HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE

Appointed by the City & Borough of Juneau's Mayor

Meeting Agenda
Friday, March 25, 2022
12:00 P.M. – 1:30 P.M.
Marine View Building, 4th Floor Conference Room & Zoom Webinar

Members of the public may listen in or watch by following one of these options.

Please click the link to join the meeting: https://juneau.zoom.us/j/85832155977, or call 1-669-900-6833 or 1-253-215-8782 or 1-346-248-7799 or 1-929-436-2866 or 1-301-715-8592 or 1-312-626-6799, and enter Webinar ID: 858 3215 5977

A. Call to Order
B. Approval of Agenda
C. Minutes
    a. December 10, 2021 Draft Minutes
    b. February 11, 2022 Draft Minutes
    c. March 4, 2022 Draft Minutes
D. Comments About Last Meeting
E. Discussion of List of Operational & Regulatory Tasks / Priorities
F. Public Comment (10 Minutes)
G. Next Steps

Assembly Charge

The purpose of this task force shall be to provide helpful advice to the Assembly regarding housing and development issues. Specifically, the task force is asked to:

1. Review the path that a project must take to gain approval. Identify areas where pathways may be improved, keeping in mind staff constraints. Evaluate the current pre-application process and make recommendations.

2. Discuss possible structures to engage a working group that interfaces with land and facility developers in the industry.

3. Consistent with Assembly goals, identify general processes and areas in existing Title 49 code that inhibit growth and development. The goal is to identify and prioritize tasks or projects that could be worked on by this task force or other groups.

THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
HOUSING & DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE
December 10, 2021 – Meeting Minutes

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Housing and Development Task Force was held in the 4th Floor Conference Room of the Marine View Building, and was called to order by Chair Loren Jones at 11:03a.m.

Roll Call

Members Present: Ex-Officio Chair Loren Jones, Dave Hanna, Wayne Jensen, Bill Heumann, Paul Voelckers, Nathaniel Dye (via Zoom)

Members Absent: Vice Chair Maria Gladziszewski and Michelle Hale.

Staff Present: City Manager Rorie Watt, Mayor Beth Weldon, City Attorney Robert Palmer, Community Development Department Director Jill Maclean, CDD Administrative Assistant Chelsea Wallace

B. Approval of Agenda

Hearing no changes, the agenda was approved as presented.

C. Approval of Minutes

a. September 30, 2021 Draft Minutes
b. October 15, 2021 Draft Minutes
c. October 29, 2021 Draft Minutes

Mr. Voelkers noted that the October 29 Meeting Minutes listed him as being present at the meeting, when he was actually absent and traveling during that time.

Hearing no further comments, the September 30 and October 15 Minutes were approved as presented.

D. Comments About Last Meeting

There were no comments about the November 12, 2021 meeting.

E. Review of Variance Ordinance

Mr. Jones referenced the discussion surrounding variances at the November 12 meeting, which prompted him to invite City Attorney Robert Palmer to today's meeting to provide additional insight to variance-related ordinances.

Mr. Palmer thanked Mr. Jones for the introduction, and identified two key concepts essential to this discussion: the Conditional Use Permit and the concept of variances. He described the Conditional Use Permit as a permit approval process designed to provide flexibility to developers, whereas a variance is a request that violates the law as it is written.

He further explained that variances are not meant to be used for flexibility purposes. Mr. Palmer noted that in the past decade, CBJ has been highly responsive to concerns about Title 49. On average, Title 49 is updated nearly ten times a year via ordinances; about 30% of the total ordinances adopted by the Assembly are subsequent amendments to Title 49.

Mr. Voelckers added that variances are often rather difficult to obtain, and heavily rely on geographical and physical limitations.

Mr. Hanna responded to Mr. Palmer's comments, particularly regarding how 30% of CBJ's ordinances are amendments to Title 49. He said that this high volume of ordinances could be seen as a testament to an underlying problem, as a functional Title 49 would not necessitate a large number of ordinances amending it. (11:59)

Mr. Voelckers asked CDD Director Maclean to define the criteria in which a Conditional Use Permit is necessary.

Ms. Maclean explained that the CUP process is often determined on the number of dwelling units, bedrooms, and acreage. She suggested the committee to keep neighborhoods in mind when considering the CUP process, and to recognize the impact that rezoning may have on neighboring properties.

Mr. Jones shared his experience from attending a significant amount of Planning Commission meetings over the past nine years, saying that the public process is often the most contentious part of the CUP process. He spoke to the importance of allowing the public the ability to weigh in by opting for a thorough public comment period.

Mr. Jones asked Ms. Maclean to clarify where in the process the public comment period begins prior to a Planning Commission decision, such as a neighborhood meeting hosted by CDD. Ms. Maclean shared that the initiation of the public comment period is at her discretion as CDD Director, and typically depends on the type of permit being issued. She added that she takes this aspect of her role very seriously, and has adopted the Systemic Racism Review Committee criteria into her decision-making. Ms. Maclean also added that CDD strives to issue notice to the public at least six weeks in advance, beyond the standard two week public notice requirement.

There was further discussion surrounding the Conditional Use Permit process.

F. Assembly Retreat Update

Mayor Weldon provided an update on the Assembly Retreat that was held on December 4, where the Assembly met to decide upon the Assembly Goals for 2022. Mayor Weldon reported that the Assembly considered the revision of Title 49 and updating the Comprehensive Plan as Assembly Goals related to the Housing and Development Task Force.

Mayor Weldon added that one of the Assembly Goals involved allocating funds for the purpose of accomplishing the goals they established.

Mr. Watt reported that the Assembly discussed revising and improving Title 49, facilitating housing, the implementation of projects and strategies that further develops the Affordable Housing Action Plan, and continue utilizing the Affordable Housing Fund.

Mr. Voelkers asked if the Assembly had considered an entire rewrite of Title 49 or selective upgrades to Title 49 as needed.

Mayor Weldon said that the sentiment of the Assembly seemed to be to revise Title 49 as needed.

G. Examples of Permitting Delays

Mr. Jones recommended this topic be included in the agenda for a future meeting.

