AGENDA

WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
Monday, December 13, 2004
 Noon
 Assembly Chambers

I. Call to Order

II. Action Items
   A. Draft Scope of Work for Boroughwide Large Cruise Ship Dock Study
   B. Local Match for Historic District Grant

III. Information Items
   A. Seawalk CIP - Status Report
   B. FEMA - Status Report
   C. Fish and Game Storage Building at Subport - Status Report
   D. NWCA Comments on Waterfront Plan

IV. Next Meeting
   • Seawalk Action Item
   • Wayfinding Plan Report
   • Discussion of NWCA Comments

V. Adjournment
Project Objectives and Scope of Work
Boroughwide Evaluation of Potential Locations for Large Cruise Ship Docks

DRAFT

Introduction

On October 25, 2004 the City and Borough of Juneau adopted a Long-Range Waterfront Plan dealing with a variety of waterfront and adjacent upland issues for the downtown waterfront. During the Plan review and adoption process it was demonstrated that there will likely be a demand in the future for more large cruise ship berths than identified in the Plan. For planning and permitting purposes, CBJ desires to evaluate potential locations for large cruise ship docks meeting community and industry needs.

Study Area – within the City and Borough of Juneau north of Grand Island. (Study would not include the downtown Juneau waterfront area encompassed by the Long Range Waterfront Plan).

Land Ownership – Private property information to be provided by CBJ staff. (Assessor’s office does not track non-taxable property ownership)

Cruiseship Dock locations –

Primary Goal: Identify potential fixed berth locations for large cruise ships with the following qualities:

- Adequate water depth to accommodate cruise ships at all tide levels.
- Adequate protection from inclement weather and wave conditions that might be encountered during the Juneau cruise ship season.
- Sufficient potential upland areas adjacent to a potential dock to provide staging for 12-19 busses and any other necessary supporting facilities.

Secondary Goal: Identify potential large cruise ship anchorage locations that are reasonably close to potential tender dock sites and with access to the road system, public infrastructure and sufficient upland staging areas.

Identify and Evaluate Impacts to Local Areas -

- Noise
- Small vessel traffic
- Air and Water Quality
- Potential Environmental Disturbance
  - Wildlife
  - Sea plants
  - Wetlands
• Traffic Issues –

Potential traffic from new dock facilities is perhaps the most significant area wide impact of additional cruiseship berths. Therefore this aspect of new berth will be carefully considered.

• Traffic to and from bus storage areas to the dock site.
• Forecast traffic volumes and evaluate impacts to the community and visitor industry related to scheduling multiple busing companies serving geographically dispersed cruise ship docks transporting visitors to multiple Juneau venues.
• Traffic to and from bus staging area to Juneau visitor venues. These destinations include but are not limited to:
  o Mendenhall Glacier
  o Helicopter flight seeing businesses
  o Vessel based sight seeing excursions
  o Fishing charters
  o Kayaking
  o Whale watching
  o Hiking
  o Horseback riding
  o Chapel by the Lake (Auke Lake)
  o River rafting
  o DIPAC fish hatchery
  o Mine tours
  o Juneau Downtown:
     ▪ Historic District
     ▪ Maximization of merchant opportunities
     ▪ Alaska Museum
     ▪ CBJ Museum
     ▪ Capitol
     ▪ Floatplane flight seeing

CBJ Services –

Evaluate the impacts on CBJ to provide services (police, fire, emergency medical, etc.) to more remote, dispersed locations.

Permitting Issues –

Identify potential permitting requirements either enhancing or devaluing each option, including but not limited to:
  • U.S. Army Corps of Engineers permits
  • US Coast Guard
  • US Fish and Wildlife
  • FEMA floodplain management requirements
- Alaska Coastal Management Program
- Juneau Coastal Management Plan
- Special Waterfront Areas
- CBJ Zoning regulations

**Phase I** – technical evaluation of potential cruise ship dock sites, basing recommendations on the above criteria. Fixed fee of \$ \ldots .

Phase I Deliverable – Report and evaluation, including a listing of the three highest ranked options, ranked.

Phase I results will be provided to the CBJ Assembly; after review, a decision will be made as to whether to proceed to Phase II.

**Phase II** – public outreach program, where options are presented to the public and input is solicited. Negotiated fee.

Phase II Deliverable – report on results of public meetings, hearings, and surveys, if necessary.
MEMORANDUM

CITY/BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
City & Borough Manager’s Office
155 S. Seward St., Juneau, Alaska 99801
Donna_Pierce@ci.juneau.ak.us
Voice (907) 586-5240
Fax (907) 586-5385

DATE: December 13, 2004

TO: Stan Ridgeway, Chair
Waterfront Development Committee

FROM: Donna B. Pierce
Deputy City Manager

SUBJECT: Request for $9700 Local Match Funds from Existing Waterfront Planning Budget

Below is a description of a grant application from CDD to the State to update the 1984 Historic District Standards. This is an important and timely project for the downtown waterfront planning area. The application has been reviewed and the City has received verbal approval. However, we must meet the local match requirements. This is a request to use available funding in the waterfront plan CIP for this purpose. If approved, this will require an ordinance to transfer the funds to the operating budget.

