

## MINUTES

### PLANNING COMMISSION COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

Michael Satre, Chair

March 19, 2013

#### **I. ROLL CALL**

Chairman, Michael Satre, called the Committee of the Whole meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building to order at 7:03 p.m.

Commissioners present: Jerry Medina, Dan Miller, Nicole Grewe, Benjamin Haight, Marsha Bennett, Michael Satre (Chair), Karen Lawfer, and Dennis Watson.

Commissioners absent: Nathan Bishop.

A quorum was present.

Staff present: Hal Hart, Director; Ben Lyman, Planner; Greg Chaney, Planning Manager.

Chair Satre addressed Mr. Lyman and asked for an update between the last Planning Commission meeting and this meeting in terms of public comment.

Mr. Lyman stated that after the last meeting, last Tuesday, he was asked to make a couple of changes as to how comments reach the Committee. Comments received by Friday afternoon were to be incorporated into the overall comment document and sent before 4:30 on Friday. He said what was in the blue folder was what was emailed out on Friday. The blue folder also contained comments from Duff Mitchell at Juneau Hydro, the same written comments that were provided at last Tuesday's meeting, but were made part of the record and available to the public.

He mentioned receiving an email from Commissioner Bennett which had been included in the blue folder and another email from Commissioner Miller with typos and grammatical errors which Mr. Lyman went ahead and corrected. He referenced a stack of paperwork in the packet which was the draft Capital Improvement Program for the next 6 years. This was on the agenda for next week's meeting but Ms. McKibben had asked him to provide it to the Commissioners earlier so that they would have a chance to look at it. The Committee could go over the list of projects and see if there are any projects that they would like to nominate to that list or schedule any changes and/or suggestions. Mr. Lyman referenced discussions as how to move forward Comprehensive Plan. At the staff level, his understanding was that the Commission would like to go through all of the comments received to date and review them based on its depth and its relevance to the Comprehensive Plan itself. He suggested doing that on a chapter-by-chapter basis as Chair Satre had proposed.

Ms. Bennett spoke of the extensive comments received on the introduction in the March 12th document of which she summarized a few into an email that was sent today at 4:30 or so, with some of her own comments. She also mentioned a very well written comment from a person who wrote about the native community and the history of Juneau.

Mr. Lyman mentioned receiving several emails regarding aspects of the Comprehensive Plan, but was unsure whether they should be forwarded to the Commission or mulled over before submitting as comments. A lot of discussion about the introduction, the history of the community, and also the cultural heritage, which he believed they should definitely talk about. He did not think that the description of the community's history was all inclusive at this point, however, noted that they had started out to do a technical update with numbers and data, but with the level of comments received, they have almost rewrote the chapter and gone beyond the scope of what was originally intended. Mr. Hart added that Mr. Lyman, himself and Mr. Chaney have all been discussing Chapter 1 over the last couple of workdays.

Chair Satre appreciated the Commissioners' work over the past year in reviewing the Comprehensive Plan, the edits that staff put out, comments from the public etc. He stated that they were now in the last leg and appreciated everyone's attention to detail and thoughtfulness by which they have approached this project. He stated he certainly has been more than willing to let them go down some different paths and go a little bit beyond the simple numbers update that they were originally tasked to do. There were certainly some areas that needed some in-depth review and re-write. Moving forward and trying to get wrap up, he understands that the Comprehensive Plan will always be a working document and there might be comments that they have missed or tucked away for future edits but he emphasized that the important step was to do as much as they can within the timeframe available. He once again thanked everyone for their efforts. He hoped that they could get a lot done in today's meeting. Chair Satre opined going chapter-by-chapter to see if the edits reflect their conversations thus far and address the ones that don't. He would then like to go through public comments that need to be covered for that chapter, decide which ones they want to use and which ones they want to put aside for future updates. He asked the Commissioners if that would work.

Ms. Lawfer stated that she had an issue to address regarding Chapter 1. She did not wish to deal with it now, but stated that quite possibly they will be dealing with this in the near future to lay out all of the different communities that Juneau has been, as far as the CBJ, as a native community, as a mining community, as a State, as a Federal Community, as a State Capital, and then they can have little vignettes that are specific to each community. She would also like to see some real involvement with subarea plans, to make sure that all historical and cultural resources are addressed in each individual plan, that all totems listed, their significance etc. Chair Satre agreed and stated they needed to bring in the appropriate experts in appropriate fields to guide them in that work.

Mr. Lyman asked which plan Ms. Lawfer was referring to. Ms. Lawfer suggested addressing it in the subarea on Page 218. Mr. Lyman mentioned that was actually discussed in 2008 during the update and they have lists including petroglyphs, totems, and burial sites; but were asked to remove it at the request of the Sealaska Heritage Institute because they were concerned about vandalism. Ms. Lawfer agreed, stating that if that was the case, then she did not want that. She stated maybe they just need to address Juneau as a native community in the history in Chapter 1.

Chair Satre queried about documenting the recommendations for future rewrites since people had taken the time to point them out. Mr. Lyman replied that he would do his best and will listen to minutes again multiple times to make sure that it has all been captured. Ms. Lawfer added that she would follow it up with an e-mail as well.

## Chapter 1

Chair Satre asked the Commission if there was anything substantiate that needed to be addressed in the introduction and background portion.

Ms. Bennett said she would like to know whether the other Commissioners were interested in what she had proposed and what she has synthesized from the comments that were provided.

Chair Satre stated that Commissioners were interested in redoing that chapter at a future date, but not doing any gross changes to it at this time. He stated Ms. Bennett's time spent on the chapter was extremely valuable and wanted to preserve that for future efforts.

