

# **APPROVED MINUTES**

Agenda

**Planning Commission**

***Regular Meeting***

CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

*Erik Pedersen, Chair*

April 14, 2026

**A. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT** – Read by Mr. Gamez

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!

**B. ROLL CALL**

Erik Pedersen, Chair, called the Regular Meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) Planning Commission (PC), held in Assembly Chambers of the Municipal Building, virtually via Zoom Webinar, and telephonically, to order at 6 p.m.

**Commissioners present:** Commissioners present in Chambers –Erik Pedersen, Chair; Lacey Derr, Vice Chair; Mandy Cole, Clerk; Douglas Salik; Larry Gamez; Carlee Simon; Keith Koruna; Karinne Wiebold

Commissioners present via video conferencing – None

**Commissioners absent:** Jessalynn Rintala, Vice Clerk

**Staff present:** Scott Ciambor, CDD Planning Manager; Forrest Courtney, Senior Planner; Madeline Carse, CDD Administrative Assistant; Nicole Lynch, Attorney III; Justin Smith, Planner I

**Assembly members:** Greg Smith

**C. REQUEST FOR AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. March 24, 2026 Draft Minutes, Regular Planning Commission

**MOTION:** *by Ms. Cole to approve the March 24, 2026 Planning Commission Regular Meeting minutes.*

*The motion passed.*

**E. BRIEF REVIEW OF THE RULES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

**F. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

**G. ITEMS FOR RECONSIDERATION**

**H. CONSENT AGENDA**

1. **SMF2026 0001:** Tlingit Haida Regional Housing Authority requests final plat approval for Phase 1 of Seet Kanax Duteen, consisting of 21 lots and one tract in the D18 zoning district for detached residential development.

**Applicant:** Lorraine DeAsis  
**Location:** No existing address

**Director's Report**

THRHA requests final plat approval for Phase 1 of Seet Kanax Duteen, consisting of 21 lots and one tract in the D18 zoning district for detached residential development. The plat has been modified from the preliminary version (SMP2024-0001) after a more thorough analysis of the topography and existing drainage. The preliminary plat was designed to accommodate 25 lots with two tracts, A and B, to be set aside for future development. The current final plat will consist of 21 single-family residential lots and a large tract that would be subdivided at a later time. Sheix'w Deiyi (Red Alder Road) is a 60-foot right-of-way that will be provided as a CBJ adopted access within the subdivision and be consistent with Title 49.35.240, the table of roadway construction standards.

**Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends the Planning Commission adopt the Director’s analysis and findings and APPROVE SMF2026 0001.

Mr. Gamez announced a potential conflict of interest, as he works for Tlingit-Haida Regional Housing Authority in the admin department as a safety coordinator, but stated he did not have any financial gain in the outcome and could be objective in reviewing it.

**MOTION:** *by Ms. Derr to accept staff’s findings, analysis, and recommendations, and approve SMF2026 0001.*

*The motion passed unanimously.*

**I. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

**J. REGULAR AGENDA**

- 1. **FZE2026 0001:** Flood Zone Exception for construction of a gymnasium/agricultural structure at Echo Ranch Bible Camp in an unnumbered Velocity (V) Zone.

**Applicant:** Ryan Regier  
**Location:** 40001 Glacier Hwy

Ms. Derr, Ms. Simon, and Mr. Koruna disclosed their kids attend the Echo Ranch Bible camp, but they all felt they could be impartial and objectional in the matter.

**Director’s Report**

The applicant requests a Flood Zone Exception to allow the construction of a structure on an existing foundation to be used as a gymnasium by Echo Ranch Bible Camp (Echo Ranch) for five (5) months and agricultural storage for seven months (7) out of the year. The existing foundation was constructed in 1988 and was not evaluated for flood loads, general flood hazard protection, or the more stringent Zone V requirements. The proposed design and construction methods have not been certified by a licensed professional engineer or architect. Base flood elevation data for the site is inconclusive. The site is remote and does not have emergency services. Alternative construction sites outside the special flood hazard area are available.

### **Staff Recommendation**

Staff recommends that the Planning Commission adopt the Director's analysis and findings and DENY Flood Zone Exception FZE2026 0001.

Ms. Cole asked if there was a temporary flood zone exemption they could potentially grant that was not the full exemption.

Mr. Ciambor responded in terms of Title 49 and Building Code Title 19 is 180 days, and the initial application extended that, and there is not a temporary exception through the flood plain option.

