

# ASSEMBLY LANDS HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MINUTES

February 23, 2026 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 Neil Steininger, Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Paul Kelly, Maureen Hall

**Additional Assembly Members Present:** Mayor Weldon, Christine Woll

**Liaisons Present:** Paulette Schirmer, PRAC liaison; Jim Becker, Docks & Harbors Board liaison ; Lacey Derr, Planning Commission liaison

**Liaisons Absent:** none

**Staff Present:** Lands Manager Dan Bleidorn; Deputy City Manager Robert Barr; CDD Planning Manager Scott Ciambor

## D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – approved as presented

## E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 26, 2026 Draft LHED Minutes – approved as presented

## F. AGENDA TOPICS

### 1. Vertical Bridge Request to Amend the Communications Tower Lease at 3000 Fish Creek Road

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. No committee discussion.

**Mr. Kelly moved that the Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee provide a motion of support to amend the lease of CBJ property located at 3000 Fish Creek Road. Motion passed unanimously.**

### 2. Proposed Land Trade between CBJ and the State of Alaska

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Mr. Kelly asked what we currently use this property for and what would we use the easement for if we move this forward. Mr. Bleidorn replied that currently the property is vacant, and it's outside of the existing Whale Park area, and I think if we were able to get an easement from DOT as part of a land trade, it could be used for any type of activity that wouldn't build a permanent structure on it. That could be something like a public market style event, or anything that would be non-permanent, and anything that would allow the DOT to come in and utilize the property for reinforcing the bridge in the future.

Chair Steininger asked if this isn't the area directly underneath the bridge, but more of the grassy area near where there's the whale-tailed looking benches. Mr. Bleidorn replied that it was correct, it is not the area directly under the bridge, it's directly south and adjacent to the bridge, the corner of this property is in the shadow of the bridge. This property has the tax id of 1C060K580060.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs asked for confirmation and that Mr. Bleidorn used the example of a public market, you know, I'm imagining tents or things like that, so long as the guideline be, if we can break it down within a day, we could stage something there. Mr. Bleidorn replied that it was correct and any easement

for use would be negotiated with the DOT, but one time prior to the 2016 Land Management Plan being adopted, the Assembly looked at this property to try to think about somehow doing some type of affordable housing on it. It was very complicated because of the shape and size of the property. But I think at that time, DOT took note, and they were maybe against it, and since then, they've been thinking about ways to try to acquire this from the city. I think it's been on their mind for about 10 years since we went through the public process of adopting the Land Management Plan.

Mr. Kelly asked if the values of the land are approximately the same, and if that matters in a government-to-government transaction. Mr. Bleidorn replied it does matter but less so in a government-to-government transaction. Based on the square footage of what we would need from the DOT, it's likely that the city property that we would be giving up as part of this land trade would have a lower value than the property that we'd be acquiring from the DOT. We're going to work on calculating that out and making sure that we negotiate a land trade that is in the city's best interest, financially. That is something we'll look at in the future, but most likely, we'd be benefiting more than a value-value-wise.

**Ms. Hughes-Skandijs moved that the Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee provide a motion of support to direct staff to begin the negotiation of land trade with DOT. Motion passed unanimously.**

**3. Request for Direction on the Disposal of City Property located at 155 Heritage Way**

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Mr. Kelly asked that under the current zoning of this area, what could a future owner use this property for. Mr. Bleidorn replied that this property is zoned mixed use, so there's a wide array of future uses that could take place here.

