

# ASSEMBLY LANDS HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MINUTES

June 03, 2024 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. CALL TO ORDER – 5:05pm**

**B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT**

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 in this place, a part of this community, and to honor the culture, traditions, and resilience of the Tlingit people. Gunalchéesh!

**C. ROLL CALL**

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

**Members Absent:** 'Wáahlaal Gídaag,

**Additional Assemblymembers:** Michelle Hale

**Liaisons Present:** Chris Mertl, PRAC

**Liaisons Absent:** Jim Becker, Docks & Harbors Committee, Matthew Bell, Planning Commission

**Staff Present:** Dan Bleidorn, Lands Manager; Roxie Duckworth, Lands & Resources Specialist; Katie Koester, City Manager; Scott Ciambor, Planning Manager; Joseph Meyers, Housing & Land Use Specialist

**Members of the Public:** none

**D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – Red folder item in Supplemental Materials for Agenda Topic #2, approved**

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - April 15, 2024 – approved as presented**

**F. AGENDA TOPICS**

**2. Resolution 3057 Re-authorizing the Manufactured Home Down Payment Assistance Program**

Ms. Koester presented this topic. Chair Hughes-Skandijs asked the committee if they understand the concept of how much we've allocated to each of the lines in the resolution for the Affordable Housing Fund. She asked the manager if we have had 3 for the ADU for this year, Ms. Koester replied it was for fiscal year 2024.

Mr. Kelly asked how much the loans usually range. Ms. Koester replied that the affordable ADU program is \$13,000 and that the housing coordinator can get better information on the nature of the manufactured loan program.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs asked if we did adjust the ADU program and then moved on to adjust this one, am I correct that we upped the rate because it was originally \$13,000, and looked out to the committee to get a visual that she was wrong, then we'll stick with your top of the head numbers. No, I'm getting head shakes from housing people. So I think I made that number up. Mr. Bleidorn replied that he believes it was \$5,000, and then we changed it up to \$13,000, this round. Chair Hughes-Skandijs replied that we've adjusted that one, and we've adjusted this one. And now we understand this would up the underutilized one in case this one is aggressively utilized. Madam Manager, you like to give the line number for a proposed amendment? Ms. Koester replied that in order to give the manager's office clear direction on this she would request that you amend the \$30,000 on line 45 to \$100,000, and the reason for this is the back and forth between law and myself, we didn't catch that.

**Mr. Smith amended the motion in the packet to increase line 45 in the resolution from \$30,000 to \$100,000. Amendment approved unanimously.**

**Mr. Kelly noted that lines 107 and 110 in the resolution had grammatical errors and needed correction.**

**Mr. Kelly moved that Resolution 3057 be forwarded to the full Assembly for consideration. Motion passed, no objections.**

3. **Blueprint Downtown**

Mr. Ciambor presented this topic.

Mr. Smith asked about the recommendations, he didn't see the one from SHI, Chamber, or HRAC and was curious about that difference. Mr. Ciambor replied that those should have been in the packet and were put in a red folder item as commentary. Mr. Smith clarified that he was wondering if there was a reason that those weren't put into the recommendation grid on the on the proceeding pages. Mr. Ciambor replied that the items that are in the proposed revision and changes table came in through the Planning Commission and were received by the time the Planning Commission moved it on. These are additional comments that have come out as staff continually reaches out to partners, saying, "Hey, you didn't comment the last time around. It's time to get them in."

Mr. Mertl thanked staff for finally getting this out and recognizing that some issues are a little dated now and a lot has happened in the last 2 to 3 years. He followed up on that and saw that one of the recommendations was to go back and reevaluate everything in 2 years as part of a departmental review. Did I read that correctly, did I see that in this package somewhere. Mr. Ciambor replied that he thinks Mr. Mertl is referring to the memo where it talks about the CBJ assembly and Planning Commission roles and in the code, one of the conditions in section 49.10.170 is the Commission shall undertake a general review of the comprehensive plan 2 years after the adoption of the most recent update, and shall recommend appropriate amendments to the plan. Mr. Mertl followed up to ask if the intent, as this becomes adopted potentially as part of the Comp Plan, would be to review this document every 2 years. Mr. Ciambor replied that was correct.

Mr. Mertl wondered about the agency comments from Parks and Recreation deputy director Verrelli, those weren't in the package, but it looks like there are Parks and Recreation recommendations in the table. He received a copy from Mr. Schaaf and the comments were missing. Mr. Ciambor replied that Parks and Recreation's comments made it to the Planning Commission, and they were summarized and put in the table, and not the entire memo was put in the packet.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs appreciates the difference in focus with the Planning Commission role versus them sending the recommendation on to us, but maybe it's not a recommendation, but to encourage stronger focus on housing. She was wondering if Mr. Ciambor could characterize that a bit, as it's not super specific. Each thing has its own recommendations, like you said at each section, that is a general sense of housing from the Planning Commission which we share here on the assembly, but if you could speak to that piece a little bit. Mr. Ciambor replied that he didn't want to speak for the Planning Commission but has observed the dialogue on that topic. They were excited to continue to move the plan on and didn't want to dive that much deeper into that component in that discussion, also knowing that it was the assembly's priority as well. But they did want to send a message to the assembly, saying that housing language in the plan could be stronger because it is a high priority for them as well.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs followed up to ask, since it has been a little while since we did do the Comp Plan, and this one obviously took a long time for good reasons, to what extent when will we ask other questions, and maybe we'll need more information, that this is a good summation of the information we have and then it will further be delved into by the assembly. But to what extent is useful to staff, to the plan, knowing that we do all want to see this come to its ending, and be put in its place for the assembly in our role to get into things like the metrics. On the icons page, there's full icons that have no metrics, and some that have multiple metrics, and some of them are just hard to measure, a downtown for everyone is a hard thing to immediately come up with a metric for. But speaking from staff's perspective both in this committee and then when it goes to COW, what is useful feedback versus opening the plan

