

MINUTES

**PLANNING COMMISSION**  
CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU  
Daniel Bruce, Chairman

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE MEETING  
June 17, 2008

**I. CALLED TO ORDER**

Acting Chair Gladziszewski called the Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in the Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, to order at 5:34 p.m.

Commissioners present: Nancy Waterman, Dennis Watson, Victor Scarano, Linda Snow, Frank Rue, Maria Gladziszewski

Commissioners absent: Dan Miller, Michael Satre, Daniel Bruce

A quorum was present.

Staff present: Dale Pernula, CDD Director; Benjamin Lyman, CDD Planner

**II. AGENDA ITEMS**

**CSP2007-00009**

The 2007 Transit Development Plan and Downtown Circulator Shuttle Feasibility Study.

Location: Boroughwide

Applicant: CBJ Community Development

Chair Gladziszewski welcomed Assembly members Merrill Sanford and Bob Doll, and Mayor Bruce Botelho.

Staff presentation

Benjamin Lyman stated that Jim Moore, representing Moore and Associates, is the consultant that the CBJ hired to conduct studies for the Transit Development Plan (TDP), Transit Improvement Plan (TIP), Coordinated Human Services Plan (CHSP), and Downtown Circulator Shuttle Feasibility Study (DCSFS). He noted there was some confusion and delay during the internal review process, so Mr. Moore recently agreed to an extension of the contract for one month. Therefore, the COW has until the end of July 2008 for the final TDP to be delivered. He stated that staff would continue to receive public input until June 30, and then Moore & Associates would complete the final Draft TDP by the end of July 2008.

Mr. Moore said the purpose of the project is to provide an evaluation of Capital Transit, including the supporting elements Mr. Lyman mentioned. In doing so, they developed a

practical and sustainable strategy for continuing public transit development over a horizon of at least five years. They sought to identify service gaps on both a temporal and spacial basis; leading to increased ridership that increases fare revenue, and improved mobility for the entire community. Additional goals include the infrastructure, such as the fleet, bus shelters, and bus stop improvements. They also are improving coordination among local transportation providers, which includes the element required by the FTA, and service organizations throughout the borough. Lastly, they assessed the feasibility of a downtown circulator shuttle.

He stated that this project included extensive public involvement opportunities for existing transit riders, perspective riders, and the community as a whole. There were opportunities to participate in direct mail and web-based surveys, and at a series of community meetings that were well attended. They discovered an on-time performance issue that stems from the existing transit plan, which has been in effect for many years; however, external conditions have greatly changed, which is mostly attributed to roadway congestion and population growth. In order to attract choice riders (folks that have other mobility options), the decision making factors are reliability and convenience, defined in large part through reliability and on-time performance. Other findings were that there are a 40% to 45% of choice riders who have a desire for earlier morning commute service to town, and to utilize the service to travel back home. He said more people are choosing or contemplating transit for financial and economic concerns given the ever-increasing cost of fuel. Overall, despite some of the shortcomings mentioned, there remains a high satisfaction rate by the current customers. A joint-mail survey was mailed out to a random number of households that were both owner occupied, and non-owner occupied, regarding improvements for on-time performance, as well as some service expansions out to the Ferry Terminal, the Home Depot/Costco area, including service along Riverside Drive to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA)/National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) facility. He said most of the people wished transit to be provided because they were either employed, or hoped to be employed, at these locations. They held community workshops and heard comments to improve the snow day notification process, plus improve existing bus shelters (and to make more of them available throughout the service area), and improved public information material. They requested greater frequency and capacity of buses during peak hours, particularly from the valley to town. They also wished for a longer service day, both in the morning as well as in the evening, and to extend service to the Ferry Terminal.

Through his professional experience, including discussions with staff and meeting with stakeholder groups, four service scenarios were developed, which are the Baseline, Intermediate, Optimum, and Preferred scenarios. He referred the COW to the comparison matrix of these four scenarios on Page 7 of the Draft TDP, Exhibit 1-1, which he explained, as follows:

*Baseline Scenario*

This is principally a tweaking of the current transit service that allows them to improve on-time performance. In large part, this scenario could be accomplished with minimal additional resources. He cautioned the COW that this is a fallback position because it does little to address the existing demand, or the forecasted demand.

*Intermediate Scenario*

This introduces hourly service to the Ferry Terminal, NOAA/NMFS facility, Mendenhall Loop Road (Back Loop), along Riverside Drive, and updates the schedule to improve on-time performance. The advantages are expanding the transit service footprint, balancing

transit supply with demand, as well as how they would utilize the service. He noted that if the intermodal linkage is a stretch to include hourly service to the Ferry Terminal, they might instead consider limiting service to only fast ferries and during arrival/departure of other selected ferries. However, six employers within close proximity of the Ferry Terminal stated that their employees would utilize transit if it were made available. The disadvantages are bus frequency on the Back Loop that has experienced modest ridership, although this might change. Additionally, he explained that there is always the possibility of losing ridership if the transit schedule is altered. This scenario includes an increase in operating and possibly capital costs, as they immigrate to other types of vehicles.

#### Optimum Scenario

This scenario would institute major changes, consisting of a service plan that focuses on a trunk line from Auke Bay to downtown, with frequent service utilizing the existing larger buses. This includes breaking up service in the Valley, Lemon Creek, and the downtown area utilizing circulators. The circulators would travel more frequently throughout the neighborhoods serving to feed the trunk-line service, which would expand the service footprint because they are: able to provide transit to areas that larger buses are unable to access. They would adjust the Back Loop frequency to introduce service along Riverside Drive, and new service to the Costco and Home Depot area. The Capital Transit staff provided 11 points, which were incorporated into this scenario, as well as the next one. He said the advantages are expanding the service area, intermodal linkage, and probably increased ridership because they would be responding to what the market is dictating, along with providing more options from which to select. This scenario would improve on-time performance. The disadvantages are: lessening the Back Loop frequency, the increased annual operating cost, as well as a probable increase in ridership transfer rates.

#### Preferred Scenario

After they compiled the previous three scenarios, they held discussions with Capital Transit staff, which resulted in this fourth scenario. This scenario creates a single, limited-stop trunk line providing service every half-hour between Juneau and Auke Bay, and hourly service between Auke Bay and the NOAA/NMFS facility. This service streamlines the alignments resulting in a 30-minute service seven days a week. The transfer points would be located at the Mendenhall Mall, Fred Meyer, Lemon Creek, the hospital, the Federal Building, and the Main Street Transit Center. The disadvantages are the potential resistance to change by riders, increased operating costs, the need for additional circulators, and this scenario would increase transfers.