Ms. Hall asked that regardless of who wins the seal bid, would the building go on to the property tax roll, or would that depend? Mr. Bleidorn replied that depending on who purchases it, if a non-profit acquires a building, or if another government entity acquires the building, then we'd have to look at their tax abilities. But if it does sell to somebody who acquires it is a private business or a private entity, then it would just be on the tax roll.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs noted the breakdown and description of each of the disposal types from city code, and wanted to discuss the disposal methods, particularly for this property. Were there any times that the city has exempted a specific disposal by ordinance? Are there examples in recent memory? Mr. Bleidorn replied that he thinks that question is related to options for terms and conditions, and I think there's the option for the Assembly to choose to make some type of request for proposals, which would be more related to a response rather than a disposal. I think that would be another option and I briefly touched on that in the memo, but I think if the assembly determines that they want some type of parameters, guidelines, or a specific future use in mind, it might make sense to do some type of request for proposals and then determine how to move forward with the disposal from that. Ms. Hughes-Skandijs followed up to ask that when she looks at this, a request for proposals is one of the things the city could do, but if the city exempts this particular piece of property by ordinance, is there anything that stops the city from doing some modified version that's a combination of these, where the city desires to have some control of the future use, or some control that's not based solely on price, so it's not solely a disposal, but mimics some of what is good about, say, a sealed competitive bid. Mr. Bleidorn replied that any type of disposal, if the Assembly determines that certain things they want to have completed as part of this, we could incorporate all those things into an ordinance that would authorize the disposal.

Chair Steininger asked if we did a sealed bid auction on the property, could we include parameters, along the lines of sometimes when the state auctions off property, you get a credit towards your bid based on certain criteria, usually it's like a veteran's preference or something along that line. But could we structure something where we said we want to see housing preferential, but we don't want to put so many strings on this as to close down the pool of bidders, and say have some credit towards your bid if you intended to use the property for housing, or something along those lines, rather than going to a full RFP, some kind of mixed option. Is that within the realm of possibility? Mr. Bleidorn replied that it's definitely within the realm of possibility, and there's opportunity for development proposals to be a significant factor in the award, and if that's the case, it would be subject to approval by the Assembly.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijis asked if it is true more often than not that when we do an appraisal it comes in higher than our assessed value. Would you say that's true in the disposals where we've done an appraisal? Mr. Bleidorn replied that it's a complicated question to provide an answer to, especially because we don't have assessments of publicly owned property. The assessment database is based on properties that are on the tax roll, and this building is not on the tax roll. I talked to the assessors and it's hard for them to evaluate this property, especially when you can look at it in different parameters. If the Assembly determines that we want to do something that's more complicated than a straight sealed competitive bid sale, then maybe evaluating the price through a appraisal makes the most sense. But the competitive nature of a sealed bid sale would be the starting price, the \$2.5 million, would be the minimum bid. And so I think, you know, the more parameters, the more terms and conditions, the more complicated we want to make this, the more we would want to fine-tune the value of the property prior to going and looking for requests for proposals, for example.

Mr. Kelly asked if we would be able to apply tax incentives to a future buyer if, say, they end up building housing, or some other use that the Assembly decides that we find important. Mr. Bleidorn replied that the building is in downtown, and we do have tax incentives in place for downtown, so outside of the sale process, say somebody acquired it from the CBJ, and they've determined that their best use is to build housing, it is in the downtown area, so they can apply for the tax abatement, and then they could follow through and also apply for the Affordable Housing Fund loan program, which has an extra benefit if it's downtown, they score higher if they're downtown. There's opportunity for new owners of this building to apply for the existing programs that the city has to help build housing.

Chair Steininger asked about the need to generate some revenue in order to help offset the cost of our move to the Burns building, if that weren't a factor, would it still be the recommendation to dispose of this property when we're leaving? Are there other municipal uses for this land or this property that we should be considering as we think about a sale. Mr. Bleidorn replied that he did discuss this with the city manager and a couple of department heads, and it didn't appear that there was any need to retain this property for a public use within the current city programs. It does make sense, regardless of the move, if this building was going to be put up for sale, I would still be recommending sealed bid. It provides the fastest, most efficient way to sell city property. It allows for the most involvement from citizens as far as the opportunity to place a bid on it, and, it's just pretty straightforward, and it's the most common used way to dispose of city property. The minimum bid at \$2.5 million is in a lot of ways less important to finalize the actual true appraised value, because the market would determine the final value of the property. I'll just note, there has been cases when we sold vacant property out at the Lena or Renninger subdivisions, where we didn't have any bids, and then from that point, the property was put on the market as an over-the-counter sale, in which case, it's just made available and put on our website. In all those cases, people reached out to us after a certain amount of time, and then acquired them at that minimum bid value.

