

MINUTES
PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE
Tuesday, December 6th, 2016
CBJ Assembly Chambers – 6 p.m.

I. Call to Order at 6:00 p.m. – J. Anderson, Vice-Chair

Present: J. Anderson, O. Brudie, B. Farrell, T. Gilmour, C. Mertl, T. Rutecki;

Absent: F. Dowd, E. Ouder Kirk, C. Prussing

Staff Present: Kirk Duncan, P&R Director; Lauren Verrelli, Staff Liaison; Maria Gladziszewski, Assembly Liaison

- II. Agenda Changes – T. Rutecki:** Would like to add a discussion on governance under the Directors Report (Section C), this would be a quick rundown of things that would make us a better group that we could discuss at our next meeting. Motion by T. Rutecki to approve changes to the agenda, no objection. ***New agenda approved.***

III. Public Participation of Non-Agenda Items – None.

IV. Approval of Meeting Minutes from November 1st, 2016 –

November 1st, 2016: J. Anderson adds Gary Gillette for clarification under Liaison Report for 1% for Arts. Motion by B. Farrell to approve, no objection. ***Minutes adopted.***

V. New Business – None.

VI. Director's Report – K. Duncan

A. Priority Based Budgeting:

K. Duncan: This will affect how we budget in the department. Staff scored the attached spreadsheet, the leadership team scored it, and other CBJ departments scored it as well. Now the City Managers office will take the information and combine it all together. This will come back to us in February and boards, commissions and committees will be part of this process.

B. Master Planning Update:

K. Duncan: You will get a copy of the survey results at next months meeting. It's an incredible positive report; the public holds Parks & Rec as a very important part of the community. You can have a statistically valid survey with 300 people and we had 516 connect with our phone survey.

C. Parliamentary Presentation:

K. Duncan: It was mentioned that the former Mayor could be involved but the Law Department prefers they provide any additional training. If the PRAC could list what areas we would like attention on that would be great.

T. Rutecki: Other boards have governance committees which are pretty handy. You can have a committee with at least two people or you can have one person be the governance chair. I wrote a letter to the PRAC showing some areas where we could use some improvement on parliamentary procedures.

J. Anderson: It looks like everyone is in favor of learning more on parliamentary rules.

K. Duncan: Tom's idea of forming a small committee of 2 people to spend a little time on creating an outline of what we should talk about is good. Then the Law Department can come in and address point by point what is concerning members.

J. Anderson: I would volunteer to get on this. Anyone else would like to volunteer?

T. Gilmour: I'm happy to do some research; I don't have time to be on a committee. I can come up with some ideas that I think is important for the group.

B. Farrell: I will participate too.

T. Rutecki: One suggestion, we can start with the agenda and address what can go wrong.

D. 6-Year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) & 1% Sales Tax Ideas:

K. Duncan: You can see on page 15 what is proposed for FY18-FY22. What's listed under column 18 is what really gets acted on. There are more projects listed here than money available. If it's not on this list, it can't be considered for the 1% sales tax. It would be beneficial to have a couple members of PRAC to form a subcommittee that would be more involved in the 1% sales tax.

T. Gilmour: The suggestions for the 1% in the past came from the department.

K. Duncan: If the PRAC could set up a small committee or we could discuss it more thoroughly with the entire group at the January meeting so the PRAC can be involved in this process.

O. Brudie: I would be willing to participate in the subgroup.

J. Anderson: I would be willing to participate as well.

T. Rutecki: I could go either way, with a smaller group or all of us.

K. Duncan: The subcommittee I have envisioned meets once to go over the list and then meet again after we have developed the material that is ready for the public presentation. This will be voted on by the public in October 2017.

E. Hut-to-Hut/OHV:

R. Watts: All CIPs exist for a period of time as we try to accomplish goals and the idea of using some of the OHV CIP is not meant to be a threat to the OHV idea.

K. Duncan: There was a motion made to recommend that PRAC recognized the value of the Hut-to-Hut concept. We can make a case that it would be better for funding for Hut-to-Hut to come from a non-motorized CIP than a motorized CIP. Currently we have a motion for the PRAC to write a letter to the Managers Office supporting Hut-to-Hut. That has not taken place, so if you the board wishes to amend or rescind that motion, you can do that. The question on the table right now is if the PRAC would like to stay with that supporting motion that includes using funds from the OHV CIP?

O. Brudie: I'm still in support of the Hut-to-Hut concept and I think that \$50,000 is a reasonable start for the study; but I'm not talking about the funding source.

T. Rutecki: Is there a possibility looking at some mixed use, such as motorized use in the winter time between the huts?

T. Gilmour: What about the underfunded and unfinished projects around Juneau? Why would be talking about a new one when \$50,000 could a long way to finish unfinished projects around town?

What's the reasoning?

R. Watts: I wanted to pursue Hut-to-Hut as an economic development idea. I got the Forest Service to say "yes, we're interested"; with us each coming up with half the money to research business models from other places. Try to find a route that makes sense from the tourism perspective and appealing to locals, whether it is a mountain route, kayaking route, ice field route, as long as it is a new route that didn't conflict with existing paths. I thought I asked the engineering department to include funds for \$50,000 in the upcoming CIP, meaning it would be considered in this budget cycle and adopted in July 2017. My email was read as finding \$50,000 now. If it takes till July and we do new money, that's totally fine. But this also brings up another question of what's going on with the OHV CIP? It can't sit there for years without any activity. It can be reprogramed for another parks use. If there was an OHV project that is supported, I think it would be a fairly easy sell for additional funds.

