

ASSEMBLY LANDS HOUSING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT MINUTES

April 13, 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: Chair Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Neil Steininger, Maureen Hall, Paul Kelly (zoom)

Additional Assembly Members Present: Mayor Weldon

Liaisons Present: Paulette Schirmer, PRAC liaison

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

Staff Present: Dan Bleidorn, Lands Manager; Emily Wright, City Attorney

D. APPROVAL OF AGENDA – approved as presented

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. March 13 2026 Draft LHED Minutes – approved as presented

F. AGENDA TOPICS

1. Juneau Gun Club Request to Continue to Lease CBJ Property

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Chair Hughes-Skandijs asked if the entity type, that is the rest of the year, they lease from the city, we set this up with them, and then is it volunteer run? Mr. Bleidorn replied that it was correct, they are non-profit, and they do have volunteers.

Ms. Hall noted that she's in the neighborhood, and they are good neighbors and appreciate the fact that our kids have the opportunity to have firearms training and that she would love to see is collaboration with the Nordic Ski Club, for a biathlon, but that can be down the road.

Ms. Hall moved that the Lands Housing and Economic Development Committee pass a motion of support to the full assembly to renew the lease of 21.5 Acres of CBJ land in the Montana Creek area to the Juneau Gun Club. Motion passed unanimously.

2. Ordinance Amending Chapter 69.40, Short-Term Residential Rental Registration Program, by Establishing Limitations and Establishing a Registration Fee

Ms. Wright discussed this topic. Chair Hughes-Skandijs added for context that we have materials that the short-term rental task force received and all of the work that has been done previously, but we had a big packet with those materials, we have those to refer back to conceptually about the numbers. We looked at those recommendations from the task force, and then with this committee, the goal would be that now we have an ordinance, and this singular ordinance is doing the multiple things at once. Her goal for this committee is to do some work on this to where we have some of those policy discussions, and we tighten up or add or remove things as we want to see as amendments. It's possible we come up with some things that we'd like to change and then the ultimate goal would be to move this to the COW. I'm just resetting the scene of where the trajectory is. Let's take the time to do good work in this committee and make sure we get questions asked and have policy discussions.

Mr. Kelly asked Chair Hughes-Skandijs if it was her intention, as we're just now being exposed to the ordinance, that any amendments are basically meant to be drafted at a subsequent meeting and considered at that time, or to move this from committee today? Chair Hughes-Skandijs replied that if there's amendments to this ordinance, let's work on those today. Other than to say we're trying to move this within the cycle, and we know how long it takes to schedule things. Let's make sure we do the work in here. So, yes, let's make amendments or changes today that you want to see and talk about this.

Mr. Steininger asked to clarify the definition of operator, as it was changed to be specifically the owner of the short-term rental property, and then later, we're striking the word operator and replacing it with person, or I think there's applicants, another word used. I just want to make sure that I'm clearing this, where you're using person or applicant later in the ordinance, that's also referring to the owner of the property? And to add to that, in a situation where there might be one person managing properties owned by others, not owned by themselves, how would that apply and work? Ms. Wright replied that this ordinance is in base draft form. It's a policy question about what you want to do. Say Mr. Bleidorn is allowed to have one, I'm allowed to have one, and that's it, but if we hire a property management company to handle it, we can write that in that you're not trying to legislate property management companies. There's many property management companies that handle individual rentals that aren't short-term rentals. The goal here was not to limit a property management company from coming in. The goal was just to say, I could have one, Mr. Bleidorn could have one, and that's it. Mr. Steininger followed up to ask that you own one, Mr. Bleidorn owns one, I have a property management company that's managing your two properties, the two of you would have to register with the CBJ sales tax office, and then provide that information to me, who would then ensure that it's on the short-term rental platform and I, as the property manager, wouldn't be the one responsible for ensuring that your sales tax compliance is accurate, and things of that nature, is that right? Ms. Wright replied that's correct, and the second part of your question is that we are the owners of the property itself, and so we, as property owners, can have one short-term rental, and then we can ask someone to manage those separately.

