

Holtan Hills Committee:

Here are some comments on what I feel are needed amendments to the Development Agreement between MOA and CY Investments. The past cannot be undone. But I think understanding some of what the community is now facing requires a bit of historical perspective. There are two key actions/nonactions that have landed us here. The first was not following up on Chapter 8 of the Crow Creek Neighborhood Plan. The community saw the current shortage of worker housing coming more than a decade ago. But no action was taken to put in place any of the options identified in Chapter 8.

The second was MOA continuing to negotiate with CY after the withdrawal of Pomeroy Lodging. One strategy for creating worker housing used in other resort communities is to condition access to public property or public infrastructure (water/sewer) on an enforceable promise to construct work force housing on a portion of the property. The idea is the developer/builder can still make a reasonable return on investment by selling more expensive homes while limiting a portion of the property to work force housing. That "formula" is easier to make work when there is a builder involved with the development in part because there is additional profit to be made actually building and selling homes. That was a possible result when someone with experience in building work force housing (Pomeroy) was teamed with a developer (CY). It is much more difficult to make work when the developer has no experience or interest in actually constructing housing of any type but just wants to profit from selling lots.

I see two possible changes to the agreement designed to result in work force housing. One is for provisions to be added requiring CY to complete construction of a specified amount of work force housing in Phase 1 prior to being authorized to sell lots in Phase 2. Then a second amount of work force housing in Phase 2 before being allowed to proceed with Phase 3. This reduces CY profit which may need to be offset by a change in the "split" of "profits" from the development.

Another possible (and perhaps better) approach is for MOA to take some of its payment in property rather than money. Right now there is an ill-defined concept of MOA receiving 50% of the "profit" from development of the property. That payment mechanism could be changed so that MOA receives a lower percentage plus platted lots with a capacity to contain a specified number of dwelling units. MOA in turn could place restrictions on these specific lots intended to guarantee they are used for work force housing. And MOA could promise to convey the lots it receives to a non-profit exclusively for development as work force housing. Ideally this would be a locally based non-profit who would have a set period of time to create the housing or title would go back to MOA. This concept could result in a "Girdwood Land Bank". The ideal recipient would be the existing Land Trust. Folks may doubt the capabilities of the Land Trust but our track record of community success is long- the folks that started the Forest Fair had no experience in organizing arts, crafts/music festivals yet here we are more than 40 years later

with a continuing and successful community tradition. The folks that started Little Bears were a bunch of hippies that needed child care. Decades later it is the longest running non-profit child care provider in the State of Alaska. The idea of a stand alone community school was dubious at best. Yet here we are with one of if not the only functioning non-profit community school in the State. The Land Trust should be given a chance to succeed.

The other major change to the agreement that could result in work force housing are limitations on the number of platted lots (up to 100% even) that could be used for short term rentals. This would impact marketability/affordability for use of Holtan Hills for second recreational homes or income producing property which could mean a higher percentage of lot owners work in Girdwood or at least live full time in Girdwood.

Another outcome I would like to see out of this effort is for someone to actually start following the law. I won't get into all the violations to date some simply can't be fixed. But some can. Here is a list:

1. Develop a schedule that starts with HLB completing a site specific study as required by municipal code and HLB Policy IX(B)(10). The statement at the community meeting that the Crow Creek plan is no longer effective is another reason why this must be done first- before the property is sold to CY.
2. Assembly approval of the Development Agreement BEFORE platting and subdivision. Assembly approval is required by municipal code. The plan seems to be to fully plat the property before the terms are presented to the Assembly for approval. This violates code and does not make sense.
3. Master Planning BEFORE platting. I was stunned to see a platting presentation that violates existing Master Planning requirements for a development of this scale in Girdwood (per Marco Z who I have no reason to doubt).

There are a couple of more technical amendments that are needed.

1. Rezoning of Girdwood Elementary School Subdivision- this is a requirement for MOA. But apparently this was thrown into the agreement with little thought. At a recent meeting the community was told rezoning was not going to occur. But as written MOA NOT rezoning the property makes all obligations of CY ineffective. So this paragraph should be removed by amendment.
2. The August 1, 2022 deadline for municipal appropriations for Offsite Improvement Costs (paragraph 5.3(c) needs to be changed. Again as currently written missing this

deadline relieves CY of any obligations under the Agreement and puts MOA on the hook for “all actual costs incurred by Developer”)- a ticking time bomb.

