

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE *DRAFT* MINUTES

November 07, 2022 at 6:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar/YouTube Livestream



Assembly Committee of the Whole Worksession (No Public Testimony Taken)

Immediately following the Special Assembly Meeting 2022-25

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

A. CALL TO ORDER

Deputy Mayor Maria Gladziszewski called the Assembly Committee of the Whole meeting to order at 6:20p.m. following adjournment of the Special Assembly meeting. The COW meeting was held in the Assembly Chambers and broadcasted virtually via Zoom.

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Mayor Weldon 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 people 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 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, Wade Bryson, Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Greg Smith, Michelle Hale, Christine Woll, Carole Triem (via Zoom), 'Wáahlaal Gíidaak, and Mayor Beth Weldon.

Assemblymembers Absent: None.

Staff Present: City Manager Rorie Watt, Deputy City Manager Robert Barr, City Attorney Robert Palmer, Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen, Deputy City Clerk Diane Cathcart, Lands Manager Dan Bleidorn, BRH CEO David Keith, Port Director Carl Uchytel, Assistant City Attorney Adam Gotschalk

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The agenda was approved as presented.

E. AGENDA TOPICS

1. Huna Totem Support Dock Update

Huna Totem Corporation President/CEO Russell Dick and Vice-President of Marketing & Business Development Mickey Richardson gave a high level planning presentation about their proposed dock and uplands located at the subport. They spoke to other cruise port projects they have been involved with including Icy Straight Point and are currently working on projects in Klawock and Whittier.

Mr. Dick said that they started working with Norwegian Cruise Lines (NCL) over a year ago with an RFI process, never thinking at that time that NCL would be gifting them the land at the subport. That gift was a big surprise and Huna Totem's stance is that with that gift also comes with great responsibility. He said that means that they have to take on the challenges, the commitments, the concerns, and the ideas that were floated for this project as they were initially proposed by NCL. He noted that NCL's plans were started pre-pandemic and Huna Totem is now working on this in a post-pandemic world. There are changes to the design that they are contemplating with the project but they intend those to still fit with the culture and community values. He noted that they will stay within the original 2.9 acre footprint and are designed to the existing waterfront parcel which will not require any variances in the zoning rules or regulations. He said it can't be all things to all people but they will do what they

can to make it work for our community. He spoke to the importance of integrating the local values and culture into the design and working together with CBJ on additional tidelands. He said that they have built the seawalk into their design as well as creating a pedestal for Juneau's future development. He stressed the importance of building something that will be open to the community year round, "A place where the community meets."

Mr. Dick said that when they are talking about retail, they are talking about restaurants and eating spaces but also stores such as Nugget Alaskan Outfitters that would be open year-round and not stores that are only going to be open for 4-5 months of the year.

Mr. Mickey Richardson then shared the Powerpoint Presentation. He explained that their primary approach to the project was in using five core methodology concepts:

- 1) Representing the Local Culture and People – highlighting Juneau history and culture similar to what they did with their Icy Straight Point property.
- 2) Curating the Traffic Flow – moving people from the ships to their tours while also allowing for traffic along the seawalk in an interesting way that encourages exploration while also keeping them safe throughout the process.
- 3) Open for Business Year Round – having indoor parking is key and having curated retail/restaurant experiences that allow for them to be open year-round and creating events and activities year-round.
- 4) Meet NCLH Community Commitments – incorporating as many of the prior commitments into the Huna Totem model while knowing and understanding #5 below...
- 5) There is no Pixie Dust! They are designing based on keeping everything within the 2.9 acre footprint without having to make any zoning changes.

He then proceeded to elaborate on all of the above concepts and how they incorporated those into their preliminary design. Those include a curved trestle, having local Alaskan Native art as individuals walk off the ship, taking the curved trestle up the seawalk.

Mayor Weldon said that she understands the view plane they are going for with the curved walkway but asked what their plan was for emergency vehicle access. Mr. Richardson said that the curved walkway is for pedestrians but that there is a separate straight walkway in the design for vehicle/emergency access purposes. He spoke to the recent news they received within the last week that the USCG will not be working with them using their initial design and they will be relocating portions of the walkway in an updated concept design to meet the USCG requirements.

