



**ASSEMBLY LANDS HOUSING & ECONOMIC
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MINUTES**

March 16, 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

Assemblymembers Present: Chair Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Paul R. Kelly, Neil Steininger, Maureen Hall

Assemblymembers Absent: None

Additional Assemblymembers Present: Mayor Beth Weldon (in audience), Christine Woll, and Nathaniel (Nano) Brooks (in audience)

Liaisons Present: Paulette Schirmer, PRAC liaison (via Zoom)

Liaisons Absent: Jim Becker, Docks & Harbors Board Liaison; Lacey Derr, Planning Commission liaison

Staff Present: Acting Community Development Department Director Scott Ciambor, City Manager Katie Koester, City Attorney Emily Wright, Municipal Clerk Breckan Hendricks, and Meeting Technician Kevin Allen

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – APPROVED AS PRESENTED

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. February 23, 2026 Draft LHED Minutes – APPROVED AS PRESENTED

F. AGENDA TOPICS

1. Affordable Housing Fund Annual Report

Mr. Ciambor discussed this topic. Mr. Steininger asked about the Accessory Dwelling Unit Grant Program, looking at the numbers, it looks there's 28 denials and 35 grants. It seems like a high rate of denials. Can you speak to why an application might get denied? Mr. Ciambor replied that one of the components of the program is a certificate of occupancy has to be received within 18 months, some of those projects don't get built in time, or they don't come back for the grant, that's the primary reason for those denials. However, there were periods, especially during the COVID years, where we extended the grant period from 18 months to 2 years based on project by project. Everybody understands there's contractor delays or some extenuating circumstances, so there's a

lot of approvals that we've had extensions on, and we try to work with applicants, but the primary reason for the denials was not completing it or getting the grant in time.

Ms. Woll asked on that same table there on the ADU grant program, just making sure I understand this table, when it says total number of ADUs, does that mean how many were built in that year, unrelated to the program, just total in our community based on permitting data, is that correct? Mr. Ciambor confirmed that was correct. Ms. Woll followed up to say we're making just a small dent in terms of how many we are granting relative to how many are being built. Do you know why people are not applying for funds, are the funds too restrictive? Do people do not know about the program, are we hitting our limits. Mr. Ciambor replied that in general the grant program is popular. We get inquiries all the time. It's become more popular in the last year, year and a half, since two things happened, the grant amount has increased to \$13,500, as well as the change in the ordinance allowing for more opportunity for people to create ADUs on their property. In the past, we've heard concerns that some people just don't want to engage with local government grant programs or they're of means, and they don't need the grants, or they don't think it applies to them. We could probably do better marketing. However, like I say, now that spring is arriving, I have got a list of people to contact with who are interested in the program and want to get on the list. Another reason for people maybe not participating in the ADU grant program is the funding isn't enough. There was a proposal a couple years ago to bring it up to \$50,000. We hear a lot of people are more in line with what it would take to get them to do it because the overall cost.

Mr. Kelly asked about the budget and revenue sources. He was noticing that the general fund appears to have the same numbers, it looks like it's \$1 million for FY27, \$750,000 for 28 and 29, and then it goes up to over a million for FY30. I was wondering where those numbers came from. Mr. Ciambor replied that when the 1% sales tax was voted on, those were the amounts that came along with that vote and that the finance department had projected out once revenue was collected. For that line, that comes from the 1% sales tax conversation that the Assembly has had.

Mr. Kelly asked if given the additional exemptions, are we still budgeting about the same amount in the general fund? Ms. Koester replied that for this year, the direction was not to reduce all of our sales tax capital projects across the board, but to reduce certain projects. For FY27, the CIP that was introduced at PW&F Committee today, that does include that, and the manager's budget does include that full scheduled funding amount. In future years, the Assembly may want to tackle that revenue reduction differently, but that's the direction that we're working under.

Ms. Woll asked about the Manufactured Home Down Payment Assistance Program, with rising sale prices, we increased the amount people can borrow, are we, in terms of the interest we're seeing in the program, are we seeing steady dropping increase as some of those things have changed? Mr. Ciambor replied that in 2024, we worked with True North to update the program, because just like housing costs everywhere, manufactured homes saw a rise in costs that the original terms of the program weren't really working to attract people. We bumped it up to \$20,000, or 50% of the required down payment, based on what they're seeing with their clients. It seems to be working well because we are getting more applicants than we've had the previous 3 or 4 years. There is definitely interest at that level. I did reach out to True North last week to say, hey, let's reconvene, because I did hear from other manufactured homeowners that they are thinking there might be a need to boost it a little bit more because the prices are still going up for that type of a unit. I've reached out to True North to converse on what that might look like in the future, and if they're seeing the same thing.