#### COW discussion

Ms. Gladziszewski said several of the scenarios appear to be the same, which is confusing. Mr. Moore explained that almost exclusively the consultant team developed the Optimum Scenario. The Preferred Scenario was developed in response to a series of 11 points provided by the Capital Transit staff. He characterizes the Optimum Scenario as being more strategic that would involve major changes; whereas, the Preferred Scenario would consist of a series of relatively tactical modifications to the existing plan. Overall, both scenarios result in the same outcome, although he believes the Optimum Scenario would be more strategic and offer more opportunity for flexibility and growth over time. He explained that the Preferred Scenario is a list of technical changes that would benefit the system, although this might not be as strategic. He noted that the Baseline Scenario includes updating the schedule, and the advantages include:

improved on-time performance, the ability to attract future customers, and it would retain the familiarity of the system. The goal of this scenario is to add greater value to what is currently being spent, rather than adding additional costs to the system. The disadvantages are that there is no new service, and it does not respond to the needs that were heard over the past 10 months from the community.

Ms. Waterman asked if it is possible to provide a digital readout that displays in real time where the bus is to provide the ridership confidence that the bus is on time, and if this was figured into the cost. Mr. Moore said the introduction of an Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) is not included in any of the scenarios. However, it is possible to do so, which could become increasingly valuable as the service grows and new components are added to the transit system. Such a cost could be included in the CBJ-Capital Improvements Program, and an AVL would be eligible for federal funding as well.

Ms. Waterman asked him to expound on the North Douglas route utilizing the Baseline Scenario and incorporating changes in the fleet. Mr. Moore said the Baseline Scenario does not include any changes in the fleet, and instead, utilizes existing buses, or a comparable number of buses, that consists of the total composition of the fleet; whereas, only the Preferred or Optimum Scenarios consider a fleet mix. He noted that circulators would be best afforded through a change of vehicle or fleet nature. He said there would always be a need for larger buses for trunk line service; however, circulators lend themselves to smaller and more flexible vehicles that are able to expand the transit footprint within the community.

Mr. Watson noticed that the Riverside Drive corridor was rated as the highest number of potential riders, and asked if they intend to expand service in this area. Mr. Moore did not believe the focus should be unidirectional or bidirectional because no matter what happens, mobility and travel options in that area would greatly enhance, short of selection of the Baseline Scenario.

Ms. Waterman stated, under the Intermediate Scenario, it appears that the statistics in the plan reflects that the route from the Ferry Terminal to NOAA/NMFS would take approximately 15 minutes. She noted that the existing density is not projected to increase to NOAA/NMFS. Therefore, she believes those 15 minutes could potentially be better utilized in a different location under this scenario. Mr. Moore said the goal is to optimize the value of the resources. He explained that if they have a bus that has a schedule that requires 45 minutes out of the hour, he believes it makes sense to send that bus further out the road in order to obtain maximum value. He explained that they are paying for labor and capital acquisition whether that bus operates 30 minutes or 60 minutes out of the hour. However, given the linear nature of the Juneau community, there are a relatively modest number of options of where to send the bus. Therefore, sending a bus another 15 minutes out the road, not every hour, but perhaps on alternating trips seems reasonable. He noted that it is difficult to gauge what the return on investment (ROI) would be by sending the bus out the road because they never had transit out there. So until they do, and properly market it, they are unable to determine that ROI outcome. He explained that the ROI is determined by where and when the bus routes are allowed in order to obtain the greatest return, or if all people equally deserve access to transit just as much as those who reside in the urbanized portions of the community, which is a policy decision.

Mr. Scarano said he resides off of Back Loop where there are minimal covered bus shelters. Considering that Juneau experiences extreme climate conditions, if they installed more bus shelters, he believes this might potentially increase ridership, e.g., introducing circulators. Additionally, he asked if such a question was provided in the surveys. Mr. Moore replied that that specific question was not.

Mayor Botelho said with respect to intermodal transit to the Ferry Terminal and Airport, he asked if they anticipate any reconfiguration of the fleet, recognizing that these locations might consist of different types of customers, versus local commuters. Mr. Moore said that would constitute having a limited number of larger buses reconfigured with fewer seats to allow for luggage racks, along with determining a market-friendly rotation between those facilities.

Ms. Waterman asked staff to explain the concept of the Urban Service Boundary (USB) to include components of the transit infrastructure. Mr. Lyman referred to the adopted Comprehensive Plan (Comp Plan), and cited Policy 2.3, which states, "It is the policy of the CBJ to promote compact urban development within and adjacent to existing urban areas to insure efficient utilization of land resources and facilitate economic provision of urban facilities and services." He said this Policy delineates the USB. Additionally, he cited Implementing Action (IA) 2.3.2, which states, "Adopt an urban service boundary which defines the limits within which the full range of urban services, such as water and sewer, will be provided by the CBJ. Except for fulfilling existing commitments or serving new growth areas, such services should not be provided elsewhere. Delineate the urban service boundary by ordinance in the Land Use Code." He explained that this IA states a full range of urban services will be provided, noting that this has been completed, and the USB does not currently include the Ferry Terminal or Lena Point areas. However, it is currently being proposed under the Draft Comp Plan to move the USB to Waydelich Creek where it bisects a single piece of property, and instead they want the USB to conform to property boundaries, making it more conducive for development. Even so, they already extended City water well past Lena Point; therefore, limited urban services are already being provided outside the USB. He explained that in order to extend transit out the road, they are not required to install costly infrastructure, and instead only need to utilize a bus, signs, schedules, and possibly a couple of shelters. He said there are many graduate and doctoral students that attend the UAS-Fisheries Program in the new Lena Point facility, and they do not know how they will get to school, as they are unable to afford cars. Additionally, there are janitors and other employees in the same predicament. However, if they do not have sufficient ridership out the road in 18 months, they are able to remove the signs, reprint the schedules, and send that bus on an alternate route. Therefore, if this should be the case, they really would not have lost much on such an investment. Mr. Doll said the USB is intended to advise property owners that beyond a certain point they are unable to obtain certain City services, which guides certain CBJ decisions; therefore, it is a cost-limiting device. Conversely, in this case, they are attempting to enhance ridership, so he does not wish to have a USB prohibiting the potential generation of additional CBJ revenue. Ms. Waterman stated that instead, the USB is a concept that they should be proactively considering extending now, rather than after the fact, so maybe this boundary should be moved before transit services are extended to it. She explained that when CBJ extended water out to Cohen Drive, before they extended the USB to that area, they later had to extend the USB after the fact over the course of many years of work. She noted that

the Ferry Terminal is not much further beyond Waydelich Creek, which contains the most density, although beyond that does not.

Mr. Watson said the greatest potential to increase primary ridership is by workers that are driving their own vehicles that might have the ability to commute. Mr. Moore agreed, stating that ridership generally consists of three groups. The main ridership group would always be riders because they are either economically disadvantaged or environmentally conscious. The second group would never utilize transit unless the amenities and availability of transit is greatly enhanced. The third group consists of people that would never ride, no matter what. He spent most of his professional career in public transit marketing, mainly focusing on the second group of people that are undecided. However, the second and third groups would not negatively affect the main core customer base that depends on transit. Instead, the latter two groups would greatly broaden the spectrum of possible customers if reliability, frequency, and transit were provided closer to their homes. Therefore, adoption of this TDP would expand the customer base, without negatively impacting those that have utilized transit for years. Mr. Lyman clarified that a major caveat to this is if they were to adopt the TDP, and only implemented the Baseline Scenario, it would not really change transit; therefore, they would negatively impact those riders that depend on Capital Transit. Right now, they currently have an over-extended level of service (LOS) for transit. As costs rise, and roadways become more congested causing less turning movements, buses are no longer on time, so people are beginning to miss transfers. Therefore, they would need to cut service in order to continue the status quo, which would be a step backwards. Mr. Moore said he appreciates and agrees with Mr. Lyman's statement, and apologizes if he misspoke.

