

**ASSEMBLY STANDING COMMITTEE
COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE**
Meeting Minutes – June 6, 2022

I. CALL TO ORDER

The Assembly Committee of the Whole Meeting, held in the Assembly Chambers and broadcasted virtually via Zoom following the Special Assembly meeting, was called to order by Deputy Mayor Gladziszewski at 6:07p.m.

II. LAND ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Mayor Weldon provided the following land acknowledgment: We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land, and wish to honor the indigenous people of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. *Gunalchéesh!*

III. ROLL CALL

Assemblymembers Present: Maria Gladziszewski, Wade Bryson, Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Greg Smith (via Zoom), Christine Woll, Michelle Hale, Carole Triem, ‘Wáahlaal Gíidaak and Mayor Beth Weldon.

Assemblymembers Absent: None

Staff Present: City Manager Rorie Watt, City Attorney Robert Palmer, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Deputy Clerk Diane Cathcart, CDD Planning Manager Scott Ciambor, Finance Director Jeff Rogers, Engineering/Public Works Director Katie Koester, City Architect Jeanne Rynne, Port Director Carl Uchytel, Library Director John Thill, City Museum Director Beth Weigel, Lands and Resources Director Dan Bleidorn, Parks and Recreation Director George Schaaf, Tourism Manager Alexandra Pierce, Assistant City Attorney Sherri Layne, CDD Planners Teri Camery and Irene Gallion.

IV. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Hearing no objection, the agenda was approved as presented by unanimous consent.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- A. February 14, 2022 DRAFT Assembly COW Minutes
- B. March 7, 2022 DRAFT Assembly COW Minutes

Hearing no objection, the above minutes were approved by unanimous consent.

VI. AGENDA TOPICS

A. Short Term Rentals & Housing Action Plan Update

Assemblymember Greg Smith disclosed that he does not currently have AirBnB customers but will be starting to have customers through AirBnB in the near future. He stated that he discussed

this with the City Attorney and was advised that any actions that he may take from a policy standpoint was likely in a general enough nature that he would not need to recuse himself.

Hearing no comments or objections, Mr. Smith remained at the dais for the remainder of this discussion.

Community Development Planning Manager Scott Ciambor gave a presentation touching on the status of Housing in the community focusing on those areas currently under high pressure on the housing stock, a rise in Short Term Rentals (STRs) and he provided an update on the Housing Action Plan. He explained that what we do know about Short Term Rentals in the community is that they are currently very dynamic and there are a lot of unknowns that CBJ does not have data about.

Mr. Ciambor and Mr. Rogers then answered questions from Assemblymembers related to collections of sales tax on short term rentals, specifically as it relates to AirBnB. Mr. Rogers said that at this time, CBJ does not currently have an agreement with AirBnB to collect sales tax on behalf of CBJ. He said that most rental owners list their spaces on multiple sites. The owners would be required to collect and remit sales tax regardless of the platform they rent from. He cautioned that if AirBnB was collecting the sales tax, CBJ would not have as much data that they currently receive from the owners when they register and remit sales tax on their own behalf.

When asked about the tracking and collecting of sales taxes for STRs, especially for services like AirBnB and Vacation Rental By Owners (VRBO), Mr. Rogers explained that those are classified as local sales rather than remote sales since the owners and services are located within the community. He said that it is a nuanced issue but at present the remote sales tax collection commission considers the STRs as a local brick and mortar sale within the local community and would not qualify as a remote sales tax service.

Mr. Ciambor, in continuing with his presentation, explained that the land use code does not have a definition of Short Term Rentals (STRs) in the Table of Permissible Uses (TPU). Ms. Gladziszewski asked how it is that AirBnBs/STRs were not already incorporated into the Bed and Breakfast section of the TPU. Mr. Ciambor said that the land use code does have a very specific definition with respect to Bed-and-Breakfasts (BnBs), boarding houses and rooming houses and that differs from STRs by the requirement that the BnBs are owner occupied dwellings with multiple rooms available to rent.

Ms. Gladziszewski spoke to a document that she had compiled in Excel format that compared parts of the TPU, what is and isn't allowed or defined in the current code.

Mr. Ciambor then finished up his presentation answering questions from Assemblymembers. He pointed to the following recommendations as found on the memo in the packet:

- Continue to aggressively pursue Housing Action Plan strategies to increase supply to the housing stock;
- Appropriate funding to hire short-term rental monitoring services;

- Prioritize updates to the Land Use Code Table of Permissible Uses to better define classifications of housing, including Short-Term Rentals.

