

**MINUTES**  
**PARKS & RECREATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**  
**Tuesday, November 5, 2013**  
**CBJ Assembly Chambers**

- I. Call to Order, 6:05 p.m.  
Present: Odin Brudie, Traci Gilmour, Dixie Hood, Gerry Landry,  
Chris Mertl, Tom Rutecki, Kate Walters, Jeff Wilson  
Absent: Eric Morrison  
Staff Present: Brent Fischer, P&R Director; Fran Compton, Admin. Asst.; George Schaaf,  
Parks and Landscape Superintendent; Rorie Watt, Engineer  
CBJ Liaison: Randy Wanamaker
- II. Agenda Changes - none
- III. Public Participation of Non-Agenda Items

Bob Janes, 448 Mountainside Dr.: I have been developing these mobility carts for the past couple of years and we are ready to mobilize them and put them to use. Gastineau Guiding is ready to operate tours with people with mobility issues and probably coming to Parks and Rec in the next couple of months to propose a tour. What I am here for is to request PRAC look at the definition of Motorized Use on our Trails – there are a lot of trails that have signs that state: no motorized use. This is a motorized assisted vehicle - you can pedal it, it has 8 gears, but it also has ability to run on electric. Mobility cart for people who have been active all their lives and still want to get out and to exercise their legs, get their cardiovascular system going, and still exercise but may not be able to walk. My father can't walk more than 10 feet with arthritis, but he gets on his and rides the trail along Twin Lakes, which is also "non-motorized". He uses the motor as he doesn't have the ability to not use the motor. He puts as much into it as he can. It is time to rethink – through ordinance or whatever channels we have to go through - of what the definite of "motorized use" is because we are going to see a lot of changes in the next few years as electric vehicles come on the market, become less expensive, and people start adding them like bicycles. I will be facing the issue when I propose my tours to Parks and Rec or the Forest Service of "no motorized use" because it does have a motor. Something for us to all think about, consider, start talking about and be looking at on our local trail systems in the future in order to all people with mobility issues to get out on the trails and have motor assistance.

Mr. Wilson can you please think about a proposal and send us something in writing?

Mr. Janes: That would be correct, through Gastineau Guiding which I own.

Mr. Wilson: I will have you coordinate with (P&R) Director and we can bring you back to the PRAC in 2014. Please identify what trails you would like to be considered.

Mr. Mertl: what is the catch-all phrase for one of these?

Mr. Janes: I don't think there really is one yet, I designed it; developed it, and I call it an "access". I have some patent things going on with it, with a folding mechanism. Do you want to get in the market on it? This is a prototype.

Mr. Fischer: January is the deadline for Commercial Permits. If you want to contact me, we will work with you on getting that and then get back to PRAC on it. We don't want to hang up the process on getting a permit.

Mr. Wilson: this is something we need to look at with our ordinances and see what the mobility cart means to that. We all have our non-motorized plan like bicycles, but we need to look at this.

Ms. Hood: I would like to suggest that you make the name a little more alliterative, catchy or humorous.

IV. APPROVAL OF MEETING MINUTES – October 1, 2013; Motion, no opposition, approved.

Mr. Wilson: I would like to make the introduction of the new CBJ Assembly liaison, Mr. Wanamaker. Mr. Wannamaker was our liaison two years ago and I'd like to ask Mr. Wanamaker to give us background and a quick introduction.

Mr. Wannamaker: Good to be with PRAC again, I was the PRAC liaison for two or three years before my mandatory term limit kicked in. When I came back I was the school district liaison because I am a former school board member but I missed the PRAC so I asked to be reassigned back here, and I am pleased to be here. I look forward to working with you. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson: You will have a chance, Mr. Wanamaker, at the end of the meeting to make a liaison assembly report.

V. Unfinished Business:

A. Off Highway Vehicle (OHV) report from CBJ staff engineer, Mr. Rorie Watt

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Fischer do you have any update regarding this topic? Mr. Fischer: No, Mr. Watt will be talking about how we got to where we are right now. OHV is one of the Assembly's goals and objectives. They are very dedicated to getting an OHV park. Mr. Wilson: (introduction) Mr. Rorie Watt, CBJ Engineer.

(Power Point presentation) Mr. Watt: You don't need me to tell you that accommodating the OHV use is a hard issue that is not new – it's just the fact that we have. You, of the PRAC, have a report that the NOHVCC [National Off Highway Vehicle Conservation Council] team we hired, wrote for us. I think we need to read that and take it to heart. Everybody knows that this has been a long and difficult issue, and the City, in various capacities, has looked at many sites to try to accommodate OHV use. It is an Assembly priority. It has been frustrating for user groups. It has been frustrating for near neighbors of past proposals. That said, after some time the City decided to pursue the 35-mile site and we hired a consulting group to help with the mapping, permitting and trail layout of the site: how to make the best park or trail system possible at 35-mile. For those of you who don't know NOHVCC is an advocacy group, and their mission is to help people work through OHV issues, help communities manage those issues, help communities build and operate responsible OHV recreation areas – that is what they do for a living and they have a lot of experience. What I want to say is that every issue that we face with OHV issues is not unique to Juneau. When they came their basic information was that they had seen a lot of communities struggle through the issues like we have. They looked at the 35-mile site and said they could develop a trails system for us, but their number 1 message was - take a step back, we don't think this is an idea that is sustainable for us. I know that is not a message that a lot of people want to hear. I know the Assembly is frustrated; the assembly wants to find a solution and wants to commit resources. PRAC probably doesn't want to hear this, you'd like to think you had a good solution at 35-mile site. (Their) recommendation may feel like we are going backwards and nobody likes to do that. We need to really look at what they are saying and think about it - be

sure that if we pursue 35-miles site, we understand the potential consequences that could arise, and be sure that we have the resources and are willing to commit the resources to making that site work. In looking at the 35-mile site, their basic estimate was: we can do this, but to develop the trail system that would be big enough to satisfy users groups you'd be in to big bucks -- 3 to 12 million dollars was the number they came up with, and I think that makes sense. You have a handout tonight that has available options. Option B, Mile 35 – the cost you would face out there, a modest cost to build a parking lot, you might spent \$250,000 a mile for trail, or more, it depends on the training we go through, it depends on the volunteer effort. We would spend a significant amount of money on fencing barriers to keep people on the trail. The basic issue that comes out is if we pursue the 35-mile parcel, with limited resources which I think is very likely – I don't think in the normal City budgeting process that \$3-12M funds is at all likely. The funds are are not available easily for that scale of project. But let's take the low end and do a hypothetical – on \$3Million you develop 4-to-5 mile trail system, if you can get that high. Maybe 20 mph with 15 min loop going each way. I don't think we are going to keep OHV users on that trail system. And I think you are going to get OHV use on Glacier Highway and a host of management issues with that. I think you are going to get more people using the Goldbelt land, quarry and old logging roads and I think that is going to pose Goldbelt with management issues, as well. If we develop the 35-mile site with small resources, we are going to manage the Goldbelt site and the quarry and dedicate a lot of capital dollars available for any recreation use to this issue. It is a cautionary note. I am not going to tell you not to do it, but I am going to tell you: you need to have your eyes wide open on whether this is a good deal or not. When we gave the NOHVCC report to the Assembly, they were frustrated and I don't blame them. The comments that we had 1) Don't let the good be the enemy of perfect. I understand that - We need to keep this as a high priority. One member said "OK, I understand the report and what it says, but I don't want to be here in 6 months and not have made any movement in any direction." Another Assembly member was really disappointed that the 35-mile site wasn't what it appeared to be. (describing map) City owned 35-mile site so it is within City control. Except for the boat ramp, all the (other) property out here is Goldbelt Corporation property. I am not going to say that Goldbelt would be amenable to revisiting their site. They may not, they have a board of directors and the board may flat out say they don't want to go there, I don't know. We made some outreach to the CEO and President of the Board, explained where we were with the NOHVCC report and gave them a copy and respectfully asked they read and understand CBJ's process and know that it is possible we may come back to talk about the quarry site again. They did not suggest that it was an easy opportunity for them or an easy possibility, but it is worth exploring.

