

MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, January 6, 2015
CBJ Assembly Chambers -- 6 p.m.

I. Call to Order 6:00 p.m. Kate Walters, Acting Chair

- Present: Josh Anderson, Traci Gilmour, Gerry Landry, Christopher Mertl, Tom Rutecki;
- Absent: Odin Brudie, Eric Morrison, and Jeff Wilson;
- Assembly Liaison, Maria Gladziszewski;
- Staff Present: Kirk Duncan, Director P&R; Brent Fischer, Superintendent of Facilities, Maintenance and Landscape; Lindsey Brown, P&R Administrative Officer; Fran Compton, Administrative Assistant.

Ms. Walters: I would like to welcome and introduce new Parks & Recreation Director: Kirk Duncan.

Mr. Duncan: Thank you, it is nice to be here. We have lots of exciting projects to work on.

Ms. Walters: We will all work very hard on those projects. Also farewell to Brent Fischer, it has been great working with you over the past couple of years. We have gotten some things done, which is great.

II. Agenda Changes – Ms. Walters: I would like add one thing to New Business after the Historic Restoration Item, which is Liaison Assignments. Tonight is also my last meeting and we will have seats to fill for PRAC liaisons.

III. Public Participation of Non-Agenda Items

Lisa Mattson, 15900 Lee Drive: My husband and I gave testimony in opposition of the proposal of the Motocross facility at Aant'yeik Park by PRAC member Josh Anderson at the last PRAC meeting, December 2, 2014. Since then we have been quite busy drafting and circulating an informal petition, walking door to door to inform the neighbors of Lee Drive, Glacier Highway, Lena Loop, etc. of the proposal. Sadly, out of 189 people so far that have signed the petition, only two people were aware of the said proposal. At the moment there are still 20 plus petitions in circulation and the sheets did not reach me by last night's deadline. We have 189 residents against an OHV Motocross facility at Aant'yeik or within 3 miles of any residence. The verbiage of the petition state states:

OHV parks are not compatible with neighborhoods. We the undersigned oppose the construction of the proposed OHV Motocross facility at Aant'yeik Park or any such proposed facility within three miles of any residence. The negative impacts associated with such facilities are detrimental to the quality of life expected from a residential area and as such, constitutes an unacceptable use of CBJ Parklands.

We will continue to gather signatures and an informal petition until we move to a formal petition. The formal petition will then become a city ordinance and our plan is to make it a law that there are no OHV motocross proposals, facilities, etc. And we would keep that from

popping up in any one's neighborhood. This is not something that we are against, but this should not be in anybody's neighborhood.

I know there were studies done that stated a decrease of property value of 22% for my husband and I our home is our main asset and that is \$132,000 right off. I feel very strongly that this should have been done in 2008 and again in 2013 when this was brought forth with North Douglas. I continue my meetings and correspondence with resident and attorney James Shine Sr. On December 3, 2014, at 5:08 p.m. Hetty Guertin forwarded an email from Assembly liaison Maria Gladziszewski* out to the Lena Association. Maria quotes Josh Anderson as stating "if the noise and other concerns cannot be settled that he did not want to fight with the neighborhood and would walk away from the project." Let it be known that the noise and other concerns cannot be settled - that he should walk away from the project immediately. A residential area is no place for a city sponsored Motorized Vehicle Park. Josh, walk away. We have 189 signatures in 3 weeks, and this is a handful of us out there knocking on doors with the proposal with all the documentations. We also have letters that were sent to the PRAC, I have contents and index as well as the Assembly members. Tonight I was greeted with four additional letters. Per resident and attorney James Shine Sr. I request that these letters be stamped in as part of the record. I oppose the OHV motocross proposal as an unauthorized use of an exclusively residential area. We are paying real estate taxes for a residential area not this proposed use. If you were to proceed over our collective objections that would significantly reduce the value of our homes and land by the way of imminent domain, for which we would seek compensation both imminent domain claims for the reduction value of our homes and our lands, as well as an exception of the significant credit in our annual real estate by 50%. I thank you.

*Note: Ms. Gladziszewski called F. Compton on Wednesday, 1/7/15 and advised that she was not the author of the email that Ms. Mattson quoted above. She did advise Ms. Mattson after the meeting.

