ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MINUTES

May 22, 2023 at 6:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

https://juneau.zoom.us/j/95424544691 or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 954 2454 4691

Assembly Committee of the Whole Worksession-no public testimony will be taken.

A. CALL TO ORDER

Deputy Mayor Maria Gladziszewski called the Assembly Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 6:00p.m.

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Ms. Woll provided the following land acknowledgment: We would like to acknowledge that the City and Borough of Juneau is on Tlingit land, and wish to honor the indigenous peoples of this land. For more than ten thousand years, Alaska Native people have been and continue to be integral to the well-being of our community. We are grateful to be in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. *Gunalchéesh*!

C. ROLL CALL

Assemblymembers Present: Maria Gladziszewski, Christine Woll, Carole Triem, Michelle Hale (Zoom), Wade Bryson, Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, and Mayor Beth Weldon.

Assemblymembers Absent: ‘Wáahlaal Gídaag, Greg Smith

Staff Present: City Manager Rorie Watt, Deputy City Manager Robert Barr, Acting City Attorney Sherri Layne, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Deputy City Clerk Andi Hirsh, Engineering/Public Works Director Katie Koester, Port Director Carl Uchytil, Community Development Director Jill Maclean, Assistant Attorney Emily Wright, Lands Manager Dan Bleidorn, Harbormaster Matt Cresswell

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – *The agenda was approved as presented.*

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

E. AGENDA TOPICS

1. Docks & Harbors - UA Lease Fisheries Terminal

Mr. Watt provided an overview of the issues and the recommendations from the Manager as found in the memo provided in the packet. The recommendations were as follows:

1. Consent to a 4 year continuation of UA leasing, after which the site will be vacated or private operators may lease directly with UA (CBJ gets out of the middle of this activity).

2. Consent to the general fund support of UAS student activities and the contractualization of the existing Eaglecrest program.

3. Direct Docks and Harbors to attempt to transition boat yard services to a new location.

4. Agree that the $2M that was previously allocated for purchase of the property can be used for capital improvements to a new location.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that Port Director Uchytil and Docks and Harbors (D&H) Boardmembers were present to answer any questions.

Mayor Weldon asked why they are recommending a four year lease and not something shorter.

Mr. Uchytil explained that the reason for the four years is to give time to work with the new Chancellor at the university. He noted that the UA Lands Division is a different entity than UAS. UA Lands Division can make institutional decisions less than $1 million without the consent and the approval of the Board of Regents and the President. He explained that he, Mr. Watt, D&H Chair Etheridge and the University representatives have been in conversations/negotiations and that the university needs time to sort out all the various uses of the Vocational Technical facility in alignment with the new Chancellor and that is how the 4 year lease period came about.

Ms. Woll asked if there was a chance that the University would be willing to sell that land at the end of the 4 years and if there was any chance that CBJ would be the first ones they would reach out to if/when they might be willing to sell it.

Mr. Uchytil said that he thinks the university believes it is in their best interest is to hold onto the entire 5.34 acre lot vs. the 2 acre lot size. He said that he thinks the University believes this property is highly valued and they may have an opportunity for a Mental Health/Subport type of windfall if they sell it. Mr. Uchytil said that he and his board do not view it like that. The property is adjacent to the two harbors and has links to the high school and whenever the land does go for sale, he believes the Juneau Legislative Delegation may also want to weigh in on the disposition of that property.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs expressed her concerns that they go with this option for four years and that they may end up in the same place at the end of that time. She asked Mr. Uchytil what their alternative plans may be that they end up with at the end of that four year period if they don't get to purchase this lot.

Mr. Uchytil said they have done some microstudies for marine services facilities. They have looked at a number of alternatives including Norway Point, the Little Rock Dump. He said that with Juneau being long, linear, and steep, there isn't flat land accessible to the water so there aren't a lot of choices and any of those choices that he mentioned would require a significant amount of fill. He said that any land next to water will be very expensive and when you look at trying for federal grants, boatyards do not have a high BCA.