Mr. Lyman noted that there was a request for a "how to use this plan" and a list of all of the other smaller plans, topic plans, to be included in Chapter 1, but that he hadn't had a chance to get to that yet. He felt that this would also fall under Commissioner Bennett's comments about the study area and plan organization, other plans referenced in other chapters etc. The Commission had mentioned this in the past as well and staff was still working to accomplish some sort of synopsis of those other plans by the next draft.

Chair Satre proposed may be adding it on the website rather than in the plan because it might be more helpful to the public.

Mr. Watson concurred with Chair Satre's comments on that. He spent a fair amount of time looking at other Comprehensive Plans, some of which were a lot lengthier and harder to read. He stated Chair Satre's suggestions would make it much more efficient, stating that most people go to the web for resources and research. Chair Satre was unsure if it all could be done in the three weeks before the Plan was presented to the Assembly.

Ms. Grewe spoke about the comments from Page 11 through 14 of the comments packet. Essentially the core of the issue is that the community history section, which starts on Page 3, has one sentence related to the first inhabitants of Auk and Taku Tlingit tribes. She thought the paragraph that the commentator provided on the original history of Juneau is a really good substitute. She opined that looking at this section completely, there is a whole paragraph on the Spanish and English; a paragraph on statehood; a paragraph on the Economic Downturn of the mid 80s; and the history of the Tlingit people in this community gets one sentence. She requested that a paragraph get added and substitute the commentator's paragraph in place of the staff's paragraph.

Chair Satre asked for the page she was referring to. Ms. Grewe replied that it was on Page 11 at the very bottom paragraph that starts off as, 'With the place we call Juneau...' in the version that

Mr. Lyman had sent most recently. Ms. Bennett stated that she used that, but she used a lot more of it than a paragraph.

Chair Satre referenced Ms. Grewe's suggestion of taking the two sentences on Page 11 and asked if there were any objections to that. There were no objections to move that forward.

He then went back to Ms. Bennett's printed comments and asked about the suggestion of adding language regarding the diversity of Juneau's people and the opportunity to learn about their different cultures. No questions were raised.

## Chapter 2

Mr. Miller noted Mr. Duff Mitchell's comment on Chapter 2 - Sustainability, and pointed out Assembly Resolution 25.28 adopting the Climate Action Plan and expressed concern if Chapter 2 reflected that resolution.

Mr. Lyman suggested that if it was the will of the Commission, he would suggest that since they started with discussing Resolution 2401 and creation of the Commission on Sustainability, that the logical place to put the resolution regarding the Climate Action Plan and would be below it, but before Policy 2.1. Committee was in agreement.

Ms. Bennett mentioned it was new topic in the upcoming American Planning Association meetings; suggested adding the term 'Resiliency' along with Sustainability and addressing Juneau as an Innovative Community etc. possibly in the Economic Development Section. Chair Satre proposed adding it in the section of things to address in the next version.

## Chapter 2 – Public Comments

Mr. Haight brought up Page 12, 2.1-1A13, said that this was new language that they had added to encourage LEED Certification. The Commission on Sustainability was working away from advocating LEED Certification and trying to formulate something more towards certification involving energy conservation and carbon reduction.

Mr. Lyman cited a comment on Page 15 of the comment document that Mr. Miller had sent a revision to read, 'Adopt energy efficiency guidelines and/or standards to encourage LEED or similar certification eligible construction by the public and private sectors.'

The Commission agreed that sentence would work.

Mr. Miller referred to Chapter 2, 'Sustainability' and then listed 5 things and added that the 6th thing should be Resiliency. Chair Satre asked if that would work for everyone. Ms. Grewe added on the resiliency comment saying that they could add a bullet that said "Resilience to socioeconomic and environmental challenges."

## Chapter 3

Mr. Watson brought up Page 18 (third line) 'Within this 20-year planning horizon...' and asked about their discussion on that. Mr. Lyman noted that a Comprehensive Plan should never be for

less than 20 years and was a long-range planning document. They would be doing a find and replace because anything shorter than that is not really worth being a Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Lyman continued to Page 17 about Mr. Miller's comment regarding how new growth areas function and what their intention was, there was concern about the last sentence, 'Certain small-scale, non-residential uses such as port facilities, resource-related industrial development such as the lumber mill, fish processing plant or recreational resort uses may be appropriate on an interim basis on portions of areas designated by this plan as new growth areas'.

The idea of the new growth area was rather than piecemeal development, one use at a time, that it should be a master planned community. This was just in a way saying before getting to the master planning of the community, it may be appropriate to look at the short term and long term uses i.e. gravel quarry or a dock facility. Mr. Lyman offered a suggestion, per Mr. Miller's comment, to keep 'interim basis', ....on portions of areas designated by this plan as a new growth area prior to new growth area plan approval...- basically saying before the approval goes through, there are still some things that could be allowed on an interim basis.

Ms. Bennett said she had spent quite a bit of time working on the issue regarding industrial land and commented about adding road connection(s) to the new growth area for dock and possible repair of helicopters and mining equipment etc. [written comment submitted]

Chair Satre felt they were all aligned as to putting side roads around the new growth area.

Ms. Bennett noted it was not just in Chapter 3, but several other places too.

Mr. Lyman mentioned that there were a lot of things that were redundant throughout the plan, they have tried to remove some, but in other cases the chapters cross reference and thus had to be left in.

Mr. Miller asked to go back to the interim growth question and raised the point that if there was economic development that took place across the island, e.g. repairing ships and it was approved on an interim basis; when growth happens (e.g. high rises), the thing that fueled the growth would have to leave because it was not part of the long term plan. He thought that they should be promoting all the economic development they could and remove the potential hurdles if they could.

