



**Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting Agenda  
Zoom Webinar & Telephonic**

**July 8, 6:00 p.m.**

**Steering Committee Members Present:**

Karena Perry, Chair  
Betsy Brenneman  
Kirby Day  
Daniel Glidmann  
Michael Heumann  
Ricardo Worl

Patty Ware  
Nathaniel Dye (PC Liaison)  
Iris Matthews  
Jill Ramiel  
Tahlia Gerger

**Steering Committee Members Absent:**

Laura Martinson  
Jill Ramiel

**Staff:**

Beth McKibben, Project Manager

**Assembly Members:**

Loren Jones

**I. Roll Call**

The meeting was called to order at 6:05 pm by Chair Perry.

**II. Approval of Minutes**

**a. May 6, 2021 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting**

**MOTION:** By Mr. Day to approve the May 6, 2021 minutes with corrections as noted. Ms. Brenneman seconded.

**The motion passed with no objection.**

**III. Public Participation**

None

**IV. Steering Committee Updates**

Ms. Brenneman asked for an update on the CBJ Hazard Mapping Project, and clarification on what a FEMA certified community means.

Ms. McKibben explained that a FEMA certified community is related to the Flood program and not related to the hazard mapping. She explained that becoming a FEMA certified

community is a big process and larger than “downtown” and stated the recommendation has been removed from BPDT.

Ms. McKibben indicated the hazard maps were a result of a grant received from FEMA and they were about to be released for public review and potential adoption. The text of plan states the area is subject to avalanche and landslide hazards. The plan is very high level in this discussion in order to not “get ahead” of the mapping project. Also, that is important that the plan acknowledge the hazards.

Ms. Brenneman encouraged the steering committee to remember it is important to talk about how this plan is unique and not simply regurgitate other plans.

Ms. McKibben reminded the committee their task was to “knit together” past plans. At the same time, new ideas have come out of the process and we need to think about how to highlight those new ideas.

## **Chapter 2**

Ms. McKibben thanked the committee for providing comments, which were helpful in keeping the effort moving forward. She mentioned several comments regarding enforcement. She explained that while enforcement is important it does not belong as an action in the table. She suggested several other ways that the committee’s priority for enforcement of existing rules, perhaps in the “user’s guide” or letter from the committee.

Ms. McKibben also noted the master action table no longer references others plans. This information will remain in the action tables for the individual chapters.

### **a. Actions**

#### **Topic- Cruise ship berth at Subport**

Ms. McKibben asked the committee to revisit their recommendation for an additional cruise ship berth at the Subport subject to the conditions recommended by the VITF. She wanted to confirm this is the wish of the committee.

Mr. Day stated that in addition to the recommendation of VITF there is a plan to have community meetings on this topic and there may be more recommendations/requirements through the planning commission review/approval.

Ms. McKibben indicated the recommendation could be reframed to instead of recommending VITF conditions; instead state the specific conditions they recommend, or remove support for the additional cruise ship dock altogether.

Ms. Brenneman said that through the voter initiative she started thinking more about cruise ship tourism management. She asked if the VITF was able to finish their work.

Mr. Day stated the VITF finished. There was discussion about reconvening the VITF but that has not happened.

Ms. Brenneman stated she is uncomfortable with the current recommendation in the draft.

Assemblyman Jones stated the Assembly accepted the VITF report. The Assembly instructed the Manager to develop an implementation plan.

Mr. Day suggested changing the wording support a process to discuss construction of an addition cruise ship dock.

Ms. Matthews reminded the committee to touch on the vision and how does the recommendation support or not support the vision. She is not sure that specifics of the recommendation contributes to the broader vision

Ms. Brenneman read Mr. Huemann's comment from the chat, which stated that he is not necessarily in favor to limiting the recommendation to one berth.

Ms. McKibben read the current recommendation" Allow construction of a single cruise ship berth at the Subport subject to conditions as outlined by the VITF."