Mr. Uchytil answered additional questions from Assemblymembers and he noted that the UA Lands Division has a fiduciary responsibility to the UA Board so that is one of the challenges. He also noted that the university is only currently receiving approximately $12,000/year from CBJ. He was asked about the type of investment D&H will plan on putting into the equipment at the boat yard over the next 4 years. Mr. Uchytil said that the owner/operator of Harry's Commercial Marine will be at the board meeting on Thursday and they will have that discussion at that meeting depending on what the Assembly's decision is tonight. The equipment that is under this lease is owned by the university and that includes the travel lift, the travel pier that supports the travel lift, two cranes. He said that the boat yard operator is responsible for the maintenance of the travel lift. D&H has been maintaining the three cranes at the dock and over the last year, D&H has put approximately $75,000 into repairing those cranes for use by the commercial fisherman. He said that there will be a requirement for repairs/maintenance to that travel lift to make it safe and usable for the next 4 years. How that gets carved out with the boatyard operated will be part of the negotiation process.

Ms. Triem said that she generally agrees with the outline and she was most interested in the long term planning after the four years ends and wants them to start that planning process now. She is in support of CBJ & D&H ensuring the conditions necessary were met to provide this service.

Mr. Uchytil said they have been applying for Build RAISE grants and other grants for the UAS property to build a more efficient crane facility, to build a net shed, and a drive down dock. They applied for a $25 million grant. When it was apparent they would not be getting the property from UAS, or a long term lease, they applied for a different PID type of grant, small port/small project and redesigned the project for a drive down float on CBJ owned property. The idea with the drive down float is to put a couple of cranes on the drive down float so that they would not have to rely on the University land for that service.

Ms. Gladziszewski expressed her concern that CBJ was playing the role of the middle man by leasing the property from the university and then subleasing it to Harry's Commercial Marine. She asked what it would look like if CBJ were to get out of the middle of that arrangement.

Mr. Uchytil then spoke of what the contractual implications might be for that and that the lease rent rate was established based on Fair Market Value (FMV) by Horan Appraisal. He said that CBJ has sub lessees to Harry's Commercial Marine at an annual rate of $30,000 and also Larry's Hydraulics at a rate of approximately $3,000/year. He noted that we can extend the boat yard lease to Mr. Duvernay (Harry's Commercial Marine). He said that there is one main float on one side of the pier that we collect moorage on. The other side is used by Harry's Commercial Marine to be able to do maintenance. He said that if the university were to walk away, the university would be required to lease it at fair market value to the boat yard. He doesn't think the university would be having any educational benefit if they were to lease it to the boat yard owner at FMV.

Ms. Hale noted that her brother owns Maritime Hydraulics, one of the businesses that lease from D&H, and she discussed this topic with the City Attorney in the past and he determined that she does not have a conflict of interest.

Mr. Uchytil went on to provide additional information about the finances, the history of the lease/property agreements as well as any potential lease and sublease negotiations the what the timelines associated with those leases look like.

Mayor Weldon asked if we could do the $100,000 lease but without the educational benefits. She was not in favor of the educational benefits on top of having to pay the $100,000 lease.

Mr. Uchytil said they are currently in negotiations and they have a one month extension but they need to go back to get approval by the Eaglecrest Board and Manager before they can agree to any of these options.

Ms. Triem asked what the timeline for these negotiations would be since they are on a month to month lease and it does not look like there is a consensus on this.

Mr. Watt said that we are on a month to month basis and we have been for some time. He said that he would characterize the university as having been generous in extending that short term extension repeatedly and agreeing to the legacy lease rate. They did not have to do either of those things and yet they have and have been very cooperative. In response to the Mayor's question of whether it is at $100,000 only or if there is additional pieces such as the educational benefits. He noted that if they were to be leasing at FMV rates, it would be somewhere in the neighborhood of valuing the educational benefit that we are offering generously as well.

