

**VISITOR INDUSTRY TASK FORCE  
THE CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA**

March 4, 2020 4:30 PM  
City Hall, Assembly Chambers

- I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**
- II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
  - a. 12-17-2019 VITF Meeting Minutes
  - b. 1-21-2020 VITF Meeting Minutes
  - c. 2-18-2020 VITF Meeting Minutes
- IV. DISCUSSION**
  - a. Review the Draft VITF Final memo and provide comments
- V. UPCOMING MEETINGS**
  - a. Work Session scheduled for Sunday, March 8 at 10:00 am
- VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Note: Agenda packets are available to review online at <https://juneau.org>

ADA accommodations available upon request: Please contact the City Clerk's office 72 hours prior to any meeting so arrangements can be made to have a sign language interpreter present or an audiotape of the Assembly's agenda made available. The Clerk's office telephone number is 586-5278, TDD 586-5351, email: [city.clerk@juneau.org](mailto:city.clerk@juneau.org)



**MEMORANDUM**

**DATE:** February 28, 2020

**TO:** Visitor Industry Task Force

**FROM:** Staff

**SUBJECT:** DRAFT Taskforce Recommendations

**Note to the Visitor Industry Task Force**

*These Draft Recommendations are based on the Task Force discussions and written comments received. The goal of this draft is to encompass the key points that the Visitor Industry Task Force (VITF) may wish to forward to the CBJ Assembly.*

**Visitor Industry Task Force**

The Visitor Industry Taskforce held a number of public meetings between October of 2019 and February of 2020 to advise the CBJ Assembly and advance community thinking on a range of visitor industry topics.

The VITF took public testimony on January 11, 2020 and February 1, 2020 and received **XX** spoken comments and 175 written comments. The testimony reflected a diverse range of viewpoints in the community and was generally provided nuanced views of the benefits and impacts of tourism.

There appears to be wide community support for further work on the questions that were given to the VITF.

# Visitor Industry Task Force Report

## To the City & Borough of Juneau Assembly

### March 2020

#### ***1a) Is the current approach to managing the visitor industry adequate to make Juneau an attractive place to live and visit?***

The current management approach is not adequate and needs to be evaluated and reorganized. The current approach is too reactive and CBJ should be proactive about addressing community issues.

There are numerous planning efforts, underway, or contemplated, that would affect tourism management/opportunity/efficiency. Some are directly related to tourism, and some are related to the downtown geographic area and have a close connection to tourism. They include:

1. Consideration of Eaglecrest as an enhanced tourist destination
2. CBJ grant to Whale SENSE Program
3. Blueprint Downtown
4. Housing issues downtown
5. Waterfront Museum
6. Small vessel docking study
7. Issues identified in the Manager's recommended Passenger Fee Memo to the CBJ Assembly
  - a. Juneau Cruise Passenger Survey
  - b. Cruise Passenger Transportation Study/Planning

The current approach is a mix of industry best management practices, agency permits and operations, and services provided by non-profits through grants and infrastructure planning. Compliance with visitor industry regulations and best practices is voluntary at times and mandatory under federal, state, or local statute or regulation. CBJ has an adopted resolution (Resolution 2170) that lists management policies. This resolution was adopted in 2002 and contains guiding ideas that are still relevant to the community. However, the resolution has not been used as a guiding tool.

CBJ does not manage tourism through a single entity or under one section of code; various CBJ Departments manage areas used by tourists and tour operators. Those management activities include:

1. Dock Scheduling – Cruise Lines Agencies of Alaska (CLAA) schedules usage of CBJ's two large cruise ship docks. CBJ has no contractual relationship with CLAA or member lines over use of the docks.
2. Docks & Harbors Waterfront Management
  - a. Commercial Use Permitting of Docks and Harbors
  - b. Dock Maintenance
  - c. Seawalk Maintenance
3. Parks & Recreation Management
  - a. Commercial Use Permitting

- b. Seawalk Maintenance
  - c. Parks Management and Maintenance
4. Community Development Department Land Use Permits (including Planning Commission reviews)
  5. Engineering/Public Works Right-of-Way Management
  6. DOT Management of South Franklin Street – The roadway from Main Street to the Rock Dump is owned and managed by State DOT (Marine Way and South Franklin Street). However, for over 30 years, CBJ has taken the lead on roadway improvements.
  7. Tourism Best Management Practices (TBMP) – Annual funding provided by CBJ; the program is operated voluntarily by tourism operators.

### **Recommendations**

TBMP remains an industry driven and operated program. As an industry program, peer and industry pressure achieves compliance that would be difficult to obtain under a regulatory regime.

1. TBMP program should be augmented/supported by additional CBJ regulatory efforts.
2. CBJ should create a framework and policies for consistent management of commercial tour use on all lands, including parks, docks and harbors, right-of-ways, and other lands owned by the CBJ. Management considerations should include:
  - a. Fees charged to fund required services and mitigate impacts.
  - b. Regulate commercial tours (cycling, jeeps, etc.) on city streets, the same way CBJ regulates trails.
  - c. Limiting Parks & Recreation use permits by determined facility capacity and impacts (including hours and days). This may include some areas with higher visitation and some areas with lower or no visitation.
  - d. Require all tourism operators receiving Commercial Use Permits to comply with TBMP and Whale SENSE Guidelines.
  - e. Juneau should endorse operators participating in the state travel industry, Alaska Travel Industry Association (ATIA), program “Adventure Green Alaska”, to encourage sustainability practices.
  - f. Recommend operators/cruise lines adopt “Juneau Pledge” and ATIA “Alaska” pledge. Cruise lines may also create their own “Alaska” pledge (a creative method to encourage guests from around the world to embrace community respect and positive visitor behavior).
  - g. Recommend ships turn off large LED screens while in port.
3. CBJ should establish a centralized tourism management function within CBJ with full-time staff.
4. CBJ should clearly establish operating guidelines and goals for Cruise Lines International Association (CLIA) member cruise lines.
  - a. No use of the landfill by large cruise ships
  - b. Maximize use of shore power