Ms. Cole asked for clarification they would have to grant the same exemption whether it included the word temporary for 9 months or 3 years.

Mr. Ciambor answered yes.

Ms. Wiebold inquired if they could put a permanent structure in the same spot and not revisit this.

Mr. Ciambor responded a permanent structure would have to meet the same criteria, but the application did not have information suggesting it would be a permanent structure.

Ms. Derr asked about grandfathering and how that works, as her understanding was because the structure was completely demolished it is considered new construction and must meet current codes and maps.

Mr. Ciambor stated that was correct.

Mr. Salik inquired if they were aware if the structure was considered in the flood zone in 1988 when it was constructed.

Mr. Ciambor answered he would have to search through the report and find that answer.

Chair Pedersen believed the flood mapping they see of today was made around 2013.

Mr. Salik asked more information about the flood data being inconclusive.

Mr. Ciambor responded one data point is checking when the V zone for the area originated, and the other is around base flood elevation, as there were inconclusive reports for this project site.

Chair Pedersen added normally FEMA will figure out the base flood elevation and then they can build through FEMA's base flood, but since this is a low density area of development, FEMA chose not to specify the base flood elevation. He said it is a V-zone with undetermined base flood elevation, which puts the onus on the flood administrator, CBJ, or the applicant to figure out.

Mr. Gamez asked about the seven months of storage for agricultural stuff noted in the report. He added if there was a way to put out a fire if the agricultural storage catches fire.

Mr. Ciambor answered that would be a question for the applicant.

The applicant and Echo Ranch Facilities Director, Ryan Regier, explained they are wanting to build a hoop style structure on the slab of the old gym that, and are looking for a flood zone exception due to the nature of their immediate need to fully function as a summer camp in Juneau. He stated this will be a temporary structure, as they want to build a new permanent structure across the road eventually. He noted the structure will serve as a gym for the kids to meet when coming to camp, a place to play when it rains, and a place to hang out in scheduled free time. He clarified they do not encourage kids to be in the gym when it is storming. The structure will also serve as storage for equipment in the off-season. Mr. Regier shared they are aware this is in the V-zone, and they have flood proof construction materials. He added they want to also build a dividing wall to separate the basketball court from the game room, and the hoop structure will be engineered. He said their hope is the new permanent structure will be fully erected and usable in three years, in which the temporary structure will be taken down. He assured they have safety protocols in place to ensure campers remain safe in all situations, including floods and tsunamis. Mr. Regier shared their professional engineer, Michael Stevens, ran data and came up with a base flood elevation of 22.63 feet and said there is a natural drain line contour where the elevation is above 25 feet with two openings where water can come through. He stated if they had the 100-year flood or large storm come in, the waters would rise very slowly, as it cannot get over that taller area, which would give them time to remove campers from harms way and follow their tsunami and flood protocols. He expressed they take safety very seriously, and they need this gym to operate properly and cannot afford to not have it this season. He wanted it known that they want to heed CDD's recommendation and build their permanent structure on the AE zone.

Randall Alderfer, camp director, added the ministry of Echo Ranch has been there since 1964 and has been providing a place and opportunity for the people of southeast Alaska and Juneau to experience it. He said every building within their organization has a purpose and safety was a concern from the very beginning, but they have never had a concern of flooding.

Chair Pedersen asked the members if they were okay with giving the applicant a few extra minutes to present since it is a complex issue. They agreed.

Mr. Alderfer stated they have seen a lot of weather since 1964, including a tsunami in 2016, and have never seen any evidence their location was not safe. He expressed this building has many different uses and it would very negatively affect them if they could not utilize it.

Mr. Regier added if they had a clear spot somewhere on the camp in the AE zone to do the project now, they would, but they do not have time and it is not practical, as there is still 3 foot of snow in a lot of places and they did not want to cancel their summer programs to build. He said they need to get the building up and running as soon as possible for the ministry purposes of camp.

Ms. Cole asked if the current building was gone or if there was any opportunity to re-enforce the structure.

Mr. Regier answered no, the roof is completely caved in.

Mr. Coruna asked if there was evaluation of the condition of the existing slab.

Mr. Regier answered in preliminary views of the slab, there are no cracks, signs of weakness, or structural damage to the concrete, but they have not removed the building completely yet.

Ms. Derr inquired if they would be taking guests to the chapel or dining hall in case of emergency, which is not located in this zone.