Ms. Hall asked if the city considered this site for a future city museum. Mr. Bleidorn replied that they have not and that he doesn't know if the city would want to. There's a list of problems with this building, and if we were going to try to retrofit it for a museum, it would be extremely costly. If that's something the Assembly wanted to evaluate, I would defer to the City Manager's office, but as staff, I would recommend against that.

Chair Steininger asked if there has been any consideration into retaining ownership of the land, but entering into a long-term lease with someone, so we can kind of maintain kind of ownership footprint in downtown Juneau, or would that not be viable moving forward? Mr. Bleidorn replied that we haven't evaluated trying to continue to own the land. It starts to get pretty complicated to own the land under a building that's beyond its lifespan. It could provide opportunity in the sense that not owning the land would mean the future owners of whatever gets built here wouldn't necessarily be taxed on the land value of it. It could be some type of land trust model. We don't have anything like that currently, and it would be creating a new program, it would be something we need to evaluate. Currently, the Land Division consists of just myself, and so I'm the only employee in the Division of Lands and Resources, so starting a new program like that, I have a lot of caution, just with the amount of time and energy it would take and the cost to continue to own the land. And then also the legal team would really need to evaluate it as well, but it could be something we could look at and evaluate if the Assembly determines that's the direction they want to go.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs wanted to break up the motion and spoke to her reasoning in that she wanted a motion that the city engage with the responding appraiser to get the property appraised. She commented that she's not interested in doing a disposal to the competitive sealed bid to the highest bidder. And I think, as Mr. Bleidorn said, if you are looking to do something else, or the wilier you're trying to get with it, perhaps the more it matters that you are getting closer to the value, and if an appraisal helps us do that, I think that cost is worth it. I will use the example of the property over by the archipelago lot, I think it was listed for \$10 million, and I know that 2.5 is just the minimum bid, but this footprint, knowing the amount of traffic it gets and everything else, I think it would be helpful to get a more of an idea of what that's appraised at. My motion would be to engage with that appraiser and get the property appraised, and I would ask unanimous consent.

Mr. Kelly objected for the purposes of a question to evaluate whether or not he supports this, and asked what the other motion idea Ms. Hughes-Skandijs is pursuing. Ms. Hughes-Skandijs replied that it was her intent to break this up into pieces to find the points the committee would agree on and to direct staff to bring this information back to exempt by ordinance.

Chair Steininger objected to asking how long it would take to get an appraisal. Mr. Bleidorn replied that maybe June or July he would have more information. Bleidorn also noted that the CBJ wouldn't engage with the one appraiser since the cost is above the amount for a sole source, CBJ would create an RFP to solicit appraisers. Chair Steininger followed up to ask if we chose the sealed bid process how long would that take? Mr. Bleidorn replied about 9 months.

**Motion: that the city engage with the responding appraiser to get the property appraised.**

**Hall – No**

**Kelly – No**

**Steininger – No**

**Hughes-Skandijs – Yes**

**Motion fails 3:1.**

Mr. Kelly moved that the Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee provide a motion of support for the sealed competitive bid sale of 155 Heritage Way with the minimum bid of \$2.5M and direct the City Attorney to draft an ordinance for introduction authorizing the sale.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs objected about timeline factors and the highest and best use of this municipal facility and that with all of the other things we have going on with CBJ, we are rapidly moving this forward and feels ill-advised.

Mr. Kelly objected to asking that if this moves forward, we would have time to consider variations on the proposal. Mr. Bleidorn replied that the next step would be the ordinance for introduction that could include the terms and conditions that the assembly could help draft.