H. Recommendations for Changes to Title 49

Mr. Heumann shared that the developers held a meeting on December 7, the general consensus from this meeting expressed that a revised Title 49 should include specific requirements for the timing of the permitting process. He added that one of the biggest problems shared amongst local developers was identified as a lack of communication between developers and the City. Mr. Heumann provided examples of this through his experiences with the City from past developer projects.

Mr. Hanna agreed with Mr. Heumann's report, and said that communication issues was one of the biggest concerns discussed at the developer meeting. He acknowledged the staffing issues at CDD, and suggested the City address the empty positions through contracting outside help.

Mr. Voelkers noted that one of the first actions taken by this committee was to modify the pre-application process. He asked if a streamlined pre-application process would help address concerns regarding timing.

Mr. Heumann explained that the pre-application process typically takes up to a year, during which the project often morphs and changes, which in turn results in further delays in the pre-application process.

There was further discussion regarding the details and the timing of the pre-application process.

Ms. Maclean explained that the issue regarding the pre-application schedule was recently brought to her attention, and she was able to fix that problem the following day. She encouraged the development sector to plan further out with their scheduling, noting that the winter months are often a slower time for CDD. Ms. Maclean also said that putting hard deadlines into Code would be difficult; if the developers were asking CDD to consider adopting hard deadlines into

Code, she noted that in order to do so, pre-applications would need to be detailed, specific, and meeting the requirements set by the state.

Ms. Maclean provided an update on recently filled CDD staff positions.

I. Public Comment (10 Minutes)

Municipal Clerk Beth McEwen mentioned that the draft Assembly Retreat Meeting Minutes would be posted later that day, prior to the Regular Assembly Meeting on December 13.

J. Suggestions for Next Agenda

Mr. Jones set the agenda for the next meeting to include a discussion related to the Table of Dimensional Standards, permitting, and Title 49.

There was a discussion about Title 49 in relation to the local housing shortage.

K. Next Meeting Date

Mr. Jones recommended the committee set the next HDTF meetings to be held on January 14 and January 28.
Ms. Maclean shared that she would be travelling during January 28.

Mr. Jones suggested setting the next meeting dates to be held on January 7 and January 21.

L. ADJOURNMENT

There being nothing else to come before the Housing & Development Task Force, the meeting was adjourned by Chair Loren Jones at 1:30p.m.

THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE
February 11, 2022 – *DRAFT* Meeting Minutes

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Housing and Development Task Force (HDTF) was held at the Marine View Building Conference Room and via Zoom Webinar, and was called to order by Ex-Officio Chair Loren Jones at 12:01p.m.

Members Present: Ex-Officio Chair Loren Jones, Assemblymember Maria Gladziszewski, Assemblymember Michelle Hale, Planning Commissioner Nathaniel Dye, Planning Commissioner Paul Voelkers, Architect Wayne Jensen, Developer William (Bill) Heumann, and Developer Dave Hanna.
Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Mayor Beth Weldon, City Manager Rorie Watt, Community Development Director Jill Maclean.

B. Approval of Agenda

Mr. Hanna noted that the committee had received the agenda packet shortly before today's meeting, and said they did not have enough time to read through the CDD Informational Memo.

He asked to table Item E - CDD's Informational Memo and move it to the next meeting, while moving Item G - Pre-Application Ordinance Status Update in its place.

Hearing no objections, the agenda changes were approved.

Hearing no objections, the agenda was approved as amended.

C. Approval of Minutes

a. January 7, 2022 Draft Minutes

Mr. Hanna said that he did not have a chance to read over the January 7, 2022 meeting minutes as they were submitted shortly before today's meeting. He moved to approve the draft minutes at the next meeting.

Approval of the January 7, 2022 minutes were postponed to the next HDTF meeting.

D. Comments About Last Meeting

None.

E. Community Development Department Informational Memo

This agenda item was postponed for discussion at the next HDTF meeting.

G. Pre-Application Ordinance Status Update

This item was moved to be discussed prior to Item F.

CDD Director Jill Maclean explained that the pre-application ordinance was introduced at the January 25 Planning Commission meeting after being discussed at a Title 49 Committee meeting. Ms. Maclean recommended the Planning Commission approve the ordinance, but ultimately the Commission referred the ordinance back to the Title 49 Committee for further discussion. She added that there were no members of the public were present to testify.

Mr. Voelckers shared that there had been rigorous debate at the Planning Commission meeting regarding the pre-application ordinance. He said the PC came within one vote of passing it as submitted and written. He said that there was some collective apprehension, that there may have been some aspects of the ordinance that needed of further consideration and potential unintended consequences or the possible negative outcomes for applicants who opted out of the pre-application process. He said that it was a close vote and PC members weren't trying to be obstructionist but it seemed important enough to get more conversation at a committee level to figure out how to get the wording just right.

Ms. Hale asked for clarification on when the pre-application conference requirement began. Ms. Maclean said that she believed that the pre-application requirement came into being about a decade ago, shortly after the Assembly's creation of the Randy Wanamaker Committee. She added that the intent, at the time of that committee, was to help streamline the application process, while also providing more information to applicants.

Mr. Hanna said that he wanted to provide a recap of what has happened to date. He noted that he watched the Planning Commission meeting recording. He reminded members that there was a lot of discussion at the task force meeting about this and at one of those meetings, Ms. Maclean acknowledged that not all applications are in need of a pre-application hearing. At previous HDTF meetings, Mr. Hanna said that the committee unanimously agreed by the HDTF that it would be simplest and best to make the pre-application conference optional. He did not think that the Planning Commission would have an issue with approving their recommendation. He said that he didn't think anyone on the HDTF thought there would be any problem in this ordinance passing. He then went onto state that while Ms. Maclean conveyed to the Planning Commission that the HDTF was in favor of this, at that meeting, the planner who introduced the ordinance did not present it in a favorable light. He recalled this planner giving an example of an applicant wanting to split a lot, but did not realize that the lot was too small until the pre-application conference. He felt that this issue could have been resolved via phone call.

