Members:
__ Gary Gillette (Chair)    _____ Don Harris (Vice-Chair)    ___ Shauna McMahon (recorder)
___ Marie Darlin    _____ Gerald Gotschall    ___ Sorrel Goodwin
___ Myra Gilliam    ___ \ Zane Jones    ___ Michael Tripp (by phone)

Staff:  _abs_  Jane Lindsey (CBJ, Juneau-Douglas City Museum)

__  Jonathon Lange (CBJ Community Development)
__  Allison Eddins (CBJ Community Development)
__  Chrissy McNally (CBJ Community Development)

Guests: Hal Harte (CCD)
Amy Fletcher
Dana Gunderson - Alaska Brewing Co.
Margo Waring – JEDC
Electra Gardinier - Artist Roundtable
Jordan Kendall

I. Call to Order:  5:07 pm,

II. Approval of Agenda:  Approved unanimously.

III. Approval of Minutes:  Minutes not available. Tabled to next meeting

IV. Public Testimony on Non-agenda Items:

Margo Waring presented some JEDC information. Off season window dressing- JEDC would like to get more participation next year. They also are hoping to do a storefront improvement contest again. Ms. Waring emphasized keeping business life vital and growing community and investment support and resources
V. New Business

1. Elections

The following people were nominated for committee offices and accepted offices:

- Motion- Chair- Zane Jones – (Gerald Gotschall motioned, approved unanimously)
- Vice-Chair- Don Harris – (Myra Gilliam motioned, approved unanimously)
- Recorder- Shauna McMahon (Myra Gilliam motioned, approved unanimously)

2. Guidelines and Standards for Murals in the Downtown Historic District

Current procedures (Laura Boyce)

Murals are not regulated in city unless falls into sign classification. For the historic district there are no standards in place for murals so variance is current practice- the Filipino building was mentioned as example. Variance usually has a $400 fee, is about an eight week process, and has some board of adjustment oversight. Later Ms. Boyce also noted detached murals require permit because of safety hazard element.

Process of approving new historic district standards (Laura Boyce)

Proposed standards are developed. These are reviewed by CBJ Law Department. The proposed standards are then presented to the Title 49 Planning Commission and onwards to the full Planning Commission. It is then item at two CBJ Assembly meetings. 30 days after Assembly approval the standards are implemented.

HRAC function and Regulatory Choices

After the mural and regulatory procedure introduction the HRAC member discussed direction and issues of Mural standard development and related issues. Michael Tripp had broader questions about the type authority and role wanted in future- discretionary powers? He also asked about HRAC role in the Mural standard implementation- whether it was CBJ staff implementing and enforcing proposed mural standards or whether HRAC had a larger decision role. Gerald Gottschall mentioned that If CBJ implementing then wording has specific enough to apply. Laura noted that choices about what buildings included will be need to made: contributing, non-contributing, outside historic district? Mike asked whether a group review by HRAC or related committee might be incorporated for Mural proposals. Gerald Gottschall noted that art has subjectivity for which group review may have advantages.

Public Commentary Regarding Mural and Regulatory Development

Artist Electra Gardinier noted that many businessowners are approaching roundtable artists for mural proposals but there is lack of administrative structure for getting city approval. She noted that a “defining history” clause might limit subjects and could hinder more contemporary concepts. She encourages research and access to information related to conservation needs and materials for murals. She also noted that detachability
allows the mural to follow leasees. Current variance fee can be imposing to artists and she was concerned about the artist losing that fee cost if the proposal is not approve

Margo Waring supported the mural development in CBJ and the issues mentioned by Ms. Gardinier. She felt mural art can contribute to vitality. Ms. Warning felt some of the sample processes could be over restrictive- perhaps looser standards for non-contributing buildings could help accommodate.

Gary Gillette offered thanks to the public for their commentary. He noted that artists are always welcomed to bring mural concepts to HRAC early in process. He then guided the Committee to focus on three aspects of mural regulation- design, review, and enforcement.

Design and mural guidelines

Size was an element that was a discussion topic: allow mural to dominate space- different cities have different attitudes. Laura Boyce noted that 3-D (depth) is limited by property line restrictions. Limits of mural lifespan and requirements of maintenance were discussed. Moving and flashing elements in murals was a discussion item—artistic creativity versus nuisance and safety issues. Accomodating old historic sign elements-“ghosts”- was raised in the discussion. A lot of time was spend on differentiating cultural versus historic themes. A list of priority considerations for mural designs was brainstormed.

1) Preserve Historic value
2) No logos or text
3) No damage to building (reversibility)
4) Does not obscure historic features of building
5) Neighborhood outreach
6) Maintenance
7) End lifespan & remove if in disrepair
8) No moving mechanical parts
9) Requirements related to placement
10) Rules regarding lighting elements
11) Theme requirements?
12) Public notice signs at site during review
13) Considerations for digital prints.

Review and mural guidelines

Gary Gillette was curious about feasibility and support for a historic district permit. Hal Harte commented that need to build public will towards permit would be important. Time would be needed to build property owner and downtown rapport.

Priority considerations for mural design review included: 1) Use of CDD staff on development in historic district 2) Specific permits 3) and public noticing protocols.
Enforcement and mural guidelines

Two enforcement issues were discussed: 1) A requirement and timeframe to remove mural if does not follow previously approved design 2) Determining the appropriate part to contact for enforcement measures (artist? Building owner? Leasee? Building representative?)

3. Grant Status and Opportunities

Laura Boyce and Gary Gillette overviewed recently awarded grants. The 1st phase of the Preservation Grant was awarded – funding details pending. Evergreen cemetary project was changed to have mapping done inhouse and GIS compilation done by consultant. Last Chance Mine power tower project anticipates project engineering plan next September.

The HRAC members brainstormed concepts for project proposals for future grant opportunities. These included historic register nominations for capitol building and/or Treadwell mining district. Also noted was expanding historic neighborhood survey to top of Starr Hill and Norway Point areas

VI Committee Member Comments.

Hal Harte gave status update on Mendenhall Apartments- condition issues make historic restoration unfeasible and has lowered assessed value of property. Owner is still coordinating possible private issues. Private owner would enable more property use options than public city ownership. Fiscally hard time for city developed development incentives. Despite this Mr. Harte said it is important time to generate creative concepts for investment in historic downtown. A professional speaker by the name of Escobar from Washington D.C. was named as giving presentations on generating real estate vitality and economic valuation. Could be a good next step for CBJ and downtown interest groups.

VII. Next Regular Meeting – April 1, 2015, 5:00 p.m. City hall Room 224

VIII. Next Special Meeting – Signage Subcommittee – Thursday, March 5, 5 p.m., CDD Conference room, Marine View building, 4th

IX Adjournment 7:35