Mr. Uchytil said the original 33 year lease expired in 2021, there was a one year extension which was then extended for another year and it was due to expire May 5, 2023 and they have now been granted a 1 month extension. He said that in looking to the attorney, the contract language has some additional language that will allow that to continue for month by month extension.

Mayor Weldon apologized for this question but said that we are going to be paying $100,000 plus educational benefits for a return on investment of $35,000 and did he think this actually a good idea.

Carl said that the board has been working on this for the past three years. The D&H board supports and encourages a thriving maritime community in Juneau and wants to be a place for commercial fishermen. He said that we have subsidized these activities for many years. They subsidize just about everything they do in the harbors. There comes a time that board weighs the pros and cons and sometimes they have to hold your nose and determine what is in the best interest of the community.

Mr. Uchytil and Mr. Watt then proceeded to answer additional questions in response to Assemblymembers' questions and comments.

<u>MOTION</u> by Mayor Weldon for the Assembly to allow for the following (which somewhat differs from the memo recommendations):

1. Consent to a 4 year continuation of UA leasing.

2. Consent to the general fund support of UAS student activities for the following: offering an internship with Eaglecrest and anything under the Docks & Harbors. (Mayor Weldon noted that she is not including the Capital Transit and Parks and Recreation activities since that is putting pressure on departments that we shouldn't.)

3. Direct Docks and Harbors to attempt to transition boat yard services to a new location.

4. Agree that the $2M that was previously allocated for purchase of the property can be used for capital improvements to a new location.

Objection by Ms. Hughes-Skandijs for purposes of clarification. She asked the Mayor to clarify the sections of the agreement that she is proposing to amend.

MAIN MOTION CLARIFICATION by Mayor Weldon that her motion is to forward portions of the UA & CBJ Amendment 4, Lease Agreement… page 2 of 6 of the agreement which is found on packet page 9, striking through C.1, as follows and excluding C.2 and C.3:

C. Educational Benefit …
   1. ~~Lesse shall provide free lift tickets and 50% discounts on gear rental at Eaglecrest for UAS students and~~ Entering into internships for UAS students pursuing outdoor recreation degrees.
   2. ~~Lessee shall provide CBJ bus passes to UAS students at no cost.~~
   3. ~~Lessee shall provide access at no cost to Treadwell Rink, CBJ Pools and Dimond Park Fieldhouse for UAS students.~~

Objection by Ms. Triem.

AMENDMENT #1 by Ms. Woll to restore C.3. "Lessee shall provide access at no cost to Treadwell Rink, CBJ Pools and Dimond Park Fieldhouse for UAS students."

Objection by Mayor Weldon. In speaking to her objection, Mayor Weldon noted that it puts undo pressure on other departments who did not plan for these conditions within the budgets they already forwarded to the Assembly.

Roll Call vote on Amendment #1 to restore C.3. language:

Yeas: Woll, Triem, Hughes-Skandijs, Hale, Bryson

Nays: Gladziszewski, Weldon

Motion passed 5 Yeas: 2 Nays

Deputy Mayor Gladziszewski said that puts us back to striking the first part of Sentence C.1. from Mayor Weldon's main motion.

Objection by Ms. Hale. In speaking to her objection, Ms. Hale said that she understands Mayor Weldon's concerns about burdening other agencies and the Assembly may need to come back and look at a small supplemental appropriation. She said this has been a long process and she would hate to step on all the work and effort that D&H has put in on this.

Objection by Ms. Triem as well, she said that in looking at all of these, Eaglecrest is likely the most desirable benefits to college students and that Eaglecrest also has a board and that there are at least seven months for all of this to be worked out before they need to start providing these services.

AMENDMENT #2 by Ms. Woll to restore the first part of the C.1. sentence that Mayor Weldon had originally excluded.

Objection by Mayor Weldon.

Additional discussion took place to clarify the motion and amendment before the body.

