I. Call to Order
Mr. Wheeler called the meeting to order at 12:02pm.

II. Approval of Minutes
The Minutes from 7/25/05 were approved with no objection.

III. Docks & Harbors Board Report
Greg Fisk (new board liaison), referenced the July 29 memorandum from John Stone raising issues about the Franklin Street widening project. There are concerns about the disposal of tidelands on several issues including potential revenue loss in the case of alienated tidelands, impacts on operating budgets and maritime security issues. Long-term tideland leases may be the alternative to the complete loss of revenue in the area. This could force the issue of increased dock fees to make up the potential losses, effecting operating budgets for the city and industry budgets. The memo expressed concern about the ability to develop alternate corridors due to possible closure of the docks in the event of high-level security. This is a problem with using the current dock as a seawalk. Finally, the board is recommending that the Committee and the Assembly consider, as a high priority and as initial stage of the seawalk, building an alternative route behind those existing businesses to direct some traffic off Franklin Street. This could accomplish some of the goals of diverting traffic and perhaps creating new business alternatives and provide an alternative to using the docks for pedestrian access during increased levels of security.

IV. Action Items
Interpretive Signage Grant (Steamships and Seaplanes)
Rorie Watt addressed the state’s offer of funding for additional signs for consistency with our existing signage. The suggestion from staff is the appropriate revenue source for a match would be the Seawalk CIP. The required $8,000 would not impact the current plan. Mr. Dybdahl made a motion to move this item to the full assembly. There was no objection.

V. Public Comment (not to exceed 10 minutes total)
Barbara Wilmot, Juneau, spoke as a part of a community effort to preserve the Hangar and save Merchant’s Wharf, stating numerous reasons as to why the Merchant’s Wharf needs to be persevered. Among these are the contribution to Alaska’s aviation history, along with its ambiance, thriving businesses, unique shops and great cuisine. She gave a detailed outline of the history of the building, and supporting statements from several individuals including Ted Spencer, Dean Williams, and Jim Ruotsala. She stated that $16,000 is available from the Office of History and Archeology, to be matched by 40%, to do some condition surveys of the building, but the property owners have turned down this proposal.
Dee Longenbaugh, 808 Dixon Street, clarified the financial piece above, by explaining that there are two possible sources of funds. One is for $5,000 to research historic conditions, and the other is $16,000. These are available from the Office of History and Archeology, but are contingent upon the building nomination to the National Register. She asked some specific questions regarding the property, about tideland inclusion and whether an engineer’s report had been completed.

Daniel Glidmann, 130 Seward, Suite 001, representing Merchant’s Wharf owners, addressed the questions above stating that no engineer’s report would be done until they had a bona fide offer to purchase. He discussed the options for the Wharf property. The first would be to close the facility. He presented closure dates and current lease status of occupants. The second option is to offer the facility as-is on the market. The third option is selling the property to CBJ based on the fair market value for the entire 94,000 square feet parcel. The fourth, most preferred option is for the owners of Merchant’s Wharf to retain approximately 10,000-20,000 square feet of the western-most portion of the property and continue to explore the possibility of constructing a new building, offering the rest of the property to CBJ after the building is demolished.

Marie Darlin, 415 Willoughby, representing the Historic Resources Advisory Committee, reported that the HRAC wrote a letter to the city manager indicating that the History and Archeology Office would be willing to contribute $16,000 toward a construction survey of the situation of the building, but it requires a 40% match. She said that the city manager told the HRAC that CBJ would not do anything more unless the owners of the building were willing to have the survey done, which they are not. The HRAC is looking at another grant from the same office to do just the historical survey.

Mayor Botelho clarified that to be eligible for any of these grants, the building must be nominated and accepted to the Historical Registry.