At the heart of what NOHVCC recommended is: go back and look at your other opportunities and ask: have you tried to do what you can to make your other sites work to the best of your abilities? I think the answer is "no, I don't think we have." You have four sites in front of you – 35-mile site; Goldbelt, Fish Creek Quarry and Lemon Creek gravel pit. And they all have a story. Even if we decide to pursue the 35-mile site, the first step in permitting. We will be going to Corp of Engineers and the first thing they say is "let me see your alternative analysis". In the hierarchy of filled wetlands permitting, and that is unavoidable, the hierarchy is: avoid, minimize and mitigate. They are going to focus on avoid, and for the Corps of Engineers avoid means: Have you looked at other places that can accommodate your OHV use without filling any wetlands? The exercise we are going through tonight, we have to do - to go through for permitting at the 35-mile site. I know the people in North Douglas are frustrated that we are opening old wounds, but if we choose the 35-mile site, this is that necessary first step in explaining why you can't avoid filling wetlands at 35-mile site. That is important in the hierarchy of permitting. Put yourself in the OHV seat and think about: you drive 35 miles, parked, pulled your OHV off the trailer, and go for a ride on the trail we built – your experience as OHV rider is not trail riding because that is not what they have

done in Juneau – they have play riding, quarry riding. Trail system is a new kind of recreation activity – it is going to be a relatively short loop. I don't know how long that first phase will be. Even if we get \$3M threshold, we aren't going to get there right away – is going to be incremental – we are going to afford to build a mile, a half-mile. You have driven that 35 miles, and you ride that mile loop – "that was pretty fun" – you are going to turn around and ride the other way – "that was pretty fun" – what do you think? Am I going to get on my trailer and drive back to town? Have I satisfied my recreational urge? The money I have invested in my OHV? Does it feel like I am done for the day? For some users, maybe. But I think the fair number of users are going to see the gravel road and check out the Goldbelt Quarry like they used to, it's pretty fun down there. I see that as an unavoidable consequence. If we choose the 35-mile site we have to understand that is an issue we are going to have to manage and live with and the temptation is great.

I know we have people here from North Douglas and I know that people did not want to hear that the City was thinking about Fish Creek again – I know that this is really frustrating. To think this issue was done in 2008-2009, I know and understand it is opening up an old wound and a really, frankly - a stupid idea. I know we are talking about people in their homes and they are going to be thinking "how does this affect the quality of life in my home". That is an uncomfortable place to be. I want to say: the planning exercise in 2008 and 2009 was ill-advised. There were failures in the concept, in proposing a trail system in close proximity to people's homes. [points to the map] This is the quarry, the road back to Eaglecrest - and you've got your radius here – 1000 ft., 2000 feet. You have homes on North Douglas to 9 mile creek, maybe from quarry, falls 1300 (feet) not that far. The 2008-2009 (OHV) proposal had a play area in the quarry and a trail system, and the trail system came unacceptably close to property lines. It was well-intentioned, people were trying to solve OHV situation, but fatally flawed.

The NOHVCC people drove out to the 35-mile (site); they called it a 'greenfield site' and thought "you must have other opportunities. This must not be your best last opportunity". We had a nice summer and they drove around town, queried the Engineer Dept. staff and the Parks staff, they said "we are going to drive around and see what you have. I know you want us to plan for a trail system at 35-Mile but we are going to look around." They went to Goldbelt Quarry. They thought "if this was us we would figure out how to manage this property, and avoid a \$35M capital cost and avoid having to manage your 35-mile site, and Glacier Highway and this private property issue AND I would make a deal with these guys." They drove to North Douglas and looked at it and basically thought: what were you thinking in 2008-2009 running OHV trails that close to existing homes? Bad idea but you have an old rock quarry with a bowl/amphitheater - may have some opportunities there. Not every OHV use but have opportunity to develop a more limited size rec area and more limited in time/experience. Have you thought about a motocross track, limited in hours/days, limited in the bowl that will limit the noise could come out of OHV that use it? This is what you have, existing conditions, your existing neighbors, and what could you do to make this the best possible proposal? Have we made the other areas developed as best we can? No, I don't think you've done that. (This is a) good point of departure on Fish Creek.

Lemon Creek: (indicating map, Option D) Gravel pit next to Home Depot, 10 acres of lands, trying to give proximity to homes, condominiums across the creek within 1000 feet, so there are issues there. Management concerns, very wet, we could not control storm water runoff. Lemon Creek is an impaired water body; it has regulatory limits on it (TMDL). If we did any OHV activity in the gravel pit, it would be weather dependent. There is ongoing gravel extraction that would be a concern. In the long run this is extremely valuable property. Used for some industrial and commercial development worth probably \$5M. If there is a big industrial development that Juneau wants to do it is one of the few large areas left in urban boundary that is available.

If I were you I would be thinking – Ok great, I thought we had an answer to this problem, thanks for all the help. What are we going to do? - (We) need to hear from public and get information – that is really good; need to think about what you want to recommend to Assembly; need to weigh all the issues.

Whether you stay with 35-mile site, you need to understand and acknowledge the limitations and consequences. The consequences are difficult management and using up of capital resources that could go to lots of recreation opportunities. You might want to ask us to develop Fish Creek concept as best as we can. I am not going to tell you it is a good idea or a bad idea, but I am going to tell you: we have to develop an idea to minimize the problems as best we can. Don't think any property owner can sit in the position to fairly respond to OHV use in the quarry. If I was a homeowner I would be concerned. I would not want or expect them to respond to a conceptual idea. If we do something it has to go through a rigorous process. The NOHVCC people thought if you want to combine OHV use in the bowl, you could manage the noise issue. I think noise is the #1 problem. I am not going to say it is the only problem but the biggest. They suggested things like OHV noise and providing 1) stationary sound test manual. If you have an OHV park and go to noise testing stations; look at manual, plug you in - if the noise is within acceptable standards you can use the park, if not you are out. That is the tool you have for noise, at Fish Creek. If we are going to do something in Fish Creek, I would test it. Get some motorcycles out there, Plug into sound meter, go to a near neighbor house and sit in their back yard and see what the experience is like. That is the kind of thing that will have to happen.