Mr. Richardson then walked through each of the elements within their proposal including covered parking, retail areas, bus staging areas, and community spaces for community events to take place. He then spoke to developing the space in three phases. Phase 1 would be completed by 2025 and move forward quickly after that with Phase 2 and then decide what the timing might be for Phase 3 based on demand.

Mr. Richardson then answered questions from Assemblymembers regarding the conceptual designs and phases including questions about the impacts of USCG Icebreaker plans, Huna Totem's plans for dock electrification and EV charging stations.

Assemblymembers asked them about changes/options based on what the USCG changes might require. Mr. Watt explained from a historical perspective that our current CBJ owned docks are commonly referred to as "16B" due to there being sixteen different versions of the dock design before the final design was reached. He said that this is version 1 of the Huna Totem dock design and it will very likely have many other versions based on input from the USCG, pilots, etc... once it is finally designed and built.

Assemblymembers asked them about the public comment opportunities that might happen during the design phase for feedback and input into their design/development. Mr. Richardson spoke to a number of informal community public opportunities such as Chamber of Commerce. Mayor Weldon suggested they might want to hold some more specific open houses for community engagement such as during one or more first Friday venues.

Additional discussions took place regarding zoning and Planning Commission review and Deputy Mayor Gladyszewski said that while the Planning Commission will be looking at the specific requirements for zoning and operations. She said that the Assembly's charge, when they come looking for a tidelands lease, will be looking at broader issues such as whether the overall development is good enough for the community or not. Those are not so much technical issues but rather she will be looking at guaranteed year-round vitality. She said that right now, Phase 1 is looking somewhat empty and it will be balancing act to look at the communities wishes and what is best for the community overall. Ms. Gladyszewski said that the housing component would be one that she will be looking at specifically as that shows more year-round vitality.

Mr. Dick and Mr. Richardson then answered additional questions from Assemblymembers related to the Phase 2 timing, the NCL list and the status of the Ocean Center. The said one of the challenges they face are determining which to go with: housing or an ocean/science center, vs. cultural center/flex space.

The Assembly thanked them for the presentation and said they look forward to hearing more and especially to the public outreach opportunities they will be providing.

2. Ordinance 2022-21 An Ordinance Related to Property Tax Appeals and Codifying the Board of Equalization Rules of Procedure.

This ordinance would amend the Juneau Board of Equalization's (BOE) rules of procedure, which govern property tax appeals. The substance of this ordinance comes from three sources: the Anchorage Board of Equalization rules, the existing Juneau Board of Equalization rules, and changes to state law since the existing Juneau property tax appeal code was adopted in the 1970s.

The Juneau Board of Equalization reviewed this ordinance on September 20, 2022. The Assembly Committee of the Whole reviewed this ordinance on September 26, 2022.

Deputy Mayor Gladyszewski said that the idea for this ordinance is for the Assemblymembers to ask their questions, see what is happening. She said they have had some comments from an organization. She suggests that they let the ordinance be introduced and then brought back to the COW for additional review and any potential amendments. She also noted that they will be looking at the Hazard Mapping topic in the same way and provide high level direction and see it come back at a future meeting.

She then invited Assistant City Attorney Adam Gottschalk to provide any additional information to the Assembly about the proposed ordinance. Mr. Gottschalk said he could go over the materials provided in the packet, which are very similar to those covered in the September 26 COW meeting, or he can answer specific questions from Assemblymembers. Ms. Gladyszewski said they will open it up to Assembly questions.

Ms. Hale asked him to explain more about the burden of proof that lies with the appellant as required by state law. Mr. Gottschalk pointed to AS 29.45.210(b) which requires the tax payer to prove that the valuation is unequal, excessive, improper, or undervalued. He noted that most of the changes included in Ordinance 2022-21 are procedural in nature and don't affect the burden of proof requirements of AS 29.45.210(b).

Ms. Woll asked him to elaborate the reasoning for the first amendment, on page 2 of the ordinance under CBJ 15.05.041, rendering the body to hear appeals about exemptions to be superior court rather than the Assembly. Mr. Gottschalk said that generally appeals of administrative decisions go directly to superior court and they are much more familiar in those types of appeal processes than the Assembly. He said that he was not aware of the frequency or numbers of those types of appeals that may have had to go through that process but that possibly City Attorney Palmer might have more information on those numbers. Mr. Palmer said that in his approximately nine years with CBJ, they may have been four or five exemption appeals. He said that Assemblies change and exemption decisions are very nuanced legal decisions and past Assemblies were not comfortable with making those nuanced legal decisions. He said there is a somewhat archaic provision in city code that provides that exemption appeals go to the Assembly. He said that state law has evolved since CBJ adopted those code provisions and this change would align it state law. He said that state law also has a provision that if the Assembly wants to hear exemption appeals, they can choose to do so.