- c. Coordinate with CLIA on scheduling of ships to minimize congestion, including:
    - i. Not arriving or departing at the same time
    - ii. Avoiding or prohibiting hot berthing
    - iii. Attention to people-moving issues
    - iv. Receiving draft schedules two years in advance or upon creation
  - d. Maximize “localism”
    - i. Partner with locally owned businesses
    - ii. Cease production of maps/shopping programs that steer passengers towards seasonal jewelry shops
  - e. Marketing of Juneau
    - i. Juneau should establish a marketing identity, which CLIA should follow. Integrate marketing identity across community (conceptual draft – Juneau is proud of its cultural heritage, support of the arts, love of the natural environment, and finds its identity as an ocean and mountain town).
5. CBJ should clearly establish guidelines and goals for the scheduling of municipal docks. Recommendations include:
- a. No ships at a dock on a particular day of the week or on particular days of the season
  - b. Stagger arrival times of ships
  - c. No hot berthing
  - d. Prioritize docking for shore power configured ships (when shore power is ready)
  - e. Reduce peak day volumes
  - f. Strategically dock ships based on size with the goal of reducing traffic congestion downtown
  - g. No docking of cruise ships in Auke Bay except for emergency purposes
6. Incentivize Juneau as a turn port
7. Require CLAA to provide draft schedules two years in advance or upon creation.

***1b) Is the approach adequate within the existing dock infrastructure and within other foreseeable public or private infrastructure projects for the growth anticipated?***

The current management approach within the existing and foreseeable infrastructure projects is not adequate. Many of the current projects address important issues, but the approach needs to be consistently coordinated among city, state, and federal partners. Additional work should be continued to mitigate current impacts and anticipate future impacts.

Numerous upgrades to downtown infrastructure are underway. These projects increase Juneau’s ability to host large numbers of visitors. The upgrades, with completion dates, include:

- 1. Egan Drive improvements (2020)
- 2. Small bus staging at the Archipelago area (2022)

3. Open space at the Archipelago area (2022)
4. Sidewalk stanchions (2020, 2021)
5. Dock Electrification planning (ongoing)
6. Seawalk Infill at Marine Park (2021)
7. Seawalk expansion South to AJ Dock planning (ongoing)
8. Marine Park Upgrades (2023)
9. Marine Way Crosswalk (2021)
10. Open Space Infills (2022)
11. Cruise Ship Real Time Wastewater Monitoring (2021)
12. Franklin Dock Floating Berth (2021?)

### **Recommendations**

1. Additional infrastructure development should be considered in the downtown area to accommodate current volumes and potential growth. Continued efforts to move people and vehicles through downtown efficiently and safely are necessary.
  - a. Traffic congestion on S. Franklin is a critical infrastructure issue that needs to continue to be addressed through planning, design, and construction to separate pedestrian and vehicular flow. CBJ and DOT should coordinate to accomplish this work. Considerations should include:
    - i. Maximize right-of-way space for pedestrians
    - ii. Minimize required stops for vehicles
    - iii. Extension of pedestrian stanchions
    - iv. Minimize and consolidate turning movements
    - v. Focus pedestrian flow to appropriate areas
    - vi. Consider staging areas outside of downtown for cargo deliveries
    - vii. Work on plan to electrify tourism vehicles
2. Other efforts to move people on and off the right-of-way should be planned, including circulators, electric ferries, Seawalk extension, and alternative pedestrian routes.
3. Support dock electrification.
4. Maximum of five docks in Juneau with one large cruise ship at each dock.
5. Wastewater, water, and electrical infrastructure should be evaluated for increased capacity to reduce impacts on the health of the community and environment. Wastewater quality should be monitored regularly.
6. Prohibit visible emissions from ships while docked.
7. Support public and private development ventures that alleviate pressure on existing infrastructure such as Eaglecrest, an Ocean Center, and a Waterfront Museum.
8. Ensure recreational facilities such as trails for hiking and biking are developed to maintain Juneau as a top recreational place to live and visit.

9. Recognize the contributions of Native Alaskan organizations to the downtown core and support continued growth and installation of Native Alaskan art in public places, including support of the Sealaska Heritage Institute's cultural heritage development.

### **Regarding reviewing and updating the Long Range Waterfront Plan**

The Long Range Waterfront Plan (LRWP) has guided CBJ thinking and actions on the development of waterfront infrastructure for the last 15 years. In the early 2000's, writing, considering, and adopting the LRWP was very time consuming, and an update or re-writing is likely similarly difficult and time intensive.

### ***2a) What are the pros and cons of updating the LRWP?***

#### **Pros**

1. The LRWP is an infrastructure development plan for the waterfront land between the Douglas Bridge and the Little Rock Dump. The extent of tourism reach in Juneau has expanded beyond the downtown waterfront; updated planning could be done in those areas including harbors and transportation corridors.
2. Proactive planning instead of a reactive approach is needed on infrastructure and tourism issues.
3. In 2004, the work on the LRWP was a positive step in bringing the community together on tourism issues.

#### **Cons**

1. The effort and cost of the LRWP was very high.
2. It is uncertain whether the community has the capacity to focus on a yearlong waterfront planning process.
3. The current plan is still functional and valid for the waterfront area.
4. There are many neighborhood, harbor, and park plans that inform zoning and infrastructure development.