Mr. Hanna said that when the discussion at the PC got going, the director lobbied strongly against this ordinance, which he found to be very disingenuous. He said that one of the commissioners asked the director if her recommendation should be taken with a grain of salt, as she seemed not to be in favor of this ordinance, to which the director replied in the affirmative. Mr. Hanna expressed frustration about this, and felt that this was an end run around the task force and that Ms. Maclean's issues with this ordinance should have been voiced at an HDTF

meeting. Mr. Hanna commended Mr. Voelckers in his support of this ordinance, but said that it wasn't enough.

Ms. Maclean did not believe that she had spoken any differently from the outset about her stance on pre-application ordinance. She said that she strongly felt that the pre-application conference is an incredible tool for both the CBJ and the private sector, be it either a developer or a private homeowner. Ms. Maclean said that she firmly stated her concerns in the HDTF meetings as well as with the PC, as she believed that this ordinance could potentially come back to bite the CDD if it were to be adopted. She felt that this ordinance could extend the permitting timeline, as they will not be able to have all of the information upfront on a project. She expressed her concerns that CDD and other department staff have to run around and track down additional information that will cause a number of delays to project timelines. She said that those have been her concerns from the beginning of these discussions and she has shared them throughout the HDTF discussions on this issue.

Ms. Maclean stated that they never assume that whatever comes out of a particular committee should be rubber stamped by the Planning Commission just because it may come to them as a unanimous recommendation. The job of the PC is to take those recommendations and to make their own informed decisions. She added that it was a public meeting, and no members of the public, or representatives from the development community, came forward to testify in favor of this ordinance.

Ms. Maclean noted that CDD Planner Beth McKibben had stepped up to assist Ms. Maclean in preparing the staff report for this ordinance due to Ms. Maclean being out of town and the timeframe which Ms. McKibben had to work on this was extremely shortened for this type of legislation. Ms. Maclean also clarified that the example provided by the planner at the meeting was approved by her, as it was a good example demonstrating how the little guy who doesn't always know what they are doing might miss some important details that can be addressed during the pre-application conference.

Mr. Hanna explained that he does not expect the Planning Commission to be a rubber stamp for HDTF recommendations, but he had believed that the ordinance was supported unanimously by this committee. Mr. Hanna said that he did not expect Maclean to lobby against this ordinance, and said that the task force should have been informed of her stance. He suggested that someone from the HDTF, such as the committee chair, should have attended to relay the position of the HDTF to the Planning Commission.

Ms. Hale commented that this was the second instance that she had heard the phrase, "the meeting was public notice, so you should have known". The first example of this was the SRRC meeting that Mr. Arndt did not attend because he did not know about the N. Douglas rezone. She said that CBJ staff should be careful about relying on that notion, and was frustrated that the chair of HDTF was not asked to attend the Planning Commission meeting. Ms. Hale felt that Ms.

Maclean should have informed the HDTF that she would be arguing against the recommendation of this task force, which were forwarded to the Planning Commission by the Assembly.

Mr. Watt explained that it is commonplace for the Planning Commission to deliberate on the details of an ordinance. He recalled that he also expressed concerns about this ordinance at earlier HDTF meetings. Mr. Watt believed that that CBJ staff and the Planning Commission are doing what they normally do, going into the details and referring it to committee for further discussion.

Mr. Hanna said that the Planning Commission is right to debate the ordinance, his concern was rooted in the task force not being made aware that the ordinance would be lobbied against. He said that he concerns were that things have not been open or transparent, and felt blindsided.

Mr. Heumann said that this experience had taught him that they must learn how to advocate for the decisions they make as a committee at meetings such as this one. He said that they need to represent themselves at these meetings. He said that he felt it would be a courtesy for staff to inform HDTF members that meetings are happening on topics they have forwarded.

Ms. Gladziszewski, commenting on the process, noted that another member of this task force chose to vote against the pre-application ordinance at the Planning Commission meeting.

Mr. Dye shared that he was the member that did not support the ordinance at the time of the Planning Commission meeting. He said that process wise, he did not consider this as a rubber stamp and he often doesn't know how he will be voting on something at the Planning Commission meeting until that moment comes. He said that as part of that process, he feels staff did support it but with some level of concern, and that is why he asked what he did and voted the way he did. He believed those concerns were justified. He spoke to the public process and said he has struggled with CBJ's public process for some time and is glad they are discussing it. He checks the CBJ agenda/meetings page every week to see what is coming up. In regards to public meetings, Mr. Dye stated that one of the concerns raised by the HDTF was the amount of staff time that is spent not working on moving projects forward and he said that if staff was required to be sending personal notices to individuals and groups on every particular meeting, that would delay things rather than make them more streamline and efficient.

Mr. Heumann said that they try to keep on top of things and they keep the communication channels open. He said that he did not feel that it would be particularly time consuming to communicate with involved parties about upcoming meetings.

Mr. Voelckers agreed with Mr. Heumann, saying it is fair to expect to be notified when a meeting regarding a particular issue is about to occur.

Ms. Maclean said that she can appreciate this to a certain extent, but added that there are many sectors and developers that are not represented here. She said that her concern is with providing

special treatment to some over others. She said that the pre-application conference affects everyone, and to expect CDD to be responsible for contacting certain developers at any given time is not realistic. Who are they notifying, do they send it out as a list, what determines who gets to be notified? She spoke to the standard public notice protocols followed by the Clerk's office for meetings, and mentioned the notification to the Neighborhood Association distribution list as an example.

Ms. Hale said that she does not want the committee to get bogged down by this discussion about notification, and this discussion can occur outside of this task force.

Mr. Jones asked Mr. Dye to clarify when the next Title 49 meeting is set to be held. Mr. Dye said that the next Title 49 Committee is set to be held on Thursday, March 3 at 12:00pm. Mr. Jones noted that is held at the same time as the Juneau Chamber of Commerce meeting. Ms. Maclean clarified that the March 3 Title 49 meeting will be split between discussing the pre-application ordinance and coastal zone management.