Ms. Bennett suggested referencing Tables 4.5 and 4.2, which talk about the historical building of housing in Juneau from 2006 to 2012 and the list of available parcels, under adequate development opportunities, also because the housing section was up-to-date.

Chair Satre proposed adding that reference in and the commission agreed.

Ms. Lawfer mentioned the policy of CBJ selling land as opposed to leasing it, which was not necessarily related to housing.

Mr. Lyman said that if there was going to be a reference to that, it would probably be in Chapter 18, Implementation and Administration, because if they were going to provide a policy direction in the Comprehensive Plan to the Land Management Plan, it didn't make sense to do it in a

Housing Chapter or Community Forum Chapter, but in the Implementation Chapter. Ms. Lawfer agreed.

Mr. Miller said that he thought the leasing land idea or leasing land to-own or rent-to-own were some ways that the CBJ government could help subsidize affordable housing and it could be income based. He also felt that it would be better to have it listed in the Comprehensive Plan, so that it could be looked at and changed later.

Chair Satre called for any objections to moving forward along those lines in Chapter 18.

Mr. Lyman interjected that Mr. Chaney just pointed out that Chapter 17, Community Development, second heading was CBJ and Selected Lands and talks about land disposal and so he would retract his suggestion to put it into Chapter 18 and instead put it in 17.

#### Chapter 4

Ms. Bennett made a couple of suggestions on Chapter 4 for implementing actions, a new 4.1-IA9, develop a strategic plan to address dilapidated housing with incentives to either demolish or rehabilitate this housing, standards for evaluating degree of damage and potential for rehabilitation and mechanisms to encourage or force compliance for the public health and safety of CBJ citizens.

Chair Satre said he appreciated that and that would become a new implementing action after 4.1-IA9 on Page 45.

Ms. Bennett added that the last one would be to assist in the establishment of, which could be #9 which talks about the different issues around dilapidated housing and try to put it all in one implementing action.

Chair Satre suggested that it might be wise to separate it from #9 and possibly leave it on its own. Mr. Watson related the need to take out some of the things that would no longer be needed.

Chair Satre said that Ms. Bennett had suggested a new implementing action to go under policy 4.1 box, it would actually become IA10, leave it as its own.

Ms. Lawfer questioned Page 46 of the orange book, under 4.2-AI11, and felt it didn't really tell her what it was that they wanted to do. Mr. Watson suggested they take it out of there because it was addressed under economic development as one of the recommendations from JEDC. Chair Satre asked if there was any opposition to removing it. Ms. Bennett opined that from Mr. Lyman's standpoint about redundancy, maybe it was good to have it in the Housing portion as well as in Economic Development.

Mr. Miller said that he thought workforce housing was a real problem, but they didn't have enough answers to put it in an IA, but that didn't mean that somebody wouldn't at some point in the future. Ms. Grewe seconded Commission Miller and added that some of the implementing actions were very specific but some were very vague; and felt that some of the comments could

be used as placeholders for policy makers to know that this was a priority at this point in time. Chair Satre agreed to use it as a placeholder concept.

Mr. Miller brought up that there were a lot of comments about the need for more suburban housing and subdivisions.

Mr. Lyman suggested reviewing Figure 4.3 on Page 34 and whether or not this was actually adding anything to the chapter or the discussion and whether they wanted to keep it.

Mr. Haight and Mr. Medina agreed it should be removed.

Mr. Miller didn't agree completely. The block that describes homeless, single parents, senior disabled, working poor, he thought could be removed but the other part of it he felt gave a better description of income levels and went along with the Juneau Affordable Fair Market Rate. He continued to say that these were the key components of the whole dialog regarding median family income and affordable housing.

Mr. Medina stated that he could appreciate what Mr. Miller was saying, but thought they had talked about removing references to specific numbers because they were outdated as soon as you print up the document.

Mr. Watson said he didn't think it was particularly useful as there were plenty of places to access that information and preferred to see it removed.

Ms. Lawfer thought it had some value, especially the average median income, because it had been established with the Census and they wouldn't have another formal Federal Average Median Income for 10 years. She thought it was key to know what the average median income for Juneau was and then apply that to the 30 percent of income used towards housing. It didn't necessarily need to be a table, but they could talk about an established average median income.

Chair Satre concurred with referencing the source so everyone would know that it was a dated number at a specific point in time. Ms. Lawfer said that it was established for a 10-year time period.

Mr. Watson asked if they were not part of the update of the American Community Survey where they were taking it in shorter increments in smaller communities like Juneau. Ms. Lawfer pointed out that wasn't used for LIHEAP and all the federal programs.

Ms. Grewe opined that one couldn't understand the figure without reading the text and suggested several ways to correct amend it - AMI has been used interchangeably in the text = Area Median Income / Average Median Income – She thought it was Area Median Income. She didn't quite know how to fix it all. She also added that Juneau will have updated stuff every year from the American Community Survey, but the error rate is really high and not dependable.

Mr. Miller agreed with Ms. Grewe's statement that the table could be made more useful if it was correlated better with the text. He was okay with removing the income data and explaining the

rest of it to make the text clearer in terms of affordability and he thought that having a line at 80% would give some further clarification as well.

Mr. Lyman said he wanted to refine his earlier comments. On Page 24, of the comment document, the figure is very confusing. First, he would recommend that they get rid of the labels of the group (seniors, single mothers, etc...) because they don't really have anything to do with the numbers that were underneath them. The next question was the title, Juneau Affordable Fair Market Rate, which made you think about housing costs, then it says high end of 60% AMI = \$ Number, which is an income number, not a market rate number; so he recommended taking it out.

Mr. Medina opined that it would make the document shorter and suggested taking it out as well.