For Goldbelt, it might be a dead issue. If you think it is worth pursuing, ask the Assembly to ask the Manager to enter into high level discussions. Question would be: what would it take to make a deal to work this out, is it possible or is it dead? The City has to acknowledge that land management out the road is very frustrating for Goldbelt and the long view for Goldbelt and shareholders is that it hasn't worked out so well for them. You go way back, it was all Goldbelt land and the City wanted to trade, put in a boat ramp, little piece of property – we will manage it. Well that opened Pandora's Box for Goldbelt. If Goldbelt had not done the trade they would not have the management issues. We have to respect the long view from Goldbelt – they tried to do the community a good thing by trading for a boat ramp which was great for the community, but for the Goldbelt lands they have suffered the brunt of unintended consequences. If the City were to approach Goldbelt to talk about an OHV solution on the Goldbelt parcel, we would have to acknowledge that is where we all come from.

When I stand back and look at the end of the Road (map), Goldbelt property has everything we like. If you ask - the OHV community would be satisfied, happy. Won't cost \$3-12M to develop. Could be tricky to develop a deal, but worth going back. The Fish Creek property - we have not developed it for "limited use activity" - would be motocross in that bowl. It is not going to accommodate the volume or variety you get out at Goldbelt but it has a place in the development. We haven't explored how that would be best proposed.

I am happy to answer questions. There are a lot of people who would like to give you their opinion.

Ms. Hood: what were the unintended negative consequences with the Goldbelt property?

Mr. Watt: With boat ramp there was a public inholding, you have motorized used on the Goldbelt property on the beach, and you have motorized use at the quarry. If it was all Goldbelt property there could be a gate at the end of the road. But there can't be a gate at the end of the road

because of the boat ramp. . As soon as you let people into that parking lot all the recreation activity is spilling into Goldbelt land.

Ms. Hood: So, basically illegal use of the land in various places.

Mr. Watts: Unsanctioned use. What the public has rights to is parking lot, boat ramp and a very small piece of land. 90% of the recreational use at the end of the road is not in that small piece of land.

Mr. Brudie: Question regarding Lemon Creek parcel and may apply to Goldbelt property, why would a motorized park preclude commercial value? Is it a significant investment of infrastructure needed?

Mr. Watt: At the Goldbelt property, I think you are looking at putting up a port-a-potty, rules, barriers – you already have a gravel pit and quarry developed, you already have roads developed, you already have play areas developed, so the Goldbelt property pretty limited infrastructure cost. (It) would be mud hole if we have OHV in there during wet time. Lemon Creek you have noise issues not a Goldbelt site, more complicated. The prospect of commercial development in Lemon Creek a real possibility in the 5 year timeframe whereas the Goldbelt Quarry it is a long range development prospect.

Mr. Brudie: Motorized use might be short term, without significant investment until higher commercial uses are planned.

Mr. Rutecki: Goldbelt being corporation – what about CBJ trading Lemon Creek for Goldbelt property, then spend \$8-12 M at 35-mile, CBJ owns, make arrangement like Field House where CBJ saves money on labor and worry about enforcement? Can that be considered?

Mr. Watt: Goldbelt has complicated issues as does CBJ, when I and another engineer met with Goldbelt we acknowledged the headache historically, but we ask them to see it as an opportunity, and how could you see something better for the future. If Goldbelt is off the table and Fish Creek is off the table, we are probably going to building the trails at 35-mile and here are the consequences for you. We were as blunt with them as we are with you. They listened, we have a board, and we would respectfully entertain proposals from CBJ but would not say we think this is easy.

Mr. Mertl: what timeline to give recommendation to assembly? Do you have a sense of what they are looking for from us? I know there is a lot of people that are going to be for and against, but I think we are not at the point yet that we can make concrete recommendations. Like you said, we went through this in 2008-2009, just so we aren't wasting time, would be great to understand the timeline to get to the Assembly. Can we do more analysis so people can make comments from things that are more justified and solidified?

Mr. Watt: You don't have a January 17 deadline - the Assembly wants to see progress, diligent effort and high on the agenda, PRAC has to keep working on it and keep trying and as long as we are doing that the assembly would be satisfied. There can't be months and months gaps of what is going on.

Mr. Wilson: Mr. Fischer, we are taking public comment tonight, but there isn't time for PRAC to dig into this and do anything other than take public comment. I see we will have to push into December.

Mr. Fischer: What the plan was - is this presentation to the PRAC and public. Public comment tonight and through email to the Parks and Rec office, wherever they feel comfortable sending it. As we get comments we will forward to PRAC and collect and in December we can have more public comment. In December we can see how the public comments are coming in and if you have enough information to make a PRAC recommendation.

Mr. Wilson: Based on the comments from Mr. Watt, the PRAC make recommendations on different time schedule like in December, one recommendation can ask the Assembly to ask the City Manager to sit down with Goldbelt and find out whether that is a real option or not. If it is that is then that is something we should pursue, and if it's not, then it shuts that door and we look at other things. PRAC could forward that recommendation to the Assembly in December.

Mr. Fischer: I recommend we take no action tonight, listen and gather information.

Mr. Landry: is there a way you can separate uses to Fish Creek Quarry, maybe just motorcycles only, and ATV's to Goldbelt to lessen the impact on both or is that not realistic?

Mr. Watt: There is a whole host of management issues that would have to be made at any of these places, but I think that clearly Fish Creek would be a narrower range of things to do – narrow range of types of vehicles and noise might be more easily able to accommodate at Goldbelt.

Mr. Wilson: One thing I saw in the Fish Creek Quarry is to allow mountain bikers and BMX to be used by motorized and non-motorized – I would like to put something in there and sit in neighbors' houses and see if there is an impact. It needs to be part of the matrix -- that needs to happen. Engineering, manager and assembly will want to know. I can't believe if there is an active quarry with blasting is there more noise?

Mr. Watts: I don't know and I don't want to speculate. In fairness, go do it. It might be helpful to understand process: at the end of day if we pursue an OHV recreation area, there will be permitting requirements. (With) 35-mile we talked about permits, for any of them there will be a conditional use permits which goes to planning commission to approve or reject – approve with conditions. In the Fish Creek Quarry in 2008 that is what happened – there was an application to the Planning Commission and they rejected it. That process is going to happen. There is a core permit process at some sites and planning commission process at all sites and then through the course of managing the site the management, it has to comply with the conditions of the use permit and the noise ordinance. The assembly is actively considering amending the noise ordinance and this would fall under that ordinance, with an additional layer of the law.

Mr. Wilson: this sounds like, even if we make recommendations, knowing how the City government treadmill works it will be next summer there will be funding requests, we will need to get the consultants back again. There will be the Army Corp permits then deciding what the public wants to doesn't want. Then goes to the Assembly or the Planning Commission and they give you or us direction to move ahead on this

Mr. Watt: My department builds stuff for you. Once the policy decision of what to build is made we are going to marshal that process, communicate with the Assembly and ride that project. All of these have long range issues, land negotiation with Goldbelt will not be fast, and permitting at the 35-mile site and rounding up that kind of money will not be fast. Fish Creek Quarry would be pretty easy to implement that smaller concept of motocross track but have a contractor using through the summer. Lemon Creek has similar sorts of issues.

Mr. Wilson: Please hand up the sign-up and take public testimony. Thank you Rorie.

