

# JUNEAU TOURISM SURVEY REPORT

2025

Prepared for:

CITY AND BOROUGH OF JUNEAU

January 2025

**McKINLEY RESEARCH  
GROUP, LLC**

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>Introduction and Methodology.....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Visitor Industry Impacts .....</b>	<b>7</b>
Overall Impact of Visitor Industry.....	7
Follow-up for "Both Positive and Negative" Impacts.....	8
Composite Result.....	10
<b>Types of Impacts.....</b>	<b>12</b>
Types of Impacts Affecting Households.....	12
<b>CBJ Tourism Management.....</b>	<b>16</b>
Overall Management.....	16
<b>Tourism Best Management Practices .....</b>	<b>17</b>
TBMP Awareness.....	17
TBMP Effectiveness .....	18
<b>Tourism Initiatives .....</b>	<b>19</b>
CBJ Tourism Department Priorities .....	19
<b>Cruise Volume Limits .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Importance of Douglas Master Plan.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>Tourism Employment.....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>Respondent Characteristics .....</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>Appendix .....</b>	<b>28</b>

# Executive Summary


The City and Borough of Juneau contracted with McKinley Research Group to conduct a telephone survey of Juneau residents regarding tourism. The survey was conducted in November 2025; similar surveys were conducted in 1995, 1998, 2002, 2006, and annually since 2021. To qualify for the survey, respondents were required to be current residents and to have lived in Juneau in the summer of 2025. Survey results were weighted by age, gender, and neighborhood to reflect population characteristics. Following are key survey results.

## Overall Impacts: Positive vs. Negative


When asked about the overall impact of tourism on their household, three out of ten respondents (31%) said that tourism had an overall positive impact, while 10% said it had a negative impact. The most common response was both positive and negative impacts at 39%, while 18% said they felt no impact at all.

Those that said both positive and negative impacts were asked whether the positive outweighed the negative or vice versa; these respondents were more likely to say positive impacts outweigh the negative (43%) than negative impacts outweigh the positive (31%); another 22% said neither/neutral.

**Do you feel the visitor industry has an overall positive impact, negative impact, both negative and positive impacts, or no impact at all on your household?**




**Among those who responded "Both:" Do you feel the positive impacts outweigh the negative impacts or the negative impacts outweigh the positive impacts?**



The question about the overall impact of tourism has been asked over the last seven editions of the survey. Those reporting overall positive impacts decreased over time from 40% in 2002 and 2006 to around 30% in the last three years (31%, 29%, 31%). Those reporting negative impacts increased from 6% in 2006 to 13% in 2024, then dipped to 10% in 2025.

#### TREND: Overall Impact of Tourism on Households, 2002 to 2025




Notes: The 2021 survey referred to 2019 impacts. Excludes "don't know" and refused responses.

#### Specific Impacts

Respondents were read a list of nine visitor-related impacts and asked how affected their household was in 2025. Respondents were most commonly affected (somewhat and very affected combined) by *crowding on sidewalks downtown* (70%), *crowding at Mendenhall Glacier* (66%), and *vehicle congestion downtown* (59%).

**For each of the following visitor-related impacts, was your household very affected, somewhat affected, or not affected in 2025?**




Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to *don't know* responses.

## Tourism Management


When asked to rate how CBJ is managing the impacts of the visitor industry, the most common response is that CBJ is *not doing enough* (53%), followed by *just the right amount* (33%). Responses have remained consistent over the last several years, with all changes within 3%.

**Is CBJ doing more than enough, not enough, or just the right amount to manage the impacts of the visitor industry?**



Respondents were asked what level of priority should be placed on eight different CBJ tourism activities. The highest-rated priorities were *keeping the five-ship limit* (60% said this should be high priority), *managing impacts from tours on residents* (58%), *keeping the daily passenger cap* (56%), and *reducing traffic congestion* (50%).


**Should CBJ place a high priority, medium priority, or low priority on each of the following items?**



Note: Rows may not sum to 100% due to don't know responses.

**How important do you think it is for CBJ to develop a Master Plan for the back side of Douglas? The plan would include both CBJ and Goldbelt lands and would address issues such as transportation, emergency services, and utilities.**

After being told "Goldbelt has proposed to build a cruise ship destination on their land on the back side of Douglas," respondents were asked about the importance of a Master Plan for the area. Over half of respondents (56%) said it was very important, 24% said it was somewhat important, and 16% said it was not important. Four percent didn't know.



# Introduction and Methodology

## Introduction

The City and Borough of Juneau (CBJ) contracted with McKinley Research Group (MRG) to conduct a public opinion survey of Juneau residents regarding tourism. Results help inform CBJ's tourism management and planning efforts. This is the fifth consecutive (annual) tourism survey of Juneau residents. Previous surveys were also conducted in 1995, 1998, 2002, and 2006.

## Methodology

The survey was designed by MRG staff in cooperation with CBJ staff. Most questions from the previous surveys were repeated in order to gauge trends. To qualify for the survey, respondents confirmed they were current residents and lived in Juneau in summer 2025.

The survey sample was randomly drawn from an appropriate mix of cell and landline numbers purchased from Dynata, a national supplier of survey samples. Multiple call attempts were made to encourage participation. Surveys were completed with 520 randomly selected Juneau residents. The survey was conducted from November 5 to 25, 2025.

The maximum margin of error at the 95% confidence level is  $\pm 4.3\%$  for the full sample; this margin of error increases for subsamples.

The survey sample was compared to Juneau's adult population by gender, age, and area of residence. Relative to the 2020 census population estimate of Juneau (the latest available data with population estimates detailed enough to show population by neighborhood), the survey sample over-sampled men, older residents, and residents who lived downtown, Douglas Island, and those who live in Auke Bay and Out the Road.

To maximize representativeness, the survey data was weighted to match population by neighborhood, and to correct the age and gender balance.

See table, next page

**Table 1. Telephone Survey Sample versus Juneau Population**

	Survey Sample (%)	Juneau Population (%)
<b>Gender</b>		
Male	54	51
Female	46	49
Unknown	<1	-
<b>Area of Residence</b>		
Mendenhall Valley	41	46
Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek/Switzer Creek	9	16
Douglas/West Juneau	13	12
Downtown/Thane	15	10
Brotherhood Bridge/Out the Road	15	11
North Douglas	8	5
<b>Age</b>		
18-24	6	11
25-34	12	17
35-44	22	19
45-54	11	15
55-64	16	16
65-74	21	14
75+	12	8

Sources: U.S. Census for age and gender; CBJ for neighborhood.

Survey data was also tested for differences by neighborhood of residence, neighborhood of employment, age group, gender, and whether a household member was employed in the tourism industry. Statistically significant differences between subgroups are addressed in the text accompanying each table.

## COMPARISON WITH PAST SURVEYS

This report presents comparisons with results from similar surveys conducted multiple times since 1995, but focuses on comparing results from recent years. Changes in question wording, where applicable, are noted.

The following cruise passenger volumes provide context for the trend analysis. Juneau's cruise passenger volume more than tripled between 1995 and 2025 (+350%). The latest season saw a 1% decrease.

**Table 2. Juneau Cruise Passenger Volumes in Survey Years**

	Cruise Passenger Volume	% Change
1995	380,600	-
1998	568,500	+49%
2002	741,500	+30%
2006	951,400	+28%
2019*	1,305,700	+37%
2022	1,167,000	-11%
2023	1,669,500	+43%
2024	1,732,000	+4%
2025	1,712,600	-1%
<b>Change 1995-2025</b>		<b>+350%</b>

\*The 2021 survey referred to 2019 cruise volume.

# Visitor Industry Impacts

## Overall Impact of Visitor Industry

Respondents were asked to characterize overall visitor industry impacts on their household as positive, negative, both positive and negative, or no impact. Roughly four in ten respondents (39%) said they experienced both negative and positive impacts. Nearly one-third (31%) said the overall impacts were positive, while 10% said the overall impacts were negative. Another 18% said they experienced no impact at all.

This question yielded the following statistically significant differences by subgroup.

- The main difference by area of residence was a higher likelihood among North Douglas and Douglas/West Juneau residents to report negative impacts at 21% and 19%, respectively, compared to between 7% and 13% among other residents.
- Residents from the Creeks, Valley, and Out the Road were significantly more likely to report no impact on their households (35%, 17%, and 16%, respectively) than all other areas of town, which ranged from 5% to 13%.
- Middle-aged (35-54 years) and older (55+ years) residents were more likely to report positive impacts than younger residents (18-34 years): 33% and 35% versus 25%, respectively.
- Households reporting tourism employment were more likely to report positive impacts than those who did not report household tourism employment (39% versus 28%).

**Table 3. Do you feel the visitor industry has an overall positive impact, negative impact, both negative and positive impacts, or no impact at all on your household?**

n=520	% of Total
Positive impact	31
Negative impact	10
Both negative and positive impacts	39
No impact at all	18
Don't know	1

## Comparing to Past Surveys

The percentage reporting positive impacts was slightly up in 2025, from 29% to 31%, while those reporting negative impacts fell from 13% to 10%. No changes were statistically significant year-over-year. However, the longer-term decline in positive impacts from 40% in 2006 to 31% in 2025 is significant.

**Table 4. TREND: Positive Versus Negative Impacts, 1998 to 2025 (%)**

	1998	2002	2006	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
Positive impact	29	40	40	36	35	31	29	31	+2
Negative impact	10	6	8	8	7	11	13	10	-3
Both negative and positive impacts	43	37	34	33	41	46	42	39	-3
No impact at all	16	15	17	20	16	11	15	18	+3
Don't know	1	1	1	2	1	<1	1	1	-

Note: Wording of the question changed slightly over the years, although there were no changes between 2022 and 2025. In 2021 the question was, *"Thinking back to 2019, the last regular visitor season before COVID, do you feel the visitor industry had an overall positive impact, negative impact, both negative and positive impacts, or no impact at all on your household?"* In prior years, the question was, *"Considering the costs and benefits of tourism, do you feel that the current level of tourism in Juneau has a positive impact, negative impact, both negative and positive impacts, or no impact at all on your household?"*

## Follow-up for "Both Positive and Negative" Impacts

Respondents who had cited both negative and positive impacts were asked a follow-up question, whether the positive impacts outweighed the negative or vice versa. The most common response was "the positive outweighs the negative" at 43%; 31% said the opposite; and 22% said neither/neutral.