There is $118,353 available in the Waterfront Plan fund. I do not anticipate that full amount being needed for the boroughwide cruise berth study, also on this agenda.

GRANT APPLICATION SUMMARY

Downtown Juneau Historic District Guidelines adopted in 1984 have served the Historic District well, however, need has been identified in updating the guidelines, based on experience with administration of the guidelines. Unique factors have contributed to the need for an update, including the following:

- Originally drafted guidelines, in conjunction with a Design Review Board comprised of architects and designers, no longer reviews projects since dissolution of the Design Review Board. For lack of specificity of standards, subjective expertise falls upon CDD staff, which at times does not have knowledge of Architectural Design.

- Change in nature of district due to increased seasonal commercial ventures. For example, jewelry display windows, while not prohibited in the current guidelines, do not allow desired interaction between pedestrian and shop interior. Guidelines do not address situations such as these.
• An opportunity exists to provide more “user friendly” guidelines that provide clearer requirements, thus providing predictability in the permitting process.

• No evaluation has taken place of the effectiveness of the guidelines, since adoption.

The CBJ has the opportunity to participate in the 60/40 Federal program for local municipalities to update the guidelines. The State Historic Commission, at its annual meeting for appropriating grants, approved CDD’s and the Historic Resources Advisory Committee’s (HRAC) request to update the guidelines, as a two-phase project. The commission found that the request met all the criteria for funding.

Components of the proposed Phase I Downtown Juneau Historic District Evaluation—Recommendations include:

- Evaluate *Juneau Downtown Historic District Design Standards* and all applicable revisions to Title 49 (CBJ Zoning Code) regarding disestablishment of Design Review and Design Review Board. Evaluation of current permitting process (including enforcement) for projects within the Historic District.

- Conduct public meeting(s) to evaluate process and standards.

- Recommend changes to existing standards and permitting process as groundwork for Phase II of project (eventual re-write of *Juneau Downtown Historic District Design Standards* and implementation of recommended changes).

The product of this Evaluation will be a final report summarizing recommendations to be implemented in Phase II, Historic District Design Guidelines Re-Write. Phase II, a separate CLG application to be applied for next year, would entail re-write of the standards from recommendations gathered during public outreach.

The Historic District has served as an economic asset to the community, as witnessed in acknowledgement in the Long Range Waterfront Plan, publications conveying information about Juneau from the Juneau Convention and Visitors Bureau (JCVB), Juneau Chamber of Commerce, and other civic-minded groups. Numerous studies provide support for Historic Districts and the positive economic impact these districts have for municipalities. The Historic District figures prominently in proposed Wayfinding signage. As a unique destination, the Historic District serves the community well, and the proposed district evaluation will continue to preserve and protect a valuable resource to the community for generations to come.
BUDGET:

In the following space enter the proposed budget for your project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUDGET CATEGORY</th>
<th>SOURCE OF FUNDS</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fed Share</td>
<td>Applicant's Share</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Beanes, Staff Planner II (CDD)</td>
<td>1,080</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(30 hours x 36.01/hr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penny Kohler, Admin. Assistant (CDD)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td></td>
<td>165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(5 hours x 33.02/hr)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary (CDD)(10 hours x 20.00/hr)</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Contractual Services</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Consultant</td>
<td>14,230</td>
<td>9,770</td>
<td>24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(see consultant scope of work below)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Supplies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous Office Supplies</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. TOTAL DIRECT COSTS ........................................ $25,495.00
2. 10% STATE SURCHARGE .............................. + 2,549.00
3. TOTAL PROJECT COSTS ................................... = 28,044.00
4. APPLICANT'S TOTAL SHARE = 40% of amount on line 3........ 11,215.00
5. FEDERAL SHARE = 60% of amount on line 3.................. = 16,826.00
6. LESS 10% STATE SURCHARGE = same as amount on Line 2.... -2,549.00
7. TOTAL PARTICIPANT RECEIPT = amount grantee = 14,277.00
   is reimbursed.
Proposed Source of Funds: Clearly identify cash, in-kind goods and services, and donated goods and services that constitute the applicant's matching share. Donations cannot exceed 40% of the total project costs. Other federal funding sources are ineligible as matching share for this grant program. Grantees will be reimbursed for cash expenditures up to 60% of total project costs, less the state surcharge (the amount shown on line 6).

APPLICANT: must total 40% of the total project costs.

