

ASSEMBLY LANDS HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MINUTES

December 18, 2023 at 5:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar



<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/94215342992> or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 942 1534 2992

A. ROLL CALL

Members Present: Chair Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Wáahlaal Gíidaak, Greg Smith, Paul Kelly

Members Absent: none

Liaisons Present: Mandy Cole, Planning Commission; Chris Mertl, PRAC

Liaisons Absent: Jim Becker, Docks & Harbors Committee

Staff Present: Dan Bleidorn, Lands Manager; Roxie Duckworth, Lands & Resources Specialist

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – approved as presented

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - November 6, 2023 Draft Minutes – approved as presented

F. AGENDA TOPICS

2. LeMann Bluff LLC Application to Purchase CBJ Property located on USS 4694 Juneau Indian Village
Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic.

Mr. Mertl commented that we've gone through this process before in the past. When we get an application do they get sole source for purchasing the property, or does the property go out for general advertisement to let the public know it's for sale. Is it first person that shows up and can purchase these properties outright? Mr. Bleidorn replied that it is to be determined by the assembly. At this point, the city manager has received an application, and it has all the necessary information included to be deemed complete, and then the assembly can determine, as a new business item, to work with your original proposal, where we'd work and start negotiations with them and start the process of an appraisal and any other site work that we need to get done. Other options would be to determine if it is in the city's best interest to retain this property at this time until either some other catalyst moves us to move forward with it or retain it if there is public use or determination that the city needed it. The third option would be to open it up to some type of competitive process. In this case, the properties really do not have any road frontage and most of the city owned property here is very steep. If we're going to go out to some type of competitive sale, it would be more likely that we'd be having another neighbor that was interested in it, because the general public couldn't really build anything on this property due to the size and the shape, it's not really conducive to housing. There's another part to this request that is for an isolated right-of-way (ROW), an undeveloped ROW, undeveloped road that has no connection to other existing roads, it's not connected to Capital Ave or Village Street. A ROW vacation has its own process through the Engineering department because the city doesn't own ROWs. They are not sold like a piece of property, it's independent. That was included in the application, and we're also working with the applicant to follow through that process for the ROW vacation.

Wáahlaal Gíidaak asked what the process is in terms of our recommendation to the full assembly, do we recommend now whether or not we want it to be competitive or non-competitive or does that come at the full assembly level? Mr. Bleidorn replied that staff in the past have gone both ways. If it's something where there's no adjacent neighbor, there's no other ROW close by, where it would make sense to work specifically with the applicant at that stage. At this point I was uncomfortable making that recommendation to this committee because I want to hear from some of the neighbors, we're still collecting information, and waiting for review. I think by the time this goes to the assembly as new business we'll be in a situation where we can provide some additional direction as staff.

Mr. Smith commented that he was looking at this downtown location, near where the tribe has had some recent investments and land. Would this potentially be desirable to somebody else? I understands the applicant's desire to keep it clean but was questioning whether doing cleanup is a reason enough to

dispose of land. Could there be potential projects or something in that area if we either held onto it or if anyone else was interested in it. Mr. Smith likes the motion in the packet. Chair Hughes-Skandijs noted that she has the same concerns and appreciates the Staff's recommendation and could see this being an open request to see what the neighbors think, especially that these were foreclosures.

Mr. Smith moved that staff request the Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee to forward this application to the full Assembly to be reviewed for a determination of whether the proposal should be further considered and, if so, whether by direct negotiation with the original proposer or by competition after an invitation for further proposals in accordance with 53.09.260(a). Motion passed unanimously.

3. Request to Continue to Lease CBJ property located at U.S. Survey 3760 for a Parking Lot
Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. No committee discussion.

Wáahlaal Gíidaak moved that that staff request the Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee to provide a motion of support for renewing a lease of CBJ property to Amalga and Huffman Harbors Community Association for a parking lot. Motion passed unanimously.

G. STAFF REPORTS

4. 520 Sixth Street Foreclosure Verbal Update

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Chair Hughes-Skandijs asked about the foreclosure process, that there is no financial incentive. We're not rushing for a closure process. Mr. Bleidorn replied that it goes to the previous owners and added that the process for this ordinance is going to be proposing a sealed competitive bid sale, which we'll set a minimum bid for the price, and then there'll be a window of 45 days for the application to be out there to collect bids. We'll provide a bid form, a brochure, and then we'll open all the bids at the end, and the highest bid will get it.

