

Minutes
Assembly Lands Committee
Monday, November 19, 2012, 5:00 p.m.
Assembly Chambers

I. Call to Order

Chair Carlton Smith called the meeting to order at 5:00pm.

Members Present: Mary Becker, Johan Dybdahl, Carlton Smith, Loren Jones

Additional Assembly Members Present: Karen Crane

Liaisons Present: Nathan Bishop

Liaisons Absent: Michael Williams, Jeff Wilson

Staff Present: Heather Marlow, Lands & Resources Manager; Jessica Beck, Lands & Resources Specialist

II. Agenda Changes

Ms. Marlow added Information Item B, Buildable Lands Update and moved the Seawalk update to Item C.

III. Approval of Minutes

The minutes of the following Lands Committee Meeting were approved:
October 29, 2012

IV. Public Participation – non-agenda items (10 minutes)

There was no public participation on non-agenda items.

V. Action Item

A. Ordinance 2012-49 – Amending the Disposal Section of the Land Management Code

Ms. Marlow gave a brief summary of her memo and Ordinance 2012-49.

Ms. Becker: I'm not sure if I like this. On the third page, the Satisfaction of CBJ 53.09.260(a), the action is to not have an ordinance when property is being disposed of if it is already in the management plan. I did not see a reason to not have an ordinance. I think the land management plan should be updated often but if it isn't it would be a length of time before that happens again. If it is a while before the management plan is updated, then an ordinance should happen if the land is disposed.

Mr. Dybdahl: With that issue, does it matter for what purpose the land might be disposed of?

Ms. Marlow: I don't think so. When we identify land for disposal in the management plan, the intention is that we will use one of these methods for disposal to obtain the value that we want to achieve. It's usually for its highest and best use.

Mr. Dybdahl: To me, something that might not be known until the initial development. Times change and people come up with different ideas. Would that make a difference if we open up a large area for housing?

Ms. Marlow: No, I don't think so.

Ms. Crane: Would it still have to go to the Planning Commission, even if it doesn't have to come back to the Assembly?

Ms. Marlow: No, the Planning Commission recommends a Land Management Plan to the Assembly, including properties for disposal, and the Assembly adopts the plan by ordinance.

Mr. Jones: If somebody is paying a fee and the proposal is to be reviewed by the Assembly. To skip that, if it's part of the management plan, I would agree that I don't care for that section.

Ms. Marlow: There are several ways we could go. We could put a time limit on it, for example, 5 years for a plan. 53.09.260(a) is for negotiated sales, leases and exchanges. Those have to be approved by ordinance by the Assembly anyway. It depends if you want an ordinance that authorizes the sale to be negotiated or an ordinance that says the terms and conditions that have been negotiated.

Ms. Becker: It says the determination of whether the proposal should be considered. I'm feeling uncomfortable with it. I don't see a reason to not continue with what we're doing now.

Ms. Marlow: In section B, if you get through the first sentence it says "upon satisfactory progress in the negotiation or competition undertaken pursuant to subsection (a) of this section, and after review by the planning commission and authorization by the assembly by ordinance, the manager may conclude arrangements for the lease, sale or exchange or other disposal of City and Borough land." That's the ordinance process that authorizes the terms and conditions of property, that was identified in the management plan, for disposal.

Mr. Jones: The front section says that if it's in the management plan then we don't have to apply this section.

Ms. Marlow: It's referring to 260(a), rather than 260(b).

Jones: If the new 260(a) and if it's in the plan, then the manager doesn't have to get a motion from the Assembly.

Mr. Dybdahl: This will go to Docks & Harbors and the Airport Board and then what?

Ms. Marlow: This will go to Docks & Harbors and Airport Board and then back to Lands Committee, then maybe the COW.

Motion: Mr. Dybdahl moved that the Lands Committee forward Ordinance 2012-49 to the Docks & Harbors Board and the Airport Board for review and comment.

Hearing no objection, motion passes unanimously.

VI. Information Items

A. Affordable Housing Commission Update

Ms. Marlow reviewed her memo and the Affordable Housing Commission task list.

Mr. Dybdahl: If the community forum will be in February and March, does that give time to make changes to ordinances?

Ms. Marlow: No, ordinance changes normally take longer than that.

Mr. Smith: What is the format for the forum?

Ms. Marlow: We had a housing summit in 2007 that was facilitated. I anticipate replicating the housing summit. I think framing the forum, content and how it will be delivered are still items that need to be discussed. We're open to all suggestions.

Mr. Smith: I have a suggestion - it could be a panel format where you give an assignment to the panel for solutions to the problems. The other could be a breakout session for areas of people's particular interests.

Mr. Bishop: Breakout sessions are always useful. People are more free in their discussions.

