



**PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING AGENDA
TUESDAY, JANUARY 5, 2021
5:30 P.M.
ZOOM WEBINAR**

This meeting will take place virtually via **Zoom Webinar**. To join the Zoom Webinar, go to <https://juneau.zoom.us/j/94184441385> or call: 1 253-215-8782. **Webinar ID: 941 8444 1385**. Members of the public wishing to provide public comment during the meeting can do so by clicking the “Raise Hand” button (online Zoom Webinar) or press *9 (telephone).

Agenda Item	Presenter	Action Requested
I. Call to Order	C. Mertl	
II. Approval of Agenda Agenda Changes	C. Mertl	<i>If no changes: Motion to approve</i>
III. Approval of Minutes Meeting of September 1, 2020 Meeting of November 3, 2020		
IV. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items	C. Mertl	
V. New Business FY 2022-27 Capital Improvement Program Prop 2 General Obligation Bond Projects	G. Schaaf/ M. Elfers	
VI. Unfinished Business Brigadoon Estates Land Disposal	G. Schaaf	
VII. Staff Reports Amalga Cabin Update Capital School Park Improvements Project Update Operations Update	M. Elfers M. Elfers G. Schaaf	
VIII. Committee, Liaison, and Board Member Reports Chair Report Liaison to the Assembly Board Member Liaisons Other Board Member Business	C. Mertl Wade Bryson Liaisons All	
IX. Adjournment	C. Mertl	



TO: Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee
FROM: George Schaaf, Parks & Recreation Director
DATE: December 29, 2020
RE: January 5, 2021 Meeting

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Please find enclosed the information supporting your agenda topics for this meeting. The meeting is anticipated to last 60 minutes and will take place via **Zoom Webinar**. To join the Zoom Webinar, go to <https://juneau.zoom.us/j/94184441385> or call 1-253-215-8782. **Webinar ID:** 941 8444 1385.

NEW BUSINESS

A. FY 2022-27 Capital Improvement Program – Requested by K. Duncan [Page 11-12]

At the December 1, 2020 PRAC meeting, staff presented the initial draft of the Department's FY22 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). The PRAC convened a subcommittee to conduct an in-depth review the CIP and forward a recommendation. A memo detailing the work of the CIP Subcommittee is attached.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

The Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee recommends that the Assembly fully fund the Parks and Recreation Department's FY 2022 CIP request.

B. Proposition 2 General Obligation Bond Projects – Requested by G. Schaaf

Juneau voters approved \$15 million in general obligation bonds for infrastructure projects by a 62% margin during the October municipal election. The Assembly Finance Committee on December 9, 2020 considered a list of projects recommended by Engineering & Public Works staff, including \$5.4 million in Parks & Recreation projects (below).

If approved by the Assembly, these projects would allow the Department to make significant progress toward addressing long-deferred maintenance projects throughout our community.

Project		Estimated Cost
FY21	Capital School Park	\$1,500,000
	Savikko Park Lighting Replacement	\$300,000
	Eagle Valley Center Repairs & Energy Efficiency Improvements	\$300,000
	Eagle Valley Center Parking Lot & Drainage Improvements	\$250,000
FY22	Melvin Park Sports Field Lighting Replacement	\$1,000,000
	Savikko Park Pavement Repairs & Drainage Improvements	\$750,000
	Hank Harmon Rifle Range Repairs	\$200,000
	Treadwell Arena Roof Replacement	\$1,100,000
TOTAL – Parks & Recreation		\$5,400,000

The CIP Subcommittee recommended that the PRAC express its approval to the Assembly for these projects, as well as the level of funding.

SUGGESTED MOTION:

The PRAC express its appreciation for the Assembly’s support of Parks & Recreation projects totaling \$5.4 million, and recommends that the Assembly appropriate bond funds for these projects, as presented at the December 9, 2020 meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau Assembly Finance Committee.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Brigadoon Estates Land Disposal – Requested by G. Schaaf [Page 13-50]

At its regular meeting on June 4, 2019, the Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee considered a request by John & Ginger Bean to purchase municipal park land adjacent to their property in Brigadoon Estates II. The Department initially recommended approving the sale of this parcel; however, a motion by the PRAC supporting the sale failed. The PRAC asked the Department to engage the community in a public process regarding the potential sale of this parcel.

The Law Department and Community Development Department subsequently concluded that the property is a “public way” because its dedication as a public park was required by the Planning Commission. Public ways (including streets, sidewalks, and other areas dedicated for public use) cannot be sold under the usual Title 53 process because they are not owned by the CBJ in its proprietary capacity (i.e. there is no title or deed). While CBJ owns the land, it can only dispose of the property by vacating it through the process outlined in CBJ 49.15.404. When a public way is vacated, it is either added to the adjacent property or given to the “rightful owner” at no cost. The logic is that the CBJ should not profit from the sale of land it required someone else – in this case the developer of Brigadoon Estates – to dedicate as a public park.

With assistance from the Community Development Department, we sent a mailer to all property owners in Brigadoon Estates II on November 25, 2020, inviting them to comment on the proposed vacation. The CBJ Public Information Officer issued an information release on December 10th, along with posts on CBJ’s Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram accounts. The public was asked to submit comments through a dedicated page on the Parks & Recreation website. These comments are included in the packet for tonight’s meeting. Of the 166 responses we received, over 80% recommended retaining the parcel as a public park.

Following the public comment period, the CBJ Law Department concluded that even if the Assembly decided to vacate the property, the Beans are not the “rightful owners” of the property and would not be eligible to receive the land if it was vacated. Consequently, we believe that the issue is moot.

STAFF REPORTS


A. Amalga Cabin Update – Presented by M. Elfers

B. Capital School Park Improvement Program – Presented by M. Elfers

C. Operations Update – Presented by G. Schaaf

The following summary of projects, programs, and activities over the last month is provided at the request of the Chair:

- **Storm Damage** – Twin Lakes Park was impacted by mudslides and flooding during the record-setting storm on December 3rd. Damage was minimized thanks to quick action by CBJ Streets Division staff, who built a temporary dam to divert debris from Wire St. away from the playground. While the playground was spared, Park Maintenance staff spent nearly a week removing mud and debris from the parking lot and pathway. Parks & Recreation staff also assisted Public Works during the storm by keeping drainage structures clear throughout downtown and Douglas, allowing their staff to focus on Wire St., Behrends Ave., and Mountainside Estates.


- **Candy Cane Hunt** – Parks & Recreation partnered with downtown businesses to offer this holiday-themed scavenger hunt. Our goal was to give kids and adults a fun activity while

also encouraging people to shop locally. Participants were challenged to locate 35 candy canes in storefronts and CBJ facilities – the more candy canes you found, the more chances you had to win dozens of prizes provided by our business partners. More than 210 people submitted entries, and many provided comments in the survey we conducted afterward (Pages 51-58).

- Gardening Partnership** – This past fall, Zach Gordon Youth Center staff partnered with the UAF Cooperative Extension Juneau District and local Master Gardener volunteers to grow, harvest and donate produce to Juneauites in need. Between mid-August and mid-October, they grew about 150 kale plants; all of which are still growing and producing fresh food for kids in Juneau. They also grew an assortment of lettuce and harvested around ten pounds for the Glory Hall in September. Lastly, 75 green bean plants of different varieties flowered and yielded green beans before the last day in the greenhouse. Huge thanks to Ben Patterson with Landscape Maintenance, Darren Snyder with UAF Cooperative Extension Service and the Master Gardeners, including our own Theresa Spina with Zach Gordon Youth Center, who did the day-to-day of planting, transplanting, watering, harvesting, and transporting the plants to their current homes.



- CivicRec Launch** – We launched our new online reservation and point-of-sale system launched on December 28th. CivicRec replaces eTrak, which the Department has used for the last five years. The new system is much easier to use than eTrak. Most transactions can now be completed online, including shelter reservations, pool passes, and activity registration, significantly reducing the need for customers to visit or call the main office. We will also manage Amalga Cabin rentals through CivicRec. Launching new software that affects all of our divisions required a tremendous effort by our staff and other departments, including Finance and MIS. We're especially grateful to Amanda Lovejoy, Lauren Verrelli, and Amanda Babbin for all their hard work.
- Treadwell Arena** – While gameplay is suspended due to COVID-19 mitigation requirements, Treadwell Arena continues to offer limited rentals along with scheduled ice time for JDIA, JSC, and Juneau School District teams. The Arena is also partnering with



Zach Gordon Youth Center to offer scheduled ice skating sessions for limited numbers of kids each month.

- **Aquatics** – Staff is working with the Engineering & Public Works Department to develop options to repair the pool deck at Dimond Park Aquatic Center. The existing deck has a smooth surface that creates a significant slip and fall hazard. We are evaluating a number of options that will create an attractive and safe surface. Both pools are continuing to operate under a reservation system while CBJ remains at Risk Level 3 for COVID-19. The Aquatics Board will be working on the FY22 operating budget beginning in early January.
- **ZGYC Solstice Bingo** – Our Zach Gordon Youth Center and Recreation staff teamed up to offer drive-in bingo to dozens of families during the Winter Solstice. The holiday-themed event offered lots of honking and bingos, along with tons of prizes and baked treats.





PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 1, 2020 – 5:30 PM

Zoom Webinar

I. Call to Order at 5:33 p.m. – C. Mertl, Chair

Present: Josh Anderson, Alex Beebe-Giudice, Edric Carrillo, Ron Crenshaw, Kirk Duncan, Chris Mertl, Will Muldoon, Emily Palmer, Tom Rutecki

Staff Present: George Schaaf, Director; Michele Elfers, Deputy Director; Lauren Verrelli, Staff Liaison; Allison Eddins, CDD Planner

II. Agenda Changes – None

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes – None

IV. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items – None

V. New Business –

A. Chicken Yard Park Utility Easement Request

M. Elfers: In the fall of 2019, Parks & Rec signed an agreement with the adjacent property owners that allows for parking, turnaround space and pedestrian access through the park to the property. The property was sold but the agreement carries with the deed to the new property owners. The new property owners have an electric car, are planning to get another, and would like to charge their cars at their parking spaces. They have requested an easement to run a buried conduit and electrical wiring through the park from their house to the parking spaces, to support an electric vehicle charging station. The department is in support of this request. The cost of the utility work and ongoing electrical maintenance would be the responsibility of the owners.

W. Muldoon: I move that the PRAC recommend that the Assembly approve the request for a utility easement through Chicken Yard Park by Marta Lasatufka and Michael Bucy.

Motion passes with unanimous consent.

VI. Unfinished Business – None

VII. Information Items –

A. Trail Master Plan Update

Allison Eddins (CDD): Staff from CDD, Parks & Rec, Trail Mix, USFS and State of Alaska are working on the Juneau Trails Plan that will cover the 170 miles of Juneau trails. The intent of this plan is to provide coordination and connectivity for maintenance and development between all of these agencies. We envision having specific actionable items that will allow Trail Mix to identify which projects take funding priority. Multiple plans dating back from 1993 through 2017, including a trail inventory and mapping project from Parks & Rec in 2018 & 2019 will go into this new plan; we want to build on what was done in the past. We are wrapping up the initial public engagement phase

where we put out a public survey for 7 weeks and received 1440 responses. Next, we will be meeting with various user groups and then this winter, we will draft the plan and have partner agencies review. Come February of 2021, a draft document will go out for public comment. Then late Spring/Summer of 2021 we will bring the document back to PRAC and Planning Commission. Initial survey results show that 89% report using trails at least one day per week.

W. Muldoon: I have a question about the timeline. 20 years seems like a long time for the master plan to exist.

A. Eddins: It would have a 20-year life but will include that it needs to be revisited every 2-5 years and updated every 10 years.

C. Mertl: Do not forget to look into a hut-to-hut system within CBJ. It is a great opportunity to strengthen our trails.

VIII. Committee, Liaison, and Board Member Reports

A. Chair Report— Montana Creek has a lot of activity going on. Since the survey ends at the end of this month, I propose we move our October meeting to October 12 to give staff time to compile all the comments. We also received comments about the pump track at Cope Park and that there was not enough public notice.

B. Liaison to the Assembly Report— Reappointed Will & Edric; HRC approved PRAC, YAB and JOAAB 2019 Annual Reports

C. Liaison Reports—

Aquatics – W. Muldoon: GSC coach is interim Aquatics board member until they find replacement.

