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The Big Picture

Girdwood is not Anchorage, it’s worse*

* with respect to housing
### Housing: Municipality-wide pain points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Anchorage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Inventory</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging housing stock</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development mix</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/construction cost</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory issues (T21)</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing cost</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing: Girdwood perspective

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Anchorage</th>
<th>Girdwood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Inventory</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aging housing stock</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New development mix</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development/construction cost</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory issues (T21)</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing cost</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-term rentals</td>
<td>😟</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dark homes</td>
<td>😊</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Match to income distribution</td>
<td>😞</td>
<td>😞</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Owner-occupancy pattern

Residential housing: Owner-occupancy rate

Author’s analysis - source data from CAMA 9/13/22
Community Housing in resort towns

• Prioritize supply of housing to **community members**
  • Those who **LIVE** and **WORK** in the community
  • Both rental and purchase
  • Across a wider range of income levels (at least to 120% AMI, possibly to 150%)

• **Community housing is infrastructure**
• **Permanently affordable housing is investment**

However, the market focus is on second/vacation homes and rentals

More housing alone won’t help (multiple examples from other resorts)
• Need right mix of **density, housing type & use**

See 2023 Girdwood Comprehensive Plan for details – **coming soon**
Framework: Housing spectrum
Holtan Hills

Girdwood needs Community Housing
Original RFP & winning proposal

• All are laudable goals
• **Promote Housing and Employment Stability**
  • Primary goal for community
  • Partnership with Municipality should provide ideal opportunity to benefit the community
• **Public land for maximal public benefit**
• Winning proposal *emphasized mix* of density and housing types
Main concerns

• **Process & community input** – see extensive community comments

• RFP focus and community need is for *housing*, but the project produces zero housing units directly
  • Outsources housing development to unknown third parties with no guarantee of what or when or even “if”

• No mechanism for promoting, let alone guaranteeing, any community housing
  • *Living neighborhood* is the stated desire but market promotes non-residential use

• No long-term regulatory framework
  • HOA’s as private entities have **no obligation to enforce** rules
  • Potential effects of FHA standards are speculative and don’t apply in Girdwood now

• **Nothing from local government to address affordability**
Community risks

• Girdwood has *limited land for residential development* (~230 acres under current zoning). Allocating 20-30% of it to a project that does not address our most pressing housing needs will *limit the options for future solutions*.

• More residents or visitors means increased demand for local services, e.g. childcare or restaurants, hence increased demand for employee housing. *There has to be a balanced approach across the range of housing needs.*

*Relying on market-rate development alone got us here. Hoping it provides a solution is at best wishful thinking.*
A path forward?

• With some changes, the project could meet Girdwood’s needs.

• As a public body, **HLB should represent the citizens** of Anchorage, including Girdwood, not just maximize financial return
  • Perhaps HLB’s statutory structure makes it the wrong Municipal entity to manage critical public land development?

• Overall project outcome must include **community housing**

• **Public investment** in community housing since project uses public resource
  • Requires long-term guarantees to justify public investment, e.g. deed restriction for use as primary residence or active management entity

• Allocation of developed parcels for affordable housing, **only if it is feasible**
  • not an ideal location due to uncertain construction costs
  • no identified sources for necessary subsidy
Thank you