## VI. Public Comment – OHV Park.

Dave Hanna, 11495 Mendenhall Lake Rd. I have been here as ‘motorhead’ for 50 years. I am not going to spend a lot of time talking about the educational opportunities, the career opportunities, the recreational opportunities, and how wonderful it is to get kids off computers and out riding. Instead I want to talk about what we listened to tonight. You heard a really good presentation by Mr. Watt, very comprehensive –but there are two things: one of the most important, you heard a lot of things about cost – there are costs don’t have to be incurred. There is a huge amount of interest among earth moving contractors willing to donate time and equipment to build these facilities. I know you say talk is cheap, we say we will go and do and then it doesn’t happen, but we have proven it can be done – we have parking lot and trails for snow machines access done with volunteer labor, volunteer equipment and cheap materials. We can do it again if you give us a place to build one of these we can get it done. We have tools, equipment, expertise, and manpower, and we can maintain it. These can easily happen if you give us a place to do it. I have one other thing I would like to touch on, and that is the possibility of an alternate “E”. I am going to pass this on down (handout). Basically I had a conversation with the one of owners of “the pond” while lies behind the police station, today, and those people would be interesting in talking with the City about the possibility of siting a riding area there - it has a lot of things going for it. It’s basically a gravel pit that is being filled back in right now. It is very centrally located, AND it has police station right next door to keep an eye on it. How much better over-site can we get of a riding area than having the police station right there? I would encourage you to encourage City staff to get together and meet with those land owners and see about the possibility of some sort of a land trade for all or part of that. They told me they wanted to retain part of it, but there is large area there, 10 or 15 acres could be available for riding area and it would be a great asset for the community. With that I will let you go.

Mr. Wilson: thank you, any questions for Mr. Hanna?

Ms. Hood: Isn’t that land being considered for mitigation for a refuge? I forgot the name of the organization? SEAL Trust?

Mr. Mertl: What area exactly are you looking at? (Mr. Wilson points at map handout.) OK understood.

Mark Smith, 9596 Wolf Ram Way. I have been riding motorcycle since I was a young kid, moved from out of state. Areas are usually places that become something else so if you have area that you say is going to be developed, people have usually ridden there – gravel pits, rock quarries. We don’t need a place that is permanent if we can have a place and move around, that could be an option. I was involved with southeast dirt riders back in the 80’s when we had rock dump, we were able to use that area. It was privately owned land that seems to work the best. There was a large group of people that wanted to do it. There is a need for it, I am glad to see we are looking at it from a perspective that it is no longer something that we might want to do but is something necessary to do, there is a large group of people here that want to do this. Two groups – motorcycles and four-wheelers. The areas can be the same but sometimes they conflict. Motorcycle people want a motocross area – a small area set area that can be changed internally from week to week. The four- wheelers like a bigger open area with fire roads and things like that. The 35-mile site is good idea – out the road and won’t bother anyone, but building trails cost a lot of money. I don’t know who came up with idea of building trails and everyone wants to trail rides,

but if you talk to the off road vehicle riders here there is not many of them that thought trail riding is what they are looking for. Some of the areas have been shut, use to ride to Mendenhall Glacier, Dredge Lake, Montana Creek, places that were open but now are closed. A temporary area is a good area – behind the prison, the City has a gravel pit back there. Years ago we asked if we could ride back there and the answer was no we are going to be using that for something, we are going to have a gravel pit, We could have had a place to ride for 5-6- 10 years, and then revisit it then. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you Mr. Smith, questions for Mr. Smith? (No response.)

Craig Orsborn, 84838 Thunder Mountain Road. I would like to, first of all, express my opposition to proposed area at 35-mile simply of the fact of because of the money/value involved in that. We all know that if that was to go out and ask tax payers of Juneau to put up a million dollars to build an off road operating area, the opposition would be beyond extreme. I think the Goldbelt area out there has a lot more potential to it. If you start talking millions of dollars and you bring people into a room and start to offer up some numbers I bet you would see a serious attitude change on that. Another quick aspect I want to put in here and I am not sure on this, there was discussion early on the Goldbelt property out at Echo Cove being destroyed by off-road riding. My understanding, and I could be wrong on this too, is that Goldbelt property comes down to the edge of the high water mark, anything below the high water mark on down is considered State land, which is also considered patented and unpatented land. 98% of all off-road riding is done on the sand out there at the sand point out there. The off-road riding out there has done on the beach are which is State land and which is not Goldbelt land. I just want to put that in, and like I said I may be wrong on that. Like Mr. Smith said earlier there was a lot of different places I have been able to ride that have been closed down, I like the idea of even if there is a temporary spot, that relieves some congestion at any one point. It is going to make a big difference right now everything is 100% “no”, so if there is a “yes” in there somewhere I think you are going to see a big attitude change. That is all I really wanted to put in.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, Mr. Orsborn - questions? (no response) Thank you very much.

Ron Berg, 10725 Horizon Dr. (Bayview Subdivision Mile 8 North Douglas Hwy.) I strongly oppose development of a motorized park along Fish Creek Road. The proposed site is already used by residents of that neighborhood. They walk their dogs, go berry picking, watch birds, bicycling, put their kids in little carts and go along that quarry road. It is already used by the neighbor for values which make the neighborhood just great. I have been there for 17 years in that neighborhood and pretty much used a lot of those areas every single day. I hope OHV riders can find a place to ride. I know it is important to them as well as their community at large, but Fish Creek is not that area. I find that the neighborhood values are constant, they are used. The whole idea of trying to come up with an area that doesn't have a lot of noise just doesn't work. You can put a monitoring machine out there and detect any noise. I happen to be one of those people that just appreciate having quiet. I don't want to go out there and listen to any kind of noise, not even one decibel. So those are my values. How can a small group of OHV riders expect the City at large to throw those values out to further the use of OHV riders? I hope they find a place to ride, but there are a lot of North Douglas people that have the types of concerns as me. Looking at the way this took off for years, it was really some battles meeting after meeting and I suspect that will repeat all over again. Thank you Mr. Chairman, those are my comments.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you Mr. Berg, any questions? (no response)