Mr. Regier responded it depends on the type of emergency, as there is a high ridge on the east side of camp in case of tsunami or flood, but for storms they go to the chapel or dining room.

Ms. Cole asked if they had reviewed the flood plain exception criteria included in the packet, which are the criteria under which they have to make findings in order to grant this exception, as she did not see that all criteria had been met. She wanted to hear their thoughts on how they had been met.

Chair Pedersen suggested a 3-minute at ease.

[At ease]

Chair Pedersen asked for public testimony.

Shawn Kantola commented he has been a camper, counselor and wilderness guide at Echo Ranch, and he and his family take shifts covering winter caretaking there. He said his own children now attend camp there, so he is very interested in it being safe. He stated this is the only safe spot feasible to have the building up in time for this camp season, and per the flood map, a portion of the slab is in zone V with potential wave action and a portion is not. He expressed in the packet, under velocity zone standards, it talks about the potential flood wave action and breaking waves of 3 feet high or higher, but he did not believe they should be talking about 3 foot breaking waves affecting this building, as he has been a caretaker there for multiple winters and never seen any issues. He asked the Commission to look at the site with logic and common sense and allow that to supersede rules that seem to apply to flat areas.

Reed Bowman, Mendenhall Valley resident, expressed strong support for granting Echo Ranch's request for a flood zone exception to allow them to rebuild the gym. He said the gym is a vital educational, logistical, and team building space that supports a wide variety of user groups during the summer and stores important camp equipment through the winter, and many people depend on that building. He shared a significant hardship would be incurred if they are not permitted to rebuild the gym and without the space, they have no adequate alternative for securing and maintaining essential gear used by campers and retreat groups, and it would directly impact their ability to operate safely and sustainably. He added there is no other suitable relocation site on

the property that would avoid impeding accessibility or safe camp activities, and rebuilding in the current location is the only practical and safe option temporarily.

Chair Pedersen commented that 10 years ago, when the Commission reviewed one of these, they had a lot of discussion on all the 11 factors that should be considered, but not necessarily met outright. He said FEMA's guidance instructions state, "Variances are granted for the structure and not associated with the property owner, as such, when communities review a variance request, they should consider the life expectancy of a building." He suggested going through and discussing each criteria one by one.

Ms. Cole expressed it appears the slab is not entirely in the V zone and some portion of the current existing slab in the safe zone, so she wondered what the city done in the past when there was a proposed construction that straddles two zones.

Mr. Ciambor said he would have to refer to the variance document for guidance.

Ms. Wiebold asked if they could avoid the issue of having an exception completely if they had them revisit the base flood elevation data, as there were three possible outcomes there.

Mr. Ciambor responded according to staff, one of the criteria needed to make an exception based on the FEMA guidelines has been met, and in the FEMA documentation it suggests that an exception for hardship should not be granted unless it's very unique and limited. However, they have circumstances where this body can take that under consideration and consider all the criteria not being met and make a decision.

Criteria 1: The danger that materials may be swept onto other lands and cause injuries to other persons or properties.

Chair Pedersen explained the property is large and could not see how that would actually happen.

Ms. Cole believed the analysis of that exception is less based on where the site is and more about the potential hazard, and she agreed there are no neighbors that could be impacted.

Criteria 2: Danger to life and property due to flooding or erosion.

Ms. Derr did not believe that was specific to this property and more in general of a structure in a flood zone, so this criteria should be negatively evaluated towards this situation.

Ms. Cole said she heard the argument about opening the doors on either side to reduce flood loss, but someone manually having to open those doors seemed risky.

Mr. Salik commented this is guidance to implement the regulation, and he felt where they are with Echo Ranch was a whole different place than what this criteria was implemented for.

Chair Pedersen did not think Echo Ranch should be subject to any sort of CBJ building codes, as it is well beyond the Urban Service Area.

Ms. Cole stated this guidance is what they have used for years to evaluate flood plain exemptions, and they are beholden to use this guidance as they have in other cases that have come before them seeking flood plain exceptions.

Chair Pedersen felt they should look through all the exception criteria, but it is very hard to meet all the criteria 100%, so they have to look at it holistically and with a greater good.

Ms. Simon inquired if there was a way to have this structure be temporary and then be not temporary.

Ms. Cole voiced that's why she asked staff about that earlier, which they said it did not matter if it was temporary or not, because if it needs a building permit in the flood zone it needs to pass this unless the guidance does not apply.

Mr. Salik said the guidance says it has to be considered, and the Commission could disagree.