**Table 5. Do you feel the positive impacts outweigh the negative impacts or the negative impacts outweigh the positive impacts?**

Base: "Both positive and negative impacts"

n=206	% of Base
Positive impacts outweigh negative	43
Negative impacts outweigh positive	31
Neutral/neither	22
Don't know	2

## Comparing to Past Surveys

Respondents saying the positive impacts outweigh the negative were up slightly from 39% in 2024 to 43% in 2025, while those saying the negative outweighs the positive increased from 28% to 31%. None of the year-over-year changes were statistically significant; however, the longer-term drop in those saying the positive outweighs the negatives over the 2021 to 2025 period (from 51% to 43%) is significant.

**Table 6. TREND: Weighing Both Positive and Negative Impacts, 1998 to 2025 (%)**

	1998	2002	2006	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
Positive impacts outweigh negative	45	46	47	51	49	38	39	43	+4
Negative impacts outweigh positive	32	29	32	30	32	25	28	31	+3
Neutral/neither	16	16	14	14	12	30	30	22	-8
Don't know	6	8	7	4	5	4	3	2	-1

Note: In the 1998 through 2006 surveys the wording was "benefits outweigh costs" and "costs outweigh benefits."

## Composite Result

When combining results of the previous two questions, nearly half of respondents (48%) felt that tourism either has an overall positive impact on their household, or the positive impacts outweigh the negative. About one-fifth (22%) felt either that tourism has an overall negative impact on their household, or the negative impacts outweigh the positive.

- North Douglas and Douglas/West Juneau residents were more likely to view tourism negatively at 34% and 30%, respectively; this compares with 27% of Out the Road residents, 22% of Downtown/Thane residents, 19% of Valley residents, and 18% of Creeks residents.
- Respondents reporting a household member employed in the tourism industry in the last five years were more likely to report (composite) positive impacts at 54%; this compares to 46% of other respondents.

**Table 7. Combined Results: Overall Impacts + Both Positive/Negative Impacts**

n=520	% of Total
<b>Positive TOTAL</b>	<b>48</b>
Positive impact	31
Both; positive impacts outweigh negative	17
<b>Negative TOTAL</b>	<b>22</b>
Negative impact	10
Both; negative impacts outweigh positive	12
No impact at all	18
Neutral/neither	9
Don't know	3

## Comparing to Past Surveys

There were no statistically significant differences in year-over-year responses. However, over the last five years of the survey, the decrease in positive responses (from 53% to 48%) is significant, as is the increase in negative responses (from 18% to 22%).

**Table 8. Combined Results: Overall Impacts + Both Positive/Negative Impacts, 2021 to 2025**

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
<b>Positive TOTAL</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>55</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>45</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>+3</b>
Positive impact	36	35	31	29	31	+2
Both; positive impacts outweigh negative	17	20	17	16	17	+1
<b>Negative TOTAL</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>-4</b>
Negative impact	8	7	11	14	10	-4
Both; negative impacts outweigh positive	10	13	11	12	12	-
No impact at all	20	16	11	15	18	+3
Neutral/neither	5	5	14	13	9	-4
Don't know	4	4	4	3	3	-

# Types of Impacts

## Types of Impacts Affecting Households

Respondents were read nine different types of visitor-related impacts and asked to characterize how much each impact affected their household. Respondents reported the highest degree of impact with *crowding on sidewalks downtown*, with 45% very affected and 25% somewhat affected, for a total of 70% affected. The next most impactful was *crowding at Mendenhall Glacier*, with 45% very affected and 21% somewhat affected, for a total of 66% affected. Least impactful was *vehicle congestion on North Douglas*: just 5% reported being very affected and 11% somewhat affected, for a total of 16% affected.

Differences by neighborhood of residence and employment are shown in the following pages.

**Table 9. For each of the following visitor-related impacts, was your household very affected, somewhat affected, or not affected in 2024? By "affected" we mean changing your use of an area in addition to other kinds of impacts. (%)**

n=518	Very affected	Somewhat affected	Very + Somewhat Affected	Not affected	Don't know
Crowding on sidewalks downtown	45	25	70	29	<1
Crowding at Mendenhall Glacier	45	21	66	32	2
Vehicle congestion downtown	31	28	59	40	<1
Whale watching boat traffic and wakes	33	21	54	40	5
Flightseeing noise	22	26	48	50	2
Crowding on trails	15	29	44	53	3
Air emissions from cruise ships	18	23	41	53	6
Vehicle congestion in Auke Bay	11	22	33	64	3
Vehicle congestion on North Douglas	5	11	16	80	4

## Differences by Neighborhood

All impacts showed differences in responses according to the respondents' neighborhood.

- Downtown/Thane and Douglas/West Juneau residents were the most affected by *crowding on sidewalks downtown* (both 82%) followed by North Douglas residents (76%) and Out the Road residents (69%).
- Out the Road residents were the most affected by *crowding at Mendenhall Glacier* (79%) followed by Downtown/Thane residents (69%) and Valley residents (68%).
- Douglas/West Juneau residents were the most affected by *vehicle congestion downtown* (76%) followed by Out the Road residents (73%) and North Douglas residents (71%).
- Downtown/Thane and North Douglas residents were the most affected by *flightseeing noise* (both 59%), followed by Out the Road residents (58%) and Douglas/West Juneau residents (57%).
- Out the Road residents were the most affected by *vehicle congestion in Auke Bay* (51%) followed by North Douglas residents (38%) and Valley residents (36%).
- North Douglas residents were the most affected by *whale watching* (75%), followed by Douglas/West Juneau (69%); all other neighborhoods showed a lower rate of being affected (between 38% and 61%).
- North Douglas residents were the most affected by *crowding on trails* (59%) followed by Out the Road residents (56%).

**Table 10. IMPACTS BY NEIGHBORHOOD OF RESIDENCE:  
"Very affected" plus "Somewhat affected" (%)**

	Downtown/ Thane n=79	Douglas/ West Juneau n=66	Creeks n=44	Mend. Valley n=212	North Douglas n=39	Out the Road n=78
Crowding on sidewalks downtown	82	82	67	65	76	69
Crowding at Mendenhall Glacier	69	65	52	68	58	79
Vehicle congestion downtown	65	76	48	53	71	73
Whale watching boat traffic and wakes	61	69	38	50	60	75
Flightseeing noise	59	57	32	44	59	58
Crowding on trails	48	52	32	39	59	56
Air emissions from cruise ships	65	51	30	34	55	41
Vehicle congestion in Auke Bay	30	28	16	36	38	51
Vehicle congestion on North Douglas	19	32	6	11	43	16

Only three impacts showed statistically significant differences according to where the respondent worked (*flightseeing noise*, *air emissions from cruise ships*, and *vehicle congestion on North Douglas*). Note that the sample sizes of those working in Douglas/West Juneau, North Douglas, and Out the Road were too small for analysis.

- Respondents who work in the Downtown/Thane area were more likely to report being somewhat/very affected by *flightseeing noise* (56%, compared to 44% of Mendenhall Valley employees and 39% of Creeks employees).
- Respondents who work in the Downtown/Thane area were more likely to be somewhat/very affected by *air emissions from cruise ships* at 54%; this compares with 35% of those working in the Valley and 34% of those working in the Creeks area.
- Respondents working in the Downtown/Thane and Creeks areas were more likely to be somewhat/very affected by *vehicle congestion on North Douglas* than those working in the Mendenhall Valley (19% and 16%, compared to 6%, respectively).

**Table 11. IMPACTS BY NEIGHBORHOOD OF EMPLOYMENT:**  
"Very affected" plus "Somewhat affected" (%)

	Downtown/ Thane n=103	Creeks n=59	Mend. Valley n=75
Crowding on sidewalks downtown	77	69	72
Crowding at Mendenhall Glacier	70	65	78
Vehicle congestion downtown	68	55	59
Whale watching boat traffic and wakes	57	52	57
Flightseeing noise	56	39	44
Crowding on trails	49	38	50
Air emissions from cruise ships	54	34	35
Vehicle congestion in Auke Bay	29	28	37
Vehicle congestion on North Douglas	19	16	6

## Comparing to Past Surveys

There were no statistically significant changes in reported impacts from 2024 to 2025; all responses were within ten percentage points of 2024 responses. However, there were some significant changes from 2021 to 2025, noted below.

Note that the impact "vehicle congestion outside of downtown" was removed in 2025; instead two new impacts were added: "vehicle congestion in Auke Bay" and "vehicle congestion in North Douglas." No trend data is shown for these three categories of impacts.

- *Crowding on sidewalks downtown*: affected rate remained 70% from 2024 to 2025, with a significant longer term change from 57% in 2021.
- *Crowding at Mendenhall Glacier*: affected rate declined just one percentage point from 67% to 66%. The year-over-year change was not significant, but the longer term change was: from 57% in 2021 and 2022 to 66% in 2025.
- *Vehicle congestion downtown*: affected rate dropped from 65% to 59%.
- *Flightseeing noise*: affected rate declined from 54% in 2024 to 48% in 2025.
- *Whale watching*: affected rate increased from 48% in 2024 to 54%. The longer-term change was even more significant, from 40% in 2022 to 54% in 2025.
- *Crowding on trails*: The yearly change of those affected rate declined just one percentage point, from 45% in 2024 to 44% in 2025. The longer-term change was significant, from 34% in 2021 to 44% in 2025.