Mr. Rue asked how many riders request bus service just around in the Mendenhall Valley, or just in the Lemon Creek area. Mr. Moore said he did not have specific numbers of people that requested such service, although they constantly received requests for neighborhood circulator services to be provided throughout the community.

Ms. Gladziszewski referred to the Optimum and Preferred Scenarios, and asked if it would take the same or a longer amount of time, versus now, to commute to work from the Valley. Mr. Lyman said an option is that riders are able to catch the hourly bus to one of the transfer points, which would entail no more than 25 minutes from that point to town. However, if the rider is traveling on a day, or at a time when there is no express service, it would take about 1-1/2 hours to commute to town. Mr. Moore added, under the Preferred Scenario, that overall it should take approximately 35 to 40 minutes, although this would also depend upon the time of day. The attractions of the circulators are not only do they provide transit closer to a greater number of households, they also provide conveniently timed transfers so the rider would only have to wait for five to seven minutes. Mr. Scarano stated that whenever a rider has to transfer, it is going to add time to their commute because the circulator is not going to be there at the same time the hourly bus arrives at the transfer point. Mr. Moore replied that the goal is to have the shortest transfer time as possible either by increasing the number of vehicles that are available, or by determining where the vehicle travels. Mr. Rue noted that many riders currently walk to the transfer location, which takes some of them a half-hour, unless they have a car to drive and park at the transfer site.

Mr. Scarano stated that it appears staff prefers the Optimum versus the Preferred Scenario. John Kern, the Superintendent of CBJ Capital Transit, said he does not think there is any realistic difference between these two scenarios. Mr. Lyman explained that the Baseline, Intermediate, and Optimum titles were taken from previous TDP's for the sake of consistency. However, the new Preferred Scenario includes Capital Transit staff's 11 points, noting that there is a vast cost difference between the Optimum and Preferred Scenarios as well. He said they intend to re-title the Preferred Scenario in the final draft. Mayor Botelho said the changes are confusing; therefore, he requested a programmatic explanation of differences between these two scenarios. Mr. Lyman explained that the Optimum Scenario entirely changes Capital Transit as it exists today, with the exception of the Douglas route. Mr. Kern referred to Page 102 of the Draft TDP, Exhibit 4-24 Scenario Comparison Matrix, which lists 11 points that the Capital Transit staff provided to the consultant to utilize as design guidelines as a method in which to measure transit success. Therefore, he said this matrix measures performance and compares the four scenarios against those 11 points. Mr. Lyman referred to a map reflecting the proposed bus routes of the four scenarios, explaining that no changes are proposed for the Douglas route. An express bus currently runs to UAS, turns around and comes back, with no changes to that route as well. Currently, there are two Juneau/Valley routes through Lemon Creek – one runs counter-clockwise, and a half-hour later the other one runs clockwise – and then they return to town. Under the Preferred Scenario, only one bus runs from Downtown to the Valley through Lemon Creek, which stops at the transfer point. A valley circulator travels the Back Loop through Mint Way and down Riverside Drive, which is a faster route because the speed limit is higher without many stops. The next circulator travels through Back Loop and continues past Mint Way, which is a much slower route because it runs through a residential area, loops in the Valley, and does not travel downtown. In the Optimum Scenario, they only have Valley, Lemon Creek, and Downtown circulators, and a trunk line that replaces the express that ties into transfer points of all of these circulators, which is the difference between this scenario and the Preferred Scenario. Mr. Doll does not believe the transfer time was considered under the 'No routes longer than 60 minutes,' listed in the matrix, and believes this is, instead, a labor-contract consideration. Mr. Kern said, from an operational standpoint, one of the issues they have is that the existing Mendenhall Valley route takes two hours to complete, consisting of an hour out and an hour back, without any make up time. Therefore, if that bus is late the first hour, it is late the second hour as well. Mr. Doll asked how this figures into the Optimum Scenario. Mr. Moore replied that they are getting closer to merging the Optimum and Preferred Scenarios, so they would not be mutually exclusive. Instead, he is a major proponent of improving on-time performance, streamlining the trunk line to the best of their ability, and adding neighborhood circulator transit. In doing so, he stressed that they would not extend service to the Ferry Terminal and NOAA/NMFS at the expense of the other routes. Mr. Scarano asked why there is a significant cost difference of \$6 million over five years for the Preferred versus the Optimum Scenario, as the buses and circulators still cover the same territory. Mr. Moore replied that there is more value in resources of where the buses are routed and how often they operate, which all factor into the cost.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked Mr. Kern why the Optimum Scenario causes him concern, versus it being just another possibility. Mr. Kern explained that the 11 points were only intended to serve as a performance measurement; however, it was the consultant's decision to present two Optimum and Preferred Scenarios that meet those criteria. Mr. Moore apologized, stating that he

did not understand that those 11 points were supposed to be utilized as guiding principles. Instead, he thought they were specific items staff wished to have addressed in formulating the scenarios. He explained that it could be that Moore & Associates approached it one way, and staff did so in a different method. However, the net impact is fairly the same, whereby he suggests they move onto completing the final preparation of the plan, which is to combine the Optimum and the Preferred Scenarios into one. In doing so, from staff's point of view, he would make sure that this merged scenario embraces all the guiding principles. Once this is completed, it would allow a decision to be made among the Baseline Scenario, the Intermediate Scenario, or the newly-merged scenario.

Ms. Snow noticed that the cost projection matrix does not provide for revenues that would be generated. Mr. Lyman referred to Pages 158-160 of the Draft TDP, which lists the financial information, and then noted that the Intermediate and Baseline cost information precedes this section on Pages 154-155. Ms. Gladziszewski referred to Exhibit 7-7, Page 154, stating that the Revenue Federal Capital Funds exactly match the Expenditures Subtotal. Mr. Lyman noted that there are six years reflected on Pages 158-160, but it is a five-year plan that starts next year; therefore, the first year reflected in those matrixes is actual, not projected. Mr. Scarano asked where Local Transportation Funds are allocated within CBJ. Mayor Botelho said those revenues are allocated to the General Fund for the operation of buses.

Mr. Scarano asked if the average fare the riders currently pay is higher or lower than what is projected. If it was higher, he asked if they correlated this with the actual ridership to determine whether it is aligned with the fee structure. Mr. Lyman referred to Page 272, Exhibit A 3-8 Fixed-Route Key Indicators. Mr. Scarano noticed that in essence they were benchmarking the passenger ridership against certain peer groups in other cities. Mr. Moore said not specifically, instead, it provides an arbitrary trend analysis, although such a concept could be done very easily, noting that the peer groups are the same that were utilized in the previous TDP study. He said those calculated costs are best faith estimates that were adjusted for inflation. He said it is reasonable that a customer should pay more if an enhanced LOS were provided. He would even make the case that if they were to implement one of the more ambitious scenarios, not only would the ridership increase, but doing so would attract more choice riders as well. If this is the case, he believes it is very reasonable to consider a fare adjustment to gain insulation against rising costs.

