

Called to order by Mr. Day, Chair 8:37 am

Present: Daniel, Kriby (chaired), Iris, Ricardo, Thalia, Betsy, Jill, Patty

Minutes approved 8:39 am, motion Ms. Brenemann with technical changes re: who is present, seconded by Ms. Matthews.

Questions: Ms. Benemann, pedestrian overlay, public process

Mr. Worl, technical question.

Public participation:

Emily Ferry, concerns about Calhoun and the public process

Steering committee updates:

Ms. Mckibben: Chapter 2

Ms. Pierce: NCL Dock at COW

Round table:

Items to discuss when we get to a specific section of the document

Mr. Gludmann: Document is big and dense – needs a good summary, well executed, word heavy

Ms. Ware: Read more smoothly than the most recent draft. Looking forward to chapter 2. A lot of the information will be consolidated into recommendations, etc. Needs more forcibly stated recommendations in Ch. 2. “These are things that the committee recommends”

Ms. Ramiel: Agrees with other two, wants to see near term, medium term, long term recommendations and a summary section. Public process/ document needs to be as exciting at the end as at the beginning

Ms. Matthews: Doesn't get excited. Feels like it has a lot of words but doesn't say anything. Doesn't mean anything without figuring out what the vision is. Lack of cohesion. How do we realize vision for vibrant downtown.

Mr. Worl: Formatting, structure will help accomplish the visionary piece on top of everything else. Highlights/visions/summary each chapter. Maybe telling people to change their expectations. Pull things out for everyday reader, community conversation, realizations. Housing, homelessness, parking, traffic are topics we need to 'go big' on.

Ms. Breneman: Plan is improved, needs more work, can be all over the map and needs to be more cohesive. Thinks that's confusing. One way to make more exciting/relevant to public is to be careful about language. Can we call the executive summary something else? Section called reality, realizations, here's what we see? No quasi recommendations, limp, get rid of them.

Ms. Griger: Too many words.

Mr. Day: Good job trying to pull together a variety of points and ideas, things from the past and new ideas for the future. Needs to be exciting. Rollout is going to be a challenge. Cliff notes, easy reference guide, and could provide some clarity. Organization is good but there are probably gaps.

Ms. Mckibben: clarifying question? Is it better to have recommendations in chapter or in tables?

Ms. Ware: Didn't see tables as recommendations at all. Verbage is misleading in certain places. Want things more clearly stated and doesn't want them at the end at the graphic. Less words. Shorter chapters, punch recommendations out.

Ms. Matthews: Too many recommendations in tables, thought we were developing priorities today.

Ms. Mckibben: A few clarifying thoughts, appreciates input. Appreciates comments about original marching orders holding us back a little. Hearing that the table doesn't come across as recommendations. When we get to the specific chapters it would be helpful to hear from everyone their top 3 priorities for each chapter when we get to the chapters discussion.

Vision statement:

Ms. Mckibben are we going to reopen the vision statement and change it or edit the vision statement as suggested?

Ms. Matthews: suggested letting vision go for now but let's get through priorities first

Vision discussion moved to the end of this meeting or a future meeting

Chapter Review

Ms. Mckibben: Asked whether to split up chapter 3 and add sections to chapters 1, 5, and 7.

Ms. Benemann: Doesn't want historic preservation to get lost but supports the idea generally

Mr. Day: Agrees, doesn't want to lose message.

Ms. Ware: Supports consolidation

Mr. Worl: On the fence and concerned about diluting other chapters

Ms. Benemann: Would it be helpful to have another table of contents with sub-headings

Chapter 1:

Mr. Gludmann: None

Mr. Worl: None

Ms. Benemann: Add maintaining quality of life for residents – add ensuring livability, and clearly add that line. Break up into columns. Make relationship to comp plan less wordy. Move piece about addendum to same paragraph on page 8. Clarify relationship between two documents. Clarify that it's area specific and not functional.

Ms. Matthews: Feels like the chapter speaks to the internal audience. Wants a visual montage that highlights things that are exciting downtown. Trying to understand how to reshape visions into actions and priorities

Ms. Brenemann: Renewed Vision for Downtown could be executive summary section. Wondering if we can't rewrite with our vision talking about the public process a little bit. Move 9 visions to page 6 under the visioning process.

Ms. Ramiel: Finds chart on page 5 is strange and not thought out. Be clear about improvement and achievement.

Ms. Mckibben: Do we do the list or a visual montage

Ms. Ware: Prefers the montage idea plus photos plus where they go with regard to chapters. Doesn't consider some of these things accomplishments.

Mr. Day: Maybe put a timeframe on improvements

Ms. Gregier: No comments

Mr. Day: Might want to include tram on list as an improvement, change seawall to seawalk, four points hotel not 4 seasons, include Goldbelt Dock and Intermediate Vessel Float under docks.