up, which has been in process for a very long time. Mr. Ciambor replied that one of the items to look at in the revisions table is the 1st one which says, basically staff is going to take another look through it for grammatical minor changes. So any minor work, I would not spend a lot of assembly time on. I think it's probably figuring out if the components of Downtown Blueprint match the assembly goals and how well they match them to encourage staff to either leave it as is, or make some subtle changes that you think are important, that would be more in line with what the assembly's role is, that's the sort of level you would have to be looking at. There's some examples of other plans that have been adopted as addendums to the comprehensive plan, and some of them have been adopted wholly. I think the Willoughby Land Use District Plan with only Chapter 5 was adopted wholly. I believe you have a lot of leeway at the assembly level to make sure the division matches your vision as well.

Mr. Smith asked if the assembly can propose an amendment to this at the full assembly level or at the COW, such as striking a sentence or additional changes? Mr. Ciambor replied that high level changes are important, and staff wants to see this plan move and be implemented and in terms of planning strategies for the future for the department. We also have the South Douglas West Juneau plan to wrap up and we want to move on to the comprehensive plan, knowing that this Blueprint Downtown area plan and the steering committee have put significant labor into providing good background and information for this future dialogue. The kind of the nitty, gritty commentary we can do that as well, but I think we're probably looking for big picture items.

Mr. Mertl asked about the recommendation to keep city hall downtown, is that issue handcuffed since it's a hot topic right now, is this a good recommendation or is that a restrictive recommendation. Mr. Ciambor replied that it's a process, the steering committee has developed this plan, and the Planning Commission has also reviewed and recommended it As-Is on the website. It is a recommendation of the plan, and as this committee or the assembly, what you want to do with that recommendation is up to you, but it is in the plan. Mr. Mertl made a comment of the recommendations. You talked about data collection for downtown Juneau, when this plan was written we had 1.2 million visitors, we are up to 1.7 plus million now. One of the recommendations in the action items that I saw was to do a carrying capacity study to find balance, is that what's coming out the of the recommendation 187, or something different that needs to be brought forward, given the change in the cruise ship visitation we've received. Mr. Ciambor replied that he would have to defer and look into that to provide more background. Again, it is in the plan and up to the assembly to determine how they want to handle that suggestion or modify it, and then direct staff to change our approach in terms of collecting data or doing a study.

Mr. Smith noted that the creation and development of the plan was a massive public process. Has the public seen it through the Planning Commission process, and will they see it as we move it through our process? When will the public see it in its entirety and can they write in to provide commentary? Mr. Ciambor replied that he put a bullet point list of all the community engagement and public input. The public has had a lot of input at the very beginning, but the steering committee, before it finalized the plan, actually did a big public outreach. All of those public comments and appendices were garnered by staff and the steering committee prior to them finalizing and adopting the draft. The public has seen it then, and as we ramped up this winter, a concerted effort and outreach was made to make sure those comments came through the public hearing process at the Planning Commission. Not a whole lot of comments tonight, but when it is up for public hearing we'll do another round of outreach to make sure the public knows what's there.

**Mr. Kelly moved that the Lands, Housing, and Economic Development Committee refer the draft Blueprint Downtown Area Plan to the Assembly Committee of the Whole for further discussion. Motion passed, no objections.**

**G. STAFF REPORTS**

**4. 2024 Tax Foreclosed Property Sale**

Mr. Bleidorn presented this topic. Chair Hughes-Skandijs asked if the public has until July 9<sup>th</sup> to submit a bid. Mr. Bleidorn confirmed and noted that there is a foreclosure website on the Lands website with the brochure and more information posted.

**5. Second and Franklin Street Verbal Update**

Mr. Bleidorn presented this topic. Chair Hughes-Skandijs noted that this verbal update is just refreshing this topic for the LHED Committee as we have talked about this before and perhaps the timeline would affect what we decide to do with this property.

**H. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS**

**6. RED FOLDER: AME 18-07\_Blueprint Downtown Agency Comments Form Sealaska Heritage Institute Additional Comments**

Discussed in Section F, Topic 3, Blueprint Downtown.

**I. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

Assemblymember Hale acknowledged Mr. Bleidorn for the staff report topic presented at the last LHED meeting about the A. J. Mine, managed by CBJ, with no violations. She noted that was remarkable during the inspection, and quoted from the report that “there were no violations identified during the inspection, either on site from what was visible, or in a deep, deep, dive into your monitoring, reporting, or records, both on site and provided electronically. That is unusual, says Jon Wendel, Compliance Manager for the Division of Water at the State of Alaska. You are one of only a handful of people I have inspected in my many years, who has come away with a clean bill of health.” Ms. Hale used to do this work and noted that this is actually really remarkable. She presented Mr. Bleidorn with a gift, a copy of this email framed for perpetuity. Mr. Bleidorn thanked Ms. Hale.

Mr. Smith wanted to bring up Section 106 to save that for a later discussion.

**J. NEXT MEETING DATE – July 15, 2024**

**K. ADJOURNMENT – 5:48pm**