

ASSEMBLY LANDS HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MINUTES

November 3, 2025 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: Chair Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Paul Kelly, Neil Steininger, Maureen Hall

Liaisons Present: Paulette Schirmer, PRAC liaison; Lacey Derr, Planning Commission liaison

Liaisons Absent: ; Jim Becker, Docks & Harbors Board liaison

Staff Present: Dan Bleidorn, Lands Manager; John King, Deputy Lands Manager; Roxie Duckworth, Lands and Resources Specialist; Scott Ciambor, CDD Planning Manager

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – approved as presented

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. September 29, 2025 Draft LHED Minutes – approved as presented

F. AGENDA TOPICS

1. Downtown Douglas/West Juneau Draft Area Plan

- **Planning Commission Notice of Recommendation with Draft DD/WJ Plan, Agency Comments, and Public Comments** ([link](#))

Mr. Ciambor discussed this topic. No additional discussion from the Committee members.

Mr. Kelly moved that the Lands, Housing and Economic Development Committee forward the draft *Downtown Douglas/West Juneau Area Plan*, with the Planning Commission recommendations that are noted on page 8 of our packet, and refer the plan to the full Assembly for further discussion and adoption into the Comp Plan as an addendum. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Juneau Affordable Housing Fund Round Five

Mr. Ciambor discussed this topic. Assemblymembers Maureen Hall disclosed that she is a board member for St. Vincent de Paul and Neil Steininger disclosed that he sits on their Finance Committee.

Ms. Hall asked about Family Promise, if there is an opportunity to reconsider if they are closer to having site control and to help them to be able to begin the project. Mr. Ciambor noted the timeline in the packet, on November 3, with recommendation from the Committee, it goes to the Assembly. In the program guidelines, there is language that the Assembly can make whatever decision you want. When it goes to the Assembly level and you want to fund another project or go against the Committee's recommendation, you may do so. That's not necessarily advisable, considering all the work that the Committee does and the information they receive that you don't see on your level, but there's opportunity for that, and it has been done in the past. In the past there have been questions whether we can run two rounds of funding per year, do a Spring funding. Again, that's not advisable from a staffing perspective, because of the work that goes into the program to make sure it's organized, transparent, and that it's coming from the same budget that you passed in June. Realistically in the timeframe of housing development, it typically takes 3 to 5 years. Moving this on to the next year is advisable.

Mr. Kelly asked if the Committee were to consider new information from Family Promise, would it be helpful to return that recommendation back to the Committee, or if the LHED Committee did decide to move forward with this project, would there be any impediments? Mr. Ciambor replied that at this point the review Committee's work is done. We had a timeframe, the applications that were submitted by the deadline were as-is, and it's complete. There's a recommendation in front of you but if this new information intrigues your interest so that you want to know more, then staff could reach out for an update and bring that back as you deliberate what to do on the final step. The other part is it was just one component of the Committee's review and recommendation. If you look at the score sheet, there's a lot of other categories other than site control. I wasn't in this Committee dialogue this year, there may have been some other components that I missed, but I just wanted to highlight that at least one big component is being cleared by that applicant. Mr. Bleidorn added that they've submitted more information to us after they've received our comments, and we recommended against funding, but sets them up to be a better applicant for next year's funding. Between now and then I think they'll be in an even better spot.

Mr. Steininger asked about the program, not necessarily about the applicants, do we have a sense of how many of the previous loans have been paid back, if we've had any applicants default on their loans, or the condition of prior funding through this program. Mr. Ciambor replied that we have contracts and loan agreements with all. With those agreements, we ask for an annual update, I believe it's March 1, and we take those summaries and get that into your summary report in the spring for future deliberation. He has information on every project and can give to the LHED Committee at any point, but that's typically the way we organize it and provide information to the Assembly. On our dashboard, you can see individual projects, and it is noted if they've been completed or not. On my list from the website, projects 1 through 8 have been completed. Most of those were in the first round and affordable housing projects who were entities that knew how to work with government grant programs, they were getting money in, spending it, and ready to find more. A lot of the ones that have been either loaned or granted out in the last two years are still in progress. That's typical of how long it takes to develop housing in Juneau.