**Table 12. TREND: Somewhat + Very Affected, 2021 to 2025 (%)**

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
Crowding on sidewalks downtown	57	56	59	70	<b>70</b>	-
Crowding at Mendenhall Glacier	57	57	63	67	<b>66</b>	-1
Vehicle congestion downtown	57	51	61	65	<b>59</b>	-6
Flightseeing noise	41	46	43	54	<b>48</b>	-6
Whale watching boat traffic and wakes	41	40	47	48	<b>54</b>	+6
Crowding on trails	34	38	40	45	<b>44</b>	-1
Air emissions from cruise ships	36	42	36	41	<b>41</b>	-

Note: The wording of this question was adjusted slightly between 2022 and 2023. The following phrase was added after the question: *By "affected" we mean changing your use of an area in addition to other kinds of impacts*. This phrase was added because in 2021 and 2022, respondents sometimes expressed confusion on whether avoiding an area due to visitors would be considered "affected."

# CBJ Tourism Management

## Overall Management

When asked whether CBJ is doing enough to manage impacts of the visitor industry, respondents were most likely to say they were *not doing enough* (53%) followed by *just the right amount* (33%). Only 7% said they were doing *more than enough*, and 7% didn't know.

- Residents of North Douglas (79%) and Downtown/Thane (66%) were more likely to say CBJ was not doing enough; this compares with residents of Douglas/West Juneau (60%), Out the Road (58%), the Valley (47%), and Creeks (44%).

**Table 13. Do you think the City and Borough of Juneau is doing more than enough, not enough, or just the right amount to manage the impacts of the visitor industry?**

n=518	% of Total
More than enough	7
Not enough	53
Just the right amount	33
Don't know	7

## Comparing to Past Surveys

There were no statistically significant changes between 2024 and 2025.

**Table 14. TREND: CBJ Tourism Management, 2021 to 2025 (%)**

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
More than enough	7	4	4	4	7	+3
Not enough	45	45	56	54	53	-1
Just the right amount	39	41	33	33	33	-
Don't know	9	10	7	9	7	-2

# Tourism Best Management Practices

## TBMP Awareness

Respondents were asked how familiar they were with the Tourism Best Management Practices (TBMP) program. Over half of respondents (59%) were not familiar; 27% were somewhat familiar; and 14% were very familiar.

- Valley and Creeks residents were more likely to be unfamiliar at 61% and 69%, respectively.
- Respondents in the younger age bracket were more likely to be unfamiliar (74%) compared to those in the middle and older age brackets (56% and 50%, respectively).

**Table 15. The Tourism Best Management Practices program, also known as TBMP, is intended to reduce impacts in the community. It includes a hotline for reporting concerns about tourism.**

**Are you very familiar, somewhat familiar, or not familiar with this program?**

n=518	% of Total
Very familiar	14
Somewhat familiar	27
Not familiar	59
Don't know/refused	<1

## Comparing to Past Surveys

There were no statistically significant changes between 2024 and 2025.

**Table 16. TREND: CBJ Tourism Management, 2021, 2022, 2023, 2024, 2025 (%)**

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
Very familiar	14	16	14	17	14	-3
Somewhat familiar	32	26	22	25	27	+2
Not familiar	54	57	62	57	59	+2

## TBMP Effectiveness

Among those somewhat or very aware of TBMP, 17% said the program was very effective; 44% said it was somewhat effective; and 27% said it was not effective.

**Table 17. Do you think this program has been very effective, somewhat effective, or not effective at managing tourism impacts on residents? (%)**

Base: Somewhat or very familiar with TBMP

n=234	% of Base
Very effective	17
Somewhat effective	44
Not effective	27
Don't know/not aware	13

## Comparing to Past Surveys

The percentage of respondents saying TBMP was not effective rose from 21% in 2024 to 27% in 2025, although this change was not statistically significant.

**Table 18. TREND: Effectiveness of TBMP, 2022 to 2025 (%)**

	2022	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
Very effective	17	15	14	17	+3
Somewhat effective	52	49	49	44	-5
Not effective	15	27	21	27	+6
Don't know/not aware	16	9	16	13	-3

# Tourism Initiatives

## CBJ Tourism Department Priorities

Respondents were asked what level of priority should be placed on eight different CBJ tourism activities. The highest-rated priorities were *keeping the five-ship limit* (60% said this should be high priority), *managing impacts from tours on residents* (58%), *keeping the daily passenger cap* (56%), and *reducing traffic congestion* (50%). There were several statistically significant differences between subgroups.

- *Keeping the five-ship limit*: Downtown/Thane residents were the most likely to say this was a high priority (69%), followed by Out the Road and Douglas/West Juneau residents (both 67%).
- *Shore power*: Douglas/West Juneau residents were the most likely to say this was a high priority (52%), followed by Downtown/Thane (44%).
- *Managing impacts from tours on residents*: Douglas/West Juneau and Out the Road residents were the most likely to say this was a high priority (72% and 69%, respectively). Residents of the Creeks were least likely to say this was a high priority (45%).

**Table 19. Should the CBJ Tourism Department place a high priority, medium priority, or low priority on each of the following items? (%)**

n=518	High Priority	Moderate Priority	Low Priority	Not a Priority	Don't know
Keeping the five-ship limit	60	18	13	7	2
Managing impacts from tours on residents	58	25	10	5	1
Keeping the daily passenger cap	56	18	15	8	3
Reducing traffic congestion	50	29	15	4	2
Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting independent visitors	43	33	15	5	4
Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting conventions	35	35	22	4	4
Shore power	35	31	17	7	10
Completing the Seawalk from the whale statue to the Rock Dump	26	29	29	13	3

When asked which priority was most important, the number one response was *managing impacts from tours on residents* (32%), followed by *keeping the five-ship limit* (17%) and *reducing traffic congestion* (12%).

- Creek residents were significantly less likely to select *managing impacts from tours on residents* as most important (12%) than those from other areas (ranging from 30% to 45%)
- Creek residents and those who live Out the Road were the most likely to select *reducing traffic congestion* as most important (both 21%), followed by North Douglas residents (10%), Downtown/Thane and Valley residents (both 9%), and Douglas/West Juneau residents (4%).

**Table 20. Of the priorities I just mentioned, which one do you think is MOST important? (%)**

n=518	% of Total
Managing impacts from tours on residents	32
Keeping the five-ship limit	17
Reducing traffic congestion	12
Keeping the daily passenger cap	9
Shore power	8
Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting independent visitors	7
Completing the Seawalk from the whale statue to the Rock Dump	5
Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting conventions	3
Don't know	5

## Comparing to Past Surveys

The largest change in responses between 2024 and 2025 was for *supporting Travel Juneau in attracting independent visitors* (see note about change in survey language below), increasing from 37% high priority in 2024 to 43% in 2025.

Trend data is only shown for comparable questions; the 2025 survey included new priorities.

**Table 21. TREND: CBJ Tourism Priorities, "High Priority", 2023 to 2025 (%)**

	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
Managing impacts from tours on residents*	38	53	<b>58</b>	+5
Reducing traffic congestion	42	49	<b>50</b>	+1
Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting independent visitors**	39	37	<b>43</b>	+6
Shore power	40	35	<b>35</b>	-
Completing the Seawalk from the whale statue to the Rock Dump***	25	24	<b>26</b>	+2

\*The 2023 survey used the phrase "managing impacts from tours on residents throughout the Borough."

\*\*The survey previously used the phrase "Supporting Travel Juneau in growing the independent visitor market."

\*\*\*The survey previously used the phrase "Extending the Seawalk."

# Cruise Volume Limits

2025 survey participants were asked if they were very supportive, supportive, opposed, or very opposed to CBJ limiting cruise ship volume. The question was new for the 2025 survey. Four-fifths of respondents (79%) were either very supportive or supportive of CBJ limiting cruise volume. Sixteen percent were opposed, and 5% didn't know.

- Downtown/Thane and Out the Road residents were most likely to be very supportive (57% and 56%, respectively), followed by Douglas/West Juneau and North Douglas residents (49% and 48%, respectively).

**Table 22. Are you very supportive, supportive, opposed, or very opposed to CBJ limiting cruise ship volume? (%)**

n=518	% of Total
<b>Supportive TOTAL</b>	<b>79</b>
Very supportive	38
Supportive	41
<b>Opposed TOTAL</b>	<b>16</b>
Opposed	12
Very opposed	4
Don't know	5

**Table 23. SUPPORT BY NEIGHBORHOOD:  
"Very supportive" plus "Supportive" (%)**

	Downtown/ Thane n=79	Douglas/ West Juneau n=66	Creeks n=44	Mend. Valley n=212	North Douglas n=39	Out the Road n=78
<b>Supportive TOTAL</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>90</b>	<b>78</b>	<b>73</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>82</b>
Very supportive	57	49	26	29	48	56
Supportive	30	41	51	43	33	26
<b>Opposed TOTAL</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>13</b>
Opposed	8	6	16	13	13	10
Very opposed	5	1	3	6	3	3
Don't know	1	4	4	7	2	3

# Importance of Douglas Master Plan

After being told "Goldbelt has proposed to build a cruise ship destination on their land on the back side of Douglas," respondents were asked how important they think it is for CBJ to develop a Master Plan for the area. Over half of respondents (56%) said it was very important, 24% said it was somewhat important, and 16% said it was not important. Four percent didn't know.

While 2024 survey respondents were asked about their level of support for both the Douglas Goldbelt Dock Project and the downtown Huna Totem Dock Project, the question about the importance of a Master Plan for Douglas was new for 2025.

- Douglas/West Juneau residents were most likely to say a Master Plan is very important (76%), compared to residents of other areas (ranging from 46% to 66%).