Ms. Bennett asked the other Commissioners and Mr. Lyman, for their thoughts on the number of charts and graphs in the housing section, more than in the other chapters. Chair Satre liked the pictures. Mr. Watson said as long as they made sense and the average person could read them, he didn't have any problems with the graphs and charts. Mr. Haight found that most of these charts and graphs were relevant, have a point of reference and establish a relationship quickly.

#### Chapter 5

Ms. Bennett stated that she had added a fair number of SOP's and IA's to the chapter mentioning that it was very well written and added a lot to their understanding of the economy. Ms. Bennett started with Policy 5.5, stating that the SOPs and IAs didn't address the problems identified in the opening paragraph. So, she added 5.5 SOP 3 to coordinate and possibly combine planning for downtown Juneau and any development of the Capital Complex. She noted that downtown Juneau didn't have room for both an expanding capital and housing unless they redefine what downtown Juneau meant.

Mr. Lyman announced with all due respect that he did not agree with Commissioner Bennett on that. If they just looked at the Willoughby District's Plan where they had an expanding cultural complex and expanding Capital present, the Capital site itself was identified as Telephone Hill where there were a few historical homes that are owned by the State of Alaska, and their own city-owned downtown transportation center. Those were the identified properties for an expanding State Capital. Also in the Willoughby District's Plan, recent changes to zoning regulations have allowed for taller height limits, increased density limits, and that's for the entire rest of the Willoughby Area where they currently have about half the land taken up as parking lots. Those sites have one and two story buildings but if redeveloped with five and six story buildings and structured parking, there would be space for 400-500 dwelling units, adequate parking and an expanded Capital Complex – he felt that the two concepts mutually reinforce each other.

Ms. Bennett commented with regards to the top of the hill down to Front Street, the area of downtown that surrounds the capital complex didn't have much room for additional housing. Mr. Lyman stated that downtown was generally defined in their subareas and was basically between Norway Point and Thane. Ms. Bennett was fine with that.



Ms. Bennett answered that 5.51A5, needed to be a referenced to 16B, dock facilities, and then 5.51A8.

Chair Satre asked if there were any objections to referencing the 16B project.

Mr. Watson suggested not using the word 16B because it meant nothing to people outside of Juneau and didn't see any reason for it to be there. Ms. Bennett stated that she didn't mean necessarily using those words, but just to reference the dock facilities as an upcoming project.

Regarding 5.51A8, Bennett suggested using the first sentence, "Support and facilitate the abatement of biohazards in the downtown area", and cut out the background.

Mr. Lyman noted on Page 61, Cruise Ship Passengers, the data was now out of date, and he would try to obtain the 2012 data for the next draft.

Chair Satre moved on to 511 Implementing Action 5 (Page 72 after IA4) and asked if this was new. Ms. Bennett said yes and suggested a change to read, 'Encourage funding of a second crossing and road system to West Douglas Island for improved port facilities, etc.'

Ms. Lawfer mentioned the concern of unknowns like cost, environmental impacts etc. She suggested encouraging planning instead of funding. Chair Satre proposed encourage continued analysis, not only just the nuts and bolts, but how to fund it as well.

Ms. Lawfer asked if the Assembly had made any official recommendations regarding crossing. Mr. Lyman mentioned a resolution identifying a community-preferred alternative. It had also been identified and routinely mentioned for the past 20 years, that the North Douglas crossing was the top transportation priority for the City and Borough of Juneau. Chair Satre noted that it was a few years back when they did that community-preferred alternative.

Ms. Grewe questioned if the preferred action from the Assembly right now was to continue studying and establishing community-preferred alternatives. Mr. Lyman responded saying that he wasn't able to say what the desire of the current Assembly was.

Chair Satre asked if it was still a standing resolution. Mr. Lyman said it was still a standing resolution, working on Pioneer Road off of the end of North Douglas Highway currently and planning for that; still looking at potential Deep Water Port Facility on West Douglas – when the item went before the public for a funding vote, the incredible amount of background information (gathered by the City, volunteers and the State) and work that had been done on that project and why that project was being proposed the way it was with the funding mechanism that was being proposed was not explained.

Mr. Watson reminded them that as a Planning Commission, they should be looking to future developments; he wasn't saying they shouldn't be concerned about environmental or funding issues, but primarily to be planners looking out for the development of Juneau.

Mr. Haight said it goes beyond the development side of the purpose for the road, but it also provides that extra element of safety if they do lose the bridge, they still have a way to get over.

Ms. Grewe replied that she didn't necessarily dispute adding it, but was trying to figure a way, because these were all related to the same core issue that they better use the land as available for development without necessarily taking a position on the funding of a second crossing.

Mr. Lyman suggested changing it to, 'Encourage continued analysis and planning for a second crossing and road system to West Douglas Island.'

Ms. Grewe asked why the others weren't included, port facilities, less intrusive industrial uses in urban areas, more land for a variety of industrial uses; she thought that Ms. Bennett was getting at the core problem of land available for industrial development of all kinds.

Ms. Bennett raised another possibility, Policy 5.11-IA5 and then right underneath it is 5.14-IA8. She suggested repeating the IA under 5.14 and then the same DG3 because they were all related or if they didn't want to have the wording exactly the same in each of the three, they could split it up a little bit.

Mr. Lyman said that in responding to Commissioner Grewe's question, he wasn't recommending to delete references to Port Facilities and Industrial Uses, but to clarify the language in the Implementing Action. To encourage pursuing and planning for this facility, regardless of the reason, e.g. encourage sprinklers in buildings downtown regardless of what the fire marshal says about it because they know it's an important thing and don't necessarily need the background of a sprinkler's purpose.

