I. **CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Deputy Mayor Jeff Bush, Chair, called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Assembly Chambers.

Assemblymembers Present: Jonathan Anderson (teleconference), Jeff Bush, Sara Chambers, Johan Dybdahl (teleconference), Merrill Sanford, David Stone, Randy Wanamaker.

Assemblymembers Absent: Bruce Botelho, Bob Doll.

Staff present: Kim Kiefer, City Manager; John Hartle, City Attorney; Laurie Sica, Municipal Clerk; Rorie Watt, Engineering Director; Dale Pernula, Community Development Director; Greg Chaney, Planning Manager; Joe Buck, Public Works Director; Deb Morse, JSD Maintenance and Facilities Supervisor; Laury Scandling, JSD Assistant Superintendent.

Others Present: Mark Choate, Andi Story, Phyllis Carlson, Ed Flanagan, School Board members; Dennis Watson, Nicole Grewe, Marsha Bennett, Nancy Waterman, Planning Commission members; Valerie Watson, Mary Borthwick, and other members of the League of Women Voters.

II. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

A. May 11, 2009

Hearing no objection, the minutes of May 11, 2009 Assembly Committee of the Whole meeting were approved.

III. **STATUS REPORT ON THE SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT STRATEGY IMPLEMENTATION**

Ms. Kiefer said that staff believes it is time to move forward with hiring the Solid Waste Coordinator position. Mr. Buck referred to his memo in the packet which outlines timeframes for accomplishing the twelve core management tasks identified and adopted by the Assembly in January 2008. The time frames he proposes are estimated with the assumption that the Solid Waste Coordinator would be hired and dedicated to working through the tasks. His report summarized the work done by SCS consultants regarding the rate model and their draft implementation program, a brief narrative regarding the feasibility study on the plasma arc incineration, and a position description for the Solid Waste Coordinator which is under review by the Human Resources department. The funding for the position was budgeted within the FY09 budget and was not filled. The funding for the position is budgeted in the FY10 budget, and the source of funds it the solid waste management fund. Future funding for the position would be
from another source, either a franchise fee or a host fee at the landfill, which are normal for this
type of position.

Mr. Wanamaker asked what the maximum length of time could be for the city to hire a temporary
person. Mr. Hartle said an employee could be hired for the length of a project. Mr. Wanamaker
said if there is not a solid time line for the position, it could continue without anything more
definitive. Mr. Hartle said it would have to be in the budget, but it appears to be to implement the
program, then run the program.

Mr. Wanamaker said he does not think there is enough information to hire a person as a full time
position, he wanted to see a limit of two years on the position until further information was
available.

Ms. Kiefer said this position has been considered an ongoing position, which would implement
the program, then keep the program going, to coordinate contracts, fees, the hazardous waste
program and other components. If no long term solution is achieved, the position can be phased
out. The problem with creating a temporary position is that we don’t have a solid time frame to
define the project, which limits the position and the applicant’s commitment level. It would be
difficult to define the timeline, and it would be difficult to find a person to take a temporary
position. It will be difficult to find the right person anyway.

Mr. Stone said he supported recycling and this position is critical to see this move forward. We
have to give someone a sense that we are going to hang in with this program and see it through.
This is in the long term interest of the landfill.

Mr. Sanford said he was not sure the Assembly had made a decision for moving forward in a
specific direction. We have not decided on the method of disposal that we are going to pursue.
He referred to number 6, the material recovery facility (MRF) and asked the status.

Mr. Buck said there has been a solicitation of interest to private landowners to seek locations for
such a facility, to get information to determine cost estimates. Mr. Sanford said that seemed
legitimate to get costs for decision making.

Ms. Kiefer said all the factors and options need to be reviewed so that potential fees can be
determined. We have to look at everything up front without any promises and with all the factors
known so that decisions can be made.

Mr. Hartle said that task three is an ordinance. That is a decision point for the Assembly.

Ms. Chambers said it seemed to be putting the cart before the horse to hire someone to coordinate
what we aren’t sure what we are coordinating. Will the position do some of this work to get us to
the decision point?

Ms. Kiefer said there will be a big learning curve for the person hired, we will have the
coordinator working with present staff and the committee to get up to speed and develop an
understanding of the project. This will be beneficial. We have struggled with this idea. The
position is funded not funded out of the general fund. Now we have four CBJ staff people on this and this will be the new position’s job to pull this all together.

Mr. Stone understood the concerns and the fiscal issue of hiring and said this is a risk the Assembly should take.

Mr. Anderson asked if the information is available on the rate study for curbside recycling. Mr. Buck said a first draft of that analysis was recently submitted and he has not had an opportunity to do a detailed review. Mr. Anderson asked for a sense of the cost. Mr. Buck said he did not have that.