Mr. Smith asked for clarification that this ordinance change would not change the pathway for valuation appeals. Mr. Palmer responded that was correct that valuation appeals go to the Board of Equalization and any appeal of those decisions would go to superior court.

Mr. Smith also asked for clarification that the time for filing an appeal is still at 30 days from the date the assessment notice was mailed. Mr. Gottschalk responded that was correct, that the filing period remains with closing 30 days after the date the assessment notices were mailed. He also stated that the ordinance does propose new language that provides appellants, who file a late appeal, five minutes of oral argument for testimony before the BOE regarding the reasons for having filed late.

Ms. Woll asked about how we would be paying BOE members at the rate of \$100 per hearing and said that differs quite a bit from how we are paying the Assembly and other boards that receive a stipend and she asked where that structure came from. Mr. Gottschalk said that was based largely on the Anchorage model that are paid \$50 per session. He said that CBJ's BOE process is more extensive in that Anchorage provides each party 5 minutes to state their case, whereas CBJ allows each party 15 minutes per case. The requirement for the BOE to meet for a concentrated time period during the year as well as the hundreds of pages of appeal documents that they have to review and consider warrants the greater rate. Ms. Woll asked if any cost analysis had been done for that rate. Mr. Gottschalk said that the 2021 season might be considered a more 'normal' type of year having held 7 hearings, and using this new rate, the cost estimate for those hearings would be approximately \$2,100.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that BOE Chair David Epstein was available online if anyone had questions for him.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Mr. Gottschalk about the possibility raised by the Chamber of Commerce about providing guidelines for possibly providing examples of types of evidence that might be used by an appellant to prove their case. Mr. Palmer pointed to the language provided on page 10 of the draft ordinance starting on line 17 and that Assessor staff may provide an FAQ list to appellants based on those categories.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon to refer Ordinance 2022-21 to the Assembly for introduction but to also leave it in the Committee of the Whole for additional discussion.

Ms. Hale asked when they would be discussing the items addressed by the Chamber of Commerce letter. Mayor Weldon noted that she has already discussed some of these with staff and will be drafting up some possible amendments which she will share with everyone once those are drafted. Ms. Gladziszewski said that she would also like the Board of Equalization to look at the suggestions in the letter and provide their input as well. She asked Ms. Hale that if she had any comments or items to address now, this would be the time to do it.

Ms. Hale said that she will discuss it with Mayor Weldon and make sure they aren't causing duplicative work for staff. Ms. Hale stated that she has a broad question, not related to the letter. She said that members of the public have brought it to her attention that other community assessor's offices follow a prescribed procedure/process for their assessments and apparently ours does not. She asked staff for clarification on whether we should be following a prescribed process.

Mr. Gottschalk spoke to the process during the appeal hearings. Mr. Watt said that if a member of the public has a specific recommendation on how to improve our processes, we would welcome that information for consideration.

3. Hazard Mapping

Gastineau Avenue Event Summary

Mr. Watt pointed to the memo on page 44 of the packet and complimented all those who were involved in the recent Gastineau Avenue event, especially Director Katie Koester, Emergency Program Manager Tom Mattice, people from the neighborhood and community volunteers. He and Mr. Barr met with the three property owners on Friday and he went for a tour yesterday. He commended the property owners for staying together and working together to address the financial and other considerations. He said he and Director Koester were available to answer questions from Assemblymembers before they got into the Hazard Mapping conversation.

Mr. Smith asked about the rainfall intensity chart. Mr. Barr said that he asked for that data and he is confident that the weather service will follow-up with him on that request. He said that other Southeast Alaska communities are also looking at those data sets but that predicting landslides is tricky and that is just one datapoint among many that get looked at.