### ***2b) If the LRWP was updated, should it be an infrastructure update or should that update consider other policy or operational issues?***

1. The LRWP horizon extends to 2026. Currently, the concept design approaches and recommendations within the plan are still valid and can be used as a foundation for continued development along the downtown waterfront.
2. Since the creation of the LRWP, the impacts of tourism have extended beyond the waterfront and throughout Juneau. Plans for infrastructure development including design standards and analysis of growth and impacts should be completed for other areas outside of the downtown waterfront where tourism growth is occurring, such as Auke Bay.
3. Updates on completed projects along the downtown waterfront should be made and communicated to the public through a conceptual five-year CIP.

4. Regarding considerations of policy and operational issues, recommendations in Task Force charging question #1 respond to this need.

#### **Long Range Waterfront Plan Related Recommendations**

1. Do not expend the effort necessary to update the LRWP, but the CBJ Assembly should maintain focus on better tourism management. Rely on the finer detailing from the ongoing Blueprint efforts.
2. Complete development of the Seawalk.

### **3) Regarding the persistent idea of a restriction on the number of visitors**

1. Consider and research whether a restriction on the number of visitors arriving in Juneau would be legal, enforceable or practical.
2. If found to be legal and enforceable, advise on the pros and cons of the concept of restricting the number of visitors and whether a restriction strategy might be:
  - a. A concept that would apply to annual/seasonal visitation numbers?
  - b. A concept that would apply to daily visitation numbers?
3. Consider whether changes to ship scheduling (daily arrivals and departures) might address community concerns and impacts.
4. Consider the pros and cons of CBJ becoming involved in dock scheduling.

#### **Legal Considerations**

The City Attorney provided the task force with a memo that broadly outlined the numerous legal hurdles that could oppose a legal limitation on the number of cruise ship passengers that visit Juneau.

#### **Practical Considerations**

As a practical matter, limitation of cruise ship passenger visitation can be achieved by the following methods:

##### **1. Limit by Infrastructure**

Whether or not to lease tidelands for a new large cruise ship dock (or docks) is the largest capacity question that Juneau will face in the foreseeable future. The CBJ Assembly should spend a significant amount of time studying this issue. A new dock could supplant the existing anchoring & lightering and may not result in significant ship visitation growth. However, that analysis is greatly over simplified.

##### **2. Limits on Ship Scheduling**

The revenue bonds that financed the construction of CBJ owned cruise ship docks (commonly known as 16B) requires that the debt service not be placed in jeopardy. Limitation on dock availability at the municipal docks may cause such jeopardy.

CBJ does not have the authority to limit scheduling at the two privately owned docks. If, over time, the municipality acquired the private docks, it would eventually have more control of scheduling



(once the debt incurred in the acquisition was retired). Note, however, that neither private dock is for sale.

To limit lightering, CBJ could consider limiting availability of its owned lightering docks. However, private lightering options could become available.

Daily or hourly limits could also be considered on the availability of commercial activity on CBJ lands and harbors.

### **3. Limit by Negotiation**

CBJ effectively ended years of litigation with CLIA by negotiating a Memorandum of Agreement that satisfies the needs of Juneau and the industry. A best course of action should include determining community goals and directly negotiating to achieve them.

### **4. Financial Incentives/Disincentives**

Different ship/dock configurations could result in less congestion, but there are barriers to dock scheduling adjustments. Issues include cruise lines' historical preference and the economic disparity between the costs of the less expensive public and the costlier private docks.

### **Recommendations**

1. The CBJ should not pursue a "cap" on numbers of visitors.
2. CBJ should focus on limiting the number of ships through infrastructure and should focus on better management of the impacts of visitors.
3. CBJ has traditionally left scheduling of its docks to CLAA, but should take a more active role, including taking positions on lightering and hot berthing.
4. CBJ should consider negotiating changes that would affect more efficient ship scheduling, likely putting larger capacity ships at the City docks, creating less traffic on South Franklin.
5. CBJ could set goals regarding the number of ships (for example, five ships per day by 2023 or only five ships at a time) and work with the industry on a formal agreement. This would give the industry time to adjust to recommendations.
6. CBJ should work with cruise lines to attempt to "get the peak out of the week" and balance the numbers of visitors across days of the week. There are more docks being constructed throughout Southeast; CBJ should work with the cruise lines to manage visitation throughout the region.
7. CBJ should work with the Coast Guard (USCG), CLAA, and individual ship lines to discourage or prohibit lightering by large vessels (greater than 1,000 passengers).
8. If a Subport dock is constructed, the CBJ should more thoroughly investigate and completely understand under what circumstances the USCG would remove or restrict the current anchorage.
9. CBJ should determine community goals (emissions, shore power, congestion mitigation, etc.) and work to achieve them.

#### **4) Considering methods for collecting public opinion**

*Consider the pros and cons of collecting public opinion through formal surveys, including researching survey costs. Public opinion is always important for the CBJ Assembly to determine and collect; however, asking simple yes/no questions on nuanced issues can be polarizing and can be difficult to get the public to understand all of the details necessary for formation of well-founded policy decisions.*

In the 1990's and 2000's, CBJ commissioned a number of surveys on public perceptions on tourism. The 2002 Juneau Tourism Management Plan identifies survey results as the primary indicator for activating "safety valves" – constructing an additional port separate from Juneau, but within the Borough to disperse the CBJ's visitor load. Public surveys can be a useful community engagement tool, because they make it possible to get results from a broader cross section of the community than with other public engagement methods. However, it is important for survey questions to be well designed and not biased or leading. It is also important to have a clear understanding of the purpose of the public survey. Such a survey could be focused on general public perception (i.e. "has Juneau reached its capacity for cruise tourism?") or focused on measuring community impacts in specific areas. It would also be important to consider who would use the survey results and for what purpose.

##### **Recommendations**

1. Engage a third party contractor to complete a public opinion survey at the end of the 2020 cruise season.
2. Depending on the utility of a survey this fall, additional surveys should be planned annually (or every 2 years) to gauge how management strategies are influencing public perception.