Mr. Medina added maybe they should make reference to the resolution, that it is a priority and to put that resolution number in, and that resolution could give all the background details, because he was not sure that they were all covered. If the Assembly had already adopted the resolution, then it would make sense to reference it.

Ms. Grewe proposed a language change, 'Encourage continued analysis and planning of industrial development lands including West Douglas Island, and other industrial lands'. She was trying to state that continued planning needs to occur, so that they can provide land for industrial development without making a position on the second crossing to open up West Douglas Island. It's wasn't just West Douglas Island, there were other issues at stake when it came to industrial land development.

Ms. Bennett indicated that under Policy 5.14, '...to support the development and expansion of the seafood industry and services and facilities...' that's where 5.14-IA8 could encompass some more of that information. She liked Mr. Medina's idea of referencing the resolution in Policy 5.11 and the idea of shortening the sentence and including the rest of that information in 5.14-IA8.

Mr. Miller opined that regardless of how controversial or divisive the second crossing was, the fact remains that development potential for Douglas Island was finite without it. It had been identified clearly with the resolution. He recommended that it be kept in the way Mr. Lyman had stated it, and felt it was a good idea to have the resolution number and comments in there.

Mr. Watson agreed with Commissioner Miller and considered the second crossing a very important part of their planning process.

Mr. Haight thought that the resolution by itself establishes a policy and they have to recognize it as one of their policies.

Chair Satre asked if the will of the Commission was to put a short reference to the resolution, i.e. to reference the existing resolution on a Community-Preferred Alternative for second crossing.

He noted that Ms. Bennett wanted to add some Implementing Actions under 5.14.

Ms. Bennett mentioned shortening the sentence to, 'Encourage planning or continued analysis of the second crossing and road system', they could use the other aspects of that sentence under 5.14 (discussion referencing Marine Transportation) and in 5.17 as well.

Chair Satre felt that referencing the resolution under the Industrial Land portion was a good place to include it and will also be included in 5.17.

Chair Satre then asked about her suggestions for 5.18 Implementing Action 8 and if that was a new one. Ms. Bennett said yes and read, 'Work with other Southeast Alaska Communities to foster innovative solutions to local challenges'.

Ms. Lawfer felt that it would be better if they define it further especially because it was an Implementing Action.

Mr. Haight interjected asking if that would be more appropriately placed as a Standard Operating Procedure versus an Implementing Action.

Mr. Lyman suggested that perhaps the proposed new IA8 as well as the IA5, IA6, and IA7 above, and perhaps even IA3 which all begin with 'Encourage' would be better suited as Standard Operating Procedures rather than Implementing Actions.

The Commission concurred.

Chair Satre then addressed, 520-IA2.

Ms. Bennett read, 'Encourage local purchases by school food programs, cruise ships, mining and fishing industries'.

Chair Satre proposed instead of listing individual business entities, he would say 'by all industry segments' to make it as broad as possible.

Mr. Watson thought it was covered under 5.4 SOP 7, 'Strengthen Juneau's role as a regional service hub for such things as fisheries, research, medical, retail, tourism, transportation, education...'

Chair Satre opined that he thought this one was different where they were encouraging buying local.

Mr. Lyman asked for clarification regarding the language on 5.20 IA2. Chair Satre reiterated that the first sentence was okay because it was specific to the food program and then encourage local purchases of goods in all industry segments. Ms. Bennett said she meant all basic industries in Juneau. Chair Satre suggested that it could read, 'Encourage local purchases of goods and services by local industries'. Mr. Haight voiced that maybe this should be an SOP resolution. Chair Satre and the Commissioners agreed.

Mr. Watson referred to Page 54 under Federal Government in the Orange Book, second line they had changed it to ...also brings a large federal government presence to Juneau. At the end of the third sentence, he struck through 'such as and through all the rest of the sentence down to the last one where it says, 'The US Coast Guard employees 363 staff.' Mr. Watson thought they were just listing federal agencies that they didn't need to, it was just superfluous information.

Mr. Lyman mentioned that that was a new paragraph that was requested by the Commission.

Ms. Lawfer wondered if this was referenced in the Housing Section as Housing for Military, i.e. Coast Guard; because it was a specific need. Mr. Lyman did not believe that they had mentioned Coast Guard Housing with any specificity. Ms. Bennett noted that it did say a need for military housing.

Mr. Miller commented about the length of the Comprehensive Plan saying that he thought it reads very well and did not see a need for it to be cut shorter.

Mr. Watson responded saying that his intent was not to cut it down because it was too long but that some of the information that was in there, was not necessary to make their point. e.g. Page 55 - Regional Economics and Services, Mr. Watson asked why the University of Alaska Southeast was listed as the number 1 item, there was no prioritization for those issues. He thought it was added by the Juneau Economic Development Council. He gave another example that there was more emphasis on fishing than there was on Juneau's biggest private employer - Mining.

BREAK: 20:40 TO 20:52.

Mr. Watson opined that this chapter had become more of a self-serving document for JEDC when it should not have. He also noted that University of Alaska was mentioned quite often. He directs the group to go to 5.11 DG1, and quotes it stating, "Prior to making a recommendation to the City Planning Commission on requests for the need to rezone industrial zone land, the Director of the Community Development Department should consult with the Director of Finance, etc..." He suggested striking that.

Mr. Lyman noted that it was standard operating procedure for planning staff when considering a rezoning request to circulate it to department heads that may be affected, but stated that the Finance Department was not generally a department that comments are requested from. The assessor's office is consulted on a regular basis and asked about impacts to property values, but that's a division within the Finance Department. Going to the Finance Director would be a policy change in terms of their day-to-day operations, but they do seek advice from the Director

of Public Works, Director of Engineering, Police Department, Fire Department, and other relevant agencies when considering zone changes.