Fred Hiltner, 9601 North Douglas Hwy. I would like to thank you for opportunity to testify. Because I would like to say first I feel strongly that Fish Creek area is still a fatally flawed proposal, to go back and revisit what was turned down by the Planning Commission several years ago. I respect Mr. Watt's very well rounded explanations of the issues but the saying that comes to mind is let's not make a silk purse out of sows ear. In 2009 the application was denied by Planning Commission again, it was a different plan than would likely go forward from this committee, but I really recommend that you read that entire report from commission because it talked a lot about the noise. The noise was tested; very good noise testing reports that came out of that, what was found at that time was that one off-road vehicle came to the standards of the limitations of the Juneau regulations, the noise standards. And more than one at the same time surpassed that standard. I believe that noise testing was done inside the quarry that will be important to look at. It is such a tiny area too; I think your proposal says 3 acres or less than 3 acres. It is an absolutely tiny area. Last time we met here, years back, the ORV group said that even the 240 acres at Dredge Lake was too small, and I think that is important to consider when we starting thinking about trying to squeeze a lot of people into that small area at Fish Creek. The ORV Park is not compatible with the traditional recreational use of this area, including deer hunting, hiking, skiing, snow shoeing, bird watching. Last time there were no funds that were planning on being dedicated to manage and protect the area there. It appeared that if that was allowed to be used for ORV's it would be self-policing type of activity out there, which has not worked very well in the past. The history of ORV use in our area has been one of being difficult to impossible to contain users within a designated ORV area. I say that with all respect to people in this room having used those, including myself, that it is not you but a few people can really ruin it for a lot of other people. That was the case out at Goldbelt and also at Dredge Lake where the Forest Service found that it impossible to contain the riders within the designated areas, and found they couldn't afford to maintain reasonable security to have riders out there. I feel it would be a huge step backwards to put residents through the process of revisiting Fish Creek Rd as an option for OHV use. I recommend that we try to move forward for a location that is not in a quiet recreation area, but one that is large enough, away from quiet neighborhoods, away from virgin muskeg, and traditional quiet recreational use, where the temptation to go out onto the pristine muskeg will not be too tempting to reasonably assume that the area will not be ruined. How many of you would be willing to bet that will not happen in Fish Creek area. I think it will be tough to assume that. The noise testing has already been done. Again, I hope you will take a look at that. I am hoping that rather than using our resources to go back to battle the 3 acres of motocross area, how about a committee to keep searching for a really reasonable area that has got the size, away from neighborhoods. I can just imagine that rather than going to battle again, if we could concentrate on the process now, get the NH groups together from all the neighborhoods as well as the OHV people and really put our heads together, and work towards finding an area that is less controversial. 35 miles does seem like a long way to go but there has got to be a better place if we put our heads together. I think we could find a place that would be compatible.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, questions for Mr. Hiltner? (no response).

Josh Anderson, 8544 North Douglas Highway. I am president of Juneau Motocross Association and want to say thank to City to continue to work on this project, it means a lot to myself and all of the OHV riders. I am favor of Mr. Hanna's new location, site E tonight, I think that is an excellent idea. Our group doesn't require a lot of infrastructure and/or size of property. Most of the big tracks down in America, or even on TV are contained within the size of football field or a few acres. We can rearrange our track; basically change our trail system, if you like, weekly like Mr. Smith said. Noise can be contained within the rock walls because we would never need to leave the quarry itself. We could easily put a fence around quarry; it's a small, small area. As far as

containment of keeping people outside of quarry, who is to say someone couldn't take a four-wheeler off North Douglas Highway, or downtown Juneau, and drive off into the trees. So you are never going to stop everybody – if they want to do it, they can. Electrical power is already in that area, there is a power pole that goes right down the rock quarry road and feeds the cell tower there. Local electric companies are willing to donate earth moving equipment and electrical time and supplies to provide power for security cameras, lights or anything of that nature that would need to be put in there, so that things like this would impact the City budget for lighting or anything like that. A lot of the riders live in North Douglas area and could maintain the track as well as, opening and closing the area. Urge you to help us keep looking for places. We have limited areas where we can ride, where everyone else has Juneau and all of Southeast Alaska for quiet places to go. At the rock quarry everyone sits in their rifles there. They are digging rocks out of there too. Another point is the rock quarry could still expand. They could be pulling gravel out of there and the City could be generating money while we have a track, inside the rock quarry. We could take care of little kid's needs as well as our own because, again, we don't need but 3-4 acres to do what we need to do. It doesn't bother us if loaders are pulling rocks out of the quarry right next to us because there is plenty of room there. So, that way the City is not impacted, losing money in the quarry because we can share it with contractors.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, questions for Mr. Anderson?

Mr. Brudie: May you know, is there a BMX contingent in Juneau?

Mr. Anderson: Yes, there is a small one. A lot of them have what they call punk tracks in back yards, or even out at the Goldbelt spot there are make shift tracks where they use their momentum to make jumps. For what we do, there is a lot of room to make motocross track and a small kids' dirt bike track and get them going. My daughter is 3 years old and she already rides in my yard, so I don't need a lot of room for little kids. It would be easy to squeeze some BMX guys in there, no problem. I also want to mention we have 312 members in the club and growing every day and we are all pulling for it, so thank you.

Mr. Wilson: thank you Mr. Anderson.

Denise McPherson, 10738 Horizon Dr, which is off North Douglas. I think there has been a lot of good testimony here this evening and I appreciate the opportunity to speak, as well. To confirm what Mr. Watt was saying, yes, you have opened an old wound yet again, and I am very disappointed that I have to be back here and I understand why I do. I do think that there are some good opportunities to take advantage of but I am going to really, really push for you to stop considering the Fish Creek Quarry. We have gone over this, and over this, and over this and there is testimony before me as to why we should not use that area. I am here to say, please respect the time and effort that went in to previous testimonies and studies, and do your homework and read that before you ask the people again to do all the testimony, the painful testimony yet again. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson: That was quick! Questions for Ms. McPherson? (no response) I got an email from you today and I will make sure it is in the record. Ms. McPherson: Thank you.

Jack Query, 8866 North Douglas Highway. I lived there since 1983. My wife and I enjoy the neighborhood we live in, we enjoy the quiet there. One of the things we do a lot is walk up that road and spend time up there picking berries, occasionally I hunt up there. I like to ride my bicycle up there and it is really nice place, the way it is. I think it will change drastically with a motocross

track there. I have no idea about the noise levels, but I know when I am sitting inside my house and my neighbor is testing his snow mobile, it is very audible inside my house - about a quarter mile away. It is a place a lot of us enjoy and I hate to see it become a noisy place, I wouldn't go there anymore. I have had that happen at other places in Juneau, places I used to enjoy that I can't use anymore. I would like for you to consider that as you go through your alternatives. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you very much, questions? (No response.)

Jill Sullivan, 9371 North Douglas Highway at the base of Fish Creek Road, 3 driveways towards town. I wasn't really prepared to speak tonight, I apologize. But most of the North Douglas residents have already spoke up and I whole heartedly agree with everything they are saying. I oppose the Fish Creek Quarry development for motocross or any type of motor use. The noise really echoes throughout the whole valley. I use the area quite often, just like the gentleman before me, I walk up the road quite a bit, ride my bike, take my daughter up there, I ski, we hike, all those things. I agree, I think it would really, really change the area in a negative way – not just for people who live there, but for people from the Valley, or Lemon Creek, or Downtown that use that area as well. I agree that it feels like it is opening up an old wound. I have to say it was very stressful in 2009 for my family and my neighbors. I feel it coming on again. I ask you to take a look at those letters that were written to the City in 2009 and you can feel how people opposed in whole heartedly.

Mr. Wilson: Ms. Sullivan thank you for coming out tonight – you are very brave. Any questions (no response.)