##### ***Additional Task Force Discussion Issue***

###### **Subport Development/Upcoming Norwegian Cruise Line Dock Proposal**

Whether or not to support an upcoming Subport development proposal is a CBJ Assembly decision. The USCG and/or NOAA also have important roles. Future discussions should consider the allowance or prohibition of anchoring and the use of dynamic positioning navigational systems.

A shift in docking or anchoring of cruise ships may alter spending patterns of passengers and affect the local economy. In addition, a dock at the Subport could leverage other community goals such as:

1. Seawalk
2. Small Boat Harbor
3. Ocean Center
4. Berthing for small cruise ships (note that there are many definitions of "small ships")
5. Homeporting of "small ships"

6. Economic and/or Housing Development

**Recommendation**

Support a Subport dock if the following conditions are met:

1. One large ship per day
2. Maximum of five large ships in port at any one time
3. No hot berthing
4. No ships over 300 passengers allowed to anchor
5. High quality uplands development for community and visitors
6. Year round development orientation
7. CBJ manages dock to some extent
8. Dock orientation effectively prohibits large ship anchoring

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**Visitor Industry Task Force**  
**Tuesday, December 17, 2019; 12:05pm**  
**Municipal Building – Assembly Chambers**

- I. **Call to order:** 12:06pm
  - a. Task Force: Chair, Carole Triem, Wade Bryson, Bobbie Meszaros, Holly Johnson, Alida Bus, Meilani Schijvens, Paula Terrel, Craig Dahl, Kirby Day, and Dan Blanchard.
  - b. Staff Present Michele Elfers, P&R Deputy Director, Myia Wahto, P&R Facilities, Parks & Landscape Administrative Officer I, Lauren Verrelli, P&R Recreation Public Services Manager, Loren Jones and Greg Smith – Assemblymembers, Di Cathcart, Deputy City Clerk, Scott Hinton, Port Operations Supervisor and David Borg, Harbor Master.
- II. **Approval of Agenda:** approved
- III. **Approval of Minutes:**
  - a. October 22 – approved. Ms. Terrel would like to see something other than action minutes at these meetings.
- IV. **Meeting Goals**
  - a. **Address the charging question during the meeting.** Is the current approach to managing the visitor industry adequate to make Juneau an attractive place to live and to visit?
    - i. Understand who manages what activities related to tourism in Juneau
    - ii. Learn about various management approaches
    - iii. Identify areas of weakness in management and opportunities for additional collaboration
- V. **Presentations on Tourism Management**
  - a. **TBMP History:** Mr. Day gave a verbal presentation on what the TBMP has done over the years. Have the same goals of the community.
    - i. The less call volume is useless to judge
    - ii. Flats family association: TBMP has been a big success in our neighborhood
    - iii. Is there a way for TBMP to work more with the CBJ to have more teeth with the tour companies? Mr. Day, there is not a tour operator today that can create an impact that is not part of the TBMP.
    - iv. Is this an optional membership with TBMP? There is no fees to join the program, anyone can join.
    - v. With no fees, where do you get your funding? We get \$15k from the marine passenger fees that goes to holding public meetings, monitor the hotline, printing of the guidelines, outreach, and advertisements locally.
    - vi. Tour operator: we know we have to hold each other accountable since our actions reflect everyone
  - b. **Managing Commercial Activity at the Waterfront:** Scott Hinton with D&H gives a presentation on D&H's fees for cruise ships, tour operators and busses on D&H land
    - i. Member requests to get hard copy of the presentation and add the totals to the slideshow for the next meeting
    - ii. What is the cost of administering all the permits throughout the summer?

- c. **Cruise Ship Scheduling:** Drew Green of Cruise Line Agencies of Alaska (CLAA) gave a verbal presentation on their support for cruise ship traffic in Juneau. Organize the cruise ship scheduling – ask for voyage itinerary 2 years out. Juneau has 4 docks— 2 docks can accommodate the mega ships, 2 other docks can accommodate mid-sized cruise ships (under 1000 ft.). The fifth option is the anchorage in the channel when there are no docks available. There is a threshold of viable capability of number of ships in Juneau. Geographic and infrastructure limitations; strive to fill every dock as best as they can. For this coming summer, there is only two berths available (2 days) in the peak season. We are top on the list for destinations in Juneau.
  - i. If this new dock goes in, will that affect the anchorage in the channel? The anchorage does go into where the new dock would go. We would have to eliminate anchorage in the channel if the dock is built.
  - ii. Does the CBJ have any say on the CLAA scheduling?
  - iii. 2020 cruise scheduling is currently available on their website.
- d. **Whale SENSE Program:** Suzie Teerlink with NOAA gave a presentation on whale watching tour companies. Currently have 20 companies and 68 boats in the Juneau area. Runs the Whale SENSE program in partnership with NOAA fisheries and other companies. Whale SENSE is specific in reducing impacts to whales themselves.
  - i. How many violations do you receive each year? Don't have those numbers
- e. **Mendenhall Glacier Visitation Management:** James King of the USFS gave a presentation on the Mendenhall Visitor Center. Currently going through a master plan as they move into the future. Designed to accommodate 1500 persons/day and they see anywhere from 2000-8000 a day. Another big issue is the safety of the people and the receding glacier. The existing site will remain the hub, and putting boats on the lake to get people closer to the face of the glacier. About to kick off the National Environmental Policy Act analysis process this January.
  - i. What is the plan for the construction phase? The project is a \$111 million and they have to raise the money. They're hoping to do all the construction at one time and hope to start in 2-3 years.
- f. **Other CBJ Tourism Management Permitting:** Michele Elfers gave a verbal presentation on other CBJ permitting which includes Community Development Department and Parks & Recreation.

VI. **Discussion:**

- a. Need to look into task force meeting times
- b. Wants to have statistics on the Bartlett Regional Hospital seasonal impacts, etc. impacts in the future. Wants to see legal opinion on the issue of limitations.