Mr. Watson interjected saying that it was a part of their department's operating procedure and it was unnecessary and did not belong in this long-term development plan.

Chair Satre stated that the heart of the issue was to find ways to ensure themselves that they were not losing industrial references. He suggested that it could read, 'Lands designated for industrial use on the Comprehensive Plan....converted use is not allowed unless an essential public purpose as deemed by the Planning Commission and Assembly orders such conversion....'

Ms. Bennett understood Mr. Watson's position as they are trying to superimpose different processes on their way of doing things and that is not appropriate.

Chair Satre suggested getting rid of that whole part altogether. He recalled looking at old implementing actions, which fall along the line of ensuring that all of the industrial land is not being rezoned.

Chair Satre suggested leaving the original language.

Ms. Grewe supported leaving the original language in total. She thought the intent of what they wanted to do is in the original language and what has been proposed is more or less a management guideline as to how they go about their business. She noted that JEDC is composed of a board of directors that are appointed by the Assembly; it is not just the organization. They have leadership that have had input on this. This is one of the chapters that have undergone significant revision and addition. She had encouraged that JEDC review this strongly at the time, but now felt they were dealing with a different chapter, she appreciated the input of locally appointed leaders but reiterated using the original language.

Chair Satre asked if Mr. Watson agreed with the use of the original language. Ms. Watson agreed with the original language.

Mr. Lyman asked for clarification, asking if they were going back to the original language on 5.11 DG1 and not striking the entire first part, but just going back to the original language.

Chair Satre stated that was correct.

Mr. Lyman also noted that they have changed the industrial land use designation to the heavy industrial designation and stated he would make that change.

Mr. Watson referenced Page 75, 'Employers must recognize...', and stated he was going to leave the comments he made at the opening because it did not turn out the way he had envisioned it and did not contribute towards economic development any more than it had in the past. Specifically, no emphasis was made on the biggest private employer in the community, which is mining and the growth opportunity.

Chair Satre referenced Page 79, the Developmental Guidelines 1 and 2 under 5.17; his recollection of the conversation on these developmental guidelines was to not necessarily to single out an industry. He recommended striking Developmental Guideline 1. He suggested editing Developmental Guideline 2 to fall underneath the Policy of 5.17, where they are actually considering the economic impacts of private investment. He proposed consulting with investors,

entrepreneurs, local housing developers, and JEDC to look at long term worker housing solutions as well as bringing the appropriate parties within the community together for input.

Ms. Lawfer agreed with Chair Satre; however, did not think that housing was their only primary responsibility for fast growth and suggested looking at infrastructure like schools, transportation, and housing.

Chair Satre mentioned that any type of rapid expansion is painful (in terms of schools, roads, houses), be it a new mining operation or a research facility or school. He read the SOP under 5.17, ‘...utilizing the CIP program to focus and invest in infrastructure in new or expanded basic industries..’, which he thought was absolutely appropriate; but suggested making Development Guidelines 1 and 2 work with any industry that is booming.

Mr. Miller concurred that the burden cannot be put on one industry sector and agreed that all industry sectors should be included. Regarding striking DG1, but proposed striking ‘mine operators’ to ‘read industry leaders’. He suggested rewriting Development Guideline 2 to include what the Assembly is doing now with the Affordable Housing plans.

Ms. Bennett why eliminating DG2 was necessary.

Mr. Watson mentioned that the SLAM project being built right now will bring about 400 workers into town, rotating. He did not feel that the general contractor should be responsible for DG1 and DG2. He stated that they need to be very careful, because it was bordering on being negative about developing the community economically. He gave another example of the Bartlett Hospital and the expansions that they have gone through. He agreed fully with the Chair.

Chair Satre recapped saying that he had suggested getting rid of DG1, but Mr. Miller has recommended keeping it in and just changing the language to be all inclusive.

Ms. Lawfer did not agree with the primary responsibility aspect but would like to see a collaboration in the consultations.

Mr. Medina supported removing DG1 under 5.17.

Ms. Bennett reworded it to say, “Industries coming to Juneau should coordinate with CBJ government to anticipate the necessary roads, ports, worker housing and other infrastructure facilities needed to adequately service their needs.”

Ms. Lawfer suggested keeping the word ‘operations’.

Mr. Haight wondered if policy 5.17 was even needed.

Mr. Lyman stated that he thought maybe it was intended by the JEDC Board when they suggested impact fees, that all the taxpayers not be responsible financially for the impact that a new industry has on a community, e.g. ‘..If you’re going to put in 200 or a 1000 new residential dwelling units, you either need to build a school or a park or pay into a fund for those public facilities, because that residential development is going to bring some number of children to that area, and rather than telling all of the taxpayers in that community that they need to build a new elementary school, so that the kids in this new residential development have somewhere to go to

school, instead they pay in that fee or they build that school themselves'. Mr. Lyman further stated that similarly, in Juneau, as in other places, developers have to build the roads and extend the utilities to serve their new developments; he gave examples of roadwork connecting different mining operations that are not paid through taxpayer money. While he understood the Commission's concerns about the phrasing, he thought there was some rationale used throughout the country where developers do have to pay for the impacts of what they are building (e.g. Home Depot building a sidewalk along Commercial Boulevard and had to pay for right-of-way acquisition and some changes to the intersection of Anka Street and Glacier Highway).

Ms. Bennett stated that her corrections were going in the wrong direction.

Mr. Miller mentioned that it sounded like CDD is able to take care of these things that need to happen as they are getting permitted.