Brent Mattson, 15900 Lee Drive: If it may please the chair, I may go a hair over five minutes, I have two pages to read. Thank you to the committee for taking the time to hear public comment on an issue that could possibly affect so many. Also like to Thank you for removing from the website the logo of the Juneau Motocross logo, the logo of Chatham Electric and the logo of the International Brotherhood of Electric Workers which Mr. Anderson is surely connected to. This must surely be a sign of good faith on behalf of the committee that private interests will not be involved in swaying a public department's decision making. Under the matter of the proposed OHV motocross facility at Aant'iyek submitted by Josh Anderson at last month's PRAC meeting, my comments were mild, unprepared, and regrettably uninformed. Some of what I say tonight will not be mild and I have tried to become as informed and prepared as I could while leading an ordinary life over the holidays. As I began to think about what I wanted to say tonight, what could be better than simply quoting some of the best points from all of the previous testimony given regarding proposed OHV parks in Juneau? There is just too much of it. If you have time I suggest you read the public testimony given by Kent Sullivan, Charlie Elliot, Vance Sanders, Ben Carney, Fred Hiltner from meetings held March 18, 2008, November 5, 2013, December 3, 2015. All of these are accessible in the public records of meeting minutes. As I began looking into the previous discussions between the

residents of Juneau and the various proponents of OHV parks in Juneau it became clear to me that this issue has lacked guidance from the one place it should – our Parks and Rec department. The more I thought about the results of the last PRAC meeting the more I became frustrated. Why, after so much dialogue with the residents of this city would our Parks Dept. continue to accept and support proposals of this nature? Why wasn't there a single member of this committee that would publicly say "OHV Parks are not compatible with Juneau's residential areas."? Why can't they figure out a way to help the residents support a proposal like this rather than infuriating them? Some people may remember the decision made by the CBJ planning commission on June 24, 2008, actually signed by Maria Gladziszewski. There was a similarly proposed OHV Park at the Lower Fish Creek Quarry. The Commission ruled: "The Commission finds this type of recreation is needed in the Borough however, the relative proximity of existing residences and the OHV park pose undeniable conflicts between uses. It was determined that the proposed change in increase in ambient noise would be unacceptable and the perceptible increase in noise or a decrease in the quality of ambient sound generated from the OHV Park would translate into a negative impact on residences, thus affecting property values and neighborhood harmony."

The City's Planning Commission has spoken. Why does the Parks Department continue to ignore that decision? Amazingly the current PRAC seems to have forgotten that they agreed with the Planning Commission at the December 3, 2013, meeting. A Motion was passed that evening for: "the City to enter negotiations with Goldbelt for an OHV Park and use the Goldbelt Quarry at Echo Cove with option B at 35 mile as a secondary site. The City should/could continue to look for a viable option in non-residential areas." Personally, I want to see an OHV Motocross Park in Juneau. I think that many citizens of this city really do. But I also think that it needs to be done in a way to eliminate the impact on established residential areas. It is time for the PRAC to start thinking outside the box if they want to make the public and OHV users happy. I am going to just throw out some of my own ideas for you guys to contemplate. I recently caught a snippet of an article regarding an underground mountain bike park. Is there a possibility that the tunnels and caverns of our old local mines could be utilized as OHV trails? How about the far side of Douglas? Indoor facilities can be extremely effective at reducing noise levels, is there a way to utilize Treadwell Arena during off season for motocross? I believe that at last month's meeting Mr. Fischer said that hydrocarbon based fluid would be destructive to the infrastructure of the Arena, has anyone looked into what would be necessary to contain them? This brings up another question: Why would it be ok to have these fluids leaching into the ground of any city property? And finally, what about 35 Mile? The cost of developing miles of trails at the site has discouraged most people. But what if we cleared and leveled an area the size of two softball fields there? That would be roughly the same size as the Aant'iyek Park proposal without the disturbance of established residences. I will grab my chain saw and help you clear it. Worried about communications? I am sure that most residents would agree with installing a telecommunications tower near that site since they are still pushing the road further north. I have a genuine concern that if the PRAC does not move tonight to put an end to OHV Park proposals in residential areas this will become an ugly fight. Not just for our neighborhood but for each and every neighborhood such a park is proposed in. The City has spoken that OHV Parks pose an undeniable conflict between uses, will the PRAC listen? Thank you.

