



**Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting Agenda
Virtual & Telephonic**

November 19, 2020, 6:00 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present:

Karena Perry, Chair
Betsy Brenneman
Kirby Day
Laura Martinson

Ricardo Worl
Patty Ware
Iris Matthews
Tahlia Gerger

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Daniel Glidmann, Michael Heumann, Nathaniel Dye, Jill Ramiel

Staff:

Beth McKibben, Project Manager
Joseph Meyers, Planner I

Assembly Members:

None

I. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:04 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

a. August 13, 2020 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting

MOTION: By Mr. Worl to approve the August 13, 2020 minutes. Ms. Ware seconded.

The motion passed with no objection.

b. September 17, 2020 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting

MOTION: By Ms. Brenneman to approve the September 17, 2020 minutes. Mr. Worl seconded.

The motion passed with no objection.

c. October 29, 2020 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting

MOTION: By Ms. Martinson to approve the October 29, 2020 minutes. Mr. Worl seconded.

The motion passed with no objection.

III. Steering Committee Updates

Staff reported that Norwegian Cruise Lines (NCL) had a meeting about the downtown subport. Staff will share future meetings with the Steering Committee when they receive notice. Staff intend to reach out to Paul Voelckers with MRV Architects to talk about the subport and linkages to Blueprint Downtown.

Ms. Ware said NCL talked about the whole section as having a focus on connecting the Seawalk, lots of green space, and honored the Aak'w Kwaan. Instead of calling it the Subport, they will call it the Aak'w Kwaan Landing. One side of the dock will be monitored and used by the U.S. Coast Guard. NCL wanted to make sure they included ocean education, so their presentation referenced the ocean museum. Ms. Ware said she felt like it was less about cruise ships and forcing increased tourism on Juneau, and more about integration with community visioning.

Ms. Martinson said she was impressed with their attention to the traffic patterns and trying to mitigate those impacts, for both pedestrians and drivers.

Ms. Brenneman asked if NCL said they were going to build a cruise ship dock.

Ms. Ware said yes; it will extend from Whittier Street.

Ms. Brenneman confirmed that this required city approval and asked about the permitting process.

Ms. McKibben said they would have to show that the dock is consistent with the zoning, as well as with the adopted plans.

Ms. Brenneman asked if NCL talked about a delay in their plans due to COVID-19 and impacts on the cruise ship industry.

Ms. Ware said they talked about implementing CDC recommendations and their talk with a medical panel about the best ways to move forward. Each ship is very different, but they know they need onboard medical capacity and testing.

IV. Draft Action Tables: Chapter 3, 4, 5, 6, 7 & 8 – Introduction and Overview

Ms. McKibben explained the structure of the tables. She asked for input on the overall structural aspects. She explained that they were modeled after the tables in the Transportation chapter, but the format does not work as well for other chapters that are less prescriptive than the Transportation chapter.

Mr. Day said he liked the way the tables are laid out, but he was now reconsidering. He said that sometimes the subsections worked well and sometimes they did not.

Ms. Brenneman asked if some of the recommendations would appear in the chapters or only in the tables.

Ms. McKibben said they are chapter-specific tables, and they will be at the end of the chapter rather than throughout the text. These will be used to create the master table for Chapter 2: Implementation. Some recommendations are the same or very similar, so the language will be refined for consistency. Recommendations will only be in the Implementation table once, but will reference all relevant chapters. For chapter two, staff wanted to focus on a top ten list of recommendations. One of the reasons the Implementation chapter is at the front is many readers will only look at the table, so they need to have the big issues at the front.

Ms. Brenneman said she would prefer consistent outcome columns. She called attention to subheadings in a chapter for which there are no recommendations, and recommended revisiting those sections.

Ms. Ware said there is a big difference between the Transportation tables and the tables for the rest of the chapters. She recommended consistency with the level of detail, as well as less detail overall. She also recommended consolidating the duplication within the tables.

Ms. Matthews asked about the intended audience for these tables. Her impression is that, due to the technicality, the tables are for planners. She recommended narrowing the focus in service of the larger vision.

Ms. McKibben said the audience for the Chapter 2: Implementation table is more likely to be the public, the CBJ Assembly, policymakers, and business people. The users of the tables within the other chapters will probably be the technical people, like planners. Staff picked the highlights from relevant plans for the chapters, but the tables allow staff to include all of the other important things for the more technical readers.

Ms. Martinson said this is where the chapter overview could be helpful for the nontechnical readers.

Mr. Day said the Visitor Industry Task Force ran into the repetition issue. He suggested the repetition is to ensure that everything important is addressed where it is relevant.

Ms. McKibben said the solution for repetition in Chapter 2 is to state the recommendation once and reference every chapter where it is mentioned. She agreed with Ms. Ware that they shouldn't repeat recommendations within the same chapter table.

Ms. Martinson said it is safe to assume most users will not read the whole text, so it is acceptable to have repetition across chapters.

Ms. Matthews asked if the Steering Committee needs to discuss what to whittle down and what to include.

Ms. McKibben said yes, but first staff need to find where repetition can be consolidated.

Mr. Day said that the Natural Resources subheading in Chapter 3 is the only subheading that doesn't have a recommendation. He asked if the plan would all be in 8.5 x 11 inch format, or would the tables be on larger paper.

Ms. McKibben showed a past plan to give an example of what the final document would look like. The maps will be foldouts, and most of the plan will be 8.5 x 11 in a landscape format. There will be less text and more graphics than past plans for easier engagement. Text will be in two columns. Staff have identified topics for appendices, such as a job description for a Main Street coordinator or forms for right-of-way permits, to make it more useful for different types of readers.

Ms. Martinson asked, regarding the section on resiliency, if they should be specific with recommendations like gathering outdoors, heated outdoor eating spaces, etc. When they talk about expanding the way our community can function, should we add more to the resiliency section or keep it broad?

Ms. McKibben said outdoor dining and spaces are talked about in other chapters. There is not much language in the plan that talks about recommendations for resiliency, but there is more in the visioning document.

Ms. McKibben said some recommendations are very specific and are more action-like, while some are very broad. Should they be co-mingled or separated into actions and recommendations? She asked for Committee feedback during their comments.

V. Committee Comments

The next meeting is scheduled for December 10, 2020, and will be a review of all committee comments on the draft chapters. Staff suggested taking a break from December 10 to the new year, since this time of year becomes difficult with the holidays. Ms. McKibben said she will send out a poll with potential meeting dates.

Ms. McKibben gave the Committee two weeks to give feedback on the tables, with comments due back December 6.

Ms. Brenneman said she has not read through the draft chapters yet, but she felt that she needs to reread the minutes. She read the focus group report and was surprised by a few things. In almost every focus group, one of the strengths mentioned was Juneau's walkability. She does not think walkability is emphasized enough in the Blueprint Downtown plan.

VI. Adjournment

Mr. Worl moved to adjourn, and Mr. Day seconded. The meeting was adjourned at 7:18 pm.

Next Meeting Date: December 10, 2020, virtual and telephonic.