Mr. Watson mentioned being responsible for bringing a medium-sized business to Juneau (72 employees) where he had met with some of the city officials and property owners because they needed to build a building, but he did not recall anybody mentioning housing to him. He stated that if those things had come up, they would have gone to Ketchikan, because that was their second option. Mr. Watson pointed out that putting in language that would be detrimental for bringing in businesses wasn't a good idea. He understands putting in a sidewalk like Home Depot had to or building roads to reach establishments, but did not understand the point of Policy 5.17.

Mr. Medina supported Mr. Miller in that he really did not see the need for Policy 5.17. While he understood what Mr. Lyman described and what JEDC was doing, he felt that they were going to be stepping on too many toes trying to get there and thought it would be easier to just remove it.

Ms. Grewe thanked Mr. Lyman for the clarification and could understand JEDC's intent, but suggested keeping Policy 5.17 - Standard Operating Procedure as stated. As for the Development Guideline 1, she proposed a change that would read as 'Private and public sectors should have shared responsibility for anticipating the necessary roads, ports, worker housing and other infrastructure facilities needed to adequately service the industry'. Mining does not need to be called out, because theoretically any one of the industries could boom and cause undue burden to the community and expense to the public. She also proposed striking Development Guideline 2 because the language sounded like it was telling the borough how to do should do business. Chair Satre liked the language on DG1 as Ms. Grewe proposed.

Mr. Haight mentioned that as the population expands, there are going to be increased infrastructure costs and questioned the method of payment – pay upfront or through taxes.

Mr. Chaney pointed out that the Land Use Code really is bifurcated in that if it is a rural mine, those mines are considered allowable use permits and the regulatory regime over those is very limited; but if it is an urban mine, there is language in there that addresses economic impacts and is very thorough. Mr. Chaney mentioned the difficulty in trying to craft one policy for both those circumstances.

Mr. Lyman stated that instead of a development guideline, may be they could have an implementing action to review and adopt with appropriate provisions for collecting impact fees for large developments [any industry/ any size]. They currently did not have impact fees in the community and may not even be allowed under State law, but staff could research it further.

Mr. Lyman stated that instead of a development guideline, may be they could have an implementing action to review and adopt with appropriate provisions for collecting impact fees for large developments [any industry/ any size]. They currently did not have impact fees in the community and may not even be allowed under State law, but staff could research it further.

Mr. Miller emphasized he was dead set against impact fees. He agreed with the text changes to that Ms. Grewe had proposed to DG 1, but wasn't against getting rid of Policy 5.17 in its entirety either.

Mr. Watson agreed with Mr. Haight.

Ms. Bennett was in favor of keeping the policy with Ms. Grewe's suggestions, considering the research done on Wal-Mart in various communities and the impact on the communities with regards to low wages, lack of health care etc., for their employees.

**MOTION:** *by Mr. Haight to strike Policy 5.17 entirely.*

Ms. Grewe objected to the motion saying that striking DG2 and adjusting the language to DG1 makes this a relatively harmless policy to keep in place, but it does keep a placeholder for weighing development and the burden to the community of needed infrastructure and housing and other such things.

**Roll Call Vote:**

Ayes: Medina, Haight, Watson, Satre

Nays: Lawfer, Bennett, Grewe, Miller

*Motion to strike Policy 5.17 failed for 4:4 vote.*

**MOTION:** *by Mr. Grewe to change the language on DG1 to private and public sector have shared responsibly to anticipate the necessary roads, ports, worker housing and other infrastructure facilities needed to adequately serve the industry and strike DG2.*

*Friendly amendment by Mr. Haight to include public and private investment in the title.*

Mr. Haight then apologized saying that 5.16 was a policy just about public investment and 5.17 just about private investment and withdrew the friendly amendment.

With no objection, Ms. Grewe's proposed language was accepted.

Mr. Lyman asked if Ms. Grewe could read the new language for DG1.

Ms. Grewe read, 'Private and public sectors have shared responsibility to anticipate the necessary roads, ports, worker housing and other infrastructure and facilities needed to



adequately serve the industry.’ She added it should be ‘growing’ industry to accommodate any economic impacts.

Mr. Miller referred to Mr. Haight's friendly amendment and said that Policy 5.16 considers other municipal investments, but not in the same way. He noted that there may be public investment such as the SLAM building which could have an impact in the same manner. He felt it was crucial to add add public and private investment because 5.16 discusses completely different aspects of investment.

There being no objection, ‘public’ was added into 5.17.

Mr. Chaney was uncomfortable with some of the policy directions that stated they would provide funding to JEDC directly. He was wondering if they could substitute the language of appropriate agencies for JEDC and leave that up to the future as to whether it will be JEDC or some other appropriate agency to do whatever it is that is required.

Ms. Grewe suggested doing a Find through the document for JEDC and wondered if perhaps replacing it with ‘appropriate local entity’ would serve the purpose of each of those statements without limiting it to only JEDC.

Mr. Haight supported the measure and also proposed highlighting those areas to be reviewed at the next meeting.

Mr. Lyman noted that they would try to get all the changes requested by the next meeting but may be not all of it. He gave an example where an appropriate agency may not even have to be mentioned, e.g. 5.18-IA2 ‘Provide financial support to JEDC to provide micro small loans’, he said it could just read as ‘Provide financial support to provide micro small loans’. He sought approval from the Commission to do that because he felt that was completely workable. They could then go over the finer details later.

Mr. Miller expressed concern over the number of times JEDC was mentioned and questioned if these things were part of their scope of work. The JEDC was appointed by the Assembly and if they are volunteering to do all the work, it wasn’t necessarily a bad thing; but if it was just to gather more work and more funding, he was against it.

Chair Satre mentioned that the JEDC could always address it with the Assembly if the edits did not meet their approval.

Mr. Medina liked Mr. Lyman's suggestion in that they have to be careful when they mention only certain organizations.