Ms. Snow stated that currently the transit fare is the same to travel on any route in Juneau, and asked if they intend to charge more for longer routes, versus shorter routes, in the future. Mr. Moore agreed that the riders currently pay a fixed-fare on all routes, and changing it to a distance-based fare is a policy decision, although doing so would become increasingly complex for the user. However, later on, they might wish to consider a different transfer policy where the riders might pay a base fare on circulators, and then a modest fee of \$.15 or \$.20 for a transfer. Overall, he believes the goal of transit should be singular, i.e., to make transit an attractive alternative by removing as many barriers as possible. In doing so, there are many different quantified benefits that include lessening roadway congestion and improved air quality. Since 1995, public transit has been a profit making entity, which is due to a quality-of-life change to subsidize public transit. He noted that it is going to cost more, or as much, to collect the fare if they institute small incremental changes, as it is to actually obtain that money. Ms. Snow noted



that a friend who lived in Douglas began to ride the bus to work in town; however, she soon realized that it costs her more to do so. Even so, with the price of fuel increasing, she felt that this might no longer be the case. Mr. Lyman agreed, stating that he also resides in Douglas and rides the bus to town, noting that it is cheaper for him to drive his vehicle, versus riding the bus. However, his vehicle is not paid for, nor is the insurance he is required to pay, when he considers whether or not to ride the bus. Additionally, if he did drive his vehicle to town he is assuming that he has free parking, and would not get parking tickets. Therefore, riders need to consider all these factors when determining whether transit is cheaper than driving their own vehicle.

Ms. Waterman noted that the Mendenhall Mall Road is less desirable in its configuration. Therefore, she asked if CBJ intends to complete any work to enhance pedestrian safety. She said this is in relation to considering the Optimum Scenario, which encompasses a transfer station at the Mendenhall Mall parking lot area. Mr. Lyman explained that the Mendenhall Mall is private parking, not a public right-of-way, so CBJ and that private property owner would need to agree to allow CBJ the right to drive on their property. He realizes that this location would be more central, less out of the way, and lends itself to a transfer point for a park-n-ride for the riders that reside in the Mendenhall Valley. However, there would have to be significant improvements made to that parking lot in order for it to be a safe location for pedestrians. Ms. Waterman noted that there are benefits to a property owner to have the transfer point, or park-n-ride, at their facility, so this type of marketing might be directed to potential property owners. Mr. Lyman said that alternatively, it is conceivable that the nearby vacant lot at Vintage Business Park might be a better location even though this area somewhat complicates bus movements, it could be addressed.

Mr. Lyman stated that this is Moore & Associates last visit to Juneau on this project, although if the Commissioners wished to meet with the consultant again, the meeting would take place via teleconference. At this time, staff wished to provide additional opportunity for the public to attend, and to get the Commissioners and Assembly members up to date, as well as hear their input on the Draft TDP. He noted that the final deliverable document is due the end of July 2008, so if they wished to provide additional comments following this meeting, they were able to do so until June 30, 2008, which he would forward to Moore & Associates. Mr. Doll said realizing the deciding issue in adopting the TDP proposal would be cost, he requested Moore & Associates to return with a simplified bulletproof budget. Ms. Gladyszewski asked that they also include how much CBJ would need to invest in the new transit system, as it is not clear in this Draft TDP.

**BREAK**: 7:04 to 7:15 p.m.

**TXT2006-00003**

A review and discussion of the CBJ Comprehensive Plan.

Location: Boroughwide

Applicant: CBJ Community Development Department

Staff presentation

Benjamin Lyman stated that the COW review would continue beginning on Page 13 of the April 28, 2008 memorandum on Transportation-related chapters of the July 2007 Draft Comp Plan,

regarding Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs), Development Guidelines (DGs), and Implementation Actions (IAs). Additionally, he provided two separate June 4, 2008 memorandums; one on Sustainability-Chapter 2, and another on Energy-Chapter 6. Chair Gladziszewski stated that the Juneau Commission on Sustainability (COS) was asked to review the draft Sustainability-Chapter 2, and after an extensive revision process, the COS's rewrite was provided to staff.

#### Subarea Transportation Needs:

Ms. Snow requested the following revisions:

Policy 8.6IA1{8.5.1} "...transportation improvement priorities that can be included in the next revision to the STHPDOT needs list, and revise the priority table of the CBJ Area Wide Transportation Plan accordingly. Potential priorities for STHPfederal, state, and local funding and implementation may include the following:..."

Ms. Waterman suggested the following deletion:

B. "The CBJ should seek funding to design, develop and operate a Downtown Transportation Management Program. ~~to encourage use of public transit rather than private automobiles by Downtown employees commuting to work. Private and public employers should participate in the Program to implement numerous strategies to encourage alternative modes of transportation to downtown, including:...~~"

Ms. Snow said the shaded section below is very similar to 8.5.IA6 {8.11}. It was the consensus of the COW for Mr. Lyman to move, if need be, the shaded text, and to also cross-reference this language to 8.5.IA6 {8.11}, in addition to revising the numbers to letters:

8.6.IA1 {8.5.1}:

~~1A. more buses (including a shuttle service), vanpools and carpools, walking and bicycling for commuters;~~  
~~2B. effective staggered work hours to relieve peak hour congestion;~~  
~~3C. convenient and free parking for car and van pool vehicles, preferential parking for car sharing vehicles, and for electric, hybrid and other alternate fuel powered vehicles in parking lots and garages;~~  
~~4D. provision of secure, dry bicycle storage in or near public buildings for commuting cyclists, joggers and pedestrians; and~~  
~~5E. fee rates for on street parking which discourage weekday, daylong parking to be coupled with a residential parking program to prevent commuting motorists from parking all day in nearby residential neighborhoods."~~

It was the consensus of the COW for Mr. Lyman to rewrite the following IA, and to incorporate the following revisions as best he can:

[REWRITE]

8.6.IA2 {8.5.2.} "The CBJ should develop and manage an emergency transportation plan to address temporary or emergency access ~~to and from the Downtown from Thane, and Douglas Island, and to the hospital and the Valley airport~~ in the case of a blockage of Thane Road, Egan Drive or the Juneau-Douglas Bridge, *respectively*. This may include emergency marine vessel (ferry or water taxi) and/or helicopter service."

Ms. Snow made the following revision:

8.6.IA4 {8.5.3}

- C. "Develop a secondary roadway connection to between Downtown Juneau~~in the vicinity of and~~ the Hospital. The connection would be two lanes with separated pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The road should function as a through-road and as a secondary access to the Hospital; and..."