Mr. Steininger said it's good to hear that we have a handful of past projects that have been successful and completed, and a handful still in progress, as you would expect from the project diversity that we have, thank you. Mr. Ciambor replied that we have permitting data on a dashboard and can calculate how many city funding projects and units are part of those overall numbers to get a sense that your investment is pushing the needle in helping with the Housing Action Plan goals. That's not only for this program, but also the accessory dwelling unit grant program. If you take those units out, we would be in a more difficult housing scenario than we currently are, it speaks to the success of both of these investment programs.

Mr. Kelly wanted to have a discussion about the future expectations of the Affordable Housing Fund, considering the fiscal situation that we find ourselves in, and that this program is largely dependent on sales tax, which has been reduced with the exemptions. He was interested in exploring ideas, one might be a temporary moratorium on the grants, and maybe more focus on loans, that way we can help ensure this program is continually replenished. He wanted to get an idea for the Committee's appetite in having this discussion, we don't have time for this evening, but if we want to have this discussion at a later date. Chair Hughes-Skandijis asked to sum up Mr. Kelly's thoughts or proposal and issued a one minute at ease and restarted the meeting to state that she tried to offer Mr. Kelly wording and thought what he wanted to do was keep it in Committee, but maybe he has some clarity on his motion or if he doesn't have a motion, that's okay, his comments can stand, and we'll let the others respond.

Mr. Steininger made a motion based on his understanding of Mr. Kelly's ideas and moved that the Lands, Housing, and Economic Development Committee adopt the Juneau Affordable Housing Fund Committee recommendation but only forward the loan funding requests; loan of \$900,000 to Brave Enterprises LLC

for Bergman Hotel and loan of \$200,000 to Southeast Endeavors LLC for Lee Street fourplex, to the Assembly for approval and hold the grant items for further discussion and asked for unanimous consent.

Mr. Steininger spoke to his motion that maybe it should have been phrased a differently, the points that Mr. Kelly brought up, giving money versus a loan that we get paid back, makes sense given our fiscal constraints. This might be a broader discussion for the Finance Committee, considering we have a lot on that next agenda, but moving around this general idea of what resources we have and what fast actions we can take. Moving forward with loans makes a lot of sense, because that money's going to get paid back, but we may want to have a larger group discussion on grants that we issue. I don't know if that's what I heard when Mr. Kelly was speaking, but I'd really love to hear his response.

Mr. Kelly objected and said that his thinking was that he didn't want to change any of the recommendations that have gone through this process. What he was thinking was how we do this with future applicants and what they can expect. I think that the people who have applied for a grant probably applied specifically for a grant, because that's what they need in order to get the project done, and I don't want to undermine that. I'm thinking that this might not be sustainable in future rounds, in round 6, for example. So, it is my intention to move forward with the current recommendations for Round 5 then to have a discussion for a later date about doing future rounds with exclusively loans.

Ms. Hall objected and added that this needs to be a bigger discussion, possibly at our retreat, but she is with Mr. Kelly that we probably ought to move forward with the recommendations from this round.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs objected for similar reasons as the other Assemblymembers and appreciated Mr. Steininger taking a stab with a motion, but is of the same mind and would like to see this round go out. We have enough funding for these at this time and would like to forward these recommendations. She would be happy to have this conversation at a future LHED Committee meeting, but agrees it would be more appropriate to have that with the full Assembly, maybe at a Finance meeting or a COW, and we can talk to those chairs and see where it is most appropriate.

Three objections, Mr. Steininger withdrew his motion.