VII. **Adjournment:** 1:36pm

**DRAFT MINUTES**  
**VISITOR INDUSTRY TASK FORCE**  
**THE CITY & BOROUGH OF JUNEAU, ALASKA**  
**January 21, 2020 12:05pm**  
**City Hall – Assembly Chambers**

**1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Meeting called to order at 12:05pm

Members present: Chair Carole Triem, Vice-Chair Craig Dahl, Holly Johnson, Meilani Schijvens, Paula Terrel, Dan Blanchard, Kirby Day, Assemblymember Wade Bryson, Alida Bus and Bobbie Meszaros.

Members absent: none

Others Present: Assemblymember Maria Gladziszewski, P&R Deputy Director Michele Elfers, City Attorney Robert Palmer, P&R Administrative Officer Myiia Wahto, D&H Port Operations Supervisor Scott Hinton, Mayor Beth Weldon, Port Director Carl Uchytel, City Manager Rorie Watt, Assemblymember Alicia Hughes-Skandijs, Finance Director Jeff Rogers, Planning Manager Alix Pierce and MEBA Rep. Ben Goldrich.

**2. Scheduling**

- a. Some still need to do doodle poll.
- b. 2/25 meeting at 12:00pm confirmed
- c. Rescheduling public comment meeting, Saturday, 2/1, 10:00 in Chambers.
- d. 2/4 meeting – SE Conference in town, consider adding this meeting after public comment – will consider that option.

**3. Presentation by CBJ Law Department Robert Palmer and City Manager Rorie Watt with discussion. Mr. Palmer read his memo and then took questions.**

Mr. Palmer started the discussion with the following statement - Legal issues regulating tourism – balancing act, best when policy makers come up with ideas and run through legal test. Less effective when an attorney is offering policy advice. Mr. Palmer read his memo and explained each point.

**Mr. Blanchard** – works with ships, uses BMP's, all voluntarily. Is there a time when BMP's have become pseudo law? Example, what if we decide we don't want hot berthing, and all cruise lines sign up voluntarily with Tourism Best Management Program (TBMP) and say they won't hot berth. What happens when a cruise line decides something different?

**Mr. Palmer** – TBMP enforcement is complicated, social pressure can happen, but it is not through the city. Special agreements with Docks or cruise lines could happen where we put in consequences. This can be a legal tool. Regulatory approach, government tries voluntary compliance through TBMP, then contracts, then regulatory realm. Maybe we get to a point where we work with USCG to prevent hot berthing or maybe USCG says no, and we need to figure out what to do.

**Mr. Blanchard** – Do we put ourselves at risk if we put CBJ funds to help TBMP? Can we do this legally?

**Mr. Palmer** – CBJ gives grant, no contractual agreement. No special standing given.

**Mr. Day** – TBMP could recommend an act to manage an impact and present to Assembly and CBJ could decide if money would be given.

**Mr. Palmer** – Yes, you could tie grant to some act/policy.

**Ms. Terrel** – CBJ can't limit capacity by limiting number of individuals?

**Mr. Palmer** – this has never been challenged.

**Ms. Terrel** – Can we limit number of ships that come in?

**Mr. Palmer** – yes, on public docks, cognizant of debt service payments, bond requirements.

**Ms. Terrel** – If we can control ships that come in, is there any way we can control scheduling so we don't have two ships with 6000 people on board at 4 docks? Any way to spread out?

**Mr. Palmer** – CBJ doesn't schedule city docks now, if we desire what boats come and how long they are in town, we can probably look at those options. We could encourage Norwegian at City Docks on Tuesdays with larger ships so we can control traffic impacts, and then limit hot berthing.

**Ms. Johnson** – Has USCG worked with communities in past on hot berthing type issues?

**Mr. Palmer** – USCG has indicated they are willing to work with us, not sure how far, imagines if there is a policy direction, he recommends formulating policy and then we would go talk to USCG.

**Mr. Day** – Suggesting anchorage closed by USCG, are you suggesting just large ships or any ships?

**Mr. Palmer** – just large ships.

**Mr. Day** – Dynamic positioning is not considered anchoring, is there CBJ control over ships that are underway?

**Mr. Palmer** – For anchoring or ships lightering, he will figure out arguments to help CBJ if this is a policy decision.

**Ms. Triem** – who would take action against us?

**Mr. Palmer** – Bond holders, not sure how many or who they are?

**Mr. Dahl** – Other communities, ideas or communication?

**Mr. Palmer** – hasn't reached out to other attorneys in AK, in world other places doing this, but they are not subject to AK and US constitution.

**Mr. Dahl** – What is our access to you to run things by you?

**Mr. Palmer** – Through Chair Triem and if asked I will provide legal guidance.

**Ms. Terrel** – With Mr. Palmer's help, we can look at specific issues and make a decision of options that can be used to put that into effect. Not saying we would set the policy, but give an option, like, whale watching, if we can come up with options on how to work with that and use that as a tool to the Assembly, then Assembly decides what they will do and how they will do it. Come up with solid recommendations with options for tools Assembly can use.

**Ms. Triem** – Four broad charging questions, to come up with multiple specific policy options will take more time than we have, Assembly is decision making body, Assembly may not want certain policies, don't waste time.

**Ms. Terrel**- We don't have to set policy, just come up with options. Would not be too difficult to come up with options.

**Mr. Day** – If recommendation to Assembly made, one avenue that in 2022, CBJ could tell CLAA, first Saturday of every month in summer no ship at Steamship Dock. If this compromised repaying of bonds, would we have to wait until 2026 to do this?