Dave Carlile, 15580 Glacier Hwy: I just took a quick look on Google Earth and I measured the distance between Aant'ieik Park and my house and I may be the third closest house to Aant'ieik Park. I am relatively close and want to go on record to saying I am opposed to an OHV Park at Aant'ieik Park. My concerns are – main one is noise. My comments are: The noise doesn't have to be loud to be irritable. Noises can be cumulative; we hear noises from the highway behind us. That cumulative noise can be irritating. The other thing I am worried about is loss of property values. You don't have to actually have noise – you don't have to have erosion from an activity like this – all you have to have is the perception – all you have to have is the proximity of an activity like this that could contribute to lowering property values. So that is another one of my concerns. I guess the other one, I recently learned about this in the last day or two; I am concerned about activity and potentially erosions. I would like to go on record; I think it is incompatible with a neighborhood like that. One of the reasons a lot of us live out in a neighborhood like that is because it is rural, because it tends to be quieter – a little bit more solitude. I think those things can be compromised by an activity like this. Thank you very much, I appreciate you listening.

Rory Darling, 15385 Glacier Hwy: I am here to testify against the motocross proposal. My first point is from just from a parks perspective - I travel a lot and I go to a lot of parks in different parts of the country and the world. Never once have I ever seen a public park that has a motorized facility as part of their offering to the public. I think the whole concept is wrong, let alone the specific implementation, which is what people are talking about. So from a Parks point of view, I don't see that it is the remit of any kind of Parks Advisory Committee to say that we should say that we should have one of these in a park. It is inconsistent with the commonly accepted notion of a public park. So that is my first point. The second point is I think that noise is definitely a problem. I lived in North Douglas close to the heliport for a while and I can assure you that having noise in your close proximity it wears you down, it really does. In the area we are talking about, of all the places in Juneau, Juneau is a noisy place – the valley is noisy with different activities, but the area we are talking about up near the Park is remarkably quiet. It would be taking away one of the few quiet places in Juneau that is residential. I think that is some of the objection that the residents have, is that one of the main reasons why we are there. We do get noise from the whale watching boats, but other than that it is generally a quiet place. In terms of other places that motocross could be in the Borough I've seen different proposals. I sit on the state advisory board and there was a proposal to study an area out around 30 mile, or something like that and there are no residences out there – but we looked at it from a Parks perspective the noise that would be generated out there where there is nothing would still be objectionable to us because it was incompatible with the use of that area as a State Park. So the notion of noise being close to a Park is objectionable. And I should also point out that the Auke Recreation Area is also in this area, very popular place. A lot of people use it for a number of different things, picnicking, beach walking, and so forth and that would also be impacted. So not only do you have the residential concerns you also have the other public facility out there which is a federal facility – Auke Rec Area. I also think that if you go ahead with this you would incur costs. You can't just put these things on the land. There would be development costs you would have to prepare the soil, noise barriers, and so forth and I really don't see that as a good use of parks funds. My main objection is noise and the neighborhood thing and I am certainly of that opinion and I am strongly opposed to the proposal as it exists.

Teresa Svancara, 15965 Glacier Highway: I lived there for about 10 years. I have been in Juneau over 20 years. While it is not as convenient to live 16 miles out the road, what we do have in exchange is a lot of quiet. It is a wonderful quiet neighborhood and when I heard of this proposal I thought: this doesn't go in a residential area. This would really negatively affect the quality of life we have out there and listening to some of the other commenters tonight about lower property values, that is definitely a concern too. I definitely agree with what Mr. Darling just said that it doesn't seem appropriate to have a motocross facility in a park, especially a city park. I urge you really consider this and consider doing the right thing, which is don't bring a thing into a park that would impact many residents. I was one of the people that took the petition around to my neighbors and every one of them was really aghast when they heard about this proposal. It would affect so many people in such a negative way. Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Thank you for doing the right thing.

Scott Rinkenberger, 15900 Lee Drive; I one of Lisa and Brent's tenants, I rent a portion of their property. I am relatively new to Juneau; I moved up here from Portland OR back in Feb. One of the main reasons I selected the area where I reside in now is because of its distance from the main part of the City. Being a pilot and manager at Wings of Alaska up at the Airport, we take our noise abatement procedures pretty seriously. We try not to fly where residential areas because we understand the impact of low flying aircraft and the noise that it makes. I field my share of noise abatement complaints with the local FAA officials when we do get a noise abatement complaint. Now, experiencing my first summer up here and the craziness with all the tour ships and all the flying we do in the summer, generally I am working a 14-15 hour shift. Generally, it requires me to be at the Airport about 3 a.m. This subsequently means I need to be in bed resting right around 4:30 – 5 o'clock in the evening. Now, with the extended sunlight that we have and the possibility of a motocross park nearby and the constant drone of this equipment racing around, is certainly going to have an impact on my quality of life and my ability to enjoy the area that I selected to reside in. If that becomes a continued problem or becomes a nuisance, I would have no other choice but to make complaints to the local law enforcement or make even appearances in front of other regulatory boards. I just want to point out that one of the main reasons why I selected where I reside now is because of the peacefulness and the tranquility of it. I certainly hope to continue to enjoy that. I appreciate the opportunity to make comment.