Mr. Steininger asked to clarify that when applications come in as a grant versus a loan, how does that weigh into the consideration, is that a choice by the applicant of what they're asking for, or are there other rules in the deliberations that define grants versus loans. Mr. Ciambor replied that if you look at the names of the organizations who applied, affordable housing entities, nonprofit organizations, Tlingit Haida Regional Housing Authority, St. Vincent de Paul, Glory Hall, AWARE, Gastineau Human Services, all of these are working on affordable housing projects that either target just straight affordable housing or housing with special needs. The grants that are applied for are non-profit agencies, that's the world they work in, that's what they need. At the creation of the Affordable Housing Program, it was already relevant that the community also had a workforce housing problem, so how to entice fair market developers to utilize some funding in order to put units on the ground with a bit of affordable units with it. This fund is geared to target both of those types of organizations. Those who need grants are the affordable projects, affordable housing developers, they get grants, and for-profit developers, are eligible for loans. All are capped at \$50,000 a unit and that's how they're vetted. Back to your earlier discussion about what to do with this recommendation, you're on course, this is the recommendation for this year. It was budgeted; it was publicly noticed. We had all these entities go through a pretty intense process. So, for all intents and purposes, this round is almost complete. You're also on point at deliberating policy changes for the future, which typically we do in the spring when we bring back the full analysis and report on the Housing Fund, so you can have all the information on how to set the standards for the policy and program going forward.

Maybe you're just going to do loans going forward, you can make that decision at that point and then establish the budget and do an analysis on where your funding's coming from.

Ms. Kelly moved that the Lands, Housing and Economic Development Committee adopt the Juneau Affordable Housing Fund Committee recommendation and forward the following funding requests to the Assembly for approval, grant \$800,000 to Tlingit Haida Regional Housing Authority for Pederson Hill, grant \$250,000 to Tlingit Haida Regional Housing Authority for Séet Kanax Dutéen, loan \$900,000 to Brave Enterprises LLC for Bergman Hotel, loan \$200,000 to Southeast Endeavors LLC for Lee Street fourplex, and grant \$150,000 to Society of St Vincent de Paul for maintenance and upkeep. Motion passed unanimously.

G. STAFF REPORTS

3. Mark Thorson, Alaska's Capital Inn Bed & Breakfast request to purchase CBJ parkland

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Mr. Steininger asked if the property owner had already owned that land, would everything they had done been up to code, do they meet all the setback requirements, or do we know that? Mr. Bleidorn replied no, this came up because they illegally built across the property line, part of their structure is on city parkland. Had they gone through the permitting process and legally tried to build something through the process that everybody else has to follow, it would have been flagged, and they would have told they couldn't build it because it's within the setbacks and because it's not on their property. Mr. Steininger followed up to ask if the property line wasn't encroaching onto city property, but the property line was where that fence is, where they're asking to buy, would it still be within the setbacks? Mr. Bleidorn replied that he thought that it would still be within the setbacks.

No motion is requested at this meeting. Once this application has been reviewed by the PRAC it will be brought back to this Committee for direction prior to requesting Assembly authority to negotiate a sale. This application is scheduled for the agenda of the November 4, 2025 PRAC meeting.

4. AT&T request to lease CBJ property at Dimond Park

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Mr. Kelly asked that while work is going on at this light pole, how will lighting be handled or will it be so quick that we won't really need to do anything to handle lighting in the area? Mr. Bleidorn replied that if this application moves forward, we'll get into the details of construction. Ideally, it would happen during a period when the field isn't in heavy use, and also if it's during summer, the lights are less needed than if it's sometime in the fall. That's something we'll consider as we move forward to making sure that we still have proper and safe lighting of the fields during construction.

No motion is being requested at this meeting and once this application has been reviewed by the PRAC it will be brought back to this Committee for direction prior to requesting Assembly authority to negotiate a lease. This application is scheduled for the agenda of the November 4 PRAC meeting.

H. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

- Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (PRAC) – Ms. Schirmer provided an update that they discussed the Legislative Capital projects and put forth for a recommendation of the Lemon Creek Multimodal Path to the COW and they had also discussed the annual report.
- Planning Commission – no update
- Docks and Harbors Board – no update

I. NEXT MEETING DATE – December 1, 2025

J. ADJOURNMENT – 5:44pm