Ms. Woll asked if there were any big lessons learned in terms of response. Director Koester said that there are always lessons to be learned from events and during this event they learned some things about our internal communications, communicating with the Red Cross and sheltering. She said that Leadership Team did a debriefing last week to talk about how we can take lessons learned from this event and really help the entire team be prepared for future events. She said that she has been here for two and a half years and some type of incident has happened and we have been fortunate to have no loss of life but there is always something to be learned.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked how they responded in light of the All Hazards Plan. Director Koester responded that they have followed the protocols for emergency response but it also depends on who is available and who shows up during an emergency response. She said that the All Hazards Plan is a more of a planning document that is used as the basis for those responses. It is updated every five years as lead by the City Manager's office and Tom Mattice, and there are always lessons learned that can help improve the plan for future responses.

Mayor Weldon asked about the tree that was blocking the road and they had talked with AEL&P on making Gastineau Avenue a through street which may or may not be gated depending on what happens. She asked if they are still working on that or if they have reached an impasse. Director Koester said that is certainly on the table. She noted that that is AEL&P property and there is an AEL&P easement but there is also a private property owner who owns a key section of that. She said that the Fire Department has been in conversation with that private property owner and she spoke with Fire Department staff this weekend about making sure those conversations continue in case access is needed. That said, it has not yet been buttoned down but they are continuing those conversations.

Mr. Watt said that in 2005 when they worked on the Gastineau Avenue project, they negotiated with that property owner and AEL&P to build a temporary access road so that they could get people in and out when the road was under construction and they could have ambulance access as well as access for people with mobility issues. They did it once, but it would be a big deal in terms of dollars in terms of permanent public access. It would be a good topic for PWFC to contemplate for the CIP list and determine if the benefits would outweigh the costs.

Hazard Mapping Update/Recommendation

Mr. Watt said that the packet contained an uncharacteristic long memo from him regarding the Hazard Mapping project. He said that we need to update our code with regards to development restrictions in hazard zones. The changes to Title 49 have to go through the Planning Commission first. He said they do not need specific direction from the Assembly but rather a nod that the direction that he has laid out in the memo is close enough to where we think we might end up. That would allow for the Planning Commission to begin working on it. Otherwise, if the Assembly wants to see modifications to what is in the memo, this would be the time to provide that direction. He said they did discuss this some time ago when they discussed targeting only those areas that would be likely to experience incidents in a 50-100 year horizon. He said that he had thought that would be specific enough for staff and the Planning Commission but apparently that is not and hence the memo in the packet.

He said that when the PC starts to work on this, CDD staff with Law Department staff will draft an ordinance to be brought to the PC which will include public process at neighborhood meetings, PC meetings and other opportunities before it would come back to the Assembly for additional public process and eventual action. He said this is just starting that process. It will be on the November 28 COW agenda as well and he is asking that they read this information, follow the links and be ready to engage in the conversation at the November 28 meeting.

Mr. Watt then touched on the historic slides included in the COW packet and he walked them through some of mining history which caused some of the issues in what is identified as some of those hazard zones. He discussed the logging of the hillside and the filling down the hillside of mine tailings in the Gastineau area. He showed where

the 1920 slide had occurred. The next photo he showed was from the November 22, 1936 slide that included loss of life. Debris slid with a much more significant slide which had 6-10 feet of mud and rock that slid down to the Cold Storage dock area. The third photo he showed was from the current time with the recent Gastineau Avenue event that was to the left of the 265 & 269 Gastineau properties. The last photo he showed provided a different angle showing the 1920 and 1936 slide areas and the proximity of the AJ Mill site and the Railroad section. He said that he wanted to show these to the Assembly so they can understand our hillside dynamics along with the fact that our two big events were related to the mining activity. He said that while we should be very careful and thoughtful about assessing our slide hazards in the downtown area, he feels those two have special circumstances as it relates to mining history.

Mr. Watt noted that he has also studied some of the events around the region that were big, tragic events in Sitka and Haines during which people lost their lives. He said there may be more events coming in Skagway. He noted that those are very different from what Juneau's circumstances are and it is hard to know why the Haines slide even occurred. It is a low angled forested slope and it doesn't look steep like Mt. Roberts. It looks more like Douglas Island and it is a cautionary tale that we live in mountain country and things like that can happen anywhere. He said that maybe science will eventually get to where they can identify the reason the Haines slide occurred but mountains can be unstable and we don't necessarily know how or why.