Ms. Lawfer mentioned that the resolution that established the JEDC was very specific as to what they were supposed to be doing and the chapter should reflect more towards that resolution. She stated she would find the resolution for the next meeting.

While Ms. Grewe understood it was part of their scope changes, she recalled that at a Planning Commission, they had discussed the need for an overall economic development plan and how they could potentially encourage JEDC to embrace that part of their role. They could look at

their resolution from when it was passed, but noted that it had probably been 20 years or more since the JEDC was incorporated. She thought that the resolution was probably very generic i.e. to promote the overall economic wellbeing of Juneau as a community, but she did not think it spoke directly to economic development planning. Ms. Grewe went on to say that they have to make sure that this chapter is not encouraging more activity to JEDC for them to seek more funds, but to encourage them to pursue a stronger role in Economic Development Planning.

Mr. Watson agreed that the Borough did not have an economic plan, but the Borough should give the leadership to JEDC to do that, not the Planning Commission. He cautioned staff to be careful with the language incorporated.

Ms. Lawfer referenced Page 52 - Economic Drivers, the Economic Development Plan for Juneau (AI3) and suggested rewording it to some extent.

Ms. Bennett mentioned Pages 51 and 52, adding in mining and fishing to the discussion and also 5.1-1A4, adding of ASMI and JCVB and other organizations to deal with marketing and not just JEDC alone.

Mr. Lyman stated that they would do their best to make the appropriate changes.

Chair Satre cautioned the Commissioners to take a look at those changes very carefully to make sure those changes were still needed.

Mr. Medina referred to Page 80, Development Guidelines 5.18-DG1 and noted it should be an SOP rather than a development guideline; 'Encourage Juneau School District and UAS to graduate workers, prepare for Creative Innovation in Economy'. The Commissioners concurred with the change.

Mr. Watson referenced Page 83, 520-IA1, 'Review the CBJ purchasing code to promote local purchase...' he did not think it was a complete enough statement. He gave examples of organizations that buy out of state like hospitals (Bartlett) and University of Alaska. He suggested either including other agencies or striking it out.

Mr. Lyman clarified that Bartlett was part of the CBJ, but UAS was not.

Chair Satre recommended adding a separate implementing action to encourage the State of Alaska to do the same thing, but added that they wouldn't be able to implement any sort of review of their operating procedures. Mr. Watson accepted.

Ms. Bennett mentioned that in her comments regarding 5.20-1A2, they had included the State. 'Encourage local purchases by schools for their food programs, encourage local purchases of goods by...'.

Ms. Grewe referred to the implementing action in the orange report of the Comprehensive Plan, Page 83, 'Review the CBJ purchasing code and amend it to promote more local purchase to the greatest degree practical and legal' and stated that she supported it remaining in. She then referenced context relating to looking local first, articulated at the end of Page 82, with the local

government spending local dollars on sourcing their local goods to local companies and Ms. Bennett's comments about encouraging local purchases by schools for their food programs, local purchase of the goods by cruise ships, mining companies and visiting groups – Ms. Grewe asked who had the responsibility of marketing local products. She did not think it was the Borough's responsibility to market privately produced goods, but did think it was the Borough's responsibility to buy local goods whenever practical and legal. She felt that Ms. Bennett's comment was in a sense incorporated by reference in the policy statement of 520.

Mr. Watson mentioned that as a businessman, he knows that a large amount of the money used to purchase goods by governmental agencies goes to the State because the first place most people go to is the website, not because it's practical and legal, but as a matter of habit and convenience.

Mr. Miller was in favor of 520, Implementing Action #2, but just thought it needed more emphasis.

Chair Satre asked if there was any objection to leaving IA1 and IA2 in. None were raised.

He closed up comments for Chapter 5 and thanked everyone including staff, for working through it again. He thought it worked well and opined that it might all be done by the end of April.

Mr. Haight concurred that it might be the end of April as they were not even a third of the way through the Plan and suggested having one more session like this. Chair Satre agreed to have another Committee of the Whole where they could solely focus on this.

Mr. Miller suggested starting the next Committee of the Whole meeting at 5:15 instead of 7 p.m., so that they could accomplish more, especially on Chapter 6.

Mr. Chaney mentioned a scheduling conflict was the reason the meeting was moved to 7 p.m. He then asked if there was going to be public testimony for the next Committee of the Whole meeting. Chair Satre replied that it would be mostly Commissioner comments as they have had long periods of discussion and public comments, but at some in time they just have to move forward. Mr. Haight agreed because they don't really have a lot more time left as well.

Mr. Lyman brought back the subject of native community, tribes etc. discussed in Chapter 1 which would be coming up again in Chapter 16 and also Mr. Mitchell's comments about the plan being inclusive of all; saying that he wanted everyone to know that there was never any intention to only mention one tribal entity and not another. Mr. Lyman stated that they will be going through and making sure that if they have mentioned one tribal entity, that they are mentioning the others as well. No disrespect was meant to the Douglas Indian Association by not mentioning them. He was also glad that the public had pointed that out.

Ms. Bennett mentioned that she would be gone from April 9th to the 21st, but would have the rest of the comments ready before she leaves [community comments] and would submit them to Mr. Lyman.

Mr. Lyman remarked that he would not be in the office for the next two weeks and requested the commissioners to send their comments to PC\_Comments@ci.juneau.ak.us or to Greg Chaney or Hal Hart.

Chair Satre then discussed the dates for the next meetings - Regular Planning Commission meeting on March 26th, Committee of the Whole on April 2nd, and may be one more between the Regular Planning Commission meetings on April 9th and 23rd. He hoped to have this wrapped up by then.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** *By Chair Satre to adjourn the meeting.*

*With no objection, the meeting adjourned at 9:56 p.m.*