Kent Sullivan, 9371 North Douglas Highway. I appreciate opportunity to address you tonight. This proposal, while certainly it is understood that there needs to be a place for OHV riders to use within Juneau, the problem with what is being suggested here, in my opinion, is the Fish Creek Quarry again. We already addressed this. The last time this took place there was over two years of hearings, and two years of proposals, that were taken back, and done over, and resubmitted. I can't count the number of times I appeared here and testified, again and again. There were studies done, there were noise studies done, and there were experts retained on the issue of noise. The North Douglas community retained a consultant who testified that property values would go down in that neighborhood because of use of that quarry and the surrounding areas as an OHV Park. That is not going to change if there is a Motocross track limited to the quarry bottom. One of the other things we submitted last time was a big Power Point that demonstrated that there is not another place in the country with an OHV Park as near a close proximity to residential homes as this proposal in North Douglas. They weren't even remotely close. There were a few instances where parks were located within 1500-1800 feet of homes. In most of those instances, those were already in an industrial area, they weren't in areas like North Douglas. In most spots, places were miles away from residential homes. Placing a track out there – even a thousand feet away from homes, isn't going to make any difference. It is not going to diminish the fact that our property values will be reduced and people will be impact. We identified a case last time in which in Ohio, an OHV park that was located as far away as like 1800-3000 feet from homes, 102 land owners were successful in suing the park, enjoining their use of that park because of the high decibel level noise that was impacting their homes at their property lines. That would be the case here, this would have a big impact to property owners and their property values. I would really urge you to not consider North Douglas as a solution to this. The problem with this is, I think that 35-mile is actually, probably a good proposal, but when you tie it together with a really, really bad idea, I think you run the risk, and I think the OHV riders run the risk of

having the whole proposal fail. I wouldn't risk tying these two together and saying if we do one we have to do this one to go along with it. I would simply look at the best solution and I do not feel the best solution is North Douglas. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you. Questions for Mr. Sullivan? (no response), thank you very much.

Jim Sheehan, 1009 Ski St; right down Fish Creek Road and probably within a mile of Fish Creek Quarry. I am very much against having the OHV track out at Fish Creek. My wife and I bought our house two years ago and we did a lot of research on that area of Juneau before I bought our house. We went through and read all the back and forth between the residents of North Douglas and the planning commission and it is pretty frustrating to see that this option is open again because when we bought our house we were under the impression this it was just a done deal and wasn't going to come up again. So, it's frustrating to hear that I advocate for members of this committee to read report and really, really go through it and read it and think about it before you make decision on this issue because you are going to face a lot of – there is going to be a lot of dispute if you put this out at Fish Creek. I think that just based on that report, and the information you can find CBJ website about what happened a few years ago, you should probably add \$500K to option C because there is going to be litigation. And it's not going to be just at the Planning Commission level, its going to be Assembly, and go to the Superior Court, and its going to be appeals to the Supreme Court so you have to take that into consideration when you are making your decisions.

Mr. Wilson: That's it? Questions? (no response) Thank you very much.  
Virginia Stonkus? She had to leave?  
Bruce Tenney? He's gone?

Neil Michem, 1737 Horizon Dr. that is out in Bayview. I testified back in 2008 or 2009 and I will continue to testify. First off I would like to say that: put in an OHV Park in a residential area violates the first rule of holes: if you not familiar with the first rule of holes it's simply this: if you are in one stop digging. I do think that the OHV riders do need a place to ride I think that putting it a residential area is a really bad idea. The two examples that I gave last time, back in 2008 or 2009, my wife and I had traveled down to the state of Oregon, and if you travel just south of Florence, on the Oregon coast they have a beautiful recreation area with all sorts of ATV riders and so on and so forth. Wonderful area, after riding through it, a guy from Minnesota and I were talking, he and I both looked at each other and said "beautiful thing to do but glad its not in my back yard. Another thing is with regards to the motocross park, there is a motocross park in and around the Portland area, it sits right next to a golf course. I played a round of golf there and I have to tell you it was one of the most un-enjoyable rounds of golf I have had in my life. The farthest point away from the motocross was about a mile away, you could still hear them. I am wondering if there might be other options out there as well. For example I know the City is interested in developing the back side of Douglas, and I am wondering, why that is not being explored. Also you have the summertime use around Eaglecrest, I am sure it would piss off a lot of people if you did ATV and OHV riders up there as well, however, you have a huge parking lot in that area, so that solves some of the problems these guys are looking for. Over all I think that one of the things you guys really need to do is kind of sit back and take a look. Look at the picture behind you and remind yourselves of why we are all here. If you notice there is no motorized vehicles allowed on that lake, there are no motorized vehicles allowed on that lake for a reason, one is that it makes a lot of noise. That is all for now.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you Neil, any questions (no response).

Merry Ellefson, 8170 North Douglas. I do want to thank Rorie for his presentation and I just kind of want to give you more information, he asked for that, for you. I did send my letter today, but I strongly oppose any development of a motorized park off the Fish Creek Road as well as one near any neighborhood in Juneau. I have been a very active member of my neighborhood association for twenty years. I strive in many ways to promote safety and enhance North Douglas for neighbors, for our kids, and for all those who recreate in that area. So, a couple of ideas I want to share: number 1 is the proposal for motorized use again flies in the face of what is important to those of us who have made North Douglas our home. And which is stated in the Comp Plan, which I think I forwarded last night, quote unquote predominantly rural. Additionally, the Comp Plan follows principals, one of which is to maintain the identity of our neighborhoods. And as inferred tonight Fish Creek is part of our neighborhood. Like Jay said, like several people said, we walk there, we take our dogs there, we hike, and we jog every day. And have you have a hard job, because I noticed NOHVCC report states that the first principal in managing an OHV park is to provide for the riders needs and you need to balance that with needs of our neighborhood. We live there. So we also talked about our homes and the noise related to our homes, but I am here to say that a motorized park is grossly incompatible with the recreation that already occurs on Fish Creek Road and this area. And I suspect that many of you spend time, I bet hundreds of people from Juneau spend time here in the area because it is quiet and it is scenic, and it's an escape. Again, we bike, walk the dog, berry pick, and for those of us that are more adventurous, we venture to Fish Creek Trail from quarry. We find space alone which is a rare treat in Juneau in the summer. And we do this at the same time as the proposed time for the motocross park, which is after work and on weekends. I want you to consider that if you, the PRAC, are looking at this you are going to negatively impact all the Juneau recreationists with one incompatible, single use OHV Park. Again, Rorie is right; I am frustrated to be sitting here again. I understand the report is a little bit different but how about you guys talk with Planning Commission and go through the testimony. I don't want to be sitting here again in 2 to 3 years. Ten or 14 years ago when I was working on the Comp Plan and giving feedback I asked that we have a simple park here, at the quarry and a place where our kids to learn how to bike. The quarry was much smaller then so I asked for picnic tables and we would build the trails. So tonight I would like to offer a proposal to turn the quarry into a multi-use year-round park for families and put in compatible recreation opportunities so that a collateral project between the neighborhood association, the free-wheelers association, the Nordic Ski Club, the Audubon Society and some trails for snowshoers. Let's just make something out of it with the uses that are already happening there. Rorie talked about management and it was interesting, Josh, that you are here – I am your neighbor, kind of, because I really think that the testimony from 5 years ago is relevant, and encourage you to read that, but I had a frustrating (experience) that happened since then. About 3 years ago my husband and I were walking around Hendrickson Park, which is behind us which is at 5.6 to 6 mile there. It is a natural park with non-motorized use. I am going to finish quickly, but I saw ATV tracks out there ripping up the area. So I followed the tracks to the wet lands. I called the City, I called Fish and Game, I talked to the Wetlands Refuge Manager but there is no staff or state patrol to enforce the rules. So one day in the spring of 2012 I found an ATV stuck in the snow in this non-motorized park, and I followed the tracks to the house. I called the City again, I was asked to go out on my snowshoes and take photos. Because I couldn't produce evidence, and there was no one available to enforce to protect their habitats and their parks. The impact of these illegal users still exists. And I know I really believe that OHV group deserves a place but it's not compatible with the neighborhood or the other people that use this. So thank you for your time.

