

From: [Kevin Elliott](#)
To: [City Clerk](#)
Subject: Public commentary on VTIF's 12/06 meeting
Date: Sunday, December 15, 2019 4:59:26 PM

EXTERNAL E-MAIL: BE CAUTIOUS WHEN OPENING FILES OR FOLLOWING LINKS

I have a few comments on the Visitor Industry Task Force's December meeting that I would like to share:

I disagree with Mr. Bryson's comments stating that CBJ "cannot just put a hard limit" on the number of visitors and "that's just not something we can do". Municipalities and governments put "hard limits" on plenty of things: liquor licenses per square mile, the number of fishery permits given out, the number of Denali Park road lottery, etc. I realize that regulating industry in this way is often tricky and can lead to unintended consequences but I don't think its fair to say to that it's just not something we can do.

I would also like to point out that while the Passenger Head Tax funds many city services, (as Mr. Bryson states, "tourism pays a lot of our bills"), the legal status of many of those services are now called into doubt due to CLIA's lawsuit. I think the potential exists for a similar case to be filed in the future and if a ruling is made it seems likely that the City will lose and the public will end up subsidizing those services via property taxes. I'm not trying to understate the positive economic impact that tourism has on our community but I think it's important to remind ourselves that much of the Passenger Head Tax comes with significant strings attached and I would not at all be surprised to see a future ruling greatly curtail the city's already limited use of that money.

I think its important to keep the Downtown Waterfront Plan closed and see it through to its implementation but also recognize it's limitations. It does not address the area-wide impacts of tourism in places like Auke Bay, Mendenhall Glacier, North Douglas/Eaglecrest and it as Mrs. Elfers stated is not "a management or policy plan ... it is an infrastructure plan". Infrastructure is only one piece of this puzzle.

I believe that a great outcome for the VITF would be to develop a "destination management plan" detailing how CBJ wants to manage the growth of high volume cruise ship tourism in terms of policy: Do we want to encourage growth or discourage growth? What means to do we legally have at our disposal to even do that? Do we want to increase our capture of fees/taxes/funds or not? Do we want increase the head tax? Or berthing fees? Do we develop zoning and permitting structure that incentives mixed use or not?

Thank you all for your time and work on this issue.

Kevin Elliott
Juneau AK