Mr. Glidmann stated his thoughts on the additional berth have changed over time. If we are looking to make downtown a more attractive place to live and visit reducing congestion is important. Placing a new berth outside the core downtown it will ease congestion. If the berth makes room for an additional ship that changes the parameters. He suggested adding language about supporting an additional berth to reduce congestion in the downtown core.

Ms. Brenneman suggested supporting a process that is mindful about congestion and exploring other locations.

Mr. Dye stated that a recommendation to support a process is not helpful and suggested the plan either support the berth or not.

Ms. McKibben suggested asked if the committee is in favor of an additional berth at the subport. If the vote is yes then she could receive guidance and draft a recommendation.

Ms. Ware asked for clarification that the berth at the subport would not be an "additional" berth.

Ms. McKibben noted there is no berth there.

Mr. Huemann stated support for supporting a process.

Mr. Day clarified that another recommendation from the VITF is that there be no more than 5 ships per day. If that is implemented this new berth would not bring in an additional ship, it would locate it in a different location.

Ms. Matthews asked what does BPDT recommendation on the subport help the process.

Ms. McKibben stated the VITF recommendations were “accepted” by the Assembly, which is different from a Blueprint Downtown Area Plan that is “adopted” by the Assembly. Future permitting processes look to adopted plans. She stated BPDT speaks to this area quite a bit and the berth will significantly impact that area.

Mr. Dye agreed with Ms. McKibben regarding how different plans are adopted and used. He said it is important to answer the position on an additional berth at the subport.

Ms. Ware asked if there is value to using the language “subject to recommendation of VITF”.

Mr. Dye clarified he thinks it’s important to make a recommendation and that perhaps there was not a lot of discussion by the committee because the VITF happened concurrently.

Motion by Mr. Worl to recommend, “Support construction of a single cruise ship berth at the Subport subject to conditions as outlined by the VITF.” Seconded by Ms. Ware.

Ms. Brenneman objected for purposes of discussion.

Ms. Brenneman is more in favor of discussion talking about development at the subport. She thinks there will be process. Should we support an additional cruise ship dock not in downtown? She would prefer to take out the recommendation.

Ms. Matthews agreed with Ms. Brenneman. She would prefer to focus on other actions that have broader support.

Mr. Glidmann clarified that he supports a berth at the subport as a way of spreading out the impact of cruise tourism throughout downtown, if no additional cruise ships are added.

Ms. Ware called the question.

Ms. Ware read Mr. Worl’s motion to the committee.

Mr. Worl clarified he changed one word of the recommendation in the “allow” to “support”

Ms. McKibben called the roll. **Yes -8 No -0 Motion Passed**

Mr. Day stated he shares a lot of the same concerns voiced by the committee, but knowing the recommendations by the VITF, and anticipated review and potential conditions by the Assembly and Planning Commission, and expected community meetings, that the proposal will change a lot from what is being looked at now and that it could draw a lot bus traffic out of the core.

### **Topic – Murals**

Ms. McKibben reviewed the current language and recommendation about murals. She also reminded the committee that murals, without a commercial message, are considered art and are not regulated.

Mr. Worl asked what the current process is for reviewing murals on public buildings.

Ms. McKibben said there is not one.

Ms. Brenneman stated she does not feel this is a priority. She is in favor of a process and if this is a priority then she is ok with the recommendation.

Mr. Huemann stated he loves murals but is not in favor of a review process.

Mr. Glidmann understood that in the past art was not allowed on buildings because they were considered signs. He is working on art for the Goldstein building. The art would be stylized but represent that there are other places up street to shop. The question is whether or not this is considered “offsite” signage. He noted this is a complicated issue. He is in favor of encouraging murals with a simple review process.

Ms. McKibben reminded the committee that murals on private buildings without a commercial message are considered art and based on case law cannot be regulated. When there is a commercial message, it considered a sign and regulated as such. The recommendation is for a review process for murals (art) on public buildings.

Ms. Matthews reminded the committee they have recommendations about public art in other areas of the plan and asked if murals are covered in this broader recommendation.

Mr. Dye mentioned this is specific to public buildings. Suggested that recommendation has value. In his experience, the process for allowing murals on public buildings has been confusing and inefficient.

