

Dear Visitor Industry Task Force:

Having lived in Juneau for almost 50 years, I have seen our town go through a lot of changes: Some good, some bad. Having made that declaration, I'll add that I have also learned that one person's vision of good is another's perspective of lousy.

That said, I've made a number of mental concessions to what I experience as the negative impacts of the tourism industry with the understanding that some folks are benefitting from the economic stimulation and we are also sharing the beauty of Southeast Alaska with visitors from all over the world. I've rationalized the annoying helicopter noise (I live 1/8 mile from a heliport), commercialization of local trails, the transformation of the South Franklin neighborhood to Disneyland and (I could go on)—all to the understanding that compromise is necessary in a community so that we might all get along.

But there are some hallmarks in the history of our relationship with the cruise ship industry that have raised my ire and I daresay took a number of Juneau citizens, including our city manager, by surprise. Most recently, the Norwegian Cruise Line's bid for the subport land in order to build a new cruise ship dock was a flagrant, ostentatious display of financial bullying by offering over \$15 million over CBJ's bid. This felt to me like a rude slap in the face and I think all of us should be insulted and threatened by the message of this gesture: "We can buy you."

This should be a warning to all of us who live year round in Juneau and choose to invest our lives in our community. We need to keep in mind that Juneauites' investment is not all about financial profit—it is about maintaining our values quality of life.

I know that the Visitor Industry Task Force is aware that Juneau has been tackling our relationship with the tourism issue for a long time. Back in 2003, CBJ acknowledged the necessity of a "safety valve" that would go into effect if tourism growth or impacts exceeded acceptable levels. Our policy stated that we would develop measurable indicators when these safety valves were triggered.

The sight of diesel emissions spewing from cruise ship stacks into our clean air has raised another conundrum. Often I have wondered how does this display of pollution support the promise to our visitors of experiencing the pristine Alaskan environment? I was hopeful when the shore based power was introduced that would help ensure that air quality would be improved. Sadly, the fact that last year's drought diminished our ability to supply the hydro power necessary to provide this source of clean power seems to be another grim indicator of exceeding our "safety valve". And we know that the alternative industry solution of using "scrubbers" as a suitable way to reduce pollution is a fallacy.

I would also cite that research being done by citizen activists brings to light to the impact of "leakage" and calls into question how much of the financial benefits of the

tourist industry are seen by locals. Prudent analysis of these figures may help inform how we weigh the cost versus the benefits of the impacts of the tourist industry on our community.

More than ever, I feel that the aforementioned safety valves have been triggered. Before the Norwegian Cruise Lines threatens to expand the Disneyfication of the downtown corridor to include the Aak'w Kwáan Village District by putting in another cruise ship dock, we need to take back local control. Juneau needs to explore all avenues to actively manage the industry for the long term benefit of our community. I urge that this effort would include attempting to stop the addition of the proposed Norwegian dock.

Please let us send an emphatic message: "Juneau is not for sale."

Respectfully,
Laura Lucas
6615 North Douglas Hwy
Juneau, Alaska 99801
lucasdesign@gci.net