

Land Table

Rank Projects 1-5. 1=We have serious concerns; 5=We're ready

Telephone hill: 3, 4.5 (excited to do extensive planning and public visioning), 5-excited to plan

Questions and concerns to address:

- We already own the land (yay!) but we need to do a lot of planning and prelim work
- How much money to get rid of the hump?
- How much control do we keep?
- What kind of housing provides the maximum public good?
- How much interest is there from private developers?

Pederson Hill: 4, 5, 5

Questions and concerns to address:

- Do we rezone? Current D10-SF, should we go to D10?
- Determine assembly vision for what we want to see there?
- Do we go further up the hill? How much \$\$?

2nd & Franklin: 5

- Can we acquire 2nd and Gold from the State? How do we sweeten the pot so they work with us?
- Should we use a process similar to Vintage Park (i.e., decide what we want, then use RFP)

How do we get more done on land issues to support housing?

- Evaluate easement code and low-value transactions to remove from committee process....cautiously
- Explore community land trusts (ask Tamara Rowcraft)
- Add FTEs / \$\$ to the lands department
- Buy or otherwise acquire vacant land / minor subdivisions
- Develop process to use CBJ land for USCG housing
- Analyze state land to acquire
- Evaluate LHED staff (RN staff is Lands staff; committee includes housing and econ dev)

Regulation Table

What regulation changes should we prioritize to increase housing in the short term? Do we have the appetite to tackle public and private improvements (i.e., roads and utilities)? What big ideas do we want to prioritize?

- Table of dimensional standards including floating setbacks
- Allow extra accessory apartments
- Increase density wherever possible (set minimums, reward maximums)
- Consider making Ch35 variable (cautiously)

- Consider decreasing road stds AND changing LID code (so that roads build past houses aren't paid for 90% by the CBJ)
- STRs
- Customize/eliminate pieces of ICC for Juneau?
- Tiny homes / manu home villages / senior 1 story housing
- Eliminate SF zoning / Inclusionary zoning

How can we get more work done? Do we work on the system that result in Title 49 changes?

- Maybe?
- Limited hearing officer for some things; take things from Director and PC to give more time for other things
- Goal is to lighten load, not take all authority away
- Actively work on PC recruitment
- Example of different flow for Title 49 changes:
 - o Assembly has idea -> Director/CDD draft concept -> Law writes code change -> comes back to Assembly (PC comments on change).

Money Table

How aggressive should we be with grants, loans, and tax abatement?

- Rankings:
 - o Cautiously aggressive (as 39% of public in HAP suggested) (1)
 - o Very aggressive and targeted (6)
 - o Extremely aggressive (1)
- Existing programs:
 - o Mobile home loans
 - o Accessory apt grant
 - o Tax abatement
 - o Affordable housing fund
 - o Public-private partnerships
 - o CBJ Development – Sale
- Additional Comments:
 - o No individual developers should come to the Assembly \$\$ (use AHF instead)

What new (or existing) \$\$ programs should we focus on?

- Renters to homeowners
- Title 49 – Build to maximum capacity? – impact fees
- Move JAHF to 2x year, develop dedicated revenue source, and look to state/federal match
- Bonding – capital improvement or private
- Preserve housing
- Interest rates = Bank/CBJ loans
- Use “patient” capital – i.e., extend repayment timelines
- Loan/grants to build new or remodel multifamily homes

- Reassess JAHF terms of loans
- RFP / Competitive bids for MF and Seasonal
- Loan Program for Roads at sale of property. Partial grant if MF target
- Community Loan Program
- Coast Guard land
- Telephone Hill
- CBJ Develop and Sell