



TITLE 49 ADVISORY AD HOC COMMITTEE AGENDA

March 17, 2026 at 12:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/86964237460> or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 869 6423 7460

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

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 7, 2026 T49 Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes - Draft

F. AGENDA TOPICS

1. **Staff Seeking Opinions, Experiences, & Suggestions related to topics below. Proposed update concepts will be provided for discussion:**

1. Parking
2. Drive-Throughs
3. Outdoor Lighting
4. Outdoor Storage
5. Home Occupation (home-based businesses)

2. **Preview of concepts for Table of Permissible Uses (TPU) reorganization and related definitions**

G. STAFF REPORTS

H. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. **Open discussion on Title 49 rewrite, including process, public engagement, and specific questions with project staff**

I. NEXT MEETING DATE - TBD

J. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

1. Title 49 rewrite webform comments

K. ADJOURNMENT

ADA accommodations available upon request: contact the Clerk's Office (907)586-5278 or city.clerk@juneau.gov at least 36 hours prior to a meeting, to request ADA arrangements.



TITLE 49 ADVISORY AD HOC COMMITTEE

DRAFT - MINUTES

January 7, 2026 at 12:00 PM

Assembly Chambers/Zoom Webinar

<https://juneau.zoom.us/j/86964237460> or 1-253-215-8782 Webinar ID: 869 6423 7460

A. CALL TO ORDER

Chairperson Greg Smith called the meeting to order at 12:06pm

B. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT – Read by Erik Pedersen

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

Committee Members Present: Greg Smith, Lorraine DeAsis, Corey Baxter, Bill Heumann, Rich Harris

Committee Members Absent: Maggie McMillan, Mandy Cole

Staff/Others Present: Erik Pedersen, Planning Commissioner (Mr. Pedersen is representing the Planning Commission in place of Ms. Cole while she is unavailable); Rob Dumouchel, Special Projects Planning Manager; Breckan Hendricks, Municipal Clerk; Mintalbo, Senior Planner

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA - Approved

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. October 28, 2025 Title 49 Ad Hoc Committee Meeting Minutes – Draft

Minutes approved without objection

F. AGENDA TOPICS

1. Comprehensive Plan Update

Senior Planner Mintalbo, the project manager for the Comprehensive Plan Update provided a presentation to the Committee regarding the project and its progress to date. Presentation was followed by questions from the Committee. Mr. Heumann asked questions related to the schedule for the Comprehensive Plan and Ms. Montalbo noted that the project is roughly a month behind schedule due to the addition of extra Juneau Futures public engagement workshops. Plan development is expected to be complete in approximately a year and a half, but the amount of time required for the political process to approve and adopt the plan is unknown. Ms. Montalbo stressed that the project was making great efforts to engage the full community and vet the content as well as possible with the public before bringing it to the Planning Commission and the Assembly. Chair Smith noted that he is the Assembly's Planning Commission liaison and will be working to keep the Assembly up to date and aware of all the public engagement that is occurring for this project. Mr. Heumann asked further questions about the interface between the Comprehensive Plan and the Title 49 rewrite. Mr. Dumouchel discussed the expected extent of Phase 1.5 of the project (technical rewrite) and then the Comprehensive Plan alignment that will occur in Phase 2.

2. Title 49 Rewrite Status Update

Mr. Dumouchel provided a brief update on the progress of the Title 49 rewrite based on the PowerPoint provided within the meeting packet

3. Discussion – Tools for Flexibility – staff seeking opinions regarding variances, bonus provisions, etc.

Mr. Dumouchel provided a presentation on existing and proposed flexibility provisions within Title 49 which included variances, administrative adjustments, reasonable accommodation, and a zoning incentive program. Mr. Dumouchel requested feedback from the Committee on proposals for the creation of an administrative adjustment mechanism and a zoning incentive program to replace the existing bonus provisions. Mr. Pedersen indicated strong support for the administrative adjustment concept, likes that it's a simple mechanism that is easy to understand and implement. He thought the zoning incentive program could be quite useful but is concerned about it being complicated to use if we don't keep it simple. Mr. Heumann commented that developers will automatically ask for adjustments if available. He had comments regarding the percentages applied and whether each category should have the same as the impact is not equal between all standards, particularly height. He echoed Mr. Pedersen's concern about incentive programs being too complicated for developers to pursue and the need to keep them simple. Mr. Dumouchel indicated that his aim is to make the program as easy to understand and use as possible. Mr. Smith asked about how to deal with projects that are significantly different from the zoning code after Mr. Dumouchel discussed a tool found in some codes that create a special consideration overlay with Assembly approval of project. Mr. Heumann suggested a creative idea where the administrative adjustment percentages could scale based on how many standards are impacted.