Assemblymember Hale and 'Wáahlaal Gíidaak noted that whatever programs they implement, they wanted to be sure that whatever the Assembly does with respect to helping to create housing opportunities, they want to be sure those aren't then turned into STRs.

Mr. Ciambor answered additional questions from Assemblymembers about the current policies and procedures for the accessory apartment grant program and the tax abatement program.

Assemblymembers weighed in on the need to get more data, to be mindful that Juneau is the Capital City and there is the potential for special sessions of the Legislature overlapping with the summer season and the competitive nature of providing housing during those times even if it is short term. They also noted the challenges that CDD has been having with staffing resources and while they just restored one position, they have to be mindful to also provide the resources to their department so they can handle the workload the Assembly has tasked them with.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that they have been discussing a myriad of issues as relates to this topic: Land Use Code, Sales Tax Abatement, and Housing Action Plan all combined in the same conversation. She said that makes it difficult to determine which path they should be looking at going down.

Ms. Triem said that Juneau's role as the Capital City goes both ways that we need to have enough housing options for state employees full time as well as those who are here for legislative session. She noted that if there is not enough housing available in Juneau, state jobs will be located elsewhere where they can find housing.

MOTION by Ms. Triem to direct attorney to draft ordinance requiring the registration of short term rentals and for the ordinance to be brought back to the COW for review and consideration.

In speaking to her motion, Ms. Triem asked that they start this process right away so that they can collect the data. She said many other communities already have these types of ordinances on the books and we don't have to begin from scratch; she suggested the Atlanta regulations could be a model for a new CBJ ordinance.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked for comments on the motion.

Ms. Woll asked Ms. Triem about the requirement for people to register their STRs rather than have a 3rd party consultant monitoring them.

Ms. Triem noted that the ordinance could provide for both those things to go hand in hand. She said that they could potentially contract with one service to provide the registration process that would make it very simple and another service that would be doing the monitoring. She said she doesn't see those services as mutually exclusive.

Ms. Gladziszewski said that the motion is one step on this path and, if it passes, it would be brought back to the next meeting.

Mr. Watt said that implied in that motion is that staff would bring back a number of options for definitions of STRs since different jurisdictions handle them differently and he would expect that would become part of the Assembly's discussion at the next meeting.

Ms. Hale asked if Ms. Triem could clarify that she is proposing that this ordinance would require people to register their STRs in addition to their sales tax registration. Ms. Triem agreed that was correct.

There being no further questions and hearing no objection, the motion passed by unanimous consent.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon for staff to draft an ordinance that would appropriate up to \$20,000 to hire one of these firms to monitor the registration process for short term rentals.

Ms. Triem asked Mr. Ciambor to clarify if both the registration and monitoring services he mentioned in his presentation could be done by one company or if it would be two separate things. Mr. Ciambor responded that of the four companies he mentioned in his slide presentation, they could perform both the registration and the monitoring services and those could be tailored to fit the definitions of the STRs in the CBJ ordinance and that could be done for \$12,000-\$20,000.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Mayor Weldon if she intended this ordinance to come back to the COW to be discussed at the same time as the ordinance requested by Ms. Triem. Mayor Weldon confirmed that was the case.

Hearing no objection, the motion passed by unanimous consent.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked members what else they need to know when they discuss this next, specifically as it relates to STRs.

Mr. Smith said that he would be interested in moving in the direction of looking at the companies that are out there that collect and remit sales tax.

Ms. Woll asked if the money in the previous motion would be a one-time fee or a long term ongoing payment. Mayor Weldon stated that her intent was for a one-time fee. Any additional fees could potentially be paid from the revenues from the STRs.

Mr. Rogers provided the following information on the sales tax collection/remitting options: Option 1 is the current status quo where the owner themselves is the responsible party, they are required to register, collect and remit the sales tax.

Option 2 is that CBJ would sign an agreement with AirBnB and/or VRBO stating that they are responsible for collecting and remitting sales tax and hotel bed tax on behalf of the property owners.

Option 3 would be for CBJ to use a separate 3rd party that would operate and work a little bit more like the remote sales tax platform.