F. Chamber's Housing & Development Committee Recommendations Memo

Mr. Jones noted that they included in the packet the memo from Juneau Chamber of Commerce (JCC) CEO Craig Dahl about the Housing Development Committee.

Mr. Hanna suggested the Chamber create a discussion seat to forward suggestions through a formal process, and said it would be invaluable to the development community and CDD.

Mr. Jensen mentioned that they are considering ways to potentially accelerate CDD's permitting process. He said they were trying to stay focused on the big picture process issues rather than getting down into the weeds on particular issues. He said that from the JCC group's viewpoint, permitting is the most important thing that the CDD department does and they are looking for ways to help make that be more efficient.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked where CDD was in addressing the requests made in regards to tracking and expediting the permit process.

Ms. Maclean explained that CDD staff is currently reviewing the available permitting software other communities are utilizing. She mentioned that the timing is good, because CDD has some building inspectors and permit technicians attending a national conference where they will be tasked with speaking to their cohorts about what systems they have in place. Ms. Maclean also spoke to the staff turnaround at CDD, and said that there are only two permit specialists and they were both hired within this past year.

Ms. Maclean said that CDD intends to figure out a way to show the volume and types of permits, which is what the LHEDC and Assembly have asked for. She is aware that developers are wanting to know where their individual applications are at in the permitting process; but that information is is difficult to provide on a daily basis without adequate software. She said that

CDD is trying to come up with inexpensive ways to track what they are doing, but without the software there is not an easy way to go about it.

Mr. Voelckers asked if any other community development departments in the country have a time tracking aspect that implement hard deadlines.

Ms. Maclean explained that the last city she worked for had a population of 100,000, and they had just received a grant to purchase permitting software shortly before she left. Regarding deadlines, Ms. Maclean said she had never worked anywhere that had a timeline for review except for Massachusetts, due to the state's law which automatically approves variances if they are not acted upon within a certain timeframe.

Mr. Jones and Ms. Hale had a brief discussion about the possible implementation of permitting software. Ms. Hale said the HDTF needs to be focused on identifying solutions and that the Assembly would be supportive of trying to provide those solutions.

Mr. Heumann spoke to the level of frustration in the development community regarding the timing of the permitting process. He mentioned that the recommendations of the HDTF have addressed this issue from various angles: the pre-application ordinance, scheduling, and communication – he said that these all help expedite the permitting process.

Ms. Maclean said that CDD is doing their best to make the permitting process go as fast as they can. She spoke to how quickly Juneau is able to permit buildings such as accessory apartments. She said that there does not seem to be an appreciation for the workload that the department is currently managing.

Ms. Hale said that it is not productive of this task force to be talking about CDD and have Maclean defend her own department. She said that the HDTF needs to be focused on finding solutions and she spoke to her frustration of the task force's tendency to go off target. Mr. Hanna agreed with Ms. Hale's comments. Ms. Gladziszewski noted that many of these concerns were operational issues that the Manager and Director need to work out. She asked what they are trying to accomplish with this task force, are all the requirements as they should be, the number and type of permits that are needed, etc…? She said she thought the HDTF was trying to find solutions within the code and those types of things that could be addressed with legislation but that operational issues need to be addressed by the Manager and staff.

Mr. Watt encouraged the HDTF to read the memo provided by CDD in the packet, which had been forwarded to the next agenda. He spoke to the solid recommendations in the memo Maclean provided. He mentioned that CBJ is a complicated system that requires a lot of information, and the Planning Commission is rather rigorous. Mr. Watt hoped that the next meeting could focus on the CDD memo and prioritization.

Mr. Watt and Mayor Weldon left the meeting at 1:01p.m to attend another meeting.

Ms. Gladziszewski asked if there is anything in the Code that the development community believes to be unnecessary, and to specifically identify them.

Mr. Hanna reminded the committee of the extensive list of suggestions and changes to the Table of Dimensional Standards that was submitted by him, Mr. Heumann, and Mr. Voelckers; which was referred to the Title 49 Committee.

Mr. Heumann suggested they should take another section of code to review prior to the next meeting, and asked Ms. Maclean if she had any recommendations.

Ms. Maclean said that the memo provided a list of nine recommendations of what could be looked at next. The first recommendation is related to the Comprehensive Plan, and the rest are related to Title 49. She said it would be great if the task force could go through the memo at the next meeting. She asked them to be mindful that the Title 49 Committee will be working on the pre-application ordinance and coastal zone management at their next meeting.

H. Public Comment

Wayne Coogan mentioned that the Engineering Department regularly holds a pre-bid conference, which allows for bidders to become familiar with the issues of the bid for each project. Mr. Coogan also said that he did not think it was fair to expect the public to find the time to attend public meetings as CBJ staff do, while staff is being paid overtime to attend. He felt that the city should spend time reaching out and getting opinions from the public. He also questioned the necessity of multiple committees weighing in on a single ordinance.

Ms. Hale clarified that most CBJ staff who attend public meetings in the evenings are not paid overtime, as they are salaried employees.

I. Suggestions for Next Agenda

Mr. Jones said that he will include the CDD informational memo and Mr. Heumann's emails to the next meeting's agenda.

Mr. Heumann volunteered to redline the Table of Permissible Uses and bring that to the committee for the next meeting.

Mr. Hanna suggested attaching Mr. Voelckers memo to the agenda, as it had good suggestions and changes to the TDS as well. He was also interested in Mr. Dye's memo on streamlined setbacks.

Mr. Jones clarified that Mr. Dye and Mr. Voelckers respective memos have already been forwarded to the Title 49 Committee, but he will still include them in the agenda.

J. Next Meeting Date

The next scheduled Housing & Development Task Force meeting was scheduled to be held on March 4, 2022 at 12:00pm.

K. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, the Housing and Development Task Force meeting was adjourned at 1:22p.m.

THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA
HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE
March 4, 2022 – DRAFT Meeting Minutes

A. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting of the Housing and Development Task Force (HDTF) was held in the CDD Conference Room and via Zoom Webinar, and was called to order by Ex-Officio Chair Loren Jones at 12:04p.m.