G. STAFF REPORTS

None

H. COMMITTEE MEMBER COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

1. Open discussion on Title 49 rewrite, including process, public engagement, and specific questions with project staff

No discussion from the Committee

I. NEXT MEETING DATE - TBD

J. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIALS

None

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee meeting adjourned at 1:03pm

From: domadmin@juneau.org
To: [Rob Dumouchel](#)
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions
Date: Thursday, January 8, 2026 5:35:05 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

| |
|--|
| Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49 |
| 49.25.440 |
| What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section? |
| "the corresponding maximum lot coverage for a dwelling may be increased..." i think taking out "for a dwelling" would be good to remove as lot coverage often deals with accessory structures, covered porches/decks, and garages while dwelling is defined as to only be for human habitations |
| How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal? |
| see above |
| Name |
| Katie Oberlin |
| Email |
| koberlin03@gmail.com |

Rob Dumouchel

From: domadmin@juneau.org
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 10:34 AM
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

Title 49.65.900 – Definitions

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Title 49 currently classifies all equines as agricultural or livestock uses without regard to size, function, or land-use impact.

This results in miniature horses used as companion or service animals—whose physical size, waste output, noise, and nuisance profile are comparable to large dog breeds—being regulated as agricultural uses rather than household companion animals.

This classification is inconsistent with state and federal law recognizing miniature horses as permissible service animals (28 CFR § 35.136; adopted and enforceable in Alaska), and it limits administrative flexibility.

The lack of a size- or impact-based distinction creates an overbroad classification that can result in unnecessary permitting requirements or prohibitions in residential zones despite no material difference in external land-use impacts compared to permitted companion animals.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

Amend Title 49 to create a narrow, impact-based distinction for miniature horses kept as companion or service animals.

This could be accomplished by adding a definition that allows a limited number of miniature horses meeting specified size, care, and nuisance standards to be treated as household companion animals rather than agricultural uses.

Criteria could include limits on height and weight, prohibition on breeding or commercial activity, no agricultural structures, and application of the same nuisance and enforcement standards used for dogs.

This clarification would improve consistency with state and federal law, better align regulation with actual land-use impacts, and reduce unnecessary permitting while preserving neighborhood compatibility.

Proposed Title 49 Amendment

Amend CBJ Title 49.65 – Definitions

Add new definition:

Miniature Horse (Companion or Service Animal).

A miniature equine that:

1. Measures no more than 34 inches at the withers at maturity;
2. Is kept solely as a companion animal or recognized service animal, and not for agricultural, breeding, boarding, or commercial purposes;
3. Is maintained in a manner that does not require agricultural structures such as barns or paddocks; and
4. Is managed so as not to create noise, odor, waste, or other nuisance impacts greater than those typically associated with permitted household companion animals.

Miniature horses meeting these criteria shall not be classified as livestock or agricultural animals for purposes of land-use regulation under this title.



Amend CBJ Title 49.15 – Use Tables (Residential Zones)

Add permitted use (or accessory use):

Household Companion Animals, including dogs, cats, and qualifying miniature horses as defined in CBJ 49.65, subject to the limitations below.



Add new subsection – Standards

Standards for Miniature Horses as Companion or Service Animals

- A. A maximum of one (1) miniature horse per dwelling unit is permitted.
- B. No breeding, boarding, training for compensation, or commercial activity is allowed.
- C. Waste shall be managed daily and shall not accumulate on site.
- D. The animal shall be subject to the same nuisance, noise, and enforcement standards applicable to dogs under CBJ code.
- E. Nothing in this section limits enforcement action for animal neglect or public nuisance

This provision is intended to address companion or service animals only and does not expand agricultural or livestock uses in residential zoning districts.

Name

Dorene Lorenz

Email

Dorenemlorenz@aol.com

Rob Dumouchel

From: domadmin@juneau.org
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 11:01 AM
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

Title 49.65.900 – Definitions

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Standard household quail husbandry commonly involves incubators holding 50 eggs per hatch with an expected even sex ratio; birds mature in about two months, after which hens begin egg production and males are harvested, with approximately 30 laying hens sufficient to offset a household's average chicken egg purchases.