Mark Scolton, 3868 N. Douglas Hwy.: I am here tonight to speak about the opportunity and also the possibility of getting the lights put back on the South Twin Lakes Park. As you know we have had a really nice stretch of weather that has made for some really good ice skating. In addition to that the Caouotte Shelter that was built by volunteers is pretty much ready to roll except for the final deck over the lake. It is totally usable now. The past weekend we had between 200-400 people per day skating on the lake. As you know with our really short daylight hours there isn't time for hockey for people who work a regular 9-5 job, or want to go skating after work. It is pretty difficult to do if you don't have lights. If you notice, there are light poles and they are already wired. The City did operate lights there back in the past, it must have been 15 – 20 years ago. I know there is a potential risk for people who could go through thin because we do have very extreme weather conditions, all the way from 40 degrees down to 10 degrees. My suggestion would be that we have a group that would volunteer to monitor

the area. To go ahead and determine whether the ice is safe or not and when those conditions are met then we could switch on the lights. It is a huge opportunity for recreation in Juneau. I would like to give it a go again. I think that Risk Management folks aren't so positive about that.

Mr. Mertl: Do you know Mark, is everything wired up – are they hooked up to a CBJ meter?

Mr. Sullivan: I looked at them today, the poles are up, the conduit is up there. The racks that hold the lights are there. What I was told is that they took the lights down several years ago and I think they ended up in a city warehouse somewhere, I don't know if they are still there or not.

Mr. Rutecki: I had a comment about the motocross after Mark is done.

I thought I heard a comment that really needed addressing - that I thought was hitting below the belt on Parks and Rec and highly criticize them for looking at this issue at all. That is what we are supposed to do – there is a new Parks and Rec Director. Just some examples are: how many times did we vote on a pool – how many times did we vote on an ice rink? Voters rejected them, the issues came back. It is Parks and Rec's job. They were approached by a user group; the same as a user group that doesn't like the idea so they have to be fair to hear both sides of the story. We are not really the deciding body in this. This is my nine years on this body, with five Parks and Rec Directors; I didn't hear anything new tonight. Except I did hear something new at the last December meeting, when we had a presentation by the OHV folks that said they did sound testing and they couldn't hear it. They had a preliminary study and I think it was worth looking in to. You don't have any data, other than go back and look at North Douglas but you shouldn't be so critical because this is a preliminary thing. Parks & Rec is doing a good job.

Ms. Walters: On that note, we appreciate public input that is why we have these meetings.

The OHV proposal hasn't gone put forward, it was simply introduced as an information item.

Your comments written and verbal will be in our minutes and recorded for the record. Please note that there is not a formal proposal going forward, we are not taking any action at this time it was simply an idea being brought forward. We thank you for your input.

IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes for December 2, 2014

Ms. Walters: There are new pages 8 through 12, written verbatim public testimony from the past meeting and all of the emails.

Mr. Mertl: I would like to propose that we table these minutes for review and approval at the next meeting.

Ms. Walters: We will review the minutes at the next meeting for approval.

V. P&R Director's Report – B. Fischer

At the March 4th PRAC meeting this year, Elder Paul Marks and Richard Steele from Goldbelt Heritage Foundation gave a presentation of a project called "A Time For Healing". This project honors the Tlingit people and tells the story of the Douglas Indian Village. Mr. Steele informed me that he is submitting the grant to the National

Endowment of the Arts this month and will keep us up to date on the status of the grant and the project.

As you know, I transferred over to the new Superintendent position of Facilities/Parks/Landscape. This new division merges the Facilities Maintenance Division with the Parks and Landscape Division.

I would like to thank the members of the PRAC for their dedication and service to our community and my staff for the honor and privilege of serving as the Parks and Recreation Director for the last three years.