Mr. Bush asked if the rate structure took long term issues into consideration, such as savings from not land filling material. Mr. Buck said no, it is based on cost of service today. The consultants are looking at development costs for a recycling facility and automated equipment that can handle both recyclables and trash. Long term implications have not been considered because no decisions have been made.

Mr. Anderson said a second question is whether to go to recycling or incineration, and he asked what information was needed to decide which direction to go. One seems to preclude the other.

Ms. Kiefer said this is a question still under review. We continue to get new information, and we need to determine if this will be a CBJ cost, a private business cost, or a portion of both. The Solid Waste Coordinator position will help us gather this information.

Mr. Anderson asked if the position was based on an assumption that recycling was the direction the city was heading toward and Mr. Kiefer said no.

Mr. Dybdahl said he supported Mr. Stone’s position about moving forward. He is concerned that this whole issue remains somewhat fragmented and having this position will provide us with a more clear focus. He did not see the waste-to-energy and recycling as a “one or the other.” Once there is more information gleaned from the new coordinator, we will likely find that both are going to be applicable in our case.

Mr. Wanamaker said he did not think it was the best idea to hire a Solid Waste Coordinator full time now. The economy may lend CBJ toward being able to find someone during this industrial downsizing. We need to recruit on a temporary basis and take us as far as we can to see what our decisions might look like, and see if the position will be able to fit in with those decisions. Now, he does not support a full time position.

Mr. Sanford said he supports the position, he was not sure whether it should be permanent or temporary. He hoped within six months the primary responsibilities will be taken care of, as this has taken too long for a decision to be made about the approach we will take. We need to take the leadership and set a direction.

Mr. Wanamaker asked the next move by staff in regards to the position. Ms. Kiefer said she has heard several viewpoints.
Mr. Dybdahl said there didn’t need to be a debate on whether there is a temporary or permanent position – that is the purview of the manager and the subsequent policy decisions that are made by the Assembly as we get more information and move forward.

Mr. Stone said we need to move forward, to get to a decision by the end of the year, and he left it to staff’s recommendation to how they can get the best applicants.

Mr. Anderson said he agreed with Mr. Stone and Mr. Sanford, and was comforted by staff’s comment that this is not a direction toward recycling or waste-to-energy, but citizens have said that managing the landfill and solid waste is among their top concerns. He supported the position moving forward.

MOTION, by Dybdahl, to recommend to the full Assembly, the staff’s recommendation to hire a Solid Waste Coordinator.

Mr. Wanamaker asked if Mr. Dybdahl was recommending a full time or a temporary position.

Mr. Dybdahl said recommended a permanent, full-time position, and there are subsequent decision points and policy decisions that will be made by the Assembly and by the manager’s office in regards to this position.

Ms. Chambers said she has no problem with a permanent position as long as the Assembly moves forward to provide the person with the decisions to proceed and act.

Mr. Bush said that we have said we want this to happen and this is why staff is recommending this course of action.

Ms. Chambers said right now there is nothing to manage and there are varying directions that we have not narrowed down. There could be skill sets missed if we went in one direction or another, but supported the staff’s judgment to move forward.

Roll call:
Aye: Anderson, Bush, Chambers, Dybdahl, Sanford, Stone
Nay: Wanamaker
Motion passed 6 ayes, 1 nay.

IV. SCHOOL DISTRICT – FUTURE BONDING PROJECTS RELATED TO THE OCTOBER BALLOT

Mr. Watt said the Public Works and Facilities Committee (PWFC) met on June 1, 2009 in joint session with the School Facilities Committee. That group forwarded this issue of bonding for three school projects on the October 2, 2009 ballot to the Assembly Committee of the Whole. He outlined the information in the packet.

Ms. Morse said the three projects would be the Juneau School District’s last three large scale projects to come before the Assembly in the near future. She spoke about the age of Gastineau and Auke Bay Elementary and Marie Drake, and the lack of major work on these facilities. Work
was needed on all of them to remodel for ADA accessibility, mechanical work, plumbing, and a variety of major maintenance issues.

Mr. Watt said that engineering is at the end of several big projects, we have seen good bids. The hospital has a fairly large project forthcoming, but municipal efforts are on the decline. We have put money into the local economy with these projects. School projects leverage state dollars. There are lots of good reasons to do the projects and there are lots of good reasons to keep taxes down.

Mr. Sanford asked if new windows were put into Gastineau. Ms. Morse said yes, and also acknowledged that new roofs have been put on these schools.

Mr. Wanamaker asked what was happening with the mill rate and the bond capacity for the projects on line or coming on line.

Ms. Kiefer said that information on the current mill levy and the level of debt for each project was in the packet, and one graph showed the debt level with all three projects.