Title 49 does not distinguish between large agricultural poultry and small, domesticated quail kept for personal household use.

As a result, domestic quail—whose enclosure requirements, noise levels, waste output, and nuisance profile are significantly less than those of permitted household chickens—are implicitly classified as agricultural livestock.

This overbroad classification does not reflect actual land-use impacts and can create unnecessary permitting barriers or uncertainty in residential zones where comparable low-impact poultry are otherwise allowed.

Clarifying the definition presents an opportunity to align regulation with actual impacts and improve administrative consistency.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

Amend Title 49 to explicitly recognize domestic quail as a low-impact household poultry option in residential zones, subject to clear enclosure and nuisance standards.

Quail provide a fast-maturing, household-scale source of high-quality eggs and meat and require minimal space, feed, and infrastructure.

Standard husbandry practices allow approximately three to four quail per square foot of enclosed space, enabling meaningful food production within a very small footprint.

Their low noise levels, limited waste, and fully enclosed housing support neighborhood compatibility while enhancing household resilience and local food security.

Clarifying this use would improve regulatory certainty without introducing agricultural land-use impacts.

This clarification aligns with Comprehensive Plan goals related to community resilience, sustainability, and the ability of households to adapt to supply disruptions, emergencies, and changing economic conditions, without introducing agricultural land-use impacts or commercial activity.

Proposed Title 49 Amendment

Amend CBJ Title 49.65 – Definitions

Add new definition:

Domestic Quail (Companion or Household Poultry).

Small, domesticated galliform birds, including Coturnix or similar quail species, that are:

1. Kept solely for personal, non-commercial household use, including companionship or egg production;

2. Maintained in enclosed cages or hutches designed to prevent escape and predator access;
3. Not bred, sold, boarded, or raised for commercial purposes; and
4. Managed so as not to create noise, odor, waste, or other nuisance impacts greater than those typically associated with permitted household poultry.

Domestic quail meeting these criteria shall not be classified as agricultural livestock for purposes of land-use regulation under this title.



Amend CBJ Title 49.15 – Use Tables (Residential Zones)

Add permitted or accessory use:

Household Poultry, including chickens and domestic quail as defined in CBJ 49.65, subject to the standards below.



Add new subsection – Standards

Standards for Domestic Quail

- A. A maximum of fifty (50) quail per dwelling unit is permitted.
- B. Quail shall be kept fully enclosed at all times; free-ranging is prohibited.
- C. Waste shall be managed regularly to prevent odor, pests, or unsanitary conditions.
- D. Quail shall be subject to existing nuisance and enforcement standards applicable to household poultry and domestic animals.



This provision is intended to allow low-impact household poultry and does not expand agricultural or commercial livestock uses in residential zoning districts.

Name

Dorene Lorenz

Email

Dorenemlorenz@aol.com

Rob Dumouchel

From: domadmin@juneau.org
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 11:13 AM
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

CBJ Title 49.65 – Definitions

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Title 49 currently classifies all goats and sheep as agricultural livestock without regard to size, number, or household-scale use.

This categorical approach does not distinguish between large commercial agricultural operations and small, low-impact animals kept for companionship or limited household food and fiber production.

As a result, residents are unable to responsibly maintain small goats or sheep—comparable in size and land-use impact to permitted companion animals—despite no material difference in noise, waste, or neighborhood compatibility when appropriately managed.

This lack of differentiation limits administrative flexibility and is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan goals related to community resilience, sustainability, and household self-reliance, which encourage adaptation to supply disruptions and support for low-impact, residential-scale food security.

Clarifying these classifications presents an opportunity to better align land-use regulation with actual impacts while preserving neighborhood compatibility.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

Proposed Amendment – Domestic Goats and Sheep (Household Scale)

Amend CBJ Title 49.65 – Definitions

Add new definition:

Domestic Goats and Sheep (Household Companion or Food Animals).
Domesticated caprine and ovine animals that:

1. Measure no more than 34 inches at the withers at maturity;
2. Are kept at a household scale for companionship, personal milk production, fiber, or limited personal meat use;
3. Are maintained so as not to create noise, odor, waste, or other nuisance impacts greater than those typically associated with permitted household companion animals.

Domestic goats and sheep meeting these criteria shall not be classified as agricultural livestock for purposes of land-use regulation under this title.