There was discussion about various murals and whether they were public or private buildings.

Ms. McKibben stated she would work this into a grouping with other recommendations about public art.

### **Topic – Travel Demand Management**

Ms. McKibben stated the draft language from the Transportation chapter about Travel Demand Management is in the memorandum. She is looking for direction from the committee about this topic. She then explained that travel demand management is a programs and policies for managing transportation and parking. Strategy to increase transportation efficiency by encouraging a shift from single-occupant vehicle to other modes of transportation or shifting auto trips out of peak periods. It is a “term of art”.

Mr. Glidmann is concerned with a term of art and it seems like another set of process on top of ones we already have. He would vote to take it out.

Ms. Ware noted the term was repeated in multiple places and there appears to be lots of opportunity to consolidate.

Ms. Brenneman thinks the average reader may think of travel demand management is related to tourism. She would like to think about it in larger terms. She noted two bullets that do not seem to work together. She would like the term to address resort trips and parking.

Ms. McKibben noted the opportunity to consolidate. She indicated travel demand management is bigger than just residents or tourism and that the program is broad and touches on the entire transportation system.

Ms. Brenneman said the draft language mentions that past plans speak to works. If we go with only the second bullet is it enough.

Ms. McKibben suggested the Travel Demand Management recommendation would be used more by government, local and state and less likely used by a developer. The language should work in that context.

Mr. Day said the program might incorporate many of the other recommendations in the plan, such as those related to parking. He asked if it is a tool to help accomplish many of the other recommendations.

Mr. Worl knowing this is one of the topic concerns identified through the public process. He would be fine with removing the first bullet. The idea of building bigger roads and adding parking is not necessary the right fix and that we need to change our behavior. The second bullet does this.

**MOTION:** by Mr. Worl to remove the first travel demand bullet and keep the second one. He asked for unanimous consent. Seconded by Ms. Matthews.

**Motion passed by unanimous consent.**

### **Topic – Neighborhood Associations**

Ms. McKibben gave an overview of the draft recommendation for neighborhood associations. She said that she had received some comments about how this is not a transformative recommendation, and that neighborhood associations already exist. She stated that some committee members feel strongly about the need for stronger neighborhood associations. She also mentioned the various ways that the city currently interacts with neighborhood associations, how she has experienced working with them in other communities. She asked the committee to discuss and provide direction.

Ms. Brenneman identified opportunities to consolidate several recommendations into one, as well other roles neighborhood associations could take.

Mr. Day agrees. He suggested support and encourage is good, because the city isn't going to go so far as to tell the neighborhood associations how they should operation

Ms. Ware states she loves neighborhood associations. But she does think this recommendation is priority. Associations will come together when there is an issue and need.

Ms. Matthews was the president for her community council in Anchorage. She knows CBJ handles it differently. There is power in having a neighborhood association. There is not anything that requires the city to consult. She suggested real neighborhood associations are not formed over an issued. If the committee thinks its important then the recommendation should have teeth. If it is important the recommendation should say how the neighborhood associations should operate.

Mr. Dye said the city does send neighborhood association's public notices and such. If the committee wants the city to interact with neighborhood associations proactively then there is value in this recommendation.

Mr. Worl asked Ms. McKibben what she sees as the value for keeping this recommendation.

Ms. McKibben stated she sees a lot of potential for neighborhood associations. The recommendation does not go far in saying how the associations should operate because that is a big thing. If the recommendation were to bring associations in to city processes earlier, that would be good.

Mr. Day suggested the recommendation said something about how notices get out to associations.

Ms. Matthews we want to say the structures on the city side are in place for how neighborhood associations engaged early in processes.

Ms. McKibben stated that neighborhood associations can be instrumental in neighborhood placemaking.

Ms. Matthews suggested adding the word "use" of neighborhood associations.

Chair Perry asked if anyone objected.

Ms. Brenneman suggested the following language  
Support and encourage the use of neighborhood associations to foster early public involvement and communications among residents, businesses.

Mr. Day moved to accept Ms. Brenneman's suggested language.