**Table 24. How important do you think it is for CBJ to develop a Master Plan for the back side of Douglas? The plan would include both CBJ and Goldbelt lands and would address issues such as transportation, emergency services, and utilities. (%)**

n=518	% of Total
Very important	56
Somewhat important	24
Not important	16
Don't know	4

Asked whether they had concerns about this project, 60% of respondents answered affirmatively.

- Douglas/West Juneau residents were most likely to say they had concerns at 84%; this compares with 72% of North Douglas residents, 67% of Downtown/Thane and Out the Road residents, 55% of Valley residents, and 38% of Creeks residents.

**Table 25. Do you have any concerns about this project?**

n=518	% of Total
Yes	60
No	37
Don't know	4

Those that had concerns were asked to share their biggest concerns. The most common responses were road traffic on North Douglas (36%), environmental impacts (35%), and increased cruise traffic (22%). Many respondents (29%) shared “other” concerns that are provided in the Appendix.

- There were few statistically significant differences by neighborhood. Douglas/West Juneau and North Douglas residents more often mentioning road traffic on North Douglas (49% and 52%, respectively, compared with 30% to 35% among other areas).

**Table 26. What are your biggest concerns? (Multiple responses allowed)**  
Base: Has concerns

n=320	% of Base
Road traffic on N Douglas	36
Environmental impacts	35
Increased cruise traffic	22
Impacts to downtown businesses	14
Second Crossing	14
Vessel traffic on the water	11
Increased traffic to Mendenhall Glacier	8
Emergency service access	7
Vehicle traffic in Auke Bay	6
Loss of waterfront access and subsistence access	4
Bench Road	3
Eaglecrest Tram	2
Overall quality of life impacts	2
Outer Pt/False Outer Point	1
Other*	29

\*See Appendix for complete list of “Other” responses

# Tourism Employment

One-third of respondents (32%) said that they or a member of their household had been employed in the Juneau tourism industry sometime in the past five years.

**Table 27. Have you or any members of your household been employed in the Juneau tourism industry at any time during the past five years? (%)**

n=520	% of Total
Yes	32
No	68

Among those reporting a household member employed in tourism, the average number of household members employed in tourism was 1.6 people.

**Table 28. How many people? (%)**  
Base: Household member employed in tourism

n=143	% of Base
1	57
2	33
3	5
4+	5
Average	1.6 people

## Comparing to Past Surveys

The percentage of people saying a household member had been employed in tourism remained at 32% from 2024 to 2025 – matching the 2021 rate of 32%. The average number of household members employed decreased from 1.7 to 1.6.

**Table 29. TREND: Household Member Employed in Juneau Tourism 2021 to 2025**

	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	Change 2024-25
Household member employed	32%	38%	20%	32%	32%	-
Average number	1.5 people	1.8 people	1.6 people	1.7 people	1.6 people	-0.1 people

# Respondent Characteristics

The tables in this section show unweighted data to accurately reflect sample characteristics. (All survey data in the preceding tables was weighted by age, gender, and neighborhood of residence; please refer to Methodology section for more detail on weighting.)

Respondents were most likely to live in the Mendenhall Valley (41%) followed by Downtown/Thane and Brotherhood Bridge/Out the Road (both 15%), Douglas/West Juneau (13%), Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek/Switzer Creek (9%), and North Douglas (8%).

Respondents who reported being employed (66%) were most likely to work in Downtown/Thane (31%), followed by the Valley (22%) and Creeks (18%), with 11% working Borough-wide.

**Table 30. In which area of the City and Borough do you live? (All Respondents)**  
**In which area of the City and Borough do you work? (Base: Employed)**  
**UNWEIGHTED**

	n=520 LIVE % of Total	n=336 WORK % of Those Employed
Mendenhall Valley	41	22
Downtown/Thane	15	31
Brotherhood Bridge/Out the Road	15	7
Douglas/West Juneau	13	3
Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek/Switzer Creek	9	18
North Douglas	8	1
Outside of city	-	7
Borough-wide	-	11

**Table 31. Are you currently employed? (%)**  
**UNWEIGHTED**

n=514	% of Total
Yes	66
No	33
Don't know/refused	1

Just over half of respondents were male (54%) and fewer than half female (46%). Survey participants were not asked to identify their gender; instead, surveyors inferred respondents' gender. In instances where the surveyor was unsure of respondent gender, gender was labeled as "don't know."

**Table 32. Gender  
UNWEIGHTED**

n=514	% of Total
Male	54
Female	46
Don't know	<1

Respondents reported an average age of 53 years.

**Table 33. Age  
UNWEIGHTED**

n=486	% of Total
18-24	6
25-34	12
35-44	22
45-54	11
55-64	16
65-74	21
75+	12
<b>Average age</b>	<b>53 years old</b>

Respondents were most likely to report their race/ethnicity as White or Caucasian (75%) followed by Alaska Native/American Indian (14%). Respondents were allowed more than one response.

**Table 34. Race/Ethnicity  
UNWEIGHTED**

n=513	% of Total
White/Caucasian	75
Alaska Native/American Indian	14
Asian/Filipino	4
Latino/Hispanic	3
Black/African-American	2
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	1
Don't know	1
Refused	5

# Appendix

Following are three sets of comments from respondents:

- Comments regarding CBJ tourism priorities
- Comments about the project on the back side of Douglas.
- General comments shared throughout survey

## COMMENTS REGARDING CBJ TOURISM PRIORITIES

In response to the question, "Of the priorities just mentioned, which one do you think is MOST important?" The interviewers were instructed to record (but not ask specifically for comments about priorities) comments respondents offered.

- A bigger priority should be cruise waste management.
- Access to trails.
- All items are equally important. I am worried about getting sick from tourists.
- All of them are important.
- Auke Bay congestion involves boats, not cars. Regarding air emissions, I don't know how they affect us in the long run, such as whether they cause cancer. Cruise ships have scrubbers that are supposed to reduce emissions, but they consistently fail EPA tests. This is an important issue that needs to be addressed because these emissions enter the water, affect our ecosystem, and are not adequately enforced or policed.
- City buses are too full due to tourists with bikes.
- City buses are too full of tourists, making it difficult to get to work.
- Construction workers are impacted everywhere on the island.
- Cruise ship numbers need to be reduced to three. It is impossible to hold a conversation outdoors when helicopters are flying overhead.
- Cruise ship volume could be reduced to three to four ships per day. The CBJ is too influenced by the tourism industry. We have the product "the crown jewel that the cruise industry wants" and we should stand up for our own economy rather than conceding to industry demands. The cruise industry exploits workers, paying cleaning staff less than minimum wage. We can and should set the terms.
- Downtown congestion, including sidewalks, is so severe that I avoid the area. I am also very affected by whale-watching boats, as I am concerned about whales being followed too closely by too many vessels. The TMBP seems to cater to the tourism sector, and I feel that my concerns are not being heard. The most important priority is listening to residents. The city should also be surveying residents about hospital capacity, because when ships are in port, passengers use hospital services and resources. A ship fire ten years ago required all available ambulances, but what if someone outside of Auke Bay had a heart attack or other medical emergency?
- Downtown sidewalk congestion and flightseeing impacts are severe enough to justify the "very affected" designation. The current passenger limits and the five-ship limit do not seem to make much of a difference, as the number of passengers still feels too high. Assigning a high priority to the five-

ship limit does not mean that five ships is an appropriate number; fewer ships should be considered. The five-ship limit could remain if passenger numbers were reduced from the 2025 limits. The highest priority should be conventions and independent visitors, because they can come throughout the year, not just from May through September.

- Environmental financial funds are not available.
- Flightseeing noise is too high and is more impactful around the airport. Managing impacts on residents is a very high priority so that we can maintain support for the tourism industry among residents who are significantly affected.
- Hotels are too expensive for independent travelers.
- Hunting guide trips are negatively affected.
- I am a marine electrician and am opposed to cruise ships having shore power.
- I am concerned about environmental impacts from increased population on Douglas Island.
- I am concerned about the city becoming too heavy-handed with private industry. Cruise lines should limit themselves. We like seeing visitors enjoy the area, so flight noise and crowded trails indicate that people are enjoying the area.
- I am glad there are passenger and ship limits. However, I am concerned about public transit being overused by tourists. We still need tourists, so more events and conventions should be held during the off-season.
- I am not sure what you are asking about shore power, so I cannot prioritize this activity. My highest priority would be policies that help moderate environmental impacts from cruise ship emissions, as well as ethical practices within the tourism industry.
- I am pro-tourism; that is where our money comes from. Anything that detracts from tourism I am against, and anything that promotes it is the right direction to go.
- I am totally supportive of increased tourism from cruise ships.
- I am very disappointed in the monitoring and enforcement of the pre-agreed number of cruise ships and passenger limits.
- I do not see friends until tourists are gone. Only independent visitors add to our local economy.
- I do not think we should have a maximum number of cruise ships per day. We already have limits on what people can do here, such as buses to the glacier. I do not want cruise ships to have a monopoly on the business, and I also think it is silly to have a day without cruise ships. We need the revenue. However, if Travel Juneau brings in too many independent visitors, access to housing becomes very difficult or expensive. There needs to be more infrastructure to house visitors so that we do not lose housing to them. One solution is for the CBJ to become a shareholder, along with a group of investors, including locals, to build a hotel. The city could own 51 percent, and other local investors could own shares. This would allow everyone to receive a return on the investment each year. This avoids a monopoly and benefits the community.
- I have avoidance strategies during the summer to avoid congestion, and I think the limit on ships should be fewer than five large ships per day. My highest priority, however, is reducing the impact of whale-watching and charter boats, especially in Auke Bay.
- I know Alex Pierce, an executive with CBJ tourism, and I have shared my concerns with her.
- I learned the most about the TMBP from the questions here. The cruise ship limit should be lowered to a maximum of two to three ships per day. The highest priority is reducing the daily ship limit to two, with a maximum of three ships per day. Auke Bay should not be an alternative destination or moorage.
- I like limited trails for commercial use.
- I support growth and increased housing.

- I support independent visitors.
- I support keeping Juneau as it is and not expanding cruise ship docks, such as on the backside of Douglas Island.
- I support tourism, and we recognize it is a huge part of our economy, but the CBJ needs to look at common-sense solutions to impacts such as congested roads. We would support tourism more if these problems were managed better.
- I would also like impacts from tours to be better managed for residents.
- I would like cruise ships to be further limited or made smaller. Boat traffic and wakes are excessive and cause significant impacts.
- I would like fewer than five ships per day.
- I would like the cruise ship limit lowered.
- I would like to further reduce passenger and cruise ship volume limits.
- I would like to lower the cruise ship limit.
- If conventions are brought in, they should be held during the off-season.
- If money is being made from tourism, it should benefit taxpayers and small mom-and-pop businesses operated by year-round residents, not large chain cruise lines and their affiliated shops.
- Independent travelers spend more.
- Juneau has only one electrified dock, and AEL&P allows only interruptible power. They say they cannot justify additional fully electrified docks. The ship limit is voluntary, but we should have only two ships per day or 10,000 people per day. We want to avoid lawsuits from hard limits, but we still need enforceable limits. Cruising is a lucrative business, but at what point do we say enough is enough? We are beyond the marginal rate of disutility. I used to never leave Juneau in the summer, but now I leave in July and August because of cruise crowding. Another high priority is creating incentives for electric buses and cars to eliminate emissions in town and take advantage of Juneau's clean hydroelectric power.
- Keep trails in the best condition.
- Keeping tourism in Juneau is the highest priority. Noise comes from the military, not flightseeing. Auke Bay traffic is not caused by tourism. The city needs to keep listening to reasonable residents.
- Large cruise ships place heavy demands on community resources. Grocery stores run out of staples, and hospitals are impacted when inundated with cruise passengers, increasing wait times for long-term residents. Regarding the five-ship limit, I am unsure whether it is sufficient and think it may be better to lower it.
- Let the crossing guards do their jobs.
- Limit cruise ship volume.
- Limit cruise ships and passenger numbers even more.
- Limiting cruise ships is government overreach. Downtown sidewalk congestion benefits downtown businesses. Completing the waterfront walk is also the highest priority, along with supporting Travel Juneau.
- Limiting tourism is the highest priority.
- Lower the cruise ship limit.
- Lower the cruise ship limit.
- Lower the passenger cap.
- Lower the ship limit.
- Lowering the cruise ship limits.

- Managing tourism flow during five-ship days is important. I avoid downtown entirely, but we need the revenue from tourists.
- Minimize the cruise ship limit in Juneau.
- My entire family works in tourism, and five ships per day is too many.
- Not limiting cruise ships is also a priority because tourism brings in money.
- Nothing can be done about traffic congestion, so why ask about it?
- Overall, I have no problems with the tourism industry. They seem to manage it fairly well, although you can never make everyone happy.
- Passenger limits are also needed to improve residents' quality of life during the summer.
- Passenger volume needs to be controlled because crossing guard issues are problematic.
- Please limit cruise ships to one per day, out of respect for the way Alaskans value wildlife, land, water, and neighbors. People come here for the beauty of the environment, resources, and cultures, and tourism has diminished that experience. The number of people on downtown sidewalks makes it very challenging for wheelchair users to navigate. The crowds impede tourists as well, not just wheelchair users. At times, there is very little security downtown. On one occasion, I witnessed a homeless individual yelling at foreign-born crew members and a young couple trying to eat lunch. I intervened and redirected the individual, but I should not have to put myself in that position at this stage of life. I greeted the workers and the couple and apologized on the town's behalf. Tourism can unify people, but when it becomes too large and overwhelming, it strains community resources.
- Proposed projects would pass through crabbing and fishing grounds.
- Raise taxes on visitors.
- Reduce waste in the water through shore power.
- Reliable internet downtown is poor and becomes especially unreliable on large-ship days. Powering ships while they are in port does not seem cost-effective for the CBJ given the problems it causes. Starting work at 7:00 a.m. on large-ship days is difficult due to unreliable internet and limited parking.
- Resident complaints calling for zero tourism are unreasonable.
- Safety is a concern.
- She would like ship limits reduced to three per day.
- She would like the ship limit lowered to fewer than five ships per day.
- Shore power is important due to diesel fumes and air quality concerns.
- Temporary bus jobs are low-paying and do not significantly benefit local residents.
- The CBJ does not go far enough in limiting cruise ships. The limit should be lower than five large ships per day, and total passenger visitation should also be lower, including limits on crew workers. That is why "refused" was selected for those questions.
- The CBJ is making the Goldbelt dock too complicated.
- The CBJ shows zero accountability and a lack of leadership and is doing a poor job managing this situation.
- The CBJ's hands are tied regarding road congestion, and there is not much they can do. Managing tourism impacts on residents "not just tours" is important, but I am not sure we have the resources to manage the numbers.
- The city does not know enough about the project, which could undermine progress already made with the cap.
- The city needs to address this at a financial level, such as increasing docking fees.
- The city needs to better manage foot traffic downtown.
- The City of Juneau is greedy and selfish.

- The cruise ship and passenger limits are not a big deal to me. Let the private sector and the energy sector deal with shore power. The Tourism Department is not effective in its current role. I think they would be better off stepping back and doing something constructive, whatever that may be.
- The five-ship limit and passenger cap need to be lowered.
- The five-ship limit applies to downtown only, and I am not concerned about ships elsewhere.
- The five-ship limit does not go far enough; we should ideally have fewer ships and passengers. Five ships completely block my view of the water, which is very distressing during the summer. Crowding on the docks also impedes my access to the downtown core, including places like the library. I recognize that tourism is a positive part of our economy, and I appreciate that people come to Alaska and value Juneau. However, I would like time in the summer when there are not thousands of people on the docks and five cruise ships present. I was very supportive of the Saturday "Free Day" with no cruises. I also recognize that tourism brings summer jobs and interesting young people to work here, and I support that as well.
- The highest priority is having even fewer cruise ships per day, such as limiting to three large cruise ships per day, which would help reduce congestion.
- The limit of five ships should be reduced to four ships.
- The more visitors, the better, due to sales tax revenue. Traffic congestion is managed smoothly by the summer buses and works very well.
- The only issue I care about in advising the tourism board is stopping construction of the North Douglas cruise ship dock.
- The participant avoids Mendenhall Glacier because of the tours. The participant's experience is that the five-ship limit is not followed. The participant thinks rerouting foot traffic via the Seawalk would be a good idea but does not think businesses would enjoy this change.
- The participant is an electrician and has had trouble getting to downtown job sites due to buses and difficulty finding parking.
- The participant is concerned about the addition of two more cruise lines on the backside of Douglas Island being counted outside the five-ship limit.
- The participant supports promoting conventions during the off-season, but not during the summer when tourist numbers are high, because there is not enough hotel capacity.
- The participant thinks the five-ship limit should be lowered to fewer than five ships per day. If able to choose more than one "most important" priority, I would also select the daily passenger cap.
- The participant would like cruise ship and passenger caps reduced so Juneau is less congested and tourists can better enjoy their visits.
- The project is too large, too expensive, and does not provide enough benefits for year-round residents.
- The reason for assigning a low priority to convention promotion by Travel Juneau is the strain it places on very limited housing infrastructure. If more housing were available, it would rank higher. The Ironman Race is an example of this strain. The top priority is a combined passenger and ship limit, with the ship limit being the highest priority for data collection. Glacier congestion is only rated as "somewhat impactful" due to avoidance strategies.
- The respondent selected "somewhat affected" because they already avoid impacted areas to reduce exposure, as the impacts are severe. The TMBP comes across as industry-first, so its hotline may not be as effective because it appears to prioritize industry and residents involved in tourism, even though they are also Juneau residents.

- The respondent's biggest concern is ensuring there is enough space for cruise ships to dock. She thinks it would be a good idea to stagger ship arrival times.
- The Seawalk can be somewhat dangerous during periods of heavy traffic. The TMBP hotline is often a source of complaints from older residents who do not want change, which can clutter the system even when tourism is beneficial.
- The ship limit should be reduced to four per day.
- The tourism industry pays for electricity and helps fund Juneau.
- There are both good and bad points to the project.
- There are far too many whale-watching boats.
- There should be fewer than five ships per day.
- There were more than five ships in port.
- This is a high priority because managing impacts on residents and working with everyone to find middle ground is essential, even though I am not sure how feasible that is. The highest priority is working with the community.
- This person was conflicted on items F and G. They support the tourist population in Juneau but were not comfortable supporting an agency they were not familiar with, in this case Travel Juneau. They did not like the question being tied to a specific entity.
- Tourism has a positive overall impact on the community. I am retired and live in the Valley, so I am not as directly affected by tourism, but it is important and necessary for our economy.
- Tourism is our summer economy, and with no road access, it is a critical part of our livelihood.
- Traffic should be spread out more evenly.
- Vehicle congestion has affected more residents.
- We avoid downtown due to congestion.
- We avoid downtown during the summer.
- We did not notice a significant difference between having more than five ships per day and having five ships per day, which seems acceptable.
- We need more independent visitors because they spend money in town.
- We need to attract more people to Juneau while managing the resulting impacts.
- We need to have the Auke Bay bypass.
- Whale-watching tours disrupt marine life, bother whales, create large wakes, and negatively affect commercial fishermen.