Additional discussion took place and Ms. Gladziszewski asked staff to bring back some of those options, any analysis of what might be the best method for registration, collection, and remitting sales taxes and hotel taxes. She also asked staff to bring back any reports on neighborhood and land use issues and analysis and whether or not we are hearing complaints from people in the neighborhoods.

Mr. Bryson asked about the time length where a residential rental becomes a STR and if that was already in the code.

Mayor Weldon asked if there is anything in code that is or could be incorporated into code that would require the ownership of STRs to be owned by Alaska residents.

Mr. Palmer answered Mr. Bryson's question that the timeline for STR vs. residential rentals is 30 days. Any rentals over a 30 day timeline are not required to collect and remit sales and hotel/bed taxes. Any rentals at 30 days or less are required to collect and remit sales and hotel/bed taxes. Mr. Palmer said that with respect to the Mayor's questions, we have something similar to the concept in our code already with BnBs in that it has to be owner occupied on site. That gets around a delicate issue of "outside owners" since an outside owner could be a business.

MOTION by 'Wáahlaal Gíidaak that management bring back an ordinance to fix the accessory apartment funds that it be mandatory to be used for long term rental units only.

Objection by Ms. Woll and Ms. Hale.

Ms. Woll said that she was objecting as she would like to see the data come back about who should be in charge of doing STRs before they limit those funds.

Ms. Hale said since the amount is \$6,000 and barely enough to pay for their CDD permits, she is in favor of letting that 2-year process play out and then circling back to this to see if they may want to increase the amount given through that program.

Mayor Weldon also objected for the same reasons stated by Ms. Woll.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs spoke in favor of the motion as even if it is a small amount of money, since it is still public money some of it is still going to potentially affect what is a crisis in community.

'Wáahlaal Gíidaak said that she wasn't around for the initial discussion and she appreciates this discussion. In looking at the notes in front of them, at the time it was adopted, 8 of the 27 units are being used for STRs. She said that is a significant number in her book and a significant number that they can make one small fix in the grant program to affect that change.

Mr. Bryson said he sees two different trains of thoughts before them – he said the current motion is a band aide to try and fix one small portion of the issue where the other path is to look at the big picture and find solutions. He said that he would not be supportive of this motion as he'd rather try to tackle the bigger issue at hand and not try to put a number of band aide solutions together.

Ms. Gladziszewski spoke in favor of the motion. She said that this is public money in the form of a tax abatement subsidy for \$6,000 of public money, some of which is currently going to fund STRs. She said the purpose of the tax abatement program was to subsidize the creation of rental housing for the residents of Juneau.

Roll Call Vote

Ayes: 'Wáahlaal Gíidaak, Hughes-Skandijs, Smith, Triem, Gladziszewski

Nays: Bryson, Hale, Woll, Weldon

Motion carried 5 Ayes, 4 Nays.

Ms. Triem thanked staff for bringing this to them, for their presentation and she agrees with Ms. Hughes-Skandijs that this is a crisis and unlike Mr. Bryson, she feels that one solution isn't going to be able to fix everything and she thinks this is something the Assembly will need to continue to work on. She said that the number 1 recommendation in the memo is to pursue aggressively Housing Action Plan strategies and she would like to continue to do that, preferably within the COW if the Deputy Mayor would allow it.

Mayor Weldon echoed Ms. Triem's comments and reiterated Ms. Triem's recommendation to Assemblymembers to be sure to read the Housing Action Plan. Mayor Weldon said she re-read it today and found hidden gems that she had not remembered were in there.

B. 1% Sales Tax

Ms. Gladziszewski, in speaking to Mr. Watt, said that they discussed this topic this morning. The packet contains a list, which is in very tiny print, but she asked if staff could provide an updated list along with explanations to bring back to the next meeting that they could vote on.

Mr. Watt said that they are working on a version 2 that is more readable with a description of everything on the list. He said that the goal for this meeting is to confirm that all the ideas are there that were submitted to them. He said that if the committee is happy with everything that is listed, he will bring them back something easier to work on.

Mayor Weldon thanked staff for this information and their work on this. She agreed with Ms. Gladziszewski that they would like to see the next list include detailed explanations and she also noted that the Capital Civic Center group has asked to be removed from the list.

Mr. Smith asked if there were projects on this list that may be of too small a size to be included. He said that maybe that is something they deal with when it comes to voting on the items on the list at the next meeting.