Mr. Pernula asked the COW to keep in mind that this secondary access would not necessarily be located above Egan Highway, considering that CBJ Docks & Harbors is contemplating creating additional harbors along the waterfront, including a new roadway as well. He noted that this development is planned from the Yacht Club through to the Channel Drive area.

Mr. Rue said to enhance safety, this IA needs to include sidewalks, separate bicycle paths and/or lanes, and a 36" minimum shoulder width. Mr. Lyman stated that Mr. Rue previously provided similar information at the May 2008 COW meeting, so he would incorporate such ideas into this IA, as well in other relevant areas of the Comp Plan. Mr. Rue thanked staff, and also requested the following revision:

[STAFF TO REVISE]:

8.6.IA6 {8.5.4.} "Urge DOT to undertake roadway capacity, vehicular turning movement improvements, bus pullouts and pedestrian and bicycle safety improvements within the Urban Service Area where an existing intersection Level of Service on the state route is *compromised* (LOS "D" or worse); priority improvements should be given to intersections that would serve new ~~low to moderate income affordable housing developments~~ high density development."

Ms. Snow noted that DOT already completed a Fritz Cove improvement study several years ago. Mr. Lyman explained that he recently met with DOT, and was informed that no improvements are going to be made to the Fritz Cove intersection. Additionally, he worked on this IA with David Haas of DOT, noting that the deleted language below refers to a CBJ plan. Although after re-reading the next sentence, he said it no longer makes sense, as this is not DOT's Auke Bay Corridor (ABCOR) study, and instead, it is a separate study proposed for the CBJ to conduct, which he would revise. Ms. Gladziszewski also suggested deleting "any," as follows:

[STAFF TO REVISE]:

8.6.IA7 {8.5.5.} "Urge DOT to undertake ~~any~~ transportation improvements *to state ROWs* within the Auke Bay area pursuant to recommendations included in a CBJ-adopted Auke Bay neighborhood plan ~~to be conducted by CDD staff with the participation of area residents, workers, property owners, recreationists, government agencies, the University and other interested parties.~~ The Plan should address existing and anticipated travel demands generated by the Ferry terminal, boat marina, commercial fisheries facilities at the harbor, affordable housing, expansion of the University of Alaska Southeast, and other destinations located further "out the road," *and should incorporate the improvements identified in DOT's ABCOR (Auke Bay Corridor) study. Extension of existing sidewalks and provision of additional sidewalks should be high priorities.* [1995 IA 4.4.19]"

Ms. Snow asked if the CBJ has jurisdiction over this access area in this IA. Mr. Lyman said it is a DOT right-of way, although this IA is suggesting they eliminate the Glacier Highway

access drive through to the Chapel by the Lake access area, which is supported by CBJ, DOT and UAS. He explained that this access provides for poor sight distance, and drivers frequently travel on it at high rates of speed. Mr. Scarano asked why they should include this IA if the CBJ does not have control over this access. Mr. Lyman explained under Title 49 the CBJ is charged with reviewing transportation projects by DOT in terms of compliance to the Comp Plan. Therefore, when DOT presents this City-State Project for review, CBJ staff is able to make a recommendation to the Commissioners as to whether it is in compliance with the Comp Plan; whereas, if they eliminate this IA, it might hinder their ability to do so. Mr. Watson noted that CBJ Parks & Recreation Dept. is in the process of making improvements to Auke Lake, which is adjacent to this access roadway, so it might present a challenge by increasing the probability of accidents. Mr. Pernula stated that if this IA is not deleted, because it would leave the UAS with only one access, it should state so. Ms. Waterman noted that people accessing Chapel by the Lake also utilize this access, as well as the UAS. Mr. Lyman said instead of limiting this IA to only one access point, which does not address the real issue, he suggested the following revision, to which the COW agreed:

8.6.IA8 {8.5.6.} "Vehicle access to the University via the Fritz Cove Road intersection should be ~~limited~~discouraged to the Back Loop Road entrance. An alternative access should be encouraged and developed."

Ms. Snow requested a new IA to develop a secondary road connection between the Mendenhall Valley and town because that is where the access roadway behind Fred Meyer stops. Mr. Pernula suggested a more generic IA, which states:

[NEW IA] "8.8.IA To provide a secondary means of road access to downtown Juneau, in addition to Egan Drive."

Ms. Snow stated that the Comp Plan specifically addresses secondary access to Salmon Creek; therefore, they need to do so for this location that is a blockage point as well. Mr. Pernula stated that staff would work with DOT before including this new IA into the Comp Plan.

Ms. Snow noted that this IA states, "improvements to Juneau-Douglas Bridge," which is not where the problem is, and instead it is the intersection of 10th/Egan. Mr. Lyman noted that the italicized text were additions he made after meeting with Mr. Haas. He said DOT's method to address capacity of the 10th/Egan intersection was to add the reversible lane to the Juneau-Douglas Bridge, which is their engineering-preferred alternative. However, that solution really does not address the 10th/Egan intersection issue of how the bridge relates to that intersection. Therefore, he suggested the following revision, to which the COW agreed:

8.6.IA13 {8.5.10.} "Urge DOT to make improvements to roads, intersections and bridges on Douglas Island to accommodate ~~new affordable~~ housing development. *As of 2007, transportation infrastructure deficiencies which should be addressed in the near future* ~~These improvements should~~ include increased the capacity of the 10th/Egan intersection, on of the Juneau-Douglas Bridge, improvements at particular turning movements at the Cordova and Douglas Highway intersection, and the reliance on a single road connection between Douglas Island and a North Douglas Bridge to the mainland. [1995 IA 4.2.8]"

Mr. Rue and Mr. Lyman requested the following revisions:

8.6.IA4 {8.5.11.} "Maintain strong municipal support for construction of a North Douglas crossing of Gastineau Channel to accommodate new, compact development of North Douglas and the New Growth Area on west Douglas Island. *On the North Douglas landing*, the bridge should connect to a roadway, which provides sufficient right-of-way to accommodate a *future light rail or heavy rail fixed guideway* transportation system to West Douglas."

Ms. Snow felt that maybe (C) should be listed first in the section below. Ms. Gladziszewski stated that if they did so, (C) would need to be rewritten. Mr. Lyman said doing so would entail fairly innocent wordsmithing, which he offered to do, to which the COW agreed.

"In the near term, the CBJ should conduct a neighborhood plan for the North Douglas neighborhood, which would include:

"(CA). [REWRITE BY STAFF] Analysis of those elements should identify potential impacts and improvements needed to maintain and enhance the existing character of the North Douglas community. All improvements should be designed to provide adequate capacity to take residents, workers and visitors of ~~the New Growth Area~~ Douglas Island to their destinations on the mainland. This may require improvements to the Juneau-Douglas Bridge *intersection of Tenth St. and Egan Dr.* as well as providing a new Channel crossing ~~route located as close to Mendenhall Valley as is practicable;~~ and

(AB) The evaluation of the engineering design and costs and the environmental impacts of the bridge landing intersection, including the options of the landing intersecting with North Douglas Highway or upland of the Highway at a bench road alignment; and

(BC). Analysis of the location and configuration of separated pedestrian/bicycle pathways, bus pull-offs and any access road(s) carrying traffic from the Island to the mainland; ~~and~~"

Ms. Snow said that since the CBJ already picked a Second Crossing, she suggested making the above deletion of a portion of the last sentence in (CA)."