Members Present: Ex-Officio Chair Loren Jones, Assemblymember Maria Gladziszewski, Assemblymember Michelle Hale, Planning Commissioner Nathaniel Dye, Planning Commissioner Paul Voelkers, Developer William (Bill) Heumann, and Developer Dave Hanna.

Members Absent: Wayne Jensen.

Staff Present: Community Development Department (CDD) Director Jill Maclean, Assistant City Attorney Sherri Layne.

B. Approval of Agenda

The agenda was approved as presented.

C. Approval of Minutes

a. January 7, 2022 Draft Minutes

Hearing no objection, the minutes of the January 7, 2022 meeting were approved by unanimous consent.

Ms. McEwen noted that there were some technical difficulties in connecting to the Zoom portion of the meeting. Mr. Dye and Ms. Hale noted that they both were able to access the meeting via Zoom so it appeared to have been just a technical glitch with the Clerk's office.

D. Comments About Last Meeting

No members had any comments to share related to the previous meeting of the task force.

E. Builders & CDD Draft Recommendations Memo

Mr. Jones noted that since the last meeting, the City Manager, City Attorney's staff met with the Juneau Chamber of Commerce (JCC) and discussed both the CDD memo of February 10 and the Chamber letter from February 7. Following that meeting, Mr. Jones and Ms. Maclean met together worked on what is the one page document in the current packet (packet page 9) titled

"Summary Recommendations – Housing Development Task Force" Version March 1, 2022. He said that was a way they were trying to put together a summary of all the issued they had heard and to put it in writing in one document that might serve as a basis for the report of this task force moving forward. At this point, it is just a topic of discussion by the HDTF. Mr. Jones said that March 25, is slated to be the last meeting of the task force but if they approve or modify and approve this document, it is possible to make this the last meeting of the task force. He noted that he and Ms. Maclean are not available to meet on March 18 and that while Ms. Maclean would be available on March 25, he would not be available to attend.

Mr. Jones noted that what was before the task force at this meeting was to review the following documents:

a. CDD Memo from February 10, 2022
b. Chamber Letter from February 7, 2022
c. Mr. Heumann's Emails from January 7, 2022
d. Commissioner Voelckers' Edits to the Table of Dimensional Standards
e. "Summary Recommendations – Housing Development Task Force" Version March 1, 2022

Ms. Gladziszewski thanked Mr. Jones for explaining that one page Summary Recommendation document. She said that this is exactly the opposite of what they told the Assembly in the November 13, 2021 memo when the Assembly was looking at its goals for the coming year.

Ms. Gladziszewski then highlighted the contents of the November 13, 2021 memo to the Assembly which placed the HDTF recommendations/priorities in the following order:

1) Process permits in a timely fashion
2) Review Title 49 for edits/efficiencies
3) Recommend a rewrite of the Comprehensive Plan if there is time

Ms. Maclean noted that at past meetings, CDD had been asked to draft a memo of their overall workload. She explained how the workload is distributed across different divisions. The planners focus on permit and plan review and then will also be working on updates to the land use code. She said she is trying to balance what she is hearing from the assembly to help accomplish their goals while also trying to address the HDTF recommendations.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that the Assembly did adopt goals that included the update to the Comprehensive (Comp) Plan as one of its top priorities but she also expressed her concern that focusing on the Comp Plan gorilla project may take away from the ability to affect smaller changes to other important pieces such as updating Title 49 and the Table of Permissible Uses.

She said that she doesn't object to the Comp Plan update but that will take years to do and she does object to it coming in on the HDTF recommendations as the first priority on the list.

Mr. Hanna said that he believes the full HDTF would agree on all the points in the summary but that it would likely need to be reordered. He commented that item #1 should have the words "contracting out" added such that it reads:
"1. Undertake CDD staff will be ***contracting out*** the revision of the Comprehensive Plan in order to execute on the following, …"

Mr. Jones said that this summary document was not listed in any priority order. Ms. Gladziszewski said that since the one thing the HDTF had all agreed upon was the November 13 memo, the summary document threw her off guard when the Comp Plan was the first item to appear on the list.

Mr. Hanna asked to also add a new Number 13 as follows:
"**13. Consider contracting out more plan reviews and inspections.**"

Mr. Voelckers said that he views this summary as a good faith way to put their arms around a variety of pieces, some of which are related to the Comp Plan and others are not but are rather administrative steps that can be taken. He said in looking over the list, items 8 and 11 are the main ones he sees that would be clarified by the Comp Plan process. He said that item 6 might be a little bit since Mr. Dye has proposed an interesting, provocative thing to get rid of the Table of Dimensional Standards and replace it with a category called form based zoning. He said that might be something to be studied by someone contracted to look at a comprehensive plan. Otherwise, he views the remaining items as being primarily administrative improvements that are done at a departmental level that keep the pieces moving correctly.

Mr. Voelckers said that with respect to item 6, they have already had a motion from this committee forwarded to the Title 49 Committee to begin work in terms of possible improvements. He said that the TPU may be treated in the same way. He said the Title 49 Committee is the correct venue to work on the level of specificity that it needs to get it right.

Ms. Hale said in going back to Ms. Gladziszewski and Ms. Maclean's comments at the beginning of the meeting. She said that this document is supposed to be this task force's recommendations and not the Assembly goals and not the CDD goals and workload issues and she was concerned that they are trying to conflate all those pieces. She agreed with Mr. Hanna's suggestion that when the Comp Plan is worked on, that it will need to be contracted out and even then, it will be a big lift for the CDD staff to work on.

Ms. Gladziszewski said she was looking at this list and tried to determine a way it could be parsed out into different categories such as a "management" category or "regulatory" category or a "planning" category that might help address Ms. Hale's concerns and suggestions.

Ms. Maclean said that she doesn't have any qualms with what is put on this list. She brought forward the workload information based on what the HDTF had asked her to provide. She said that CDD will have other opportunities to address workload concerns with the Assembly such as when they are discussing their budget pieces during the Assembly Finance Committee meetings.

