MINUTES  
Waterfront Development Committee  
Tuesday, June 29, 2004 ~ 5pm  
Assembly Chambers  

Waterfront Development Committee Members Present: Jeannie Johnson, David Stone, Jeff Wilson, Don Etheridge, Merrill Sanford, Stan Ridgeway  
Members Absent: Johan Dybdal  
Staff Present: Dale Pernula, Donna Pierce, Debbie Meyer  

I. Call To Order  
Ms. J. Johnson called the meeting to order at 5:02p.m.  

II. Agenda Changes  
Move Port Office Project to 1st item of discussion and a report on Fema as 2nd item of discussion.  

III. Approval of Minutes  
Approval of the June 8, 2004 minutes were deferred till the next meeting.  

IV. Agenda Items  

A. Port Office Project  
Mike Krieber, Port Engineer, reported that Docks and Harbors is proposing to remodel the "old bus driver's break room" located in the ferry terminal/visitor center building, which is in extremely poor condition. The U.S. Customs Office will use it as an office-interview-search room. They received a proposal from a CBJ term contractor for $11,655 to perform the remodeling. The proposed source of funding is the Ferry Dock Wharf Widening/Port Office/Information Center (#354-73). They are requesting the Committee's concurrence on using this funding source for the U.S. Customs Office remodeling.  

Committee had a brief discussion.  

Committee Action: Mr. Sanford moved to approve the Committee's concurrence on using the proposed funding source for the U.S. Customs Office remodeling, with the caveat that Mr. Ken Koelsch, U.S. Customs, would provide the CFR regulations showing the U.S. Customs exemption from paying rent for this facility.  

Mr. Sanford asked if there was any objection. Hearing no objection, it was so ordered.  

B. FEMA Report  
Staff and the developer of the Timberwolf property met with Debbie Key, FEMA representative on June 21st. Mr. Pernula reported the following:  

1. Debbie Key indicated that she was in Juneau on a fact-finding mission in Juneau, to determine what the issues were relative to development on the downtown waterfront. She said she wasn't sure if CBJ supported or opposed the proposed development. CBJ staff indicated we supported the development beyond mean high tide.  
2. FEMA is in the middle of a coastal study focused on California and Washington coasts, but applicable to Alaska as well. The study may be completed before the project on South Franklin.  
3. CBJ has executed a Cooperative Technical Partnership(CTP) agreement with FEMA to conduct a mapping activity on Duck Creek. From the discussions, it seems as though this agreement may improve the likelihood of future funding projects such as remapping the downtown area.  
4. One alternative discussed was remapping the area from a V to an A zone, which would permit the project. That may take 18 months or so, however, and therefore would not facilitate the South Franklin projects.
5. Another process was suggested, the CLOMR - Conditional Letter of Map Revision, which could be accomplished within four weeks. Applicant completes application forms and engineering, which is reviewed by Baker Engineering in Washington, DC.

6. Ms. Key is not aware of a CLOMR issued for structures over the water. She is aware of shops on a pier in New Jersey, that were permitted to be rebuilt after they were destroyed.

7. The one limitation of going through the CLOMR process to permit the building is that federal flood insurance would not be available.

Mr. Pernula pointed out that even if we get FEMA's approval, and they get the CLOMR, and if we build over the water beyond of the reach of the mean-high-tide, federal flood insurance would not be available. They would have to find flood insurance from some other source, so it would be a lot more expensive.

There was a general discussion regarding remapping the downtown waterfront. Mr. Pernula said there may be some small areas that could be taken out of it. There would be an engineering study done as to whether or not some areas would be taken out or some added. There was a question as to who would pay for the study. Mr. Pernula said we could probably pay for it. He got an estimate of $160,000 from an engineering group to remap.

Committee requested that Mr. Pernula put in a formal request for remapping the entire downtown waterfront.

C. Combined Area Recommendations

Mr. Pernula referred to his memo in the packet. Most of the recommendations were made in previous meetings. Area "C" needs to be reworked.