Ms. Hall asked on that same discussion, it says operator means a person who is an owner. Right off the get-go, that's not necessarily true, because an operator can be that property manager, someone that's operating it, but doesn't necessarily own it. Ms. Wright replied that she can tighten that section up.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs commented that Ms. Wright said that I can have one, Mr. Bleidorn can have one, there's nothing as written right now that says anything about the one that I have being the one that I live in, correct? If I own two homes right now I might not want to Airbnb the one I live in, so if I own two homes, as this is written, I have to choose which of those homes to register, is that an accurate read? Ms. Wright replied that was an accurate read. There is legislation in other communities that require short-term rentals to be owner-occupied. Nothing in here requires owner-occupied. In that scenario, it could be either one of those homes for the short-term rental.

Mr. Steininger referred to the definition, in here it says anyone who furnishes, offers for rent, or otherwise makes available in the City and Borough rooms in a hotel-motel or residence, so if we implemented a limit of one, does that also limit hotel ownership? Ms. Wright replied that hotel-motels are covered in a different section of the code, not in this section. This language is Alaskan language that was taken when we started to regulate short-term rentals. I don't know if there's any in Juneau that fall under that hotel-motel, concept. I would say if we're limiting it to one or and or an owner-occupied, that language should probably go away, because it wouldn't exist anymore. Mr. Steininger followed up to ask for an example of outside of Juneau where it exists, what that language would be. Is that somebody who's operating a hotel, but then puts some of the rooms on a short-term rental platform, and what's

the distinction. Ms. Wright replied that she can't give a specific example right now. I know we put it in place when we first did this language. I would have to double check with Deputy City Manager Barr to know if he had any examples, because 99% of multi-dwelling buildings are going to be covered under our hotel bed tax, which is a separate code definition and full hotel. I think that the max this would cover is a triplex scenario. There are a few buildings within Juneau that have 4 or 5 apartments, and if you're operating a majority of those apartments as short-term rentals, Ridgeview, may qualify for that scenario, but I can find out if there's actual buildings within Juneau.

Ms. Hall asked how many are currently registered. Ms. Wright replied that we have about 250 to 300. That's just at this moment in time and it bumps up in the summer months since we have started requiring registration, but we don't have the current number.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs asked about grandfathering in or phasing in, and you noted that that brings some legal risk. Grandfathering where someone is locked in with what they have now, that would be different than doing an effective date by this date, someone has to phase something out, is that a different mechanism, as I have seen in other examples. Could you speak to that and the legal risk. Ms. Wright replied that grandfathering is on page 3, it says a person who has to be compliant with the registration requirements, as of whatever effective date, shall be exempted from the limitation of one and that would phase out. There's multiple ways to do it. You can build in a grandfathering clause we would pull everyone who has more than one at that point in time, and we would say, okay, as long as you've got the annual registration, and as long as you're still not adding, you can't add any more, you're fine as you drop them off. Let's say they decide to sell one of the houses, they can't go back to that number. That's a typical grandfathering there. You could also say that this ordinance, in part or in total, because you can have parts that say registration is going to start being \$100, versus there's no registration fee right now. Maybe you want the registration fee to start immediately, but the limitation on one per person is phasing in over 2 or 3 years, and that gives people time to adjust their ownership of certain things. Either way, those grandfathering concepts are good and useful and have been used. In general, the reason why we recommend grandfathering is because you are changing the property right that somebody has and the way that they utilize their property. There are assumptions that people might be making for their own income and ability to operate and live in Juneau. It gives them time to adjust to income changes, whether it be selling property or shifting to a different process. It recognizes the property interest they have and gives them time to adjust.

Mayor Weldon asked if the same holds true if the person isn't compliance, i.e. they haven't registered, do we have to grandfather them in? Ms. Wright replied that the way that it's written, let's say you went with a date instead of just a general grandfathering, if they're not in compliance, they are not grandfathered in. They have to be registered, and we have to know who they are. Chair Hughes-Skandijs followed up to ask if it's a policy decision. Ms. Wright replied that this is 100% a policy decision.