Ms. Woll asked about when the program was originally set up, it was intended to target both affordable housing, being less than 80% AMI, and workforce housing, which is up to 130, and it was my understanding that we made it a requirement for all funded projects to have some less than 80% AMI. I'm getting a head nod, so good. We obviously need affordable housing, we also need workforce housing, are we seeing applicants that are interested in workforce housing that are not interested in our program because of that requirement or is that preventing anyone from coming into our pipeline that might help us meet those goals. Mr. Ciambor replied with a little background on the Affordable Housing Fund Program, for clarity on how unique our fund program is. Back in 2010, when we created this program it was considered a housing trust fund program. In the memo, there's a link to the Housing Trust Fund project, which gives the guidance on the 350 state and local housing trust funds that there are across the country. Those housing trust funds are basically all 80% AMI and below. When ours was created, it was originally intended just to be a non-profit regional housing authority grant program. Over time, in between 2012 and 2018 with the Affordable Housing Commission, there was debate that multifamily workforce housing loans is also a huge problem in our community, why can't we create a program that does both? We've fused both goals together through this one program, which is extremely efficient, and the caveat, when you want to use private developer using public funds, is you have to get something in return for it. At the time in the 2018 rewrite, it was, what is a good return, but not going to kill projects, that's where 20% of the units at 80% AMI came into. Since 2018, the AMI rates have increased, it's not a high barrier for private developers to meet. In some cases, to be competitive, they aren't going to charge 80% AMI, they might even go lower, based on the numbers that come out annually. Long story short, unique program, meeting both of the community's goals, and it's not really a deterrent to developers who want to engage and use it, because the threshold to participate isn't very high. But what you will see about the spreadsheet in your packet is the 5-year trend. Rounds 1 and 2, affordable housing developers were on it. They were ready, they had projects, they knew how to work with local government. Workforce housing loans, that's a different relationship. Fair market, government funding sources, two different languages, like, different countries. It's taken a couple of times to get them to engage and now you're starting to see in rounds 3, 4, and 5, we've got a model, we've made some modifications, and private developers who want to do projects that want to use this funds for this little bit of incentive, it's pretty tight right now. You can see how to participate. I look at it as we have hit our stride with the program, to hit both goals, which is unique amongst housing trust funds across the country.

Mr. Kelly commented that maybe he wasn't very clear in what he was asking for, it's suggesting that it would be narrowing the number of available units, where he was thinking this would be additional units that could be available for professionals. I'd like to work and refine this idea more, such as maybe figuring out the monitoring thing, or maybe an alternative to that, would I still have some time to come back to the Lands Committee to study this with the additional changes. Mr. Ciambor replied that he thinks timeline-wise, realistically, the next round doesn't go in place until you pass the budget. From admin staffing, the day after you pass the budget, we want our new application up with the new terms, so we can go out and promote it. I'd say if we stay on schedule, you have a window to make changes through the Assembly.

Ms. Woll asked that with Southeast Endeavor's project, the fourplex, I believe he provided public comment at one of our recent meetings about the price per year, or the amount awarded per unit is fixed, but he said when you're building, say, a 3 or 4 bedroom, he was advocating for more per bedroom to encourage more family housing, can you speak to that request? Mr. Ciambor replied

that the safeguard for the Assembly is a \$50,000 cap, that's fixed for, both affordable housing developers and fair market housing developers, and it's a way to be equitable amongst projects. Those are also 2018 dollars, and it was done with some research through the Housing Action Plan and some other economic sources that would kind of bridge the gap. You do have information, the Second Crossing study by DOWL. Agnew Beck did a study that said that a multifamily per unit gap is around 120. At this point, we worked with them on that report and said, hey, can you put tax abatement, can you put our housing fund, metric in there? If you do that, it's about \$75,000 reduction, so there's still a significant financial gap, depending on the project. Some developers are able to handle it, and some maybe aren't. I think in the future, the Assembly will have to determine what that financial analysis is for going up or is this going to be your donation to the housing game, and keep it while it is, as people continue to come and utilize it, there's further analysis that the Assembly will have to do.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs asked about the number that came out that makes that challenging to do, go lower than 80% just to meet the realities of our market. It's helpful to know that this is unique in that it does both workforce and affordable. With those numbers going up, other states or housing trust funds have refined the percentage if, for instance, they are focused on affordable housing to lower that percentage down as those numbers go up. In the past, sometimes we've been surprised by how much you could charge for a studio or something, Juneau is an expensive place, but more importantly, we have people who do have money and that changes our numbers. Is there any kind of trend with that you could speak to? Mr. Ciambor replied that strategy-wise, in our market, given the fluctuating costs and the absolute need to develop units, it's hard to play the game of are we getting enough with our participation? Do we need to require more, that's always going to be difficult to point down, because it changes. You do see housing trust funds all around the country that are 30% AMI and below. Basically, there's very low-income populations that need public money, and they're only going towards projects like that. Based on 2018, the Assembly wanted to get multifamily units on board, and left it at that kind of threshold. It has changed because of the annual numbers, but that can be revisited, and you could make it a lower target if you wanted. My sense, having gotten Chilkat Vistas online this round and giving their feedback, there's still some trepidation to use the program as it is, given the risk involved, so I wouldn't monkey around with it too much. The other key component, for these programs is for affordable housing and fair market developers to know exactly what the terms are from year to year, so that they can make the rest of the budget fit. If you're going to change the AMI every year, that's a moving target. People will be like, I'm not messing with that, because that's risk. So, the more you can stay consistent, the better.