#### **COMMENTS ABOUT THE PROJECT ON THE BACK SIDE OF DOUGLAS.**

- A master plan must address all services, including EMS, hospitals, roads, and quality of life, and include a clear cutoff point.
- A road was built on North Douglas but does not allow vehicle traffic.
- A second crossing would negatively affect land, wildlife, and hunting.
- Access to hunting on the backside of Douglas Island is a concern.
- Additional tourists are expected.
- An infrastructure plan needs to be developed.
- Any companies building on North Douglas must coordinate with the Native corporation.
- Are the two ships that can dock there part of the daily five-ship limit, or are they in addition? They say they will not bring passengers into town—how will those people be transported to the glacier? Which roads will be impacted, and will electric vehicles be used? Icy Strait is an interesting model, and I do

not begrudge the Native corporations for doing that, but they could be more upfront with the CBJ about planning. A comprehensive plan with the city is important. For example, Goldbelt began clearing land on North Douglas, which is their right, but they clear-cut and denied access to a commonly used trail without preparing the city or residents. Why not communicate this in advance? We are all part of the same city, and they need to be a good corporate citizen.

- As long as Goldbelt or another entity has a plan to address these issues, the CBJ does not necessarily need to. My main concern is what the CBJ would do on that property compared to Goldbelt's plan.
- Cap limits are a concern.
- CBJ involvement is a concern.
- City funds should not be used for this project.
- Congestion will increase, possibly requiring new roads or bridges.
- Construction would occur in clamping and fishing areas.
- Cost is a concern.
- Costs are passed to the CBJ while benefits remain with Goldbelt.
- Cruise ship waste released into waterways is a concern.
- Cruise ships pay a head tax per passenger that must be used for cruise-related purposes. Why is the city not using those funds to support community services such as EMS and the hospital, which cruise ships rely on heavily? The community should be able to use those funds for essential services used by cruise passengers.
- Cultural sensitivity is important.
- Decisions are being made in secret, and CBJ has little control.
- Decisions on the project depend on CBJ involvement.
- Electrical capacity is a concern. We do not currently have the infrastructure to support cruise ships, and the hospital is overloaded when there are more than five ships in port. The Ironman race demonstrated how the emergency department was overwhelmed. A solid plan is needed before implementing Goldbelt's proposal.
- Electricity and transportation capacity are major concerns due to distance.
- Environmental and financial responsibility are important.
- Everything related to infrastructure is a concern.
- Financial impacts on Juneau are a concern.
- Fishing on the backside of Douglas would be impacted.
- Fishing opportunities would decline.
- Flightseeing noise will increase.
- Funding and cost are concerns.
- Goldbelt can do what it wants with its land, but the community impacts must be considered.
- Goldbelt is going to ruin the land.
- Goldbelt may do a better job managing its own emergency services.
- Goldbelt needs more city oversight.
- Goldbelt needs to improve communication and transparency regarding its plans.
- Goldbelt should be allowed to do what it wants because it owns the land.
- Goldbelt should be responsible for roads, emergency services, and related infrastructure.
- Government should stay out of it.
- Hoonah's model feels disconnected from the town and artificial. While infrastructure such as walkways, lighting, and restrooms is well done, there should be collaboration so visitors can experience the real Juneau. The Goldbelt project should not become an isolated, theme-park-like destination.

- Housing impacts are a concern.
- Human congestion is a concern.
- Hunting access will be affected.
- I am against this project.
- I am concerned about a lack of communication and transparency from developers. Policies meant to reduce ship and passenger numbers may be worked around or manipulated.
- I am concerned about how this will affect the local economy.
- I am concerned about North Douglas residents maintaining their sense of seclusion and about negative impacts spreading to South Douglas, where I live.
- I am concerned Goldbelt may not comply with NEPA requirements or fully analyze impacts on residents' quality of life.
- I am concerned that the cruise ship limit will increase.
- I am concerned that the Goldbelt plan could reduce income for downtown businesses, although I do not know enough yet, which is concerning in itself.
- I am concerned this could become a casino.
- I am curious about what the plans are.
- I am excited about Goldbelt's plans and respect their autonomy. CBJ should ensure compatibility but not dominate Goldbelt's planning.
- I am generally in favor, with good planning.
- I am unclear whether the five-ship-per-day limit includes the North Douglas port and how this would affect traffic at Mendenhall Glacier. I am also concerned about what happens to the area when cruise ships are not present.
- I am very against this project.
- I am worried about building a road capable of supporting tour bus traffic.
- I believe this is a bad idea because it encroaches on valuable land and resources. Any development should prioritize citizens, not tourists.
- I do not want the backside of Douglas to become like Icy Point in Hoonah. Past CBJ efforts there have failed, making me concerned about further investment directed by tourism operators.
- I do not want the CBJ involved in the project.
- I feel the possibility of catastrophic failure is high.
- I have many concerns, but it feels like the decision has already been made.
- I have no specific concerns.
- I have no specific opinion.
- I have no strong answer.
- I hope the project is done well.
- I live in North Douglas and disapprove of Goldbelt's proposal due to existing downtown congestion.
- I personally do not have major issues, but North Douglas residents are upset about traffic. A master plan would help clarify impacts. One ship docking elsewhere could reduce downtown congestion.
- I support tribal development and the associated economic boost.
- I want to keep Juneau natural and preserve the landscape.
- I would like current activities such as hiking to remain.
- I would like to have input on the project and how it affects residents.
- I would like to keep North Douglas peaceful.

- I would like to know more about the plans. I am concerned about a potential doubling of visitors and the long-term impact on Southeast Alaska. Free enterprise is important, but controls and a partnership between CBJ and Goldbelt are necessary.
- If this project is a done deal, then a comprehensive plan is a high priority.
- Increased wakes and whale-watching will harm fishing.
- It is a long distance to the destination.
- It is difficult to get a taxi ride.
- It is emotionally and psychologically difficult to see visitors disrespect the land.
- It is Goldbelt's land, and they should have a say in how it is developed.
- It is Goldbelt's land, but they need a plan to get visitors downtown, or downtown businesses will suffer.
- It is surprising and concerning that Goldbelt has not presented a master plan, despite benefiting the most.
- Juneau residents are frustrated by the burden this creates.
- Leave Douglas alone.
- Local residents who walk on the waterfront beach are affected and can no longer access the beach.
- Local walking areas along the waterfront would be negatively affected.
- Many people hunt in that area.
- Moorage fees and head taxes should not be exempt from borough requirements. Exemptions would cause major revenue loss.
- More community input is needed.
- More ships would mean more revenue for the capital.
- My only concern is increased marine traffic in north Juneau.
- None of these concerns seem valid to me; people are just complaining.
- Passenger caps are important.
- Passenger numbers will increase.
- Population growth is a concern.
- Prime fishing grounds would be lost.
- Proper permits must be obtained.
- Public transportation issues are a concern.
- Qualified personnel may be lacking.
- Recreation opportunities could be limited.
- Resident impacts are a concern.
- Resident voices are being limited.
- Revenue should stay within the city.
- Road and highway maintenance is a concern.
- Road congestion will increase, and a master plan does not guarantee action.
- Road safety needs to be managed.
- Roads need to be brought up to standard.
- Sewer treatment capacity and funding are insufficient.
- She lives in Douglas and is generally concerned.
- She worries development will affect local businesses and access to fishing and camping.
- Ship limits are a concern.
- Some residents escape tourism by going to Douglas Island.
- The biggest concern is the ecological impact on wildlife and undeveloped terrain.

- The business may not benefit Juneau directly, similar to Hoonah.
- The CBJ should not pay for the project but should be involved. Traffic on North Douglas Highway must be addressed first.
- The CBJ will make a mess of the plan, while Goldbelt is better at planning for its properties. Goldbelt should be allowed to do what it wants and make its own plans for its land.
- The city and borough should not give rights-of-way to private property owners.
- The community faces too many negative impacts, while benefits mainly go to the cruise industry.
- The economy is a concern.
- The five-ship limit could be negatively impacted.
- The five-ship limit has already been exceeded.
- The lack of a second bridge is a concern.
- The master plan is important because I do not want this project at all.
- The participant dislikes Goldbelt's business practices and lives in North Douglas.
- The participant does not want more people on North Douglas.
- The participant is concerned about economic feasibility and whether Juneau can support two ports.
- The participant is concerned about North Douglas residents who value solitude and nature.
- The participant is concerned cruise ships take over local areas without creating long-term jobs.
- The participant is concerned that Douglas lacks utilities and emergency services to support the proposed scale of development.
- The participant lives in Douglas and is concerned about infrastructure capacity.
- The participant would prefer North Douglas to remain pristine.
- The project must be managed properly.
- The project would disrupt residents' peace and fisheries.
- The road should be widened.
- There are concerns about economic impact.
- There are concerns about fuel use and resource impacts.
- There are concerns about infrastructure.
- There is a lack of infrastructure to support a port on the backside of Douglas. The CBJ needs to address road issues.
- There is a lack of transparency, and existing roads would be used without funding maintenance.
- There is concern about whether a second crossing would be built in time.
- There is concern that City Hall will undermine community growth.
- There is misinformation from Goldbelt. Tourism should not dictate economic flow; balance is needed.
- There is only one bridge and evacuation route.
- There is uncertainty about Goldbelt's broader plans for its land.
- There needs to be better communication between the CBJ, Goldbelt, and contractors.
- There needs to be more input from Goldbelt.
- There should be compensation to the City of Juneau.
- There should be input from tribes.
- There will be impacts on existing limits.
- There will be impacts on North Douglas residents.
- There would be an increase in daily visitors.
- This area is critical for subsistence hunting, and further development is unnecessary. A casino would harm the community, increase homelessness, and overwhelm infrastructure.