Roll Call vote on Amendment #2 to restore the full language in C.1.:

Yeas: Woll, Triem, Hughes-Skandijs, Hale, Bryson, Gladziszewski

Nays: Weldon

Amendment #2 Motion passed 6 Yeas: 1 Nay

Ms. Gladziszewski said that the main motion was before the body as presented on page 2 of the packet

Mr. Bryson clarified that Mayor Weldon had also excluded C.2. of the language on page 9 of the packet as noted above. Ms. Gladziszewski said that she had not heard that part of the Mayor's main motion but after hearing from the other members and Mayor Weldon, she agreed that the removal of C.2. was part of the main motion.

AMENDMENT #3 by Ms. Woll to restore C.2. "Lessee shall provide CBJ bus passes to UAS students at no cost."

Objection by Mayor Weldon.

Roll Call vote on Amendment #3 to restore C.2.:

Yeas: Woll, Triem, Hughes-Skandijs, Hale, Bryson, Gladziszewski

Nays: Weldon

Amendment #3 Motion passed 6 Yeas: 1 Nay

Deputy Mayor Gladziszewski called for the roll call vote on the main motion as amended.

Objection by Mayor Weldon. In speaking to her objection, Mayor Weldon said that she thinks it is a poor deal and while she is sorry that D&H has put in all this work, she hopes they will put that much work into finding a new location. She supports the commercial fishermen but at this time, she is thinking they are throwing good money after bad and while she could have done the lease, she doesn't agree with all the educational benefits. She said they just passed the lowest mill rate and now they are giving away free stuff again and that is incompatible for her so she is a no vote.

Mr. Bryson spoke in favor of the motion. He said that the Assembly has asked in various committees why we can't provide services for reasonable groups to benefit the members of our community with those services the city is already subsidizing. He said that the more young adults/students who participate in the activities offered by our community, helps them fall in love with the community and want to stay and become professionals and raise families here.

Ms. Triem also spoke in favor of the motion. She said that she thinks it is a good idea to provide these services to university students for all the reasons Mr. Bryson stated. She said that it is funny this is coming to fruition through a D&H lease but she is supportive of it. She said this is a good move for CBJ for D&H and this service is an important one for our community and the commercial fishing industry. She said that this is not a sustainable long term situation and the D&H Board knows that and she wants to be sure they are working on finding a solution for the long term and to bring that back to the Assembly.

Ms. Gladziszewski said she thinks this is a bad deal for a four year period although she is in favor of giving students some great benefits, four years is too long of a bad deal for her.

ROLL CALL on MAIN MOTION as Amended:

Yeas: Woll, Triem, Hughes-Skandijs, Hale, Bryson,

Nays: Gladziszewski, Weldon

MAIN MOTION as Amended, passed 5 Yeas: 2 Nays

2. Accessory Dwelling Unit Grant Program Update

Housing and Land Use Special Joseph Meyers gave a presentation on the Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) grant program a copy of which was included in the COW packet. CBJ started permitting ADUs in 2001 and it was updated in 2009 and 2015. There are currently 16 grants of $6,000 each to eligible applicants. The average cost of the units are approximately $36,000 however the average in 2015 was approximately $26,000 and in 2022 the average cost was approximately $57,000. This is a significant increase in cost over the life of the program.

Ms. Hale asked for clarification that the ADUs include both apartments and free standing structures. Mr. Meyers confirmed that was correct that it included both types of structures.

Mr. Meyers provided options to try to expand the ADU program in the future if the Assembly wished to expand the program. He gave two options:

Tier 1 (Option 2) grant amount at $13,500 with no Short Term Rentals (STRs) for 3 years, receive Certificate of Occupancy within 2 years of permit issuance, no affordability requirement, available on a First come/First served basis, and requiring annual reports for three years.