DONATED GOODS AND SERVICES +

8. APPLICANT'S TOTAL SHARE = $11,215.00
9. TOTAL FEDERAL SHARE = $16,826.00

Consultant Scope of Work:

1.0 Orientation
   1.1 Review historic resource background information
   1.2 Review Juneau regulatory information
   1.3 Review other preliminary comments, meeting notes
   1.4 Conduct phone conference with staff

2.0 Analysis
   2.1 Conduct on-site tour of historic resources
   2.2 Conduct community workshop #1.
      • Identify key features of the area that are of value
      • Identify current trends and issues to be addressed
      • Brainstorm alternative approaches
   2.3 Conduct focus group meetings
      • Property owners
      • Business owners
      • Preservation advocates
      • Other agencies
   2.4 Summarize existing conditions and trends
      • Includes analysis of existing guidelines

3.0 Strategic Plan
   3.1 Outline Conservation Strategy Options
      • Regulatory tools, including ordinances
      • Design Guidelines
      • Incentives
      • Education and technical assistance
      • Administrative requirements
   3.2 Evaluate conservation options
      • Conduct community Workshop #2.
      • Conduct conference with staff & steering committee
3.3 Develop Draft #1 of Conservation Strategy
   • Report to include:
     o Recommended ordinances
     o Outline of recommended guidelines.
     o Staffing and commission recommendations
     o Phasing
     o Other program components.
     o Relationship to other initiatives, including economic development
   • Submit for review by the committee and staff.

3.4 Develop Final Report.

3.5 Present Final Report.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Stan Ridgeway, Chair
Waterfront Development Committee

FROM: Rorie Watt, Chief CIP Engineer
CBJ Engineering Department

RE: Seawalk CIP Update

DATE: December 10, 2004

This item is on today’s agenda so that the Committee can become sufficiently informed to provide direction for the Seawalk Capitol Improvement Project. It is our intent to return to the Committee with regular project updates.

The seawalk is a highlight of the recently adopted Long Range Waterfront Plan. From the plan:

“The seawalk is possibly the most important project contemplated under the Waterfront Master Plan, and one that was consistently viewed by community participants during the outreach effort as a top priority.....The CBJ should take some exciting liberties with the seawalk to truly make it a reflection of the community and to offer various programmed elements and feeling along the waterfront.”

Towards this end the Assembly appropriated $184,000 of FY05 Marine Passenger Fees into a Seawalk project.

Attached to this memorandum are proposed Seawalk Objectives and Design Principles for your review and comment. Additionally, we have a few slides of portions of the LRWP and of the construction of a portion of seawalk at the new Miner’s Cove Building (under construction).

Staff has prepared an RFP for professional services that will be issued soon. Those services will include surveying and cost estimating for possible projects. That information, as well as information from easement inquiries will be the basis for a subsequent update to the WDPC.

Please note: This is an unfinished draft. Rorie was called out of town unexpectedly but will return in time for the meeting. We will have a finished memorandum to hand out at that time.
Seawalk Objectives

- Extends from Bridge to Rock Dump, Linking Waterfront to commercial areas
- Continuous and Unobstructed Public Access. Contingency plans/access for security purposes
- Continuity of design elements
- Incorporate open space/parks and access to the water where opportunity exists

Design Principles

- Specific Design elements should include the following:
  - Width (goal min. 16’)
  - Amenities designed into Seawalk (Garbage cans, benches, landscaping)
  - Lighting
  - Bullrail
  - View areas
  - ADA Compliant
  - Wayfinding maps & interpretative signage
  - Public art incorporated

- Construct similar to regional docks (heavy timber construction), use indigenous/native materials
- Celebrate the unique characteristics of sub areas and Acknowledge the cultural and historic heritage of the waterfront
- Provide a variety of public spaces at the Channel’s edge
- Consider upland construction for portions of Seawalk
- Consider floating dock for sections of Seawalk
- Public Design Review for Private Seawalk Development Proposals
From: John White [mailto:john_white@fishgame.state.ak.us]
Sent: Wednesday, December 08, 2004 4:45 PM
To: Rod Swope
Subject: Subport Vessel Shop

Rod,

Good to talk to you yesterday. As we discussed, Fish and Game just recently signed a 30 land use permit with NOAA for the construction of a new small vessel shop on their Subport location. We anticipate a metal building type of structure with a couple of large doors to facilitate getting boats and gear in and out, plus an upstairs mezzanine to house a couple of staff and some storage. The building will have an approximate footprint of around 5,000 square feet, and be similar in color and style to the existing NOAA structures.

The Mental Health Trust folks have given us our walking papers from the Subport building which we currently reside in, and we have no other options available that will afford us dock frontage for our large vessels. Believe me we have looked at anything imaginable over the last three or four years and this is the only real viable option for us. The NOAA agreement provides us some very low cost shared arrangements, while giving us that dock use we need for our large vessels. We do a lot of cooperative research with NOAA, and this is a good fit for both departments.