Mr. Lyman explained that the CBJ used to have a Public Zoning District, which has been eliminated by the Assembly. He explained that the Assembly determined that the city and the state should be treated the same as private developers, so the CBJ should not have this zoning district. Instead, the Assembly stated that the CBJ uses should be consistent with the zoning districts in which they are located. Therefore, this IA was written at the request of CBJ staff that were not aware of this precedent, so he suggests deleting the following IA, not the Policy, to which the COW agreed.

~~"10.14.IA1 {10.13.2} Amend the Land Use Code to add a new zoning district category called P Public to include existing and proposed locations for public facilities and activities such as municipal schools, libraries, police and fire stations, jails, medical facilities, community gardens, parks and playgrounds, water reservoirs, municipal water and sewage treatment plants, municipal power plants and distribution facilities, solid waste sanitary land fill facilities, municipal vehicle and goods indoor and outdoor storage facilities *indoor and outdoor storage facilities for municipal vehicles and materials*, harbors, transit facilities, parking facilities, and other similar facilities and activities as either principal permitted or conditional uses. Map those lands for the P Public district uses."~~

Chapter 2: Sustainability:

Mr. Lyman noted that Ms. Waterman provided the following written substitution language for Sustainability Indicators, which has been replaced, and now states:

"SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS

Indicators show how well a system is working. Effective indicators are:

- Relevant: they show you something about the system that you need to know;
- Easy to understand, even by people who are not experts;
- Reliable: you can trust the information that the indicator is providing;
- Based on accessible data: the information is available and reported at regular intervals.

Indicators help a community judge progress toward its long-term goals. Over time, a community will adjust policies, programs, and collective behavior according to the trends that emerge from using indicators. Indicators reveal the status of large systems, helping a community focus on long-term planning.

Developing indicators begins by selecting important, diverse, measureable categories, and topics that the community will commit to measure at regular intervals."

Ms. Snow requested the following revisions:

3. "Recognize that the social, economical, political, built, and natural environments need to be managed to sustain a balance, now and in perpetuity;..."

Mr. Rue asked for an example of how they might manage this political aspect. Ms. Waterman stated that when many people began talking about sustainability during the Earth Summit in Rio in 1992, they reviewed all aspects of life. She explained that there is a government, which is the political aspect of a group of people who reside together, which governs how such a group is managed so it does not fall apart, whereby everybody votes. Back in 1994-1995, when they were working on the Sustainability addition to the CBJ Comp Plan, some people in Juneau met to determine the aspects of it. They chose to develop a list of indicators, measures, and values that were based upon the principal sustainability interrelationships – social, governmental, ecological and economic; although, notably one aspect they were unable to include was spiritual. Mr. Rue said he believes political is the root, stating that as government becomes unbalanced, the political aspect is able to rebalance it. He noted that if there is a healthy political system, people are franchised to feel good about realigning government, which is the whole point of politics. Ms. Gladziszewski stated that in Eastern Europe, the verbiage they utilize is to promote democracy to strengthen civil society. Instead, Mr. Rue preferred to utilize the word "political," to which the COW agreed.

Ms. Snow said "(CB)" should be listed before "(BC)" in the following two IAs (IA 2.2.IA1 and 2.3.IA1), as the same verbiage is utilized in both. Ms. Gladziszewski instead preferred to turn both (C)s into new separate IAs, to which the COW agreed.

2.2.IA1. "Support the CBJ Commission on Sustainability in ~~completing~~ its mission and tasks to (A) provide ongoing development of sustainability indicators and measures; and (B) periodically review the indicators and measures to confirm their currency and relevance and to track the CBJ's trends.;

"[NEW IA] ~~and (C) Incorporate the adopted sustainability indicators into the process of scoping, funding, and carrying out all proposed CBJ Capital Improvements including buildings, facilities, equipment, and components.~~"

2.3.IA1 "Support the CBJ Commission on Sustainability in ~~completing~~ its mission and tasks to (A) provide ongoing development of sustainability indicators and measures; and (B) periodically review the indicators and measures to confirm their currency and relevance and to track the CBJ's trends.;

"[NEW IA] ~~and (C) Incorporate the adopted sustainability indicators into the process of scoping, funding, and carrying out all proposed CBJ Capital Improvements including buildings, facilities, equipment, and components.~~"

Ms. Snow stated that this IA is virtually the same as the two previously stated IAs in relation to (B). Therefore, she suggested that staff incorporate this into the two previous IAs, and then delete this one. Mr. Lyman offered to do so.

[STAFF INCORPORATE INTO 2.2.IA1 & 2.3.IA1, & THEN DELETE THIS IA]

~~"2.3.IA2 Periodically assess whether adopted sustainability indicators are measuring sustainability a intended, and amend them as necessary to improve their utility."~~

**BREAK:** 8:31 to 8:35 p.m.

Mr. Lyman introduced the former Chair of the COS, Gayle Wood. Ms. Wood thanked the COW to allow the COS to review and provide revisions to Sustainability-Chapter 2. Additionally, she noted that the Energy Subcommittee, the precursor to the COS, was previously tasked by Susana Montana to determine what has been implemented in the adopted 1995 Comp Plan. However, the COS discovered that there was not a lot that they could not state was implemented. There were also other areas of the plan where they did not know if actions were implemented or who should be doing so. Therefore, it is disheartening when they realized the amount of effort that went into this, and to also realize how little has been accomplished over the past 10+ years. Granted, many of those policies were reviewed at the PC/COW level; therefore, actions have taken place. The COS took this task to review the Energy-Chapter 6 of the Comp Plan seriously. She said they held a least four meetings as an Energy Subcommittee, prior to presenting their recommendations to the COS, along with others who submitted comments prior to the COS's final review. She noted that the rapid change in oil prices and emerging climate change indicators are making this section more important than ever. This also includes the recent avalanche situation, which heightened everyone's awareness as to Juneau's vulnerability as a community. The recognition that energy disruptions are possible has certainly caused the community to think more carefully about how to become more self-sufficient in terms of energy. She noted that she would be working from Mr. Lyman's memorandum dated June 4, 2008 on Energy-Chapter 6. Chair Gladziszewski requested that she specifically address the sections she does not agree with, to which Ms. Wood agreed.

Chapter 6: Energy:

Ms. Wood referred to the bottom of Page 3, next to the last line, to include the following verbiage:

"...it is the role of the CBJ to set an example for businesses, other government entities, and individuals in adopting cost effective energy saving..."

She requested the following revision:

POLICY 6.3. "IT IS THE POLICY OF THE CBJ TO INCORPORATE TECHNOLOGIES AND OPERATING PRACTICES THAT WILL PROMOTE CLEAN AND EFFICIENT AND COST EFFECTIVE ENERGY USE INTO ALL OF ITS NEW AND EXISTING BUILDINGS AND ENERGY-USING PROJECTS."