Thanks for putting some volunteer hours into this and good luck in your efforts!

Brooks Chandler

John Weddleton said “Land for low-income housing can happen” the following response was “How can legislators prioritize workforce housing?”

John Weddleton also said “Girdwood has a reputation for good community organizing and a good public process” and the Girdwood Community Land Trust (GCLT) should partner with HLB in this process.

How can a partnership actually be formed between HLB and GCLT, or any entity that’s committed to affordable housing & community land preservation?

The project is “profit - driven”

The HH plan does not plan or care about long term impacts on Girdwood

What “say” does Girdwood actually have in development?

Concerns that the Girdwood voice will be ignored

Project is geared to people from the outside of our community and benefits developers, not Girdwood

Important values should center around People, Planet & Profit, not just profit

As it is now, the HH development is not a true pathway to affordable housing

People don’t have time to “speak up” for what they desperately need, and they don’t understand the process of when they can share their voice. Even knowing there is a meeting, doesn’t mean they can get there, make time, know how the procedures are for comment

The important social needs, and concerns of residents (real people) aren’t being heard

Voices of workforce and working families are not being heard, and they’re too busy to join the conversation

Need for a “Community Action Plan” where locals with limited time/resources can show their support

Locals need help understanding the “path to participating” and “the development process” in order to efficiently advocate for themselves on the decisions that affect them

How can people show support for affordable housing other than attending meetings?

To be effective, people have to “speak at the places where decisions are actually made”

If GBOS is just advisory, how can we “speak at the places where decisions are actually made” who has time to go to the city council meetings in Anchorage?

The Girdwood governing process is so complex - it’s hard to understand where these “places where decisions are actually made” are

Request that public meetings, such as the HH Planning and Zoning, be in Girdwood

The Girdwood Area Plan revision is still in progress but needs more funding to be completed, ways to participate are through imaginegirdwood.org The GAP revision process should be honored and completed before any HLB land sale for HH development

Join the Working Housing Group meetings and LUC and GBOS to share comments

Small business owners & employers are bearing the burden of workforce social needs

Important infrastructure like the Glacier Valley Transit should not have to be funded only by donations/grants

Is it realistic to get an HLB land donation for affordable housing?

It happened other places in Alaska! For example, in Meadowlakes and Valdez, city land was donated for this and other purposes, it is realistic in MOA? Is it realistic in Girdwood? TBD

Creekside Apartments were done through a HUD (Housing and Urban Development) program in conjunction with a private developer

We need more places like Creekside

Seniors that want to stay in Girdwood and have homes but want to downsize, are priced out of options. They are staying in dangerous housing situations, not easily maintained (shoveling, stairs, too big etc) because the other option is that they have to leave their homes and communities - creating unnecessarily isolating situations

There is no MOA services that help with senior mobility, food security, well care check ups, only local non-profits and compassionate individuals

The number of volunteers is affected by the change in resident/non resident in the valley. How can we encourage the second home owning crowd to help with time and funding?

(Muni of Anch) MOA services are not provided equally to Girdwood and Anchorage

Girdwood Bed Tax and Property Tax revenue that Anchorage receives does not come back to Girdwood to provide crucial social services

The Girdwood community is forced to have an Ad-Hoc approach to social services, due to disproportionate amount of funding returning from MOA

Request for 50% ownership of HH development to be "owner occupied"

Some housing in Girdwood puts locals in unsafe living conditions, or without access to proper food prep or bathroom space

Some folks in this community live in their cars, despite having college degrees and current jobs, "homelessness has many hidden faces"

All small business owners have an interest in affordable housing being built, why would it just be Pomeroy that gets to develop land for workforce housing?

Quick solutions to workforce housing like trailers is not allowed due to zoning, during this time of crisis that is difficult and ridiculous

Small business owners could join together to help the movement for affordable/workforce housing

HLB has 5000 acres of land in our valley that was part of the 1976 land deal when Girdwood became a part of the MOA, their mission is to benefit the residents of the MOA. Does that feel to be the case?