I don’t have much I can send you at this time because we are just getting the RFP together to get a design consultant on board. What I will do though is provide you with a copy of our first conceptual design when we get one sometime later on in the winter.

We don’t want any misunderstandings with anyone over this project, but we truly exhausted all options to replace our vessel shop prior to finalizing this plan. For those new to the process, we put this option on the table several times over the last few years at various waterfront meetings. My boss and I both attended several of those meetings, and I had numerous other conversations with the previous harbormaster and the local DOT folks looking for alternatives, so this shouldn’t be a big surprise.

Feel free to call me at any time with questions as necessary. My phone number is 465-6178.

Thanks again and keep in touch.

John White
ADF&G Procurement/Facilities Officer

12/9/2004
December 10, 2004

Donna Pierce
City & Borough of Juneau
155 S. Seward Street
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Subject: Juneau Waterfront Plan

Dear Donna,

Over the last months we have provided occasional and informal feedback to you on the Waterfront Plan. At this time I would like to provide you with a summary of comments from the cruise industry perspective as a result of review by our Operations and Technical Committee and Government Affairs and Community Relations Committee.

First, we would like to commend the CB Juneau Assembly members and the City/Borough management on your work in developing a comprehensive plan for the Juneau waterfront. As noted in the Plan the waterfront is indeed a central component in the vitality of Juneau.

With regard to extension of the downtown docks, we agree that this is an option that should be explored further. The initial rough estimate of $20 million for an extension to accommodate two large ships seems high compared to recent dock developments in Alaska. We would be interested in working with the City and the Harbors and Docks Department to examine this option further, including undertaking preliminary engineering work for better estimates of technical feasibility and costs. The advantage of this, if technically and economically viable, is that it allows for docking of two panamax vessels close to the existing downtown merchants and other attractions. We would also want to make sure the positioning of the new berth extension did not hinder the approach to the Franklin Street Dock and would involve the pilot organization in that assessment.

NWCA Member Lines:
Carnival Cruise Lines • Celebrity Cruises • Crystal Cruises • Holland America Cruises • Norwegian Cruise Line
Princess Cruises • Radisson Seven Seas Cruises • Royal Caribbean International • Silversea Cruises
We do not believe that a T-pier extending from the Steamship Dock is a viable option. There are a number of reasons for this. First, it would bring a high concentration of people and motor vehicles into the Marine Park area, which we believe to be above and beyond the capability of the land-side infrastructure. Second, this option poses some serious ship maneuvering issues. Third, we do not believe that this is a cost-effective option, since the entire T-pier project would result in a net gain of only one additional berth.

We have also considered the option of a dock towards the Gold Creek area. We understand the concerns that have been raised by residents about this site. Our comments here are strictly of a technical and operational nature. Here are some of the factors: 1. This area has adequate uplands space for motor vehicle staging and turnaround; 2. It is within walking distance of Downtown; 3. It removes some motor vehicle traffic from the Downtown streets, since most of the tours are towards the airport and Valley and could utilize a planned traffic light at Whittier and Egan. 4. A T-pier oriented toward the harbor entrance would provide for good ship maneuvering angle, and favorable orientation with respect to wind direction (a dock parallel to shore in this area has the disadvantage of unfavorable windage); 5. Depending on the final estimated costs of extension of the Downtown docks, this might be a more cost-effective option (since it would leave the city-owned docks on S. Franklin Street with capacity for one large and one small or mid-sized ship).

In reference to other berth development options outside Juneau Harbor, I can reiterate our previously stated concerns. First, cruise visitors want to experience Downtown Juneau. This means that a dock outside the central area would not be desirable from a customer satisfaction standpoint. And because the guests would still want to visit Downtown, they would have to be bussed (using 10-12 additional coaches), thus adding to the bus traffic congestion in the Downtown as well as on the access roads leading from a new proposed berth to Downtown. Having said this, we are aware that the CB Juneau is undertaking a study of potential sites outside Juneau Harbor. We are of course interested in giving input to the consultants.

Much of the pleasure of the visit to Juneau is derived from the experience of the culture and the rich history of the City. We agree with the overall themes of preservation and enhancement of the historical nature of Downtown. We commend the Assembly and City and Borough Management for planning, zoning and specific projects in the past to achieve this.

It is for this reason we have worked with in collaboration with the City and Borough of Juneau on projects such as Marine Park and on other initiatives to minimize the impact in street congestion, noise, air emissions and the like. These are matters that affect not
only the quality of the City for residents, but also the quality of the experience for visitors to Juneau.

We would be pleased to meet with you, Mayor Botelho and other Assembly members to discuss the above at an early date.

Sincerely,

John Hansen
President
NWCA