YAB – T. Rutecki: Had one contingency request.

Eaglecrest – E. Palmer: Started selling passes early; CCC working on mountain biking course & trails.

Jensen-Olson Arboretum— E. Carrillo: Merrill is retiring this fall; discussed commercial use policy.

Lands – C. Mertl: T&H proposed to purchase Hurlock property for at-risk youth; discussed film permitting.

Park Foundation— C. Mertl: Bond initiative is good for Juneau; cabin coming along.

Treadwell Arena Board – K. Duncan: Roof leak now over the ice; promoting bond for new roof; discussing ventilation due to COVID; JAHA pushed start of season.

TrailMix— R. Crenshaw: Received estate gift; hired 14 folks for CCC crew.

1% for Art— J. Anderson: None.

Other Member Business –

J. Anderson: I am planning to get the OHV subcommittee rolling soon. On the committee is myself, Will Muldoon and Ron Crenshaw.

Adjournment – 6:35 p.m. *Having no other business before the board.*

Respectfully submitted by Lauren Verrelli, Recreation & Public Services Manager, 12/14/2020



PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 3, 2020 – 5:30 PM

Zoom Webinar

I. Call to Order at 5:31 p.m. – C. Mertl, Chair

Present: Josh Anderson, Edric Carrillo, Ron Crenshaw, Kirk Duncan, Chris Mertl, Will Muldoon, Emily Palmer, Tom Rutecki

Absent: Alex Beebe-Giudice

Staff Present: George Schaaf, Director; Michele Elfers, Deputy Director; Lauren Verrelli, Staff Liaison; Merrill Jensen, Jensen-Olson Arboretum Manager

II. Agenda Changes – None

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes – None

IV. Public Participation on Non-Agenda Items – None

V. New Business –

A. Youth Activities Board (YAB) Member

G. Schaaf: The YAB consist of nine members including one member from PRAC. Mr. Rutecki has served in the PRAC position previously but he has accepted a position on the board as a member of the public. Tonight, the PRAC needs to recommend someone to fill that seat.

T. Rutecki: YAB is a unique board that influences 10,000-11,000 local youth where the board distributes \$300k in funding. There is more time involved when reviewing the grants in the spring; then the boards meets whenever there are contingency requests.

J. Anderson: I have been interested in YAB but was hesitant with my work travel schedule but now things are via zoom, it might work.

T. Rutecki: I move that the PRAC recommend that the Assembly HRC appoint Josh Anderson to serve on the Youth Activities Board as the PRAC member.

Josh accepts; motion passes unanimously.

VI. Unfinished Business – None

VII. Information Items –

A. Appreciation & Recognition of Merrill Jensen

M. Elfers: As we all know, Merrill is retiring in early December. Michele presented [this PowerPoint](#) appreciation and recognition of Merrill for all his work at the Jensen-Olson Arboretum the last 13 years.

G. Schaaf: We are really going to miss you and Kelly. You took a leap of faith to come to Juneau and you leave Juneau with a gift.

Merrill Jensen: It has been an honor and a privilege to take Caroline's vision into fruition. Thankful for this journey.

C. Mertl: On behalf of PRAC, you have taken a diamond in the rough and created

something amazing. You have evolved it into a world-class garden in 13 years with a limited budget and personnel. The passion and the beauty shows.

K. Duncan: What a pleasure to work with Merrill & Kelly. Thank you for everything.

B. Dimond Park Field House Update

G. Schaaf: The Assembly received a staff report on the prospect of the Fieldhouse being transferred over to CBJ to be operated by Parks & Rec. We think they will take this up at the COW on November 9. Everyone understood what is happening and there has not been any objection.

C. 2020 Infrastructure Bond Update

M. Elfers: The bond initiative passed by the voters for \$15M. It will likely be split in thirds between JSD roofs, Streets projects and Parks & Rec projects. Engineering and Parks have been working together on prioritizing the list of projects. Capital Park is one of the top priorities. Part of the idea behind the bond is economic stimulation.

VIII. Committee, Liaison, and Board Member Reports

A. Chair Report— Received many follow up phone calls/emails after Montana Creek discussion.

G. Schaaf: I did get a call from the JNSC President; talked about ways we can work together. Encouraged them to work with the Snowmobile Club; we will be collecting data this winter.

B. Liaison to the Assembly Report—None

C. Liaison Reports—

Aquatics – W. Muldoon: Both pools are back to a reservations system.

YAB – T. Rutecki: We have a couple new members.

Eaglecrest – E. Palmer: Finalized COVID mitigation plan; opening December 1.

Jensen-Olson Arboretum— E. Carrillo: None.

Lands – C. Mertl: None.

Park Foundation— C. Mertl: None.

Treadwell Arena Board – K. Duncan: Scaled back use due to level high, 20 people allowed on the ice at one time; getting new roof.

Trail Mix— R. Crenshaw: Been busy with CCC crew out on the trails; highest membership they have had; annual fundraiser is a virtual auction this year; replacing trailhead signs.

1% for Art— J. Anderson: None.

Other Member Business –

W. Muldoon: D&H has been meeting in regards to skateboarding by the Juneau Visitor Center. The board has created a subcommittee to work on skateboarding ordinance.

K. Duncan: What is the status of the challenge course at EVC?

M. Elfers: Yes, we signed a lease with SAIL. The brought up a consultant from down south to do a final inspection of the course. The CCC crew is working on improving the trail currently. They are planning to start operations Spring 2021.

Adjournment – 6:29 p.m. *Having no other business before the board.*

Respectfully submitted by Lauren Verrelli, Recreation & Public Services Manager, 12/14/2020



TO: Chris Mertl, Chair, Parks & Recreation Advisory Committee
FROM: Kirk Duncan, Chair, PRAC CIP Subcommittee
CC: George Schaaf, Director, Parks & Recreation
Michele Elfers, Deputy Director, Parks & Recreation
Lauren Verrelli, Recreation & Public Services Manager
DATE: December 17, 2020
RE: FY2022-27 Capital Improvement Plan

The PRAC CIP Subcommittee met via Zoom at 12:30 p.m. on Monday, December 14, 2020. The Subcommittee members in attendance were Chris Mertl, Alex Beebe-Giudice and Kirk Duncan served as the chair.

At the December 1, 2020 meeting of the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee (PRAC), Parks and Recreation (P&R) staff presented the initial draft of the Department's FY22 Capital Improvement Program (CIP). As CIP funds are an extremely important component of the Department's long-term budget planning, the PRAC formed a subcommittee to do a more extensive review of both the CIP and also projects to be funded by general obligation bonds authorized by Proposition 2, approved by the voters in October, 2020.

Additional detail on bond-funded projects is provided in the table below:

Project		Estimated Cost
FY21	Capital School Park	\$1,500,000
	Savikko Park Lighting Replacement	\$300,000
	Eagle Valley Center Repairs & Energy Efficiency Improvements	\$300,000
	Eagle Valley Center Parking Lot & Drainage Improvements	\$250,000
FY22	Melvin Park Sports Field Lighting Replacement	\$1,000,000
	Savikko Park Pavement Repairs & Drainage Improvements	\$750,000
	Hank Harmon Rifle Range Repairs	\$200,000
	Treadwell Arena Roof Replacement	\$1,100,000
TOTAL – Parks & Recreation		\$5,400,000

P&R staff made a PowerPoint presentation which covered current capital projects, the FY22 CIP funding request, and the projects funded with bonds approved by voters in October. That PowerPoint is attached to this memo. The Subcommittee members asked several questions and requested additional information, which was provided. The Subcommittee members agreed with the P&R staff recommendations and priorities: The Department's FY22 CIP request for parks and trails totals \$3,630,000, of which \$2,350,000 would be funded through general obligation bonds authorized by Proposition 2. The remaining \$1,280,000 would be funded by the General Fund. Additional detail is provided in the table below:

FY 22 Funding Requests			FY 22	FY 22	FY 22
Account			CIP	Bond Funds	Total
P41-093	Parks & Playground Repairs	Savikko Park Playground Replacement Steelhead Street Park Playground Replacement	\$ 410,000		
P41-092	Sportfield Repairs	Savikko Park Outfield Turf Installation	\$ 250,000		
P46-102	Trail Improvements	Lena Point Trail Perseverance Trail Bridge Replacement Outer Point Floating Walkway	\$ 255,000		
P46-109	Capital School Park	Capital School Park Improvements		\$ 1,500,000	
New	Juneau Community Foundation	Neighborhood Matching Grants	\$ 15,000		
New	Twin Lakes Park Pathway	Drainage and Safety Lighting	\$ 350,000		
New	Savikko Park	Lighting Replacement		\$ 300,000	
New	Eagle Valley Center	Repairs & Energy Efficiency Improvements		\$ 300,000	
New	Eagle Valley Center	Parking Lot & Drainage Improvements		\$ 250,000	
			\$ 1,280,000	\$ 2,350,000	\$ 3,630,000

Alex Beebe-Giudice made the following motion:

The Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee CIP Subcommittee recommends to the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee that the City and Borough of Juneau Assembly fully fund the Parks and Recreation Department's FY 2022 CIP request.

Chris Mertl seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Alex Beebe-Giudice then made the following motion:

The CIP Subcommittee recommends that the Parks and Recreation Advisory Committee express its appreciation and support for the Assembly to appropriate voter-approved bonds funding \$5.4 million in projects for Parks and Recreation facilities, as outlined at the December 9, 2020 meeting of the City and Borough of Juneau Assembly Finance Committee.

Chris Mertl seconded the motion and the motion passed unanimously.