Mr. Wilson: Are there any questions (no response). Thank you for your time. Any members of the public like to testify, this is your chance. I see a hand, lady in pink and gentleman you are second. Could you state your first name and spell your last name.

Kristine Lowry, 17215 Andreanoff Dr. I apologize; I didn't come here to do this tonight. And I feel for all of these people, I wouldn't want it in my back yard either, but we have 4 four wheelers, we spend a lot of money and time taking our vacations out of town to places that we can enjoy our hobby. I have two teenage boys, that like was said by somebody I want them off their computers, out of the technology, and enjoying outdoors. I disagree with whoever said: it isn't in our background, sure it is. This town has enough room for all of us to enjoy our hobbies and this has been going on forever. I have been living here for 21 years, and my kids are going to be gone before we ever figure it out. I really, really beg you to help us find a place that is somewhere we can all live happily ever after but enjoy what we want to do. I know other communities have done it , we can do it too. So please help us figure this out and in a more timely manner. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson, Questions for Ms. Lowry? (no response). Thank you.

Richard Behunika, 8939 Afton Court. I have lived on North Douglas for a while. It is beautiful place, I missed the meetings on opposing the quarry, but I don't think it's a huge issue out there. It doesn't seem like - it seems like trucks, blasting, moving rock that would also be noisy. Also it wouldn't affect snow-shoeing or skiing, any of that summertime activity, so I don't think that be an issue either. We do need a place to ride. I think that is a perfect spot for motocross track. Another issue is that I feel like the motocross track and the trails are two different issues that need to be addressed separately, almost. I don't know if that has been thought of but I do think it is separate. I think trails are cool, I think most people would like to see a motocross track. It is something that can be done with lots of volunteers, lot of equipment, and time. I think it would be a very cost effective thing, I mean I don't think it would be a big deal to put in a motocross track within 3 acres – Perfect! The rock walls it seems they would block noise, but maybe we need to do a noise test, I think that is a good idea too. I think the Option E is also a great idea; I guess there is no one that really knows a whole lot about, but I think that is something to look in to. We need to get something going, it would be better to have everybody in one spot instead of everywhere. I agree they do tear stuff up, not saying they don't, but at least if you get one spot where everybody can go then it seems like it will solve an issue. Does the highway put off noise, or is that a quiet thing? I don't think you live on the Highway if you want to live somewhere quiet. Maybe I am wrong, cars like Subaru are pretty quiet. That's it for me.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, any questions? (no response)

Red Langel, (no address given) I live in the valley. I want to bring up the fact that there is tons of activity that these people in North Douglas were concerned about and I don't want to say one place is better than the other. North Douglas is great, out the road is great. However, we do need a place. I don't know if anyone looked at the option that it could be a dual purpose. We are talking about a lot of summertime activities. There are people who use snow machines; there is no reason that a snow machine couldn't use the same track a motorcycle used in the summer. You guys need to keep in mind that we might seem like a small voice because everybody is very vocal about their trail walking, and their snow shoeing and their berry picking. They have the opportunity to do that anywhere in Juneau. We don't have the opportunity to do our stuff, really, legally, anywhere. It is very important that you put some effort in to this because in talking with people I know who don't own motorcycles or four-wheelers or anything, the reason – I am told – they don't most of the time, is because there is no place to ride. There are businesses that

would benefit from people having those types of off road vehicles. I have six motorcycles at my house. I have a 7 year old who lives to ride. My wife rides, I ride, my older boy rides if there's a place to ride.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you, any questions? (no response). This is it we are going to close testimony. Does anyone else want to testify? With that we will close public testimony;

Discussion

5 minute break

## VIII. New Business

A. Invasive Plant Species – John Hudson, USFW, Habitat restoration biologist. What invasive plants are and the scope in Juneau and specific infestation and partnership and what we are doing now.

Invasive Plant: non-native species which introduction does... harm to human health. Bohemian knot weed stand; cause economic harm to the country \$34B to US per year, Jordan Creek, weed canary grass highly invasive. Creates change in habitat. All over the state, with 80 species in Juneau. Infestation means a discrete patch of invasive plants. (this map) Shows distribution where known infestation in Juneau. Good at taking advantage of disturbed habitats. Kaxdigoowu Heen dei Trail: (Brotherhood Bridge) large red canary grass infestation and going to move into the meadow where the fireweed meadow is in trouble. Outcompete and displace most other plants. If you look you will find it in the middle of the fireweed meadow. It will expand and outcompete. What is FW doing? Two years partnered with Conservation District in Montana Creek watershed and figure out what plants are in there. Inventory: 6 acres of infestation, bohemian, orange knot weed – pulled organ knot weed and ornamental jewelry and herbicide to knot weed, and canary grass. We do a lot to protect scenery and habitat. Nancy Street wetland, old gravel pit, did some pond work, native plants, a creative wetland in place of dangerous water pit. Hand herbicide to get rid of infestation. Cat tails have been planted there, from mid-west. A good partnership between Fish & Wildlife and CBJ for funding and in-kind help to work on infestation.

Mr. Wilson: After you spray and kill what happens to root mass, do you have to replant?

Mr. Hudson: We will let vegetation move in and cover at Montana Creek. The Kax Trail infestation will have to be reseeded.

Mr. Brudie: Do you dial herbicide to that species?

Mr. Hudson: General herbicide with correct concentration. Best we can to apply to specific vegetation.

Mr. Brudie: Bohemian knotweed is hybrid can grow 15 feet under pavement, can come back from dormancy.

Ms. Gilmour: So homes above Statter Harbor and has been there two years, breaking through barriers with tarps over the yards.

Mr. Hudson: Herbicide and two year process. Used in Twin Lakes area.

MR. Mertl: Does CBJ P&R inventory and catalog these?

Mr. Fischer: We would love to partnership and grants, it is important in several areas if we don't attack now it will be a real problem.

Mr. Hudson: Comes free, and will discuss park areas for management.

Mr. Brudie: City streets? Does DOT manage?

Mr. Fischer: I don't believe so. They would ask P&R staff because of business we are in. I don't have any information from them if they have asked.

Mr. Hudson: Root structure does not hold.

Mr. Wilson: Ask Mr. Hudson to coordinate with P&R Director so that we can use resources.

## VII. Unfinished Business (continued)

B. CIP and 1% sales tax Scheduling – George Schaaf. We just drafted up a list and turned into Engineering, tried to figure out when and how to work on these projects. We won't receive 1% until FY16 (starting July 2015). Grant dependent projects and higher priorities:

- Cope Park project;
- Twin Lakes ADA projects;
- Arboretum applying for matching grants;
- Riverside Rotary;
- Capital School Park;
- OHV Park;
- Treadwell Mine Historic Park

Assembly looks at funding and comes up with six year plan.

