

**Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting
Room 224 & Zoom Webinar
December 22, 2022, 6:00 p.m.
DRAFT MINUTES**

Steering Committee Members Present:

Betsy Brenneman
Kirby Day
Daniel Glidmann
Michael Heumann
Patty Ware

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Karena Perry, Chair
Laura Martinson
Ricardo Worl
Tahlia Gerger

Staff:

Beth McKibben, Project Manager
Scott Ciambor, Planning Manager

Assembly Members:

None

I. Roll Call

The meeting was called to order at 6:06 p.m.

II. Approval of Minutes

Approval of the minutes was postponed to the next meeting.

III. Public Participation

None.

IV. Steering Committee Updates

None.

V. Review of comments – table and compiled comments

Ms. McKibben introduced the packet. She asked if they thought they had addressed all the public comments at the last meeting or if we missed anything.

Ms. Ware wondered about Stuart Cohen comment about p.207 of the plan; the reference to the public participation about the number of cruise ships. His comment was that it seemed the plan glossed over the level of concern.

Ms. McKibben says the page he references is in the appendix, which is the Visioning Report, which will not be amended as part of this plan.

Ms. Ware noted that Mr. Cohen also had a second comment about page 70. Ms. Ware said that she had the same discontent with the concept but wondering where the committee is on this.

Ms. McKibben suggested this would be best discussed at the next meeting when the committee has the broader discussion about tourims.

Mr. Day asked how the committee would be addressing the topics and potential amendments discussed at the previous meeting. He noted that the challenge is that things are changing.

Ms. Brenneman said she noticed consistent themes in the public comments, tourism management, little support for a new dock and too little enforcement. She is concerned the plan does not say enough about enforcement. She also asked about the metric proposed about accidents for vehicles and pedestrians. She suggested the plan be stronger about dock electrification, possibly even saying ships cannot come to Juneau unless they use shore power.

Ms. Brenneman reviewed the comments about enforcement – no parking enforcement, no enforcement of non-EVs using the EV charging space at Basin, and lack of enforcement of building and maintenance codes.

Mr. Heumann disagreed with the lack of parking enforcement.

Mr. Glidmann said he got a parking ticket yesterday.

Ms. Brenneman suggested the plan does not go far enough in its recommendations on parking. She thinks the new city hall discussion should have included a parking structure with housing.

She acknowledged that some of the public recommendations are not practical such as an underground by-pass for trucks. She said the public comments include short-term rentals, but she cannot remember if the committee discussed it. She is concerned with the comments of historic preservation funding not being helpful in restoration.

Ms. McKibben said she will review the plan again and list where/how enforcement is discussed. She does know that enforcement is mentioned in the preamble to implementation and in several of the recommended actions.

Ms. McKibben will also see what data may be available for pedestrian/traffic accidents

Mr. Heumann agreed that data is needed for any metric and data is sometimes hard to get.

Ms. Ware said she had some suggestions for the action on enforcement/blighted building that she will email to staff for a future discussion.

VI. Discussion revisions to the plan

Ms. McKibben directed the committee to page 92 of the packet. This document is the framework for a future memorandum to the committee for amendments to the plan. The committee will then be able to review and vote on each amendment or vote to adopt all the changes. The document identifies the page or pages the language is found in the public review draft of the plan, with new language shown in **bold underline** and language to be deleted is shown as ~~strikethrough~~.

Ms. Brenneman thought the committee decided all buses, not just tour buses would be multi-fuel.

Ms. McKibben explained that the recommendation in the plan is only for tour buses and does not include Capital Transit. She said the plan discusses an electric circulator.

Ms. Ware likes phrase of low or no emissions and prefers encourage or promote.

Mr. Day asked if it is easy as adding vehicles line catchall in transportation.

Ms. McKibben expressed worry that this type of edit may be the type that could prove to be complicated and affect many other areas of the plan.

Ms. Ware supports not extending to all vehicles unless it can easily be incorporated into an existing action.

Mr. Day said that Blueprint supports CBJ Continued efforts of pursuing dock electrification.