Ms. Hall asked how the data is collected to know where the need is, is it workforce housing, how are we collecting that data? Mr. Ciambor replied that a lot of the data collection to create this version of the program was done in 2018, it was a housing needs assessment from JEDC, their annual economic data, updates, the Housing Action Plan, and then the Regional Housing Authority needs assessments in multiple years, that went into this format. There's also state data, AHFC has a rental market survey they do every year, that you can consult, but there hasn't been a specific needs assessment done for housing that I know of in the recent years. That DOWL and Agnew Beck study, from 2 years ago is really phenomenal for understanding our market. If you read the executive summary of our CBJ's pro-housing grant on the CDD website, that was a collaboration of all the most recent data at that time, about a year and a half ago.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs noted that a lot of the time we focus our attention on the fund, and specifically about keeping it consistent helps it be successful, because then people know what they're expecting. It sounds like yes, but are the ADU program and the Manufactured Home Down Payment Assistance Program, from the staff side, do those feel as easily defined or easy to administer, or at least hopefully comparable to the fund? Mr. Ciambor replied that from the staff, daily administration side, all three programs, no significant changes. Like I say, they've been pretty fine-tuned, and there's good relationships with True North to make changes if needed, let's see how \$13.5 works for a couple of years, and can maybe bring that \$50,000 per unit back. you have a budget for the housing fund, keep that intact, or keep a version of it going, so that we can continue to build this relationship with the affordable and fair market developers.

No motion on this topic.

2. Short Term Rentals – One Per Person Limits

City Attorney Wright and Manager Koester discussed this topic. Mr. Steininger asked if the requirement that short-term rental operators register with the city is that public information? Is that something that can be provided to the committee in terms of how many short-term rental operators have more than one, that kind of information to help us get an idea of if we did implement limits, how many people it would impact. Ms. Koester replied that we could provide you that data but want to check with Finance if we needed to provide it, more aggregate so you didn't know the individual details. Chair Hughes-Skandijs added that the materials weren't linked withing that toolkit that the task force received, but at that time the task force was able to get a lot of good data. There's already existing data, just from the work that's been done on this. It's a simple idea mechanically, but we can think about what would go into that if we were interested.

Ms. Hall asked if we have had many complaints, like party houses in neighborhoods, or, I realize we're not a beachfront, summer, or spring break vacation destination, but is that anything we're tracking? Ms. Koester replied that she didn't know of any complaints, that being said hasn't specifically asked that question. It just hasn't percolated up to my office, as those type of complaints have a tendency to do. Chair Hughes-Skandijs added that when the task force looked at this, generally, when you're trying to tear into the problem, some communities have more of a party house problem, lots of complaints in the neighborhood versus overall numbers for Juneau, there certainly have been some, but that was not the problem we were trying to solve, because it is generally not a problem. Of course, that could always come with growth into residential areas.

Mr. Kelly was interested in knowing how it would affect people to limit to just one unit per person or address and looking at fees for permits. I'm interested in looking at using the revenue that we might get from these fees to support additional housing.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs asked for discussion on what legislation and mechanisms would look like, fees, cap, what are we doing with those fees and is there a phasing out period. Is there specific aspects that you think were lacking in the materials that were in the last packet that you have questions on; we can chase those down but there's probably good stuff we can fall back on.

Ms. Hall commented that if it's not broken, don't fix it.