Mr. Kelly asked about the grandfathering clause, it specifically uses the number one, but we haven't decided on a number, so if we do end up changing 69, 40, 020(h), we would also need to make a simultaneous amendment to update that number. Ms. Wright replied that was correct and added that when she was asked to write this ordinance, there's a little bit of a question of how do you limit short-term rentals? For example, a husband and wife. My husband and I are both in the same home, maybe we have one short-term rental, it's in our home, and it's under his name, am I also allowed to have one, yes, under this, if we were going to say one each. I was not able to find an example where we could limit to a husband-wife or partners, that goes too deep. I just want to flag that when we're doing this, the per person was as far as I could get any limitation. We can't go any narrower than that and legally enforce it.

Ms. Hall asked when did we start collecting for short-term rentals, and what is that currently? Ms. Wright replied registration was about a year ago, maybe a year and a half ago. That's been, pretty recent, hotel stuff has been a very long time. Ms. Hall followed up to ask that is now, say, this fall, being collected through the rental platform. Ms. Wright replied that it was correct, we did shift to no registration fee, but we have that connection with the platform, because there was follow-up legislation, though not quite a year's worth of data yet.

Mr. Steininger asked about the different buildings with multiple units within them, at what point without this ordinance, in size of a building, if I'm renting out a bunch of short-term rentals in a large apartment building, what point do I roll over and just be considered a hotel under the law? Are there more distinctions and different licensing types that make that distinction, or is it a number of units being rented on a nightly basis? Where does that changeover happen? Ms. Wright replied that hotels do have a definition, it's under 2010-010, it's any building or structure kept, used, maintained, or held out to the public to be an inn, hotel, lodging house, sleeping accommodations, with or without meals, with 5 or more rooms that are used for the accommodation of such guests. Mr. Steininger followed up to ask about one example, it sounds like potentially we might have a building that has crossed over into that definition, if we pass this ordinance and limit it to one, would that building then no longer be limited under this ordinance, because now it's seen as a hotel under our code. Ms. Wright replied that she wants to be careful about making any assumptions about Ridgeview, I don't know much about their inner workings, that's not really completely fair. So if we took the Bergman, which has 20 potential spaces, Bergman was a hotel-motel. Let's say that there were 20 apartments in there, and 5 or more are being used for accommodations and being held out to the public as a lodging house where you can sleep, they would potentially shift over to that hotel-motel concept for those five lodgings. There are buildings in town that are big enough to switch over, and where we would go to them and say, we don't think that you're really an apartment complex with short-term rentals, we think you're more like a hotel-motel, and then there are a ton more registration and insurance requirements, all of those things. There are a few buildings in Juneau that probably do switch over.

Mr. Kelly asked about if there would be more requirements, such as zoning. If one of those buildings decided we have 5 or more, and if it was imposed on them, either way, if the distinction was made that these are no longer short-term rentals, they are hotels, are there any zoning issues that might conflict with that? Ms. Wright replied that the short answer is yes, there are zoning requirements, however, many large buildings already are in a mixed-use or a multi-dwelling zoning. I couldn't tell you for sure exactly where zoning issues might crop up, but yes, they're subject to zoning, just like any other building.

Mr. Steininger asked about page 2, under D, the annual registration fee, could that fee be charged based on the zone in which a short-term rental is operating, could we charge a different amount in D18 versus mixed use. Ms. Wright replied that she would have to look more carefully at that. You can have different fees in different areas, because zoning is responding to different neighborhood requirements and how different neighborhoods should look and what's allowed there. My hesitation in giving you a full answer is that anytime we look at fees or registrations or anything, we're keeping an eye on that kind of equal protection. Are we treating everyone the same? Is there a reason to shift and have it different in certain areas or in others or not. We would need to look at the zoning and have a reason for why you were doing it, and if they're going to be different. Mr. Steininger said that he's thinking about in terms of what policy objectives we're trying to do here. We're trying to preserve longer-term rental housing, One of the goals of the assembly is availability of housing, long-term rentals for residents. In my mind, is there a public purpose to charging a higher fee or charging a fee only if that short-term rental is in a zone that we have zoned just for housing use. I'm trying to distinguish, I guess, between things that are operating as if it's a hotel and mixed use, versus somebody taking a family home out of neighborhood, and that

might be something I want to investigate. I've not totally convinced myself that it's a good idea, but it's something I want to put out there, if it's even allowable, and to talk through the policy implications.