OVERSTREET PARK & KAYAK LAUNCH

Ms. Brenneman suggested cutting discussion on Overstreet Park and the kayak launch from page 158 as its unnecessary duplication.

GOLD CREEK

Ms. Ware is concerned that “soften” may not be the appropriate word. She would like the plan to specifically state “to remove barbed wire”.

Mr. Day says there may be some risk or liability reasons for the barb ware.

Ms. Brenneman agrees with strengthen the language.

Ms. McKibben suggested this could be an opportunity box, where the specific suggestions for improvements could be listed in the narrative.

Ms. Ware likes that idea.
The committee agreed with the proposed language.

RECREATION & SEAWALK

The committee agreed with the proposed language.

WATERFRONT SUBDISTRICT

Ms. Ware suggested that language be added that from S. Franklin from library we want the waterfront to be more friendly. We want the downtown to be more vibrant for locals when cruise ships are gone but how does that happen, when half of the place is shut.

Mr. Glidmann suggested removing the last sentence.

After discussion the committee agreed to remove the last sentence.

HAZARDOUS TREES

The committee agreed with the proposed language for hazardous trees.

MARINE PARK

The committee agreed with the proposed language for Marine Park trees.

CIVIC CENTER

Ms. McKibben explained that she had to Bob Banghart, Executive Director of the Partnership, which the organization spearheading this project so that the plan would reflect the current status of the project.

The committee agreed with the proposed amendments for the discussion on the JACC.

TELEPHONE HILL

Ms. McKibben provided background on Telephone Hill and asked the committee for direction on where in the plan to put this section.

Mr. Heumann suggested it belongs in the Downtown Subdistrict. The rest of the committee agreed.

Ms. Brenneman said this is important to her because of interest in historic preservation and because she lived there when she first moved to Juneau. She asked if the plan can recommend a new historic survey and inventory before any development or demolition takes place. She

wonders what resources are left. She noted that it is prime property for developers and she would like to see housing and mixed use. She believes there can be higher density housing and retention of some existing historic structures. CBJ will need to work with HRAC. She feels there are some wonderful buildings up there.

Ms. McKibben said the HRAC work plan includes an updated survey of Telephone Hill. Ordinarily the state land disposal process would require an updated historic survey and inventory for the historic district. It is unclear whether the legislative process eliminates this requirement. In her discussions with the Lands Manager, he was not opposed to re-survey. She said the map was interesting, showing the land to be transferred to the CBJ in relation to the historic district and the historic structures. There is less overlap than she expected. The committee can make a recommendation to support preservation; would be helpful to discuss development what type of development they would like to see here.

Mr. Heumann says it should start with the inventory; what are you working with.

Mr. Glidmann asks what about encouraging residential housing on Telephone Hill.

Ms. Brenneman said this could be missing middle and sustain the historic preservation.

Mr. Glidmann responded that would be an economic decision. He would support higher density if there would be parking.

Ms. McKibben asked the committee what they thought about mixed use in this area.

Ms. Brenneman supports mixed use but residential as primary.

Mr. Glidmann said residential only.

Mr. Day expressed concern for parking needs and nonresidential uses.

Mr. Heumann said parking is not required for development. Anchorage recently eliminated parking requirements. Parking takes up space, which forces people to have cars which is indirect conflict to walkable communities desired.

Ms. Ware would like added density, residential for sure.

Ms. McKibben to put some language together for the committee to consider.

VII. Next Steps

Ms. McKibben explained that at the next meeting, January 5th the committee will revisit their recommendations around the VITF report, and proposed amendments related to tourism. Ms.

Pierce, the CBJ Tourism Manager will be at that meeting. At the January 25th meeting the committee will review the entire body of proposed amendments to the plan. She is hopeful they committee could adopt their amendments and move the plan on the Planning Commission at that meeting and the February 1st meeting could be canceled. If not the committee could wrap up on February 1st.

VIII. Committee Comments

None.

IX. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 pm.

DRAFT