Tier 2 (Option 3) grant amount at $50,000 with no Short Term Rentals (STRs) for 10 years, receive Certificate of Occupancy within 2 years of permit issuance, Affordability requirement at 80% AMI for 10 years through a recorded covenant, available on a First come/First served basis, and requiring annual reports for ten years.

The Manager's Recommendation is for the COW to forward a draft resolution for continuation of the ADU grant program as a two-tiered program as outlined above.

Ms. Hale said she is interested in this program for many reasons, including possibly utilizing it if her zoning is ever changed to allow for an ADU on her current property. She asked, particularly related to the Tier 2 option, what happens if a unit is vacant for a part of that time. She also asked if someone builds a unit, is it acceptable when advertising it that they include that renters have to meet the income parameters for the 80% AMI.

Mr. Meyers said they have not considered the vacancy issue but they are open to suggestions.

With respect to the income issue, Mr. Meyers said he didn't think there was any problem with advertising for that. One note on his presentation showed that 80% AMI in Juneau for a family of four is $95,300 (in 2023 numbers).

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Ms. Layne if there was some way that renters have to provide income statements or something. Ms. Layne said that rents would have to be considered affordable at the 80% AMI rate for a period of 10 years in the Tier 2 scenario. Ms. Layne said that her assumption was that the person is going to be responsible for figuring out what 80% is and the property owner can't go above that amount when renting out the unit so they do not need to ask people what their income is.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked how CBJ will know if they are in compliance with the program requirements. Mr. Meyers said that there is a reporting requirement and there is a reporting form and they will be required to report their tenants and what they charge annually.

Ms. Triem asked for clarification that the 80% AMI number applies to the amount of rent charged and not to the income of the renters. Mr. Meyers confirmed that was correct.

Ms. Woll asked about the covenant on the smaller grant as well as the reporting. She said that they have not required those in the past and asked if there was a reason those are now going to be required.

Mr. Meyer said that they did not require those before. They wanted to provide additional extra funding above the current $6,000. CDD Director Jill Maclean explained that the first round of the grants was years ago, prior to her employment with CBJ, when there was some extra funding from the legislature. At that time, they knew that additional housing was needed and they divided up those funds into 16 grants of $6,000 each. That is how they have pretty much run the program since that time but recently, mostly since the pandemic, short term rentals have become a big concern for the Assembly and members of the public so this was one attempt to reflect the

need to care for longer term housing and to ensure that these units aren't STRs for the times identified for each of the Tier 1 and Tier 2 grants.

Ms. Hale said that she feels it is important that they address the issue of potential vacancies, especially for the Tier 2 grants so that the owners understand the rules. Ms. Hale also pointed out the application on packet page 30, it refers to CBJ Accessory Apartments … as opposed to Accessory Dwelling Units so that will need to be updated when the changes to the program are updated.

Ms. Triem said that since this meeting is the Assembly's chance to discuss this program. She said she doesn't have a strong feeling but said that she would like to hear from her fellow Assemblymembers and/or staff on the dollar amounts.

Director Maclean said that this was before the Assembly Lands, Housing, & Economic Development Committee (LHEDC) last month at which they considered four options: Option1 was Status Quo, Options 2 & 3 are the Tier 1 & 2 options noted above, and Option 4 was to do away with the program. Staff strongly recommended against Options 1 and 4 and the LHEDC liked both Options 2 & 3 and that is why these are before the COW tonight.

In speaking to Ms. Hale's language concerns about the application, she noted the application in the packet is the current version but that it will be updated as the program changes are implemented.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs said that she was also concerned about the vacancy factor that Ms. Hale asked about. She is even more curious about the smaller amount with the 3 year term and she would be concerned that someone gets a subsidy for an ADU and it sits vacant for awhile and then term is up and the next thing you know, it becomes an STR that was subsidized by the city. She said that the three year period seems rather short to her.