**Motion vote:**

**Ms. Hall – Yes**

**Chair Steininger – Yes**

**Ms. Hughes-Skandijs – No**

**Mr. Kelly – Yes**

**Motion passes 3:1.**

**4. Amending Title 69 Code Related to Peer-to-Peer Vehicle Sharing**

Mr. Barr discussed this topic. Mr. Kelly commented that he did receive an email from a concerned constituent, a business owner, who was mentioning that this could create something of a couple different markets. There's this market of peer-to-peer rental, but then there's also the rental cars that are out at the airport. They would probably not be subject to this excise tax, are there any other taxes and fees that car rental companies would be paying, so we're not adding a disadvantage to these peer-to-peer rentals. Mr. Barr replied that it was correct, traditional car rental companies would not be subject to this excise tax. We generally have been seeing the impacts that I was speaking to earlier from peer-to-peer, car rental companies, not from traditional car rental companies, traditional car rental companies, I'm sure there are exceptions, but typically utilize their own private property, their own methods of renting, and not marketplace facilitators like peer-to-peer rental companies do. I would say they are similar, but slightly different markets. Mr. Kelly followed up to ask if there is anything that would affect them in the same way as this excise tax so that we are not unfairly adding or discouraging users from using a car rental company versus a peer-to-peer. Mr. Barr replied that's it's slightly different. I'll use the airport example, it's typical for traditional rental car companies to operate out of a permanent fixed space at airports. Space that they may lease or rent from an airport, space that have associated business costs that a peer-to-peer car rental company would not have. It is also common in airports, including our airport, to have a specific tax that only applies to peer-to-peer car rental companies and not their traditional car rental companies, because the impacts that those two businesses impart on the airport, in this example, or on downtown and my example are different.

Chair Steininger asked if this would apply to any peer-to-peer car rental within the red zone on the map. Would that be regardless of whether the pickup and drop-off point was on private property or public property, or is it only if it's on public property? Mr. Barr replied that this would apply to peer-to-peer car rental companies that have an origination or an ending point, anywhere in those red circles. It may, if the Assembly wishes, it may, I'm not sure, be possible to create, using geotargeting and engaging very specifically with the industry, to only target, what is public versus private. Anecdotally, what we see is public use of those peer-to-peer, marketplace-facilitated by software company rentals.

Ms. Woll asked that if she remembers correctly, we recently increased parking fees significantly at our lots with the intent to solve a different related problem, which was that peer-to-peer car sharing networks we're using are lots and leaving cars. Am I remembering that correctly, have we seen any results favorable as a result of that, and, I'm assuming, if yes, we're still having a congestion problem, people just aren't leaving the cars there for a long period of time. Mr. Barr replied that we did recently increase parking permit fees, as well as the fine structure, and I think the fine structure is what you're recalling. We are seeing better compliance in the garages, due to that increased fine structure. We nevertheless still see significant waiting lists in both of our garages downtown. We are currently oversold in each garage by over 45%, we aim for a 30% oversell rate, and even with that oversell rate, which is standard in the industry, because not every permit is being used at every period of point in time, even with those oversell rates, we have waiting lists of nearly 200, for the Marine Parking Garage and 87 for the Downtown Transportation Center.

Chair Steininger asked that looking at the map, I noticed the half-mile distance laid out in the ordinance, there is a very small sliver of neighborhood on Douglas Island that would be excluded. Is that something that could be cared for in the ordinance, so we don't end up with just a handful of households that can't operate peer-to-peer? Mr. Barr replied yes, absolutely. Chair Steininger followed up to ask about the regions. The way the ordinance is drafted right now, would it require an amendment at such time that the Huna Totem development opens, or would it be able to just adapt itself? Mr. Barr replied that it was his understanding of the way the ordinance is written right now, and I'll correct myself if it turns out that I'm wrong, but I believe it is written in such a way that the Huna Totem Dock would simply be included once it is constructed and does not require an amendment.