Amend CBJ Title 49.15 – Use Tables (Residential Zones)

Revise permitted or accessory use to include:

Household Companion Animals, including dogs, cats, and domestic goats and sheep as defined in CBJ 49.65, subject to the standards below.



Add New Subsection – Standards for Domestic Goats and Sheep

Standards for Domestic Goats and Sheep

- A. The combined number of domestic goats and sheep permitted per dwelling unit shall not exceed the maximum number of dogs otherwise allowed under CBJ code.
- B. Animals shall be kept in secure enclosures designed to prevent escape and ensure animal welfare.
- C. Waste shall be managed regularly to prevent odor, pest attraction, or runoff impacts.
- D. Domestic goats and sheep shall be subject to the same nuisance, health, and enforcement standards applicable to dogs, including removal if persistent nuisance conditions are documented.



Clarification of Intent.

The allowance for domestic goats and sheep is limited to low-impact, household-scale uses and does not authorize agricultural or commercial livestock operations in residential zoning districts.

Nothing in this section shall be construed to expand allowable animal uses beyond those expressly stated.

Name

Dorene Lorenz

Email

Dorenemlorenz@aol.com

Rob Dumouchel

From: domadmin@juneau.org
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 12:06 PM
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

CBJ Title 49.65 (Definitions) and Title 49.30 (Nuisance / Enforcement Standards)

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Juneau's current one sentence provision addressing dog barking and animal noise relies on subjective or undefined standards, "Any keeper of an animal has to prevent the animal from disturbing a neighborhood or any number of persons by frequent or prolonged noise, barking, howling or other noises," which has led to inconsistent enforcement and neighborhood conflict.

In a November 2025 appellate decision interpreting this ordinance (CBJ 08.45.010(a)(1)), the Alaska Court of Appeals described the prohibition similarly and noted its vagueness absent an objective standard.

The problems are structural:

1. Any number of persons, that means one person is enough. There is no requirement that the person be a neighbor, resident, or affected long-term. A passerby, visitor, or transient qualifies. Juneau Karens love this.
2. No time qualifier. The standard applies 24/7. Barking at noon is treated the same as barking at 2 a.m.
3. No duration threshold as "Frequent" and "prolonged" are undefined. That leaves interpretation entirely subjective. Juneau Karens have determined that a dog barking once a day at the mailman is frequent and a "rough-rough" is prolonged.
4. No context exception. There is no carve-out for: alert barking, response to wildlife, territorial warning or safety or deterrence behavior.
5. "Prevent" standard. The owner is required to prevent disturbance, not reasonably manage it. That creates a near-strict liability framework. The owner is cited even if the dog is at a boarding facility or in the care of a dog sitter.

Taken together, the sentence does not ask: Is this barking unreasonable? It asks: Did someone say they were disturbed? That's a very different legal test.

The absence of clear, objective criteria makes it difficult for residents to understand compliance expectations and for enforcement staff to apply the code uniformly.

A real world example: A homeowner boards a dog at a licensed kennel or private residence.

A bear enters the yard. From inside the house the dog barks repeatedly - as dogs are expected to do in the presence of large predators.

A person walking on the street hears the barking in the distance and is annoyed or startled. They call animal control and report "frequent barking."

A. At that point the code does not require animal control to assess whether the barking was reasonable, whether it served a safety purpose, whether it was temporary or situational.

B. The code does not provide an objective duration limit that would allow the officer to say, "this does not qualify."

C. Because: the barking was audible, it disturbed "a person," and there is no contextual defense written into the ordinance,

animal control has very limited discretion.

Issuing a citation becomes the safest enforcement action even if the behavior was normal, justified, and short-lived.

Under the current code, that outcome is legally possible and that's the problem

D. Under the current structure the ordinance assigns responsibility to the owner or keeper of the animal.

It does not distinguish between the person who owns the animal, and the person who has care, custody, or control at the time of the alleged violation.

So if a dog is boarded with a friend, sitter, kennel, or caretaker, and a barking complaint occurs, the citation is still issued to the owner, even though: the owner is not present, the owner has no immediate ability to correct the behavior, and the owner may not even be aware the event occurred.