Areas discussed in memo of Combined Area Recommendations:
- Page 1, first bulleted item - last sentence in underlined paragraph …Land Use Code should "be" developed.
- Page 3, first bulleted item - last sentence in underlined paragraph …Land Use Code should "be" developed.
- Page 2, Item #3 - wording should refer to both the seawalk and street being a formal extension under the bridge.
- Page 3, Item #5 - replace the wording of title to read - Consider purchasing land "where" the seawalk starts going east and west.
- Page 4, Item #2 - Take gateway feature near the Red Dog Saloon out of Plan.
- Page 5, Item #5 - utilization of various venues would be wrapped around the exterior of the garage and would not be in the "first floor of the parking garage."
- Page 8 - last paragraph, add wording - "Bus shuttles should at the scale…"
- Jefferson Dock should always be referred to as the AJ Dock.
- All references to …maintain building heights between 2 and 3 stories…should say (maximum of 35 feet)
- Comparison memo, last page - change Master's clock town to read Master's clock "tower".

Mr. Sanford questioned whether we substitute or do an amendment to the Sheinberg – Subport Vicinity Revitalization Plan or how will it be incorporated into the Waterfront Plan? Ms. J. Johnson suggested looking at Mr. Pernula’s comparison of the Subport and Waterfront Plans.
D. Comparison of Subport and Waterfront Plans

Mr. D. Stone excused himself from discussion because of conflict of interest.

Mr. Pernula went through his memo of comparisons between the two plans. He said there was a lot of information to go through and it is an incomplete list, but he did highlight the major elements. Covered in his memo are the below topics:

- Subport Vicinity Revitalization Plan - Major Elements
- Waterfront Plan, Area “B”, Subport - Major Elements
- Similarities of Plans
- Major Differences in Plans
- Covered in Subport Plan – not in Waterfront Plan
- Covered in Waterfront Plan – not in Subport Plan

Mr. Sanford commented that both plans are very similar and the two major issues would be building height and the bonus system. He felt that some of the minor issues from the Waterfront Plan could be incorporated into the Subport Vicinity Plan. He wasn’t sure how the two plans would be blended.

Ms. J. Johnson wondered if the Planning Commission would want to use the Waterfront Plan as a tool to modify the Subport Vicinity Plan. She also was concerned about the loss of parking in the Subport Vicinity Plan and this needs to be carefully looked at.

The Committee discussed the parking issue and thought it would be better if they didn’t get into details, but make sure the issue is dealt with in the final plan. Mr. Pernula will have Mr. Sam Kito put some information together about possible parking spaces that could be developed.

Ms. Pierce suggested the Committee deal with the major differences/contradictions with the two plans on a general level.

Mr. Ridgeway asked Mr. Etheridge that when the Subport Plan was developed, did he know if Docks and Harbors Board was contacted and the harbor area discussed? Mr. Etheridge said there was a presentation done before the Board and they did an extensive walk through the Plan. At that time the Board said there was no way they could afford a marina in that area without something else there to help pay for it. That was when they discussed a cruise ship terminal in this area to help pay for the facility and moorage for the marina.

Mr. Pernula pointed out that the Subport Plan was funded 50% by the Mental Health Trust, 25% by CBJ and 25% by Docks and Harbors.

Mr. Pernula said the big issues are the height of the buildings, setbacks and other closely related things. The language that was talked about a couple meetings ago that was added on massing and scale, in Area “B”, Page 3, Item #2, of the Combined Area Recommendations Memo, has a line that is added “Consideration should be given to permit additional building height in exchange for amenities such as preserving identified view corridors, open space, or building design… That is what is now recommended in the Waterfront Plan for Area “B”.

The Waterfront Plan is general and the Subport Plan is more specific and if you make that change he doesn’t see where there is necessarily the conflict anymore. There could be a conflict in adopting this or some regulations if you come up with 50 feet instead of 75 feet.
Mr. Pernula said there is a need to add more reference to parking. Although the Subport Plan is making recommendations to reduce parking, the plan by B&A talked more about where it would go, didn’t talk about numbers or didn’t say how we would provide the needed additional parking spaces.