School growth concerns, stress for high schoolers, teachers and other school staff lack access to affordable/workforce housing

Concerns with the lack of transportation to Anchorage for seniors and many others with no vehicle or unreliable vehicles. Food security is of great concern to those that can't get groceries in Girdwood when our small store is empty. The Food Bank shoulders this burden

Desire to monitor/regulate AirBnB and VRBO's

Concerns regarding current lack of access to 24/7 trash removal and recycling, and great concern for AirBnB and VRBO visitors with no Bear Aware trash knowledge

Concerns regarding the current 30% resident/70% non-resident land ownership statistic

This moment is a current housing crisis because of this 30%/70% statistic

The level of local services cannot handle when all the beds in the valley are full

There is a desire/need to facilitate community financing for interested locals

The lack of childcare puts kids in dangerous situations, and forces families to make choices that have long-term negative effects, this is also true for school age and high school children

Lack of after-school activities and a place for year-round recreation creates unsafe and negative consequences for local youth

Early housing developments in the 80's were at a price-point everyone could afford, for example, even the Sitzmark dishwasher. Many of those folks still live here today, and that initial home affordability is one of the reasons this community has been so great

The previous development proposal circa 2004-6 (Crow Creek Neighborhood Land Use Plan) was detailed and full of useful info, why isn't it being referenced, and why no attempt at community involvement this time?

Desire to see development in the valley be accountable and adequately research the impacts, for example, and EIS or a "risk management study"

The Army Corp of Engineers showed that complexity of the topography, bedrock existence and wetland areas were too extensive for the proposed 700 lots of the earlier Crow Creek Neighborhood Plan.

The lack of transparency in the current HH plan gives the community the impression that it is a rushed proposal. The reason to rush this proposal is regarded as being due to the current high land prices and potential for ROI (Return on Investment)

No part of the HH proposal has given regard to the community, unlike the last plan, that although it was too many lots to be feasible, did have extensive community involvement

Safety

* Girdwood violates its wastewater permit more than both Eagle River and Anchorage. The Girdwood wastewater plant is not prepared to take on large scale new development, or even medium scale. The Holtan Hills project is going to cut down old growth forest, which consumes ground water, and is going to fill in wetlands, which absorb runoff. Holtan Hills is going to not only add to the amount of sewage that our utility deals with, but it will create a groundwater/runoff scenario that exacerbates our already existing problems.

* Seniors that want to stay in Girdwood and have homes but want to downsize, are priced out of options. They are staying in dangerous housing situations, not easily maintained (shoveling, stairs, too big etc) because the other option is that they must leave their homes and communities - creating unnecessarily isolating situations

* There is no MOA services that help with senior mobility, food security, well care checkups, only local non-profits like the Food Bank and compassionate individuals

* Some housing in Girdwood puts locals in unsafe living conditions like overcrowding or black mold, or without access to proper food prep or bathroom space.

* An increasing number of locals are now living in their vehicles, including families. These are folks who work here and maintain jobs, hoping that a place to live will open up

* Concerns with the lack of transportation to Anchorage for seniors and many others with no vehicle or unreliable vehicles. Food security is of great concern to those that can't get groceries in Girdwood when our small store is empty. The Food Bank shoulders this burden

* Concerns regarding current lack of access to 24/7 trash removal and recycling, and great concern for AirBnB and VRBO visitors with no Bear Aware trash knowledge

* The lack of childcare puts kids in dangerous situations, and forces families to make choices that have long-term negative effects, this is also true for school age and high school children

* Lack of after-school activities and a place for year-round recreation creates unsafe and negative consequences for local youth

* Girdwood needs another access road in the event of a wildfire, bridge collapse or other major natural disaster

* Girdwood EMT's and Fire staff are mostly volunteer, only 12 of those volunteers live in Girdwood. In any given disaster, 6-12 staff are needed to respond. 6 for a cardiac arrest, 12 for a house fire. The current lack of available staff puts Girdwood residents, their property, Municipal property, and visitors at severe and unnecessary risk.

Services

* When all beds in the valley are full, the local services that Girdwood currently has cannot handle the volume. We have such a shortage of workforce and services that we cannot grow more imbalanced, with more homes and people that need services. The thought that the "infrastructure will follow" is a theory shared by people who don't live here.