**Mr. Palmer** – yes, not until 2026, assuming those facts. We would have to run some math.

**Ms. Johnson** – head tax dollars involved in paying for city docks? Do we have full control?

**Mr. Palmer** – We do have full control, only limitation I know of right now is revenue.

**Ms. Terrel** – lots of comments on Saturday cruise ship days, could Assembly pass resolution saying we want to see a cruise ship free day on Saturday?

**Mr. Palmer** – Could assembly enact ordinance, yes, we would have to do the math. What is the hammer/enforcement tool? If resolution said intent, no hammer on the other side, probably okay. If there is a penalty, that may be different. Depends on tool.

**Ms. Terrel** – what about MOA with cruise ship that there would be no ships on Saturdays? Is that an option, a contract?

**Mr. Palmer** – Yes, under vision of point A in memo, voluntary contract between CBJ and cruise lines.

**Mr. Bryson** – Oct. 5<sup>th</sup> 2019, first day of no cruise ships, Downtown dead, empty, nice and 55 degrees. To say we are going to change face of Juneau is not going to work. One of the big complaints is big peak days, solution is to spread peak throughout week, increase on Saturdays to relieve congestion in community. It will give additional 15k days on other days of the week. I interpret this as our ability to limit traffic is almost nonexistent. We are the capital of AK, our economy is not doing great. Every discussion is about limiting and capping. Rest of economy in state is going in garbage, our discussion is limiting and denying others to come to our state. Our ability to limit tourism before 2026 is not going to happen. Turn discussion into how we can make this more productive and more amicable conversation, not “no, no”. How can we smooth it out, create infrastructure, transportation corridor to relieve construction. How can we benefit community and visitors? Focus on what we can do to improve situation.

**Ms. Triem** – Describe annual consultation process with cruise lines.

**Mr. Watt** – Settlement of litigation – litigation was about narrow views of the law and what was legal and not legal or legally defensible. Settlement about achieving practical solutions for city and industry. Negotiated payment for Auke Bay and agreed upon because it was a practical solution for industry and CBJ. October, first annual meeting, talked about all of the issues and how to work proactively, some progress to be made. Unclear what our goals are, city should state through assembly actual goals. This summer we let ships with emissions problems know it was unacceptable. But we don't have a city standard or policy on this. Industry made voluntary effort to alternate fuel. Mostly happened at my nagging, didn't have policy. We don't have municipal stance on hot



berthing, maybe we should. A lot of what Mr. Palmer told you, there is a lot of maybe on legal authority. It starts with articulating what we want.

**Mr. Day** – One public comment to raise price of docking on Saturdays, so no one would come.

**Mr. Palmer** – tool that is probably available, raise moorage fees for city docks should probably be discussed.

**Mr. Day** – does city have a way to limit number of whale watching boats in Juneau?

**Mr. Palmer** – probably, needs more research and work with NOAA and USCG.

**Mr. Day** – is cruise ship anchorage on CBJ tidelands? Can we get that answered?

**Ms. Terrel** – Saturday free day is not about downtown, it is about use of trails or getting out in other places. People want to enjoy one day when they don't have to worry about being crowded on trails and water. I don't see Mr. Palmer has put up there that we don't have any options or legal... we do have options.

**Ms. Schijvens** – Mr. Watt what are pros and cons of being involved in dock scheduling?

**Mr. Watt** – System of dock use based on historical priority and private sector action. Result is not always with regard to community interest, open question about should city try and articulate goals in a way that dock scheduling can help achieve them. A couple meetings ago, we noticed we don't communicate with CLAA on scheduling, lots of complexity. If we start to think about our goals (outside of absolute numbers). We want no visible emissions, we want ships to dock and move ships around in a manner with least congestions. Peak events I see causing most public consternation. What is it we want?

**Mr. Dahl** – Every meeting devoted to listening to input, we haven't gotten to good discussion or business community and investment, it does have an impact, haven't gotten to this debate. Agree to zero in on task mayor asked us to do, but don't throw a net over whole task force at this point.

**Mr. Day** – Taking/Inverse condemnation – if task force makes recommendation in 2022 we should prohibit hot berthing, we could do that at city facilities, if we carried that to private facilities, would that create a challenge, would that be a taking?

**Mr. Palmer** – On city docks we have a lot more control, on private docks we have to be sensitive and guess what income generated on hot berthing is. Assembly may not want to make decision, or say that we don't mind risk of takings challenge.

**Mr. Day** – On scheduling, used to do scheduling by hand, very complicated. City does have control in liaising with cruise line agencies, this is what we would like to see, and we do have some control. City does have some control over how city docks are used and private docks too.

4. **MEETING ADJOURNED – 1:22 pm.**

**DRAFT MINUTES  
VISITOR INDUSTRY TASK FORCE  
THE CITY & BOROUGH OF JUNEAU  
February 18, 2020 12:05pm  
City Hall – Assembly Chambers**

**I. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL**

Meeting called to order at 12:05pm

Members Present: Chair Assemblymember Carole Triem, Kirby Day, Paula Terrel, Bobbie Meszaros, Holly Johnson, Assemblymember Wade Bryson, Meilani Schijvens, and Alida Bus.

Absent – Craig Dahl, Dan Blanchard

Others in attendance: Parks & Recreation Deputy City Manager Michele Elfers, Planning Manager Alexandra Pierce, City Manager Rorie Watt, President & CEO of Travel Juneau Liz Perry.

**II. Approval of Agenda**

*Agenda approved as presented*

**III. Approval of Minutes**

- a. 2010-01-01 VITF Meeting Minutes
- b. 2010-01-11 VITF Public Testimony Meeting Minutes
- c. 2020-02-01 VITF Public Testimony & Work Session Meeting Minutes

*Minutes approved as presented*

**IV. QUESTION 2: LONG RANGE WATERFRONT PLAN (LRWP) REVIEW**

Ms. Elfers presents on LRWP, summarized plan with public process, assessment, design detail and concept recommendations, seawalk and tasks that have been accomplished or not accomplished.