Ms. Gamez expressed this is a unique place and not close to a city, but they need to follow through and at least bring the 11 criteria to the table.

Ms. Wiebold felt the danger to life is not applicable, as it is not a residential structure.

Criteria 3: The susceptibility of the proposed facility and its content to flood damage and the effect of such damage on the individual owner.

Ms. Wiebold commented this is on the applicant if it is a risk they are willing to take, and the 40-year history speaks to the susceptibility to the proposed being damaged.

Ms. Simon added the shape of the building should help with snow loads in the future.

Chair Pedersen stated they technically cannot consider snow load in their analysis, but duly noted. He wondered if the doors proposed to be installed would open automatically.

Criteria 4: The importance of the services provided by the proposed facility to the community.

Ms. Cole noted the applicant said the camp could not operate as planned without the space.

Chair Pedersen felt there was enough information in the packet and through the applicant and public testimony to support this.

Criteria 5: The necessity to the facility of a waterfront location where applicable.

Ms. Cole voiced the coastal experience is part of the camp, and did not know if they could have the same camp if it did not have a waterfront location, and that may fall apart some with the specific location of the gym within the camp. She added they all agreed the gym could be somewhere else but cannot be somewhere else soon.

Chair Pedersen said he has never seen a zone V so inland, so it does not strike him as being a waterfront location in its essence.

Criteria 6: The availability of alternative locations for the proposed use which are not subject to flooding or erosion damage.

Ms. Wiebold was getting hung up on the temporary versus permanent nature of it. She wondered if they had any assurances it would be 3 years or if an exemption on this parcel meant it could now be used in perpetuity and the temporary structure could be a permanent structure for the gym or a new use. She asked if this was restrained to temporary other than good will.

Chair Pedersen agreed he was also unsure on that, as well as if they could condition it to the 3 years. He mentioned there was another flood zone exemption granted previously but there were conditions with a time limit.

Mr. Gamez shared it might just be good faith in the 3 years.

Ms. Cole did not feel it mattered if they have faith in this owner for 3 years, because if the exemption goes with the land forever, it could be sold to another owner, which is why they have never been able to condition time limits.

Criteria 7 was not discussed.

Criteria 8: The relationship of the proposed use to the comprehensive plan and flood way management program for that area.

Chair Pedersen explained the relationship to the proposed use of the Comprehensive Plan established this is a fine use for this particular area, and its relationship with the Flood Plain Management Program is what they are talking about today.

Ms. Derr said they have already had two examples where they followed the Comprehensive Plan and they were overruled, so she did not always like to use the Comprehensive Plan as a criterion anymore. She felt the use of this building within the land it is in and the community it serves is well within the use of what the Comprehensive Plan should be.

Criteria 9: The safety and access to the property in times of flood for ordinary and emergency vehicles.

Chair Pedersen said it sounds like the applicant has insight to their emergency procedures, but they did not discuss specifically for ordinary and emergency vehicles.

Criteria 10: The expected heights, velocity, duration, rate of rise, and sediment transport of flood waters and the effects of wave action if applicable expected at the site.

Ms. Cole said the applicant attempted to begin some technical specifications to comply with this, and they heard in other flood plain exceptions that this data is difficult, time-consuming, and

expensive to obtain. She felt there was a lot of wiggle room based on what could be reasonably expected from an applicant to bring who does not have access to the expensive technical planning the Army Corps of Engineers have.

Chair Pedersen agreed, and in other exceptions they did, maybe the data was not exactly perfect and additional items had to be done in the future.

Criteria 11: The cost of providing governmental services during and after flood conditions, including maintenance and repair of public utilities and facilities, such as sewer, gas, electrical, and water systems, and streets and bridges.

Chair Pedersen stated he was not aware of any government services provided to Echo Ranch. He added there may be some facilities now or in the future provided by private entities, but there are not a lot of governmental service costs that would come up due to flooding of that area.

Ms. Simon was confused why that criterion was not met.

Chair Pedersen expressed it might be because there were other flooding events within CBJ where the government had to step in to mitigate in the recent past.

Ms. Simon agreed, but said if they want to follow the guidelines, they should follow it and not have exceptions of past decisions re-describe what this is. She felt this was met.

Chair Pedersen agreed.

Ms. Cole assumed staff was making the point that emergency and rescue services are more expensive when they're remote than in town. She agreed that was not a fair application of the criteria.