* Girdwood is losing a large number of families and nonprofit volunteers due to lack/affordability of housing; impacts nonprofit board members and locals to attend fundraising events

* Large number of homegrown/local nonprofits (not under a national or even Anchorage umbrella organization), each created to fulfill specific community needs - need directors and staff who live locally and properly understand the needs of Girdwood community

* The Girdwood community is forced to have an Ad-Hoc approach to social services, due to disproportionate amount of funding returning from MOA

* (Muni of Anch) MOA services are not provided equally to Girdwood and Anchorage

* Girdwood Bed Tax and Property Tax revenue that Anchorage receives does not come back to Girdwood to provide crucial social services

* Will the high tower road/Alyeska highway intersection support a roundabout? Will the fire trucks be able to function with a roundabout? What allowances does the Holton Hills development have for auxiliary EMT/fire station?

* Important infrastructure like the Glacier Valley Transit should not have to be funded only by donations/grants

* Concerns with the lack of transportation to Anchorage for seniors and many others with no vehicle or unreliable vehicles. Food security is of great concern to those that can't get groceries in Girdwood when our small store is empty. The Food Bank shoulders this burden

Housing

* Concerns regarding the current 30% resident/70% non-resident land ownership statistic This moment is a current housing crisis because of this 30%/70% statistic

* workforce housing vs. affordable housing - which one is HHHAC talking about; then use that term only

* housing crisis across the US; workforce housing is an issue at many ski resorts

* local businesses (including the Resort) are short-staffed; not open as many hours/days due to staffing issues; reaching a breaking point

* some businesses are/are looking to renting/buying properties to house employees, Pomeroy is increasingly doing this and creating an uneven playing field for small local businesses

* with price of gas/dangerous highway, employees will choose Anchorage jobs rather than commuting to Girdwood to wait tables, clean rooms/cabins, etc.

* most of Girdwood School staff own houses in Girdwood; half a dozen teachers will be retiring in the near future; where will "new" teachers live?; will make recruiting teachers difficult; new staff will probably need to live in Anchorage, changing the school's dynamic/staff knowing/seeing students outside of school

* firefighters, clinic staff & EMT's are unable to live in Girdwood due to lack of available housing

* houses that were previously long term rentals are now VBROs and Airbnb's

* very limited market of homes for sale

* seems that more and more long term rental houses are being sold or changed to short term rentals, often with very short notice for renters

* some of workforce live in their cars - otherwise known as homeless

* There is a desire/need to facilitate community financing for interested locals

* HH has potential to help housing problems or exacerbate them ("ruining Girdwood")

* estimated that only 30% of Girdwood homes are primary homes/owner occupied

"Real Life" Experiences

* Small business owners & employers are bearing the burden of workforce social needs

* Edward Parks - one bedroom apartment, moved here three years ago and rent was \$1450/month; rent is now \$1900/month (the amount his landlord thinks she could make if apartment was a short term rental); 24% increase; for \$1900 to be 1/3 of earnings, would need to earn \$68,400

* Kristina @ Girdwood Cleaning Service - "double edge sword", business thrives on nightly rentals but not able to find enough employees due to workforce housing shortage; employees are living paycheck to paycheck/working two jobs to afford a rental; half of staff come from Anchorage (Kristina pays for them to drive down)

* Frans Weits, owner of Jack Sprat Restaurant for 21 years - has cut service times in half due to lack of employees/lack of workforce housing; has applicants for jobs, but no rentals for them; workers don't want to commute from Anchorage; Girdwood at risk of becoming "bedroom community"; "The municipal land that is part of HLB, is a perfect example of non-privatized land that can help remedy this (lack of workforce housing) situation."

* Erik Lambertsen @ Bird Creek Motel - has ten studio rooms/two apartments; operates as motel in summer; gets calls weekly from Girdwood businesses looking for housing for employees

* Catherine McDermott @ FVCS (42 year old nonprofit) - all four of staff have second jobs in order to afford living in Girdwood; all nonprofits will need to expand services to accommodate HH population, so will need to pass increased

costs to local residents

*Eric Helmbrecht @ Powder Hound Ski/Bike – “Girdwood needs an area of somewhat ‘affordable’ housing that is designated to the workforce, and that restricts weekenders from filling it. [It] needs to be implemented ASAP for the well-being of our community. Without this we will lose restaurants and shops and the area will become less attractive to residents and visitors by doing so.”