J. Anderson: I support the idea of Hut-to-Hut, looking back on the motion we put together at the last meeting, I strongly recommend we amend or have the opportunity to talk about it more. If the public went through the effort to get OHV on 1% sales tax which they voted on, I think that's a substantial

signal from the public that OHV is important. I think there should be a public process to take that money and repurpose it if OHV is dead. What would it take the City to reopen the case and find other land for an OHV location?

R. Watts: If there was an OHV project that could be backed that was politically and reasonably possible, I think the Assembly would support it. If you guys want to work on it and Kirk has capacity, we can certainly assist with other City staff to revisit where it last left off.

T. Gilmour: When you came and talked to us in November 2013, and the results from the original report came out, it was too expensive. We could probably come up with some better ideas for you.

J. Anderson: I know the City has a tight budget right now. With the new Master Plan for Parks & Rec coming out, if we can get OHV included in that with some input from locals that would be great. The problem with the original plan was that it was too big. If we can get a chunk of city land, that's a good start, we can get a ton of public participation to come up with the other resources to do a lot of work. We need to come up with a new proposal and a new plan and go from there.

B. Farrell: We started this conversation about rewording our letter from last month. It sounds like we have the opportunity to change what we recommended a month ago. What is the process if we're so inclined to change it a month later?

K. Duncan: On page 18 in your packet, the City attorney talks about this. We can ascend or amend the motion but it takes a super majority which we don't have right now. As long as we don't write a letter, which has not been done, no action has taken place. A future PRAC can direct me or write its own letter if 6 board members say they would like to ascend or rescind the motion.

R. Watts: Keep it for another month, there's no rush. If there are any PRAC members who are interested in meeting to talk about the vision of an OHV park and map out a potential pathway for reconsidering new ideas, we should set up a meeting.

F. ADDITION: Board Members Term Reminder:

K. Duncan: Josh Anderson, Chris Mertl and Ordin Brudie, your term is coming to an end on February 28th, 2017. Applications are due to the City Clerk's office by February 8th, 2017 if you wish to stay on the board.

VII. Unfinished Business –

A. Gunakadeit Park:

O. Brudie: Marine Park & Gunakadeit Park are the only open spaces/public parks in the immediate downtown area. I want to keep the park on people's minds. If it's going to be a number of years before the surrounding land ownership is settled, we don't have to wait for everything to unfold to do something with the park now. Parks & Rec land downtown continues to get more and more precious with the loss of the North Franklin lot. I created a draft resolution for everyone's input (attached in packet).

K. Duncan: Reading from your resolution *CBJ should conduct a thorough and meaningful public planning process for the future development of Gunakadeit Park* that would be heading off to CDD. In the Comprehensive Plan section, are you talking about the CBJ Comprehensive Plan or the P&R Master Plan? The PRAC would make sure this is included in the new Master Plan.

O. Brudie: It's directed towards the new P&R Master Plan and should be included.

K. Duncan: Make sure that is edited in your resolution to eliminate any confusion. Odin is asking for the PRAC to make staff aware that there should be a study/review of Gunakadeit Park. It's important for the PRAC to make a strong statement that this piece of land should remain a park and its importance to downtown.

T. Gilmour: The PRAC did make a statement while the apartment was in demolition; we made a statement that it was important that we did not lose that park. Do we need to restate that the park is important to the PRAC and the Parks & Rec department? That we want it to remain a park and remain available for future use?

O. Brudie: I think the idea of being proactive and starting the work, creating a vision and not just talking about it is what we need to do. Come up with something that the downtown businesses could get behind. I think the planning process for the new Parks & Rec Master Plan is a good way to start.

C. Mertl: I believe we wanted Gunakadeit Park to remain as an open space. If it is beneficial to the redevelopment of the old apartments and Parks & Rec, we would look at options that would make Gunakadeit Park part of an open/shared space between the new development and downtown. We stated that we were opposed to Gunakadeit Park becoming a building site.

J. Anderson: What we have before us is to write a letter reaffirming our position on Gunakeadeit Park. Odin, will you tune it up and then we can vote on it at the next meeting?

O. Brudie: Sounds good.

VIII. Committee, Liaison, and Board Member Reports

A. Chair Report— None.

B. Liaison to the Assembly Report—

M. Gladziszewski: Your Parks & Rec Master Plan is a good place to put what you want to do with Gunakadeit Park.

C. Liaison Reports—

YAAB— T. Rutecki: YAP met in November to give out contingency money and agreed that with the 2018 money they will come up with a scoring system that is consistent among all members.

Aquatics— T. Rutecki: Since the ground source heat pumps have been put in, they have saved the pool around \$400,000. Also, we came up with new pool rates starting January 1st, 2017.

Jensen-Olson Arboretum—E. Ouderkirk: None.

Lands— C. Mertl: None.

1% for Art— J. Anderson: None.

Treadwell— C. Mertl: None.

Urban Forestry— C. Mertl: None

Eaglecrest— O. Brudie: Eaglecrest opened on schedule.

TrailMix—B. Farrell: None.

Park Foundation—C. Mertl: Working on the 501C3 paperwork.

D. Other Member Business –

C. Mertl: Reminder of the Mendenhall Recreation Area planning is going on. I encourage PRAC members to participate.

Adjournment – 7:45 p.m. *Having no other business before the board.*

Respectfully submitted by Lauren Verrelli, P&R Administrative Assistant II, 12/27/2016