Mr. Bush asked if the charts assumed state reimbursement and Ms. Kiefer said yes.

Mr. Sanford referred to the last chart and asked if all three projects would be paid off in ten years. Ms. Kiefer said that was correct.

Mr. Anderson asked what was continuing to be paid through the future. Ms. Kiefer said the existing bond debt was for older school projects, such as Thunder Mountain, Floyd Dryden and Dimond Park pool. The length of the bond depended upon when the bonds were sold, for what term and how it staggered out.

Mr. Bush asked to refer the issue to the next Finance Committee meeting in mid-July.

Mr. Sanford asked about the timing for the ballot. Mr. Bush said deadline is late August.

Mr. Sanford asked if any other departments are coming forward for funding on the ballot. Ms. Kiefer said she would ask and report back. Mr. Sanford referred to concerns about the sewage treatment plant.

Mr. Wanamaker asked about funds set aside for voter information, that in the past we have needed to present information to the public and it can’t just be budgeted and it has to come forward as a specific appropriation. Mr. Hartle said that is correct, that a specific appropriation has to be made to give the Assembly a chance to authorize such expenditure.

V. **COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT (CDD) UPDATE**

Ms. Kiefer said issues and concerns about CDD have come up before and so funds were appropriated for a survey to review the services. She said overall the survey shows people feel pretty good about their interactions with the department. There is always room for improvement.
Mr. Pernula provided significant information in the packet, including the full survey responses. He introduced members of the League of Women Voters and the Planning Commission.

Customer feedback surveys are available on a continuous basis, but this was a sampled survey to get specific results from a certain period of time. The League is an unbiased, third party with credibility in the community, and because of their tenacity, they got a high rate of return – 48%. The overall ratings of customer satisfaction are good or better. He said processing time satisfaction was directly correlated to the predictability of how long the actions will take. The most difficult action to predict for completion is a rezone, then a variance and they were the actions which scored lowest, as there were so many variable factors.

He provided an update on the recommendations made by Zucker and Associates in 1998 – many are ongoing recommendations that need to be checked into periodically. Construction data is included – new residential has slowed a bit, but many municipal projects are ongoing and work has not slowed down in the community.

Staff has come up with some ideas to address issues in the survey, the Planning Commission has added more:

1. Provide clear and precise submittal requirements; review existing submittal check lists and develop additional check lists where needed
2. Provide realistic expectations for review times
3. For planning cases going to the Planning Commission, provide realistic timelines and clearly articulate the often unpredictable nature of the permit (this is especially important for rezoning and variance cases, but also for CUPS and AUP's). CDD staff, along with the Planning Commission, are currently involved in an update of the Table of Permissible Uses to reduce any unnecessary processes
4. Reduce staff turnover where possible. Improve desk manuals, training programs, etc., so that processes and expectations are well understood by the staff person discussing issues with applicants when turnover does occur, and to ensure consistency.
5. The Community Development and Engineering Departments are engaged in a process to develop new computer software that will help ensure consistency, expediency and thoroughness in the permit application and record keeping processes. The software is based on work flows modeling codes and policies, thus ensuring that consistency.
6. New software will create electronic checklists for both submittals and development review processes consistent with Zucker Systems recommendations.
7. Reduce the number of permits requiring approval as CUPS or AUP's. Where possible, establish prescriptive standards instead.
8. Revise development ordinances so that they are clear and concise. The consolidation of subdivision requirements into one section of City Code is now underway.
9. Improve handouts explaining various permit processes and including timelines
10. Explain in a handout what is expected of an applicant for permits that are reviewed by the Planning Commission and the approval process
11. Staff must always be respectful of all people who enter the Permit Center and be flexible in assisting them in meeting their goals
12. Develop a new menu of universal standards to help improve consistency
13. Improve the CDD webpage and advertise its presence more widely
14. Improve plan review systems for all types of permits (this has already begun)
15. Consider permitting rezones more than two times per year
16. Emphasize the importance of pre-application conferences where potential problems can be identified and addressed early in the process
17. Reduce the number of uses requiring CUP'S or AUP's; instead employ use of more prescriptive standards
18. Monitor fees for building permits to ensure they are not excessive
19. Recruit local people to fill position vacancies to help reduce staff turnover

Mr. Stone said this survey was well done and he thanked the League of Women Voters. The homeowners seem very happy, but the contractors seemed to grumble some. He asked if Mr. Pernula have any sense of alarm from the feedback from the contractors.

Mr. Pernula said that there was one group that rated fairly low, some of them are people who use the permit center over and over again and their comments area important to us.