* Jacky Graham, local resident. “Early housing developments in the 80’s was at a price-point everyone could afford, for example, even the Sitzmark dishwasher. Many of those folks still live here today, and that initial home affordability is one of the reasons this community has been so great”

* Eben Stone, local resident. “The maximum flow for our wastewater utility is 600,000 gallons per day. There are varying numbers regarding where Girdwood is at right now, and they range from 370,000 gallons per day to 500,000 gallons per day. These numbers are on a good day. The real problem with our sewer system in Girdwood is it gets inundated from ground water seeping into the pipes to runoff going into the sewer. During these times our wastewater utility can deal with, or not deal with, upwards of 2 million gallons a day. There was a two-summer project to try and seal these pipes so that at least the ground water won’t seep in, but this effort only resulted in less than a 50,000 gallon per day difference. Girdwood violates its wastewater permit more than both Eagle River and Anchorage. This is just the wastewater utility. I haven’t even looked into electricity and gas, but I am aware that there has been quite a bit of work on our electrical grid in the last few years to just meet the current demand. I would like to know what our assembly members think should happen with regards to our basic needs before they endorse any new development?”

What We Want

*amend/revise or start over on RFP Proposal

*“a lived in community” - owner occupied primary residences and rental leases of no less than six months

*part of HH set aside for workforce housing

*maximum profit/expedited process not in best interest of Girdwood

*workforce/affordable housing needs to be factored in to maintain “small town feel that makes our community so attractive for residents and visitors”

*affordable options for first time homeowners

*Franz Weits - “The rental or sale of the property must not go for market value when sold or leased. Only basic inflation will be allowed.”; “An application process with oversight by a local governing body should be implemented.”

*housing that will remain affordable to the long term; if unrestricted, development will be maximized for profit

*purchasers/renters must work full time for local businesses (what about folks who work in Anchorage but want to raise their families in Girdwood?)

*Make the right decision. Don’t let Girdwood become another Vail.”

*deed restrictions - owner occupied; regulate short term rentals; not HOA, which could be changed by association vote at any time

*Request for 50% ownership of HH development to be “owner occupied”

*restrict home size to lot size ratio to maintain rainforest character

*limit the number of properties one person can buy

*Important values should center around People, Planet & Profit, not just profit

“The Process”

* at the Townhall this community room that Adam and Connie attended, there were a number of questions Adam was unable to answer. He jotted them down and said he'd get back to us with the answers. Has GBOS or Girdwood Inc. reviewed these answers? If so, are they publicly available? If not, why not?

* what assurance do we have that impacts to infrastructure are assessed, understood, validated, budgeted to be implemented? How is it responsible to allow this project to progress without these basic assessments being done and integrated?

*Request that public meetings, such as the HH Planning and Zoning, be in Girdwood

*The HH plan does not plan or care about long term impacts on Girdwood

*What “say” does Girdwood actually have in development?

*Concerns that the Girdwood voice will be and is being ignored

* What is GBOS' rationale for “softening the language in the letter to HLB?”

* How is a voted on “letter of resolution “allowed to be so butchered, and completely rewritten by GBOS without review in agreement by “land-use?”

*Project is geared to people from the outside of our community and benefits developers, not Girdwood

*CY Investments has a development in Eagle River, at least 3 individuals from Eagle River have reached out to warn Girdwood of making similar mistakes in regard to believing Connie about her development process: statements were made about her lies and manipulation of the permitting process, especially the 100 variances passed under very concerning and questionable circumstances.

* Voices of workforce and working families are not being heard, and they're too busy to join the conversation

* The Girdwood Area Plan revision is still in progress but needs more funding to be completed, ways to participate are through imaginegirdwood.org The GAP revision process should be honored and completed before any HLB land sale for HH development

*The previous development proposal circa 2004-6 (Crow Creek Neighborhood Land Use Plan) was detailed and full of useful info, why isn't it being referenced, and why no attempt at community involvement this time?