Mr. Kelly asked if the Assembly pass this ordinance as written, how would we publicize the existence of the zone, so people are aware of it? Would we have something like this on our website? Would we have plaques in various places, so that way companies would know the boundaries of the zone. Mr. Barr replied that in this industry, there is only one marketplace facilitator that is operating, and we would work directly with them, to ensure that they are aware of the map and aware of when they would need to apply that excise tax. The users are generally tourists. We would have information on our website for those industrious tourists who would want to kind of seek that out, but I would anticipate that most would learn about it when they saw the excise tax on their Turo bill.

Chair Steininger asked that in considering putting this together, the half-mile radius, my assumption is it's based on how far a cruise passenger might walk to get to a, a peer-to-peer rental. Rather than that strict radius, was it considered or reviewed with Law whether we could just draw a boundary around certain neighborhoods to kind of make it a little less arbitrary at those end areas on that circle. Mr. Barr replied that we did not have that specific conversation, but we can.

**Ms. Hughes-Skandijs moved that the Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee refer this to the next regularly scheduled assembly meeting for introduction and to also refer this ordinance and memo to both the Committee of the Whole and to the Visitor Industry Task Force.**

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs spoke to her motion that she appreciates this ordinance and thinks this is a good thing and makes sense to put them in front of the whole assembly. It sounds like there's maybe already a couple of amendments that we might want to make, the COW might be the place to do that. The VITF is working through issues just such as this right now and based on my conversation with you, just talking about downtown congestion, so it'd make perfect sense for them to see this and also weigh in on it.

Mr. Kelly objected to asking if we know if the next VITF meeting would be before or after the next COW? Mr. Barr replied that the next VITF is March 12<sup>th</sup> and the next COW is March 16<sup>th</sup>. **Objections removed, motion passes unanimously.**

## G. STAFF REPORTS

### 1. Short-Term Rentals

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs commented about the memos in the packet ranging pretty far back into Assembly history that the Assembly has touched on this topic. That is not the full and complete list, and I have spoken in this committee prior to, working with Mr. Bleidorn to bring something in front of this committee, to pick up the work following the Short-Term Rental Task Force. The Mayor at the beginning of the year had also requested any Assembly member comments and questions that this committee take up that topic, and finish the work of the rental task force. Because that was not ripe as of this meeting, this packet material, these memos are simply to base you, so you will be ready by next meeting. The toolkit that staff put together for the task force is, again, fairly extensive, and you also have the findings and recommendation of the task force. I would say let that be our homework for the next one, and we will pick this back up the next regularly scheduled LHED meeting.

### 2. Affordable Housing Fund Verbal Update from Scott Ciambor

Mr. Ciambor discussed this topic. Mr. Kelly commented that last year, with the suggestion that we explore options to motivate certain licensed professionals, like teachers, medical professionals and other people who we need in this community, but might be having trouble finding housing. What I would be interested in seeing is what it might look like to have the following couple of proposals. The first one is for future applicants for the Affordable Housing to perhaps have a way that would benefit additional units being provided to these licensed professions. And the other one is to provide some sort of incentive for developers who might already be underway, who might want to provide additional affordable units to people in these licensed professions. Mr. Ciambor replied that this is the perfect time for the Assembly and the LHEDC to have those sort of discussions, because we are right at the point where in the process of wrapping up the last round. There's a grant that's going to the Assembly for approval next month, but that essentially ends Round 5. The timeline was created in order to give the assembly, opportunity to decide what next year's round looks like based on your fiscal schedule. At this point, during the annual report, we will look at some changes for the program. I have had conversations with Mr. Kelly, as well as staff, so we're clear on what his ideas are. In the memo, you will have a summary of that concept, technically how it will work, as well as some of the pros and cons for making that change if you agree to do so.

