

ASSEMBLY LANDS HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MINUTES

January 29, 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

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

Members Absent: none

Liaisons Present: Matthew Bell, Planning Commission; Chris Mertl, PRAC, Jim Becker, Docks & Harbors Committee

Liaisons Absent: none

Staff Present: Dan Bleidorn, Lands Manager; Roxie Duckworth, Lands & Resources Specialist; Joseph Meyers, Senior Planner/Housing & Land Use Specialist; Alix Pierce, Tourism Manager

Members of the Public: Heather Haugland, Senior Consultant, McKinley Research Group, LLC

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES -

1. December 18, 2023 Draft Minutes

F. AGENDA TOPICS

2. Mobile Home Down Payment Assistance Program Updates

Mr. Meyers discussed this topic. Mr. Kelly noted that we are doubling the threshold and spending authority and was wondering if the reason from inflation. Mr. Meyers replied that was correct with this program having started in 2016 and based on anecdotal evidence, after speaking with True North Credit Union, that \$20,000 would be more in line with the price of a down payment on a mobile home.

Wáahlaal Gíidaak commented that for banking purposes most mobile home purchasers have a difficult time getting the funding because of insurance of a mobile home. Does this help alleviate majority of concerns for banks, for those who are applying for this program. Mr. Meyers replied that he can't speak directly to the insurance but says that there are a number of banks who don't offer loans to manufactured homes that exist within parks. This has to do with a couple of factors, including the fact that the land is not owned outright by the person purchasing the home. A lot of institutions will not make loans of this type, this is just our way to try to address that gap.

Mr. Mertl asked about the semantics of the name, weren't mobile homes developed in the late seventies and now called manufactured homes? Mr. Meyers replied that was correct, that manufactured homes is the more contemporary term to describe this housing. Mr. Mertl followed up to ask if it would make sense for clarification to change it from mobile homes to manufactured homes, or something like that. Mr. Meyers that was correct and in the memo there is a section on the name change that we're recommending, Manufactured Home Down Payment Assistance Program.

Acting Chair Smith asked about the increase to the budget authority for up to \$100,000, does that require an appropriation or anything from the city. Mr. Meyers replied that he would need to research that and reply back but he expects that these changes will come in the form of an ordinance. Acting

Chair Smith commented that he likes the tiered household income limits and wasn't certain if that language automatically meant that they would adjust for inflation and see that the income limits are based on AMI, which adjust with inflation. I just want to make sure that if we're doing this, I would like the tier and would like the income limits to move with inflation to avoid running into this problem in the future. Mr. Meyers replied that is correct, they are attached to the AMI that's reset or recalculated every year. Acting Chair Smith replied perfect, with that kind of recommended language those limits would move with inflation.

Wáahlaal Gíidaak moved that the LHEDC provide a motion of support for the continuation of the Manufactured Home Downpayment Assistance program (formerly the Mobile Home Down Payment Assistance program) with an increase in funding from \$10,000 to \$20,000, tiered household income limits, and an increase in program budget authority from \$100,000 to \$200,000. Motion passed unanimously.

Assemblymember Hughes-Skandijs moved that the LHEDC request staff to bring back guidelines and terms for a first-time homebuyer program. Motion passed unanimously.

3. Sandberg Request to Purchase City Property

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic.

Mr. Mertl asked to clarify if this would be for driveway only, no other allowable use, the applicants would not be allowed to put in for a secondary dwelling on this property. Mr. Bleidorn replied that depending on the outcome of negotiations, if it was an easement it would likely be an access and utility easement which would prevent any structures being on it, the city would still own the property. This access would be granted through it, and if in the future the city wanted to run utilities to the larger tracts, or work on a secondary emergency access through that property, the city and assembly would still have that ability. But if there is a piece that they acquire from CBJ in order to have a parking pad, or something more permanent, at that point they would own it and all the subdivision rules would apply. They have expressed interest in saying, well, is it possible to build a house up here for one of their children, and so that would be part of the negotiations. Part of what I want to do is to keep the conversation to what is necessary, so they can age in place rather than create an elaborate piece of property, and they seem interested in that type of negotiation. Mr. Mertl followed up with at this point, we're looking at couple of different possible options for moving forward. Mr. Bleidorn replied that at this point once it goes to the assembly, and the city manager has authority to negotiate, we'll work with the applicant, and if something that's not favorable to the city or the assembly is negotiated, then then staff would recommend denial in the future. I think that there's an opportunity to lessen the blow to the city property there, but still give them what they're looking for, but the outcome of the potential negotiations is unknown.

