



**Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting Agenda
Assembly Chambers & Zoom Webinar**

January 5, 2023, 6:00 p.m.

Steering Committee Members Present:

Karena Perry, Chair
Betsy Brenneman
Kirby Day
Laura
Patty Ware

Steering Committee Members Absent:

Daniel Glidmann
Michael Heumann
Ricardo Worl
Tahlia Gerger

Staff:

Beth McKibben, Project Manager
Scott Ciambor, Planning Manager
Alexandra Pierce, Tourism Manager

Assembly Members:

None

I. Roll Call

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

II. Approval of Minutes

- a. **October 7, 2021 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting**
- b. **November 17, 2022 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting**
- c. **December 22, 2022 DRAFT minutes, Blueprint Downtown Steering Committee Meeting**

MOTION: By Betsy Brenneman to approve the October 7, 2021, November 17, 2022 and December 22, 2022 minutes with corrections. Patty Ware seconded.

The motion passed with no objection.

III. Public Participation

None.

IV. Steering Committee Updates

None.

V. Topic

a. Tourism and the Subport

McKibben discussed updated language to Huna Totem project and recommendations around the Subport and Visitor Industry Task Force (VITF) topics. She directed the committee to page 21 of the packet, the minutes from when this topic was discussed previously and the committee voted.

McKibben explained other material in the packet. She completed a word searched of the public review draft plan for "VITF", "tourism" and "Subport" Any section or recommendation with these terms has been provided in the packet – as published, with no edits. She explained that she did not think the committee wants to amend all of these sections of the plan, but she wanted to be thorough, to sure the committee had all of the possible sections to review and consider.

McKibben gave an overview of the sections. She introduced, CBJ Tourism Manager Alexandra Pierce, who was at the meeting to answer questions and provide information to the committee as they review this topic.

Pierce provided an overview of the work of the VITF. She explained nothing happened in permitting or site development before the Subport property was transferred from Norwegian Cruise Lines (NCL) to Huna Totem. Since the committee last discussed this topic The Long Range Waterfront Plan (LRWP) was amended to include a single cruise ship dock consistent with the recommendations of the VITF.

Pierce explained that there had been a federal process and a decision made that an icebreaker should located be in Alaska. Four cities had been studied and Juneau was chosen. The icebreaker was not funded in this round of federal funding. The Assembly has directed the Port Director to complete a study evaluating the harbor flow, traffic, and operations from a navigation perspective in this area, considering the possibility of a cruise ship dock, an ice breaker and US Coast Guard operations. She also explained that the VITF recommendations and draft Blueprint Downtown plan recommend a MOA between CBJ and CLIA. Now, instead of the CLIA signing the MOA the individual cruise ship companies will sign. She expects all the companies to sign and the end result is the same as intended by the VITF.

Pierce said that Huna Totem had meet with CBJ Community Development Department and completed a pre-application meeting, which is the first step towards applying for a conditional use permit. Huna Totem will have to go to the Planning Commission for approval of a conditional use permit. The dock lease will be a separate process, considered by the Assembly. The conditional use permit process requires an opportunity for public comment and it is likely there will be an additional opportunity for public comment through the Assembly lease process.

Day asked if the conditional use permit is imminent and can the conditional use permit and tidelands lease processes move forward together.

McDonnell said she heard a presentation from CDD Director Maclean today. She understood that conditional use permit application had not yet been submitted and when application is submitted the

soonest it might be before the Planning Commission maybe late February but if not earliest would be March.

Pierce explained the conditional use permit process and that the Assembly will likely be interested in the conditions put on the project by the Planning Commission before they consider the tidelands lease.

Day read the committee their motion from previous meeting that lead to this discussion.

Brenneman asked about the 5-ship limit and whether it include hot berthing, etc.

Pierce explained there is a signed MOA that has the arrival time, scheduling, offloading garbage and many of the VITF recommendations, and CBJ is now working on getting a signed 5-ship MOA.

Brenneman asked if there is an agreement on what is considered to be a "large" cruise ship.

Pierce says the MOA will use the VITF definition.

McDonnell asked how do we have a the 5-ship limit and no hot berthing without the new dock? She asked if there a chance and a 5-ship MOA without a new dock at the Subport. She sees the new dock as the City last chance to control the situation.

Pierce thinks there will need to be a 5-ship MOA with or without the dock at the Subport. She noted there is other leverage but the dock is certainly a big one. Some see it as unfair with one developer/cruise ship being held accountable for all of the VITF recommendations and the challenges the community has.