*No part of the HH proposal has given regard to the community unlike the last plan (Crow Creek Neighborhood Plan), that although it was too many lots to be feasible, did have extensive community involvement

*Desire to see development in the valley be accountable and adequately research the impacts, for example, and EIS or a “risk management study”

*The Army Corp of Engineers showed that complexity of the topography, bedrock existence and wetland areas were too extensive for the proposed 700 lots of the earlier Crow Creek Neighborhood Plan.

*The lack of transparency in the current HH plan gives the community the impression that it is a rushed proposal.

The reason to rush this proposal is regarded as being due to the current high land prices and potential for ROI (Return on Investment)

*The three entities involved with the project as explained on the RFP Proposal are different than the one entity enumerated in the Agreement document. What happened to the other two entities? Does that invalidate CY Investment's original Proposal? Was HLB ever approached about this difference, and did they OK it?

* Could a listening session like this one be arranged with the full HLBAC?

* Legal action has been discussed, against HLB, since a major intent of the "Holton hills RFP ""affordable housing "was not met!!! Is this being pursued, and by whom?

* HLB is Municipal land. Do you feel that it is the responsibility of hlb/muni. to ensure our community is healthy, thrives and takes into consideration its current residence? If yes, how will you help our community?

* Everyone usually must follow the process set by the MOA and have never been allowed to skip steps like the Holton Hills project has done. Why does Holton hills get to skip steps when other developers spend weeks in the MOA permit and land-use office going through the process. The RFP was named three different companies and/or individuals and now it is only one. This is one of many issues with Holton Hills development. I say go back to step zero and re-bid as the one developer and follow the rules.

Community questions to the Assembly (unasked, but submitted from listening session)

1. Would you support new language that requires Public Lands equals Public Benefit to be inserted into City Charter/MOA Operating Policy, when disposals of public lands are being discussed with any development concept, whether it's with a Non-Profit developer or For-Profit Developer in the MOA?

2. Why has HLB/Real Estate Dept of the MOA been allowed to enter a For Profit Partnership with CY Investments (Development Agreement for HH) on the disposal of public lands called Holtan Hills?

3. CY Investments/MOA/HLB was not the entity that was awarded the RFP in June of 2021, why was the RFP not been voided, since the Capital Partner/Pomeroy Property Development and Seth Anderson, were eliminated from the award? In most jurisdictions, that would have voided the award and gone back to the drawing board.

4. Why has the MOA/HLB/Real Estate Dept of the MOA taken on the full Indemnification for the HH development and for terms that exceed the construction of the project per the Development Agreement executed on April 29, 2022? Is this a new policy that the MOA is now adopting and if so, what does Risk Management think of this exposure and liability to the Citizens of Anchorage/MOA?

5. Why did the MOA/HLB give a sole source contract to DWELL Realty to be the Marketing company to sell this public land, through the Developer/CY Investment, as buildable tracts in Holtan Hill?
6. Why did the MOA/HLB give CY Investment, a sole source contract to be the HOA management company for the Holtan Hills development in Girdwood?
7. The current Development Agreement has the MOA/HLB paying an 11% fee to CY Investments for services and fees associated with this development, that has been billed since May 2022. How much money has the MOA/HLB paid CY Investments/Connie Yoshimura to date?
8. Would the MOA/Assembly commit to completing the GWD Area Plan, in the next 12 months, to have a framework to propose a new RFP to address Workforce Housing, Affordable Housing, and Commercial development opportunities with the HLB lands in Girdwood?
9. The HLB has been without a Director for over a year now, can the Assembly demand that the Administration of the MOA, go out and find a qualified candidate with at least 10 years+ of public land disposals to fill that vacant position? The lack of leadership has caused numerous meetings to be cancelled and provide stronger oversight by the HLB Commission of the HLB office of the MOA.
10. Would you support voiding this RFP/Development Agreement with CY Investments/MOA/HLB and starting over with the Community of Girdwood, to have a transparent, public process, with defined community needs being addressed for public lands to be sold under?
11. Do you think using public land to increase the supply of workforce/affordable housing should be a public policy of Anchorage?