Ms. Becker: Was the 2007 summit an affordable housing meeting?

Ms. Marlow: It wasn't meant to be but became an affordable housing meeting by default.

Ms. Becker: Do you know if there is a listing that shows what came from those discussions?

Ms. Marlow: I would need to look for the summary from the summit and see what has been completed.

Ms. Crane: After the public meeting, are they going to go back and look at the task list? When are they wanting comments on the task list? What happens from this list?

Ms. Marlow: The list is mostly for the AHC. The thought is that we would solicit comments from the forum to be integrated. The housing plan has been on the list for years along with tax incentives but if there are good comments then they would focus on getting them in the list.

Ms. Crane: What is included in the housing plan?

Ms. Marlow: Implementing actions for how you get housing available for occupancy.

Mr. Jones: Mr. Smith, this meeting, isn't it similar to your meeting with Wanamaker and Kiehl?

Mr. Smith: I know those names were mentioned but I don't think anyone was appointed. I think that was more general housing stock, rather than affordable housing.

B. Buildable Lands Update

Ms. Marlow: The buildable lands topic was before a joint meeting between the Lands Committee and the Public Works & Facilities and it was then referred to the Affordable Housing Commission. The AHC has forwarded a recommendation to the Assembly. The Planning Commission has reviewed the disposal areas at Pederson Hill and Switzer and made a recommendation to the Assembly for a near term disposal area across from DZ Middle School for a multi-family housing development and for development across from Sherwood Lane. That recommendation has been issued and is set up for your action. The action that we need to happen is to move money between CIPs to complete those project areas. We need to get the Assembly up to speed on those areas.

Mr. Smith: Can you share the type of development and units in that area?

Ms. Marlow: The type of development is affordable housing, which is \$250,000 or less for a structure or 30% of average median income for rent. HUD determines the average median income for a community on an annual basis and in Juneau it's around \$1,200 so rents would be around \$400. The thought is for more affordable multi-family housing in Switzer. The Pederson Hill area is much larger and has several development areas. It is intended for multi-family affordable housing. It could have stand-alone dwelling units, condos, town homes, group quarters, etc. It can accommodate a wide range of price points. In addition to affordable housing, we would also get market rate housing. This would be the first step for that process.

Ms. Crane: How do we assure that we end up with affordable housing? Is there a way for the borough to sell property in those areas for less than market value with an agreement that the housing will be affordable housing?

Ms. Marlow: This is much farther than developing buildable land about 5 years out, but there are several ways to go through this. The intention is that we will solicit for proposals for affordability, duration, etc. We will then score the responses based on those criteria. That will help frame who we make the disposal to. We are intending to invest more than \$6 million in infrastructure to get the land prepped, subdivided and ready to be sold. We can sell land for less than market value but there is a large subsidy that is going out in advance of these disposals with subdivision improvements.

Mr. Dybdahl: Can you explain group quarters?

Ms. Marlow: Group quarters can be for developmentally challenged individuals with a house manager, senior housing or transitional housing for people coming out of the correctional system. There are multiple occupants of group quarters.

Ms. Becker: Do you have in mind to do one piece of property before the other?

Ms. Marlow: We're going to try to do them at the same time. To bring Switzer to the point where we're soliciting is about 18 months out and at the same time we'll be making progress for Pederson Hill where we can solicit in about 4-5 years. We would pursue them simultaneously.

Mr. Jones: You mentioned 100 housing units, is that only for Pederson Hill?

Ms. Marlow: The Switzer disposal area can hold 30-40 units. Pederson Hill can hold 100s of units but they would need a separate access point to build more than 100 homes. Our estimate is just to get going on the first 100 homes.

C. Seawalk Land Acquisitions

Ms. Marlow: Out of an Assembly motion, staff was directed to purchase pieces of land that will be future sections of the seawalk. We have closed on the spit property and we just signed off on a purchase agreement on the archipelago property. The archipelago property will require a subdivision to perform which will need to go through the Planning Commission for review and approval. We seem to be in good shape and I don't anticipate any problems.

Mr. Bishop: Why is this coming to the Planning Commission?

Ms. Marlow: It is development in a high hazard mass wasting designation.

VII. Liaison Reports

Mr. Bishop: We've been working with Lands for the disposal. We've been very strongly supportive of the Switzer Creek lands. I feel that moving into Pederson Hill presents an opportunity to put affordable housing in with market rate housing. It's appropriate to have them mixed together. I think that the Pederson Hill presents the opportunity to work towards alternative access out the road and west valley. This is a good step forward.

VIII. Next Meeting

December 10, 2012 at 5:00pm in the Assembly Chambers

IX. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 5:43pm.