MINUTES
Waterfront Development Committee
Tuesday, April 20, 2004
Municipal Building Assembly Chambers

Waterfront Development Committee Members Present: Jeannie Johnson, Merrill Sanford, David Stone, Stan Ridgeway, Jeff Wilson
Absent: Johan Dybdahl, Budd Simpson
Staff Present: Dale Pernula, Greg Chaney, Donna Pierce, Debbie Meyer

I. Call To Order
Ms. J. Johnson called the meeting to order at 7:00p.m.

II. Agenda Changes
None

III. Approval of Minutes
Mr. D. Stone moved to approve the minutes of April 13, 2004
Hearing no objections, the minutes were approved.

IV. Public Participation

Dixie Hood, 9350 View Drive - Ms. Hood said it was demoralizing as a member of the public to participate in long processes that invite input and discussion, which result in reports or draft plans, and then to have public interest be trumped by special interest groups that want to see further growth of the cruise ship industry. To see $18,000 spent on a phone survey with results that weren't too dissimilar from the mail-in survey is upsetting. She found wording in the last survey to be biased and objectionable. Would like Area "A" and "B" to be protected for public access and recreation. Encourage more of the independent traveler instead of cruise ship industry growth. Likes the bonus idea and thinks it is a good policy, but too soon to decide height of buildings. Suggested Design Review Board be restored for downtown and waterfront area.

Mr. Pernula asked Ms. Hood that if we used the height bonus system, what amenities would she like to see. Ms. Hood said she would like to see things that encourage public use, i.e. arcades or patios that would not be for commercial or retail interest. Native culture represented on the waterfront, i.e. buildings with native art or a museum.

Renate Riffe, 800 F Street, represents Board of Director for Park Shore Homeowners Association - Concerned about the development that would occur around Fish & Game, Department of Labor, Gold Creek to the Subport. Value of Park Shore Condos is due to the view of the water and wants the Committee to consider the view sheds and with emphasis on recreational and open space between the areas from Fish & Game and Department of Labor to the Subport. They very much approve of the plans for this area.

Daniel Glidman of Douglas, Manager of Merchants Wharf and Goldbelt properties - Stated that the Jacobsen Dock is going to provide some serious future pier development problems. When a project of that scope is presented, the use of technology with computerized generated elevation views may have changed the scope of this project a bit and may have changed the angular nature of the dock.

Nancy Waterman, 227 Gastineau Avenue - She shared that the view plane concept also intersects with solar rights. In the process of thinking about height, add to the list of concepts solar rights, the sun coming into a building's windows.
Michelle Lisper, 800 F Street, Park Shore Condos - She asked what other private properties exist that affect the waterfront project that was not presented last year. What is the City's plan to buy back any private property that may be in the channel that could all of a sudden be designed to be developed or asked for access or usage rights? She does not remember it being presented last year. She would like to see this researched and presented to the public.

Mr. Chaney said this information is included in the contract for the consultant to provide. In the draft plan there is a map on page 14. It is not perfect, but gives a general idea of property ownership. The consultant has been informed that it needs to be improved. That is why the Committee is going through the draft plan to see where changes need to be made.

Ms. Pierce said when a private developer comes in to develop a piece of property, this is what the Planning Commission will look at. Projects will have to conform to zoning and planning in order to be permitted.

Ms. Lisper said it would be helpful to have a larger map up on the wall for each of the meetings. Mr. Chaney projected a map of the area of discussion up on the screen.

V. Agenda Items

A. Continuation of the Review of Plan

Note: Committee agreed that when looking at the harbor in Area "F", there was not much difference between Mr. Howard Lockwood's plan and the proposed Waterfront Plan.

Ms. Pierce said Staff is trying to develop a standard way of recording changes to the Plan and also what follow-up may be required. In areas of the Plan that might not have changes, we may still need to have follow-ups done. If the Committee sees ways in which these memos could be formatted differently let Mr. Pernula or Ms. Pierce know.

Mr. Pernula wrote the recommendations in such a way to put some finality to some of the areas. This memo provides strong recommendations that are based on the Committee discussions and actions made. It also itemizes some of the follow-ups that need to be done.

The Committee read and discussed the recommendations for Area "A" and "F" in the memo.

It was agreed that an outside group should work on developing a bonus system. Ms. Pierce suggested that a sub-committee of the Planning Commission and some Assembly members work on this.

Mr. Sanford said it would be a good idea to add to the sentence on page 44 of the Plan, under Street Orientation - besides the construction of a street connecting 8th and 9th Streets extending under the bridge to Harris Harbor, it should include the seawalk.

After review of the recommendations the Committee discussed the need to contact the Thane Neighborhood Association in regards to the boat ramp at the Little Rock Dump.

Mr. Sanford asked if Staff was working on a list of private properties that may have to be purchased, get an easement or right-of-way for and get an assessed evaluation, so they can be with the Plan and will give an idea of how much it would cost.
Mr. Pernula said the Plan itself does not advocate acquiring a lot of property. It does talk about the seawalk and the necessary right-of-ways for it. The Committee thought the only piece of property that the Plan advocates purchasing is the Merchants Wharf building.

Staff will get a list together of the private property owners and the assessed value of their properties that will be affected by the seawalk and other public projects in Areas A, B, C, D, E and F.

Howard Lockwood, 2828 Thunderbird Terrace, Manager of Juneau Port Construction, LLC - Mr. Lockwood shared a comment about rethinking the need for a boat launch ramp in Area F. Every marina needs a boat launch ramp. He suggested the Planning Commission review it, so boats not be allowed through town at critical times of day, but have access in the early morning and later in the evening.

Committee went on to discuss Area "E". Ms. Pierce highlighted some things to consider.
- AJ Dock already permitted
- Not a lot of retail
- Preserved for industrial
- Need pedestrian improvements
- Water taxi be considered with private operators
- Major issue - how passengers get moved through area to downtown and how it impacts Franklin Street and the Plaza

Mr. Pernula shared a comment from the Planning Commission, on page 59, 2nd paragraph, last two sentences. Their concern was about tourist related retail uses being at the AJ Dock. It is not compatible with the neighborhood with the industrial uses in the area. The Planning Commission would like to remove the word light industrial. They also had a problem with not having some retail and some other commercial uses there. The last two sentences need to be changed to encourage industrial uses and to not permit tourist related retail uses.

Committee agreed the streets in these areas need to have good sidewalks to keep the people out of the street. This will give good connectivity through the area. This is stated in the Plan, page 59, under "Street Orientation." There needs to be a sentence added that clarifies this idea.

**Next Meetings Scheduled:**
- April 27, 5pm, Chambers - Area "D"
- May 4, 5pm, Chambers
- May 18, 5pm, Chambers
- May 25, 5pm, Downtown Library, Large Conference Room

**VI. Adjournment**

Ms. J. Johnson made a motion to adjourn at 8:25 p.m.
Seeing no objection it was so ordered.

Respectfully Submitted by Debbie Meyer, April 27, 2004