Ms. Maclean said that she did want to address a couple of the items specifically that Mr. Hanna raised. She said that she had removed one item from the original draft as the intent was to have a combined draft document that the developers and staff worked on collaboratively and agreed upon since the last HDTF meeting. She said the one item that she had removed was one that they had not discussed at those in between meetings and she wanted to flag it. She doesn't want to repeat what happened with the pre-application meeting ordinance. She wants to be very transparent and notify the committee that she does have strong concerns with Mr. Hanna's proposed new "**13. Consider contracting out more plan reviews and inspections."** because she feels it is a "pay to play" so that if you can afford to pay for private inspections and if you can afford to pay an outside person to review your permit, you end up skipping ahead in the que.

Ms. Maclean said that she wanted to be very clear on the record about her concerns on that one. She said that she would foresee that as that one goes through the process, including going before the Systemic Racism Review Committee that it would get flagged for equity and she thinks it should get flagged in that manner. She said that she is happy to work with the HDTF with whatever their recommendations 1-12 on the current list in whatever order they wish them to appear but she wants to be clear about her stance with respect to item 13.

Ms. Hale appreciated Ms. Maclean's concerns expressed with respect to item 13 about the "pay to play" and noted that there are ways to consider contracting that would not include a "pay to play" model such as the Assembly setting aside a specific amount of funding for those contractual services so that the permittees are not the ones required to pay.

Members then discussed a variety of ways to approach the list as well as the potential of splitting it up into categories.

Ms. Gladziszewski suggested that the HDTF split this list into two, possibly three, categories: **Management** and **Regulatory**. Samples of those falling within the Management category would include #3, #5, whereas Regulatory items would include #2, #6, and #10. She said that a third

category might be **Long Range Planning** that would include #1 Comp Plan and other similar planning related items.

Mr. Voelckers suggested the following item **categories**/*changes* with categories listed in **bold** and changes listed in *italics* as follows:

Comp Plan/Regulatory [New Category]
Item #1: Undertake the revision of the Comprehensive Plan, *with a focus on items 8 & 11, (and possibly others)*

Planning Commission/Title 49 Actions [New Category]
The HDTF recommends the Title 49 Committee prioritize action on the following items:
Item #2, Item #4, and Item #6 [item 6 is already in Title 49 Committee]

CDD Administrative [New Category]
Items #3, #5, #7, #9, #10, and potentially item #12

Ms. Gladziszewski said that she appreciated Mr. Voelckers suggestions but would suggest that Item #8 should not be subsumed under the Comp Plan but rather it should be one of the items before the Planning Commission. She asked Mr. Voelckers to clarify which other items he thought should fall under the Comp Plan.

Mr. Voelckers said that item #11 was a 'bonus reserve' item that has been in place since he came to Juneau and that was one that he thought would be very feasible. Ms. Gladziszewski said that she thought that could fall under the Planning Commission category but could also see why he thought it should be under Comp Plan.

Mr. Dye said that item #11 is a Planning Commission ordinance that just needs to be approved. He said that items #9 and #10 should also be Planning Commission action and not fall under the Comp Plan or CDD Administrative categories. Those would be new ordinances that would be changes to Title 49.

Ms. Maclean said that, with all due respect to Commissioner Voelckers, she preferred Ms. Gladziszewski's proposal of the two categories splitting the list between those items that could be dealt with by staff (Management Category) and those that would go through the public process from the Assembly to the Planning Commission and Title 49 Committee and to drop the Comp Plan piece and have that handled entirely separate from this process/recommendation.

Additional discussion took place regarding the naming of the two categories and the removal of the Comp Plan from the recommendation. In going down the Summary Recommendations, they came up with the following items under each categories:

Item#	Description	Category
1	Undertake the revision of the Comprehensive Plan in order to execute on the following	***Dropped***
2	Review and amend the *Table of Permissible Uses*	**Regulatory**
3	Acquire an online permit tracking system to track status of active permits	**Management**
4	Review permit threshold levels to standardize the requirements depending on the impacts of a project – such as a minor vs. major development	**Regulatory**
5	Establish Community Development *Communication Guidelines* a. Initial permit review to identify any issues that would require additional information. b. Provide permittee with a list of requirements needed for approval and timeline. c. Timely communication with permittees	**Management**
6.	Conduct a line-by-line review with recommendations to amend the *Table of Dimensional Standards* to provide more consistent flexibility	**Regulatory**
7	Review other Alaska communities' and update the permit fee schedule in line with findings	**Management**
8	Enact the Transition Zones that meet the condition to be "up-zoned"	**Regulatory**
9	Review and enact application submittal requirements	**Management**
10	Review plat review requirements and standards	**Regulatory**
11	Evaluate whether denser multi-family zoning (above D10) should be more flexible, including consideration of bonus provisions.	**Regulatory**
12	Facilitate adding a member of the Juneau Chamber's Housing and Development Committee as a liaison to the Title 49 Committee	

Explanatory Discussion points (if any were discussed):

Item #1 for this purposes of the HDTF, item #1 is removed from the above list but Ms. Hale noted that this is on the Assembly goals list already. Mr. Hanna expressed hope that even though this is coming off the HDTF list, he hopes CBJ would contract out the Comp Plan update.

Item #3 Ms. Gladziszewski asked if the word "acquire" should be used or if "make it better" was needed to wordsmith it more accurately. Ms. Maclean said they do not currently have an online permit tracking system. They have already been investigating this but they are working on that issue. She said that it will eventually lead to purchasing something. CDD will be forwarding

whatever its recommendation to the City Manager and it will then become an item being requested in the budget that the Assembly would need to decide upon (likely coming through with a recommendation in early spring.) Mr. Voelckers said he would hope that it might incorporate concepts that it would be used more as a management tool. Additional discussion took place about past practices as well as how this would be a useful tool for permittees as well as staff. Suggested language "continue developing a tracking system." Mr. Hanna stressed the importance of having an online tracking system that would make it equally as easy for staff and permittees to access.

Item #5 – Discussion took place about this item. Ms. Maclean said that her staff has almost completed putting the final touches on item 5 process. Mr. Hanna said he would suggest that stakeholder groups may also be able to provide feedback on how it is working or how it might be improved once implemented. Mr. Heumann suggested they may want to reach out to the builders in the community for their feedback. He also stated that permit applications need to be complete when submitted.