VI. Information Items
A) Seawalk Ordinance Policy Discussion –
Ms. Pierce reported that, based on existing provisions in Title 49, geographic boundaries need to be adjusted and standards included in constructing pedestrian access easement and a walkway to make Title 49 consistent with the Waterfront Plan and to carry out the City’s specific plans for the seawalk. Mr. Watt has been negotiating with the owners of the Taku Smokeries area regarding some easements along their properties for the construction of the seawalk project. Standards for that seawalk need to be formally adopted in order to continue those negotiations. The other timelines that come into play are for two projects on South Franklin Street that were the subjects of the recent South Franklin Street widening negotiations. Those projects are both permitted under the old ordinance requiring them to construct a seawalk. However, because there are no standards, what they actually construct may not match the standards in the plan or those discussed previously in committee. These include minimum width requirements and a pile-supported dock-like structure that will support a loading capacity for public assembly and certain amenities of lighting, etc.

The city has been approached by one of the owners with questions regarding intentions since they have not yet begun construction or possess a building permit. The city wishes to proceed in a manner consistent with both current and future projects. Basic policy direction from the committee is needed for a draft ordinance for introduction in early September. A Planning Commission review would also be required. Staff discussed in detail, the policy issues to be addressed in updating the ordinance and to move forward and to allow for further negotiations with the property owners. The central issues of who constructs and who pays are complex and timeframes are critical. Mr. Watt
reported estimated construction costs for the two properties who have constructed seawalks under
the current ordinance are $30,000 and $75,000. Using these as a guide, the percentage breakdown to
build the seawalk to proposed standards would equal about 20 percent for the property owners and
80 percent for the City.

Ms. Pierce stated the advantages to the City constructing include spanning multiple properties in a
single project, building to standards, and a standard with certain amenities present on the seawalk
that the owner may or may not have an interest in maintaining. The code should also address the fact
that the structure is a sidewalk, and not a dock and for security purposes, needs to be separated from
the dock. The committee agreed that the draft ordinance should go to the Planning Commission and
then to full Assembly.

**B) Subport Status Report** was presented by Dale Pernula addressing the possibility of
following a suggestion made by Barbara Sheinberg, Subport Plan contractor. This would involve not
full adoption of the Subport Plan, but implementation of those broad items already addressed in the
Waterfront Plan. There are still many complex issues such as density and height requirements to be
addressed specifically in the area. The rewrite of Title 49 and subsequent changes may be
considered in meeting the priorities for the department, but some of the desired projects and pieces
may be implemented under the existing comprehensive Waterfront Plan. If this suggestion is taken,
some projects can move forward more quickly. Mr. Sanford eloquently expressed his frustration
with the slow churning of government to “get there”. Ms. Pierce explained that by not formally
adopting the plan, rather using the provisions of the Waterfront Plan and Title 49, the city actually
skips a step and moves directly to implementation. The committee members agreed to proceed as
outlined by staff.

**VII. Other Business**

There were questions and discussion regarding the dock and marine security issues in light of the
seawalk plans. Staff is proceeding in the direction of seawalk construction from the Fisherman’s
Memorial south to the Princess dock. Changes in this priority are a possibility, but if the whole
project is to move forward, this may not be the time to redirect. The committee recommends staying
on track with the current plan at this time, but Ms. Pierce offered to look into the issues for the
northern piece. Talks are ongoing with representatives from the cruise industry.

Mr. Sanford addressed the signage project and asked staff to ensure the area not become over
saturated with signs. Ms. Pierce will discuss this concern with Peter Freer, manager of the
Wayfinding project.

There are still questions regarding Merchant’s Wharf and the city pursuing funds for studies. There
are different contexts for the funding and study issues that may be causing confusion. There are
different issues regarding historical research, and engineering reports on the building and property.
Some of those decisions are in the hands of the property owners. It was suggested that if the city is
interested in the purchase, the opportunity to get funding for a study should be pursued to look at
Egan Drive stability and other issues beyond tidelands that will affect ownership. Ms. Pierce will
address this with the City Manager.

**VIII. Next Meeting will be at the call of the Chair**

**IX. Adjournment – Meeting adjourned at 1:09pm**