5. Telephone Hill Land Redevelopment Study Update

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. PC Cole asked how maintenance has been conducted on these properties for the last two decades, who's responsible for that, and what kind of records were kept. Mr. Bleidorn replied that the city hasn't had ownership for very long and acquired this property in March of 2023. The city's approach has been to hire a professional property manager that works with residents on site to try to mitigate concerns. Building maintenance prior to that was done by some residents of the Hill that had formed what they called a neighborhood nonprofit but was neither a neighborhood association nor a nonprofit. They did work on structures but record keeping seems to have been nonexistent. I have not found a great record of maintaining these structures since the State first acquired them in the 1980s.

Mr. Kelly asked how this survey is going to fit into the general scheme of how we're taking public input. Before he was sworn into the assembly, Mr. Kelly attended two meetings held by our consultant. In the second meeting it didn't seem like people were interested in any of the four options that were available to them. He was wondering how this survey would fit into how we're receiving public input and if there's any way for the for people who might have an idea that's outside of the basic four options to weigh in. Mr. Bleidorn replied that the report that I'm requesting that all of you take some time to read about has value as far as the process goes. At some point the assembly is going to determine how to move forward with this site. If you're thinking about preservation, knowing the structure as it exists today might weigh on your consciousness if you're thinking about trying to keep these properties alive. The second part of that question was related to the majority at those meetings. I agree that most of the people who attended those meetings were either residents of Telephone Hill or had a history with the Hill. Vocally people expressed concerns but the written comments from that meeting were more favorable than the

comments over the microphone. We didn't necessarily get a full view of other parts of the communities, which has led us to the survey that we're doing now to try to get people involved who aren't as vested in the Hill as exists today. Mr. Kelly replied that he was wondering where it would fit into the overall process. I imagine it will be put into our packet at some point. Mr. Bleidorn replied that the Assembly will be asked to provide direction on how to proceed after the survey

Mr. Mertl asked what is the decision-making process for this project, we've received public input and four concepts, does this come before this committee, and we get to weigh options. Does it go to planning? Is there a steering committee or is it decided by yourself or engineering? I'm just curious about what is the decision making process as a preferred concept and master plans as they get developed. Mr. Bleidorn replied that he doubts that those processes will come to the Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee, they'll likely be routed through the Public Works and Facilities or the Committee of the Whole.

H. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

PC Cole commented about the Gastineau Apartments permit, she noted that the conditional use permits that the Planning Commission approved for the Gastineau Lodges apartments has been in the paper a lot recently. Steve Soenksen was the applicant with that project. There's been a lot of questions about how the Planning Commission could approve a conditional use permit in that area for 72 units. She wanted to speak about that, because she suspects the assembly will get some questions from their constituents. One of the beautiful and difficult things about being on the Planning Commission, you spend a long time thinking about and understanding an issue, and then it gets reported in a small space or on a radio, and it and the summary doesn't necessarily capture all of the elements that we work through weighing carefully that night. She wanted to note that they made a distinction between land use. The conditional use permit speaks to land use versus a building permit which would speak to the safety and codes that a particular building in construction would have according to those concerns. We talked about the fire code requirements for a building of that size on a one way street. The applicant acknowledged the Planning Commission, as it stands now, would not pass fire code. The applicant had a plan to work with the fire chief in order to try and come up with some workarounds to get the building permit, and if he does so he'll get the building permit. If he doesn't, he may not but we really tried to separate the issue from land use and building. That's how we got to that decision, and wanted to try and help explain that as I suspect you might get questions.

Mr. Mertl commented that he has been a liaison for 6 plus years, and this is not intentional, when you ask for unanimous consent it silences the liaisons, and we don't get a chance to talk about the motion at all. This committee has 3 liaisons that I think provide valuable input, and perhaps in crafting or refining a motion. I know we don't get voting rights, I respect that, but I think it's an unintentional consequence of being efficient and going with unanimous consent and moving things forward that you then remove the liaisons from that discussion. Just a point of order, something to consider, I just wanted to bring that up. Chair Hughes-Skandijs replied that going forward she will think about how best to involve the liaisons. She knows they take time to come to these meetings, and we want you to weigh in on how it affects the other bodies that you serve on. Something to think or talk about at a future meeting, I will say, even if someone just made a motion, it's my understanding of the assembly rules and procedures that we would still not recognize a liaison, because when we go to a voting matter of the committee, it's an assembly committee, and so the people who are qualified to object or to alter would be assembly members. But perhaps more discussion before we get to an actual committee motion would be good.

J. NEXT MEETING DATE - January 29, 2024

L. ADJOURNMENT – 5:29pm