From: [Mike Edgington](#)
To: [Girdwood Board of Supervisors](#); [Sam Daniel](#); [Emma Kramer](#)
Subject: HHAC
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 3:55:24 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Dear HHAC committee members,

I read Brooks' letter to the HHAC in today's packet with interest, and I agree with almost all of his points.

This project needs to include a guarantee of actual housing. That could be achieved in various ways through amendment to the development agreement, including contractual terms with subsequent buyers and/or deed restrictions, but we can't just leave it to the vagaries of future HOA decisions.

Holding back some lots could also work, but there would still need to be a partner committed to constructing the actual housing - HLB is obviously not the body to do that.

We (Girdwood) also need to be clearer about what we mean by the term "workforce housing" for this project. There is a need for mid-income, low-mid and low-income housing in Girdwood.

Federal programs such as LIHTC only address the lowest income range and while these programs should be a part of our overall plan, they are inadequate by themselves.

From studying how other resort communities address housing, there are three related goals that fall under "workforce" housing:

- 1) promote the use of housing as a primary residence (either owned or rented), rather than second home or purely STR business,
- 2) restrict ownership / occupancy to those employed in the geographical area, and/or
- 3) provide below-market rate housing through some type of subsidy

While all of these are valuable goals, and we could adopt policies in the future to cover them all, we need to decide the priorities for the Holtan Hills development.

I think goal 1) is achievable, but 2 is going to be difficult and 3 is unlikely to be achievable under the restrictions of HLB. Other communities have successfully used deed restrictions to mandate that a percentage of housing are used as primary residences. That could be done here too.

Separately from the immediate issues that need to be addressed, it's abundantly clear that there are bigger picture problems that need to be solved. So I'm working on a proposal that would put Girdwood in the driving seat for implementing housing policies and solutions that fit our community's needs - more details soon.

Thanks,

Mike.

From: [Krystal Hoke](#)
To: [Girdwood Board of Supervisors](#)
Subject: Drafted Housing Resolution
Date: Tuesday, August 2, 2022 7:04:52 PM

[EXTERNAL EMAIL]

Margaret,

Here is the verbiage for the resolution read allowed at the Holtan Hills Housing Advisory Committee:

Since Crow Creek Neighborhood Plan is the land plan associated with Holtan Hills, it is applicable to this committee, in addition to Land Use for the future.

GIRDWOOD LAND USE RECOMMENDATION FOR A GBOS RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR GIRDWOODS HOUSING AND COMMUNITY NEEDS TO BE ADDRESSED

Whereas, Girdwood has identified many community land use needs including a childcare facility, workforce housing, senior housing, community gardens and recreational center; and Whereas, the Crow Creek Neighborhood Land Use Plan specifically states that “Key elements of a

Girdwood affordable housing strategy include the following:

- 1.) Formal commitment to providing affordable housing in Girdwood
- 2.) Definition of level of affordability to be addressed
- 3.) Creation of a management body, or affiliation with an existing entity equivalent to the housing authorities used in other resort communities
- 4.) Definition of a funding strategy, such as requiring new development to contribute to developing affordable housing
- 5.) Definition of a target for the amount/level of affordable housing in the Crow Creek Neighborhood;”

Whereas, the community of Girdwood seeks to define these “key element” 1-5 as a public example of formal commitment for the following:

- 1.) Girdwood seeks to provide affordable housing for individuals in the valley, specifically for workforce and senior housing needs.
- 2.) Rents and Mortgage Payments shall strive to be capped at or below 30% of an individual’s direct income. Those who make 100% (and under) Area Median Income, which is currently \$104,300 for the Anchorage Municipality, may qualify.
- 3.) Those under the income limit are eligible to be assisted under a local non-profit, such as Girdwood Community Land Trust, Neighborworks, Cook Inlet Housing Authority, etc. or governmental body, set up without delay.
- 4.) Inter-governmental loans, such as those which funded the completion of the Girdwood Library, may be utilized for funding projects. Other possibilities include HUD Home Partnership grants or traditional private financing. A specific amount of affordable housing needs to be a commitment from the developer to be included in any projects on public lands.
- 5.) The target amount for housing to assist those under the Area Median Income limits shall be a minimum of 25%.

Therefore, Girdwood Board of Supervisors be it resolves: