges is getting people involved during the summer.

V. Draft Elements with Goals (remaining)

McKibben offered committee members who were not at the last meeting that they may email her comments on the first three goals.

McKibben reviewed the vision statement and reminded the committee that it is the “touchstone” for the elements and that all goals and recommendations should serve to implement the vision. She reminded the Committee to keep the following questions in mind as they review the remaining draft goals.

- Do the elements capture the ideas presented in the vision statement?
- Are there any gaps?
- As the initial filter for the plan, do the goal statements make sense? Is it understandable?
- Are any goals duplicative?
- Are any goals too long?

She then asked the committee if the process they used at the previous meeting worked for them and if they would like to continue to follow that again. They would go around the room and each member could provide comments. She clarified there is no new material, that the packet is the same as provided at the last meeting.

Discussion on a Prosperous Community

Bookless recommended adding, “unfilled needs” to the second goal. For the third goal, suggested adding “doesn’t change neighborhood character. For the fifth goal was unclear about the meaning “access” to employment.

Catterson is not familiar with the term “in-fill development” and suggested it be clarified. He likes the second goal and suggested maybe another word than support or encourage.

Embler suggests adding “and small business” to the second goal. She wants to encourage growth that maintains the community character and is “right sized”. She said it captures what the community had talked about previously.

Liebelt is concerned about the term “mixed use”. He wonders if it means mixed types of housing or businesses with residential.

McKibben clarified that what was intended was mixing businesses with residential uses. She suggested parameters would be placed around uses to minimize external impacts of nonresidential uses. She said the text of the plan could expand and explain this concept in more detail.

Liebelt suggested adding “local” to the second goal. He is uncomfortable with the term “in-fill”. He suggested combining goal two and four. The fourth goal could be rephrased “to residents.” He wonders if the fifth goal belongs in this element. He is unsure about how the plan can support this goal.

Bookless asked if development of 6th avenue is considered infill development.

McKibben said it could be.

Bookless said she would like it to be clarified. She is opposed to the development of 6th Avenue. She is in favor of infill development such as mother in law apartments or increasing density in an appropriate way.

Snow likes the idea of adding “local” to the second goal. Suggested the sixth goal be in the healthy and active element. Suggested adding, “maintain infrastructure and systems that support economic activity”.

Vick agrees with the comments of others. She suggested “supporting” and “encouraging” but not “improving”. She agrees in fill can mean many different things. She suggested adding support to the fifth goal with the idea of not limiting something.

Sewall said we need to be careful to promote the right type of development. He wants the waterfront developed in a community enhancing way. He likes the concept of enhancing more year round activity in goal six. It recognizes how use of public spaces contribute to economic development. He likes the concept of mixed use if the uses “fit” together well. He would like the text to clarify what we mean when we talk about infill development. Suggested, “enhancing year-round employment opportunities”

Delaney supports clarifying what we mean by infill development. The fourth goal may be a strategy for the second goal. Supports combining goal one and five.

L. Smith likes how it is written and has no concerns with the comments.

Bookless the goals do not address equity. We want a community where all residents can meet their basic needs.

McKibben appreciates the equity question and combining several of the goals, including combining infill and mixed use. She explained that year-round public events could be an economic engine. Employment opportunities was mentioned in the meeting notes and she appreciates the idea of combining with live – work. She had not thought of it that way.

Sewall asked McKibben what she had in mind when she wrote “in fill development”. She said the concept similar to as Bookless and Sewall described. She explained the promoting in fill makes use of existing infrastructure and reduces cost of development. She mentioned that in many other communities, it is also seen as a way to prevent sprawl but with Douglas’ geography, it may not be as important for that reason.

Liebelt noted that all of these things have a domino effect, and when we having housing, and residents we need and get more services and business. We need a stable population to be the market and this is part of why he wants to make sure our community anchors stay here so people want to live here.

Bookless suggested replacing the term in fill with “encourage growth that efficiently uses existing infrastructure”.

Snow mentioned there are communities where people want to live and there are communities where there is an industry where people move there to work.

Discussion moved A Healthy and Active Community

Vick suggested combining goal 1 and 6, or removing the sixth goal. She suggested removing “quiet” from the fourth goal. She questioned “all ages and all abilities” in goal four. She prefers “promoting health and wellness” for goal five.

Snow mentioned that for goal five it could mean roads and transit. She reminded the committee of the discussion from the previous meeting about “all ages and abilities” and assumed that applied here as well. She asked if in goal three “local and traditional foods” meant Douglas specific.

McKibben said local could be interpreted in different way. In the concept of community gardens, it could be Douglas specific, or it could be broader and mean harvested meat, fish and berries.