Ms. Hall asked if the purpose of collecting the registration fee is to track how much we have and is that information now available on the rental platform, is that information already collected, is having a registration duplicative. Ms. Wright replied that the annual registration to get a better sense of how many short-term rentals we actually had in Juneau, that was an information-gathering piece. That's why there was no registration fee associated with it. It was more to understand, and maybe track a little bit what was happening. Most communities shift to requiring a fee when they start putting in limitations, and thus enforcement is required. That fee is purely meant to cover any administrative costs of enforcement, it's not supposed to fill the city coffers, or anything like that. Ms. Hughes-Skandijs added for context that registration fees can be used for many things. Some communities have different fees as the number of registrations goes up, so your first registration is X, your second registration is Y. I think you're going to find a lot of those answers in the previous work that was done, and in that first packet we had, so I would refer back to that.

Mayor Weldon asked if the assembly didn't limit them to one person, can we escalate the fees so your first one is X, your second one is X, your third one would be even higher fee? Ms. Wright replied that yes, you can have escalating fees.

Mr. Kelly said it was suggested to him by a constituent who visited during my office hours, how grandfathering might work in that circumstance, because if somebody has multiple units, is there any way to grandfather them into not having to pay an escalating penalty for having multiple units, because we're effectively changing the rules on them. Ms. Wright replied that yes, we can create grandfathering to do that for anyone who's currently in business and has a short-term rental. This city raises fees all the time, if you're not going to limit them to one, my advice changes. I don't think that grandfathering becomes as much of an issue, you're not limiting their ability to have short-term rentals, I don't know in that scenario that you need to grandfather, but you absolutely can always grandfather.

Mr. Kelly asked to keep this in committee to continue to hash out the ideas that were worked out today. The attorney already knows that we probably want to work on the definition for operator, because my understanding from talking with constituents is that there is an owner who might own a unit, but then there's an operator, I had an operator who operates quite a few residences in Juneau and I want to make sure that we're absolutely clear where we're talking about a person and where we're talking about an operator, to make sure that's abundantly clear in the definitions and in the text of the ordinance.

Ms. Hall spoke to the Rainforest data. There's 14,000 housing units in town, and a generous number would be 400 short-term rental units. I don't see this market, this very needed opportunity to house folks coming into our community, as being the problem with our long-term rental situation. To highlight an example of one of my conversations today where, due to the lack of housing, you build workforce housing that's heavily used during the tourism season but then it sits idle. The opportunity for someone to then offer their workforce housing as short-term rentals during the off-season versus getting a tenant in there and then having to move the tenant along, doesn't solve the problem for long-term, year-round rental units, but penalizing a model of using workforce housing and then short-term rentals. I think is a great solution. I wondered if they're thinking about doing that for the legislative housing we have, it generates additional revenue for the city through the bed tax, and provides the ability to flex up when we have big events happening here in Juneau, such as a regional swim meet that was here this last weekend. There's always a need, and we do have a hotel bed shortage. Those are a few reasons that I'm not really gung-ho on this. I think it's great to track it, and if a simple registration helps that, but if that is also easily available data through the rental platform that's already collected, we don't need to

duplicate efforts, but if it isn't, and we just have a registration, I think that's fair, but knowing that if we're going to enforce limits and having to pay someone \$30,000 a year to do that, it just all becomes very convoluted and complicated, and I don't know that it's solving any of our housing issues.