Mr. Watt said that generally this funding source has been used in bigger blocks but that doesn't mean that there cannot be smaller projects included. He said that there are some items on this list that historically may not have been included. He said that they will try to categorize it and make it a little more accessible. He said that some of these ideas have other options such as possibly doing bonds for schools and/or parks. He said that the five years of sales tax are estimated at \$60.2 million and if they can't fund everything on the list, they may look at alternative avenues to take for some of those projects.

Ms. Triem asked about the process and how the decisions are made with respect to the amounts and scheduling for each project happens. She asked how those decisions occur and when they occur and how do they care for inflation rates for those projects that are done in year 5 as opposed to those done in year 1.

Additional discussion took place regarding the overall list/projects that are determined by the Assembly and staff determines the various timelines associated and they follow the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) list that is adopted annually by the Assembly. Mr. Watt walked them through the list that was included in the COW packet. He provided the explanation that the items at the top portion of the list were the projects discussed by the Assembly Finance Committee Worksession and that the bottom portion of the list are from those items that the public provided input on.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked about the timing and when the Assembly would receive an updated/ranked list. Mr. Watt explained that he would get a consolidated list with descriptions within a week to Assemblymembers and ask them to return their ranking preferences to him by June 22. He said that provides a little more time to see what the state budget (and any vetoes) might look like to affect this list.

C. New City Hall

Engineering/Public Works Director Katie Koester invited the architect team to provide a presentation and concept of the New City Hall proposed for the 455 Whittier location. The architect team was comprised of James Bibb and Sean Boily of Northwind Architects and Steve Simpson from SRS Architecture in Portland, OR who joined them via Zoom.

Mr. Bibb provided a slide show presentation explaining the location and the conceptual designs for the building of approximately 45,000 square feet, uses, and provided comparative examples from city halls within Alaska as well as across the U.S.

Mr. Simpson provided an overview of the building shape separating the underground parking garage from the pedestrian entrance/access as well as their proposed building design elements to make it LEED energy efficient that would be solar energy ready.

Mr. Boily then provided an overview of the associated costs for the proposed design. He said that using a two-year escalation formula at (5%/year), the construction cost would be \$28,403,000 with development cost at \$9,515,000 bringing the amount to \$37,918,000 for a model that would not include a parking garage in the basement. If they were to add the cost of the basement parking similar to the parking under the State Museum parking garage under its structure, that parking cost would be \$3,330,000, that would bring the total project cost with basement parking to \$41,248,000.

Staff and the architects answered questions related to the presentation as well as the memo in the packet from Director Koester. The first portion of the discussion was related to whether or not the Assembly Chambers would or would not be included in the New City Hall. They also discussed the pros/cons of using brick vs. metal structure. In answer to questions from the Assembly, the architects explained that their charge was to provide conceptual renderings along with potential numbers. Mayor Weldon asked if this proposal included the cost to implement solar within the design. The architects explained that their design concept was to make it solar ready but not to include full solar panel implementation at this early stage. Director Koester also noted that this conceptual design was the high level basis concept to be able to bring a cost estimate to the voters. The last slide showed that there still needs to be a refinement of a number of the decisions on the design along with conversation about parking. This is a vision of what it could be but this is far from the design element details at this time.

Ms. Triem asked Mr. Boily about the ability or risk of putting parking underground this close to the ocean and what type of risk might be involved. Mr. Boily said they looked at similar basement spaces in the area and said they compared the Sealaska which has its archives in the basement while the State Archives and Museum has their parking in the basement.

Mr. Smith asked if underground parking would prohibit a ground source heat pump. Mr. Boily said that the location of the building site is a bit small for ground source heat. He said that this proposed design includes an air source heat pumps. He answered questions from Ms. Hughes-Skandijis about the possibility for solar panel heat sources as well.

Director Koester pointed the members to page 3 of 4 of her memo and to discuss and decide upon the below recommendations listed in the memo. She noted that this lists the items in order of easiest decisions first.

- Discuss and confirm that Assembly Chambers should be included in the facility.
- Discuss and confirm that underground parking should not be included in the project; that municipal resources for parking in the area should go towards the North State Office Building Garage project.
- Discuss and determine whether to direct staff to draft an ordinance for introduction to put a general obligation bond before the voters at the October 2022 municipal election. Dollar amount of bond is either \$38.2M, \$31.9M, or \$25.6M depending on whether Assembly is willing to appropriate proposed \$6.3M of general fund and whether the project will also be included in the slate of projects for the 1% sales tax extension.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon to include the Assembly Chambers in the New City Hall project. *Hearing no objection, the motion passed by unanimous consent.*

MOTION by Mayor Weldon that the underground parking should not be included as part of the discussion until they get to a later date.