Ms. Hall was concerned about zeroing in on a couple professions, when across the board, from clerks at Super Bear to construction workers, people are experiencing homelessness, SEARHC is building that new property over by Riverview for professionals and I think Bartlett is also going down that same road. I think it's a problem across the borough without zeroing in, but I don't know how much staff time we want to utilize focusing, unless we have some clear data as to why those two professions, in particular.

Ms. Hughes-Skandijs asked to clarify if now is a good time if anybody has any ideas for utilizing the housing fund differently next year, is that an accurate summation, and would you say if people had other ideas, they should be talking to you now? Mr. Ciambor replied that it was correct and the good news is that we've got 5 years in a row of having organized and operated the Housing Fund program, so there's a pretty clear picture of what works and what doesn't, as well as pretty clear where the Assembly's decision points are. The main decision point for the Assembly is the budget. Are you going to put money into the funds? The second major, decision point is what is the cap per unit for affordable housing developers, and what is the cap per unit for private developers, with their loan terms. Most of

those things are already in place, so, if there are minor changes or suggestions, it's not very difficult to analyze what those changes to the program can be. We've run it for 5 years, we're clearly making head roads in terms of getting loans out to multifamily workforce housing, and our affordable housing providers who are looking to develop in the future are relying on the fund being available in the future. It's not difficult to analyze ideas that the Assembly might have because we have so much experience.

Mayor Weldon appreciated that Mr. Kelly brought this forward to try some of the professions that we have a hard time recruiting for, but as Ms. Hall said, we have several people that are from all kinds of things. But my question would be to the maker of the motion, how would you enforce that? So let's just say you have nursing housing, and for whatever reason, someone is no longer a nurse, they are retired, they got fired, you kick them out, and what happens if there's a divorce and the person that you were trying to put in there is the one that left, and so do you kick out the wife or husband that's left? I don't know how you would enforce that, any thoughts? Mr. Kelly replied that to be clear he listed two professions as an example, I wasn't specifically narrowing it down to those professions, and to respond to Ms. Hall, this would not be replacing the affordable housing that we have now, it'd be additional units of affordable housing, so it would help. I don't have answers to the mayor's questions at this moment, but, I guess, to the point, she's asking, addressing this to the maker of the motion, this isn't a new motion, this is a motion that was passed out of the LHED back in August, I'm just clarifying, what I may be previewing for the current LHEDC what I'm hoping to address, and hopefully we can discuss that at the next meeting.

Mr. Bleidorn noted that to be clear, this is a staff item, so a motion is inappropriate at this time.

Mr. Ciambor noted that CDD does have a senior housing planner position open, so we're going to have recruitment and hopefully have staff on and a few months of discussion about the housing fund going into the new year as our training opportunity. And CDD staff, about 9 of us, went and visited Chilkat Vistas, the new apartments being created, by Michael and Bill Heumann and their project director. We spent about 45 minutes in a unit, talking about their travails, what's working, what their concerns are, what they think about this product coming online, as well as the importance of the Affordable Housing Fund to it. So I would encourage, if you have connections with Bill and Michael, to take a site visit, because it was really enlightening to their journey on getting housing built in our town.

#### **H. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

Mr. Becker from D&H noted that they voted unanimously to develop North Douglas. There's a lot of need for that expansion. There's quite a bit to be done, and more will be revealed later.

Ms. Schirmer from PRAC noted that they reviewed the FY26-27 budget, discussed the need for solving the roof leaks and the turf at the Field House, and the lighting at Adair Kennedy, we're continuing public meetings on Jackie Renninger.

Ms. Derr from the Planning Commission noted that at their last meeting on January 27th there was public questions regarding city disposals and land sales, and how it goes to private users. Ms. Derr asked maybe if we could have an informational discussion at some point. I don't know if it's more appropriate in this body or for the Planning Commission, but it would just be really helpful, that way we can help answer questions.

**I. NEXT MEETING DATE – March 16, 2026**

**J. ADJOURNMENT – 6:01pm**