**V. QUESTION 4: PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY**

Ms. Pierce presents on question 4 on public surveys. She researched old surveys for samples to consider, one relevant survey was found. A survey was performed every few years to take the temperature of the community. One from 1996 was found that related to transportation issues but not tourism management. In the 2002 Tourism Management Plan (TMP) and adopted resolution discusses establishing indicators to determine if community is in a good place regarding tourism. This was done through surveys until about 2006.

**VI. RESOLUTION 2170**

Ms. Pierce talks on Resolution 2170 based on the 2002 TMP. Plan discussed with non-infrastructure related issues, as well as the LRWP, and talks about collecting metrics.

**VII. DRAFT REPORT discussion**

**Ms. Terrel** – were the surveys done by 3<sup>rd</sup> party or in-house.

**Ms. Pierce** – 3<sup>rd</sup> party, most recently McDowell Group.

**Mr. Day** – Is it typical to reopen plans?

**Ms. Pierce** – Yes, if at the end of the planning horizon, a lot of time has gone by, conditions have changed, community changes or the plans mandate changes; so this one is within the planning horizon.

**Ms. Johnson** – Why did surveys end in 2006?

**Ms. Pierce** – I think Collaboration Juneau (CJ) ended.

**Ms. Terrel** – Confirms that yes, CJ ended and people were tired.

**Ms. Triem** – Did people use the surveys?

**Mr. Day** – There were a number of surveys taken, the last one was done by McDowell and part of the CBJ tourism report. The questions were on what we are talking about including flightseeing noise, air/water quality, traffic congestion.

**Ms. Terrel** – I testified with Northstar Trekking on findings of CJ and it was hard work but there was consensus. We presented as industry and community and nobody ever said thank you or followed up on suggestions at all. I am not trying to put any blame, but it took the wind out of our sails and we didn't do anything. This is one of the reasons I am so passionate about doing something substantive. I want specifics because of my experience.

**Mr. Day** – We did use the surveys as Tourism Best Management Plan (TBMP), we were 10 years old in 2006 and we did look at recommendations to incorporate new guidelines into the program. The cruise industry found those valuable.

**Ms. Johnson** – Travel Juneau did “Destination Next”, Liz Perry is expert on this. There have been some surveys and we should think about what has happened.

**Mr. Bryson** – I remember these surveys, my recommendation on another survey, we just received hundreds of public comments, and we just went through our survey. If we do a survey, if we set it for a time when archipelago project and Egan Drive project is complete, and do it in a summer when we are not in construction and give us time to implement recommendations. If we did it at the end of next summer after projects completed, this summer we won't get new, valid or helpful information.

**Ms. Pierce** – The intent of asking the committee was asking the committee about ongoing future surveys over the years.

**Ms. Triem** – we have received a lot of public comment, it does not reflect all of Juneau, and it is a homogenous group. I am interested in a wider survey that reflects all of Juneau.

**Ms. Terrel** – I would rather not see any survey now. End of season we will see the Blueprint Downtown (BPDT). It is premature and there might be changes that would make people happier and make people feel better. As far as LRWP, I think we should do our recommendations to Assembly, see what they do and then if there is a need to do the waterfront plan, that should come after. This group should not tackle it. I would rather not see these things done until after we settle in and see what development looks like.

**Ms. Pierce** – Do you think that if you are not comfortable with reopening waterfront plan now, would you be interested in opening the management plan or resolution for discussion?

**Ms. Terrel** – Lots of very good things that have not been implemented and the resolution recognizes there is a limit to capacity in certain areas. I wouldn't reopen it now and figure out what Juneau wants to do then we can reopen if there are things we need to discuss. A lot of the things that are in there and not implemented would be good to do, for example the indicators. I would rather not open them up right now. Leave it because it is the only legal document for tourism planning right now.

**Mr. Watt** – There is never a perfect time to take a survey. On some level, for purpose of survey is this a onetime survey or an ongoing need to take the temperature. On plans, collectively, do we have as much patience today in 2020? It took a year to create the LRWP, I don't know that we have the patience to do this again.

**Ms. Triem** – As an economist, I want to do a survey now and then later to see the impacts.

**Mr. Day** – Given money put aside for a survey on passenger experience, the reason I would advocate for a survey after this summer is because the general public feels like they are being left out. I agree before the season doesn't work, after the season is challenging because of construction. But I think you can do a paired down phone survey inexpensively. If our recommendation is to take the temperature down the road and do something every two years, this would be valuable. A number of us have given recommendations for this summer. It would be good to know if this worked. This could be the basis for continuing this work every 12-18 months. I would support something in the fall to see where we are and use this as the baseline going forward. Alaska Travel Industry Association (ATIA) is doing something in the next few months, Travel Juneau is doing something. This would help Assembly going forward.

**Ms. Terrel** – One of the things we could use at the end of the summer in the survey is feedback on how people feel about the recommendations that we make and what the Assembly has or has not done. Maybe we should have a public comment on what recommendation should be, but if we cannot do that it would be a good place to have it in the survey.

**Ms. Johnson** – Public survey said we need to talk about this as a community. Big changes and more infrastructure needs to happen before we ask people to tell us what they think. Visitor experience is a place to start a survey.

**Ms. Triem** – How do you incorporate surveys into work you do?

**Ms. Pierce** – I have been part of a number of plans that involve surveys, it is one tool in a different methodologies to collect input. A balanced perspective is goal, you hear from the same people a lot, it is a challenge to get people out and participating. Random phone surveys are one tool to do that. Maybe a less accurate tool these days with less people answering their tool. Parks and Rec survey helped us with important metrics like 89% of the community uses our trails this is a helpful metric.