Should CBJ dispose the property?	Comments	Name	Location
No	Children in the neighborhood use this spot to play and it is a loved part of the neighborhood.	Meg McCarthy	Brigadoon Estates
No	I would say YES if they agreed to pay fair market value for the lot. The description says it would be given away at no cost.	Jacob Resneck	Douglas
No		Cindy Ruby	Valley
No	I think they should be allowed to purchase the lot at a fair price for the size (with a discount perhaps for the lack of accessibility). I don't believe they should be given it free of charge.	Christine Doiron	Valley
No	My family lives across the street, why should my nieces and nephews lose a public play area that is not in the middle of the road. Furthermore, The wooded areas are what sets this neighborhood apart from other cookie cutter subdivisions. Why should they change the look and culture of the entire neighborhood for their profit. This close to nature is the desirable feature to live near the glacier and not in other big subdivisions.	reena etheridge	Valley
Yes	The lot looks like it provides no park value, but value to a nearby owner. I support the property owner acquiring the property for a cost and think that the city could gain more from its property tax value, over it's potential as parkland so close to a residential structure. I also believe the lot provides no parking value to near by recreational users. I don't know of any potential issues, but I think it is reasonable to grant this request to the property owner.	Ashley Bruce	Auke Bay
No	I don't believe that the City should dispose of public lands for no benefit to the general public. I would be fine with the City selling this parcel at fair market value, as the money would go into the general fund and back to the public through services, but apparently that is against the code.	Andrea Hirsh	Valley
Yes	It seems that some payment should be made for the property.	Pam Chapin	Valley
No	I don't feel like it's fair to the other neighborhood residents nor any other property owner in Juneau for these folks to receive the triangular lot at no cost. They should have to purchase it from the City, or the City should retain the property.	Max Rosen	Downtown
No	Its a play area for neighborhood children.	Jennifer Adams	Brigadoon Estates
No	if the city set it aside for a park, it should be a park. puts some cares money to use for the kids in this community.	maggie mcmillan	Valley
No	Free land, that's a big nope.	Tim Shockley	Valley
No	I think this lot could be used for the purpose described but I don't think it's right for the city to give this property to one resident of the neighborhood who sound like they are probably using it to create rental income. They should pay fair price for the public lot.	Kirsa Hughes-Skandijis	Douglas
No	The answer would likely be different if the lot were going to be put up for public sale but to just give it to the adjacent property owner at no cost so that they in turn can subdivide their property into two developable lots makes absolutely no sense, especially given the cost of a developable residential lot in Juneau.	Nathan Coffee	Lemon Creek
No	I believe the city should sell the lot to the landowners. That lot belongs to the city and the people of Juneau. Regardless of intention, if a publicly owned good is transferred to a private owner, the city should be given compensation.	Grace Lee	Downtown
No	Why would the tax payers, ie city give the property away to a private individual so they could subdivide & sell it. If the city is giving it away then they should hold a lottery so all citizens can have a chance at free property. If this is the case no one should have to pay property tax anymore.	Brian Koelling	Valley
No	This is very unfair to the citizens of Juneau. I can't believe CBJ is considering giving away property for free. To be fair, it should be sold at fair market value or it should be held under a lottery so all of us can have a chance of getting free property considering how much land costs around here. It doesn't matter if the land will not be used in the future by CBJ, it is the principal of the thing. If the assembly does give this away for free, it will make a lot of people very angry and speaks a lot about the lack of integrity of the assembly here.	John	Valley
No	If this property is going to be decommissioned as a public park and available for subdividing, it should be available to any Juneau resident on equal terms, at a cost appropriate to its value (i.e., fair bid). It is ludicrous to give away CBJ property to one resident at no cost; this resident will financially benefit either by increasing the value of their adjacent residence or eventually selling the property themselves. If it can't be brought to the market in a fair and equitable manner, leave it as a park.	Laurel White	Valley
No	Sell it at market value to adjacent land owners.	Amanda Durrant	Valley
No		Nathaniel Saxton	Downtown
No	This is absurd. Giving away public park lands, free of charge, because someone wants to build an income property? Save the property, do not give away the neighborhood parks that we enjoyed growing up in Juneau.	Inua Blevins	Valley
No		Bonnie Noble	Valley
No	This plat should be disposed of at market value. It obviously has value according to the owners, so let's see what it will go for on the market. Run it through an independent assessment similar to ROW under the Uniform Act for federal transportation projects and allow the owners to purchase at the price.	Miles Brookes	Valley
No	It should be sold at fair market value to the applicants. The statement attached to the link says the city would not charge them. So, the applicant gets the land free and then gets to develop it? If that's the case where is my free land?	Jason L	Valley
No	I live directly across from this piece of property and when we bought our place in 2019 we were told that land would never be developed.	Audra Peterson	Brigadoon Estates
No	I'm not opposed to CBJ selling the property, but to give it away is not appropriate. I know commercial land goes for \$14-\$20 per sq ft around here in Juneau and I would bet you residentially 4500 sqft could get you at least 25-40K. Will you give any homeowner adjacent to CBJ land the same opportunity to be given land at no cost?	Rachelle Smith	Out the road
Yes	Acquire, yes, but acquire for fair market value. It should not be given for free.	Max Mertz	Douglas
No	I am not in favor of disposal of public park land into private ownership. I suspect that not many people (and no kids) know that this triangular lot is actually public property that they can legally access and use as place to play. Maybe if the City had posted a sign saying this is public property people would use it more? Sounds like a great place - "elevated and forested", for local kids to walk to and play.	Alan Steffert	Douglas
No	It appears there is no cost to the Bean's to acquire the property, which seems very unfair. Am I missing something? If it was assessed by a neutral party and sold at assessed value I would find that acceptable.	Fabienne Peter-Contesse	Auke Bay
No	Sell it for fair market value only, do not give away! Must be available for anyone to bid on unless the adjacent owner pays a premium. I support getting the lot into private hands and then it can start generating property tax but I absolutely DO NOT support this disposal unless at fair market value with a premium to adjacent landowner or open bid by the public.	David Summers	Lemon Creek
No	Land owned by the city should never be given away!	Christie Kohuth	Valley
No	Sell it for fair market value only, do not give away! Must be available for anyone to bid on unless the adjacent owner pays a premium. I support getting the lot into private hands and then it can start generating property tax but I absolutely DO NOT support this disposal unless at fair market value with a premium to adjacent landowner or open bid by the public.	Martha Hewlett	Douglas
Yes	Sell it at fair market value. Might as well get some property tax return on it!	Dominic Branson	Valley

No	Any property is not free! Especially government property. Use the revenue to pay for the unwanted whale.	Daniel Kohuth	Valley
No	Kids play there	Grace Hamrick	Brigadoon Estates
No	Why are we giving away unused park land FOR FREE???	Alicia Nestler	Brigadoon Estates
No	The language of it isn't clear if it would be given or sold. If the lot is to become available then it should be put up for bid or adjacent property owners given the option to pay premium market value for the property.	Donald Tompkins	Douglas
No	I do not support CBJ in disposing of this lot. CBJ should sell the lot for fair market value only. The lot should not be given away for free. I would support CBJ to sell the lot for fair market price to the adjacent property owners so it can start generating property tax.	Marrisa Peterson	Valley
No	I am not opposed to the city selling this property as they sell other properties, via a their bidding process. I would not be overly opposed to the adjacent owner having first right of refusal to purchase at market value as determined by an independent appraiser since the property does not meet the requirements for the zoning in that area.	Jacob Buck	Valley
No	I live right across from this park and I enjoy the trees! The privacy and close proximity to nature is what brought me to this neighborhood when I bought my first home. I chose this house because I was not surrounded on all sides by buildings. When they acquire the land is the plans to keep it the same but allow the second building on the current property to be on its own lot? I do not support another residence at the end of my driveway if that is the plan. If the building configuration on the new lot will remain the same with some trees then I'll retract my objection.	Chris Madsen	Brigadoon Estates
No	It should be sold, not given away for free.	K E	Auke Bay
Yes	Yes and No. the property Owner is going to profit by selling the land. They should have to pay at least some of the price of the land.	Donna Leigh	Auke Bay
No	I propose that the lot be priced appropriately to the square footage for the area. Allow the adjacent property owners to purchase this lot if they choose to. If the current lot owners do not wish to acquire this land through a fair purchase, allow the land to be sold to any/all future lot owners. Property is an investment, CBJ should attempt to make a reasonable profit.	J. Vasquez	Valley
No	Not for free! That's city-owned property! Sell the property at fair market value or through a bidding process.	Laurel Shoop	Douglas
No	Sell it to them, if you give it away I want free property too!	Park	Lemon Creek
Yes		Steven Stewart	Valley
No	The lot should not be disposed of at no fair coat without clear and helpful intent	Haley Reed	Lemon Creek
No	For free? While it might not have much value to anyone other than the adjacent property owner, the idea that CBJ will just donate it to someone who wants to subdivide the lot and thus gain from it is, frankly, bizarre.	Russell King	Douglas
No	You want to raise property taxes but want to give away land? It should be sold at the going rate for land in its condition.	Daniel Gibb	Valley
No	Why are we giving land away for free???	James Mitchell	Lemon Creek
Yes	Sell for appraised value. You couldn't GIVE land for affordable housing and I was told when I was on the assembly that CBJ had to sell land for appraised value.	Debbie White	Auke Bay
No	I think it should be sold at fair market value	James Harris	Lemon Creek
No	Forested land , buffer section is worth holding onto for reducing our carbon footprint as a city plus not fair to subsidize a known surveyor who has ties to many transactions over the years that have involved the C B J . Not fair to other property owners and if anything should be an open bidding process for public land	Rhonda ward	Valley
No	Only if they pay fair market value for the lot. Then I'd say yes.	Timi tullis	Auke Bay
Yes	The land is very awkward and I can not see any use that CBJ would have for it.	Erin Youngstrom	Brigadoon Estates
No	The property should be sold at market value to the applicant. Even though it has limited utility giving it away for free sets a precedent. Property owners borough wide whose lots are adjacent to city land will expect it to be given to them for free. If this transfer happens as proposed, I wouldn't blame them.	Monika Walker	Valley
No	Sell it at fair market value	Michael Heumann	Auke Bay
Yes	The land is only valuable to the adjacent property owner - but he is the only developer that can make GOOD use one that sliver of land. I suggest a third party appraisal, comparison to CBJ valuation, take higher land value minus 10% = cost to sell. Make it happen.	DARYL MILLER	Lemon Creek
No	This property needs to be assessed and sold at fair market value, not given away.	Anita Moffitt	Valley
No	This sets bad precedent. I do not support giving away public land to a private party. I also believe that erodes the conditions under which the original subdivision was made. If the owners want to build a second house on their lot, they should do so within their existing parcel.	Karla Hart	Valley
No	Sell at market value. Giving or "disposing" land is absolutely unfair to the whole community.	Tara Bay	Valley
No	make them buy it for fair market value	Robert	Valley
No	I don't like the idea of it because me and the neighborhood kids play there. We like to gather supplies for decorations. I can count 9 kids who play there and have a fun time.	Raegan Adams	Brigadoon Estates
No	I'm opposed to a no cost transfer out of CBJ ownership to a party that could generate income from it. I might favor a no cost transfer to a land trust that intends to preserve it in a natural state. I'm fine with a sale based on an appraised value by an independent appraiser. If it does not meet CBJ size and access code to build on, I'm fine with a no bid process. If it does meet code, it should be made available on the open market. I see there are similar parcels on the other end of that street and the one below. Will there next be a proposal to convey those parcels to a private party at no cost. I was under the impression CBJ was under a budget crunch. I don't think giving away land will help.	Michele Metz	Douglas
No	If CBJ is giving out free land, please sign me up. We've been trying to purchase affordable land in Juneau to build a home and there isn't any. Now we see you are giving land away. Again please sign me up for free CBJ land!!	MaryAnn Love	Valley
Yes	Please don't give it away for free rather at fair market value.	Martin Michiels	Out the road
No	I support CBJ selling the lot at fair market value, not giving it away. It's not fair to all of the other property owners and tax payers. Especially since the adjacent property owner is planning on profiting from the land. My family is lower income, we work very hard to afford our home and small plot of land.	Christina Mounce	Valley
No	The property is an asset held in common by the citizens of Juneau. The CBJ should not dispose of it without getting fair market value in return!	Mark Mickelson	Valley
No	This creates a financial boon for one homeowner in CBJ while many are struggling. It is bound to cause bad feelings amongst close neighbors as two small lots are created out of the existing 12K and one 4K gift. If the City wants to dispose of this property, it should be offered for sale at Fair Market Value to the adjacent homowner, with proceeds going to Parks & Rec for improvement or expansion of park land elsewhere. The expansion of development along	Dan DeBartolo	Valley
No	Green space is important and I believe the land should remain designated as a public park. I also think if the designation is removed, the land should be sold at fair market value.	Amber LeBlanc	Douglas
No	Green space is important and I believe the land should remain designated as a public park. I also think if the designation is removed, the land should be sold at fair market value.	Amber LeBlanc	Douglas