Mr. Wilson: Does that list show the current CIP or 1%?

Mr. Schaaf: This list is CIP we will receive.

Mr. Landry: Was the Kaxdigoowu Heen dei Trail part of the CIP funding?

Mr. Schaaf: Money being parceled out, we cannot use until it is collected, then allocated out to projects. Trail projects are quite small compared to other projects and lumped into one group of trail projects.

Mr. Wilson: Montana Creek? Is that 2016?

Mr. Schaaf: Trail Mix is solid booked for next two years; they wouldn't be available to start before 2016.

Mr. Brudie: OHV planning a previous expense.

Mr. Schaaf: The assembly funding as part of the 1% Sales Tax.

MR. Brudie: That is not specific to 35-mile?

Mr. Schaaf: No

## C. Cope Park Master Plan – George Schaaf, P&R

Final draft of Master Plan of Cope Park with Corvus and Park staff, Phase I removing old structures (picnic shelter, old bathrooms, foundations for pool being removed, rock walls, added rock for drainage, scraped with new field surfacing material, end maybe over the Nov 15 with outfield fence. Home plate will be moved. Dog owners will have fenced off area and still be baseball field. Phase two for temporary fund FY 16: new parking lot; tennis courts moved. This was reviewed by Police Dept. site lines open, lots of good lighting and reduce "hidey holes"; two new picnic shelters, available for rental with fireplace. First-come-first-served shelter by Gold Creek. Also new swings, new play equipment, a pathway through the park with lighting for a lot of positive use in the park. Swings! This spring to be a feature of the park.

Mr. Wilson: Thank you to the staff, and Mr. Mertl – this is the most impressive park we have undertaken. Are we going to replace waterline?

Mr. Schaaf: Working with water utility and new waterline from Gold Creek to pump house, road will torn up and replaced. Combining their project with ours.

Mr. Brudie: Old historic areas available or outside the scope of the park.

Mr. Schaaf: They are working on a path to the flume and some other design improvements and interpretive signage because of things coming in under bid. The ice rink will be a grass roots neighborhood effort.

VII. New Business continued:

B. Riverside Rotary Park Improvements (Glacier Valley Rotary Club): George Schaaf - Want to let PRAC know that Glacier Valley Rotary Club wants to hear of proposed improvements to the Rotary Park. They applied for grant (approx. \$9K) and that plan changed and wanted to know if we could use it. He met with representatives. Some things proposed: pressure wash, sand and repaint playground structures; vegetation management on pathway and 9/11 Memorial and new sand around playground. ADA observation platform to water edge.

- Ms. Gilmour: I live right across the street – concerned about observation platform and children vandalism. Anyone thought of cleaning that pond out?
- Mr. Schaaf: Limited ability. No plan for plants. Looked at aquatic herbicide.
- Mr. Fischer: We have been working with Airport – has aquatic weed harvester may be option.
- Ms. Hood: I like the observation deck idea, hope there would be a bench as part of it.
- Mr. Wilson: I would support anything they can do for \$9K and coordinate with P&R. That parks needs love.

IX. Committee, Liaison, and/or Staff Reports

A. Chair's Report, Jeff Wilson: Please start reading the Comp Plan for discussion.

B. P&R Director's Report, Brent Fischer: Welcome to Mr. Wanamaker, bringing his years of experience.

C. Liaison to the Assembly Report, Randy Wanamaker: Assembly last night adopted a Comprehensive Plan with discussion, unanimous. Assembly let people know want to be involved in updating the next Comp Plan, participate and set guidance, rather than reacting. Plan is simplified, readable and provides guidance. The Assembly set its Strategic Goals: a list has been distributed: 16 goals with high priority – housing (funding is difficult issue to meet worthy goals) need to develop solutions; what can be done for recreation w/in limited means available;

- Bio-solids have to be decided by December, the clock runs out. Need long term solutions;
- Economic Development Plan by professionals that can look beyond and map out goals and action items for the assembly to take that are meaningful to the City, sustainable and increase economic base to support the base and help the City carry on;
- Deferred Maintenance – maintaining recreation facilities and parks, increasing budget. Looked in a holistic way – Asset Management Plan. Parks, water, waste, streets, airport, docks and harbors. Costs that we have to deal with and inventory. Need to take care of what we have in a responsible way.

Mr. Wilson: Parking what is happening?

Mr. Wanamaker: I cannot speak to it at this time.

Mr. Wilson: How many buildings does P&R maintain?

Mr. Fischer: 30 P&R buildings, all fire stations, police, City hall, parts of municipal way buildings, libraries, some D&H and PW facility. Talking about Asset Management - where the assembly is spending. Each department is making presentations to the Finance Committee and he will make one next week. We have a long list for deferred maintenance. We work with Engineering on that list. Assembly wants that information and I appreciate the opportunity to present that information.

Mr. Wanamaker: 1% the Assembly hears from public, some things start further out. Some people are organized and thoughtful, the Library staff are very diligent and asking the City to consider \$7M now in order to get matching funds for their project.

Ms. Hood: Thank you for giving us an informative and detailed liaison report.

D. Lands Committee, Jeff Wilson: Deferred.

E. Youth Activity Board, Tom Rutecki: Nothing to report.

F. Aquatic Facilities Advisory Board, Kate Walters: Announce "Swims-giving" is 11/18-24, can bring items for admission discount. DPAC High dive is closed, under safety review by Risk Management until further notice. Region 5 State Champ meet, ASAA coming.

G. State Parks Board/Trail Mix, Gerry Landry: State Parks trails are closing, State Parks closing. Gruening and Wickersham news coming. Eagle Beach campground is closed. Trail Mix: I have tickets to auction 11/23, dinner and auction, only two tickets left. Juneau trails plan with four agencies, Forest Service, State Parks, City and DNR talking to update the trails plan. Wilson/Landry will bring info to PRAC so that we can work to form subcommittees to work with agencies.

H. Juneau Urban Forestry Partnership, Chris Mertl: Nothing to report.

I. Jensen-Olson Arboretum Board, Kate Walters: Nothing to report.

J. Eaglecrest Board/Nordic Ski Club, Odin Brudie: Nothing to report.

Mr. Wilson: I went to the Eaglecrest Learning Center presentation tonight – building out to bid in spring, open by next December.

K. Juneau Sports Association, Tracie Gilmour: Nothing to report.

X. Other Business:

Mr. Landry: Is there a Comp Plan process?

Mr. Fischer: Please give me and Mr. Wilson your comments. This is collaborated effort with PRAC. It is critical to have a public process; we need to ask what does the public want? It will be the last component before we finish Plan to move to Assembly.

Ms. Hood: I thought the Comp Plan was approved by the Assembly.

Mr. Fischer – What we are doing is the Comp Plan for P&R, the Assembly approved their Comp Plan and our Comp Plan is referenced in it.

Mr. Brudie: It would be nice to have a roundtable for PRAC members to talk after public comment like tonight. I would like to request a copy of the OHV report from 2008-2009 Planning Commission. I want to acknowledge the proposed Fish Creek Park.

XI. ADJOURNMENT at 9:15 p.m.

Respectfully submitted by Fran Compton, P&R Administrative Assistant II

NEXT MEETING – December 3, 2013