Acting Chair Smith asked that obviously there's houses built there, are there areas of this property along the front edge that are suitable for additional housing or are there geography or other conditions that make them not great sites for housing? Mr. Bleidorn replied to make sure he understand the question, if the city property that they're looking to acquire, you're wondering if the city could sell that as individual residential lots. Acting Chair Smith confirmed and was wondering if there's housing potential there. Mr. Bleidorn replied that he doesn't have a positive answer saying yes or no, but the topography there is really challenging, even the driveway they're proposing is going to have a major switch back. Once you're up on that property it flattens out, and that's kind of why I'm also hesitant to dispose of any large track of city property there. In theory it could be subdivided into single family lots. It's D1 zoning right

now, so that you can't do something large up there, but in the future I could see this property as being part of a larger piece of the Mendenhall Peninsula, and upzoning it to build a road through there. But all that's very theoretical, and in the distant future.

Mr. Kelly moved that the Lands, Housing and Economic Development Committee forward this application to the Assembly with a motion of support for negotiating with the original proposer towards the disposal of City property and/or easement in accordance with 53.09.260 and 53.09.300. Motion passed unanimously.

G. STAFF REPORTS

4. 2023 Tourism Survey Results

Ms. Pierce and Ms. Haugland discussed this topic.

Acting Chair Smith asked if McKinley does customer satisfaction surveys for any other cruise ports, hopefully in Southeast, and if so, how does Juneau compare. Ms. Haugland replied that the last one we did, I think, was Ketchikan, and it might have been 2016 or 2017. I do think we got a satisfaction for them, but it would take me a minute to dig that up. For comparing satisfaction, cruise lines themselves certainly test their customers on satisfaction, but is not sure how public they make those. Online, you can view Cruise Critic, people do that or Tripadvisor, those would be resources to compare how Juneau did. I haven't done that or collected that information, but those are some off the top of my head. If we wanted to see how Juneau compared for satisfaction, we could check cruisecritic.com and Tripadvisor, and the cruise lines themselves could probably tell us how their passengers feel about the ports in relation to each other.

Mr. Mertl asked about the weighted responses based on where people live. Given that we have a fairly large population out in the valley who may not necessarily come downtown, did you find difference in numbers, or did you extrapolate local impacts, and how they might be different with people that work and live downtown as opposed to people in the valley, is there much difference? Ms. Haugland replied that the differences by region were not as pronounced as last year and was surprised by that. There were only 2 statistically significant differences by neighborhood on that first big question of positive and negative. So it was a higher likelihood among Valley and Lemon Creek residents to report no impacts at all, which is intuitive. They reported 15% for the Valley and 12% for Lemon Creek. This compares with between 6% and 8% of other residents. That's one area where we saw a difference by region, that was that was it for that question. When you get impacts by neighborhood, we did report detail on differences by neighborhood, the report is too much to get into. For the presentation, there are 5 bullets on this page about how people are affected differently, but Downtown, Thane, and North Douglas tend to report higher levels of impact, which also happened last year. I would just say, in general, there just weren't as many of those statistically significant differences by neighborhood, with this information on page 13.

Acting Chair Smith asked where do these reports live on the CBJ website. Ms. Pierce replied that will be up on the webpage, [TBMP – City and Borough of Juneau \(www.juneau.org/manager/tbmp\)](http://www.juneau.org/manager/tbmp).

Ms. Pierce commented that they did receive a question from the public, which the assembly was copied on, about shore power, which was not in the memo, because we had discussed giving a shore power update at a later date. But I will briefly say that we're working with AELP to contracting with an engineer to start design for short power, and that engineer will work directly within AELP, which makes sense they're the utility, and they're the ones who are going to have to operate the system once we have it. Mr. Uchtyl wisely made that decision, and we have enough money to get through design, and we will

have some more funds in the marine passenger fee budget this year. Should the assembly pass that we'll also have enough money to order any long lead time parts which we cannot order now, because we don't know which system we're going with, so that that will come out of the design process. We are adequately funded for the stage that we're at and working on a funding strategy for the rest of the project which we'll discuss with the assembly when that's fully flushed out at a later date.

H. STANDING COMMITTEE TOPICS

5. LHED Committee Goals

Mr. Bleidorn noted that the standing committee goals are from last year's fiscal year, and we had the assembly retreat just a little while ago, and goals will be discussed at the COW this evening. These standing committee topics are up for discussion at the committee level, and so I'll try to meet with Chair Hughes-Skandijs between now and our next meeting and come up with some continued goals. As you're working through the assembly goals, if there's something that makes sense to include in this community's goals for the next year now is a great time to start including it. So I can give regular updates.

6. Telephone Hill Updates

Mr. Bleidorn mentioned that there is nothing direct on Telephone Hill and will just remind everybody that it's going to go to the COW at the next meeting, not this evening, but on February 12th, 2024.

I. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS - none

J. NEXT MEETING DATE - February 26, 2024

K. ADJOURNMENT – 5:47pm