No	OUTRAGEOUS! WHY is CBJ giving away land for free to select property owners so they can turn a profit on it??? I'd like a free 4500sqft added to my property too. Who's brother or buddy is requesting the freeloader? Someone on the assembly has to be getting a sweet side deal to propose handing out CBJ land for FREE	Deb Horner	Valley
No	You cannot give away city land. If you wish to sell it to person at full market value, I am not opposed to that.	Patricia Turner Custard	Out the road
No	Juneau has a shortage of buildable land. Do not sell it unless it gets put to productive use as a home site. A 4,500 lot is big enough for a bungalow lot.	Kody Stitz	Downtown
No	It doesn't seem like it's "in the public interest" for CBJ to give land to someone for the sole purpose of that person making money from it (by subdividing and presumably selling the new lot). I understand a new lot would generate property tax revenue for the city, but it leaves a bad taste. Why not sell the lot to the adjacent landowner for some version of fair market value?	Kelda Denton	Out the road
No	Parks are essential for the well being of families. Developing this parcel for neighborhood children would make a fine project for an Eagle Scout, the football team, or a group like Rotary. Keep it as intended.	Laurie Craig	Auke Bay
No	I am adamantly opposed to gifting for profit. I've yet to see a neighborhood that wouldn't benefit from a park or community garden. If the borough wants to sell the property at full market value, fine. That money could be used to acquire other parkland. Otherwise, no to this proposal.	Elizabeth Stewart	Douglas
No	The last thing Juneau needs is more subdivided properties. Overly congested neighborhoods need green spaces in order to make them desirable and healthy places to live. Encouraging further development of our already congested residential neighborhoods is a net loss to our community. If something must be done with this land, then it should be developed in a way that benefits the community as a whole and not one specific property owner. In it's current state, this green space is used by neighborhood residents on a daily basis.	Elizabeth Figus	Valley
Yes	Yes, if they are willing to pay a fair market value to acquire the land.	Kyle	Douglas
No	Original post said the land would be given away for free. This is shortsighted and irresponsible. Sell it at market value per square foot. If anything sell it for something close to the increase in value to the adjacent property that is looking to get it.	Carlos Wilfong	Valley
No	Just no	Deven	Valley
No	This is CBJ land that should not be given away to any private entity unless it were to remain green space. This sets a bad precedent for any property owner whose land is adjacent to CBJ land to ask for it to expand their holding. If the CBJ were to sell that presently open space land the monies should go into 1 other Park & Rec properties. In addition this area has dense development, this small parcel of green space is used by local children as a play area, and it affords a break from the row of homes.	Deborah Rudis	Valley
No	Charge a fair market value and I would support this. I cannot believe that the CBJ would entertain this idea. Where is the fiscal responsibility to all CBJ taxpayers?	Jerrad Hutchings	Auke Bay
Yes	As long as the city is getting paid for the land, I'm all for it	Glenn Ojard	Valley
No	I am opposed to the city disposing of any park land! I'm especially opposed to this proposed action because the adjacent property is apparently paying NOTHING for this lot, which is NOT the usual method of disposing of real estate. No. No. No.	Dennis Harris	Downtown
No	Sell it to them at market value	Zane Chapman	Douglas
No	I do not oppose the lot being sold at a fair value	M Johnson	Auke Bay
No	If CBJ is giving the plot for less than anything the fair market price, the applicants should not acquire the lot.	Ildiko McCabe	Valley
Yes	I absolutely think they should as a resident of 1104 Slim Williams Way.	Briana Williams	Brigadoon Estates
No		KAREN MCCRAE	Valley
No	Do not sell this lot for less than fair market value so someone can profit . The topography can easily be changed	Ed Cavagnaro	Auke Bay
Yes	Yes	Ryan James	Out the road
No	There has to be a better use for the land. Make a playground or something.	Robert Lafavour	Auke Bay
No	Public land should not be disposed. It has value and worth.	Ginny Eckert	Valley
Yes	Not for free, TO PURCHASE	Jasz Garrett	Valley
Yes	At fair market value.	Roxanne Stewart	Downtown
Yes	I take no issue with the applicants acquiring the land.	Cheyenne Girmscheid	Valley
No		Annette Smith	Douglas
No	So my understanding is that CBJ is willing to give this property to them free of charge is this correct ? Well if that's the case I would like to have some free property myself I'm a veteran and a senior and I've lived here for 43 years.	Ricky Deising	Lemon Creek
Yes	This parcel is in front of my house and I have no problem with it being sold.	Debbie Douglass	Brigadoon Estates
No		jerry rounsley	Valley
Yes	CBJ should sell property for fair market value even if a few thousand dollars due to its shape and size. Not really useable property to CBJ but useable to homeowners and they will profit from subdividing lot and selling acquired property.	Jeff Hoover	Douglas
No	I oppose the give-away of public property for private profit.	Jill Dumesnil	Douglas
No	In the email from the city it says(GIVE) not (PURCHASE) as a 50 year resident of Juneau i want the property given to me i have as much right to get the free lot as they do . And no matter what it should be appraised (AND SOLD) at fair market value.	Craig j Orsborn	Valley
Yes		Robert Johnson	Douglas
Yes	With no plans to ever make this a park, and the Bean's being willing to develop it and produce a new lot for possibly a home (to help with the housing crisis) and they are willing to pay the property tax (which helps the city), then they should be allowed to do it. Otherwise it's wasted property that is doing no one any good.	Mandee Collins	Downtown
Yes	CBJ should SELL the property at a fair market value and NOT give away the property.	David Miller	Valley
No		Samantha Smith	Valley
No	No person in Juneau should be given property. First of all they clearly state that they want to subdivide their lot into 2 legal lots which means they plan on selling at some point. Why should any one person be granted a leg up over their neighbors? I have been trying for 4 years to subdivide a lot that is 28,000 sq.ft. Into 2 legal and I own the property and the CBJ has given me nothing but grief and denials. It is crazy to me that you would even consider this. The only way I can see this being done is if the Beans receive the property with the clear stipulation that they won't be able to, now or in the future, subdivide the lot. We are not in the business of augmenting citizen's assets. Let the community garden people have it or garden club if it isn't getting developed as a "park".	Kaysa Korpela	Douglas
No	Unacceptable to give City property away. CBJ revenue has tanked. Balancing the budget has resulted in higher property taxes almost yearly from increased appraisals, mill rates or whatever the "adjustment" is for that year. It opens the door for other to request free land next to their property if it is unusable as is. Comments on Facebook indicate it is still in use by neighborhood children. If City and adjacent property owner wants the lots next to developed sell it at a fair price don't give it away.	Janice Dapceovich	Lemon Creek


No	I live on Slim Williams. This property owned by parks and rec is designated as public park and public property. Giving the parcel to John and Ginger Bean at no cost, does not benefit the public but instead benefits them as individuals. I would be interested to see the financial benefit they stand to make if they are allowed to subdivide their property and sell the second lot. I believe this parcel should be used to benefit the public since it is designated as such. There is a large group of children that live on Slim Williams and Arctic Circle who would benefit from a park. However, if the Beans were willing to purchase the parcel at market value, I would be fine with the transfer.	Caitlin Brady	Brigadoon Estates
No	This would set an unfair precedent by the CBJ and demonstrate favoritism...I wouldn't be surprised if nepotism or friendship are also factors here. What about the rights of the adjacent property owners, who were assured the lot would remain undeveloped? What about the rights of many other local property owners with oddly shaped lots, or adjacent city parcels or easements - are we going to be given additional land for free as well??? I have massive drainage issues I need to deal with on my property - is CBJ going to give me the easement property above the sidewalk, so I can property drain our parcel??? The property owners either need to buy - at fair market value - the additional acreage needed for allowable subdivision and/or sell their parcel and buy - at fair market value - a bigger lot.	Miriah Twitchell	Downtown
No	The city should sell the property at fair market value to the adjacent property owner or sell it to any and all Residents of Juneau at Fair market value and use the proceeds to pay for existing public parks in Juneau CBJ.	Kevin Mac's	Valley
No	The property has value and CBJ should not freely give away something of value allowing a new private owner to profit from. CBJ has a responsibility to sell the land for what its worth to meet their land requirements rather than give it away. Everyone in Juneau pays, this situation is not an exception.	Shannon Sexton	Valley
Yes		Rachel Kelly	Valley
No	I would like to purchase the property	Bruce Weyhrauch	Auke Bay
No	Public spaces are too few in our community. The original intent of the Planning Commission was preservation of untouched property for public use plus the potential for a developed public space in the future. This intent should be honored and kept.	Margo Waring	Out the road
No	If CBJ is going to give land away why don't you find some that is suitable for affordable single family homes and make sure that is how it is developed	Heather Evoy	Valley
Yes	I am opposed to "giving" the property to the adjacent property owner. Their plan is to add it to their property, subdivide it and make money off it. I think they should be charged an amount close to what their current property value is. There is land in front of me that I would like donated to me too.	Betty J. Johnson	Douglas
No	Only if you give everyone else some land. This is the worst idea I've heard in a long time. Do not set a precedent. Alternatively, auction it off to the highest bidder.	Mike Spalding	Lemon Creek
No	Seems shady. Giving them the land for free and allowing them to subdivide, literally gives them a MASSIVE chunk of free money. If this is the intent to just throw big chunks of money around, I will take some.	Willie Perry	Valley
No	We have enough development taking our forests away. We moved back there years ago because it sustains natural beauty of the forest and it's a sanctuary for smaller wildlife and to get away from over developed housing areas. We have enough issues with neighbors having property that they don't keep clean, maintain or care that they re neighbors have to live looking at their unkept yards and houses. No more development. How selfish to take a whole protected	Shadow Meienberg	Brigadoon Estates
Yes	I don't agree with the transfer being free to the Buyer. The shape, size and location negatively impact value based on other lots in the neighborhood but the plan to reconfigure the lot to create a usable parcel to sell provides the Buyer with a distinct profitable benefit not possible for anyone else.	Robin Potter	Valley
No	If they want the property they should PURCHASE it at fair market value, and pay property pay taxes like the rest of us.	Crystal Williams	Valley
No	Public space is a valuable commodity and should be maintained.	Linda Kruger	Douglas
No	Vacant lots in a subdivision are not wasted. They are there for the future. Look at the beach lots stuffed side by side with no thought of public access or use. This property is an asset for the future as it is.	Sylvia Geraghty	Valley
No		David Woods	Brigadoon Estates
No	This park is used on a daily basis by the children in this neighborhood, including my son. It is his favorite place in this neighborhood to play. It is better suited as a park than for real estate as it has a fairly large hill in the middle and half of it is covered by a pond. Please do not take our children's favorite bit of nature from them.	Rachael Woods	Brigadoon Estates
No	They should not just give it away, it should be sold and others should have the option to buy if wished	Corbin mitchell	Out the road
No	Hey if your handing out city land, where's mine? I'd settle for city lands being open to all users though, not just for those who drive subarus with ski racks on top	Ryan Blackwell	Valley
No	Does all of that property have to be acquired to meet the minimum? Are they just trying to get the whole lot?	Jessica Williams	Valley
No	Why wouldn't this person be required to pay fair market value for this land?	Debrah Clements	Valley
No	Sell it for fair market value only, do not give away. The lot must be available for anyone to bid on unless the adjacent owner pays a premium. I support getting the lot into private hands and then it can start generating property tax but I absolutely DO NOT support this disposal unless at fair market value with a premium to adjacent landowner or open bid by the public.	SHAWNA DURFEY	Douglas
Yes		Leilani Maka	Valley
No	I think that if the lot is going to be disposed of, it should be assessed and sold at market value.	Chris B	Valley
No	Property should not be given away because someone wants it. CBJ would be overrun with applications for free land. If this happens and I would be one of them.	Adam DiPietro	Valley
No	If the city is giving out free land i would like some so i do not have to pay for my storage unit anymore. Can i be considered as part of a raffle for this land?	Anna Utereyuk	Douglas
No	I worry that if the 1983 public park dedication is retracted that it would affect the other 2 areas our neighborhood that are used often by kids. In fact it would be nice if they were maintained as parks to some degree. The proposal above reads that the borough would not get paid for the property. This would be bad presidence for people to start trying to get free land. I'm all for the borough selling it's land for development and so people don't have to live so close together but not like this.	Nicole Ferrin	Brigadoon Estates
No	sell it... it says they want to subdivide... collect money as condition.. in escrow	Lynne Clement	Valley
No	Disposal of this parcel as described should only be approved if the acquiring party pays CBJ the fair market value of the land. Giving CBJ property to the applicants at no cost would be a gross disservice to CBJ taxpayers. Even though CBJ Parks and Rec has no plans to develop the lot, the property has public value as open space and thus the public should be compensated if this land is removed from public ownership.	Jon Kurland	Valley

Yes	Only if property owners pay for the land. I feel it should be fair market value or a little under price since it is most likely not enough to build a house. If you give this parcel away, it looks like there will be 2 other parcels in area which private land owners would want to inquire land for free. The CBJ needs to set a standard on the first plot. Having private owners paying property taxes on land is a good thing. CBJ just needs to work with land owners and sell \$\$ them the land.	Leeann Thomas	Auke Bay
No	No. Do not give away land for free. They can purchase it like every other citizen in this town. Put it up for sale. Absolutely ridiculous to give away property, where is all the property for the rest of CBJ citizens? I would also like to be given some land to subdivide and profit off of.	Heather Buchmiller	Douglas
No	Please do not dispose of this property in the manner proposed. The land has current value to families in the neighborhood whose children use it as a play area, even in its undeveloped state. The property was designated to be developed into a playground for children; if any change is to occur I would like to see this plan fulfilled. The property is located in a neighborhood populated with children that would use it, and is easily accessible via sidewalk by other neighborhoods. My own household has three children and is in walking distance of this area.	Jonathan Estes	Valley
No	Do not give away this property, how is this fair to any other resident in CBJ? The property should be turned into a park to promote the neighborhood, not given to a private citizen for profit at no cost.	heather boardman	Douglas
No	The city just gave away 1.5 million dollars and now we are going to just give some more property away? Sounds like a bad investment to me. Sell the land to them! If the want to acquire the land then they can do it with money like everyone else. Why should they be the ones to benefit from the CBJ property when it could be sold at fair market value and the funds used to help all residents in Juneau.	Jared Buchmiller	Douglas
No	I've been trying to find affordable land for over a year, and this is being given away for free? Where do I sign up for my free land? Sell at fair market and then start offloading other "disposable" CBJ lots so the rest of us can develop as well. If it's not a problem to give away this lot for free, I can only imagine how many more lots could be made available.	Why do you need my name?	Valley
No	This land should be sold at fair market value to whoever chooses to purchase.	Colleen Ahern	Douglas
No	I'm saying NO because CBJ is talking about "giving" it to adjacent property owner - they can buy it at market value if they want it. It also appears from the property plat lines in the assessors data base has allowed adjacent property owners to infringe on CBJ property. I have concern the city is retracting their original "park designation". Taking a park designation away concerns me as it could become a practice in the future where property owners may have turned property over for designate park or land trust and the City disposes of at a later date, that is dishonest and unethical.	Laura Baker	Auke Bay
Yes	Acquire via purchase at Market Value. NO, if at no cost to the Bean couple.	Mary Manning	Valley
No	This is a family neighborhood with kids that play in all those forests, they are a safe place to kids to go rather than. Across the street to the gravel pit or where they could meet strangers in the campground to remove them just to put postage stamp residence on them would be criminal.	Colton Tersteeg	Brigadoon Estates
No	I'm fine with CBJ shedding land that can then contribute to tax revenue, but to give it away is not right, it sets a precedent for others down the road, and the optics of this to the community is terrible. How and why was this decided? It would be in your best interest to share this to the community because right now many are discussing how some 'backdoor' deal was done. My suggestion is if you do decide to give the land, be very open on how/why this was done. If you are unable to do this then I suggest you have the land appraised and then sell at fair market value to the person wanting it. If they don't take it, keep it as green space for the community.	Todd Miller	Downtown
Yes	Yes to the disposal, BUT, only if the parcel is sold! The CBJ is in no financial position to be giving away land.	Andy Romanoff	Lemon Creek
No	The adjacent property owners should have to pay fair market value for land.	Julia Frost	Valley
No	We've been lead to believe the land would simply be given away in this situation and that is NOT acceptable. Sell it at fair market. CBJ is not in the business of giving away property. If you do that for one, you do it for all.	Scarlett Adam	Douglas
Yes	They should be allowed to do it because the city already approved the second building which was always going to be subdivided	Anne Tompkins	Valley
No	I have no objection to the adjacent property owner obtaining the property AT MARKET VALUE, supported by an appraisal. The small parcel likely would have limited recreational value if developed, there are apparently no plans to develop it, and the entire recreational potential of the Skater's Cabin area is within a short walk. However, the idea of providing it at no cost to the adjacent property owner, as appears to be the proposal, would be a use of public property	Peter Forsling	Valley
No	If the owner wants to acquire park land in order to increase the value of their property they should pay a reasonable price for it. There is a similar block of park lands at the other end of Slim Williams way. If the owner of lot 13 purchased the park land and those funds were used to develop other parklands in the neighborhood I could be for it.	Logan McClain	Brigadoon Estates
Yes	I am not opposed to John and Ginger Bean purchasing this parcel for fair market value.	Angela Mickle	Valley
No	They can buy it or cbj should use it. At a time when not only the state & the city needs money. It is also a time when many citizens can't feed their families. Not the time to give away lots unless the rest of us get some too. Born and raised in this town, as was my mother and her mother no one gave us land. Sell it spend the money on this town, pay off a debt, covid relief, stock food banks, the reasons are endless as to howthat money could help in this time. SELL NOT GIVE AWAY!!!	Victoria Scharen	Brigadoon Estates
No	See my previous comments... I just entered my residence location incorrectly	Victoria Scharen	Valley
No	Disposing this property to the adjacent landowner solely for the purpose of further development and profit is an egregious example of unjust enrichment and disingenuous concern for the public interest. This parcel is a long standing set aside as a local public park and was again recently determined, through a public land management process, that it should be retained as a park. To allow disposal now, without ANY compensation to the public, smacks of favoritism and total disregard for the public interest. As a land surveyor of long standing in Juneau and the adjacent landowner since 1993 (according to CBJ assessor records), I'm confident Mr. Bean has always been aware of the status of the adjacent park and could not have had any expectation that the property would be used for any other purpose. While I do not support disposal of property with long-standing park designation, if the public were to support disposal following a complete public process, CBJ should not dispose of this property without offering it for bids through a public process. If that is not possible, the Beans should pay the market value of the property to CBJ. There should be no such thing as a free lunch in these circumstances.	Maria Lisowski	Valley
No	I believe it's in the best interest of the neighborhood to keep the property as it is. It creates a nice visual green buffer between Arctic Circle and Slim Williams Way. The green corner has always provided a nice play area for the children in the neighborhood. The local bears tend not to go in that area which provides a safe space for children to play.	Anonymous	Brigadoon Estates
No	Build a park. Don't give away the land, for someone else to profit.	Misti Hogberg	Valley
Yes	The Beans should pay for all associated costs to make this change.	Cynthia Krehbiel	Valley

No	I own a duplex across the street from the applicant. I do not favor any more development in this area and especially on Arctic Circle. The idea that this area is not suitable to be a park is fine but just leave it as an open space without a large additional house on the street. I find it appalling that this city would possibly give this parcel to the applicant so that they may subdivide their lot to make a profit by possibly building another home. Arctic Circle is a dead end street and already has enough homes on it. Please keep the parcel and leave it alone.	Peter Hettinger	Brigadoon Estates
No	I am a neighbor of the Bean's and am one of the longest tenured residences of this subdivision. We should never give up dedicated natural "Park" areas unless absolutely necessary. However, in this case a small portion might be acceptable. The City should allow them to buy the small portion they need to meet the threshold needed to subdivide their lot, which I understand is way less than the entire plot, and retain the balance. The identified corner plot is used by the neighborhood kids to "play" in the woods in a protected and easily accessible area, and has been for many years. It also provides a valuable green belt sound and visual divider from the adjoining street (Slim Williams) intersection and the lower end of Arctic Circle. Most of us on this end of Arctic Circle bought out in this area to not be in a subdivided row house environment and to have some trees and natural barriers. If the City chooses to move forward with this, please include parameters that do not allow cutting and clearing the trees from the corner lot. The visual and sound barriers from Slim Williams are worth a lot and would adversely affect our lifestyle.	John White	Brigadoon Estates


Should the City and Borough of Juneau dispose of the 4518 SF park lot on the corner of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle and thereby allow the adjacent property owners to acquire the lot?

166 responses



Residence location

166 responses



From: Alec Venechuk
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Brigadoon Estates public comment
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 3:53:42 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hello,

This email is in response to the proposal to sell CBJ park land. I am a proponent of the CBJ selling land to the public, but the way the public notice was written gave me a few red flags. The public notice stated that the land would be sold at no cost. I believe that's a bad idea, the land obviously has value - the proposed buyers want it. At the least, this property should be sold off at fair market value. If the CBJ is giving away land, I would like my free land too. How was this land acquired by the CBJ? Did the borough require the subdivision developer to donate the parcel as a condition of the subdivision? If so, then I think the CBJ should return it to the original developer or it's heirs, and let them dispose of it, rather than give it to another private party who will ultimately profit. If the CBJ P&R department sells the land at fair market value, and those funds stay in the P&R budget, one could argue that the public was not harmed and the original developer's "donation" to better CBJ parks was not in vain. To give the land away to someone else would be theft from the original developer.

Thank you.

From: Allen Shattuck
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Land disposal at Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 10:49:58 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

CBJ should not give away the land. It should be sold at fair market value.

Allen Shattuck
Juneau



Virus-free. www.avg.com

From: ANDREA MOGIL
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Go Not Give Away Property
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 7:06:11 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hello CBJ,

After reading about a proposed property giveaway at the corner of Slim Williams and Arctic Circle at <https://www.kinyradio.com/news/news-of-the-north/cbj-considers-giving-away-land/>, I have to ask why the city would give away property to a private buyer so that they can subdivide into two profitable parcels, especially when the city is so desperately in need of funds and so many Juneauites are unemployed or facing business losses or even closures due to the COVID-19 pandemic, environmental disaster, and poor fishing. If the applicants plan to develop at least one of the subdivisions of the newly enhanced parcel, this article didn't explore that possibility.

Even if it relieves the city of any costly responsibilities attached to the parcel, and the new subdivided parcel can generate tax revenues in the future, Juneau needs the funds now.

Thank you,
-Andrea Mogil, 800 F Street
Sent from my iPad

From: Bjorn Wolter
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Property @ Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 10:45:32 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

To whom it may concern,

I'm writing in regard to the proposed disposal of 4518 ft.² of land at the corner of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle.

Let me be clear, I am 100% NOT in favor of giving away public land to private owners. I am also not in favor of disposing of the land the private ownership in anyway. It should remain in public trust. Barring that possibility, it should be sold at a fair market price determined by realtors by bid after public notice.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Bjorn Wolter
Juneau, Alaska

“Science is the great antidote to the poison of enthusiasm and superstition.” — Adam Smith

From: Casey Bullmer
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Cc: [Pamela Bullmer](#); [Casey Bullmer](#)
Subject: Public Comment: Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle Land Disposal-Park Dedication
Date: Sunday, December 27, 2020 10:39:34 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

December 27, 2020

To: Park & Recreation Advisory Committee (Tom Rutcki, Emily Palmer, Josh Anderson, Wade Bryson, Edric Carrillo, Will Muldoon, Kirk Duncan, Alexander Beebe-Giudice, Ronald Crenshaw, Christopher Merti, Mike Eberhardt)

From: Kenneth (Casey) Bullmer and Pamela Bullmer, 1015 Arctic Circle Juneau, AK 99801-8754

Re: Public Comment - Land Disposal and Retraction of 1983 Park Dedication (Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle)

Dear Park & Recreation Advisory Committee,

Both Pamela and I oppose the disposal of 4,518 square feet of land on the corner of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle located in Brigadoon Estates, to the owners of property at 10170 Arctic Circle. This green space is vital to the area and should not be developed.

Pamela and I both support keeping in tact the 1983 public park dedication for the 4,518 square feet located on the corner of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle located in Brigadoon Estates.

The 4,518 square feet of land in question has been critical in maintaining a wildlife presence. Numerous birds migrate each year to the area. Along with a new porcupine who has made the area home this previous summer. This area also provides an educational opportunity for the children in the area. Along, with a safe green space for their recreational use instead of the road. Just this previous summer, Pamela and I watched as a few of the children from the area had a picnic on the big rocks on the Arctic Road side of the area in question.

While both Pamela and I understand the lack of viable tax-based land in the borough. We both feel that this is not the parcel of land to develop but to maintain the integrity of the land from the 1983 public park dedication.

Sincerely,

Casey and Pamela Bullmer
907-723-6801

From: Chuck Blankenship
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Lot at Arctic Circle and Slim Williams Way
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 12:32:32 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

I found the news item regarding the potential transfer of this property to be very confusing. Perhaps a little clarification of the circumstances would be helpful in aiding the public come to an opinion on the action.

- 1) What is the market value of the property in question?
- 2) If the property was set aside for use as a public park, why was this done? Was this an inappropriate action at the time or have all potential plans to develop it as a public space been abandoned?
- 3) Who is the owner of the adjacent property?
- 4) If the reason the property owner seeks to obtain this property is to afford him/her sufficient square footage to legally subdivide, what is the estimated cash value of this action accruing to the property owner?
- 5) Why, I repeat why, would the City and Borough consider this gift of some undisclosed value to an individual without some reciprocal exchange of cash or property of equal value?

Thanks for any clarification you can provide.

Charles Blankenship

From: conmac414
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: property disposal slim williams way
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 11:38:01 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

I am opposed to giving away the adjacent lot to the owner on arctic circle, but would support the CBJ selling it at fair market value.

Sent from my Galaxy

12/2/20

CBT
 Parks & Recreation Department
 155 South Seward St
 Juneau, AK 99801

RE: Comment regarding "should CBT dispose of a 'park' lot at corner of Slim Wilkins Way and Arctic Circle in Brigadon + allow adjacent property owners to acquire the lot"?

In reading the background info am I correct in reading that:

"If application is approved by the Assembly, the property would be given to the applicant at NO COST pursuant to CBT 49.15.404.

At No Cost means the CBT is giving away park property to adjacent neighbors? This doesn't make sense when CBT could sell the property and use the money for Parks and Rec expenses. Better yet why not make a "pocket park" at the property since the local children have already done this. Our little neighbors play in there all the time, surely ^{you} could keep this as a park.

I would like a response to this vote!

I tried leaving comments @ your email address to no avail/no success. So much for technology.

Sincerely,



C. Trollan
 P.O. Box 33893
 Juneau, AK 99803-3893

Constance Trollan
 (1128 Slim Wilkins Way)
 PO Box 33893
 Juneau, AK 99803

Email: ctrollan@acsalaska.net

Phone: 907-784-4282

From: Dawn Wenona Jerue
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Date: Saturday, December 12, 2020 1:13:06 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

How is a person to be considered for this possible land give away on slim williams way.
Where to apply etc. Thank you.

Dawn Jerue

From: Eileen Nally
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Plot at Corner Slim Williams and Artic Circle
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 5:36:46 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Greetings,

I am in receipt of a notice that subject property is going to be given away by CBJ to 10170 Arctic Circle at no cost (a land give away) following public park designation removal.

I find it very disturbing that during this period of budget shortfalls that CBJ is giving land away for free that a new owner can develop. What was the criteria for selecting the applicant? When was this "land give away" advertised for applications? How can others get on this list for free land? How was this a fare and impartial process?

If CBJ is going to dispose of this parcel, it should be sold at fair market value. CBJ is not in a position to give land away when it should collect some revenue through a bidding or auction process.

Thank you in advance for collecting comments on this. Have a wonderful holiday season!!!

Sincerely,

Eileen Nally

Sent from my iPhone

From: Emily Haynes
To: [George Schaaf](#)
Cc: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Re: Public Comment - Brigadoon Estates Proposed Land Disposal
Date: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 12:48:17 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hi George,

I appreciate the follow-up information. I'm sure you're not surprised but I do have some follow-up comments.

In 1983, the developer of Brigadoon Estates was required by CBJ to include dedicated park space as part of the subdivision review and approval. CBJ owns that property and P&R manages it as an undeveloped park. CBJ now feels it is no longer needed for park space. I would agree that the land would then revert back to the developer.

Thanks again,

Emily

On Tue, Dec 15, 2020 at 10:13 AM George Schaaf <George.Schaaf@juneau.org> wrote:

Also an excellent point. When the Beans submitted their original application, that started the Title 53 process to dispose of the land at fair market value. At the time, I don't believe anyone realized there was no title or deed for the property. A few months after the Beans submitted their application, our Law Dept. concluded that the property was a right-of-way subject to the Title 49 process.

There are probably other situations like this throughout the CBJ. I'm afraid we don't have the resources to go through all the plats to see which park parcels are rights-of-way by dedication, but it's certainly something we'll keep an eye out for in the future.

Best,

George

From: Emily Haynes <erhaynes@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, December 15, 2020 7:14 AM
To: George Schaaf <George.Schaaf@juneau.org>

Cc: Parks Rec <Parks.Rec@juneau.org>

Subject: Re: Public Comment - Brigadoon Estates Proposed Land Disposal

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hi Mr. Schaaf,

Thank you for responding! None of the plans that CBJ has developed specific to the parcel (notably, the Land Management Plan) have identified this parcel as right-of-way. Instead, it is called out as a park and the disposal would be completed through Title 53. Wouldn't that be a bit misleading to have a plan specifying how parcels would be disposed and then using other means?

Emily

On Mon, Dec 14, 2020 at 3:09 PM George Schaaf <George.Schaaf@juneau.org> wrote:

Dear Ms. Haynes,

Thank you for reaching out. I appreciate your detailed comments and research; you raise some excellent questions.

Our attorneys determined that the property is a right-of-way because the Planning Commission in 1983 required the developer to dedicate the parcel as a public park. As such, their position is that the CBJ does not own the land in a proprietary capacity.

We've since received updated guidance from the Law Department indicating that, if CBJ vacates the right-of-way, the land would most likely go back to the company that developed the subdivision in 1983, and not the applicant. That could mean the whole issue is moot.

Again, thank you for your thoughtful comments. We will be sure to include them in the record.

Best,
George

George Schaaf

Director

Parks & Recreation Department

City & Borough of Juneau

155 S. Seward St.

Juneau, Alaska 99801

(907) 586-5226

george.schaaf@juneau.org



From: Parks Rec <Parks.Rec@juneau.org>

Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 2:36 PM

To: George Schaaf <George.Schaaf@juneau.org>

Subject: FW: Public Comment - Brigadoon Estates Proposed Land Disposal

From: Emily Haynes <erhaynes@gmail.com>

Sent: Monday, December 14, 2020 11:58 AM
To: Parks Rec <Parks.Rec@juneau.org>
Subject: Public Comment - Brigadoon Estates Proposed Land Disposal

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hello,

I am submitting a public comment in opposition to the disposal of the public park (LND-0416*) at the intersection of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle (Brigadoon Estates II, Block B Park) in Juneau, AK. (**Public notice identifies it as LND-0419*)

I am a resident and property owner in Juneau, Alaska and, as such, have a vested interest in decisions made to public property. The following provides support for my comment:

1. The 2016 Land Management Plan designated this property as "retain" in CBJ ownership, for public purposes.
 - According to CBJ Code 53.09.150, "The plan [Land Management Plan] shall identify the management intent for each parcel of City and Borough [of Juneau] land." The Land Management Plan also has strict public involvement required before adoption by the assembly. Applying decisions out of conformance with the Land Management Plan without first proposing changes to the Land Management Plan and holding public involvement, is not in compliance with CBJ code.
 - The plan states, "CBJ property represents a significant resource for the community that would be the envy of many towns across the nation."
 - The plan defines "Retain" as lands to be "retained for various public purposes which include parks, harbors, airport, fire stations, schools, the hospital, maintenance shops, etc. These lands are not intended to be sold but may be eased or leased for specific purposes, such as airport related uses, consistent with an adopted plan." The proposed decision does not meet any of that criteria.
 - CBJ Code 53.09.180 requires a biennial report of all CBJ lands. In 2018 and 2020, this parcel was not identified for disposal.
2. In 2018, CBJ developed the CBJ Parks Inventory document. Within this plan, it states, "Methods for disposal [of parklands] will follow those set forth in the CBJ Land Management Plan (CBJ Code 53.09.200)." This decision is proposing to dispose under Title 49.
3. In 2019, CBJ developed the Parks and Recreation Master Plan 2019-2029.
 - This parcel is identified as "Vacant/Other Lands" which are classified as

Natural Park Areas. The table (4.8) in this section does not identify this parcel as meeting reclassification criteria.

- Section 7.8.2 discusses Parkland Disposal and states, "In general, parkland is presumed to have a significant recreational, environmental, or cultural value, and/or is necessary to fulfill the goals established by this plan."
- The disposal process for lands is established in CBJ Code 53.09.260. Again, this decision is proposing to dispose under Title 49.

4. Title 53 of CBJ Municipal Code

- CBJ MC 53.09.0600, proceeds from property sales are to be deposited in the municipal land fund.
- CBJ Code 53.09.200(e) states, "Except as provided in CBJ 53.09.270, Disposal for public use, the sale price for City and Borough land shall not be less than market value as determined by the manager." Disposing of land to a private citizen for private gain would not meet the intent of this code.

5. Title 49 of CBJ Municipal Code

- CBJ Code 49.15.404, which the proposed decision is using, is specific to Public Way vacations.
- This section "does not apply to property owned by the City and Borough in its proprietary capacity."
- This proposed decision is applying code inappropriately. Public ways are not public lands dedicated as parks; they are for transportation purposes.

6. This property is used by the public. Google Streetview shows many vehicles utilizing the right-of-way in front of this parcel for additional parking for access to the Mendenhall Lake Campground and trailheads within the Tongass National Forest.

As stated in CBJ documents, this land is to be retained as a significant resource for the benefit of the citizens of Juneau. This decision is not being made in the best interest of the public. If CBJ would like to pursue disposal, the Land Management Plan would need to be amended, the property could not be sold for less than fair market value per the available routes in Title 53, and those funds would be deposited into the Land Fund. Title 49 is not the appropriate avenue.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment. Please keep me updated of the proposed decision. I can be reached at erhaynes@gmail.com.

Thank you,

Emily Haynes

1772 Dimond Drive

From: Emily Haynes
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Public Comment - Brigadoon Estates Proposed Land Disposal
Date: Monday, December 14, 2020 11:58:26 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hello,

I am submitting a public comment in opposition to the disposal of the public park (LND-0416*) at the intersection of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle (Brigadoon Estates II, Block B Park) in Juneau, AK. (**Public notice identifies it as LND-0419*)

I am a resident and property owner in Juneau, Alaska and, as such, have a vested interest in decisions made to public property. The following provides support for my comment:

1. The 2016 Land Management Plan designated this property as "retain" in CBJ ownership, for public purposes.
 - According to CBJ Code 53.09.150, "The plan [Land Management Plan] shall identify the management intent for each parcel of City and Borough [of Juneau] land." The Land Management Plan also has strict public involvement required before adoption by the assembly. Applying decisions out of conformance with the Land Management Plan without first proposing changes to the Land Management Plan and holding public involvement, is not in compliance with CBJ code.
 - The plan states, "CBJ property represents a significant resource for the community that would be the envy of many towns across the nation."
 - The plan defines "Retain" as lands to be "retained for various public purposes which include parks, harbors, airport, fire stations, schools, the hospital, maintenance shops, etc. These lands are not intended to be sold but may be eased or leased for specific purposes, such as airport related uses, consistent with an adopted plan." The proposed decision does not meet any of that criteria.
 - CBJ Code 53.09.180 requires a biennial report of all CBJ lands. In 2018 and 2020, this parcel was not identified for disposal.
2. In 2018, CBJ developed the CBJ Parks Inventory document. Within this plan, it states, "Methods for disposal [of parklands] will follow those set forth in the CBJ Land Management Plan (CBJ Code 53.09.200)." This decision is proposing to dispose under Title 49.
3. In 2019, CBJ developed the Parks and Recreation Master Plan 2019-2029.
 - This parcel is identified as "Vacant/Other Lands" which are classified as Natural Park Areas. The table (4.8) in this section does not identify this parcel as meeting reclassification criteria.
 - Section 7.8.2 discusses Parkland Disposal and states, "In general, parkland is presumed to have a significant recreational, environmental, or cultural value, and/or is necessary to fulfill the goals established by this plan."
 - The disposal process for lands is established in CBJ Code 53.09.260. Again, this decision is proposing to dispose under Title 49.
4. Title 53 of CBJ Municipal Code
 - CBJ MC 53.09.0600, proceeds from property sales are to be deposited in the municipal land fund.

CBJ Code 53.09.200(e) states, "Except as provided in CBJ 53.09.270, Disposal for public use, the sale price for City and Borough land shall not be less than market value as determined by the manager." Disposing of land to a private citizen for private gain would not meet the intent of this code.

5. Title 49 of CBJ Municipal Code
 - CBJ Code 49.15.404, which the proposed decision is using, is specific to Public Way vacations.
 - This section "does not apply to property owned by the City and Borough in its proprietary capacity."
 - This proposed decision is applying code inappropriately. Public ways are not public lands dedicated as parks; they are for transportation purposes.
6. This property is used by the public. Google Streetview shows many vehicles utilizing the right-of-way in front of this parcel for additional parking for access to the Mendenhall Lake Campground and trailheads within the Tongass National Forest.

As stated in CBJ documents, this land is to be retained as a significant resource for the benefit of the citizens of Juneau. This decision is not being made in the best interest of the public. If CBJ would like to pursue disposal, the Land Management Plan would need to be amended, the property could not be sold for less than fair market value per the available routes in Title 53, and those funds would be deposited into the Land Fund. Title 49 is not the appropriate avenue.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment. Please keep me updated of the proposed decision. I can be reached at erhaynes@gmail.com.

Thank you,
Emily Haynes
1772 Dimond Drive

From: Johanna Fagen
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Brigadoon Estates II, Block B, Park
Date: Saturday, December 26, 2020 7:15:53 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

1138 Slim Williams Way
Juneau, Alaska 99801
Dec. 26, m2020

Re: Brigadoon Estates II, Block B, Park

Dear CBJ, Parks & Rec:

I have no objection to the change in the status of the parcel Block B, Park in Brigadoon Estates. I walk or drive past the property daily and had assumed it was part of John and Ginger Bean's property. It is a small parcel. The location at an intersection with a moderate amount of traffic and small size limit the parcel's recreation value.