- This could affect residents who live in the area.
- This could be very good for Juneau, but the CBJ needs to ensure it does not negatively impact North Douglas residents. Bench Road should be far enough from homes to avoid noise and traffic impacts. I support the project as long as visitation is included in the five-ship limit and not added on top of it.
- This could become a “mini Disneyland.”
- This could help spread tourists around the Juneau Borough.
- This is a complex project, and collaboration will be difficult.
- This is a waste of money.
- This is not in the best interest of the city or locals.
- This is on Goldbelt land.
- This project could disrupt wildlife. While tourism is important, maintaining proper habitat is a higher priority than expanding cruise ship access.
- This project will mostly benefit Goldbelt.
- This would be bad for the local economy and could increase taxes.
- This would bring more people into town.
- This would bring more problems.
- Tourists should pay sales tax on cruise ship purchases. Goldbelt should not bus visitors long distances.
- Trail systems used by hikers and hunters would be lost.
- Trails, wildlands, and the Mendenhall Game Refuge should be preserved.
- Transparency is essential.
- Vehicle congestion will increase.
- Wear and tear on infrastructure is a concern.
- Where will the power come from? How will 10,000 people travel on a two-lane road to Mendenhall Glacier?
- Who will pay for the roads?
- Why build a cruise ship dock far from downtown? I do not yet understand how this would work.
- Will the ship limit remain at five, or will it increase to seven?
- Worker safety is a concern.
- Would this require building a second or third bridge?
- Young’s Bay traffic would increase, and further land clearing is unnecessary.

## GENERAL COMMENTS

- Additional concern regarding decreasing Wi-Fi quality.
- Airplane mechanic concerned about who pays for development on the backside of Douglas; feels it should not be CBJ.
- Alaska Native elder avoids visitor areas during peak seasons.
- Appreciates CBJ outreach and stresses the importance of maintaining ship and passenger caps.
- Appreciates the opportunity to participate in the survey.
- As a North Douglas resident, feels the Goldbelt development would create major traffic issues; believes CBJ has not managed tourism well and that voters have little say; concerned that a casino would take money away from CBJ.

- As an employee of the tourism industry, he would benefit directly if the daily ship and passenger cap was increased.
- Avoided Mendenhall Glacier due to tourist congestion.
- Avoids downtown and Mendenhall due to congestion; believes helicopter noise can be regulated.
- Avoids downtown and Mendenhall Glacier due to tourists.
- Believes a master plan must be in place before the next tourist season.
- Believes CBJ and Goldbelt are wasting money and that cruise companies should pay for master planning.
- Believes CBJ failed to engage Goldbelt land planning over decades and supports destination-style tourism.
- Believes CBJ is poorly managed and does not want it involved in any development.
- Believes city leadership should listen to those managing impacted areas.
- Believes cruise ships funnel money into their own businesses, limiting local benefit.
- Believes government should stay out of Douglas development and objects to demographic questions.
- Believes homelessness should be prioritized over Goldbelt master planning.
- Believes the cruise industry should not increase because impacts outweigh benefits.
- Believes the tourism department prioritizes cruise industry interests.
- Believes there should be no further development on Douglas Island involving Goldbelt or city lands.
- Believes Travel Juneau is unresponsive to calls and emails.
- Caller feels whale-watching boat wakes drive away fish and create unsafe conditions for small boats; strongly opposed to a second crossing; feels tourists should be kept off North Douglas and that development would take money away from downtown.
- Caller's two adult children worked in tourism; feels the ship limit should be raised and supports relocating the Coast Guard to Auke Bay and completing the Seawalk.
- CBJ has not managed its trails well at all and should stay out of private, corporate, and Goldbelt enterprises; quoted Thomas Jefferson: "Those that govern least, govern best."
- Concerned about budgeting for the new Goldbelt dock and impacts on wildlife.
- Concerned about excessive visitor volume and housing impacts from short-term tourism workers.
- Concerned about Goldbelt adding additional cruise ships to Douglas Island and how many per day.
- Concerned about increased cruise ships from Juneau and additional congestion on Douglas Island.
- Concerned about increased ship and passenger caps, new roads, and a second crossing.
- Concerned about increased traffic and environmental impacts but supports increased business economically.
- Concerned about increased traffic and environmental impacts related to the Goldbelt Douglas cruise ship dock.
- Concerned about lack of development on North Douglas, including retail, services, housing, and infrastructure.
- Concerned about overcrowding near whale-watching areas and impacts to fishing and hunting.
- Concerned about parking, infrastructure limits, and lack of resident-focused questions in the survey.
- Concerned about rumors of a casino.
- Concerned about sidewalk congestion forcing pedestrians into streets and about whale impacts from boat traffic.
- Concerned about traffic, ship numbers, and new bridges related to Goldbelt docks.
- Concerned about where and how waste from the ships is being disposed of.
- Current harbor services where boats launch in North Douglas are already poor.

- Douglas development would benefit both Douglas and Juneau economically.
- Douglas resident who enjoys the tram area but is concerned about increased traffic.
- Emphasizes emergency service access as a major concern.
- Enjoys cultural exposure from tourism but avoids downtown during peak events.
- Experienced near-capsizing from tour boat wakes and driveway blockages from tour buses; concerned about bridge planning.
- Feels a master plan should be created for Goldbelt development to increase the likelihood of success.
- Feels CBJ is poorly organized and should not be involved in cruise infrastructure.
- Feels CBJ is selling borough access to the cruise industry; supports shore power only if ships pay; believes the five-ship limit is good but should be lowered.
- Feels CBJ made a major mistake allowing this development and wasting money on projects like the Eaglecrest tram and City Hall, which will raise property taxes.
- Feels CBJ prioritizes cruise revenue over resident voices and pushes toward a second crossing.
- Feels CBJ should allow Goldbelt to build the dock without interference.
- Feels CBJ should better manage public transportation impacts and keep ship limits.
- Feels Goldbelt should carry the majority of financial and environmental responsibility for the dock and infrastructure, not the City and Borough of Juneau.
- Feels CBJ should prioritize community benefits over cruise industry profits.
- Feels CBJ will not decrease ship limits due to greed and should improve North Douglas Highway before allowing development.
- Feels Douglas will be overrun with pollution if redevelopment begins.
- Feels downtown congestion is driven more by homelessness than tourists and enjoys visitors on trails.
- Feels fishing impacts must be considered in all decisions.
- Feels full responsibility for the new dock and infrastructure should rest with Goldbelt, not the City of Juneau.
- Feels Goldbelt development will increase traffic on North Douglas and in the Mendenhall Valley and that caps will not be followed.
- Feels helicopter noise, air pollution, and cruise impacts are a massive nuisance; believes CBJ is misleading residents.
- Feels impacts on cell phone service should be addressed.
- Feels infrastructure investments do not benefit residents and that residents are treated as second-class citizens.
- Feels Juneau is safer during tourist season, though parking downtown is difficult.
- Feels Juneau needs a more diverse economy and less reliance on tourism.
- Feels limits on ships and passengers should be removed and that CBJ should focus on better management instead.
- Feels recreational use on Douglas Island would be destroyed by visitors and that the daily ship limit should be lowered to three.
- Feels TBMP does not address resident concerns.
- Feels TBMP lacks visibility and ship limits are ineffective; believes residents must be included in carrying capacity decisions.
- Feels that CBJ is not well suited to manage any aspect of new cruise ship docks and that Goldbelt should have the majority of development responsibility; also worried about a second crossing affecting traffic and the environment.
- Feels that the Goldbelt Douglas Island new cruise ship dock is totally unnecessary.

- Feels that the new cruise ship dock on Douglas Island should be Goldbelt's responsibility and that the City of Juneau should not take on any debt or responsibility for maintaining infrastructure.
- Feels the City and Borough could do better managing downtown traffic.
- Feels the city is declining due to prioritizing cruise industry demands.
- Feels the Goldbelt project could help the city if done correctly.
- Feels the new Goldbelt dock is a very bad idea and will burden infrastructure with traffic and pollution.
- Feels the project would be a good investment for the Native corporation and help visitors learn more about Native culture.
- Feels the tourism industry overall has a negative impact due to waste dumping, congestion, and environmental harm; supports lowering ship limits and opposes Douglas Island development.
- Feels tourism greed is eroding Juneau's environment, infrastructure, and long-term livability.
- Feels tourism has an overall negative impact but acknowledges specific impacts vary.
- Feels tourism is generally positive if well managed and preferable to industrial alternatives.
- Former CBJ employee with strong opinions about cruise ship involvement at both Juneau docks and the proposed Goldbelt Douglas plan; primarily concerned about environmental impacts, increased traffic, and access to Juneau with a second bridge.
- Fully supportive of cruise ship passengers and a Douglas Island dock.
- Fully supportive of increased visitors and the Goldbelt project and new dock.
- Fully supportive of the new Goldbelt dock and believes Douglas needs infrastructure development.
- Goldbelt shareholder concerned that Douglas development would harm the local economy and increase taxes.
- Goldbelt shareholder who strongly supports Douglas development.
- Huge concern about increasing passenger numbers beyond caps and the effects on traffic, environment, and local access.
- Is not anti-tourism but wants it balanced with residents' quality of life.
- Main concerns are environmental impacts and safety.
- Major concerns about construction intent, environmental impacts, and ensuring revenue supports CBJ.
- Most concerned about environmental impacts.
- Mother and adult son with autism both worked in tourism and live in the Mendenhall Valley.
- Observes significant wildlife disruption on Douglas during cruise season due to ship vibration and traffic.
- Opposed to adding a cruise ship dock on Douglas Island; feels it is unnecessary and will increase traffic problems.
- Opposes gondola proposals and believes they will worsen congestion.
- Owns a downtown shop.
- Regarding Goldbelt: Excited to see private business developing new economic opportunities and jobs; concerned that a CBJ master plan could slow Goldbelt's work on its own land.
- Regarding TBMP: Effectiveness depends on household perspective; feels CBJ does a good job balancing tourism needs and that tourism is necessary for the economy.
- Respondent had to leave early because her appointment arrived at her office.
- Retired gentleman who is indifferent to the tourism industry.
- Retired gentleman with a very low opinion of CBJ management.
- Retired teacher who lives on the backside of Douglas Island and has very little interaction with Juneau cruise ships.