Chair Pedersen gave a recap of the comments and questions about each criteria. He asked if staff had any insight on Criteria 6, as that is the one they have been struggling the most with, aside from the type of doors and the vehicles.

Ms. Cole added wanting to make sure emergency procedures were included not mustering in that space during storms.

Chair Pedersen invited the applicant back up to answer any questions.

Mr. Regier responded in regard to the 11 criteria, they included five of those in their narrative, and felt they were meeting some of them. He stated they believe they met Criteria 1 and 2, and Criteria 3, as they are doing the FEMA guidelines for flood proof materials. He said Criteria 4, 7, 8, and 11 are self-explanatory, and they do not view this as a waterfront location. He stated they expect questions on Criteria 9 they can address, and with regard to Criteria 10, they are not going to get waves from the front beach back at the gym unless there is a very huge event, which most of the time comes with warning so they can evacuate up their tsunami route. He expressed they knew they probably could not fit all of them, but could maybe interpret them in a certain way to

fit. He urged the Commission to ask them questions if they need clarification. He added they have the door design.

Ms. Cole asked if any of the emergency procedures had a muster point at the gym.

Mr. Alderfer answered they do not. He stated in the event of an emergency, the muster point would not be the gym.

Mr. Gamez inquired about the door details and if they open in, out, and slide left and right.

Mr. Regier answered they will be special doors that are typically out-swing, but they can be in-swing as well. However, they will make them where they cannot be pushed in by the horses during the winter. He added they will have spring ball stops on the bottom and top. He explained the doors would be able to open so flood water would come, go through, and the big overhead door will be a canvas door with a weight on the bottom that can be opened up on either side and a knock-away so it can go in or out.

Mr. Gamez asked if someone would have to open it or if it would be electric.

Mr. Regier responded the door itself would be manual, but it is canvas, with a weight at the bottom with cables, so it can drape open with the flow of the water.

Ms. Derr asked in regard to Criteria 9, if the road to the ranch is accessible at least twice a day during low tide via vehicle.

Mr. Alderfer answered yes.

Chair Pedersen inquired if there were any stagnant emergency vehicles at the site for fire protection of any sort.

Mr. Regier responded they have a fire bus with a pump and three large tanks of water they keep in there, which can be taken wherever they need to be to put out fires. He added they have other vehicles on site they keep available for ambulatory type events.

Mr. Koruna asked if the slab angled out and down at all.

Mr. Regier said it was dead flat.

Chair Pedersen noted the LiDAR cannot shoot through the roof of the building, so it cannot interpret the elevation of the slab.

Ms. Cole inquired if this is not granted, are they still able to host the events and campers they have obligated for this year.

Mr. Alderfer answered they will, but it will affect their ability to provide service as usual.

Ms. Wiebold asked if the slab is in good shape and why they do not just build the gym back on the same slab and skip moving it 10 feet into the woods.

Mr. Regier responded it will take two years to build a new structure minimum, and they need something there temporarily to be the gym with concrete so kids can play basketball. He said if they could build something quick they would, but it is not practical to build something there. He added they could build somewhere else but they would still be having the same conversation.

Mr. Alderfer added they will have to rebuild above the flood zone so they will never have to have this conversation again.

Ms. Wiebold commented the engineering in the temporary building looks robust and expensive, so it is hard to imagine a good looking functional building being taken down in several years if it is allowed to exist now.

Mr. Regier said they did not want two giant buildings right next to each other, as it would take away from the camp look and feel. He mentioned they initially asked about an event tent, but they did not know if it would have to follow these guidelines. However, they wanted something more robust than an event tent since horses walk through the area and it would be hard to keep them out of that.

Attorney Lynch clarified under 49.74.10(a), it specifies the exceptions for this provision of this article, and they are limited to the powers granted in this article about the flood zone. Therefore, it is only exempting the building and exempting it from the requirements under 49.70.400.

Ms. Cole asked if that meant it could not be rebuilt without getting another exception.

Attorney Lynch confirmed that is correct.

Ms. Cole inquired if they would have to leave the temporary structure indefinitely, and if they would have to get a new exception if they ever took it down.

Attorney Lynch answered yes.

Chair Pedersen added it looks like it was tied to a building permit and not really like a land use action.

Ms. Cole commented it says the gym was constructed in 1988 and the foundation was constructed without flood load evaluation or velocity zone requirements, but the inspection records note the project engineer okayed the concrete and additional required documentation was not provided in 1989 or 1993 and no additional review occurred and the status was set as final in 2021. Therefore, the permit might have been open for all of those years and it was closed in 2021.