Ms. Woll said that Director Maclean did a good job summarizing the conversation at the LHEDC meeting. She said that, for herself, when she saw these two options, they target potentially very different segments of the community. Some of the LHEDC members wanted to go forward with the very aggressive option which was the $50,000 grant. She said that why she likes the blended approach, while she is supportive of the $50,000, there may not be a wide portion of the community willing to use those. The blended approach of both options allows for them to get some more data.

Mr. Bryson pointed out that a vacancy rate is a common thing and it would take something extraordinary to not take advantage of the ability to rent out a unit.

Ms. Triem thanked Ms. Woll for her feedback as Ms. Triem was thinking about this as an either/or option and had not originally been looking at this as a blended two option item. She asked Director Maclean if, with respect to the vacancy factor, the grantees would have to provide a report showing 36 months of rentals as opposed to a 3 year period. That would just be a different approach but accomplish the same intent.

Ms. Layne said that if that is the direction the Assembly wants to go, they can structure it that way.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon to forward Resolution 3030 to the Assembly with a minor amendment to change the period under D.7. from "three years" to "five years" and for that same period change to be reflected in the reporting requirements.

Objection by Ms. Woll. She said that the purpose of doing this program is to encourage more housing development but by putting on more restrictions, it disincentivizes applicants from wanting to apply. She is all for regulating STRs in our community but this program is to get more units available for rent in the community.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs said that she strongly supports this amendment. She thinks that three years is a blink of an eye. She supported going with the more aggressive option (Tier 2) when this was in the LHEDC so that they could get more units available in the community. If we are getting more units out there but then they are being turned into STRs, that does nothing for our year-round residents and that is not our target for this program. She said that there are other areas they are working to get a sense of the STRs in the community and their impacts through starting off by getting more data at this point. To her, five years is a good compromise for this program and supports the year-round residents.

Ms. Hale objected to the motion. She said they want to get people excited about this program and building additional units in the community and she is worried that by loading these up with more restrictions it will have the opposite effect and she objects to the amendment.

Ms. Triem asked if staff could provide information on how and when the applicant receives the money for the program and when that starts the timing clock for the three, five, ten year commitments.

Mr. Meyers explained that there is a two-year period from the time they get a building permit to the time they receive a certificate of occupancy (CO). The clock on the grant program would start at the time the CO is issued which is when the grant funds are awarded.

Ms. Triem said that she also objects to the amendment. She would be willing to work with the City Attorney to rewrite portions of the resolution that might address the 36 month vs. three year, or whatever other timeframe they arrive at. She also noted concern that they are trying to regulate STRs before the Assembly has the conversation about when and how they may want to regulate STRs.

Ms. Gladziszewski spoke in favor of the amendment because she sees this program as incentivizing the building of units that human beings living in Juneau would be able to live in rather than using CBJ grant funds to subsidize STRs.

Director Maclean provided the following points of information for clarification: the units in this program have to be built on or adjacent to the main dwelling unit of the property owner and if the property is conveyed to another owner within the covenant agreement period, the grantee has to repay those funds. She also stated that staff agrees with Ms. Triem concerns that if the Assembly chooses to regulate STRs, that should be addressed as its own topic separate from this process.

Ms. Gladziszewski called for a roll call vote on the Amendment to change the Tier 1 period from “three years” to “five years.”

ROLL CALL vote on Amendment #1:

Yeas: Hughes-Skandijs, Gladziszewski, Weldon

Nays: Woll, Triem, Hale, Bryson

Amendment #1, failed 3 Yeas: 4 Nays

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that the main motion to move Resolution 3030 forward to the Assembly is on the table.

Objection noted by Mayor Weldon for the same reasons she previously noted about disagreeing with the three year period.

AMENDMENT #2 by Ms. Woll to remove the reporting requirement for the smaller $16,500 grant. Ms. Woll said she didn’t find the location in the resolution that speaks to that so asked if this could be a high level amendment for the removal of that requirement wherever it may appear in the program language.