Mr. Sanford asked if CDD keeps track of the time it takes to get various permits out. Mr. Pernula said yes, Mr. Sanford said he would like to see those figures. Mr. Pernula said they are trying to meet the Zucker Report recommendation for specific time for plan review.

Mr. Sanford said there seems to be some problems when trying to get permits for existing homes regarding historical information on water lines sizes. Mr. Pernula said that was a general engineering issue. Mr. Watt spoke about the changing standards within the community over time, and this can cause problems for remodeling if lines are undersized. It is a calculation that needs to be done for the plumbing code, and is a consequence of how we built the water system and how the plumbing code has evolved over time. Mr. Sanford said it perhaps a decision just needs to be made up front regarding what will be required to meet permit conditions.

Mr. Sanford said the driveway permit seems to be simple, but he had heard of three different situations in which houses had difficulty getting a driveway permit – one was lost to staff turnover, and others were arguing back and forth about doing it.

Mr. Watt said he would look for efficiencies, but homeowners tend to want more driveways than are workable for street maintenance and ingress/egress. When a request is rejected, some keep asking.

Mr. Sanford said that building inspections were rated high, and they are doing a good job and are versatile. He had a good experience on his recent building project.

Ms. Chambers said she saw that there were differing standards or answers depending on who a person talked with in the department. What is the plan to help the staff get on the same page?

Mr. Pernula said that does happen at times, sometimes it is a communication issue, sometimes it is a code issue, and sometimes there are personnel issues with turnover. Trying to reduce staff turnover and create desk manuals so new staff understand will help. We may get criticized for having too many meetings, but we hold staff meetings to make sure all the permits are moving forward and at the same time we instruct staff members on difficult interpretations to let them know the interpretation and the reason.
We are trying to improve the code, reduce turnover, provide desk manuals, hold regular meetings and be consistent.

Mr. Dybdahl asked about objectivity and leaving personal biases behind. Mr. Pernula said that is a difficult one and we discourage personal biases and encourage sticking to code.

Mr. Chaney said there are a few contractors that get upset, but his experience was that complaints came more from people who did not routinely work with the department and were not familiar with the processes. The 3-6 weeks required for adequate public notice and hearings generated a lot of unhappiness. We are trying to reduce the number of public hearings, but it is impossible to make everyone happy all the time.

Mr. Hartle said the Assembly’s decision to uphold the Planning Commission’s decision regarding the appeal of the Heritage Hills cottage housing subdivision was recently upheld by the Superior Court.

Mr. Bush thanked the League, the staff and Planning Commission members present for their work and input.

VI. AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROPOSAL WITH JUNEAU ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COUNCIL

Ms. Kiefer said in May the Affordable Housing Commission (AHC) approved a full time coordinator position to be housed at the Juneau Economic Development Council (JEDC). After that meeting Mr. Sorenson, Ms. Chambers, Ms. Kiefer and JEDC met to outline the position. JEDC took the information and came back with a draft with outcomes they would provide. Their approach was not a full time position but using a variety of current staff to do pieces of the job based on their expertise. This was discussed at the Lands Committee meeting last week. The AHC still wants a primary position to be more than half time. They liked Jed’s idea, but think a key single person drives the project. They sent back a subcommittee to work on what this position will look like with JEDC. High, medium and low tasks are outlined. The full commission will meet on Wednesday, June 17, to review the subcommittee work. At the June 29 meeting, the assembly will have the outline of the work and JEDC will have a general proposal of what it will cost to do the work. This is still in flux. The push is to get something moving by July 1. We want to keep moving forward, and it is time for the AHC to report on work accomplished to date.

More information will be in the Assembly packet on June 29. She will look for Assembly direction to work out the contract with JEDC at a specific amount. It is a funding ordinance as well, to be made effective July 1, and those are generally effective when passed.

Mr. Sanford asked about the 20th Century Apartments. Ms. Kiefer said Mr. Sorenson keeps working on that separate from his work for the AHC. He updates the AHC as issues arise.
VII. COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Mr. Dybdahl said Sunday, June 20, will be the first Juneau Day at Icy Strait Point for this season.

Mr. Bush said the Russian Consul General will be here Friday and Saturday, he will do a meet and greet on both days, doing gifts, and Saturday events.

Mr. Bush noted that it was time for the annual performance evaluation of the City Attorney and this would be an executive session item on the June 29 Assembly meeting.

Mr. Bush said Andi Story is interested in finding an Assemblymember to work on drug abuse issues among children, particularly getting drug treatment programs back into Juneau, and this may be a financing issue in the future. Ms. Chambers and Mr. Wanamaker will contact her to determine the time commitment involved.

VIII. ADJOURN - 8:30 p.m.

Submitted by Laurie Sica, CMC, Municipal Clerk