Ms. Matthews objected. She wants to keep communication and feels it important to keep the second bullet about providing recommendations to City agencies.

**MOTION:** by Ms. Brenneman the following language for the recommendation.

Support and encourage the use of neighborhood associations to:

- foster early public involvement and communications among residents, businesses and CBJ.
- provide recommendations to City agencies

Seconded by Mr. Day.

**The motion passed with unanimous consent.**

**Topic – Juneau Nonmotorized Transportation Plan (JNMTP) and Safe Routes to Schools Plan (SRS)**

Ms. McKibben directed the committee to the memorandum for the recommendations about these two plans. The recommendations recommend maintaining an inventory of completed projects. Comments from the committee were that they were not transformative. She asked for direction from the committee.

Mr. Worl said he would support deleting these recommendations unless staff thought there is a benefit to keep them.

Ms. McKibben said she does not have a strong opinion.

Mr. Day agreed with Mr. Worl that this is not a strong recommendation and supports deleting.

Ms. Brenneman asked if an inventory had been done.

Ms. McKibben responded that recommended projects had been completed but does not know if there is an inventory.

Ms. Brenneman suggested that if the recommendation will help implement walkability maybe it should be kept.

Mr. Dye stated that SRS is often grant related and that the JNMPT is used. What is the harm in keeping the recommendation.

Ms. Brenneman moved to combine the two recommendations. Ms. Matthews seconded.

Mr. Day suggested only inventorying is not very helpful.

Ms. Brenneman suggested adding emphasizing walkability.



Mr. Dye suggested adding updating the plans as needed.

Mr. Worl asked if the existing language “Future projects should emphasize pedestrian/cycling and intersection improvements” was sufficient.

**MOTION:** by Ms. Brenneman that staff wordsmith to update the plans with the emphasis as suggested by Mr. Worl. Seconded by Chair Perry.

**Motion passed with unanimous consent.**

Ms. McKibben alerted the committee to the time. She asked if they wanted to continue working or stop and put the rest of to another meeting.

The committee agreed to complete the next two topics before breaking.

### **Topic- School district campus parking**

Ms. McKibben explained this topic had been brought up at a previous meeting, but the committee had not discussed it.

Mr. Day suggested deleting.

Ms. Brenneman said parking is not as big a mess as it was when there was one high school. The parking is not well thought out.

Ms. Ware is in favor of deleting. She thinks important but does not belong in this plan.

Mr. Glidmann asked Ms. McKibben if she knows if the neighborhood complains about school parking in the neighborhoods. Parking is not just for school, the school hosts many events. He also mentioned the lack of bike parking as a challenge. It should not be ignored; the recommendation is good and should be kept, perhaps combined with other parking recommendations.

Mr. Worl agreed with combining the recommendation with other parking related recommendations.

Ms. Matthews asked if this could be addressed through Safe Routes to Schools. The issues are bigger than parking. It is about kids, environmental health and walkability. Suggest deleting.

Ms. Brenneman will vote to keep the recommendation. The area needs to be studied, redesigned.

**MOTION:** by Ms. Matthews to keep the recommendation with staff rewriting to be more visionary. Seconded by Mr. Glidmann.

**Motion passed with unanimous consent.**

### **Topic – community gardens**

Ms. McKibben explained the recommendation came from the visioning process and that the draft plan speaks to community gardens in respect to food security and neighborhood placemaking.

**MOTION:** by Ms. Matthews to amend the recommendation “support the development of community gardens in parks and neighborhoods”. Seconded by Ms. Brenneman.

**Motion passed with unanimous consent.**

Work on the Rock Dump, Top Five and Metrics would be moved to another meeting. Ms. McKibben will send out a new doodle for a future meeting date.

Mr. Worl suggested starting the meeting at 5 instead of 6.

**V. Committee Comments**

Ms. Ware asked about meeting in person.

Ms. McKibben said she would look into it.

Ms. Ware thanked staff for her hard work

**VI. Adjournment**

The meeting was adjourned at 8:12 pm.

Next Meeting Date: TBD 5p.m., Zoom Webinar & Telephonic