She noted that we are currently working on trying to help facilitate the north State Office Building parking solution and that may also help with our own parking needs and this would shave off money from the project while also helping relieve the risk concerns raised by Ms. Triem.

Ms. Triem objected for purposes of a question. She asked if parking could be added after the fact. Ms. Koester noted that there is surface parking available in the area and they are also working the proposed north State Office Building parking solution. Ms. Triem maintained her objection stating she was concerned that they were making a decision for a long term building with only short term availability of parking and that surface parking anywhere is not the highest and best use of any surface lots in the area.

Ms. Hale spoke about attending the Chamber of Commerce meeting at the previous week talking about the north State Office Building parking and she agreed with Ms. Triem that they should be reducing the use of surface area parking. Additional discussion took place about the state funding for that project, the timelines involved, and Mr. Watt provided timelines and funding sources for the state project as well as those involved with the New City Hall spaces.

Mr. Bryson spoke to the cost of constructing and maintaining a parking garage space downtown is approximately \$80,000 per space.

Mayor Weldon said that she was just following the recommendations in the memo but in fact she would object to her own motion as she would like to continue to have this as an option on the table for future discussion. *Mayor Weldon withdrew her motion and replaced it with the following motion:*

MOTION by Mayor Weldon to include the underground parking in the New City Hall concept and continue this discussion at a later date.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Mr. Watt if he could provide feedback on the costs associated with parking garage spaces as raised by Mr. Bryson. Mr. Watt explained that there would be a range and that when talking about parking garages, they are also talking about the circulation space, the stairwells/elevators and when it comes to the full price tag, it would be realistic to think it could range between \$70-80,000.

AMENDED MOTION by Mayor Weldon that we continue this discussion and not put this GO Bond before the voters at the October 2022 Municipal Election.

In speaking to her motion, Mayor Weldon said that while she appreciates the work and presentation by the architects, she thinks this is a cool project and there is hope for it but she doesn't think we have brought the public along. She said there is quite a bit of fine tuning needed to be done, including the parking or no parking question. She said that when the voters are unsure, she doesn't want to have it on the same election as when they are asking voters to vote on the 1% Sales Tax ballot question. She said that she wants more time to bring the public along further in this process.

Ms. Triem asked if this does get put back a year, what money may need to be spent in the current City Hall facility since there are some immediate needs for building maintenance on the current building.

Ms. Koester explained that they had been deferring some maintenance on the current City Hall while they were awaiting the decisions about the New City Hall. She noted that the estimated repairs at this time come to approximately \$12,000,000 which includes a wide variety of repairs including repainting the façade, fixing the plaster, replacing the windows and roof. She noted that some decisions on investing real dollars into the current City Hall need to be made in the near term.

Mr. Bryson asked for a brief at ease.

Mayor Weldon withdrew her amended motion as some of the points raised by Mr. Bryson during the recess have changed her mind.

MOTION by Mr. Bryson to direct staff to draft an ordinance to introduce a General Obligation (GO) Bond to put before the voters at the October 2022 Regular Municipal Election with a dollar amount up to \$41,248,000.

In speaking to his motion, the concern was that the public has not bought into the concept of a new city hall. He said that we rent space all over town and that our current City Hall is too old and needs too much in repair costs while at the same time paying as much as we do for rent. He spoke to the long term fiscal impacts and that this would solve the issue for the long run and he believes the community would support this.

Mayor Weldon said that she would support Mr. Bryson's motion as this is just June and there is time for educating the public on this issue and she too was concerned with the price it would cost to do the needed repairs at the current City Hall.

Mr. Smith asked if staff could provide additional information about what they know about commercial office space locations/availability. Director Koester explained that taking into account that she is neither an economist nor a real estate professional, they did answer some of those questions when they did their site selection search. She said that they were really looking for a vacant facility with an approximate square foot size and while they were looking at potential properties, they were getting scooped up by other entities so the market for those

facilities has been relatively hot. She said that they did talk with the state and the state leasing officer about leasing the Goldbelt/PFD building and they were told that lease had already been turned over. Mr. Watt said that all along, they were trying to look at apples to apples comparisons. He said that when looking at this being a long term, nothing is going to be as good of a solution as a purpose built New City Hall. When looking at other options, yes there would be entities that may want to rent long term to the city but in looking at the other options out there, none of them looked like good long term solutions.