He said with respect to the incident in September in speaking to the property owners on Gastineau Avenue, they asked if there was a way that CBJ could help. Mr. Watt said that while he would like to, CBJ is the backyard property owners of tens of hundreds of miles of property owners throughout the borough and we are very institutionally adverse from getting on to steep slopes and making any changes. He said that he thinks that Mr. Palmer would agree with him that if CBJ gets up onto a hillside and makes changes, a key tenant of responsibility is going to be who touched it last and we simply cannot be getting into hillsides throughout the borough. He said that they will try to work on a case by case basis in some small ways that they can work with the property owners and they discussed some of those ways during their recent meeting.

Mayor Weldon asked for clarification on liability. She asked if CBJ owned trees and it fell down, that is not necessarily something we would be liable for but if we had done some work and then the area slid, we could potentially be liable.

Mr. Palmer explained that the overarching concept is that if land is in its natural condition and there is some natural event, high rain, high wind, or combination of wind and rain, the property owner is not responsible for what happens. He said that is especially true when it comes to trees if a tree falls down from our property onto a private property, in general we are not responsible for that tree and the damage that is caused by that tree. There are some exceptions and some of those exceptions would be if we knew that a particular tree was dangerous and we didn't do something about it. Or as Mr. Watt said, if we did work on a hillside, or AEL&P for example, did work to cut a bunch of trees, laid them on the ground to decompose and nature doing what nature does somehow turns a tree from being parallel across the hillside to turning it and aligning it more like a toboggan sled and something happened within a 10-year period, whoever cut that down could generally be held liable.

Ms. Gladyszewski asked where the 10-year period comes from. Mr. Palmer explained that Alaska law has a "Statute of Repose" similar to the statute of limitations. The statute of repose states that you are on the hook for anything that happens resulting from your actions within a 10-year period and you are generally off the hook if something happens outside of that 10-year period.

Ms. Woll asked for clarification using an example if a tree above her house was a hazard and what might happen.

Mr. Palmer said that generally, if it is on fairly flat ground, they will remove any hazard trees. However, if it is on a steep slope, then it has to undergo a hazard assessment and it becomes a compounding analysis. If they remove that tree, how do they do it. They would have to determine if it would be more of a hazard to remove a tree than to leave it there. The property owner down below has to also assume some of the risk of being downhill from that slope. The default answer is that property owners on steep slopes have to assume some risks for being there. He

said that is usually a tough lesson but also why most insurance companies cover damage resulting from trees in their policies.

Mr. Watt highlighted how much of CBJ staff time is spent on dealing with tree issues. That takes up almost half of the time of one of the staff members in the Lands Division as well as staff time from the Parks & Landscape Division.

Mr. Watt then highlighted the Hazard Maps as provided by the consultant, those were distributed as red folder items. He showed the Gastineau Avenue tree incident as it relates to those maps. 'Wáahlaal Gíidaak asked why there was a "wiggle through town" on the hazard map showing a higher hazard area. Mr. Watt said that he asked the same thing of the consultants and they noted that "wiggle area" followed the slope of the Telephone Hill the slope by the State Office Building, the nob around the Governor's House and the neighborhood up to the top of that. He said that for some reason the consultants felt that slope was a high hazard slope. His comment to them was high compared to what? Mr. Watt said that in his view, moderate or high could be dealt with, with a building permit and shouldn't rise to the level of a hazard that we should think about a development restriction for. In his recommendation, the avalanche hazard is mostly the same and they feel the science is there to tell people it is high avalanche hazard and for those areas, we can notify residents in those areas when high avalanche conditions exist and they may want to not be in those areas during those times.

He said that with the current code, landslide are a little tricky and his recommendations are on page 50 of the packet as follows.

Landslide Mapping & Code Recommendation:

I recommend that we adopt the maps as the best updated mapping available and develop a draft Ordinance for Commission review that would propose to regulate development as follows:

No restrictions in Low, Moderate or High Hazard Areas

Single Family Residency permissible in Severe Hazard Areas

Development Density Greater than Single Family Requires a Conditional Use Permit, with the developer proposing special engineering for the following:

Peak Drainage

Special Foundation and/or High back wall Engineering

Debris Flow diversion mechanisms

Possible Adjustments to Map Boundaries

Additionally, the developer/owner should be required to notify hazard details to renters

Consider requiring property sellers to disclose hazard designation to potential buyers

Assemblymembers thanked Mr. Watt for this explanation and recommendations speaking to some of the past conversations as well as some of the past projects they have discussed with respect to single family homes vs. CUPs required for anything greater than a single family home. Members asked for more information about insurance impacts as well as mortgage impacts that this may trigger. Mr. Watt said that they will try to bring more information back to the Assembly at the next meeting about those topics.