- Self-employed business owner feels CBJ could better represent the community and spend tax money more wisely; believes any Douglas development should be planned better to serve the entire community, not just tourists.
- Senior citizen who lived in Skagway most of her life and now lives in a Juneau retirement home; has total support for the tourism industry.
- Seventy-year-old caller believes CBJ officials favor cruise lines and that negative impacts outweigh benefits.
- Somewhat affected by vehicle congestion downtown and avoids the area due to traffic.
- Son works for Uber and benefits from tourism; feels downtown is not too crowded.
- South Douglas resident wants a master plan and laws in place before development.
- Strongly concerned that hospital and emergency services cannot handle more than five large ships per day.
- Supports CBJ and Goldbelt collaboration if managed properly.
- Supports closing downtown streets to cars.
- Supports Goldbelt maximizing revenue due to job creation and sees it as an opportunity for CBJ involvement.
- Supports higher head taxes to fund infrastructure and mitigate cruise impacts.
- Supports increasing ship limits while minimizing passenger caps.
- Supports limiting ships to two per day but supports Douglas development with careful planning.
- Supports ownership thresholds like those in Ketchikan to protect local businesses.
- Supports road upgrades to reduce congestion related to Goldbelt development.
- Supports shore power and is concerned about whale-watching wakes and downtown air emissions.
- Supports wider sidewalks and improved downtown pedestrian safety while opposing visitor limits.
- The Douglas Goldbelt development is a good opportunity for CBJ to develop its Master Plan proactively rather than reactively to changes in the CBJ area.
- Thinks the Goldbelt cruise port is unnecessary and would like to see a ship limit of two or fewer per day.
- Traffic through downtown from Thane Road is terrible.
- Unhappy with downtown parking; supports shore power to reduce air pollution and increase revenue.
- Upset about being contacted for the survey.
- Very concerned about trail loss and wildlife impacts on Douglas Island.
- Very concerned about wastewater, refuse, and environmental impacts from cruise ships.
- Very upset about whale-watching boat traffic affecting fishing livelihoods.
- Wants to decrease the daily number of ships.
- Wants to reinstate no-ship Saturdays and raise sales tax to 7.5%.
- Was not affected by the visitor industry due to limited mobility.
- When all five ships are docked, Juneau feels overcrowded and limits resident access to resources; concerned about taxes, landfill capacity, and lack of a master plan.
- Works in a downtown store; sees traffic as both a benefit and a challenge.
- Works in healthcare and marine electrical fields and questions classification of tourism employment.
- Works with special-needs children and finds Mendenhall Glacier too congested.
- Would like cruise ship limits lower than five.
- Would like to see major development of Douglas Island.
- Would like to see visitor numbers reduced due to worsening congestion and environmental impacts.

Interviewer Name \_\_\_\_\_

Phone Number \_\_\_\_\_

## Juneau Visitor Industry Survey 2025

Hello, this is \_\_\_\_\_ with McKinley Research. We are helping the City and Borough of Juneau with a study about the visitor industry. Can I ask you a few questions?

- 1. Do you currently live in Juneau?** 01 Yes 02 No (Thank and end)
- 2. Did you live in Juneau this past summer?** 01 Yes 02 No (Thank and end)
- 3. Do you feel the visitor industry has an overall positive impact, negative impact, both negative and positive impacts, or no impact at all on your household?**  
01 Positive impact (skip to Q5) 03 Both (ask 4) 05 Don't know (skip to Q5)  
02 Negative impact (skip to Q5) 04 No impact at all (skip to Q5) 06 Refused (skip to Q5)
- 4. Do you feel the positive impacts outweigh the negative impacts or do the negative impacts outweigh the positive impacts?**  
01 Positive impacts outweigh negative 03 Neutral/neither 05 Refused  
02 Negative impacts outweigh positive 04 Don't know
- 5. For each of the following visitor-related impacts, was your household very affected, somewhat affected, or not affected in 2025?**  
*By "affected" we mean changing your use of an area in addition to other kinds of impacts.*

ROTATE	Very affected	Somewhat affected	Not affected	Don't Know	Refused
a. Vehicle congestion downtown	1	2	3	4	5
b. Vehicle congestion in Auke Bay	1	2	3	4	5
c. Vehicle congestion on North Douglas	1	2	3	4	5
d. Crowding on sidewalks downtown	1	2	3	4	5
e. Crowding on trails	1	2	3	4	5
f. Crowding at Mendenhall Glacier	1	2	3	4	5
g. Whale watching boat traffic and wakes	1	2	3	4	5
h. Flightseeing noise	1	2	3	4	5
i. Air emissions from cruise ships	1	2	3	4	5

- 6. Do you think the City and Borough of Juneau is doing more than enough, not enough, or just the right amount to manage the impacts of the visitor industry?**

01 More than enough 03 Just the right amount 05 Refused  
02 Not enough 04 Don't know

7. The Tourism Best Management Practices program, also known as TBMP, is intended to reduce impacts in the community. It includes a hotline for reporting concerns about tourism. Are you very familiar, somewhat familiar, or not familiar with this program?

01 Very familiar	03 Not familiar (skip to read)
02 Somewhat familiar	04 DK/Refused (skip to read)

8. Do you think this program has been very effective, somewhat effective, or not effective at managing tourism impacts on residents?

01 Very effective	03 Not effective
02 Somewhat effective	04 DK/Refused

READ: CBJ has made agreements with cruise lines to have a limit of five large ships per day, and to cap the number of daily passengers.

9. Are you very supportive, supportive, opposed, or very opposed to CBJ limiting cruise ship volume?

01 Very supportive	03 Opposed	05 Don't know
02 Supportive	04 Very opposed	06 Refused

10. The next question is asking about priorities for the CBJ Tourism Department. Should they place a high priority, medium priority, low priority, or not a priority on each of the following items. At the end, I will ask you which one is your highest priority, so keep that in mind as I read these through.

ROTATE	High priority	Medium priority	Low priority	Not a priority	Don't Know	Refused
a. Shore power	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Reducing traffic congestion	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Completing the Seawalk from the whale statue to the Rock Dump	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Keeping the five-ship limit	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Keeping the daily passenger cap	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting independent visitors	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting conventions	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Managing impacts from tours on residents	1	2	3	4	5	6

11. Of the priorities just mentioned, which one do you think is MOST important?

1. a. Shore power	6. f. Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting independent visitors
2. b. Reducing traffic congestion	7. g. Supporting Travel Juneau in attracting conventions
3. c. Completing the Seawalk from the whale statue to the Rock Dump	8. h. Managing impacts from tours on residents
4. d. Keeping the five-ship limit	9. Don't know
5. e. Keeping the daily passenger cap	10. Refused

12. ENTER COMMENTS IF ANY OFFERED – DON'T ASK

01 No comment

**READ: Goldbelt has proposed to build a cruise ship destination on their land on the back side of Douglas.**

**13. How important do you think it is for CBJ to develop a Master Plan for the back side of Douglas? The plan would include both CBJ and Goldbelt lands and would address issues such as transportation, emergency services, and utilities. Read 1-3**

1 Very important	3 Not important	5 Refuse
2 Somewhat important	4 Don't know	

**14. Do you have any concerns about this project?**

1 Yes	2 No (skip to read)	3 Don't know (skip to read)
-------	---------------------	-----------------------------

**15. What are your biggest concerns? (DO NOT READ; check all that apply)**

1 Road traffic on North Douglas	6 Outer Point/False Outer Point	11 Increased traffic to Mendenhall Glacier
2 Second Crossing	7 Vehicle traffic in Auke Bay	12 Emergency service access
3 Bench Road	8 Vessel traffic on the water businesses	13 Other _____
4 Eaglecrest Tram	9 Increased cruise traffic	
5 Environmental impacts	10 Impacts to downtown	

**READ: I have a few last questions for demographic purposes.**

**16. In what year were you born? \_\_\_\_\_ 1900 for refuse (ask for nearest decade if refuse)**

**17. In which area of the City and Borough do you live?**

01 Downtown/Thane	04 Mendenhall Valley	07 Don't know
02 Douglas/West Juneau	05 North Douglas	08 Refused
03 Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek/Switzer Creek	06 Brotherhood Bridge/out the road	09 Other _____

**18. Are you currently employed? 01 Yes 02 No (Skip to Q20) 03 DK/ref. (Skip to Q20)**

**19. In which area of the City and Borough do you work?**

01 Downtown/Thane	05 North Douglas	09 Don't know
02 Douglas/West Juneau	06 Brotherhood Bridge/out the road	10 Refused
03 Salmon Creek/Lemon Creek/Switzer Creek	07 Borough-wide	11 Other _____
04 Mendenhall Valley	08 Outside of city	

**20. Have you or any members of your household been employed in the Juneau tourism industry at any time during the past five years?**

03 Yes, How many# _____	01 No	2 Refuse
-------------------------	-------	----------

**21. What race or ethnicity do you consider yourself? [Do not read; check all that apply]**

1	Alaska Native/American Indian	5	Latino/Hispanic
2	Asian/Filipino	6	White/Caucasian
3	Black/African-American	7	Don't know
4	Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	8	Refused
		9	Other

***Thank and end survey***

**22. Record gender [don't ask]**      01    Male    02    Female    03    Don't know

**23. [Write additional comments only if shared]**

---

**24. Phone #** \_\_\_\_\_ **Data entered initials** \_\_\_\_\_

**ANY Questions about specifics of projects (downtown dock, Douglas dock, whale watching, etc), please direct them to:**

[Juneau.org/tourism](http://Juneau.org/tourism)