E. This is a classic strict liability problem created by bad law and bad enforcement.

1. No ability to comply. You cannot "prevent" behavior when you are not present. That violates basic fairness principles.
2. Misplaced deterrence. The person who could actually stop the behavior (the caretaker) is not accountable. The person cited cannot correct the issue in real time.
3. Enforcement inefficiency. Citations go to the wrong party. Cases are more likely to be dismissed. That means animal control time, prosecutor time, and court time are all spent on cases that never should have been citations in the first place, but which officers had little choice to avoid under the current language.
4. Chilling effect. Discourages responsible boarding, pet-sitting, and mutual aid arrangements. Penalizes owners for using licensed or informal care.

Clarifying the standard using measurable, best-practice criteria would reduce misuse, improve fairness, and support consistent, defensible enforcement while preserving the ability to address legitimate nuisance behavior.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

Amend CBJ Title 49 – Animal Nuisance and Noise

Responsibility for Compliance
Responsibility.

For purposes of enforcement under this title, responsibility for compliance shall rest with the person who has care, custody, or control of the animal at the time of the alleged violation.

An owner shall not be subject to citation for nuisance behavior occurring while the animal is lawfully in the care of another person, kennel, or facility, unless the owner knowingly permitted or directed the conduct.



Standards for Dog Barking and Animal Vocalization

A. Outdoor Barking.

A dog shall not engage in barking, howling, or other vocalization while outdoors or unattended in an exterior area that is continuous for more than 10 minutes or intermittent for more than 30 minutes within any three-hour period during quiet hours as defined in the City and Borough of Juneau noise ordinance, or continuous for more than 20 minutes or intermittent for more than 60 minutes within any three-hour period during non-quiet hours, when such noise is plainly audible beyond the property boundary.

B. Indoor Barking.

Barking or other vocalization occurring inside a fully enclosed dwelling shall constitute a nuisance only when it is unreasonable in duration or frequency, persists despite reasonable mitigation efforts, and occurs during quiet hours as defined in the City and Borough of Juneau noise ordinance, taking into account time of day, context, and pattern of behavior.



C. Enforcement Considerations.

In determining whether barking or animal noise constitutes a violation, enforcement officers shall consider:

1. Whether the animal was indoors or outdoors;
2. Time of day and duration of the noise;

3. Whether the vocalization was a reasonable response to an identifiable stimulus, including, but not limited to, wildlife, visitors, or perceived threats; and

4. Whether reasonable steps were taken by the person in control of the animal to mitigate the behavior.



Intent.

This section is intended to regulate unreasonable nuisance barking consistent with the City's general noise standards, preserve neighborhood livability, provide clear and objective enforcement criteria, and prevent misuse of the ordinance for harassment, while recognizing normal and situational animal behavior.

Name

Dorene Lorenz

Email

Dorenemlorenz@aol.com

Rob Dumouchel

From: domadmin@juneau.org
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 1:01 PM
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

CBJ Title 49.65.900 – Definitions

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Juneau's six-hen rule assumes perpetual laying hens, implicitly forbids rotational meat birds and prevents households from raising dual-purpose breeds, cycling older hens into food and improving food resilience.

Ironically, this increases waste (aging hens disposed of elsewhere), reduces food security and doesn't actually reduce neighborhood impacts.

Additionally, fertilized eggs require roosters. COVID taught us that Juneau's demand for fertilized eggs greatly exceeds the current supply and getting eggs from outside of Juneau is unreliable.

Roosters crow primarily during daylight, do not crow continuously, and are often less disruptive than permitted equipment (lawn mowers, snowblowers).

A total ban blocks fertilized eggs, blocks sustainable flock rotation, forces reliance on imports and doesn't actually correlate with nuisance outcomes.

The problem isn't roosters. The problem is unmanaged roosters.

Other jurisdictions have successfully mitigated this by enacting ordinances which do all four of the following:

1. Limit number to two (a heir and a spare, who work together in protecting the flock from predators)
2. Tie enforcement to noise standards, not species
3. Restrict time of day, not existence
4. Use conditional permission, revocable if abused

This gives residents flexibility and gives the City control.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

Conditional Rooster Allowance

Amend Title 49 – Domestic Poultry Standards

Roosters.

Two (2) roosters may be permitted per dwelling unit solely for household-scale egg fertilization and flock maintenance, subject to the standards below.

Standards

A. Rooster vocalization shall be subject to the City and Borough of Juneau noise ordinance, including quiet-hour restrictions.

B. A rooster shall not be kept in a manner that results in repeated violations of the animal noise or nuisance provisions of this title.

C. The presence of a rooster may be revoked upon documented nuisance violations, following notice and opportunity to correct.