She stated that they made the following revision because who knows how long it would take to replace inefficient street lights if they wait for this to happen, so the COS requests the following verbiage deletion:

6.3.SOP1 "Replace inefficient street lighting and lighting in CBJ buildings and facilities with efficient fixtures ~~upon replacement cycle.~~"

She noted that the COS added the following sentence to this IA:

6.3.IA1 "Establish and fund a revolving energy conservation investment fund, to invest in energy-saving public projects that meet CBJ return-on-investment criteria. Return on investment should consider the life of the physical building, as well as the life of the improvement."

Mr. Rue asked if the COS is referring to the economic or the physical life of the building. Ms. Wood replied that it is the physical life of the building. Mr. Rue said that was an important distinction, so he incorporated "physical" into the above verbiage.

Ms. Wood included additional verbiage in "quotes."

6.3.IA6 When designing new facilities or major renovation of CBJ facilities, analyze life-cycle costs of energy applications- "with consideration of utilizing renewable energy sources given high priority."

She suggested the following header be changed to read:

**~~"Maximize Use of Local Energy Resources"~~**

She stated that although Mr. Lyman suggested they utilize the word 'Mandate,' versus 'Encourage,' she agrees there are areas where mandating energy conservation might become important. However, this is taken somewhat out of context because originally their comment was, "Mandate energy conservation and prudent use of renewable energy as determined under the IA that related to planning," i.e., it requires a plan before mandating. Additionally, she wishes the COW would move away from utilizing the word 'encourage' so often in the Comp Plan. Mr. Rue requested the following revision, to which Ms. Wood and the COW agreed.

6.4.SOP1 "Educate incentives and mandates~~Encourage~~ energy conservation to reduce the amount of money leaving the community to pay for fuels."

She noted that there is no "6.4.IA1" listed in staff's memorandum.



She believes this IA should be moved to the Transportation section of the Comp Plan. Mr. Lyman disagreed, stating that this IA is referring to converting public transportation vehicles.

6.4.IA2 "Seek federal and state funding to convert the CBJ fleet and, particularly, public transit vehicles, to hydroelectric-powered vehicles (e.g. battery-powered vehicles) dual-fuel, hybrid, or other fuel technologies with reduced carbon footprints and enhanced sustainability over fossil-fuel powered vehicles."

She suggested deleting "~~Where practicable~~" in the following two IAs:

6.4.IA3 "~~Where practicable~~ In large industrial operations, the CBJ should encourage co-generation processes to transform waste heat to electrical power for use by the operation and adjacent uses or for transmission to a nearby power grid."

Additionally, she requested adding "significant," as noted below. Mr. Rue agreed, stating that he also included "fish" to this IA as well.

6.4.IA4 "~~Where practicable and w~~Where there are no significant adverse impacts to marine or other fish and wildlife, the CBJ should encourage the use of tidal, geothermal, and wind action to generate energy for adjacent uses or for transmission to the power grid."

She said the COS wished not to utilize "~~fuel switching~~," and instead just "dual fuel systems."

6.4.IA5 "Encourage ~~fuel switching and~~ dual fuel systems which are cost effective for buildings."

Mr. Rue asked Ms. Wood to explain why. Ms. Wood replied that fuel switching provides for too many aspects if they are not careful, and doing so might overbalance dependence on electrical systems that are fairly hard to balance as it is. Instead, they should encourage less dependence on fossil fuel, and more dependence on electricity for energy use without maxing out this resources.

Ms. Wood asked the COW to consider a new IA, as follows:

[NEW] "6.4.IA7 Consider encouraging rate structures such as use of inverted block rates to encourage conservation."

She noted that this could apply to water as well as other energy; therefore, if they are using more, they should be paying higher costs for those additional blocks, which tend to encourage conservation. Mr. Lyman stated that the CBJ rate structures are regulated at the state and federal levels, and not at the CBJ level. Ms. Wood agreed; however, if an inverted block-rate structure is proposed, the City's role could entail writing to the PC/COW requesting that they support it. Ms. Gladziszewski requested adding "Consider encouraging rate structures..." and this was incorporated as well.

Ms. Wood recommended deleting ~~6.5.IA4~~, as it is basically the same as 6.4.IA6.

She stated this IA is CBJ facility-related, so it should be moved to 6.3IA6, and then they could possibly delete ~~6.5.IA4~~ as well, whereby she offered to meet with Mr. Lyman to discuss doing so.

[POSSIBLY MOVE] "6.5.IA2 When designing new facilities or major renovation of CBJ facilities, the CBJ should analyze life-cycle costs of energy applications with consideration of renewable sources given priority."

She said she does not truly believe that energy regulators and providers would do this; therefore, she suggests revising the following verbiage:

6.6.SOP1 "Require energy consultants and staff to perform life-cycle cost analyses of CBJ facilities, projects, and operations that include quantifiable external and indirect costs in establishing the cost of energy"~~Encourage energy regulators and providers to expand the cost-of-service definition to include quantifiable external and indirect costs in establishing the cost of energy to be used in the life cycle cost analyses of CBJ facilities, projects, and operations."~~

She would like to add a new IA, which states:

[NEW] "6.6IA . Establish a consensus among experts of what the external economic/social/environmental costs should be; some of which include CO2 emissions, health implications and impact to ecosystems services."

She explained that they need this type of costing, prior to completing a scenario analysis.

She suggested the following revision:

6.7.IA1 "The CBJ should work with the electrical utility providers to develop programs and educational materials promoting energy conservation."

She asked the COW to consider the following revisions:

6.7.IA2 "When designing CBJ facilities, the CBJ should encourage dual fuel interruptible loads and the ability to shift loads~~lowering peak loads by shifting to off-peak hours periods and should when encouraged by the electric utility interruptible loads."~~

Ms. Gladziszewski asked why CBJ should do so, referring to, "when encouraged by the electric utility." Ms. Wood replied that it is frankly hard to foresee under what circumstances AEL&P would really need to shift to off-peak loads. However, she assumes there would have to be some type of major supply crisis that would warrant AEL&P to do so, although a peaking problem does not currently exist. Mr. Watson explained that AEL&P has a peak-demand charge on commercial electric bills, which could be as high as 20% of the total, that produces revenue for AEL&P. Ms. Wood agreed this is a component of a rate structure utilized by AEL&P, although it is silent in the residential rates.

Ms. Wood requested the following revision:

**POLICY 6.8. "IT IS THE POLICY OF THE CBJ TO TAKE ADVANTAGE OF JUNEAU'S FAVORABLE ELECTRICAL ENERGY ASSETS RENEWABLE ENERGY OPPORTUNITIES TO ADD QUALITY JOBS OPPORTUNITIES."**

She said the COS wishes to include somewhere in this IA that there is an active show of support for other renewable energy options, which staff might consider revising if the COW agrees that they should do so:

[POSSILBY TO BE REVISED BY STAFF] 6.8.IA2 "Along with implementation of an aggressive water and energy conservation program, the CBJ should immediately plan for the next increment of hydroelectric power to be brought on-line in the CBJ, particularly to accommodate conversions of home heat and vehicle fuels from fossil fuels to hydroelectric power. The CBJ should coordinate the conversion of fossil fuel-powered

systems to electric-powered systems with the schedule for increasing the capacity of the hydroelectric system to ensure that the system is not over-loaded."