Mr. Steininger commented that he's not opposed to any of these concepts and feels we should define the angle that we're looking for. On the fee side, is it generating revenue from economic

activity, we're starting to collect sales tax, that's good. Is it a permitting issue where charging a fee for the permit might help us with some of that management, or is this bringing housing stock back into long-term rentals, is that specifically our goal? To Ms. Hall's comments, is there a need to supplement hotel inventory at certain times, what's our policy objective? That leads you down different avenues. It's kind of hard for me to envision if it's just about getting housing stock online, but keeping it affordable to buy a home in Juneau, sure, allow one per residence, and that helps you work through your loan costs on buying a home, but if it's an issue in some areas where you've seen people create off-book hotels, effectively, that operate as hotels, but are not under the same kind of regulatory regime that hotels have, it might be a different avenue that we'd want to go down. Not having been in the prior short-term rental task force, and not having the benefit of having intimately gone through all of the data they went through, I feel that I need to go through some of that data, that information, to get a better idea of the objective. I've heard from enough people trying to find housing in Juneau, trying to find long-term rental units, frustrated by rental units switching over to short-term rental, and believe, at least anecdotally, it seems to be a problem. I just want to understand a little bit better before I commit to a course of action.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs wants to bring housing stock back into use as housing, rather than being used commercially, and to help with some of those rental situations where knowing you can incentive behaviors, but you can't force anyone to rent. We've heard loud and clear from people who had owned traditional rentals, when they switched to short-term rentals they liked that a lot better, and they were very clear about not wanting to go back. If you take away that option, maybe they won't go back, but also the only way you know is by flipping some policy levers. I agree, anecdotal evidence is not the same thing as some things being borne out in the data. My own experience, looking at all the data on the task force, the majority of our short-term rental operators are not operating 5 or 15, that is the minority of them. Knowing that there are some that are doing that, then personally, I feel good about having an upper limit, and whatever they do at those houses is up to them, but I doubt that they will hold that many empty, and if they go back into use as any number of things that the homes could be used for, I would feel like that it's probably a better public use to Juneau. I agree that there is always going to be a need for them, because we don't have much of a housing stock, we have long-term travelers, we know this from the hospitals and we know how they're used in Juneau in a number of ways, I'm not trying to get rid of them, but I do think we could have some common sense limits on them, and if we were looking at per entity in a limit of something like 1 or 2, that would be a good starting place. Fees are a different way we could go. If we do, Mr. Kelly, I agree with you, I like the idea of having it be designated for housing, but just based on the length of time that I've seen it get worked on at the Assembly level, I would be interested in staff bringing us back, an ordinance that limited, per entity, and I think, obviously, this is something that's going to have to go to the COW. I think we'll see public interest in it, because the short-term rental operators were very engaged every time we've talked about the topic, but that is something that I would like to see happen, and the topic is something that the mayor asked us to take up as a committee.

Mayor Weldon added that she would prefer that this topic stay in committee to work on and then to give something to the COW.

Mr. Kelly moved that staff bring back an ordinance to the LHED committee that would set an upper limit (per applicant) on the amount of units that someone could have on short-term

rentals. Ms. Hall objected for the purposes of a question; would that be an upper limit per applicant or upper limit in town. Mr. Kelly replied, per applicant. Objection removed, motion passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. Kelly moved that staff bring back an ordinance to the LHED committee that would charge a fee for applications for short-term rentals and direct those fees to be put towards the Affordable Housing Fund. Chair Hughes-Skandijs objected to comment that she likes conceptually designing some money to keep the Housing Fund going and that if you need approval from the city to have a short-term rental, then the city is going to charge a fee for that for administrative overhead. Objection removed, motion passed unanimously.

G. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Schirmer from the PRAC commented that their last meeting was canceled so that individuals of PRAC could go and look at Diamond Park maintenance requirements.

Ms. Koester asked for more direction from Assemblymember Kelly on the program changes he'd like to see to the Affordable Housing Fund, because I believe I am the person who may be misinterpreted that direction. And, since we want to make sure that we're responsive and make those changes, or give you the information you need to discuss those changes, any direction from this body would be helpful. Mr. Kelly replied that what he is looking at is an incentive for developers to make available additional units in addition to the units that are already available that anybody can apply for, but these units would be specifically for licensed individuals, so it wouldn't be that we would be cutting into the 20% that are ADMI, we would have an additional number. The incentive could be in the amount of points that the developer has weighed in their application. I was even thinking for people who have already been approved that there could be an incentive added into the terms of their loan if they were to make additional units affordable for these professionals. And I think maybe I can think about and we could discuss maybe offline the issues having to do with monitoring. Ms. Koester asked to clarify, this would be an additional, potential term, or desired criteria for the existing program. It's hard for me to see how if we are not creating a new program, then we would be creating an additional requirement that could be, you know, voluntary or not, depending... you guys could give that direction for the existing program. Mr. Kelly replied that it was correct, an additional term was his thoughts, it wouldn't be mandatory, but it would give incentive.

H. NEXT MEETING DATE April 13, 2026

I. ADJOURNMENT – 5:55PM