Ms. Hale objected for purposes of a question. She asked if the ordinance was drafted for an amount of up to \$41,248,000.00, would that be the question that would go to the voters or if they were to forward fund or pay down some of those costs, what discretion does the Assembly have in order to change the question on the ballot. She then removed her objection.

Mr. Palmer said that the current motion is for an ordinance to be drafted in the amount of \$41,248,000 and that is the amount that would go to the voters if the motion passes. He said that if they wanted that number to be smaller, they would need to put cash towards that fund to make the GO Bond smaller.

Ms. Hale asked when they need to make that decision on the actual amount. Ms. Gladziszewski said that Mr. Bryson's motion was using the "up to \$41,248,000" language because they are not sure of the number and he is trying to get something drafted. Mr. Watt explained that the ordinance introduction date would be at the July 11 Assembly meeting with public hearing/adoption on August 1 for inclusion on the ballot. He said that the subtlety here is that they are asking the voters for the authorization to issue debt. He said that the up to language doesn't really matter with the voters because the question being asked of the voters would be yes or no, could incur debt at this amount.

He said that in other instances in which the Assembly has used the "up to" language, that has been on appropriating ordinances out of funds the Assembly already has the availability and authority to spend. This would be asking the voters for the authority to incur debt at a certain amount and they would need to decide what ordinance will be introduced at the July 11 meeting. Mr. Watt provided a timeline and options. They have introduced an ordinance for \$6,300,000 of general funds that will be up before them on at the June 13 Assembly meeting which would reduce the \$41,248,000 amount if they pass that ordinance. He said that they could determine if they want to include that project in the 1% Sales Tax options and they may also reduce any GO Bond amounts. He said those questions have to be sorted out before they put anything on the ballot.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Mr. Bryson about his intention for his motion and that the number he proposed was as a placeholder. Mr. Bryson agreed that his motion was to continue to move this discussion further.

Ms. Triem asked a process question how they would decide tonight not know what the outcome will be on June 13. Mr. Watt said that he thinks that what they are trying to decide tonight is

whether or not to put something forward on the ballot to the voters. He said that if they vote yes, the amount would potentially be adjusted on Monday, June 13 based on the action on the \$6,300,000 general fund ordinance action and that potentially it would be adjusted again if they also include it in the sales tax which adds some complexity to how the questions may appear on the ballot.

Mr. Watt said that he would think that Mr. Bryson's motion might be reworded to state: ***“to direct preparation for a GO Bond with the amount as determined through Assembly committee process over the next couple of weeks.”***

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Mr. Bryson if he would like to amend his motion. ***Mr. Bryson said that Mr. Watt's suggested motion language is exactly what he would like his motion to say.***

Mr. Smith said that he objects to the motion. He said that while he appreciates all the work that has been put into this, there are too many unknowns coming on the heels of the pandemic and this is not the right time to be asking the voters to fund a New City Hall.

Mayor Weldon stated that for purposes of a quick back of the napkin figure, if they do adopt the \$6,300,000 ordinance that would lower the amount of they are asking the voters to approximately \$35,000,00.

Mr. Watt noted that they did not cover the portion of the presentation that spoke to the debt capacity and they showed the slide of the Status Quo Forecast of Debt Service Mill Rate which showed that due to debt retirement in FY23, they would have the rare ability to incur debt service without raising the mill rate above the current 1.2 debt mill rate and that there would even be additional capacity for other GO debt if the Assembly chose to pursue that path for other projects. Additional discussion took place about the mill levy, the process still ahead of them.

Ms. Gladziszewski said that she agreed with Mr. Smith that there are a lot of details that still need to be worked out that she is concerned the voters would not be willing to support this even if with a robust educational campaign about the complexities involved.

Roll Call Vote on Mr. Bryson's motion to direct staff to prepare a GO Bond ordinance to put a question on the ballot with the amount to be determined through Assembly committee process.

Ayes: Bryson, Woll, 'Wáahlaal Gíidaak, Hale, Hughes-Skandijs, Triem, Weldon

Nays: Smith, Gladziszewski

Motion carried 7 Ayes, 2 Nays.

The Assembly then provided flowers to Ms. Hughes-Skandijs and wished her a happy birthday.

V. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Assembly, the Committee of the Whole meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.