Mr. Gludmann: Eliminate list and create photo montage

Ms. Brenemann: Update map to edit language – sub areas vs. sub districts

Chapter 3

Mr. Gludmann: Supports splitting up chapter 3 into other chapters.

Mr. Worl: Asked how we determined the sequence could this be moved to the end while remaining its own chapter.

Ms. Brenemann: Leaning toward incorporating this into other chapters. Doesn't support moving to the end. Challenges around semantics of what we're calling visioning process.

Ms. Mckibben: Can we call the section community input and then add

Ms. Brenemann: Do we remove community visioning sections from chapters?

Ms. Matthews: Would like visioning process results removed from chapters. Creates confusion.

Ms. Ware: Supports consolidation. Likes suggestion of presenting community visioning process at beginning and not putting it at the beginning of chapters.

Ms. Ramiel: Wants timeline to end now instead of 1970

Ms. Gergier: No comments

Mr. Day: No comments.

Ms. Mckibben: Questions on the table

Ms. Ramiel: I want to see priorities today

Mr. Pierce: It would be great to see the top 5 priorities but I'm not sure whether the committee is ready to have that conversation

Ms. Ware: It would be easy for each of us to state our top 5 priorities and we should do that

Mr. Day suggested we use our time to go through the plan as discussed, Ms. Brenamann agreed that she didn't think that was the purpose.

Ms. Mckibben: We all work differently. Every committee member could easily pick their top 3 priorities for the plan as a whole. We can have a future meeting on that.

Chapter 4

Mr. Gludmann: no comments

Mr. Woll: Split up paragraphs in safe and welcoming downtown section with own headings. Offered to email suggestions. Concerned we could lose people with action items at the end. What if we were to base each chapter on our action items rather than the descriptions, charts, etc? Do we cut right to it and lead with actions?

Ms. Ramiel: Page 26 we should frame homelessness issue as a nationwide problem

Ms. Benemann: Can we start every chapter with actions/priorities instead of visions?

Ms. Pierce: Can we organize the table by the visions and throw priorities at the beginning

Ms. Breneemann: Rearrange and put priorities at the beginning.

Ms. Matthews: No additional comments

Ms. Ramiel: No comments

Ms. Ware: Passing for now

Ms. Gerger: No comments

Mr. Dye: Passing

Mr. Day: Page 30, good discussion on tourism businesses, doesn't like the word "shuttered" and section discussing industry "taking over" downtown. Page 31, word shuttered again, say businesses that aren't open year round instead. Edit language around "manage impacts of businesses that are shuttered".

Revise summary of McDowell report regarding Cruise industry impacts.

Ms. Mckibben: Would like to take information that is in text out and put information in graphics

Ms. Ramiel: Would like to see Main Street discussed as an action item in the Juneau economic plan.

Ms. Ware: Dese but critically important, most recommendations don't use the words "Blueprint Downtown". Thinks table is repetitive and would support collapsing. Wants table prioritized.

Ms. Mckibben: How did we do with expanding resiliency section?

Chapter 5:

Mr. Gludmann: none

Mr. Worl: Observation about graphs and maps. Would like to see more graphs and maps re: land use, neighborhoods. A useful graphic might be something similar to what is on page 41 that identifies properties or areas that have potential for more housing and type of housing that could go there.

Ms. Brenneman: This is an important chapter. Hard to see sub headings. Improve chapter design. There is a lot of text. Make headings more clear and break up chapter more. Same with visioning results leading everything.

Ms. Matthews: Nothing

Ms. Ramiel: Page 69, last sentence should read "We recommend incentivizing and requiring mixed use development where zoning accommodates and establishing alternatives...etc." last sentence. Would like to see that things are going to happen now. Ms. Ware agreed

Ms. Ware: nothing more

Ms. Brenneman: Remove could and should and either take out and put in front or add to tables. Make priorities or recommendations. Some of that has been changed since last meeting but is still concerned and makes text watered down and wishy washy.

Ms. Ware: The box placemaking opportunities should be recommendations. Call them recommendations. How does the text in this plan dovetail with our values and our vision for downtown?

Ms. Brenneman: Would like some guidance on priorities.

Ms. Mckibben: Specific ideas are both big and small. Open to all levels.

Discussion on process going forward:

Mr. Dye said that specifics are important in plans

Ms. Mckibben suggested we have another meeting to complete the process.

Ms. Brenneman: Clear guidance and no other versions of the plan until we discuss priorities.

Ms. Mckibben to send doodle for next meeting

Ms. Matthews created a visual representation of the table of contents

Ms. Mckibben to send more information on priorities.

Ms. Brennamann suggested pedestrians and walkability be added to the chapter of the Transportation chapter.