L. Smith identified a few typos. For the fourth goal, she recommended taking out “quiet” because she worries it could be used to create conflict. She prefers “promote community health and wellness” for goal five. She wonders if goal six says what we mean. Suggested rephrasing.

Sewall says many Douglas residents live here because of the goals identified in the Healthy and Active Community. He wants some mention of quiet somewhere. He understands that not everyone will climb M. Juneau, but we need to be sure there is access to nature that accessible to the differently abled. He believes safety is an important value and it should be there in some way. He does not think that its realistic to expect the community to exist on local foods, but it’s a good value to keep.

Liebelt goal one is the same as goal six in connected community. He said for goal two could be revised to “everyone has access to”. He recollected a discussion about food security and how it applies to the third goal. We need to do more to improve food security. He suggested removing “quiet” from goal four. He agrees goal five “promote community health and wellness”. He suggests removing the six goal as he felt it was redundant.

Embler suggested adding action words to the first two goals. She suggested, “promote variety” for the goal two. For the fourth goal suggested a different verb than access. She prefers “promote community...” for the fifth goal and would remove the sixth goal.

Delaney likes Smith’s suggestions for edits to goal two. He feels it is important that access to all community member is important to call out. He suggests including food security in goal three and noted the connection to health services, and that maybe it is a strategy to promote community health. From an equity lens goal, six could say “a community where people of all backgrounds and identities feel safe”.

Catterson agrees with most of the previous comments.

Bookless noted her list of comments grew as she listened to others. She would like more emphasis on mental wellbeing. For goal two she would add infrastructure. She would like a food coop in Douglas, and that could fit within the third goal. She would like more access to health services closer to Douglas. She suggests adding “welcome” to the sixth goal in addition to Delaney’s suggestion. Consider adding encouraging healthy events. She would like the plan to address people cleaning up after their dogs. She would like the word “respect” added somewhere in the goals.

Vick suggests all the goals start with an active verb such as support or encourage.

Discussion moved to A Culturally and Artistically Rich Community

L. Smith left at 6 PM.

Embler the goals capture the main thoughts of what has been discussed previously. She suggested combining some goals but did not have specific suggestions for combining the goals.

Delaney suggested combining goal three and six could be combined. He suggested removing “unique” heritage and including totality of history. He wants to be sure we acknowledge all of Douglas’ history. He said that the term “unique’ used with history is used to gloss over history. He offered to work with staff to find some language that might be suitable. For the sixth goal, he found the phrasing odd. He is unclear as to what is meant. Clarify to be clear it is intended to include all kinds of art.

Vick agreed with Embler there is room to combine these goals and clarify. She suggests encourage or support versus provide.

Snow suggests honor instead of celebrate. Then remove all ages and abilities.

Bookless for the fourth goal asks why specifically small scale. Art and cultural experiences support physical social and physical health in an inclusive way. She agrees the language should clarify all types of art are meant.

Catterson agrees with combining goals three and four. Agrees with the point about unique heritage and it’s important to acknowledge the history.

Sewall agrees with combining some of the goals to be more concise. He likes the idea of small scale and opportunities for pop up things in addition to the large-scale events. These goals tie into his ideas for future uses of the Mt. Jumbo Gym –used for social community events. He would like to see more art that is meaningful and is tied into the community.

Liebelt agrees with the previous comments He would like art to be integrated into the fabric of the community, into new buildings and infrastructure and not a “set aside”.

McKibben asked the committee about how they want to approach the next meeting. She reminded them they need to spend a little time talking about parking. She asked the committee if they wanted to

start on the actions with revised goals or just move ahead. The committee agreed they would like revised goals before beginning work on the action/strategies.

Snow asked if the goals could be numbered.

VI. Parking Discussion
 None

VII. Draft Strategies/Actions

McKibben asked the committee about how they want to approach the next meeting. She reminded them they need to spend a little time talking about parking. She asked the committee if they wanted to start on the actions with revised goals or just move ahead. The committee agreed they would like revised goals before beginning work on the action/strategies.

VIII. Committee Comment

McKibben agreed to do that for the working draft, but suggested we may not want to number them in the actual document so that it does not imply “value” or ranking.

Liebelt asked the committee if they were OK with the meetings going until 7.

Bookless suggested sticking with the plan to stop by 6:30 so the meetings do not start to creep to 7:30 or 8.

Sewall agreed with sticking with the earlier end time. He suggested the first goal could say something like “celebrate (honor) preserve and promote Douglas and our whole history” or something similar.

Delaney told the committee that Perseverance Theater was offering their summer academy production and that tickets are available on line.

Sewall reminded the committee of the community get together on August 13th.

Snow said she was sad none of the Ironman activities were in Douglas.

IX. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 6:55 p.m.