**Ms. Schijvens** – I do surveys for a living, there are different purposes for surveys. Relying on knowing population and getting a lot of feedback, giving people a chance to weigh in, people can do it from home, kids can participate, and we can look at age ranges. It helps people to feel like they are part of the process, come up with simple wording to make it easy to participate. The value is to reach a broad spectrum of people so they feel they can participate. More technical surveys help to understand the direction people want to go in. I focus on the first value

of everyone participating. The technical value is good, I love doing annual surveys every few years to compare how results change. I have noted as I have done tourism surveys, there is a disconnect between the economic value of the tourism industry and the value of it. There is a deep connection between the people responding and the connections of the institutions that is surveying. More disconnect between visitor industry and people's perception of economic value. There is still value in the survey, but take with a grain of salt as the results are different vs. just looking at economic value. I love to do surveys and would love to do one for you. Be clear of the goal of the survey and how it will be used before we just go out and do it.

**Ms. Triem** – If we recommend that surveys be done are those surveys for the benefit of staff working on CBJ tourism management, will they be for the Assembly, and are they for the community so they feel like they can weigh in?

**Mr. Day** – My recommendation is yes, we need to go forward with some sort of survey instrument to gauge community support or else we are leaving the community behind and only surveying passengers. This will help policy makers going forward, it needs to be a broad cross section. This doesn't discount issues we are dealing with. My recommendation is we do a survey going forward and it should be in the fall and follow up every 12-18 months.

**Ms. Meszaros** – I agree with Mr. Day, do it at the end of the season and do it for the public. We shouldn't only serve passengers. Knowing there will be a second or third year of road construction. We are facing this every year, road construction.

**Mr. Bryson** – If we do the first survey in September 2020, gauge community feeling, gather info to help staff, set up second survey fall 2022, all existing infrastructure will be completed at that time. All recommendations implemented at this time.

**Mr. Watt** – Caution against the idea that there will be a summer without construction. Sealaska Heritage will have upcoming construction. Norwegian Cruise Line proposal may turn into a big construction project, seawalk and dock infill areas, Develop Juneau Now parcel, Centennial Hall and The New JACC supporters. I have no issue with timing between surveys, I just think there will always be construction.

**Ms. Terrel** – If there are changes with port management as far as ships and docks that could not happen until 2022 so having the survey after that is a good idea.

**Mr. Day** – we are just charged with pros and cons of surveys, not when they will be.

**Ms. Triem** – Happy to leave these questions to survey experts. Ms. Perry from Travel Juneau is here and can give us an update on what has been done.

**Ms. Perry** – President and CEO of Travel Juneau. Most recent survey is with MMGY Global. They have surveyed over 500 communities with Destination Next, it is a residential survey. It meets the need to poll residents on how they feel about the industry as they feel about Juneau as an entire destination, includes meeting facilities, airline and flights.

**Ms. Triem** – We have some kind of a baseline.

**Ms. Perry** – The survey is on TravelJuneau.com and you can see the results of the survey.

**Mr. Day** – The LRWP was a very long process to develop. Listening to staff, looking at list and seeing that 50% of items have been achieved and many of the unachieved CBJ does not have control over. I don't see the benefit of reopening the plan unless the Assembly sees issues they want to deal with. Mr. Watt mentioned Norwegian Cruise Line (NCL) dock, one of our first meetings someone asked me if I wanted to open the waterfront plan so NCL could open the dock. That is not the case, I was questioning the benefit of opening it. After discussion with legal department, whether NCL works with CBJ or not, opening plan may not be required. With only half completed, and still more to do that is planned, someone needs to decide more than me if that is needed.

**Ms. Pierce** – NCL purchased Mixed Use 2, they can apply to rezone, apply for conditional use permit, and they can enter into discussion with city for use of tidelands. Opening an entire plan to deal with one parcel is generally not done within the planning world because we have a process to deal with single parcels. Plans are much higher level than an individual parcel or site plan.

**Mr. Bryson** – How did a whale and an island get on the waterfront if it was not in the LRWP?

**Ms. Elfers** – An island is in the LRWP and a park and seawalk is there.

**Ms. Pierce** – Every detail and specific items do not get into plans, they are higher level.

**Ms. Triem** – The reason for my concern with LRWP is I want reassurance that this plan that was written in the early 2000's is still adequate. I don't want to reopen it if it is not necessary but I want to be reassured that it is adequately addressing the growth and future potential impacts. Resolution 2170, section I, paragraph E, while vague says CBJ wants to maintain its strong position in the cruise tourism marketplace. Sounds like its saying "keep growing." I am not sure this is still the case, we want to manage it better. In some sort of policy and infrastructure plans. Maybe we can't do this through the LRWP and not for one particular parcel.

**Mr. Day** – If something was to come about that required this thing to be reevaluated, then maybe. But at the time it was created, it was forward thinking. If we can get the last two pieces of the seawalk completed, it would help a lot. On Resolution 2170, section E, I think we can strengthen and maintain our strong position without supporting untethered growth. This is a lot of what we are working on.

**Ms. Terrel** – I think the tourism management plan, reflected in Resolution 2170, is pretty good and pretty thorough. I wouldn't want to see it reopened. We may need to amend it in some way in the future. The resolution is still effective.

**Mr. Day** – A lot of what is in Resolution 2170 is still valid. It could be reworked to better relate to today's Juneau instead of early 2000's Juneau.

#### **VIII. UPCOMING MEETINGS**

Ms. Triem – scheduling, meeting planned for Feb. 25<sup>th</sup> at 12:05pm. I am worried to start tackling a draft if we have only 90 minutes. I suggest cancelling next Tuesday and move the next meeting to the 4<sup>th</sup>. Our next meeting is March 4<sup>th</sup> at 4:30pm the Feb. 25<sup>th</sup> meeting is cancelled. Also schedule 10am meeting March 8<sup>th</sup>.

#### **VIII. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting Adjourned 1:14pm.