*Committee discussed and decided they would adopt the draft plan in the Committee’s final meeting and send both Plans to the Planning Commission and then on to the Full Assembly for adoption.*

E. **Completion of Area “C”**

Mr. David Stone rejoined Committee.

Committee looked through minutes of June 8th. Mr. Pernula had one major question on Page 2, second to the last paragraph – does not give clear enough directions, which would be very helpful for the Planning Commission. The Committee needs to at least address the general issues. Do we want more cruise ship docks and if so where do we want them, downtown or elsewhere in the Borough?

Committee discussed location of future piers. Is it to give general or specific locations? Some stressed the need to be flexible. There aren’t too many deepwater ports available in the borough. Page 64 of the Waterfront Plan states – Build flexibility into the Plan to allow it to adjust to new social and economic conditions as they warrant. Consideration should not just be about avoiding impacts, but also looking at the positive benefits and how it can be in a certain part of town. Docks and Harbors looked at various areas that would be suitable and found few places that would work. Some felt we only have room for about one more berth downtown and we are nearing capacity. Reference was made to the community survey and what they wanted.

Ms. Pierce noted the Committee needs to give some kind of planning guidance for the Planning Commission to use. It's important that the Planning Commission has a plan with which to evaluate future proposals, because with the absence of a plan, the Commission is put in a reactive position. She recommended that the Committee either affirm that for the present all cruise docks will be within the waterfront planning area or else proceed to do a supplemental study as recommended in the Draft Plan to determine what other locations in the borough would be feasible. Mr. Sanford voiced his concern that options should remain open for future development. Mr. Etheridge stated that the Harbor Board had reviewed other areas outside of downtown and had not found any suitable sites.

*Committee recommends limiting 1,000-foot cruise ship piers developed to the downtown area and possibly the backside of Douglas Island. Smaller piers could be developed elsewhere.*

Mr. Sanford reminded the Committee that the Planning Commission has a lot of tools that they look at when they approve or disapprove a project, making sure that the public is protected and the project is done in a proper manner to facilitate not only the business but the public that is involved with it too.

It was agreed that Docks and Harbors would have the flexibility to determine where the tendering float would be built within Area "C", consistent with the Plan.

☞ In the Waterfront Plan, page 54, first bulleted paragraph, change wording from floating dock to tendering float and take out “is relocated to the West.”
Mr. Sanford went through some recommendations and changes he found in the Waterfront Plan.

- Page 17, second bullet – Insufficient carrying capacity…. incorporate wording that says we now have a new city sidewalk ordinance regarding this problem.
- Page 17, 2nd column – The City Cruise Terminal…last sentence…. note that operations have been moved to a new transit center.
- Page 28, 1st column, 3rd bullet – we need to make a note that there are varied cultures that make up our community as a whole besides the native culture.
- Page 32, 2nd column, Area “B” Subport – didn’t think we are including “cruise ships” in the subport anymore if we are listening to what our community wants and doesn’t want.
- Page 34, Area “F” Little Rock Dump – Change wording to say…. former CBJ landfill and also has AJ Mine waste rock.
- Page 50, 1st column, 2nd bullet – remove reference to “clock tower.”
- Page 50, last paragraph – clarify…. The Plan also envisions wrapping around the “outside” of the ground floor of the Public Library… Also take out sentence referring to the gateway feature by the Red Dog Saloon.
- Page 59, 2nd paragraph – Update paragraph since the Jacobsen Dock has been built. First couple sentences can be deleted. Also needs to be referred to as AJ Dock, not Jacobsen Dock.
- Page 61, could say a minimum of 16 feet.

Ms. J. Johnson brought to the Committee’s attention the letter in their packet from the Juneau Chamber of Commerce, which lists their recommendations regarding the waterfront.

**Last meeting scheduled**: Wednesday, July 7th, 5pm – Look at the timeline in back of Waterfront Plan, which is outdated and have Staff give us a revised or recommended schedule to look at.

V. **Adjournment**
Ms. J. Johnson made a motion to adjourn at 6:55 p.m.
**Seeing no objection it was so ordered.**