Item #6 – Ms. Gladziszewski suggested simplifying it and mirroring the language under item #2.

Item #7 – Members discussed item #7 and said that it has to start at the management level with final piece regulatory. Mr. Heumann asked where this was coming from. Ms. Maclean said that CBJ's fees have not been updated since 2004 or 2006 and they were working on that just before COVID hit. She noted that we are woefully out of date with other communities in Alaska. She noted that if they are serious about looking at permitting software, any raising of fees may help pay for those software programs and services. Mr. Heumann said that this ties in with Mr. Hanna's suggested #13. Additional discussion took place and it was voted on to put this item under the Management category.

Item #9 – Discussion of this being similar to #7 starting in Management and going to regulatory. "Review and make recommendations…"

Item #10 –Wording change to be consistent with the wording in #9 "Review and make recommendations…"

Item #11 – Mr. Heumann asked if this means that the discussion is initiated in the Title 49 Committee and that there is no prior input from the planning department. Ms. Maclean said she greatly appreciates that question as when she looks at the list, it all starts with the planning department. CDD staff then drafts the language or concepts and provides them to the Title 49 Committee. She said that once they have something drafted, she talked about the process by which the builders can provide input via email to the PC/Title 49 Committee. Mr. Voelckers and

Mr. Heumann weighed in on the process being split between management and regulatory as well as interplay between the stakeholder groups, staff, and Planning Commission.

Additional discussion took place regarding the process by which this list would be categorized, and finalized in advance of the next HDTF meeting for additional work. Mr. Heumann said that he would like to provide a copy of the draft of the list to the Chamber Builder's Group and he felt there may be additional items added later on.

Ms. Gladziszewski noted that there are a number of additional pages in the packet that are not included on this proposed recommendation list. She noted that the Title 49 interpretation for consistency issue had not made the initial list. Additional discussion took place with respect to this issue.

Item #12 – Earlier in the meeting, Mr. Dye had proposed some wording changes to item #12. Mr. Jones noted that he captured that wording change to be: "Facilitate and work on advocacy groups that need representation." Mr. Dye said he would agree with how Mr. Jones captured his concept but he also added that he may not support Item #12 even with that conceptual word change. He provided an examples of the streamside setback process during which experts worked on that proposal a great deal. He expressed his concern was with respect to the amount of time and all the steps along the way from Title 49 to PC COW to PC to Assembly are already very public process intensive and additional membership or side groups may slow down an already drawn out process.

Ms. Gladziszewski said she definitely does not agree with the wording as it is written in the initial draft. She may be a little less adverse to the language Mr. Jones stated but that the Assembly appoints the Planning Commission and the Planning Commission has its subcommittees. She said that she was unclear what the groups are not getting with this process. Additional discussion took place regarding the public testimony protocols, when, and how members of the public can testify at Planning Commission and subcommittee meetings. Many of the points made by members during this discussion were similar to points made during past meetings of the HDTF. Members gave their reasons for why they wanted to leave in or take out Item #12 from the list.

Mr. Heumann suggested that perhaps they may want to consider created a Community Development Department Review Committee. Mr. Dye explained that the most effective way to effect change at the Title 49 committee was to submit comments, suggestions, etc… in writing in advance of the meeting so they can be reviewed during the meeting.
The task force ran out of time for any additional discussion and left Item #12 on the list to be decided upon at the next meeting.

F. Public Comment

Mr. Wayne Coogan reminded the task force that the conception of this committee was due to the industry collectively wanted to help the city function as best as it can. He said that the root of that is to help the suffering economy. He said that tracking of permits, whether they be building or land use, he has heard it said that we may be looking at software that costs $500,000 and he said that may just be hearsay but that he understands that software is complicated. He said that those who write the code and develop software do not always use the end product or are aware of the need of the people who use the software. Not accurate to say that a permit application is ever finished. He said that he hoped when CDD does look for an online/software solution that the end users are consulted to a great degree before the acquisition of a software. He said that he is available to discuss it with Ms. Maclean anytime.

G. Suggestions for Next Agenda

Mr. Jones said that staff will compile the revisions to be brought back to the meeting on March 25 and that since he will not be present at that meeting, Ms. Gladziszewski will be presiding.

H. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the committee, the Housing and Development Task Force meeting was adjourned at 1:35p.m.

Recommendations from HDTF to Assembly, DRAFT for review at 3/25/22 HDTF meeting	
OPERATIONAL (Manager/Director)	**NOTES from CDD Director**
Ensure that CDD's first priority is to process permits in a timely manner. This function should not suffer when additional duties (such as regulatory reviews or plan updates) are also tackled.	
Allocate resources to enable review and revision of Title 49.	
Develop or acquire an online permit tracking system that tracks status of active permits.	underway
Establish Community Development *Communication Guidelines* a. Initial permit review to identify any issues that would require additional information. b. Provide permittee with a list of requirements needed for approval and timeline. c. Timely communication with permittees.	underway
Review other Alaska communities' fees and update the permit fee schedule in line with findings.	reviewed in early 2020; need to update
Review and enact application submittal requirements.	
To the extent possible, subcontract for reviews and inspections.	"pay to play" raises equity concerns
Interpretetations of Title 49, building code or other CBJ ordinances should be consistent. Consistency can be achieved by upper level review, written guidelines, or possibly even adopted regulations. Similar projects should receive consistent treatment and similar conditions.	Director has authority to intrepret code, not staff.
REGULATORY (Assembly/PC/Title 49 Committee)	
Review and amend the *Table of Dimensional Standards* to provide more consistent flexibility and facilitate housing development.	
Review and amend the *Table of Permissible Uses* to facilitiate housing development.	
Review permit threshold levels to standardize the requirements depending on the impacts of a project – such as a minor vs. major development.	
Enact the Transition Zones that meet the condition to be "up-zoned".	
Review plat review requirements and standards.	
Evaluate whether denser multi-family zoning (above D10) should be more flexible, including consideration of bonus provisions.	
Facilitate adding a member of the Juneau Chamber's Housing and Development Committee as a liaison to the Title 49 Committee.	PC decision per PC Rules of Order
Allow for public input at Title 49 Committee meetings.	