Additional discussion took place about the downtown area and what the probabilities might be for a 100-year or 500+ year events as well as what types of policies the Assembly may want to look at during the next meeting.

Ms. Woll said that she appreciates the direction that this is going but also expressed her concern that they do look at these hazard maps. She said that she hopes to get a finalized version of the consultant's report after the public comments were made and incorporated. She asked for some additional information to also be provided at a future meeting regarding drainage issues. She asked about engineer reports and if these are the maps that are adopted if that means that no future changes. Mr. Watt said that in his memo, he was somewhat conflicted on those questions and he hopes that will be some policy decisions that they will look at making in the future. Mr. Smith asked if they should be looking at any potential mitigation steps regarding the zones identified in red and

orange on the consultant's maps. Mr. Watt said that he would not recommend any mitigation measures at this stage.

MOTION by Mayor Weldon to direct staff to continue their analysis of this with the goal of heading towards adopting both the landslide and avalanche maps and eventually drafting ordinances for Planning Commission review. *Hearing no objection, the motion passed by unanimous consent.*

The Clerk noted that Ms. Triem had to leave the meeting at approximately 8:30p.m.

4. Parks and Recreation Board Consolidation

Parks and Recreation Director George Schaaf said that he did not have any presentation but was available to answer any questions about his memo that was included in the packet.

‘Wáahlaal Gíidaak asked what he proposed this new board size will be and how many people would they potentially be losing by taking this action. Director Schaaf said that they have not yet drafted any legislation. The current Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee has nine members and that is likely what they will end up with for the final board. The other boards have never been fully filled all at the same time but altogether they have 43 seats if all seats were filled on all the boards involved.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs asked if they have a proposal on how to fold these together or if some will just be going away. Mr. Schaaf said he has been discussing this with all the various board chairs and asked how they might be able to incorporate members representing the various groups. They have not penciled out how that would eventually pan out.

Mr. Bryson said that when he served as HRC Chair, they looked at the fact that CBJ has by far a greater number of committees per capita than any other Alaskan community. He asked how much staff time might be saved by taking this action. Mr. Schaaf said that it will depend on the final committee make up but would probably save hundreds of staff hours per year by reducing these committees.

‘Wáahlaal Gíidaak stressed the importance of looking at ensuring diversity when they do reconstruct these committees.

Mayor Weldon spoke with Mr. Schaaf today about the Youth Activities Board (YAB) and she asked him to relay the reasons they are not proposing to fold in the work of the YAB with this effort. Mr. Schaaf said that the charge and scope of work for the YAB does not lend itself to merge into other committees. It is very specialized and requires a lot of work. He said they do have exceptional opportunities to streamline the YAB process to make it better but their tasks are quite different from the other boards they are looking at consolidating.

Mr. Smith said that as the incoming HRC Chair, he was looking at board consolidation as one of his priorities. He said they have not yet even met but they are already seeing progress on that.

Ms. Hale thanked Mr. Schaaf for his memo and she said that she understands from Clerk staff how much work the boards and commissions can be so she is hoping the HRC will continue to pursue that goal.

Ms. Woll shared her concerns about what we will be losing in community involvement and would like to see avenues kept open for community members to provide input into the city processes.

Ms. Gladziszewski shared her thoughts about the board make up, number of seats, appointment process, etc... as it moves along towards a final product.

Mr. Barr said that staff is looking for conceptual approval moving forward with this project and will bring it back with those questions addressed.

Ms. McEwen asked for clarification on whether this topic was going to remain with the COW or if they were moving it over to the HRC for future consideration. Additional discussion took place and it was decided that it will remain with the COW.

F. STAFF REPORTS

G. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

5. **RED FOLDER: Huna Totem Presentation - Additional Slide #21**
6. **RED FOLDER-November 4, 2022 Juneau Chamber of Commerce Letter re: Board of Equalization Rules**
7. **RED FOLDER: Additional Slides Hazard Mapping**

H. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the meeting adjourned at 8:42p.m.