However, she noted that if it helps, the COS's version of this IA instead suggested this verbiage:

6.8.IA2. "The CBJ should actively support hydroelectric power development and other renewable energy projects."

She suggested the following revision:

**POLICY 6.9. "IT IS THE POLICY OF THE CBJ TO ~~ENCOURAGE~~FACILITATE THE TRANSPORTATION OF CBJ RESIDENTS, VISITORS, FREIGHT AND MAIL POWERED BY RENEWABLE ENERGY ON BOTH PRIVATE AND PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION."**

She said the COS recommended the following changes:

6.9.IA2 "The CBJ should seek to convert fossil-fuel powered buses, both public and private, to ~~hydroelectric-powered vehicles~~buses that utilize renewable energy as a fuel source, as long as electric buses can be charged exclusively during off-peak times. Hybrid or other dual-fuel buses which can run on fuel other than electricity when off-peak charging is not feasible may be preferable over electric-only buses, especially in light of the effect of the April 2008 Snettisham avalanches and their effect on the provision of electricity to Juneau."

She explained that the COS deleted references to electric, hybrid, and dual fuel powered vehicles, with the emphasis on renewable energy.

She said this IA is very similar to the 6.9.IA3, although the COS instead prefers this IA:

6.9.IA5 "The CBJ should provide metered electric power sources at public parking lots and garages to re-charge public and private electrically-powered automobiles, and provide preferential parking spaces for those vehicles. The metered power sources should have the functionality of being turned off automatically or manually by AEL&P and/or CBJ staff during periods of peak loading of the electrical system."

She requested the following change:

**POLICY 6.10. "IT IS THE POLICY OF THE CBJ TO ~~ENCOURAGE~~IMPLEMENT COST EFFECTIVE ENERGY EFFICIENT BUILDING AND REMODELING PRACTICES."**

She asked that these revisions be incorporated:

6.10.IA1 "The CBJ Community Development Department (CDD) should encourage the installation of renewable sources of dual-fuel energy-efficient heating systems in new construction by offering incentives to developers and building owner's to do so."

She asked the COW to implement the following change:

6.10.IA2 "The CBJ should encourage participation in current residential energy efficient mortgage programs for both new and existing homes. Encourage favorable lending rate for more highly energy-efficient mortgage programs for energy efficient multifamily housing and commercial construction or renovation."

She said the COS instead prefers to utilize the following verbiage:

6.10.IA3 "The CBJ should establish energy efficient standards for new and existing ~~multifamily housing and commercial~~ habitable buildings."

Mr. Lyman stated that 'habitable' is a very broad term. Ms. Wood said in some respects it relates to how they are going to make the best utilization of energy resources, so they need to consider energy-efficient standards to heat buildings.

She suggested the following revisions:

6.10.IA4 "~~Encourage~~ Require the conversion of existing heating systems from fossil fuel to low-emissions renewable sources of energy when new alternative energy resources become available and affordable for the average household."

She explained that over time, a dual-fuel concept would work as well.

She said the added verbiage might be examples of the type of rewards that could be made available to builders and owners working towards high efficient designs, as follows:

6.10.IA5 "The CBJ should immediately enact water conservation ordinances. Water conservation measures would lead to significant energy savings to the CBJ in pumping water and in treating wastewater. Conservation measures might include such things as metering of water wells and single-family homes, mandatory installation of low flow plumbing fixtures, installation of on-demand electric water heaters, or other incentives to save water. A municipal bond measure should be considered to assist homeowners in paying for the installation of water meters. Reward builders and owners practicing highly efficient energy design and construction methods by expediting, permitting, and assisting where other permits are required."

She said the COS deleted the language pertaining to mining projects, as follows:

**"Industrial Energy Use**

The design and operation of industrial developments can be managed to reduce, transfer or minimize waste of energy and to maximize use of renewable energy. ~~Mining projects tend to be energy intensive and short lived (tens of years). Within the CBJ they could have a great effect on the CBJ energy economy and be greatly affected by the CBJ energy policy. For industries...~~

She noted that mining projects require heavy electrical loads, so they would likely always be either interruptible if they are taking power through the AEL&P grid, or would otherwise require their own generation.

She requested the following changes to this IA:

6.11.IA3 "~~Require~~ Encourage the use of renewable and environmentally-sensitive energy sources for energy intensive projects, ~~where cost effective.~~"

She stated that the COS could not truly state that the School District needs to necessarily improve energy education, and instead they are working on doing so. However, the COS felt this IA should include energy education, as follows:

6.13.IA1 "The Juneau School District should ~~improve~~ include energy education in K-12 public school educational curriculum, ..."

She said the COW prefers the following language (which more coincides with 6.13.IA2):

6.13.IA3 "The CBJ should conduct public ~~meetings~~education programs to explain and discuss the Energy Chapter of this Plan."

Chair Gladziszewski thanked Ms. Wood, and the COS, for their hard work in providing this beneficial input to the Draft Comp Plan, Chapter 6: Energy.

Mr. Lyman informed the COW that he has three separate drafts to incorporate, including these comments from the COS, plus Ms. Snow's written comments (which she is now re-writing following this presentation). Therefore, he recommends that the COW first review Ms. Snow's comments. Following that review, he would re-write the staff report on Energy-Chapter 6 prior to re-presenting it to the COW. However, taking into consideration his workload, he more than likely would not be able provide this until a COW meeting in August 2008. He noted that the July 2008 COW meeting is to include the review of the Appendices/Glossary, along with any loose ends from any remaining chapters, plus another review of a few revised Land Use Maps.

### **III. PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

#### June 24, 2008 - Regular PC Meeting

Chair Gladziszewski stated that public testimony was closed regarding the OHV Park case at the last hearing. Mr. Pernula said instead staff is recommending that the PC re-open public testimony, as new information in the form of a noise study was completed by a consultant from Portland, OR, which was recently submitted by the applicant. Chair Gladziszewski preferred that the PC re-open public testimony now, as she would rather read as many written comments beforehand as possible. Mr. Pernula stated that staff is unable to do so unless the PC has six votes approving re-opening public testimony, although doing so was not included on tonight's Agenda, so they need to re-open public testimony at the June 24, 2008 PC meeting. He said the PC is able to confine public testimony specifically to new information, as people have the right to counter whatever arguments they might have that is contained in that material. He noted that there would be an updated staff recommendation, which will be provided to the PC as soon as possible, noting that all other cases were placed on the Consent Agenda. Mr. Watson stated that due to the high public attendance at the the last public hearing on this case was held at Centennial Hall. Mr. Pernula agreed, and offered to look into moving this PC meeting to that location as well.

### **IV. ADJOURNMENT**

**MOTION:** *by Ms. Snow, to adjourn the meeting.*

There being no objection, it was so ordered, and the meeting adjourned at 9:29 p.m.