Day said that regardless of dock development the VITF recommendation was 5 ships. He reminded the committee that the City Attorney had recommended to the VITF that they manage the cruise industry impacts through infrastructure versus the number of visitors.

McDonnell asked there is hot berthing when there are four ships? She also asked if the 5 ships a day is in place for 2024.

Pierce says currently we are scheduled for 5 ships a day and that we are pursuing an MOA with the dock owners.

McDonnell asked what are the concerns of the committee based on what was learned tonight.

McKibben referred draft changes presented to the committee in November to update the plan in regard to the Subport and the transfer to Huna Totem.

Pierce explained the how the Huna Totem proposal is different than the NCL proposal. They plan to develop a dock, retail space, flex space that would be developed by another entity, which could be any variety of uses, and parking space for buses. She noted that the recommendation for dock was made before there was an understanding of how difficult and expensive that project would be.

Ware says that our recommendation on electrification brings up a concern, voted on the VITF pieces as a package.

McKibben notes electrification was discussed at a previous meeting but no decision was made by the committee at that time.

Pierce recommends leaving the VITF recommendations as is. Having the Blueprint Downtown plan amending the VITF recommendations complicates things.

Day says the VITF recommendations were presented to the Assembly.

Pierce expects the Assembly to adopt the VITF recommendations by resolution by the time this plan is in place.

Day read the steering committee motion from October 2021 and asked if anyone uncomfortable with the previous action.

Brenneman said she had felt uncomfortable at the time, based but she is ok with vote. She noted there is language in the plan that that needs to be updated based on what they learned tonight. She directed the committee to the minutes of November 17, 2022. She likes the language Ware proposed at that time, acknowledging the amount of time the committee spent discussing the topic etc.

Ware said she is fine with the previous vote and is not interested in opening the topic up again. She supports adding an explanatory statement along the lines that that the committee discussed this at length and the community is conflicted.

McDonnell noted that the recommendation needs to be corrected to additional "dock" (not ship). She agrees that the surveys and testimony around the topic should be acknowledged in the report.

McKibben asked the committee if adding the explanatory statement addresses the committee concerns? She asked the committee if there is anything else they would like added around the discussion of the Subport and tourism?

Ware wondered about the plan's support for the proposed ocean center.

McKibben said this was brought forward from the Visioning Report.

The committee determined there is no harm in leaving support for the Ocean Center in the plan.

Brenneman directed the discussion to page 84 and pointed out a paragraph that does not make sense to her.

Ware recalled it has to do with the difference between north and south Franklin.

McDonnell recalled it as related to pursuing the 18/365 (18 hours, 365 days per year) vibrancy in areas of downtown where this is happening acknowledging that some areas of downtown, such as South Franklin

are not likely be open year around because it may not be financially feasible or fit within their business model.

Brenneman asked McKibben for an update on the archipelago site and wondered if the plan needed to be updated.

McKibben explained that when the plan was first written there was an approved conditional use permit for a private development at that site. But over time the developer had decided to not move forward. She said the plan was current to reflect this.

McDonnell asked staff to be sure that the change in direction is not noted as covid.

McKibben suggested the details could be deleted, as it's no longer relevant about what had been proposed.

MOTION: By Betsy Brenneman to remove the last sentence on page 176 were the Ocean Center is discussed. Perry seconded.

The motion passed with no objection.

Brenneman wondered if the "tourism function" should be changed to "tourism manager". Maybe it should be stronger.

Pierce suggested "Tourism Division" in the City Manager's Office.

Ware directed the discussion the Metrics language. She would be more comfortable with different language, specifically the metrics measure progress not success.

Perry suggested the sentence doesn't need to be there, since following sentences cover the idea. No objections.

Day directed the committee to page 30 of 112 of the packet, and recommended adding another metric - the tourism survey No objections.

Day notices that still says 5 boats at one time versus 5 boats a day.

VI. Next Steps

McKibben explained that at the next meeting the committee will be presented with a memorandum outlining all the text changes to the public review draft. The committee will review and vote on them. The goal is to complete that work and for the committee to approve the plan as amended and move it to the planning commission for their review.

McKibben will double check to be sure there is still a quorum for the January 25th meeting. She stressed it is very important to have as many committee members at the meeting as possible.

VII. Committee Comments

VIII. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:59 pm.

DRAFT