I welcome Kirk Duncan to his new role as Director, and I look forward to working with him and meeting the challenges and opportunities that are ahead of us.

Mr. Mertl: Thank you Brent

VI. Unfinished Business

None

VII. New Business

A. Treadwell Historic Preservation & Restoration Society – Wayne Jensen: I want to bring you up-to-date on a project we have been working on and is starting to gain some momentum which is the restoration of what I will call the “new” office building in Treadwell. It’s the concrete building in the middle of the Treadwell area, the part that the city owns, built in 1913. It is a concrete shell right now. I want to talk about three things: One is the urgency of the project and secondly the plans that we have for addressing the project; then to ask for your support. If you have been there recently you realize the roof is, not so gradually caving in. The past couple of winters it has taken on more deterioration. The steel trusses are giving away and rusting out. Become beyond an attractive nuisance it is actually a danger. If we get good Taku (like we had this week) the roof could end up on 5th street. It is real dangers. And even if it is not a Taku wind, a snowfall could cause the roof to collapse – it’s lost almost all of its structural integrity. The second thing is to talk about what we should do with it. Is this something that should just be removed, to take away that nuisance, that risk – or is this part of our history and something that should be restored? It is our opinion that it is one of the last remnants of the mining history in Juneau; particularly in Treadwell and should be restored. Restoration means replacing the roof to protect it from the weather, sort of the same way we just did the Treadwell Saltwater Pumphouse. We didn’t try to rehabilitation we tried to protect it so it could last several decades. By putting the roof on that building we have protected that iconic structure; and it will there for a long time. That is what we are looking at doing for the Office Building – is taking off the roof, removing the risk of that area, putting on a new roof to match the existing/original roof – steel trusses and metal roof, just like it was originally. We want to do is remove the nuisance and risk factor and remove the second floor, so it is just one big open space. It would still have the appearance from the outside, but from inside, it would take away the attractiveness of climbing up to the second floor, a risk and nuisance. It would make the space a much nicer, a big tall space that could be used as a picnic shelter. A long

range plan we have. From a financial perspective, our plans are we are counting on \$150,000 included in the 1% Sales Tax dedicated for projects. David Stone was active in getting that. Looking at Grants and private funding like we approached the Treadwell Pumphouse. We had some grants from the Historic Commission, as well as in-kind services and fund raising projects; that was a very effective project and easy to raise funds for. We think this one will be as well. We are not asking for any money beyond what has been discussed. We had a structural analysis to determine if it was worth saving. And it is, structurally it is fine and we have a design ready for the new roof, which will replicate the existing roof. We are actively looking at grants. We had a grant to do the structural analysis and we have still got some of that money left and we are looking at some additional grants to further that. We are looking for your support. It's worth restoring; it's an important component of the history of that area and want to see if you can support that. I'm available for questions.

Mr. Mertl: Thank you Wayne, not really a question but a Comment. Paula came to us about 1.5 years ago. I think it is a great idea. We would like for you to work with the new Landscape Superintendent, we talked with Paulette about using some vegetation removal. Get it opened up so these structures can be preserved by letting light in; prevent roots from tearing them apart. We talked about opening up the parade grounds and showing what that would look like. I think everything and anything you do is great - This is our last mining history we can walk through - a great asset to the community.

Mr. Jensen: The office building would be a key component for opening up that parade ground; it would anchor the south end of it. Opening up the area around there is a good idea; a creative use of chain saws over there could be well applied. Not just open up for light to prevent damage of trees falling on the building.

Mr. Anderson: I used to play there as a kid and I would like to see some nice stuff happen around there - this is good.

Mr. Jensen: We have had some thoughts of collecting some of the larger components of mining history that could stay outside, the large wheels and pulleys that could be part of this facility, would be remnants of history of that area and there are plenty of those around. Since David Stone introduced me to that area I have been doing guided hikes over there. If there is anyone that would like to do that, I would be happy to. It is fun; we can do it for 20 minutes or 3 hours.

Mr. Landry: I have a comment and question – you have a great proposal there is nothing not to like about it and this question is for the Director – is there any way, he discussed the 1%, that this project if it gets started would end up taking away from other CBJ resources, my main concern is are we going to have other resources pulled away from Parks & Rec?