In speaking to her amendment, Ms. Woll said that she thinks this is an additional burden we are placing on people who may be looking at applying for this program. She said that as far as rules go, people tend to want to do the right thing most of the time and she didn’t feel reporting should be required.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Mr. Meyers if he could point to the place in the resolution where that reporting requirement was included. Ms. Gladziszewski noted that it was in the table but she wasn’t seeing it in the resolution.

Ms. McEwen did a search on the resolution and found no reporting requirements in the resolution.

Ms. Layne said that if they did want the reporting language included in the resolution, they could make that change before it goes to the Assembly.

Ms. Woll withdrew Amendment #2 since the language is not currently in the resolution.

Amendment #3 by Ms. Woll to remove the requirement for the written covenant from the Tier 1 agreement.

Additional discussion took place as to where it might be found in the resolution. Ms. Layne said that the language in the resolution doesn't quite spell out those requirements the way Ms. Woll thinks it does. Ms. Woll said those requirements were listed in the presentation table and that she would like to work with the Attorney to bring back some revised language before they take this resolution up again. Ms. Hale shared her concerns about the $50,000 tier and also about how to care for vacancy issues.

Mayor Weldon removed her motion to forward this resolution to the Assembly. After additional discussion by staff and the Assemblymembers, it was decided to keep this resolution in the COW for additional work. Mayor Weldon said that in addition to the previous questions/comments, she would like to here how this benefit compares to the recent tax abatement and the Affordable Housing Loan that they recently approved. Ms. Hughes-Skandijs said she would like to pass on her sense of urgency that they had during the LHEDC meeting that the Assembly needs to have for getting housing for our year-round residents.

Ms. Triem encouraged members to focus on the high level policy decisions and to stay out of the weeds of nitpicking on application language etc…

Amendment 3 and the Main Motion to forward to the Assembly were withdrawn in favor of keeping this in COW for additional work.

3. South Seward Street Renaming

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that Sealaska Heritage Institute (SHI) withdrew their initial application.

Mr. Watt reported that Sealaska Heritage Institute (SHI) put in an application to rename the two blocks, Heritage Way, and Dr. Worl advised us that she wanted to withdraw that and pursue a Tlingit place name. He said that they subsequently received an email stating "After much discussion at SHI and with their constituents, SHI wants to continue with the Heritage Way renaming."

Ms. Gladziszewski said that for the process, there cannot be any objection from fellow property owners on the affected street. Since City Hall is one of the properties that would be re-addressed, she asked the Assembly if they have any objections.

Ms. Woll asked if that language was in our rules that all property owners have to consent about a name change. Watt explained that in our land use code, if someone wants to rename a street, they are supposed to hold a neighborhood meeting in case a property owner wants to object. It then goes to the Planning Commission (PC) and the PC decides. Mr. Watt said he recommends they do not object but also the PC process is helpful because someone else in the community may want to comment.

Mr. Bryson said he doesn't object to City Hall if that was the only impact. He asked for additional information to be brough back to let us know what it would cost to re-address all the city functions that use the current address. He also noted that there may be at least one property owner within that area that will be objecting to the change.

Mr. Watt clarified by answering Mr. Bryson's concerns that City Hall is the only affected property and that the proposal is to just rename the portion of Seward Street from Front Street to Marine Way which would include properties owned by Sealaska, Sealaska Heritage Institute, the newly purchased building by Sealaska Heritage Building and City Hall. There are no other property owners. He said that with regard to costs, he is recommending the address for City Hall remain as 155 New Name. He said that there are not a lot of pre-printed documents that would need to be redone. As people order new business cards and thinks, we will replace those with the new name.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon to support the renaming of the southern portion of Seward Street from Front Street to Marine Way to the name Heritage Way and asked for unanimous consent. *Hearing no objection, the motion passed by unanimous consent.*

F. STAFF REPORTS - *None.*

G. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS - *None.*

H. NEXT MEETING DATE: Monday, June 5, 2023, 6:00 p.m.

I. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

J. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 7:45p.m.