Mr. Steininger noted that he has been trying to look through some of the old data and try and figure out some of the problem statement, it's hard to see in the data where this is a significant problem. I know it's definitely something that we've heard from residents, and we've heard the frustrations of trying to find housing in town, so I know that is a true problem, but how much short-term rentals are actually contributing to it is really hard to figure out from the data. I made my comments about trying to think of the different ways that short-term rentals are used, whether it's a large building that's effectively operating as a hotel, and it sounds like we do have ordinance on the books that already cares for that. It might be something that we need to keep an eye on as we see apartment buildings shift over to short-term rentals and make sure that, if you have more than however many units that is, that you're complying with the ordinance as written. I am interested in thinking more about whether we can treat a registration fee sort of as a way that's a variance from using properties that are zoned for neighborhood long-term housing for short-term rentals, and if that's something we can use as this ordinance suggests, put into affordable housing programs, into housing programs generally to try to mitigate some of that stock. I don't have enough information to point to enough of a problem to put a hard cap on the number, especially knowing that we have a lot of operators that have quite a few and as a result, the difficulty of working through grandfathering is going to get really complex, because I also don't want to create this sort of haves and have-nots, where we have a bunch of operators that were around before, and they have a ton of units, and are able to operate in a much different economic climate than new entrants. I don't know if that necessarily creates a level playing field. I am interested in further conversation on fees or some kind of way to create that distinction between housing units that otherwise would be long-term rentals. I've heard a lot of the same thing about, you might have legislative housing, or tourism worker housing and those windows don't actually always mash up perfectly, and so you can't necessarily replace a legislative worker with a tourist worker, because sessions go long, and the tourism season starts early, all those things. Short-term rentals really helps fill that gap for some of these long-term rentals that we know we need in town. I want to make sure that we're not screwing up a sector of the housing market as we work through it, but make sure we're addressing some of the concerns we hear from residents about finding long-term housing.

Chair Hughes-Skandijs noted this is a good first session to work through this before the next meeting, maybe you have no interest in taking this further, but those of us who are interested in taking it further, dig into any questions you need to ask about short-term rentals as a whole, review those previous materials, if you need to have conversations with staff or task force members on history or anything else. I am asking this committee to do your homework, get any amendments ready, chat with staff, so that the next meeting we can hopefully end up with something that we're either moving to COW or not. As somebody who's been involved in this most of the time, who was on the short-term rental task force, I will say that short-term rentals are not, as you may hear sometimes where people say this is not our housing problem, so don't do anything about it. It is not our housing problem, we're not trying to simply hammer over the head, fix a problem, but can we tweak something so that it serves our community better, I would argue that, yes, we could, and I would also argue that the finding of the task force was to tell us to come up with a number. I'm going to be bringing it next time, we didn't have a lot in here about owner-occupied, but that was something that the task force wanted to see, that's one way we can preserve that and make sure it's clear. Owner-occupied, you can always do whatever you want with the house you're living in, then the recommendation is if it's not owner-occupied, consider putting a number. I just want to respect the work of the people, because we had a lot of diligent community members who put in a lot of time on that. We will look at this topic again, May 4th.

G. STAFF REPORTS

1. U.S. Coast Guard Housing in Juneau, Alaska

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic. Mr. Kelly asked about the different stages, we're on stage two, do we have any associated timeline for those stages, would we anticipate being able to meet the need before the Storis is actually stationed here. Mr. Bleidorn replied that it was just the information that was provided by the Coast Guard, they didn't elaborate on their schedule. I'd say that I've spoken with a couple of local contractors and people who attended that meeting, there's still a few issues with the Coast Guard's plan that need to be worked out. I think that everybody's really interested in working on this and trying to create a solution here. I know JEDC has also come up with some ideas. It's in the community's interest to work this out, so hopefully we can be a good partner as this works its way out.

2. CARES Lease – Verbal Update

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic that the CARES lease, the sobering center, will be signed within the next few days. No comments or discussion.

3. Juneau Animal Rescue Lease Verbal Update

Mr. Bleidorn discussed this topic that JAR and the City has signed the lease. No comments or discussion.

H. COMMITTEE MEMBER / LIAISON COMMENTS AND QUESTIONS

Ms. Schirmer from PRAC noted that they had a very productive, short meeting where they discussed Trail Mix's 2026 work plan and the various people that they have going. Marine Park has started construction. Homestead Park is finished. The Augustus Brown totem screen is being refurbished, and we had a wonderful DPAC field trip.

I. NEXT MEETING DATE – May 4, 2026

J. ADJOURNMENT – 5:56pm

K. SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

- 1. Corrected Version of: Ordinance 2026-XX_Short_Term_Rental_Registration_Limits vLANDS v. 2 corrected**