Mr. Fischer: The intent of the 1% is for those projects. Could they get pulled away? Yes. But they haven't at this point for what we want to do; I'll check what they amount was for the Treadwell Mine Historic Park area. If we can get those funds for FY17 or FY18 designated, we can review that. It is a good project, we support it. The Master Plan was done 8-10 years ago and lays out what the vegetation management plan is for the area, for the future plans are for

the area and is pretty exciting. I can take a look at the numbers on that and get with Kirk, and with the committee.

Mr. Mertl: Do you need a letter of support from PRAC to put in your grant applications?

Mr. Mertl: **I purpose a letter now, so that if and when you need it you don't have to wait six weeks. Mr. Anderson second. No opposition.**

Ms. Walters: Mr. Mertl would you like to write that letter?

Mr. Mertl: You know I would.

Ms. Walters: Thank you.

B. Committee Liaisons Assignments from PRAC

Ms. Walters: As I mentioned before, tonight is my last meeting. I have taken a job at the University of Maine and will be moving. I was serving as liaison for: Current 1% for Art Committee, for the new Dock Projects – we had our first meeting and I brought a packet with me to share with whoever will take this on. You will look at final ideas and designs and choose what projects will add to the Dock. The other two are: Jensen-Olson Arboretum meets quarterly and I go to bring information back to the PRAC, it is a non-voting position on the board; and the Aquatics Board, we would make a recommendation to the Human Resources Committee because you are a voting member of this board. Tom [Rutecki] is on that board. I don't know what the move is for the empowered board, but they may be meeting more often in the near future. Does anyone want to claim any of those seats?

Mr. Mertl: Because we have a high possibility of almost 50% turnover of this Committee, can this be a temporary fills until we get the new board, so that we can get a sense of spreading the workload and getting people committed?

Ms. Walters: The 1% wants to meet at the end of January, early February. The Arboretum has a February meeting someone could sit in on informally, since they only meet quarterly.

Mr. Mertl: I will be willing to sit in as a temporary on the Arboretum until we get the Board members.

Mr. Anderson: I will do 1%.

Ms. Walters: There is an Aquatics Board meeting next week and I am sure Tom [Rutecki] can fill you in on any items that come up at the next AFAB.

VIII. Committee, Liaison, and Board Member Reports

A. Chair's Report: Kate Walters – I don't have one. This is my last meeting. I have enjoyed my time, it has been five years. It has been very nice to be involved in the community and wherever I land I hope to have a similar opportunity. Good Luck!

B. Liaison to the Assembly Report: Maria Gladziszewski – I don't have a report but I have a question. I was wondering how many seats are open on your board now. If you know people who want to be involved please encourage them.

Discussion on liaisons.

C. Youth Activity Board: Tom Rutecki – Meeting next week with one contingency and lots of money, I think about \$10,000 left in the fund. If you know anyone has a contingency event, get in touch with Dave Pusich.

D. Aquatic Facilities Advisory Board: Kate Walters – meeting next week, nothing to report.

E. 1% for Art: Kate Walters – I hand this folder to Josh and Fran, will you let Gary Gillette know?

F. Treadwell Ice Arena Task Force: Josh Anderson – It is wrapped up and the report has been put out. The 3 questions the Assembly asked were answered. Basically we found that Eaglecrest Board was not a good model and switching to empowered board may work in the long term but may increase costs in the near future, and using a third party outfit was not of any interest. They made a recommendation to use an Advisory Board and make recommendations and solve some problems and report back to the Assembly next year in May.

Mr. Landry: Did any one bring up the Dimond Field House and the Treadwell in an Advisory Board together?

Ms. Walters: I think the Field House is managed by Eaglecrest, its private.

Mr. Anderson: I think it is going to be a good thing. The skating community can put their ideas forward and work closer in the direction they want to and we will get someone in the PRAC to be part of that advisory committee.

G. Other Member Business

Mr. Merti: Juneau Parks Foundation update. Working with Assembly members, had a good sit down with the Mayor a few weeks when he heard through the grapevine that we were trying to put together a nonprofit. Good use of money, he agrees it should be something sought after. He wants John Pugh and I to meet with Kim [Kiefer] this year and get us scheduled for one of the Budget Meetings to present out proposal to be considered during the Budget process. He seems to approve the concept and I have not heard anything no from Assembly members. Maria, I will come and talk to you soon.

IX. Other Board Business

Mr. Anderson: A couple of meetings ago we were going to have a couple of projects and move forward. Wasn't something supposed to happen? What was happened to the Marine Park Skating? And using Pocket Park?