Mr. Ciambor responded it was closed out by the building inspector as part of routine look at open permits.

Ms. Simon asked if they had an answer on if an event tent would have the same criteria to meet.

Mr. Ciambor did not know and would have to look into it.

Ms. Wiebold inquired if there was any way they could consider it not to be demolished, as it still has some essence and footprint of the building there.

Mr. Ciambor answered anything replacing it would be considered new development and would have to meet the thresholds they have been discussing.

Chair Pedersen added there is a threshold calculation FEMA set out and it appears it probably would not meet that unless the slab almost costs more than the metal structure. He added reviewing all the criteria, they are not all experts in flood zone management and there are a lot of things to consider. He said they went through the criteria and all generally agreed they could be met, but he encouraged his fellow commissioners to express their opinion on that.

Ms. Cole asked Attorney Lynch if they were allowed to condition the exception.

Attorney Lynch answered yes. She added they must include in the record the exception must only be issued upon a showing of good cause and sufficient cause and determination that failure to grant the exception would result in exceptional hardship to the applicant and a determination that the grant of an exception will not result in increased flood heights, additional threats.

**MOTION:** *by Chair Pedersen that the Planning Commission has considered all relevant factors, including those set forth in 49.70.410(b) and 49.70.410(h). Upon such consideration, the Planning Commission grants FZE2026 0001, flood zone exception for construction of a gymnasium/agricultural structure at Echo Ranch Bible Camp in an unnumbered velocity V zone.*

Ms. Cole did not love applying this criteria to this project, partly because it is only partially in the velocity zone and because there is tons of anecdotal and logical evidence that if part of a flat foundation is safe, it is logical to assume this is safe. She said they made a reasoned discussion of the criteria, but she did not believe they were all met. She explained if they are going with they have all been met to move the project forward, she did not believe they could do that, but if they are evaluating it based on consideration of the criteria, they have considered it.

Chair Pedersen voiced they are considering the exception as a whole.

Mr. Salik felt Ms. Cole made good points, as a number of the criteria were not met, but they considered them all. He appreciated the applicant's professional engineer's work, as that number makes a big difference.

Ms. Simon felt similarly, and appreciated the clarity this is on the structure and not just some forever approval. She expressed it still felt like a tent to her, especially with the canvas door.

Mr. Gamez commented in all these years, they have never seen a flood in that area. He added they have done their research, homework, and brought a lot to the table.

Mr. Koruna echoed the same sentiment, and said they considered all the criterion and evidence.

Ms. Wiebold said she would feel more comfortable if there were legal assurances around it not being the permanent building, but agreed straddling two different flood plain zones makes it a complicated concept. She noted how strange the climate has been and the flooding camp event that took place in Texas, which caused her pause. She felt this became more complicated in the conversation but clearer in the direction.

The motion passed 6-2.

**K. OTHER BUSINESS**

**L. STAFF REPORTS**

Mr. Ciambor reported the Coast Guard has a request for information out for housing and a presentation as to what they are looking for. He said there was a city lease to Juneau Animal Rescue on Crazy Horse Drive. He thanked staff for putting together the contents of the report. He announced Justin Smith is leaving and wished him well.

**M. COMMITTEE REPORTS**

Chair Pedersen shared the Title 49 Committee met last Thursday, where they got halfway through the table of permissible uses and gamed out different scenarios. He added they will be meeting again shortly to go through the rest of them.

**N. LIAISON REPORTS**

Mr. Smith gave a brief update. He reiterated the Title 49 Committee reviewed the proposed revision of the table of permissible uses, and they are looking at meeting in early May to continue reviewing that. He said in regard to Lands, they are possible actions on short term rentals, and budget is a big focus now. He shared the manager presented her budget and gave an overview of where they stand for FY26 and FY27, which was reduced by \$4 million and an increased revenue by \$2 million. He shared they approved the year round emergency shelter, which comes with a cost.

Mr. Gamez voiced in regard to the emergency shelter, it sounds like they are going to pursue it and keep the shelter going all summer long. He asked if that was 24 hours a day.

Mr. Smith believed it will close during the summer or the day and transportation will be provided.

**O. CONTINUATION OF PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS**

P. **PLANNING COMMISSION COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS**

Q. **EXECUTIVE SESSION**

R. **ADJOURNMENT**

The April 15, 2026 Planning Commission Meeting was adjourned at 8:11 p.m.