NOTE from Vice-Chair Maria: After HDTF committee discussion and finalization of a list, my intention would be to draft a memo from HDTF to the Assembly. Along the lines of "The HDTF recommends that the CBJ undertake the following actions...." and then list the items.

CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

HOUSING AND DEVELOPMENT TASK FORCE

CBJ Housing and Development Task Force

There is created within the City and Borough of Juneau a seven member Housing and Development Task Force. The committee is composed of two Assembly members, two Planning Commissioners and three persons active in the development industry. The proposed members from the Assembly are Ms. Hale and Ms. Gladziszewski; Planning Commission will be represented by Nathaniel Dye and Paul Voelckers and the development industry would be represented through the Juneau Chamber of Commerce's Housing and Development Committee by Bill Heumann, Dave Hanna and Wayne Jensen. The non-voting facilitator/Chair of the HDTF will be outgoing Assemblymember Jones.

The committee shall elect a vice chair from among its members at its first meeting.

Purpose

The purpose of the committee shall be to provide helpful advice to the Assembly regarding housing and development issues.

Specifically, the committee is asked to:

- Review the path that a project must take to gain approval. Identify areas where pathways may be improved, keeping in mind staff constraints. Evaluate the current pre-application process and make recommendations.
- Discuss possible structures to engage a working group that interfaces with land and facility developers in the industry.
- Consistent with Assembly goals, identify general processes and areas in existing title 49 code that inhibit growth and development. The goal is to identify and prioritize tasks or projects that could be worked on by this Task Force or other groups, such examples include:

    - A line by line review of the Table of Permissible Uses
    - A line by line review of dimensional standards
    - Confirmation that a Comprehensive Plan Update is needed
    - Prioritization of efforts to update Title 49, complete Neighborhood Area Plans and funding and updating of the Comprehensive Plan
    - Consideration of governance structure, similar to or different than the Manager's memo to the Lands Housing & Economic Development Committee in July.

Timeline

The members shall serve until completion of their tasks which are proposed to be completed and reported to the Assembly by April 30, 2022. The committee shall automatically expire within six months of this date unless extended. The committee shall report to the Assembly Committee of the Whole as scheduled by the Deputy Mayor.

Meetings, Officers, Records, Quorum, Staff Support

The committee shall determine its meeting schedule according to its workload and at the call of the chair. All meetings shall be open to the public and advertised through the Municipal Clerk's office.

A majority of the committee members shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of its business. The committee shall follow the procedures used by the Assembly for transaction of its business, as interpreted by the City Attorney as necessary. The committee shall keep a record of its meetings, transactions, findings, determinations and written public comments received, which shall be filed with the Municipal Clerk and be open to public inspection at reasonable times.

The City Manager will provide staff support and assistance to the task force as appropriate and as time and priority allows.

Dated: September 9, 2021

Beth A. Weldon, Mayor

City and Borough of Juneau

MEMORANDUM

CITY/BOROUGH OF JUNEAU
Office of the Mayor
155 S. Seward St., Juneau, AK 99801
Beth.Weldon@juneau.org

Voice (907) 586-5240
Fax (907) 586-5385

DATE: September 24, 2021

TO: Housing and Development Task Force

FROM: Beth A. Weldon, Mayor

SUBJECT: Beginning the Process

Thank you for serving on the Housing and Development Task Force.

We can all agree that Juneau needs additional development especially in the housing sector. How we can make that development happen more smoothly is the crux of this task force. The purpose of the Housing and Development Task Force is determining the changes and communication that would enhance this process.

Too often, we end up in our own silos. The hope of bringing in developers, Assembly members, Planning Commissioners, and CDD staff is to have everyone together to not only understand the separate viewpoints but to be realize solutions together. Please bear in mind that this task force is not limited to the views of its members but can gather input from several sources including, but not limited to, other cities, other developers, and state/federal/tribal departments.

Remember in answering the charge questions, this task force needs to stay at the policy level and not drop into the task level. I envision this task force as the beginning of further housing and development industry discussions. Keeping that in mind and staying at the policy level will ensure the task force will meet its goals.

Again, I appreciate the time and effort that will be part of this process. I have faith that the committee will do well in their endeavor.

Let me know if the committee needs any further assistance.

Attachment

To: Mayor Weldon and CBJ Assembly

From: Housing and Development Task Force (HDTF)

Date: November 12, 2021

Subject: HDTF input on Assembly Priorities for 2022

The HDTF is charged with providing helpful advice to the Assembly regarding housing and development issues. Indeed, the mayor's charge to the Task Force specifically asked that it identify processes or regulations that inhibit development and prioritize actions to decrease identified obstacles.

As the Assembly identifies annual priorities, the Housing and Development Task Force would like to suggest the following priorities for the Assembly to consider.

RECOMMENDED PRIORITIES:

1. **Ensure that the Community Development Department's first priority is to process permits in a timely manner.** The HDTF wants to ensure that this fundamental function of CDD does not suffer when additional duties (such as regulatory reviews or plan updates) are also tackled.

2. **Allocate resources to enable review and revision of Title 49.** The HDTF does not have a recommendation at this time regarding "how" this gets done, but possibilities include hiring a firm to do a rewrite or selected editing of key sections using existing staff and committee processes (PC's Title 49 Committee) to tackle sections at a time. During its remaining time, the Task Force expects to continue to refine its recommendations regarding Title 49 updates.

3. **Work to update the Comprehensive Plan.** An update is in order, but if resources are scarce, the Task Force recommends a focus on Title 49 over a Comprehensive Plan update, because updated regulations would have a more immediate positive effect on development opportunities than would a Plan update.

These priorities, in the order listed above, were unanimously agreed to by all members of the HDTF at its meeting on November 12, 2021 for Assembly consideration at its upcoming retreat. Members of the HDTF stand by to assist the Assembly and CBJ management in meeting these priorities.