Mr. Fischer: What was asked: does the PRAC support a group coming into Gunakadeit Park to do something? That was the question. The Downtown Improvement Group was brainstorming a vendor in there or something for Gallery Walk? They came to us and we didn't have a problem with that. The tree was moved to Marine Park, and been pretty successful there - we'll see at the end of the season. The ice skating rink on the "deckover" – I haven't

heard anything from the DIG. None of those projects moved forward from the groups that presented them.

Mr. Landry: Question and comments – January and February we do board assignments. What is the process going to be?

Mr. Fischer: At the end of February three seats expire, you can reapply, I am sorry that Jeff will not be reapplying; I believe the other seats are Eric's and Tom's. You can reapply for that and Kate is resigning, so the 3 seats expire at the end of February will be reappointed or appointed for the 3 year term. Kate's seat will be appointed for the length of her remaining term, 1 year left. Any of the applications we get now, they will use to fill now. They are going to do all four of them in February.

Ms. Walters: once those board seats are filled then you can have elections for liaisons. Mr. Mertl will be running the February meeting.

Mr. Landry: Lands Committee - no one is on that now? I will fill in temporarily. Do they meet every month?

Mr. Fischer: Let's get clarification from the Clerk's office on that seat. Do you want to wait until the Chair is elected in March, or do you want to put that forth now so that the February it can be brought forth to the Assembly?

Discussion

Mr. Landry: This has to do with Aant'iyek Park: The only motorized things I own is a car and a chain saw, but I think that this proposal should be brought forth and go through the proper process. I understand people have these passions. Tom expressed that. There are a lot of pros and cons to it, and I am not sure if I would be for or against it, but it is a good idea. It is something that is good for the community and I would like to encourage Josh to keep with it. It won't be easy.

With Kirk – do you have any ideas you would like to see in the next few months, are we going to have a big annual meeting that we discuss these kinds of things? We had a master plan; we were going to do some work on that but with the consultant report that got put aside. I have a master plan at home with lots of notes and tabs. Saying Hello. Would like to hear tonight or next month what your ideas might be and the master plan.

Kirk Duncan: Tonight I am going to be a man of few words. I am wandering around taking a look at every facility and talking to facility managers, talking to senior staff. I come in with no preconceived notions. What I want to do is deliver the best possible service to the residents of Juneau in the facilities we have. How we do that, I don't know. I feel very comfortable in my recreation experience. I have run water parks, convention centers. I have not run an ice arena. I am going to stay low key. I think that Brent has done an excellent job. I am looking forward to working with Brent. WE are reinventing the department. The report will be out shortly. It has are some good recommendations. It has some recommendations that I have

questions about. I am sure I will be come more vocal as we go along, but for tonight I don't have much to say, other than I am really excited. The transition makes sense from the standpoint that when we merged Engineering and Public Works, Engineering isn't building a new high school, hospital – the only thing they have got going on in the next 10 years is the \$70M water and wastewater infrastructure that we were working on. That part really makes sense. I have some pretty good recreational experience and I think with Brent's support and the other staff support we can have a very successful department. That is it for right now. I appreciate the opportunity.

Mr. Mertl: Have been things been forwarded with Goldbelt now that the lease with the Tram been settled?

Mr. Fischer: There is a new Goldbelt Director/CEO. I can talk to the P&R Director and see if they would like to talk with us. Now that the tram property has been settled and out of the picture it might be a good opportunity for us to have that conversation again.

Mr. Mertl: Kirk, welcome, we are an advisory committee so feel free to use us for reviewing anything or throwing stuff off of us first. We are happy to help and like doing that. Sometimes we don't get to do that as much as we would like to.

Ms. Gilmour: I suggest when we talk in the future; we can refer to the motocross park as opposed to an OHV park, as they are different. The space and the people are different. I am not going to say whether I am for it or against it, that isn't relevant right now, it is a motocross park it is not a four-wheeler park. It does not need miles and miles. The footprint and the people involved are different than what the Planning Commission saw. They would differentiate the two.

Mr. Duncan: I would like some clarification, because what I see right now is that we aren't going to do anything with the motocross park. We need more information from the users group interested. They need to put together a more formal proposal. They need to address some of the concerns and move forward. The ball is in the users' court. It is not in P&R court at this point in time.

X. ADJOURNMENT – no other business before the Board – this meeting was adjourned 7:14 p.m.

NEXT MEETING – Tuesday, February 3, 2015 – CBJ Chambers