D. Roosters shall not be kept for commercial breeding or sale.

Name

Dorene Lorenz

Email

Dorenemlorenz@aol.com

Rob Dumouchel

From: domadmin@juneau.org
Sent: Friday, January 23, 2026 1:22 PM
To: Rob Dumouchel
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49

CBJ Title 49.65 (Definitions) and Title 49.15 (Use Tables – Residential Animal Uses)

What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section?

Why six hens works for eggs—but not for meat or resilience

Eggs. Six good laying hens can supply 30–36 eggs/week at peak. That’s fine for a couple with light egg use. It already strains for a family of four, winter production dips, molting and aging hens.

10 hens is the sweet spot for most families—steady supply with a buffer for molting, winter slowdown, or a couple hens aging out.

Meat birds are the real problem. Meat birds are raised in batches, harvested at 12-24 weeks pending on breed, and are not long-term residents.

A typical, modest household meat cycle might look like 10–12 birds raised at once, harvested over a short window, with zero birds remaining afterward.

Under a six-bird cap, this is impossible - even though the birds are present temporarily, the impact window is short, and the waste footprint is tightly managed.

The code treats “number at any moment” as if it were “permanent population.” That’s the mismatch.

Encouraging the use of heritage and slow-growing poultry breeds for household meat production supports animal welfare, food quality, and neighborhood compatibility.

Unlike modern commercial broilers which mature for processing at 10-12 weeks, heritage breeds mature more slowly, typically requiring longer grow-out periods of 20-24 weeks, but do so with lower daily feed intake, reduced stress, and more gradual waste production.

This slower growth pattern aligns with household-scale, low-intensity practices and avoids the high-density, short-cycle impacts associated with industrial meat birds.

Allowing longer grow-out periods supports humane, best-practice animal care by encouraging the use of poultry breeds that develop at a natural pace, reducing the risk of preventable suffering associated with extreme growth selection.

This approach reflects community values of animal welfare, responsible stewardship, and ethical household food production, while maintaining flexibility for residents and clear regulatory standards.

Allowing a longer harvest window accommodates these breeds while maintaining limited flock sizes and minimizing nuisance impacts, thereby supporting sustainable household food production consistent with residential zoning and community resilience goals.

How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal?

Amend CBJ Title 49.15 – Use Tables (Residential Zones)

Revise permitted or accessory use to read:

Household Poultry, subject to the standards set forth below.



Add New Subsection – Standards for Household Poultry

A. Laying Hens.

Up to ten (10) laying hens may be kept per dwelling unit on a year-round basis for personal egg production.

B. Meat Birds (Temporary).

In addition to permitted laying hens, a household may keep up to twelve (12) poultry at a time for personal meat production, subject to the following limitations:

1. Meat birds shall be kept for a period not to exceed twenty-four (24) weeks per batch;
2. No more than two (2) such batches per calendar year shall be permitted; and
3. Meat birds shall be harvested or otherwise removed from the property at the conclusion of each batch period.

C. Total Limits.

At no time shall the total number of poultry on the property exceed the combined limits authorized by this section.

D. Prohibited Uses.

Commercial sale, breeding for sale, boarding, or on-site retail activity is prohibited.

E. Nuisance and Sanitation.

All poultry shall be kept in a manner that prevents odor, pests, noise, or other nuisance impacts and shall remain subject to all applicable nuisance, sanitation, and enforcement provisions of CBJ code.



Intent.

This section is intended to allow household-scale poultry for personal food use while preserving neighborhood compatibility. The temporary allowance for meat birds recognizes short-duration, rotational use and does not authorize agricultural or commercial poultry operations in residential zoning districts.

| |
|--|
| Name |
| Dorene Lorenz |
| Email |
| Dorenemlorenz@aol.com |

From: domadmin@juneau.org
To: [Rob Dumouchel](#)
Subject: New submission from Manager - Title 49 Suggestions
Date: Friday, February 13, 2026 2:18:51 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

| |
|--|
| Specific Chapter/Section of Title 49 |
| 49.45.130(c) |
| What is the issue/problem/inefficiency/opportunity within this chapter/section? |
| (c) A sign permit application will be reviewed and decided by the department within three working days after receipt of a complete application. three working days is quick. sometimes review takes longer. |
| How would you propose improving Title 49 relevant to this submittal? |
| remove the time constraint OR allow at least a week or two |
| Name |
| Kathryn Oberlin |
| Email |
| kathryn.oberlin@juneau.gov |