Yours truly,

Johanna M. Fagen

Amanda Babin

From: Hamrick, Mr. <kevin.hamrick@juneauschools.org>
Sent: Sunday, December 6, 2020 11:22 AM
To: Parks Rec
Subject: Brigadoon Estates II, block B

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

No! Do not let this property be acquired. It is across from my house and provides a green area where my kids have played in the past. (and neighborhood kids still play) It breaks up the area of house, house, house, house. Keep it as is!

If you want to give it away for maintenance, I'll take it over.

--

Kevin Hamrick-FDMS Math/Sci.
JDHS Field coach

"Strength is the ability to conquer pain"

Amanda Babin

From: Kim Turley <turleyjac@yahoo.com>
Sent: Sunday, December 6, 2020 10:04 AM
To: Parks Rec
Cc: Kathy Turley
Subject: Slim Wms - Arctic Circle Lot

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Subject: The 4,518 sq. ft. Lot on the corner of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle.

Dear CBJ Parks & Rec,

Please do not retract the 1983 dedication of the subject Lot as a "Public Park". Even though you don't ever plan to develop it, retaining it just as is carries great importance in retaining the character of this subdivision. When we bought our nearby lot & house in the mid 1980's, we did so believing that this 4,518 sq. ft. Lot would never have a house on it. Please don't disappoint us by retracting the "Public Park" status.

Sincerely, Kimbern & Kathleen Turley

Sent from my iPhone

From: lpbiz@mailworks.org
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Cc: [Borough Assembly](#)
Subject: Brigadoon Park lot
Date: Sunday, December 20, 2020 6:10:25 PM
Attachments: [20201220-Brigadoon Park lot.pdf](#)

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Subject: Brigadoon Estates II, Block B, Park

Ladies/Gentlemen:

I support the Park lot (at the corner of Arctic Circle and Slim Williams Way) being sold at fair market value to John and Ginger Bean, the owners of the property at 1070 Arctic Circle.

I do not support the Park lot being given away at no cost to any applicant.

Disclosure: I have met Ginger Bean several times over the years and think very highly of her.

Sincerely,

Lee Parker
1129 Slim Williams Way
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Attachment: copy of letter mailed to Parks and Recreation and to the Assembly

20 December 2020

Lee Parker
1129 Slim Williams Way
Juneau, Alaska 99801

City and Borough of Juneau
Parks and Recreation Department
155 S. Seward Street
Juneau, Alaska 99801

Subject: Brigadoon Estates II, Block B, Park

Ladies/Gentlemen:

I support the Park lot (at the corner of Arctic Circle and Slim Williams Way) being sold at fair market value to John and Ginger Bean, the owners of the property at 1070 Arctic Circle.

I do not support the Park lot being given away at no cost to any applicant.

Disclosure: I have met Ginger Bean several times over the years and think very highly of her.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'LH R', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Lee Parker

Cc: CBJ Assembly members

PUBLIC COMMENT REQUEST

Should the City and Borough of Juneau dispose of the 4,518 square foot park lot on the corner of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle and thereby allow the adjacent property owners to acquire the lot?

The deadline to receive comments is December 28, 2020.

You may submit comments in multiple ways:

1. Online at bit.ly/BrigadoonEstates
2. Email Parks.Rec@juneau.org
3. Send comment in letterform to City and Borough of Juneau, Parks and Recreation Department, 155 S. Seward Street, Juneau, AK 99801

BACKGROUND

John and Ginger Bean, the owners of the property located at 1070 Arctic Circle, have submitted an application to acquire City property currently dedicated as a public park. The City property has the legal description of Brigadoon Estates II, Block B, Park. The lot is 4,518 square feet and is on the corner of Slim Williams Way and Arctic Circle. It was dedicated as a "Public Park" by the Planning Commission as an element of a Major Subdivision plat approval in 1983. This parcel is listed in the Land Management Plan as LND-0419 and is managed by the Parks and Recreation Department. The 2016 Land Management Plan designated this property as "Retain".

The applicant intends to subdivide their property into two legal lots; the City property is needed to meet minimum lot size requirements for this subdivision. In order for this lot to be considered for disposal, the Planning Commission must first retract the 1983 dedication as a "Public Park" as an element of a Major Subdivision plat approval. If the application is approved by the Assembly, the property would be given to the applicant at no cost pursuant to CBJ 49.15.404.

The parcel is triangular in shape, elevated from street level, and forested. The Parks and Recreation Department does not have any plans for development and recognizes that public access and use is difficult because of the size, topography, and adjacency to the road intersection.



From: maureen insure-mt.com
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Brigadoon Estates II, Block B, Park
Date: Friday, December 18, 2020 1:18:00 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

I would like to comment on the city parcel Brigadoon Estates II, Block B, Park. I do NOT support the city giving the property away. I would like it to remain the property of the city and if possible utilized as a park. The area is already very dense. It is a one way street which adds to the condensed feeling of the neighborhood. Most lots are small, attached homes. It is a very snowy area as well. It feels very tight in this area when there are snow banks. I don't support the idea of another house on this street. Also I don't like the idea of the city giving away "our" community property for anything less than the assessed value of the property. Even if the city was selling the property, I would not support the idea of more housing on this already tight neighborhood.

Thank you for your service to our community and thank you for your considerations of my thoughts.

Maureen Riley

From: Mike Michaud
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Williams Way/Arctic Circle property
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 5:28:53 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

To whom it may concern:

The city should not be giving any property away. I cant believe this is even a question. The news article prior to this one states "CBJ budget work looking pretty rough". Any city property to be disposed of should be sold at fair market value.

Mike Michaud

From: Miriah Twitchell
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: 10170 Arctic Circle
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 9:43:11 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

I am writing to oppose the giving way of a dedicated public park for the benefit of an individual land owner.

You have to be kidding me with this proposal, and to expect fierce opposition and an amateur investigation if it is approved.

How on earth would this proposal be fair to other property owners, equitable to those living in the neighborhood, and reasonably prudent for the city? Seems pretty fishy to me.

Miriah

From: rcpreston@gci.net
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: proposed land giveaway
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 6:15:33 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

This is my comment on the proposed land giveaway as reported at KINY's News of the North site: <https://www.kinyradio.com/news/news-of-the-north/cbj-considers-giving-away-land/>

I do not understand why the property would be simply given away. Should not the applicants at least be required to pay fair market value for the property? Isn't that CBJ policy? What is the rationale for simply giving it away?

Ray Preston
4990 Thane Road
Juneau

From: Rodney Womack
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Arctic Circle land transfer
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 11:44:12 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

CBJ should never be giving land away uncompensated in any situation. The public gains nothing and loses park/playground space that was intended for a specific purpose. CBJ should develop the space as originally planned as a modest project benefiting the community.

CBJ squanders money on funding this or that study or proposal on a weekly basis and I'm sure funding for development of this space can be procured possibly even through community fund raising.

I don't live in that area of town so my opinion is not based on any personal interest in that particular space but as a general principle regarding give aways of public owned property.

Thank you for your valuable time.

Rodney Womack
52 year Juneau resident.

Amanda Babin

From: Ruth Danner <ruthdannerofjuneau@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, November 29, 2020 5:37 PM
To: Parks Rec
Subject: Public comment re: request to dispose of 4,518 s.f. at northern corner of Slim Williams and Arctic Circle

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

We are writing in support of the request by John and Ginger Bean of 1070 Arctic Circle to acquire the adjacent park property. Because the City has no plans to develop this site, it seems fiscally responsible to add it back to the tax rolls. However, it does not seem reasonable that title should be transferred to the applicant at no cost. When we purchased our home, two plots of land at either end of Slim Williams Way were identified as public park space and amenities for the residents of Brigadoon Estates. To transfer ownership to an adjacent property owner at no cost opens the door to other applicants to apply for acquisition at no cost of other park sites throughout the borough.

We support transfer of this land to the applicant at a per square foot price consistent with assessment values in the neighborhood. Funds from the sale could be (1) used to provide improvements to the other park lot in Brigadoon; (2) earmarked for other neighborhood park improvements in the valley; (3) or used in some other way that benefits Brigadoon residents.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide public input.

Respectfully,
George & Ruth Danner
1030 Arctic Circle, Juneau
(907) 321-2283 (c)

From: sean damron
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Land Disposal at Slim Williams and Arctic
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 10:42:47 AM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hello,

I own a home in the CBJ. I don't think giving away 4500sq' of land is in the city's interest. I think if they want to subdivide their land(earn money) they should pay for the land. Even if they were just going to lock it to their current lot they should pay. I really don't understand how free is even a consideration.

2200 cascade st

From: Sharon Gill
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: 4,518 sq ft lot
Date: Friday, December 11, 2020 3:56:49 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

To whom it may concern, with Parks & Recreation Division,

This is in response to article on KINY web site, 12/11/20 regarding application for adjoining property on Slim Willams and Arctic Circle in the valley. I do not feel that any property owner should be given land free. They should at least pay for fair appraisal of land. If the city choses to sell at a discount due to size then so be it. But they should not give the property away for free, so that the adjacent property owner can then subdivide their property. If you do chose to set this president, let me know when the next give away is...sign me up!

Thank you for accepting opinions.

Sharon P. Gill

From: Susanne Badilla
To: [Parks Rec](#)
Subject: Comment on land disposal in Brigadoon Estates
Date: Sunday, December 27, 2020 5:18:53 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

Hello and thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed land disposal in Brigadoon Estates.

My family and I have lived at 1067 Arctic Circle since 1993.

We have seen some development on the street over the years and the expansion of the Bean property to include a house, 2 car garage with 2 apartments. The Bean property is already larger and more developed than any other property on our street. Subdividing would add more traffic and population pressure to the neighborhood.

Our children and other children in the neighborhood have and do play in the woods of the city property. Even though it isn't a "developed" park it is still a safe place for neighborhood children to play. It has always been a corner where the children in the neighborhood could safely wait for the school bus.

It has been nice to have those woods at the end of the street as a physical and visual buffer from the homes on Slim Williams Way and vice versa.

Even though it would seem that we have a lot of "green space" in Juneau this subdivision was designed to include this as a park as part of the overall design of the subdivision.

The other land around us is owned by the USFS so it is just a little piece of city land that should stay public.

While disposing of this land to the Beans would benefit them, giving this land away is not in the best interest of the neighborhood. We do not know what the public possibilities might be for this land in the future.

In summary I believe the land should remain as designated.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Susanne Carter-Badilla
1067 Arctic Circle
Juneau, AK 99801
907-321-0175

Candy Cane Hunt comments

Share any comments or suggestions you have about the Candy Cane Hunt. For example: what did you like or not like? Did you check out some shops? Any of them new to you? Did you enjoy the activity?

Some were hard to spot! Especially when it was raining

This was a great way to support local businesses!

It was a fun activity. I enjoyed discovering a couple of new shops. Bought a Christmas present. Had a beer with friends at the brewery. I think it was a good idea to get people to go downtown and explore the shops. Thank you for organizing this.

Nice reason to walk around downtown

We had so much fun! Thank you for giving us a fun activity to participate in!

Gunalchéesh for this fun activity!

Three places didn't have candy canes in their windows, so I gave up trying to find all of the rest.

Great way to get moving and enjoy downtown stores!

Layers of AK hard to find!

it was a ton of fun where is the last big candy cane!?

We had a great time! We did go to Salon Cedar and couldn't find the number anywhere in the window and it was closed so couldn't go ask about it.

We had a wonderful family weekend and got some Christmas shopping done. We did find Salon Cedar but there was no number in the window or door and it was closed so we couldn't ask about it.

The activity is a great idea and I like visiting the shops. Taking my 7yr old downtown to walk through clouds of weed smoke, drunk people yelling curse words was not so good. Downtown Juneau was awesome around Christmas time. It is a cesspool now. Will be avoiding it until things change.

Very fun!!! Thank you

We loved this activity

I definitely enjoyed this activity with my kids we had a blast doing this. I wish this town would do more stuff like this for our kids.

I had fun.

"We went downtown 3 times and had a lot of fun and silly times finding candy canes my mom even yelled one time because we went around in circles like a hundred times to find candy canes and we all laughed at her. My mom has Health problems so I was kinda sad I couldn't get all the candy canes without getting out of the car and going around people because of the Covid. Thank you for this scavenger hunt. Merry Christmas ALee Compton "

It was so much fun! The only thing is that when we went to Resolute Boutique we couldn't find the candy cane! We did stop by a few shops for some special treats on our walk! Thank you Juneau Parks and Rec for such a fun activity!

It was so much fun! The kids had a blast walking around downtown! Thanks for doing such a wonderful event!

This was awesome for me and my 4 children to do! Thank you for all you guys do.

We had a great time searching and shopping!

When reading the description of the hunt it sounded as if we were going to look for actual candy canes, not numbers made of candy canes.

Some of the candy canes were hard to find, but we walked around a lot, but it was fun, thank you :)

Yes we did! And the Showfly store is so whimsical and beautiful, the show owner gave the kids candy canes and was so nice!!!

Thought it was fun!

It was great overall. I felt uncomfortable taking my daughter around city hall, though, as there were quite a few inebriated people wandering around the building. Otherwise we would have taken the bonus pictures.

We went on Friday night and were sad to find out that every single shop was closed.

Super fun except for the homeless population who was totally inappropriate and not wearing masks or social distancing

We enjoyed walking around DT, especially getting a candy cane Shoefly. The bonus candy canes were hard to find!

Really fun activity! Our teen wage and 7 year old started the sheet while doing so Christmas shopping, and we all finished it together before grabbing some lunch downtown yesterday. Thank you, P& R!

This was a fun reason to take the kids downtown

We searched hard for that 5th candy cane and couldn't find!

We searched very hard for that fifth cane but couldn't find it!

Shopping with my cousins

sent bonus photos to messenger

Downtown was a little scary for the kids, with the environment

kids had fun, but were a little scared of environment in town

It was super fun to see new shops and my daughters had a lot of fun!

I had so much fun!

I loved this!!

Yes enjoyed it!

super fun!

Yes I did it was so much fun.

Yes

Some shops with asterisks did not have any prizes. With so many kids doing the hunt, treats should be given out instead of discounts - kids were disappointed.

Employees in a couple of shops with asterisks near their name had no knowledge of the hunt or extra treats. Kids doing the hunt should get an actual treat and not a discount - my kids were disappointed at shops with an asterisk that offered them a 10% discount instead of a candy cane or something small.

I had no idea all these stores existed! There are some good stores out there. I'm more inclined to shop downtown now that I know.

This was so fun! Thank you for getting us outside and helping to support local businesses. :)

Thank you for doing this for the community! ❤️

Was fun and found new shops

Not being able to find the last 2 big candy canes

Would have been nice to find the last 2 big candy canes

Fun for the family

Fun with my sister and cousin and shopping

fun!

fun! do it again! wheres the last candy cane!

Enjoyed the activity. Thx CBJ

It was a fun activity, the kids thought they actually got candy canes from the business, maybe a thought for the future, otherwise a great scavenger hunt.

It was fun!

Fiona gave it an A+.

Kaylee says, "It was fun!"

Thank you for this activity. My child loved hunting for the candy canes. We also discovered some new shops and enjoyed the surprise discounts. We would definitely participate again.

This was a great activity and I explored 1 new shop.

Fun! Thank you so much

"Great event. I hope it becomes an annual event."

We had a great time. Wish we could of spent more time looking for the bonus candy canes but we got a little chilly

We had a lot of fun! We looked for the 5 bonus candy cane, but couldn't find it 😊. We even tried a second day and some new idea of places. I hope at the end you'll post where it is. We are dying to know! We did go into multiple shops and checked them out and finish our Christmas shopping!

I enjoyed the activity. It would have been fun for some of them to be a little more hidden or hiding in the store so you had to look around inside the shop.

We had a lot of fun as a family walking around and finding the candy canes and shopping. I'm dying to know where that 5th bonus candy cane was hidden. We checked every last place we could think of 2-3times! 😊.

We had a great time! Finished our Christmas shopping!

Fun and great activity for Covid and winter time

Good times! Got to see some new shops

This was fun, thank you!

fun!

We are new to Juneau, so this was a great family activity to get around town. The day we went was icy, though, so it was a bit nerve wracking crossing the streets. Some of the shops had their candy canes in tough to find spots...we didn't realize Rainbow Foods had 2 entrances...nor did we know about multiple Heritage Coffee locations. But now we know!

Either a map of the boundaries of the participating businesses or even an app that you can use as you go along. We're new and really had no idea where we were going. We went up and down one street at least 5 times!

I liked seeing the toys in the windows!

It was fun! I liked seeing all the shops. I can't wait to really go shopping. Doing this with a mask on wasn't fun. But I want to do it again without my mask on! And have snacks while we're out...

Wish the Candy Cane numbers were actual Candy Cane Shape. It was a fun activity I wish the stores were more involved in it. Kind of felt like we were putting them out when we inquired about the store(s) that had an asterisk. Also, some sort of map at least circling the area of where to look would of been beneficial as we could not locate one of the stores. We called the store no answer. We googled mapped it did not take us to the correct location. Asked different sales people from different stores ALL did not know where to locate Resolute Boutique. That was frustrating especially with a 6 year old and only needing one more to finish the hunt. That part was disappointing. All and all we enjoyed it, especially with the year of 2020 it was a way to bring some holiday cheer.

"I really enjoyed this activity! I was able to make multiple trips downtown to spend one on one time with my kids shopping for Christmas and searching for candy canes. I planned to take all four on one on

one trips, but my son ended up getting anaphylaxis and we didn't get all four one on one trips in before the contest ended. We found every candy cane, but somehow we lost our trackers yesterday on our last trip somewhere between imagination station, the Christmas tree display, our van at the shoppers parking lot the in and out to see Santa's parade and the lights at the house by NLUC. So my husband took everyone back downtown today to find everything again, but the senate building was closed and they forgot to look at resolute boutique and layers of alaska. I think I remembered the right number for resolute boutique though! Other than losing our trackers and one of us stepping in a pile of human feces, we had a lot of fun. I loved having this activity to add some extra fun to our Christmas shopping - and honestly, if it weren't for this activity, I would have just taken them to fred Meyer or the nugget mall to shop because I usually avoid downtown. This gave us an extra reason to drive downtown and check out all the shops and what an adventure it turned out to be, complete with searching for candy canes and the perfect gifts, softly singing Christmas songs with strangers, trying gelato for the first time, enjoying all the holiday displays including the one by the museum and socializing with people again! We love these self paced activities and honestly prefer them over the super crowded one day events or events where there are so many offerings you end up missing out or kids don't really enjoy it because there is too much going on or the day is too long but the parents don't want them to miss out on the chance to take their kids to see and do incredible things on the one day they are offered. Way to go for another creative family friendly activity!"

I wasn't going to participate, my wife took our kids downtown several times and found all the candy canes but lost all the trackers yesterday, so I took the kids back downtown today to try to fill out the trackers again but the senate building closed before we got there and I missed one or two others. This is definitely a multi day activity if you have kids and really want to enjoy shopping downtown and get all the candy canes. It was a lot of fun going on a Christmas scavenger hunt!

"I had fun looking for the candy canes and I met three new dog friends, one of them looked like a miniature version of our dog that died a few years ago. It took us lots of trips to find the candy cane at the transit center even though we parked there everytime! It was always blocked by busses and we didn't think to look there. My mom already explained but we lost our trackers on our last trip after we found the rest of the candy canes, so we went back today but didn't get to all of them before the senate building closed and we forgot two others. "

"I thought the activity was AWESOME! But cold and disgusting because we saw three piles of human feces. But we did see the cutest doggies that were so fluffy! My mom already explained but we lost our trackers on our last trip after we found the rest of the candy canes, so we went back today but didn't get to all of them before the senate building closed and we forgot two others. "

"I loved shopping with my mom but I didn't like walking all around downtown. I loved the old teacup store Nana's Attic. I liked seeing all the stores especially imagination station. It was fun searching for the candy canes!!! It took us lots of trips to find the candy cane at the transit center even though we parked there everytime! It was always blocked by busses and we didn't think to look there. My mom already explained but we lost our trackers on our last trip after we found the rest of the candy canes, so we went back today but didn't get to all of them before the senate building closed and we forgot two others. "

"My favorite part was shopping for my brother and sisters and finding sparkly dance shoes. I had yummy gelato and looked at lots of lights. AND SANTA CAME ON A FIRE ENGINE!!!! It was loud but so COOL!!! It

took us lots of trips to find the candy cane at the transit center even though we parked there everytime! It was always blocked by busses and we didn't think to look there. My mom already explained but we lost our trackers on our last trip after we found the rest of the candy canes, so we went back today but didn't get to all of them before the senate building closed and we forgot two others. "

We had a lot of fun!

We had trouble getting to the resolute boutique because the gate was closed.

This was a lot of fun

This was so much fun. I loved it.

I loved this activity! My kids had so much fun

this was a lot of fun. do it again when the weather is nice in the summer

Thanks Lauren!!! Merry Christmas.

Fun!

Thank you, it was fun.

It was too easy! Almost every shop had it in the front window, it would be more fun to actually have to walk around the store to find them

Loved the activity, definitely found new shops, tried really hard for days to find the last city facility but sadly failed. Almost a sweep! :)

We got to go to boba tea!

I liked the city building searches because I came up with where to look and was right!

This was fun for the whole family.

This was such a great activity and motivation for my son to get out. He really enjoyed. I also learned of some new businesses. We did check out a few of the shops.

It was fun! One of the stores was caged and we couldn't see or even close to see was the number was until a week later. Next year I would appreciate if it not at a gated store where you can't get to.

I saw the candy cane on the downtown library window but it was closed and it wasn't visible so I couldn't take a selfie because it was too dark. It was intended to be fun for my family but we went downtown after 3:30 when it was dark and there were many homeless people and smoking unsafe

Really appreciate you organizing these fun things for kids! Thank you!!

We had such a blast doing this!! So much fun. It was a slight challenge with three kids and two adults in a car during a storm at night once, haha, but we made 3 trips downtown as a family. I hope this becomes a holiday tradition, as we loved drinking hot cocoa from our vehicle and searching for candy canes. Since we are an immune compromised household, doing this activity during the pandemic was so much fun. Our only bummer is that it wasn't 100% possible to do it from our vehicle. Also, the candy

canes were kinda small for vehicle viewing. Still, would do again and hope to look for more events like this. Thanks for putting it together!!!!

"were not able to upload bonus photos, sent to the messenger"

downtown was an uncomfortable area for the kids

kids had fun, downtown was a little scary for the kids

This was fun! Would LOVE to see it be an annual event. We did do some shopping at the local stores and it encouraged us to do so. We couldn't find dang Candy Cane #5

I had so much fun with this activity, but could not find the last candy cane no matter how many times I drove around downtown!

I enjoyed it but I wish the candy cane for the extra tickets were more uniform. Didn't realize a couple were part of the event.

It was cool my little brother liked it

Yes we went shopping and was fun for the family

It was fun finding shops I'd never heard of (Resolute Boutique, Layers).

Fun time

Yes we learned of many new shops and especially enjoyed going in the shops that had the asterisk.

I had family visiting as I needed help after an operation. This hunt provided SUCH appreciated and needed fun! Thank you!

Well done

We had so much fun! We didn't visit stores as a family, but went into several of them individually later. We love buying local! Sorry this is late. We had a health issue this morning at home. Everyone is fine now.

This was very fun. We got to see some businesses that we did not know about. We didn't go in any as a family, but did go in later individually. Sorry this is late. Our family had a health issue this morning. Thanks for doing this!

Sorry this is a little late. We had a health issue this morning. This was so fun and such a good idea!

We enjoyed the hunt! I liked how creative different businesses were in their placement of the candy canes. I had not heard of/known the name of a few places - pretty please, resolute boutique, Venice Italian gelateria.

We enjoyed this activity. It got the kiddos and I out on slightly rainy day. We love how our town provides activities like this for us and others. The only shop we went into was the Imagination Station, which I frequent often, but they haven't been to since March. They naturally loved seeing all the toys and books in there and all the window displays all around downtown. Thank you for this activity!

Fun idea but the homeless population and campsites we had to wade through downtown were disgusting. Three men started fighting by my parked car while we were inside the vehicle; not something I wanted my 13-year old to witness. I didn't feel safe. Next year, maybe a different location!

Awesome way to explore Juneau!

A few new shops to me. It was a fun activity to do with the family.

Thank you for creating this event at such a time. Great for mental health and morale

Some shops listed did not have candy cane numbers in their window and when asked about it, had no idea what I was talking about!

It was so much fun!

Enjoying the day with my grandkids shopping and having fun

It was fun for the family